

# $H_\infty$ CONTROL ATTENUATING INITIAL STATE UNCERTAINTIES AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE MAGNETIC SUSPENSION SYSTEM

Toru Namerikawa

Dept. of Mechanical Eng., Nagaoka University of Technology, Nagaoka, Niigata-Pref., 940-2188 Japan  
toru@mech.nagaokaut.ac.jp

Masayuki Fujita

Dept. of Electrical and Electronic Eng., Kanazawa University, Kanazawa, Ishikawa-Pref., 920-8667 Japan  
fujita@t.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

Roy S. Smith<sup>1</sup>

Dept. of Electrical and Computer Eng., Univ. of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, 93106 USA  
roy@ece.ucsb.edu

## ABSTRACT

This paper deals with a generalized  $H_\infty$  control attenuating initial-state uncertainties. An  $H_\infty$  control problem, which treats a mixed attenuation of disturbance and initial-state uncertainty for linear time-invariant systems in the infinite-horizon case, is examined. We derived a necessary and sufficient condition of the generalized mixed attenuation problem[7]. In this paper, we apply this proposed approach to a magnetic suspension system, and evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed approach by using a magnetic suspension system. Comparing the proposed controller with previous results[6], we show the property and effectiveness of the proposed generalized  $H_\infty$  control attenuating initial state uncertainties.

**keywords:**  $H_\infty$  Control, DIA Control, Initial-State Uncertainties, Magnetic Suspension Systems

## INTRODUCTION

Usual notation of the  $H_\infty$  control is a time-invariant control which attenuates the effect of disturbances on controlled outputs and is originally defined under the assumption that the initial states of the system are zero. Initial states are often uncertain and might be zero or non-zero. If the initial states are non-zero, the system adopting an  $H_\infty$  control will present some transients as the effect of the non-zero initial states, to which the  $H_\infty$  control is not responsible. On the other hand, it is expected that the mixed attenuation supplies  $H_\infty$  controls with some good transients and assures  $H_\infty$  controls of robustness against

initial-state uncertainty. Recently, hybrid/switching control are actively studied, this method might be one of the reasonable approach to implement them.

In the finite-horizon case, a generalized type of  $H_\infty$  control problem which was formulated and solved by Uchida and Fujita[1] and Khargonekar et al.[2]. This problem was extended to the infinite-horizon case[2, 3]. Furthermore a generalized type of  $H_\infty$  control problem which considers a mixed attenuation of disturbance and initial-state uncertainty was derived[4]. The problem discussed in [4], however, was limited to time-invariant systems satisfying the orthogonality assumptions [5]. This is an immensely serious problem as a matter of fact, if we apply this problem setup to the real physical control system design. The previous mixed attenuation of disturbance and initial-state uncertainty in the infinite-horizon case is not sufficient[6] in practice, because time-invariant systems satisfying the orthogonality assumptions restrict the degrees of freedom of the control system design, and have difficulty in regulating control inputs[6]. Then we formulated an infinite horizon disturbance and initial state uncertainty attenuation control problem without the orthogonality assumptions[7].

In this paper, we evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed approach[7] by using a magnetic suspension system. We apply this proposed approach to a magnetic suspension system. Comparing with the standard  $H_\infty$  controller and the other controllers via previous results[6], we show the property and effectiveness of the proposed generalized  $H_\infty$  control attenuating initial state uncertainties.

<sup>1</sup>R. Smith was supported by NSF under grant ECS-9978562

## MIXED ATTENUATION OF DISTURBANCE AND INITIAL-STATE UNCERTAINTY

Consider the linear time-invariant system which is defined on the time interval  $[0, \infty)$  and described by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= Ax + B_1 w + B_2 u, \quad x(0) = x_0 \\ z &= C_1 x + D_{12} u \\ y &= C_2 x + D_{21} w\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where  $x \in R^n$  is the state and  $x_0$  is the initial state;  $u \in R^r$  is the control input;  $y \in R^m$  is the observed output;  $z \in R^q$  is the controlled output;  $w \in R^p$  is the disturbance. Without loss of generality, we regard  $x_0$  as the initial-state uncertainty, and  $x_0 = 0$  as known initial-state case. The disturbance  $w(t)$  is a square integrable function defined on  $[0, \infty)$ . Note that this system does not have the orthogonality assumptions[5], and one of the linear time-invariant systems with the orthogonality assumptions in this framework is written in [4, 6].

$A$ ,  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$ ,  $D_{12}$  and  $D_{21}$  are constant matrices of appropriate dimensions and satisfies that

- $(A, B_1)$  is controllable and  $(A, C_1)$  is observable
- $(A, B_2)$  is controllable and  $(A, C_2)$  is observable
- $D_{12}^T D_{12} \in R^{r \times r}$  is nonsingular
- $D_{21} D_{21}^T \in R^{m \times m}$  is nonsingular

For system (1), every admissible control  $u(t)$  is given by a linear time-invariant system of the form

$$\begin{aligned}u &= J\zeta + Ky \\ \dot{\zeta} &= G\zeta + Hy, \quad \zeta(0) = 0\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

which makes the closed-loop system given by (1) and (2) internally stable, where  $\zeta(t)$  is the state of the controller of a finite dimension;  $J$ ,  $K$ ,  $G$  and  $H$  are constant matrices of appropriate dimensions.

For the system and the class of admissible controls described above, consider a mixed-attenuation problem stated as below.

### Problem 1 DIA Control Problem

Find an admissible control attenuating disturbances and initial state uncertainties in the way that, for given  $N > 0$ ,  $z$  satisfies

$$\|z\|_2^2 < \|w\|_2^2 + x_0^T N^{-1} x_0 \quad (3)$$

for all  $w \in L^2[0, \infty)$  and all  $x_0 \in R^n$ , s.t.,  $(w, x_0) \neq 0$ .

We call such an admissible control the Disturbance and Initial state uncertainty Attenuation (DIA) control. The weighting matrix  $N$  on  $x_0$  is a measure of

relative importance of the initial-state uncertainty attenuation to the disturbance attenuation. A larger choice of  $N$  in the sense of matrix inequality order means finding an admissible control which attenuates the initial-state uncertainty more.

From the definition, a DIA control should be an  $H_\infty$  control when the initial state is known ( $x_0 = 0$ ). This implies that, in order to solve the DIA control problem, we require the so-called Riccati equation conditions:

(A1) There exists a solution  $M > 0$  to the Riccati equation

$$\begin{aligned}M(A - B_2(D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} D_{12}^T C_1) \\ + (A - B_2(D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} D_{12}^T C_1)^T M \\ - M(B_2(D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} B_2^T - B_1 B_1^T) M \\ + C_1^T C_1 - C_1^T D_{12} (D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} D_{12}^T C_1 = 0\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

such that  $A - B_2(D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} D_{12}^T C_1 - B_2(D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} B_2^T M + B_1 B_1^T M$  is stable.

(A2) There exists a solution  $P > 0$  to the Riccati equation

$$\begin{aligned}(A - B_1 D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} C_2) P \\ + P(A - B_1 D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} C_2)^T \\ - P(C_2^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} C_2 - C_1^T C_1) P \\ + B_1 B_1^T - B_1 D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T = 0\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

such that  $A - B_1 D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} C_2 - P C_2^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} C_2 + P C_1^T C_1$  is stable.

(A3)  $\rho(PM) < 1$ ,

where  $\rho(X)$  denotes the spectral radius of matrix  $X$ , and  $\rho(X) = \max |\lambda_i(X)|$ .

Next, the following condition is assumed.

(A4)  $Q + N^{-1} - P^{-1} > 0$ ,

where  $Q$  is the maximal solution of the Riccati equation

$$\begin{aligned}Q(A - B_1 D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} C_2 \\ + (B_1 B_1^T - B_1 D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T) P^{-1}) \\ + (A - B_1 D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} C_2 \\ + (B_1 B_1^T - B_1 D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} D_{21} B_1^T) P^{-1})^T Q \\ - Q(B_1^T - D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} (C_2 P + D_{21} B_1^T) L)^T \\ \times (B_1^T - D_{21}^T (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} (C_2 P + D_{21} B_1^T) L) Q \\ = 0\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

with  $L := (I - PM)^{-1}$ .

Then, we obtained the following main results[7].

**Theorem 1** [7] Suppose that the conditions (A1), (A2), and (A3) are satisfied. The central control (7) is a DIA control if and only if the condition (A4) is satisfied, where the central control is given by

$$\begin{aligned}u &= -(D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} (B_2^T M + D_{12}^T C_1) (I - PM)^{-1} \zeta \\ \dot{\zeta} &= A\zeta + B_2 u + P C_1^T (C_1 \zeta + D_{12} u) \\ &\quad + (P C_2^T + B_1 D_{21}^T) (D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} (y - C_2 \zeta) \\ \zeta(0) &= 0\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

and  $S := M(I - PM)^{-1}$ .

## APPLICATION TO MAGNETIC SUSPENSION SYSTEM

We apply the proposed approach[7] to a magnetic suspension system, and evaluate its effectiveness.

### CONSTRUCTION

The experimental setup is shown in Fig.1[8]. An electromagnet is located at the top of the experimental system. The control problem is to levitate the iron ball stably utilizing the electromagnetic force, where a mass  $M$  of the iron ball is 1.75 kg, and steady state gap  $X$  is 5 mm.




FIGURE 1: Magnetic Suspension System

### MATHEMATICAL MODEL

In order to derive a model of the system by physical laws, we introduce following assumptions[8].

- [a1] Magnetic flux density and magnetic field do not have any hysteresis, and they are not saturated.
- [a2] There are no leakage flux in the magnetic circuit.
- [a3] Magnetic permeability of the electromagnet is infinity.
- [a4] Eddy current in the magnetic pole can be neglected.
- [a5] Coil inductance is constant around the operating point, and an electromotive force due to a motion of the iron ball can be neglected.

These assumptions are almost essential to model this system. Under these assumptions, we derived equations of the motion, the electromagnetic force, and the electric circuit as

$$M \frac{d^2 x(t)}{dt^2} = Mg - f(t) + v_m \quad (8)$$

$$f(t) = k \left( \frac{I + i(t)}{X + x(t) + x_0} \right)^2 \quad (9)$$

$$L \frac{di(t)}{dt} + R(I + i(t)) = E + e(t) + v_L \quad (10)$$

where  $M$  is a mass of the iron ball,  $X$  is a steady gap between the electromagnet(EM) and the iron ball,  $x(t)$  is a deviation from  $X$ ,  $I$  is a steady current,  $i(t)$  is a deviation from  $I$ ,  $E$  is a steady voltage,  $e(t)$  is a deviation from  $E$ ,  $f(t)$  is EM force,  $k$ ,  $x_0$  are coefficients of  $f(t)$ ,  $L$  is an inductance of EM, and  $R$  is a resistance of EM,  $v_m$  and  $v_L$  are exogenous disturbance inputs.

Next we linearize the electromagnetic force (9) around the operating point by the Taylor series expansion as

$$f(t) = k \left( \frac{I}{X + x_0} \right)^2 - K_x x(t) + K_i i(t), \quad (11)$$

where  $K_x = 2kI^2/(X + x_0)^3$  and  $K_i = 2kI/(X + x_0)^2$ . The sensor provides the information for the gap  $x(t)$ . Hence the measurement equation can be written as

$$y(t) = x(t) + w_0 \quad (12)$$

where  $w_0$  represents the sensor noise as well as the model uncertainties. Thus, summing up the above results, the state equations for the system are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_g &= A_g x_g + B_g u_g + D_g v_0 \\ y_g &= C_g x_g + w_0 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $x_g := [x \ \dot{x} \ i]^T$ ,  $u_g := e$ ,  $v_0 := [v_m \ v_L]^T$ ,

$$A_g = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 4481 & 0 & -18.4 \\ 0 & 0 & -45.7 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_g = [0 \ 0 \ 1.97]^T$$

$$C_g = [1 \ 0 \ 0], \quad D_g = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0.57 & 0 \\ 0 & 1.97 \end{bmatrix}$$

Here  $(A_g, B_g)$  and  $(A_g, D_g)$  are controllable, and  $(A_g, C_g)$  is observable.

### PROBLEM SETUP FOR CONTROL SYSTEM DESIGN

For the magnetic suspension system described and modeled in the previous section, our principal control objective is its stabilization. Further, as we have clarified in the modeling of the disturbances, it should be stabilized robustly against  $v_0$  and  $w_0$ . Moreover the closed-loop system is expected to have a better transient performance. To this end, we will setup the control problem within the framework of the  $H_\infty$  DIA control.

First let us consider the system disturbance  $v_0$ . Since  $v_0$  mainly acts on the plant in a low frequency range in practice, it is helpful to introduce a frequency weighting factor. Hence let  $v_0$  be of the form

$$v_0 = W_v(s) w_2 \quad (14)$$

$$W_v(s) = \Phi W(s) = \Phi C_w (sI - A_w)^{-1} B_w(s) \quad (15)$$

$$\Phi = [1 \ 1]^T \quad (16)$$

where  $W_w(s)$  is a frequency weighting whose gain is relatively large in a low frequency range, and  $w_2$  is a (1,2) element of  $w$ . These values, as yet unspecified, can be regarded as free design parameters. It is noted that, in (14), we have not made explicit distinction in the notation between a time domain function and its Laplace transform. And let us consider the system disturbance  $w_0$  for the output. The disturbance  $w_0$  shows an uncertain influence caused via unmodeled dynamics, and define

$$w_0 = W_w w_1 \quad (17)$$

where  $W_w$  is a weighting scalar, and  $w_1$  is a (1,1) element of  $w$ . Note that  $W_w$  is sometimes frequency dependent, but it is selected as a scalar for the sake of simplicity. Next we consider the variables which we want to regulate. In this study, since our main concern is in the stabilization of the iron ball, the gap and the corresponding velocity are chosen; i.e.,

$$z_g = F_g x_g, \quad F_g = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

Then, as the error vector, let us define as follows

$$z_1 = \Theta z_g, \quad \Theta = \text{diag} [\theta_1 \quad \theta_2] \quad (19)$$

where  $\Theta$  is a weighting matrix on the regulated variables  $z_g$ , and  $z_1$  is a (1,1) element of  $z$ . This value  $\Theta$ , as yet unspecified, are also free design parameters. Furthermore the control input  $u$  should be also regulated, and we define

$$z_2 = \rho u \quad (20)$$

where  $\rho$  is a weighting scalar, and  $z_2$  is a (1,2) element of  $z$ . Finally, let  $x := [x_g^T \quad x_w^T]^T$ , where  $x_w$  denotes the state of the frequency weighting  $W_w(s)$ , and  $w := [w_1^T \quad w_2^T]^T$ ,  $z := [z_1^T \quad z_2^T]^T$ , then we can construct the generalized plant as the following;

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= Ax + B_1 w + B_2 u \\ z &= C_1 x + D_{12} u \\ y &= C_2 x + D_{21} w \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \begin{bmatrix} A_g & D_g C_w \\ 0 & A_w \end{bmatrix}, B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D_g D_w \\ 0 & B_w \end{bmatrix}, \\ B_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} B_g \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \Theta F_g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, D_{12} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \rho \end{bmatrix}, \\ C_2 &= [C_g \quad 0], D_{21} = [W_w \quad 0] \end{aligned}$$

The block diagram of the generalized plant with an unspecified controller  $K$  is shown in Fig.2. Since the disturbances  $w$  represent the various model uncertainties, the effects of these disturbances on the error vector  $z$  should be reduced. Note that this generalized plant does not have the orthogonality




FIGURE 2: Generalized Plant

assumptions[5], and one of the generalized plants with the orthogonality assumptions in this framework is written in [4, 6]. Now our control design problem setup is: Find an admissible controller  $K(s)$  that attenuates disturbances and initial state uncertainties to achieve DIA condition in (3).

## DIA CONTROLLER

We design controllers for the generalized plant in the previous subsection based on the following 4-Step procedure.

**[Step 1] Selection of the weighting function  $W_v(s)$  and  $W_w$ :**

$W_w(s)$  is a frequency weighting whose gain is relatively large in a low frequency range, and  $W_w$  is a weighting scalar.

**[Step 2] Selection of the weighting Matrix  $\Theta$  and  $\rho$ :**

$\Theta$  is a weighting matrix for the regulated variables  $z_g$ , and  $\rho$  is for the input variable  $u$ .

**[Step 3] Construction of generalized plant and a DIA controller:**

With the specified design parameters in [Step 1] and [Step 2], the generalized plant is constructed. The DIA controller is designed for this plant, and its state-space description is given by easy algebraic calculation from (7).

$$\dot{x}_c = A_c x_c + B_c y, \quad u = C_c x_c \quad (22)$$

where  $x_c$  is the state of the DIA controller and  $A_c$ ,  $B_c$  and  $C_c$  are given as

$$\begin{aligned} A_c &= A + PC_1^T C_1 - (PC_2^T + B_1 D_{21}^T)(D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} C_2 \\ &\quad - (B_2 + PC_1^T D_{12})(D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} \\ &\quad \times (B_2^T M + D_{12}^T C_1) L \\ B_c &= (PC_2^T + B_1 D_{21}^T)(D_{21} D_{21}^T)^{-1} \\ C_c &= -(D_{12}^T D_{12})^{-1} (B_2^T M + D_{12}^T C_1) L. \end{aligned}$$

**[Step 4] Calculation of the max. matrix N:**

Calculate the maximum  $N$  satisfies the condition (A4). For the sake of simplicity, the structure of the matrix  $N$  is limited in  $N = nI$ , where  $n$  is a positive scalar number.

After some iteration in MATLAB environment, these design parameters are chosen by the above 4-step procedure as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} W_v(s) &= \frac{2.5 \times 10^6}{s + 0.010} \\ W_w &= 0.5 \\ \Theta &= \text{diag} [ 1.01 \quad 1.0 \times 10^{-5} ] \\ \rho &= 1.0 \times 10^{-10} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Direct calculations yield the central controller;

$$K(s) := C_K(sI - A_K)^{-1}B_K \quad (24)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_K &= \begin{bmatrix} -269 & 1.00 & 0 & 0 \\ -31700 & 2.29 \cdot 10^{-4} & -18.4 & 1.43 \cdot 10^6 \\ 2.05 \cdot 10^{10} & 5.65 \cdot 10^6 & -14400 & 1.12 \cdot 10^9 \\ 1.72 & -1.56 \cdot 10^{-8} & 0 & -0.010 \end{bmatrix} \\ B_K &= [ 361 \quad 48600 \quad -3.04 \cdot 10^5 \quad -2.31 ]^T \\ C_K &= [ 1.04 \cdot 10^{10} \quad 2.87 \cdot 10^6 \quad -7290 \quad 5.64 \cdot 10^8 ] \end{aligned}$$

The frequency response of the controller  $K(s)$  is shown in Fig. 3 by a solid line. And the maximum value of the weighting matrix  $N$  is given by  $N = 2.7735 \times 10^{-2} \times I$ .

We designed the standard  $H_\infty$  controller for the comparison, where the  $H_\infty$  controller[8] was designed via the MATLAB command `hinfscn.m`. We denote the state-space realization of the obtained  $H_\infty$  controller as  $K_\infty$ . The frequency response of the controller  $K_\infty$  is shown in Fig. 3 by a dotted line. Furthermore we also show the previous DIA controllers  $K_{DIA_1}(s)$  and  $K_{DIA_2}(s)$  in Fig.3, by a dashed line and a dash-dot line, respectively [6].

Comparing these four controllers,  $K(s)$  has a high gain at the low frequency and a good roll-off property at the high frequency, and the comprehensive frequency response looks like a modified PID controller. In the previous DIA design framework, it was difficult to let controllers get hold an integral property[6].

## SIMULATION RESULTS

We have conducted simulations to evaluate properties of the controller  $K$ . The iron ball at a standstill has been suspended stably with either the controller  $K$ ,  $K_\infty$ ,  $K_{DIA_1}$  and  $K_{DIA_2}$ . To ascertain transient responses, we input a step reference signal to a suspended iron ball with a nonzero initial state  $x_0$ . It is expected that  $K$  will show a better initial response and also a better step response for the reference signal.

A step reference signal is added to the system around 1.0[s], where the magnitude of the step signal is 0.1[mm], and the initial state is  $x_0 = [0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.1]^T$ .




FIGURE 3: Frequency Response of the controller  $K$  with  $K_{DIA_1}$ ,  $K_{DIA_2}$  and  $K_\infty$

Simulation results are shown in Fig.4. An enlargement of Fig.4 at the initial response is Fig.5, and an enlargement at the step response is Fig.6, respectively. Note that they are definitely same with Fig.4.

We first evaluate the attenuating property of the initial state uncertainty in Fig.5. From the results, we can see that the  $K_{DIA_1}$  and  $K_{DIA_2}$  show relatively better performance than  $K$  for the initial state uncertainty. However  $K$  has a better transient performance than  $K_\infty$ , which shows  $K$  has a better property than  $K_\infty$ , but not better than  $K_{DIA_1}$  and  $K_{DIA_2}$ .

Since our concerns are not only in the attenuation of the initial state uncertainty, but also in the basic control performance of the controllers, we then wonder whether the controller has a good performance for the step reference signal. Fig.6 shows an enlarged step response of Fig.4. Controller  $K$  shows better and quicker transient response than  $K_\infty$ . Controllers  $K_{DIA_1}$  and  $K_{DIA_2}$  shows pretty quick response around 1.0[s] because of their high gain at the high frequency in Fig.3, however we must give careful attention for steady-state error with those both controllers.

$K_{DIA_1}$  and  $K_{DIA_2}$  leave steady-state errors because of their low gain at the low frequency in Fig.3. In the previous problem setup, the degrees of freedom in the design parameters are limited, so that it is difficult to shape a good controller frequency response[6].

Considering all the factors, we reached the conclusion that  $K$  has a better performance for all control requirements, and has a potential ability to be improved by using the degrees of freedom in the design parameters.




FIGURE 4: Time Responses for a Step Reference with an Initial State  $x_0 = [0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.1]^T$




FIGURE 5: Initial Responses for  $x_0 = [0.0 \ 0.0 \ 0.1]^T$

## CONCLUSION

In this paper, we formulated a generalized type of  $H_\infty$  control problem which considers a mixed attenuation of disturbance and initial-state uncertainty in the infinite-horizon case, without the orthogonality assumptions. We applied an infinite horizon disturbance and initial state uncertainty attenuation control problem without the orthogonality assumptions to a magnetic suspension system, and evaluated the effectiveness of the proposed approach. Comparing the proposed controller with the standard  $H_\infty$  controller and the other controllers based on previous results, we showed the property and effectiveness of the proposed mixed attenuation controller.

## References

1. K. Uchida and M. Fujita, "Controllers Attenuating Disturbance and Initial-Uncertainties for Time-Varying Systems," *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*, vol. 156, Springer-Verlag, pp. 187 - 196, 1991.
2. P. P. Khargonekar, K. M. Nagpal and K. R. Poolla, " $H_\infty$  Control with Transient," *SIAM J. Control and Optimization*, vol. 29, pp. 1373 - 1393, 1991.
3. A. Kojima, M. Fujita, K. Uchida and E. Shimemura, "Linear Quadratic Differential Games and  $H_\infty$  Control - A Direct Approach Based on Completing the Square -," *Trans. SICE*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 570 - 577, 1992.
4. K. Uchida and A. Kojima and M. Fujita, " $H_\infty$  control attenuating initial-state uncertainties," *Int. J. of Control*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 245 - 252, 1997.
5. J. C. Doyle, K. Glover, P. P. Khargonekar, and B. A. Francis, "State-Space Solutions to Standard  $H_2$  and  $H_\infty$  Control Problems," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 34, no. 8, pp. 831-847, 1989.
6. T. Namerikawa, M. Fujita and R. S. Smith, " $H_\infty$  Control System Design Attenuating Initial State Uncertainties : Evaluation by a Magnetic Suspension System", *Proc. of the 40th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pp. 87-92, Orlando, Florida, Dec. 2001.
7. T. Namerikawa, M. Fujita, R. S. Smith, and K. Uchida, "A generalized  $H_\infty$  Control System Design Attenuating Initial State Uncertainties", *Proc. of the 2002 American Control Conference*, pp. 2204-2209, Anchorage, Alaska, May 2002.
8. M. Fujita, T. Namerikawa, F. Matsumura, and K. Uchida, " $\mu$ -Synthesis of an Electromagnetic Suspension System," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 530-536, 1995.




FIGURE 6: Step Responses