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Abstract

In this paper, the Linear Exponential Quadratic Gaussian with Loop Transfer Recovery (LEQG/LTR) methodology is employed for the design of high performance induction motor servo systems. In addition, we design a speed sensorless induction motor vector controlled driver with both the extended Kalman filter and the LEQG/LTR algorithm. The experimental realization of an induction servo system is given. Compared with the traditional PI and LQG/LTR methods, it can be seen that the system output sensitivity for parameter variations and the rising time for larger command input of the proposed method can be significantly reduced.

1 Introduction

Because of the intensive advances of microelectronics and power electronics, the vector controlled induction motor servo drives have become dominant in many applications where fast and precision operations are required[1, 2]. Due to the rapid development in automation technology, the demand for high performance electrical servos has increased. Thus, it is necessary to develop a controller that overcomes the effects of parameter variations, plant uncertainties, and load disturbances.

The Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) method with state feedback technique can provide some guaranteed robustness properties[3]. Also, the adoption of Loop Transfer Recovery (LTR) process can enhance the robustness of system with state observer[4, 5]. Thus, it was extensively applied in the design of motor drive systems[6, 7, 8, 9]. On the other hand, some papers[10, 11, 12, 13] concluded that the optimal control systems obtained by the Linear Exponential Quadratic Gaussian and Loop Transfer Recovery (LEQG/LTR) methods were insensitive to the load disturbances and sensor noises. This is due to that the LEQG/LTR method can take the covariances of both system and measurement noises into consideration. So far, the LEQG/LTR technique has not been applied to the design of induction motors yet, this paper is the first one.

We can see that applying the proposed method to the design of an induction motor servos with speed sensor, the loop transfer functions can be shaped, so that the closed-loop systems will yield better performances than those obtained by the PI and LQG/LTR methods[9] in command following, output disturbance rejection, and robustness to noises and unmodeled system dynamics. Aside, a speed sensorless vector controlled induction motor drive[14, 15] by using the extended Kalman filter[16] and the LEQG/LTR algorithm is derived. The experimental results illustrate that the system output sensitivity for load and command amplitude, and the rising time for larger command can be reduced while comparing to the PI and LQG/LTR controllers.

The rests of this paper are organized as follow. In Section 2, the proposed method is formulated and applied for an induction motor servo drive system design. In Section 3, the experiment results are given to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed method. Finally, brief conclusions are drawn in Section 4.

2 Problem and Methodology Formulation

2.1 Induction Motor Formulation

Consider an induction motor servo, the state equation in the rotating reference frame is[8, 9]

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
    i_p \\
    i_q \\
    \phi_p \\
    \phi_q
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
    \Xi & \omega & 0 & 0 \\
    -\omega & \Xi & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & \frac{M_p}{L_p} & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{M_p}{L_p}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    i_p \\
    i_q \\
    \phi_p \\
    \phi_q
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
    0 \\
    0 \\
    \frac{1}{L_p} \\
    \frac{1}{L_p}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    u_p \\
    u_q
\end{bmatrix}
$$
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where \( \Xi = -\frac{R_r}{\alpha L_s} - \frac{L_r R_s}{\alpha L_s L_r} \), \( (i_p, i_{\bar{g}_s}) \) are the stator currents, \( (\phi_p, \phi_{\bar{g}_s}) \) are the rotor fluxes, \( v_{\bar{g}_s} \) are the stator voltages respectively in the \( \gamma \) and \( \delta \)-axis, \( \omega \) is the operating angular frequency of AC, \( \omega_{\text{re}} \) is the electrical angular velocity of rotor, \( \sigma = 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha L_r} \) is total leakage factor, and \( R_s, R_r, L_s, L_r, M \) are the stator, rotor resistances, stator, rotor, and mutual inductances.

If one let
\[
\omega - \omega_{\text{re}} = \omega_{\text{se}} = \frac{M R_r i_{\bar{g}_s}}{L_r \phi_p},
\]
where \( \omega_{\text{re}} \) is the slip rate, and let \( \phi_{\bar{g}_s} = 0 \), then we have, from the last row of Eq. (1),
\[
\begin{align*}
T_e &= \frac{p M}{L_r} \phi_p i_{\bar{g}_s}, \quad (3) \\
\phi_p &= -\frac{R_r}{L_r} \phi_p + \frac{M R_r}{L_r} i_{\bar{g}_s},
\end{align*}
\]
where \( p \) is the number of poles. By Eqs. (3) and (4), Eq. (1) can be rewritten as
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
i_p \\
i_{\bar{g}_s} \\
\phi_p
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
\Xi & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -\frac{L_r}{\alpha L_s} & 0 \\
\frac{M R_r}{L_r} & 0 & \frac{V_p}{\phi_p}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
i_p \\
i_{\bar{g}_s} \\
\phi_p
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
v_{\bar{g}_s} \\
v_{\bar{g}_s} \\
0
\end{bmatrix},
\]
where
\[
\begin{align*}
v_p &= v_{\bar{g}_s} - \alpha \omega L_s i_{\bar{g}_s}, \quad (6) \\
v_{\bar{g}_s} &= v_{\bar{g}_s} + \omega (\alpha L_s i_{\bar{g}_s} + \frac{M}{L_r} \phi_p),
\end{align*}
\]
and \( v_p, v_{\bar{g}_s} \) mean the current controller outputs of \( i_p \) and \( i_{\bar{g}_s} \), respectively.

If one let \( \phi_p = 0 \), then \( i_{\bar{g}_s} = i_{\bar{g}_s} \) and the torque can be controlled by the \( \delta \)-axis stator current \( i_{\bar{g}_s} \), then we have, by Eq. (5),
\[
\phi_p = M i_{\bar{g}_s}, \quad (8)
\]
and the command input of torque current
\[
\phi_{\bar{g}_s} = (\alpha L_s + R_s) i_{\bar{g}_s} = v_{\bar{g}_s},
\]
By Eqs. (2) and (5), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_{\text{re}} &= \frac{R_r}{L_r} i_{\bar{g}_s}, \\
v_{\bar{g}_s} &= v_{\bar{g}_s} - \omega_{\text{se}} A i_p - \frac{R_r}{L_r} A i_{\bar{g}_s},
\end{align*}
\]

**Fig. 1** Block diagram of a decoupling current-controlled induction servo drive system

where \( \Lambda = \left( \frac{\alpha L_s + \frac{\sigma}{L_r}}{L_r} \right) \), hence we have
\[
v_{\bar{g}_s} = v_{\bar{g}_s} - p \alpha_{0 m} L_r i_p - \frac{R_r L_s}{L_r} i_{\bar{g}_s},
\]
where \( \alpha_{0 m} \) is the mechanical angular velocity of rotor. If the effects of windage viscosity and bearing friction are negligible, the block diagram of the decoupling current-controlled servo drive is shown in Figure 1, where \( K_I \) is the equivalent current loop gain.

Define
\[
\frac{L_r R_r}{L_r} = K_F, \quad p L_s i_p = K_E, \quad p M^2 \frac{L_s}{L_r} = K_T.
\]
Then the equivalent model of the vector controlled induction motor drive can be approximated as [9]
\[
G_p(s) = \frac{(K_I - K_F) K_T}{(\alpha L_s J_m) s^2 + (R_s + K_I) J_m s + K_E K_T}
\]
\[
= \frac{s \tau_e + 1}{s \tau_m + 1}
\]
where \( K_I \) is the equivalent dc gain, and \( \tau_e, \tau_m \) are the equivalent electrical and mechanical time constants, respectively.

### 2.2 Standard LEQG/LTR Design

Consider a Linear Time-Invariant (LTI), controllable and observable stochastic system
\[
\begin{align*}
x(t) &= A x(t) + B u(t) + \Gamma \nu(t), \\
y(t) &= C x(t) + \nu(t),
\end{align*}
\]
where \( x(t), u(t), \) and \( y(t) \) are the state, control, and measurement vectors, and \( w(t) \) and \( \nu(t) \) are the uncorrelated Gaussian white noises with zero-mean and covariances
\[
\begin{align*}
E\{w(t) w^T(\tau)\} &= W \delta(t - \tau), \quad W > 0 \\
E\{\nu(t) \nu^T(\tau)\} &= V \delta(t - \tau), \quad V > 0
\end{align*}
\]
respectively, where \( E\{\bullet\} \) is an expectation function operator. The problem is then to derive a feedback-control law.
which minimizes the following quadratic cost function:

\[
J = \alpha E \left\{ e^{i \beta t^2} \left[ (Z^T(t)) Q Z(t) + v^T(t) R v(t) \right] \right\}, \tag{19}
\]

where \( e^{i \beta t} \) is an exponential function operator, \( Z = Nx \) is a linear combination of the states, \( Q \) is a semi-positive definite weighting matrix, \( R \) is a positive definite weighting matrix, and \( \alpha \) is a dimensionless weighting factor.

The solution to the LEQG problem is described by the separation principle, which states that the optimal result is obtained which would be satisfactory at any point we would like to have, is the return ratio at the point marked 1 in Figure 2, whereas the return ratio at the point marked 2 is obtained which would be satisfactory at any point we would like to have, is the return ratio at the point marked 2.

The block diagram of the system with the LEQG-based compensator is referred to Figure 2. The robustness and performance properties at the input of the plant are determined by the return ratio at the point marked 1 in Figure 2, whereas the return ratio \((-K_f(sI - A)^{-1}B\)) is obtained which would be satisfactory at the output of the plant.

**S1:** Design a Kalman filter by manipulating the covariance matrices \( W \) and \( V \) until a return ratio \(-C(sI - A)^{-1}K_f\) is obtained which would be satisfactory at the output of the plant.

**S2:** Synthesize an optimal state-feedback regulator by setting \( M = C, Q = Q_0 + q f \) and \( R = I \) (or \( Q = I \) and \( R = \rho I \)), and increase \( q \) (or reduce \( \rho \)) until the return ratio at the output of the compensated plant has converged sufficiently closely to \(-C(sI - A)^{-1}K_f\) over a sufficiently large range of frequencies.

The standard form of the LEQG-based controller is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}(t) &= A_c \dot{x}(t) + K_f e(t), \tag{20} \\
u(t) &= -K_c \dot{x}(t). \tag{21}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
A_c &= A - BK_c - K_f C, \tag{22} \\
K_f &= P_f CV^{-1}, \tag{23} \\
K_c &= R^{-1}B^T P_c. \tag{24}
\end{align*}
\]

by \( P_f \) and \( P_c \) satisfied with the algebraic Riccati equations,

\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= P_f A^T + A P_f + \Gamma W T^T \\
&- P_f C T^T V^{-1} C P_f, \tag{25} \\
0 &= P_c A + A^T P_c + Q \\
&- P_c (B R^{-1} B^T - \alpha K_f V K_f^T) P_c. \tag{26}
\end{align*}
\]

2.3 Speed Estimation Method

Let the discrete induction motor system be

\[
\begin{align*}
X(k + 1) &= A_{d}(k) X(k) + B_{d}(k) U(k) + v(k) \\
Z(k) &= H(k) X(k) + v(k), \tag{27}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
X(k) &= \begin{bmatrix}
[i_{pr}(k) i_{ls}(k) \phi_p(k) \phi_0(k)
\end{bmatrix}^T, \tag{29} \\
U(k) &= \begin{bmatrix}
v_{pr}(k) v_{ls}(k)
\end{bmatrix}^T, \tag{30} \\
A_{d}(k) &= e^{A(k) T_s} \equiv I + A(k) T_s, \tag{31} \\
B_{d}(k) &= \int_0^{T_s} e^{A(k) T_s} B(k) d \tau \equiv B(k) T_s, \tag{32} \\
H(k) &= \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{33}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( T_s \) is the sampling period.

The nonlinear drive can be modified as[15]

\[
\begin{align*}
X(k + 1) &= f(X(k), U(k)) + w(k), \tag{34} \\
Z(k) &= h(X(k)) + v(k), \tag{35}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
X(k) &= \begin{bmatrix}
\omega_r(k) & R_c(k) & i_p(k) \\
i_{ls}(k) \phi_p(k) & \phi_0(k)
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{36} \\
U(k) &= \begin{bmatrix}
v_{pr}(k) & v_{ls}(k)
\end{bmatrix}^T, \tag{37} \\
x_1(k + 1) &= x_1(k) + w_1(k), \tag{38} \\
x_2(k + 1) &= x_2(k) + w_2(k), \tag{39} \\
x_3(k + 1) &= x_3(k) + T_{e} \omega_{x_4}(k) + \frac{T_{r}}{\sigma_L} (1 + w_3(k), \tag{40} \\
x_4(k + 1) &= -T_{e} \omega_{x_5}(k) + \chi_{x_5}(k) - \frac{T_{r}}{\sigma_L} (1 + w_4(k), \tag{41} \\
x_5(k + 1) &= \kappa x_3(k) + \nu x_5(k)
\end{align*}
\]
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\[ x_6(k + 1) = + \varepsilon x_6(k) + w_6(k), \quad (42) \]
\[ z_1(k) = i_p(k) + v_1(k), \quad (43) \]
\[ z_2(k) = i_0(k) + v_2(k), \quad (44) \]
\[ w(k) = [w_1(k) \ w_2(k) \ w_3(k) \ w_4(k) \ w_5(k) \ w_6(k)], \quad (46) \]
\[ v(k) = [v_1(k) \ v_2(k)]^T, \quad \text{(47)} \]

where \( \chi = 1 - T \left[ \frac{R_s}{L_s} + \frac{(1 - \sigma T_1 \zeta)}{L_s} \right] \), \( \eta = \frac{T_M}{\sigma L_s k^2} \), \( \zeta = \frac{T M M_{x_1}(l)}{L_s} \), \( \varepsilon = T_c (\omega - x_1(k)), \text{ and } v = \left[ 1 - T \frac{\zeta x_1(k)}{\sigma} \right]. \)

The linearized system of Eqs.\((34)\) and \((35)\) can be written as
\[ X(k + 1) = F(k)X(k) + w(k), \quad (48) \]
\[ Z(k) = \Gamma X(k) + v(k), \quad (49) \]

where
\[
F(k) = \frac{\partial f(X(k), U(k))}{\partial X(k)} \bigg|_{X(k) = X(k)} \quad (50)
\]
\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & \zeta x_6(k) & T \gamma & \chi \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -\zeta x_5(k) & T_1 - T \omega \\
0 & T \omega & \eta x_3(k) & \zeta x_1(k) & 0 & \xi \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \kappa \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \varepsilon \\
\kappa & -\varepsilon & \eta x_2(k) & 0 & \chi & \nu
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (51)
\]
\[
\Delta(k) = \frac{\partial h(X(k))}{\partial X(k)} \bigg|_{X(k) = \hat{X}(k)} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \xi \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \zeta \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (52)
\]

where
\[ \chi = \frac{\rho x_1(k) + \eta x_3(k)}{\tau = \rho x_4(k) + \eta x_6(k)}, \quad \xi = T \left[ \frac{M_{x_1}(k) - x_1(k)}{L_s} \right], \quad \rho = \frac{(1 - \sigma \zeta)}{\sigma L_s k^2}, \text{ and } \zeta = T \left[ \frac{M_{x_1}(k) - x_1(k)}{L_s} \right]. \]

Next, we use the following Kalman filter to estimate speed,
\[ \tilde{x}(k | k - 1) = f(\tilde{x}(k - 1 | k - 1), U(k - 1)), \quad (53) \]
\[ P(k | k - 1) = F(k)P(k - 1 | k - 1)F^T(k) + Q(k - 1), \quad (54) \]
\[ K(k) = P(k | k - 1) \Delta^T(k) P(k | k - 1) \Delta^T(k) + R(k) \right]^{-1}, \quad (55) \]
\[ \hat{x}(k | k) = \tilde{x}(k | k - 1) + K(k) \Delta(k), \quad (56) \]
\[ P(k | k) = [I - K(k) \Delta(k)] P(k | k - 1), \quad (57) \]

where \( K \) is the Kalman filter gain, \( \tilde{x} \) is the estimated state, and \( Q \) is a \( 6 \times 6 \) constant matrix.

### 3 Experimental Results

This model is taken from the catalog of TECO 3-phase induction motor ( TYPE : AEEF ) with four poles, the parameters are shown in Table 1. The load applies ONGRA PB-1.2 brake, and the tachometer series number is MICROTECH MES-30-1000-E-K5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Parameters list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stator resistance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotor resistance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stator inductance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotor inductance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutual inductance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lumped inertia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of poles</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Eqs.\((13)\), we can find
\[ K_F = 2.03, K_E = 0.29i_{p0}, K_T = 0.27i_{p0}. \quad (58) \]

Let \( i_{p0} \approx 3.5 \text{A} \), then \( K_E = 1.02 \), and \( K_T = 0.94 \). If we choose \( K_F = 100 \), then the transfer function of Eq.\((14)\) becomes
\[ G_p(s) = \frac{922095}{s^2 + 9296s + 9632}. \quad (59) \]

#### S1: Kalman-filter Gain Design

For the target feedback loop design, we need to set the matrices \( \Gamma, W \), and \( V \) in advance, then solve Eq.\((25)\) to find \( F \), and finally obtain the Kalman-filter gain \( \gamma \) from Eq.\((23)\). This procedure is similar to solve the Equation of a Linear Quadratic problem, thus in the following, we shall abbreviate the formulation of this step as
\[ K_F = LQE(A, \Gamma, C, W, V). \quad (60) \]

Generally, it is advisable to start with simple choices of \( \Gamma, W, \) and \( V \), then inspect the resulting Kalman-filter return ratio. One set of possible choice is \( \Gamma = B [3], W = 1, V = \mu \). Thus, we have
\[ K_F = LQE(A, B, C, 1, \mu). \quad (61) \]

After some trial-and-error, we choose \( \mu = 1 \), then
\[ K_{f1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0055 \\ 0.0001 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (62) \]

For the sake to make the steady-state error be zero, the first thing is to insert integral action to each input. As it was mentioned \([7]\), placing poles of the augmented model at the origin would lead to problems in the recovery step later, so in this case we place them at \(-0.0001\). Then the system model of this integrator can be expressed as
\[ A_w = -10^{-4}, B_w = 1, C_w = 1, D_w = 0. \quad (63) \]
The augmented system model is[12]
\[
A_a = \begin{bmatrix} A & \Gamma C_w \\ 0 & A_w \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_a = \begin{bmatrix} B \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Gamma_a = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma D_w \\ B_w \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_a = [C \ 0]. \tag{64}
\]

Now we have the new Kalman gain matrix as
\[
K_{f1}' = \text{LQE}(A_a, \Gamma_a, C_a, 1, 1) = \begin{bmatrix} 10^{-4} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{65}
\]

Define the sensitivity function
\[
S_F(s) = [I + C_a(sI - A_a)^{-1}K_{f1}'], \tag{66}
\]
and the closed-loop transfer function is
\[
T_F(s) = I - S_F(s). \tag{67}
\]

The principal gain of the return ratio \(-C(sI - A)^{-1}K_{f1}'\) is shown in Figure 3. Figure 4 shows the principal gains of the sensitivity function \(S_F(s)\) and the closed-loop transfer function \(T_F(s)\). From \(T_F(s)\) it can be seen that the steady-state error of the system is reduced to zero by inserting integral action to each input.

\section*{S2: LEQG/LTR Compensator Gain Design}

Let \(N = C_a, \ Q = I, \ R = \rho I\) and \(W = I\), then we have the Hamiltonian matrix of the LEQG problem defined as
\[
\begin{bmatrix} \dot{X} \\ \dot{P} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_a \\ -2C_a^T \Gamma_a \\ -\frac{1}{2}B_a \rho^{-1}B_a^T + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_a \alpha W \Gamma_a^T \\ -A_a^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X \\ P \end{bmatrix}, \tag{68}
\]

where \(X\) is the state vector, and \(P\) is the Lagrange multiplier. Thus by Eqs.(64), (24) and (26), one can obtain the optimal control gain \(K_c\). Choose \(\alpha = 100\) and \(\rho = 1\), then by Eq. (24) we have
\[
K_c = \begin{bmatrix} 7 & 70345 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{69}
\]

Once the control gain \(K_c\) has been found, a state-space realization of the compensator \(K(s)\) is given by \((A_{K1}, B_{K1}, C_{K1}, D_{K1})\), where
\[
A_{K1} = A_a - B_a K_c - K_{f1}' C_a, \tag{70}
\]
\[
B_{K1} = K_{f1}', \tag{71}
\]
\[
C_{K1} = -K_c, \tag{72}
\]
\[
D_{K1} = 0. \tag{73}
\]

Thus the sensitivity and co-sensitivity functions are
\[
S(s) = [I + C_{K1}(sI - A_{K1})^{-1}B_{K1}]^{-1}, \tag{74}
\]
\[
T(s) = I - S(s). \tag{75}
\]

Figure 5 shows the principal gain of \(K(s)G_p(s)\), the principal gains of the sensitivity function \(S(s)\) and the closed-loop transfer function \(T(s)\) are shown in Figure 6. The closed-loop step and impulse responses are shown in Figures 7 and 8, respectively.

\section*{S3: Digitize LEQG/LTR Controller}

Let the sampling period be 100 \(\mu\)sec, then we have the system matrices of digital controller
\[
A_{DK1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.388 & -5.52 & 1 \\ 10^{-4} & 0.999 & 0 \\ -0.003 & -87.2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{76}
\]
\[
B_{DK1} = \begin{bmatrix} 10^{-4} \\ 0 \\ 0.999 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{77}
\]
\[
C_{DK1} = \begin{bmatrix} -8 \cdot 10^{-4} & -7.029 \cdot 10^{-4} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{78}
\]
\[
D_{DK1} = -3 \cdot 10^{-5}. \tag{79}
\]

\section*{S4: Experimental Realization}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig9.png}
\caption{System configuration of the experiment}
\end{figure}

(a) With speed sensor

The system configuration of the experiment is shown in Figure 9.

i. PI-based design\(^1\).

The results of no load for the square-wave rotation speed input \(\omega_{srm}\) with amplitudes 600 and 1800 \(rad/s\) are shown in Figure 10. The responses with 1 N load are shown in Figure 11. It can be seen that there is chattering effect for the case of \(\omega_{srm} = 600 \text{ rad/s}\), and the rising time of the response is larger with \(\omega_{srm} = 1800 \text{ rad/s}\).

ii. LQG/LTR-based design

The responses by using LQG/LTR method with the same design parameters are shown in Figures 12 and 13. It can be seen that there is overshoot for the no load case with \(\omega_{srm} = 600 \text{ rad/s}\).

\(^1\)The PI coefficients, \(K_P = 6\) and \(K_I = 2400\), are designed for the same bandwidth as LEQG/LTR method.
iii. LEQG/LTR-based design
The responses by using LEQG/LTR method are shown in Figures 14 and 15. It can be seen that the results obtained by the proposed method are better for comparing with the other methods aforementioned.

(b) Sensorless
The speed sensor is replaced by the extended Kalman-filter.

i. PI-based design
The results are shown in Figures 16 and 17. From the responses, we can find that there are vibratory effects in low speed, and the rise times are larger for the high speed command responses with and without load.

ii. LQG/LTR-based design
The responses by using LQG/LTR method are shown in Figures 18 and 19. It can be seen that for the case with \( \omega_m/\omega_r = 600 \) rad/s there is vibratory in low speed. Also, the rising times with \( \omega_m/\omega_r = 1800 \) rad/s are also large for the response with and without load.

iii. LEQG/LTR-based design
The results for LEQG/LTR-based controller are shown in Figures 20 and 21. The results are still better despite of some small or shake effects.

4 Conclusions
In this paper, the LEQG/LTR method is applied for the servo controller design. A systematic design procedure is proposed. In addition, we design a speed sensorless induction motor vector controlled driver with both the extended Kalman-filter and the LEQG/LTR algorithm. Performance comparisons with load disturbance and parameter variations by experimental realization are also carried out. It can be seen that by using the proposed method to the design of induction motor servo drive system, the loop transfer functions can be shaped so that the closed-loop systems will yield (1) good command following, and (2) good output disturbance rejection, which are better than those obtained by the well-known PI and LQG/LTR methods.
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Fig. 3  Principle gain of $-C(sI - A)^{-1}K_f$.  

Fig. 7  Closed-loop unit step input response.  

Fig. 4  Principle gain of $S_F(s)$ and $T_F(s)$.  

Fig. 8  Closed-loop impulse response.  

Fig. 5  Principle gain of $K(s)G_p(s)$.  

Fig. 10  The speed response w/o load and w/ $\omega_{rm}$ = 600 and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).  

Fig. 6  Principle gain of $S(s)$ and $T(s)$.  

Fig. 11  The speed response w/ 1 N load and w/ $\omega_{rm}$ = 600 and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).
**Fig. 12** The speed response w/o load and w/ $\omega^*_m = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).

**Fig. 13** The speed response w/ 1 N load and w/ $\omega^*_m = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).

**Fig. 14** The speed response w/o load and w/ $\omega^*_m = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).

**Fig. 15** The speed response w/o load and w/ $\omega^*_m = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).

**Fig. 16** The speed response w/o load and w/ $\omega^*_m = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).

**Fig. 17** The speed response w/ 1 N load and w/ $\omega^*_m = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).

**Fig. 18** The speed response w/o load and w/ $\omega^*_m = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).

**Fig. 19** The speed response w/ 1 N load and w/ $\omega^*_m = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).
**Fig. 20** The speed response w/o load and w/ $\omega_{rm} = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).

**Fig. 21** The speed response w/ 1 N load and w/ $\omega_{rm} = 600$ and 1800 rad/s (dashed line).