## Nested Velocity Feedback Control

Dr Richard Mitchell, Cybernetics Intelligence Group School of Systems Engineering, University of Reading R.J.Mitchell@reading.ac.uk

Good Feedback Systems have high loop gain over the appropriate bandwidth. This is limited to maximum available feedback (MAF) in single loop systems
Here explore having multiple loops - specifically with local velocity feedback - inspired by Cherry Amp
Also, (borrowed from MAF) how to increase bandwidth
Resultant systems comparable with PID control, but more tolerant to changes in the plant under control







Two output lags with local velocity feedback (lvf) Preceded by a lead-lag with lvf ... could have n lead-lags Each increases loop gain; designed so system ~  $2^{nd}$  order Overall gain set by  $\beta$  in feedback path



Nested Velocity Feedback Control - 2 Presented at CS 2007 © Dr Richard Mitchell 2007



### Cherry Amplifier - Why Use LVF?

Just consider exponential lags with local velocity feedback



The velocity feedback in effect moves the time constants of the lags, which can also be done by series lead-lags However, Cherry shows VF gives better sensitivity re changes in the lag constants Also, better if only  $v_p$  term is used



Nested Velocity Feedback Control - 3 Presented at CS 2007 © Dr Richard Mitchell 2007



#### Velocity Feedback for Control

Cherry Amp: keep add stages from scratch til meet spec. For control, need to add controller to a 'plant' Let's see how to use LVF ... for say power amp + motor



As will show, v terms set to give freq response, linear K to meet Phase Margin spec;  $\beta$  usually unity for control



Nested Velocity Feedback Control - 4 Presented at CS 2007 © Dr Richard Mitchell 2007



#### Analysis

Need to analyse - want transfer function of forward path Easiest to use 'inverse transfer functions'





Nested Velocity Feedback Control - 5 Presented at CS 2007 © Dr Richard Mitchell 2007







Presented at CS 2007 © Dr Richard Mitchell 2007





# Example - Power Amp + Motor $\frac{15}{(1+s/3)} * \frac{3}{(1+s2)(1+s5)}$

So as to give comparison, a PID controller was designed, using MZN for 45° PM, Step Peak was 1.23 at 0.97s Vel FB design for same PM and peak (after an iteration)



#### Responses almost identical

So adv of nested velocity feedback? Its aim is reduced sensitivity to changes in plant. So see what happens if  $K_3$  and  $T_3$  each change by 20%



#### Improving Bandwidth

First corner freq is quite low, so bandwidth low

To increase, borrow from Maximum Available Feedback (where double bandwidth by incr slope of gain at low f)





Responses of PID, NVFB, NVFB + more bandwidth Clearly, element not affected Step significantly Re Disturbance, has improved range where D rejected





Conclusion

Nested velocity feedback has been proposed as a means of designing some third order systems.

These designs have been compared against the common PID controller, and have been shown to be much more robust as regards changes in the gain and time constant of the devices under control.

Method extended to increase the system bandwidth.

Further work is planned to investigate higher order systems and ones where the device under control also has a pure integrator.



