



fictitious disturbance generator. Using this estimated disturbance state, an estimate of the disturbance can be constructed and used for feedback.

In (Schrijver *et al.*, 2000), it is shown that the DEF and the KDO are equivalent in the sense that they represent the same disturbance observer. Although exact equivalence is of no importance from an engineering point of view, it proves beneficial in that some properties well-known for the KDO can be applied on the DEF design and vice versa.

## 2 Consequences of the equivalence

### 2.1 Relative degree

Contrary to the DEF design method, where the relative degree  $\rho$  of the filter  $Q(s)$  can be chosen freely (that is, under the constraint  $\rho \geq \rho_p$  with  $\rho_p$  the relative degree of the plant model), the KDO always implements a filter  $Q(s)$  with relative degree  $\rho = \rho_p + 1$ . So the KDO always implements at least 20 dB/decade additional high-frequency roll-off, which might be beneficial for robust stability (Schrijver and Dijk, 2000). However, it might as well be superfluous, resulting in a higher order controller than needed. The fixed relative degree also means that a DEF can not (in general) be rewritten in a KDO structure.

### 2.2 Sensitivity functions

An important aspect involved in Disturbance Observer designs (at least for the DEF), is the (complementary) sensitivity function. For the DEF design, it is well known that  $(1 - Q)$  and  $Q$  represent the sensitivity and complementary sensitivity functions, respectively. Using this property of the DEF, the filter  $Q(s)$  can be carefully chosen to guarantee robust stability and performance. However, little literature is available that discusses robustness for the KDO design method (see (Coelingh, 2000) for one of the exceptions). But because the KDO can be written in terms of a DEF structure, small-gain criteria can be applied for the KDO design as well such that robustness is attained.

### 2.3 Pole-zero cancellation

One of the requirements for the KDO method to succeed, is that the augmented plant model (i.e. plant and disturbance generator) is observable. To the best of our knowledge, similar requirements on pole-zero cancellation have never been reported for a DEF design. But because of the equivalence, this requirement can directly be translated to the DEF design.

### 2.4 Non-minimum-phase plants

Non-minimum-phase systems used to be problematic for a DEF design, as the zeros in the right-half-plane

re-appear as right-half-plane poles in the feedback loop of a DEF. In contrast, the KDO handles non-minimum-phase systems easily. It is clear that the DEF can handle non-minimum-phase systems equivalently, by virtue of the equivalence, by proper selection of the filter  $Q(s)$ .

### 2.5 Alternative disturbance models

When the disturbance to be rejected is not described by  $1/s^k$ , but more generally described by  $1/(s^k + q_{k-1}s^{k-1} + \dots + q_0)$ , the KDO design method can simply be used to arrive at a disturbance observer. On the other hand, the DEF design method is less apparent. In fact, the filter  $Q(s)$  has to be selected according to the very general structure:

$$Q(s) = \frac{1 + \sum g_m s^m}{1 + \sum f_m s^m} \quad (1)$$

such that  $1/(1 - Q)$  includes the factor  $1/(s^k + q_{k-1}s^{k-1} + \dots + q_0)$ . It is not trivial to select  $Q(s)$  such that this requirement, in conjunction with the common requirements imposed by the DEF design, are satisfied. Though, as a result of the equivalence between the DEF and the KDO, it is always possible to construct a  $Q(s)$  that fulfills this requirement.

## References

- R. Bickel and M. Tomizuka, 1999. Passivity-Based Versus Disturbance Observer Based Robot Control: Equivalence and Stability. *ASME J. of Dynamic Systems, Measurements and Control*, 121 (1999), 41–47.
- H.J. Coelingh, 2000. *Design Support for Motion Control Systems; a Mechatronic Approach*. PhD dissertation, University of Twente, The Netherlands.
- C.D. Johnson, 1971. Accomodation of External Disturbances in Linear Regulator and Servomechanism Problems. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, 16 (1971), 635–644.
- J.A. Profeta, W.G. Vogt, and M.H. Mickle, 1990. Disturbance Estimation and Compensation in Linear Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace & Electronic Systems*, 26 (1990), 225–231.
- E. Schrijver and J. Van Dijk, 2000. On the Design of Robust Disturbance Observers for Mechatronic Systems. *1st IFAC-Conference Mechatronics 2000, Darmstadt, Germany*, (2000).
- E. Schrijver, J. Van Dijk, and H. Nijmeijer, 2000. Equivalence of Disturbance Observer Structures for Linear Systems. *Internal Report WA-724, Mechanical Engineering and Automation, University Of Twente*, (2000).
- T. Umeno and Y. Hori, 1991. Robust Speed Control of DC Servomotors Using Modern Two Degrees-of-Freedom Controller Design. *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Electronics*, 38 (1991), 363–368.