Zero dynamics for waves on networks [*]

Birgit Jacob [*] **Kirsten Morris** [**] **Hans Zwart** [***]

[*] *Dept. of Mathematics, Univ. of Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Germany*
[**] *Dept. of Applied Mathematics, Univ. of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada*
[***] *Dept. of Applied Mathematics, Univ. of Twente, Twente, The Netherlands*

Abstract: Consider a network with linear dynamics on the edges, and observation and control in the nodes. Assume that on the edges there is no damping, and so the dynamics can be described by an infinite-dimensional, port-Hamiltonian system. For general infinite-dimensional systems, the zero dynamics can be difficult to characterize and are sometimes ill-posed. However, for this class of systems the zero dynamics are shown to be well-defined. Using the underlying structure, simple characterizations and a constructive procedure can be obtained.

Keywords: Port-Hamiltonian system, distributed parameter systems, boundary control, zero dynamics, networks, coupled wave equations.

1. INTRODUCTION

The zeros of the transfer function of a system are well-known to be important to controller design for finite-dimensional systems; see for instance, the textbooks Doyle et al. (1992); Morris (2001). For example, the poles of a system controlled with a constant feedback gain move to the zeros of the open-loop system as the gain increases. Furthermore, regulation is only possible if the zeros of the system do not coincide with the poles of the signal to be tracked. Another example is sensitivity reduction - arbitrary reduction of sensitivity is only possible all the zeros are in the left-hand-plane. Right-hand-plane zeros restrict the achievable performance; see for example, Doyle et al. (1992) . The inverse of a system without right-hand-plane zeros can be approximated by a stable system, such systems are said to be minimum-phase.

The zero dynamics are a fundamental concept relating to the differential equation description. The zero dynamics are the dynamics of the system obtained by choosing the input u so that the output y is identically 0. This will only be possible for initial conditions in some subspace of the original subspace. For linear systems with ordinary differential equation models, the eigenvalues of the zero dynamics correspond to the zeros of the transfer function. Zero dynamics are well understood for finite-dimensional systems, and have been extended to nonlinear finite-dimensional systems Isidori (1999).

But many systems are modeled by delay or partial differential equations. This leads to an infinite-dimensional state space, and also an irrational transfer function. As for finite-dimensional systems, the zero dynamics are important. For instance, results on adaptive control and on high-gain feedback control of infinite-dimensional systems,

see (Logemann and Owens, 1987; Logemann and Townley, 1997, 2003; Logemann and Zwart, 1992; Nikitin and Nikitina, 1999, e.g.), require the system to be minimum-phase. Moreover, the sensitivity of an infinite-dimensional minimum-phase system can be reduced to an arbitrarily small level and stabilizing controllers exist that achieve arbitrarily high gain or phase margin Foias et al. (1996).

The notion of minimum-phase can be extended to infinite-dimensional systems; see in particular Jacob et al. (2007) for a detailed study of conditions for second-order systems. Care needs to be taken since a system can have no right-hand-plane zeros and still fail to be minimum-phase. The simplest such example is a pure delay. There are a number of ways to define the zeros of a system; for systems with a finite-dimensional state-space all these definitions are equivalent. However, systems with delays, or partial differential equation models have state-space representations with an infinite-dimensional state space. Since the zeros are often not accurately calculated by numerical approximations Cheng and Morris (2003); Clark (1997); Grad and Morris (2003); Lindner et al. (1993) it is useful to obtain an understanding of their behaviour in the original infinite-dimensional context. Extensions from the finite-dimensional situation are complicated not only by the infinite-dimensional state-space but also by the unboundedness of the generator A.

In this paper, we consider zero dynamics of a class of partial differential equations with boundary control. For infinite-dimensional control systems where interchanging the role of the control and the output leads to a well-posed system, calculation of the zero dynamics is straightforward. Such systems must be non-strictly proper in a very strict sense, and this assumption is generally not satisfied. For strictly proper systems, the zero dynamics can only be calculated in special cases. For systems with bounded control and observation, the zero dynamics can calculated, although they are not always well-posed Zwart (1989); Morris and Rebarber (2007, 2010). In Byrnes et al.

(1994) the zero dynamics are found for a class of parabolic systems defined on an interval with collocated boundary control and observation. However, no other results on zero dynamics for strictly proper systems with boundary control and observation are known. Here we consider an important class of these systems, port-Hamiltonian systems. Such models are derived using a variational approach and many situations of interest, in particular waves and vibrations, can be described in a port-Hamiltonian framework. In this paper it is assumed that the wave speeds are commensurate. For these systems, the zero dynamics are well-defined. Furthermore, the zero dynamics can be calculated using simple linear algebra calculations. This is illustrated with some examples.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider systems of the form

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial t}(\zeta, t) = P_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta}(\mathcal{H}x(\zeta, t)), \quad \zeta \in (0, b), t \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

$$u(t) = W_{B,1} \begin{bmatrix} x(b, t) \\ x(0, t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (2)$$

$$0 = W_{B,2} \begin{bmatrix} x(b, t) \\ x(0, t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

$$y(t) = W_C \begin{bmatrix} x(b, t) \\ x(0, t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (4)$$

where P_1 is an Hermitian invertible $n \times n$-matrix, $\mathcal{H}$ is a positive $n \times n$-matrix, and $W_B := \begin{bmatrix} W_{B,1} \\ W_{B,2} \end{bmatrix}$ is a $n \times 2n$-matrix of rank n. Such systems are said to be *port-Hamiltonian*, see Le Gorrec et al. (2005); Villegas (2007); Jacob and Zwart (2012).

The matrices $P_1 \mathcal{H}$ possess the same eigenvalues counted according to their multiplicity as the matrix $\mathcal{H}^{1/2} P_1 \mathcal{H}^{1/2}$, and as $\mathcal{H}^{1/2} P_1 \mathcal{H}^{1/2}$ is diagonalizable the matrix $P_1 \mathcal{H}$ is diagonalizable as well. Moreover, zero is not an eigenvalue of $P_1 \mathcal{H}$ and all eigenvalues are real, that is, there exists an invertible matrix S such that

$$P_1 \mathcal{H} = S^{-1} \text{diag}(p_1, \cdots, p_k, n_1, \cdots, n_l) S.$$

Here $p_1, \cdots, p_k > 0$ and $n_1, \cdots, n_l < 0$. We assume that the numbers $p_1, \cdots, p_k, -n_1, \cdots, -n_l$ are commensurate, that is, there exists a number $d \geq 0$ and $a_1, \cdots, a_k, b_1, \cdots, b_l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$p_j = a_j d, \quad j = 1, \cdots, k, \qquad n_j = -b_j d, \quad j = 1, \cdots, l.$$

Introducing the new state vector

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_+(\zeta, t) \\ x_-(\zeta, t) \end{bmatrix} = S x(\zeta, t), \qquad \zeta \in [0, b],$$

with $x_+(\zeta, t) \in \mathbb{C}^k$ and $x_-(\zeta, t) \in \mathbb{C}^l$, and writing

$$\text{diag}(p_1, \cdots, p_k, n_1, \cdots, n_l) = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \Theta \end{bmatrix},$$

where Λ is a positive definite diagonal $k \times k$-matrix and Θ is a negative definite diagonal $l \times l$-matrix, the system (2)–(4) can be equivalently written as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{bmatrix} x_+(\zeta, t) \\ x_-(\zeta, t) \end{bmatrix} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \Theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_+(\zeta, t) \\ x_-(\zeta, t) \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} \\ K_{21} & K_{22} \end{bmatrix}}_{K} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda x_+(b, t) \\ \Theta x_-(0, t) \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{21} & Q_{22} \end{bmatrix}}_{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda x_+(0, t) \\ \Theta x_-(b, t) \end{bmatrix}, (6)$$

$$y(t) = [O_{21} \; O_{22}] \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda x_+(b, t) \\ \Theta x_-(0, t) \end{bmatrix} + [R_{21} \; R_{22}] \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda x_+(0, t) \\ \Theta x_-(b, t) \end{bmatrix}, (7)$$

where $t \geq 0$ and $\zeta \in (0, b)$.

Theorem 1. Zwart et al. (2010), (Jacob and Zwart, 2012, Thm. 13.2.2 and 13.3.1). The system (5)–(7) is well-posed on $L^2([0, b]; \mathbb{C}^{n \times n})$ if and only if the matrix K is invertible.

Well-posedness implies that for every initial condition $x_0 \in L^2([0, b]]; \mathbb{C}^n)$ and every input $u \in L^2_{\text{loc}}((0, \infty); \mathbb{C}^p)$ the mild solution $\begin{bmatrix} x_+ \\ x_- \end{bmatrix}$ of the system (5)–(7) is well-defined in the state space $X := L^2([0, b]; \mathbb{C}^n)$ and the output is well-defined in $L^2_{\text{loc}}((0, \infty); \mathbb{C}^m)$. Moreover, for port-Hamiltonian systems, well-posedness implies that the system (5)–(7) is also regular, see Zwart et al. (2010) or (Jacob and Zwart, 2012, Section 13.3). Writing $[O_{21} \; O_{22}] K^{-1} = [* \; E]$ with $E \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times p}$, the matrix E equals the feedthrough operator of the system, see (Jacob and Zwart, 2012, Section 13.3). For the remainder of this paper it is assumed that K is invertible.

Definition 2. Consider the system (5)–(7) on the state space $X = L^2([0, b]; \mathbb{C}^n)$. The largest output nulling subspace is

$$V^* = \{x_0 \in X \mid \text{ there exists a } u \in L^2_{\text{loc}}((0, \infty); \mathbb{C}^p) :$$
$$\text{the mild solution of (5)–(7) satisfies } y = 0\}$$

The zero dynamics is described by the system

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{bmatrix} x_+(\zeta, t) \\ x_-(\zeta, t) \end{bmatrix} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \Theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_+(\zeta, t) \\ x_-(\zeta, t) \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad (8)$$

$$0 = \begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} \\ O_{21} & O_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda x_+(b, t) \\ \Theta x_-(0, t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ R_{21} & R_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda x_+(0, t) \\ \Theta x_-(b, t) \end{bmatrix}, (9)$$

$$u(t) = [K_{21} \; K_{22}] \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda x_+(b, t) \\ \Theta x_-(0, t) \end{bmatrix} + [Q_{21} \; Q_{22}] \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda x_+(0, t) \\ \Theta x_-(b, t) \end{bmatrix}, (10)$$

where $t \geq 0$ and $\zeta \in (0, b)$.

3. INVERTIBLE FEEDTHROUGH OPERATOR

Inspection of (8)–(10) reveals that the largest output-nulling subspace $V^* = L^2([0, b]; \mathbb{C}^n)$ has well-posed zero dynamics if and only

$$\tilde{K} := \begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} \\ O_{21} & O_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

is invertible (Theorem 1). In this case, the zero dynamics are well-posed on the entire state space.

Theorem 3. Assume that the number of inputs equals the number of outputs. Then the zero dynamics are well-posed on the entire state space if and only if the feedthrough operator of the original system is invertible.

Proof: In Section 2 we showed that the feedthrough operator E is given as

$$[O_{21} \; O_{22}] K^{-1} = [* \; E].$$

Hence if $u \neq 0$ lies in the kernel of E, then

$$[O_{21} \; O_{22}] K^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Combining this with the fact that $[K_{11}\ K_{12}]\,K^{-1} = [I\ 0]$, we obtain

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} \\ O_{21} & O_{22} \end{bmatrix}}_{\tilde{K}} K^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Thus $\tilde{K}$ is singular, which implies that the zero dynamics is not well-posed.

Assume next that $\tilde{K}$ is singular. Thus there exists non-zero $\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} \\ O_{21} & O_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

This implies that

$$K \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} \\ K_{21} & K_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z \end{bmatrix},$$

where $z \neq 0$, since K is invertible. Thus

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = K^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z \end{bmatrix}$$

Substituting thus in (11), gives

$$[O_{21}\ O_{22}]\,K^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

and thus E is not invertible. $\qquad\square$

The following example illustrates these results.

Example 1. Consider two coupled wave equations on $(0, b)$

$$\frac{\partial^2 w_1}{\partial t^2} = \frac{\partial^2 w_1}{\partial \zeta^2} \tag{12}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 w_2}{\partial t^2} = 4\frac{\partial^2 w_2}{\partial \zeta^2} \tag{13}$$

$$\frac{\partial w_1}{\partial t}(b, t) = 0 \tag{14}$$

$$\frac{\partial w_2}{\partial t}(b, t) = 0 \tag{15}$$

$$\frac{\partial w_1}{\partial t}(0, t) - \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial t}(0, t) = 0 \tag{16}$$

$$E_1\frac{\partial w_1}{\partial \zeta}(0, t) + E_2\frac{\partial w_2}{\partial \zeta}(0, t) = u(t), \tag{17}$$

with $|E_1| + |E_2| > 0$. In order to write this system as a port-Hamiltonian system, define

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} \dfrac{\partial w_1}{\partial t} & \dfrac{\partial w_1}{\partial \zeta} & \dfrac{\partial w_2}{\partial t} & \dfrac{\partial w_2}{\partial \zeta} \end{bmatrix}^T.$$

Then the system can be written

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial t}(\zeta, t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \frac{\partial x}{\partial \zeta}(\zeta, t)$$

with boundary conditions

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & E_1 & 0 & -E_2 \end{bmatrix}}_{W_B} \begin{bmatrix} w_{1t}(b, t) \\ w_{1\zeta}(b, t) \\ w_{2t}(b, t) \\ w_{2\zeta}(b, t) \\ w_{1t}(0, t) \\ w_{1\zeta}(0, t) \\ w_{2t}(0, t) \\ w_{2\zeta}(0, t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Alternatively, to diagonalize the P_1 operator, define

$$x_{+1} = w_{1t} + w_{1\zeta}$$
$$x_{+2} = w_{2t} + 2w_{2\zeta}$$
$$x_{-1} = w_{1t} - w_{1\zeta}$$
$$x_{-2} = w_{2t} - 2w_{2\zeta}.$$

The partial differential equation becomes

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{bmatrix} x_+(\zeta, t) \\ x_-(\zeta, t) \end{bmatrix} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_+(\zeta, t) \\ x_-(\zeta, t) \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

with boundary conditions

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & \dfrac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & \dfrac{E_1}{2} & \dfrac{E_2}{8} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{+1}(b, t) \\ 2x_{+2}(b, t) \\ -x_{-1}(0, t) \\ -2x_{-2}(0, t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & \dfrac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ \dfrac{E_1}{2} & \dfrac{E_2}{8} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{+1}(0, t) \\ 2x_{+2}(0, t) \\ -x_{-1}(b, t) \\ -2x_{-2}(b, t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Theorem 1 this is a well-posed system if and only if $2E_1 \neq -E_2$.

As output select

$$y(t) = \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial t}(0, t).$$

The boundary conditions for the zero dynamics are (14)–(16) plus

$$\frac{\partial w_1}{\partial t}(0, t) = 0.$$

In the diagonal representation this is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & \dfrac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{\tilde{K}} \begin{bmatrix} x_{+1}(b, t) \\ 2x_{+2}(b, t) \\ -x_{-1}(0, t) \\ -2x_{-2}(0, t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & \dfrac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{+1}(0, t) \\ 2x_{+2}(0, t) \\ -x_{-1}(b, t) \\ -2x_{-2}(b, t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The matrix $\tilde{K}$ has full rank and so the zero dynamics are defined on the original state space. Note that initial conditions in the domain of the generator stay in the domain, but domains are dense, not closed.

The transfer function for this system can be found by solving

$$s^2 \hat{w}_1(\zeta, s) = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_1}{\partial \zeta^2}(\zeta, s)$$

$$s^2 \hat{w}_2(\zeta, s) = 4 \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_2}{\partial \zeta^2}(\zeta, s)$$

$$\hat{w}_1(b, s) = 0$$

$$\hat{w}_2(b, s) = 0$$

$$\hat{w}_1(0, s) - \hat{w}_2(0, s) = 0$$

$$E_1 \frac{\partial \hat{w}_1}{\partial \zeta}(0, s) + E_2 \frac{\partial \hat{w}_2}{\partial \zeta}(0, s) = \hat{u}(s),$$

with

$$\hat{y}(s) = s\hat{w}_1(0, s),$$

where the $\hat{\ }$ denotes the Laplace transforms. The solution of the differential equation with the first two boundary conditions is

$$\hat{w}_1 = \alpha \sinh(s(\zeta - b)), \quad \hat{w}_2 = \gamma \sinh(s/2(\zeta - b)).$$

Using the other boundary conditions leads to the transfer function

$$G(s) = \frac{-2 \sinh(sb/2) \sinh(sb)}{E_2 \sinh(sb) \cosh(sb/2) + 2E_1 \cosh(sb) \sinh(sb/2)}.$$

Hence the feedthrough is $\frac{-2}{E_2 + 2E_1} \neq 0$ implying that the inverse of the system is well-posed.

4. DIAGONAL SYSTEMS WITH ONE SPEED

Problems of transmission over a network lead to a model of the form

$$\frac{\partial x_+}{\partial t}(\zeta, t) = \lambda_0 I_{n_1} \frac{\partial x_+}{\partial \zeta}(\zeta, t), \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{\partial x_-}{\partial t}(\zeta, t) = -\lambda_0 I_{n_2} \frac{\partial x_-}{\partial \zeta}(\zeta, t), \quad (19)$$

where $t \geq 0$ and $\zeta \in (0, b)$. Here $x = \begin{bmatrix} x_+ \\ x_- \end{bmatrix}$, $P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_0 I_{n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_0 I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix}$ with $n_1 + n_2 = n$ and $\lambda_0 > 0$. We equip the port-Hamiltonian system with the following inputs, outputs and boundary conditions:

$$u(t) = W_{B,1} \begin{bmatrix} x(b, t) \\ x(0, t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (20)$$

$$0 = W_{B,2} \begin{bmatrix} x(b, t) \\ x(0, t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (21)$$

$$y(t) = W_C \begin{bmatrix} x(b, t) \\ x(0, t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (22)$$

It is assumed that the system is well-posed. Without loss of generality, it may be assumed that $\lambda_0 = 1$.

Lemma 4. Any system of the form (18)–(19) can be transformed into one for which $\lambda_0 = 1$.

Proof. Scaling the time, i.e., $\tau = \lambda_0 t$, leads to

$$\frac{\partial x_+}{\partial \tau}(\zeta, \tau) = \frac{\partial x_+}{\partial \zeta}(\zeta, \tau),$$

$$\frac{\partial x_-}{\partial \tau}(\zeta, \tau) = -\frac{\partial x_-}{\partial \zeta}(\zeta, \tau),$$

where $\tau \geq 0, \zeta \in [0, b]$. □

Since $\lambda_0 = 1$, the solutions of (18)–(19) is given by $x_+(t, \zeta) = f(t + \zeta)$ and $x_-(t, \zeta) = g(b + t - \zeta)$ for $\zeta \in [0, b]$ and $t \geq 0$ for some functions f and g. Using these definitions we can rewrite the (input) boundary conditions as

$$K \begin{bmatrix} f(t + b) \\ g(t + b) \end{bmatrix} + Q \begin{bmatrix} f(t) \\ g(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Similarly,

$$y(t) = O_1 \begin{bmatrix} f(t + b) \\ g(t + b) \end{bmatrix} + O_2 \begin{bmatrix} f(t) \\ g(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

where, referring back to (7), $O_1 = [O_{21} \ O_{22}]$, $O_2 = [R_{21} \ R_{22}]$. Note that by the diagonal representation of the system, these matrices are the same as in Section 2. Since the system is well-posed, K is invertible (Theorem 1).

$$\begin{bmatrix} f(t + b) \\ g(t + b) \end{bmatrix} = -K^{-1}Q \begin{bmatrix} f(t) \\ g(t) \end{bmatrix} + K^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (25)$$

and define the matrices

$$A_d = -K^{-1}Q, \quad B_d = K^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix},$$

$$C_d = O_1 A_d + O_2, \quad D_d = O_1 B_d.$$

The problem of determining the zero dynamics for (19)–(22) can be transformed into determining the zero dynamics for the finite-dimensional discrete-time system

$$x_d(n + 1) = A_d x_d(n) + B_d u_d(n) \quad (26)$$

$$y_d(n) = C_d x_d(n) + D_d u_d(n), \quad (27)$$

with state space $\mathbb{R}^n$, input space $\mathbb{R}^m$ and output space $\mathbb{R}^k$

Theorem 5. Let $x_0 \in L^2((0, b); \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then the following are equivalent

(1) There exists an input $u \in L^2_{loc}((0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ such that the output is identically zero;
(2) $x_0 \in L^2((0, b); V^*)$ where $V^* \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the largest output nulling subspace of $\Sigma(A_d, B_d, C_d, D_d)$.

Proof. We begin by splitting the time axis as $[0, \infty) = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [nb, (n + 1)b]$, and introducing the "discrete" time signals $(z(n))(\xi) = \begin{bmatrix} f(\xi + nb) \\ g(\xi + nb) \end{bmatrix}$, $(u(n))(\xi) = u(\xi + nb)$, and $(y(n))(\xi) = y(\xi + nb)$, $\xi \in [0, b)$. Then by (25)

$$z(n + 1) = A_d z(n) + B_d u(n), \quad z(0) = x_0 \quad (28)$$

and by (24)

$$y(n) = O_1 z(n + 1) + O_2 z(n)$$
$$= (O_1 A_d + O_2) z(n) + O_1 B_d u(n) \quad (29)$$
$$= C_d z(n) + D_d u(n).$$

Since we have only splitted the time axis, it is clear that $x_0 \in L^2((0, b); \mathbb{R}^n)$ is such that there exists an input $u \in L^2_{loc}((0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ such that the output (24) is identically zero if and only if z_0 is such that there exists a sequence $u(n)$ such that $y(n)$ is identically zero. Since for a fixed n $z(n), u(n)$ and $y(n)$ are L^2-function, we cannot conclude the pointwise equality. However, we have that there is a set $\Omega \subset (0, b)$ whose complement has measure zero such that

$$(z(n+1))(\xi) = A_d(z(n))(\xi) + B_d(u(n))(\xi),$$
$$(y(n))(\xi) = C_d(z(n))(\xi) + D_d(u(n))(\xi),$$
$$(z(0))(\xi) = x_0(\xi), \xi \in \Omega.$$

This implies that for x_0 (or equivalently $z(0)$) there exists a sequence $u(n)$ such that $y(n)$ is identically zero if and only if $x_0(\xi) \in V^*$, $\xi \in \Omega$. Since the complement of Ω has measure zero this implies that $x_0 \in L^2((0,b); V^*)$. $\quad\square$

For many partial differential equation systems, the largest output nulling subspace is not closed and the zero dynamics are not well-posed, Morris and Rebarber (2010). However, for this class of systems the largest output nulling subspace is closed, and the zero dynamics are well-posed. The following theorem provides a characterization of the largest output nulling subspace of $\Sigma(A_d, B_d, C_d, D_d)$ and hence of the zero dynamics for the original partial differential equation. Partition the matrices K and Q in (6) as

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} K_1 \\ K_2 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad Q = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 \\ Q_2 \end{bmatrix} \qquad (30)$$

where K_2 and Q_2 have m rows, the number of controls.

Theorem 6. Define $E = -\begin{bmatrix} K_1 \\ O_1 \end{bmatrix}$, $F = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 \\ O_2 \end{bmatrix}$. The initial condition v_0 lies in the largest output nulling subspace of $\Sigma(A_d, B_d, C_d, D_d)$ if and only if there exists a sequence $\{v_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$Ev_{k+1} = Fv_k, \qquad k \geq 0. \qquad (31)$$

Furthermore, the largest output nulling subspace $V^* = \cap_{k\geq 0} V^k$, where $V^0 = \mathbb{R}^n$, $V^{k+1} = V^k \cap F^{-1}EV^k$.

Proof. If v_0 in the output nulling subspace, then there exists a sequence $u(n), n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$z(n+1) = -K^{-1}Qz(n) + K^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_m \end{bmatrix} u(n)$$
$$0 = (O_1 A_d + O_2)z(n) + O_1 B_d u(n)$$
$$= O_1 z(n+1) + O_2 z(n)$$

This we can rewrite as

$$u(n) = K_2 z(n+1) + Q_2 z(n)$$
$$0 = K_1 z(n+1) + Q_1 z(n)$$
$$0 = O_1 z(n+1) + O_2 z(n).$$

or equivalently

$$u(n) = K_2 z(n+1) + Q_2 z(n) \qquad (32)$$
$$Ez(n+1) = Fz(n). \qquad (33)$$

Hence the sequence (31) is just $z(n), n = 1, 2, \cdots$. Similarly, with $z(n) = v_n$, equation (32) gives the input such that output becomes identically zero.

If $v_0 \in \tilde{V} := \cap_{k\geq 0} V^k$, then there exists a $v_1 \in \tilde{V}$ such that $Fv_0 = Ev_1$. Since $v_1 \in \tilde{V}$ this step can be repeated to construct a sequence satisfying (31). Hence $\tilde{V} \subset V^*$.

Since each V^k is a linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $V_{k+1} \subset V_k$ there is $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $V^* = \cap_{k=0}^K V^k$. For any $v_0 \in V^*$, (31) implies that there is a sequence $v_1, \cdots, v_K$ such that

$$Ev_{k+1} = Fv_k, \quad k = 0 \cdots, K-1 \qquad (34)$$

Since $v_K \in \mathbb{R}^n = V^0$, this implies that $v_{K-1} \in V^1$, and (34) also implies $v_{k-1} \in V^1$, $k = 1..K$. Similarly,

$v_{k-2} \in V^2$, $k = 1..K$. Repeating the argument leads to the conclusion that $v_0 \in V^k$, $k = 0..K$ and hence $v_0 \in \tilde{V}$. Since $v_0 \in V^*$ was arbitrary, $V^* = \cap_{k=0}^K V^k$. $\quad\square$

This result, and the construction of the zero dynamics are illustrated by several examples.

Example 2.

$$\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \xi}, \qquad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

with

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(b,t) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(0,t)$$
$$y(t) = [0 \ 0 \ 0] x(b,t) + [1 \ 0 \ 0] x(0,t).$$

Zero dynamics require

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{-E} x(b,t) + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{F} x(0,t). \qquad (35)$$

Therefore, the zero dynamics evolve on $L_2(0,b;\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $x_1(0,t) = 0$. By Theorems 5 and 6, we find that $x_1 \equiv 0$. The operators E and F are defined in (35). Using the representation of V^*,

$$V^0 = \mathbb{R}^3$$
$$V^1 = F^{-1}EV^0 = F^{-1}[\mathbb{R}^2; 0] = [0; \mathbb{R}^2]$$
$$V^2 = F^{-1}EV^1 \cap V^1 = F^{-1}[0; \mathbb{R}; 0] \cap [0; \mathbb{R}^2] = V^1.$$

This yields

$$u(t) = x_2(0,t)$$

which is the control that achieves the zero dynamics.

Example 3. This is the same as the previous example, Example 2, except the control is in a different place, so the 2nd and 3rd rows of the "K" matrix are switched.

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(b,t) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x(0,t)$$
$$y(t) = [0 \ 0 \ 0] x(b,t) + [1 \ 0 \ 0] x(0,t).$$

Zero dynamics require

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(b,t) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(0,t).$$

Since $x_1(0) = 0$, $x_1 \equiv 0$. Reducing the system to $[x_2, x_3]$,

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_2(b,t) \\ x_3(b,t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_2(0,t) \\ x_3(0,t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $x_2(0) = 0$, $x_2 \equiv 0$. This leads to one non-zero equation, for x_3 and

$$x_3(b,t) = 0.$$

In order to achieve this,

$$u(t) = x_3(0,t).$$

Using the construction from Theorem 6,

$$V^0 = \mathbb{R}^3$$
$$V^1 = F^{-1}EV^0 = F^{-1}[\mathbb{R}^2;0] = [0;\mathbb{R}^2]$$
$$V^2 = F^{-1}EV^1 \cap V^1 = [0;0;\mathbb{R}].$$

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, zero dynamics were formally defined for port-Hamiltonian systems. If the feedthrough operator is invertible, the zero dynamics are again a port-Hamiltonian system of the same order. In general, however, the feedthrough operator is not invertible - the transfer function is strictly proper. For many strictly proper infinite-dimensional systems, the zero dynamics of these systems are not well-defined. It was shown in this paper that provided the system can be rewritten as a network of waves with the same speed, the zero dynamics are well-defined, and are a port-Hamiltonian system. Furthermore, a method to construct the zero dynamics was described. The approach applies to systems with commensurate but non-equal wave speeds, and this generalization will be explored in future work.

REFERENCES

Byrnes, C.I., Gilliam, D., and He, J. (1994). Root-locus and boundary feedback design for a class of distributed parameter systems. *SIAM Jour. on Control and Optimization*, 32(5), 1364–1427.

Cheng, A. and Morris, K. (2003). Accurate zeros approximation for infinite-dimensional systems. In *42nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. Honolulu, Hawaii.

Clark, R.L. (1997). Accounting for out-of-bandwidth modes in the assumed modes approach: Implications on colocated output feedback control. *ASME J. Dyn. Sys. Meas. and Cont.*, 119, 390–395.

Doyle, J., Francis, B., and Tannenbaum, A. (1992). *Feedback Control Theory*. MacMillan Publishing Co.

Foias, C., Özbay, H., and Tannenbaum, A. (1996). *Robust Control of Infinite Dimensional Systems. Frequency Domain Methods.* Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences 209. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Grad, J. and Morris, K. (2003). Calculation of achievable broadband noise reduction using approximations. *Engineering applications and computational algorithms, Dyn. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Syst. Ser. B Appl. Algorithms, suppl.*, 438–443.

Isidori, A. (1999). *Nonlinear Control Systems*. Springer.

Jacob, B., Morris, K.A., and Trunk, C. (2007). Minimum-phase infinite-dimensional second-order systems. *IEEE Trans. Auto. Cont.*, 52(9), 1654–1665.

Jacob, B. and Zwart, H.J. (2012). *Linear Port-Hamiltonian systems on infinite-dimensional spaces*. Basel: Birkhäuser. doi:10.1007/978-3-0348-0399-1.

Le Gorrec, Y., Zwart, H., and Maschke, B. (2005). Dirac structures and boundary control systems associated with skew-symmetric differential operators. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 44(5), 1864–1892.

Lindner, D.K., Reichard, K.M., and Tarkenton, L.M. (1993). Zeros of modal models of flexible structures. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 38(9), 1384–1388.

Logemann, H. and Owens, D.H. (1987). Robust high-gain feedback control of infinite-dimensional minimum-phase systems. *IMA J. Math. Control Inf.*, 4, 195–220.

Logemann, H. and Townley, S. (1997). Adaptive control of infinite-dimensional systems without parameter estimation: An overview. *IMA J. Math. Control Inf.*, 14(2), 175–206.

Logemann, H. and Townley, S. (2003). Adaptive low-gain integral control of multivariable well-posed linear systems. *SIAM J. Control Optimization*, 41(6), 1722–1732.

Logemann, H. and Zwart, H. (1992). On robust PI-control of infinite-dimensional systems. *SIAM J. Control Optimization*, 30(3), 573–593.

Morris, K.A. (2001). *Introduction to Feedback Control*. Harcourt/ Academic Press, Burlington, MA.

Morris, K.A. and Rebarber, R. (2007). Feedback invariance for siso infinite-dimensional systems. *Math. of Control, Signals and Systems*, 19, 313–335.

Morris, K. and Rebarber, R.E. (2010). Zeros of SISO infinite-dimensional systems. *International Journal of Control*, 83(12), 2573–2579.

Nikitin, S. and Nikitina, M. (1999). High gain output feedbacks for systems with distributed parameters. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 9(6), 933–940.

Villegas, J.A. (2007). *A port-Hamiltonian Approach to Distributed Parameter Systems*. Ph.D. thesis, Universiteit Twente.

Zwart, H. (1989). *Geometric Theory for Infinite Dimensional Systems*. Springer-Verlag.

Zwart, H., Gorrec, Y.L., Maschke, B., and Villegas, J. (2010). Well-posedness and regularity of hyperbolic boundary control systems on a one-dimensional spatial domain. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 16(4), 1077–1093.