REDUCED-ORDER UNKNOWN-INPUT PERFECT OBSERVER FOR STANDARD SYSTEMS

Stefan Krzemiński, Tadeusz Kaczorek

Warsaw University of Technology
Institute of Control and Industrial Electronics
ul. Koszykowa 75, 00-662 Warszawa, POLAND
E-mails: skrzemin@isep.pw.edu.pl,
kaczorek@isep.pw.edu.pl

Abstract: The problem of the design of a perfect reduced-order unknown-input observer for standard systems is formulated and solved. The procedure of designing the observer using well-known canonical form is proposed and illustrated with a numerical example. Necessary and sufficient conditions for the solvability of the procedure are given. *Copyright© 2005 IFAC.*

Keywords: perfect observer, reduced-order observer, simulation

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of observer design for standard systems with unknown inputs has received considerable attention in the last two decades (Darouach *et al.*, 1994; Guan and Saif, 1991; Hou and Müller, 1992; Hou and Müller, 1999; Syrmos, 1993; Yang and Wilde, 1988). This problem is of great importance in theory and practice, since there are many situations where part of inputs or disturbances are inaccessible.

Recently, a great deal of work has been devoted to the observer design for descriptor systems (Muller and Hou, 1993; Paraskevopoulos and Koumboulis, 1992; Shafai and Carroll, 1987), but only in few works the problem of the design of unknown-input observer for descriptor systems (Darouach *et al.*, 1996; Yang and Ta, 1989) was considered. Many practical systems can be described by descriptor models, and the fault diagnosis of these systems may be based on the unknown input observer design. Descriptor systems give many not obvious opportunities, one of which is a recently developed new concept of per-

fect observers(Kaczorek, 2000). The idea has been extended for standard linear systems (Kaczorek, 2001*a*), singular 2-D linear systems (Kaczorek, 2001*b*) and functional observers (Kaczorek, 2002). Recently (Krzemiński and Kaczorek, 2003) the problem of perfect unknown-input observer for singular systems has been formulated and solved.

In this paper the concept of a perfect reduced-order unknown-input observer is extended for standard systems or in other words the concept of a perfect observer for standard linear systems (Kaczorek and Sławiński, 2002) is extended for unknown inputs.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Let $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be the set of $n \times m$ real matrices and $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$.

Consider the continuous-time linear system

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu + Dv \qquad (1)$$
$$y = Cx$$

where $\dot{x} = \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state vector, $u \in \mathbb{R}^q$ - input vector, $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ - unknown input (disturbance) vector, $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ - output vector and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$. The initial condition for (1) is given by x_0.

It is assumed that rank $C = p < n$. It is not a strong assumption, because we can always eliminate linearly dependent outputs or in case rank $C = n$ find x from y using $x = C^{-1}y$. From the same reasons it is assumed rank $D = m$.

We are looking for an r order observer of the form

$$E_1\dot{z} = Fz + Gu + Hy \qquad (2)$$
$$\hat{x} = Pz + Qy$$

that for $t > 0$ reconstructs exactly semi-state vector x without knowledge of v, where $z \in \mathbb{R}^r$ is observer state vector, $\hat{x}$ is the estimate of x, $E_1, F \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, $\det E_1 = 0$, $G \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times q}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times p}$, $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$. The initial condition for (2) is given by $\hat{x}_0$ and in general is different from x_0.

Let $e \in \mathbb{R}^r$ be the observer error and

$$e = z - Tx \qquad (3)$$

where $T \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$. Differentiating (3) with respect to time and using (1) and (2) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_1\dot{e} &= E_1\dot{z} - E_1 T\dot{x} \\
&= Fz + Gu + HCx - E_1 TAx - E_1 TBu - E_1 TDv \\
&= Fz - FTx + FTx + HCx + Gu - E_1 TAx \\
&\quad - E_1 TBu - E_1 TDv \\
&= F(z - Tx) + (FT - E_1 TA + HC)x + \\
&\quad + (G - E_1 TB)u - E_1 TDv
\end{aligned}
$$

If

$$E_1 TB = G \qquad (4)$$
$$FT - E_1 TA + HC = 0 \qquad (5)$$
$$E_1 TD = 0 \qquad (6)$$

then

$$E_1\dot{e} = Fe. \qquad (7)$$

Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{x} - x &= Pz + QCx - x = \\
&= Pz + QCx + PTx - PTx - x = \\
&= P(z - Tx) + (QC + PT - I_n)x = \\
&= P(z - Tx) = Pe
\end{aligned}
$$

if

$$PT + QC = \begin{bmatrix} P & Q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T \\ C \end{bmatrix} = I_n. \qquad (8)$$

It is possible to show (Kaczorek, 2002), that if

$$\det(E_1 s - F) = \alpha \neq 0, \qquad (9)$$

where α does not depend on s, then error e is equal zero for all $t > 0$.

Problem: Given matrices A, B, C, D. Find E_1, F, G, H, T, P, Q such, that (4), (5), (6), (8) and (9) are satisfied.

3. THE MAIN RESULT

The condition (5) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} F & H \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T \\ C \end{bmatrix} = E_1 TA$$

If rank $F = r$ then from Sylvester inequality we get $r + n - (r + p) \leq rank E_1 TA$, and because $\det E_1 = 0$ the conclusion is $r > n - p$.

Due to the fact, that rank $E_1 TD = 0$ we get rank $E_1 T + m - n \leq 0$ and rank $E_1 T \leq n - m$. From this we get rank $E_1 \leq n - m$. Hence we have $p \geq m$.

Lemma 1. There exists pair (L, R) of nonsingular matrices that allow us to transform the matrices of the given system (1) to the forms

$$LAR = \tilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_3 & A_4 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad (10)$$
$$CR = \tilde{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_p \end{bmatrix},$$
$$LD = \tilde{D} = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 \\ D_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times (n-p)}$, $A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}$, $A_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (n-p)}$, $A_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, $D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n-p} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times m}$, $D_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{m+p-n} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ if and only if rank $C = p$ and rank $D = m$ and $p \leqslant m$.

Proof. There exists a nonsingular matrix R_1, such that $CR_1 = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & C_2 \end{bmatrix}$, where $C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and rank $C_2 = p$, if and only if rank $C = p$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
CR = CR_1 R_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & C_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n-p} & 0 \\ -C_2^{-1}C_1 & C_2^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_p \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using similar method with

$$L_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{D}_1^{-1} & 0 \\ -\hat{D}_1^{-1}\hat{D}_2 & I_{n-m} \end{bmatrix}$$

and proper division into blocks we get the forms of D_1 and D_2. The form of $\tilde{A}$ is the consequence of use of above transformations. ∎

The state vector of the system in the canonical form (10) is given by $\tilde{x} = R^{-1}x$.

Using the fact that $p < n$ we can conclude that rank D_2 is not full.

Let $r = 2n - m - p$. Let us choose E_1 and F in forms

$$E_1 = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n-p} & 0 \\ 0 & 0_{n-m} \end{bmatrix}, F = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{n-p} \\ \alpha I_{n-m} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

It is easy to check (Kaczorek, 2002) that such choice satisfies the condition (9).

Let

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & T_2 \\ T_3 & T_4 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $T_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m)\times(n-p)}$, $T_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m)\times(p)}$, $T_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p)\times(n-p)}$, $T_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p)\times(p)}$ and

$$X = FT - E_1 T \tilde{A}. \tag{12}$$

It is possible to find H from the equation $HC = -X$ if and only if

$$\operatorname{rank} \tilde{C} = \operatorname{rank} \begin{bmatrix} X \\ \tilde{C} \end{bmatrix} \tag{13}$$

From (13) it follows that all entries of the first $n - p$ columns of X must be equal 0.

Let $T = [t_{ij}]; i = 1, \ldots, r; j = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\tilde{A} = [a_{ij}]; i = 1, \ldots, n; j = 1, \ldots, n$. Using (11) and (12) we get

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{n-p} \\ \alpha I_{n-m} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} t_{11} & \cdots & t_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_{r,1} & \cdots & t_{r,n} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$- \begin{bmatrix} t_{11} & \cdots & t_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_{n-p,1} & \cdots & t_{n-p,n} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{1,1} & \cdots & a_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n,1} & \cdots & a_{n,n} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} t_{n-m+1,1} & \cdots & t_{n-m+1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_{2n-m-p,1} & \cdots & t_{2n-m-p,n} \\ \alpha t_{11} & \cdots & \alpha t_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha t_{n-m,1} & \cdots & \alpha t_{n-m,n} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$- \begin{bmatrix} c_{1,1} & \cdots & c_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{n-p,1} & \cdots & c_{n-p,n} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{14}$$

where $c_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^n t_{i,k} a_{k,j}$.

Because $\alpha \neq 0$, to satisfy (13) and the condition, that first $n - p$ columns of X must be equal

0, we need $t_{i,j} = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n - m$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n - p$, which is equal to $T_1 = 0$, what implies rank $D_2 < m$ (what is satisfied due to the canonical form).

From the equation (8) it comes that

$$\operatorname{rank} \begin{bmatrix} T \\ C \end{bmatrix} = \operatorname{rank} \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & T_2 \\ T_3 & T_4 \\ 0 & I_p \end{bmatrix} = n \tag{15}$$

If $T_1 = 0$ then we need rank $T_3 = n - p$.

Let

$$\bar{T}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} t_{1,n-p+1} & \cdots & t_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_{n-p,n-p+1} & \cdots & t_{n-p,n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p)\times p},$$

so it is T_2 without last $p - m$ rows. What we need is $t_{n-m+i,j} = c_{i,j} = \sum_{l=1}^n t_{i,l} a_{l,j} = \sum_{l=n-p+1}^n t_{i,l} a_{l,j}$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, n - p$ which is equivalent to

$$T_3 = \bar{T}_2 A_3. \tag{16}$$

If, as we show above, $T_1 = 0$ and we have to satisfy the condition (15) then we need rank $T_3 = n - p$. If $p < n - p$ then this can not be satisfied. If, in opposite case, $p \geq n - p$, then because $\bar{T}_2$ was build on the basis of the kernels of D and its rows are linearly independent, then $\bar{T}_2$ has full rank equal to $n - p$ and what we need is rank $A_3 = n - p$.

In this moment it becomes obvious why we have to set $r = 2n - m - p$: it is needed to have rank $T_3 = n - p$.

Let X_1 be a matrix constructed from columns number $n - p + 1, \ldots, 2n - m - p$ of X. Because $HC = H \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_m \end{bmatrix} = X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & X_1 \end{bmatrix}$ we get

$$H = X_1 \tag{17}$$

From (8) we have

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} P & Q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T \\ C \end{bmatrix} R = \begin{bmatrix} P & Q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} TR \\ \bar{C} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Due to the fact that R is a nonsingular matrix it does not change the rank of the matrices it multiplies. So we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & Q \end{bmatrix} = R \begin{bmatrix} TR \\ \bar{C} \end{bmatrix}^+ \tag{18}$$

where $^+$ stands for Moore-Penrose's inverse.

From the above considerations we have:

Procedure.

1. Find nonsingular matrices L and R transforming the system (1) to the form (10).
2. Choose E_1 and F according to (11).
3. Choose $T_1 = 0$ and T_2 of rank $n - m$.
4. Using $t_{i,j}$ found in step 3 and (16) find $t_{i,j}$ ($i = n-m+1, \ldots, 2n-m-p; j = 1, \ldots, n-p$).

5. Take any values as $t_{i,j}$ $(i = n - m + 1, \ldots, 2n - m - p; j = n - p + 1, \ldots, n)$ and find G using (4) and H from (17).

6. Find P and Q from the formula (18).

Using (10) we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} L & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Is - A & D \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} =$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} LRs - A_1 & -A_2 & D_1 \\ -A_3 & LRs - A_4 & D_2 \\ 0 & I_p & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (19)$$

At the beginning we assumed rank $D = m$. Because of the canonical forms of D_1 and D_2, using elementary operations we can eliminate entries depending on s from $LRs - A_1$ using D_1 and from $Is - A_4$ using I_p. Hence

$$\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} Is - A & D \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} = n + m \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{C}$$

if and only if rank $A_3 = n - p$.

Another conclusion coming from (19) is that assumption $p \geq n - p$ needed for the Procedure is satisfied if $p \geq m$ because $p + m \geq n$.

Therefore we have proved the following theorem:

Theorem. The observer (2) may be constructed using the Procedure if and only if the conditions

a) $p \geqslant m$,

b) rank $\begin{bmatrix} Is - A & D \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} = n + m$ for all $s \in \mathbb{C}$,

are satisfied.

4. EXAMPLE

Find the perfect reduced-order unknown-input observer for the system of the form (1) with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -5 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The given system is in the canonical form. It is easy to check that it satisfies the conditions of the Theorem. Number of disturbances is $m = 2$ and number of outputs is $p = 3$ so from (11) we get

$$E_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, F = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \alpha & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

According to the third step of the Procedure we choose

$$\begin{bmatrix} T_1 & T_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \vdots & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \vdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \vdots & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using (16) we get all other entries of matrix T

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

Using (20) and (12) we obtain

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\alpha \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

Using (17) and (21) we get

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -4 & 0 \\ -\alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & -\alpha & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using (4) and (20) we obtain

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using (18) and (20) we get

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0.5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

5. SIMULATIONS

Simulations were prepared in Matlab and Simulink. Although they are the most sophisticated software available, they can not deal with simulations of all singular systems (Shampine *et al.*, 1999). However, the choice of the form of the observer (11) allows us to transform the system (2) into

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{z}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \dot{z}_{n-p} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} z_{n-m+1} \\ \vdots \\ z_{2n-p-m} \end{bmatrix} + G_1 u + H_1 y$$

$$0 = \hat{F} \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ \vdots \\ z_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} + G_2 u + H_2 y$$

where $\hat{F} = \alpha I_{n-m}$, $G = \begin{bmatrix} G_1 \\ G_2 \end{bmatrix}$, $G_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times q}$ and $H = \begin{bmatrix} H_1 \\ H_2 \end{bmatrix}$, $H_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}$. Because $\hat{F}$ is square and nonsingular, we can find $z_1, \ldots, z_{n-m}$ from

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ \vdots \\ z_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} = -\hat{F}^{-1} \left(G_2 u + H_2 y \right)$$

and using the derivative of just found $z_1, \ldots, z_{n-m}$ find the rest of the vector z with

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_{n-m+1} \\ \vdots \\ z_{2n-p-m} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{z}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \dot{z}_{n-p} \end{bmatrix} - G_1 u - H_1 y.$$

The realization of ideal derivative mentioned above is the only problem with simulations in Matlab, but by reducing the solver step size we can make this error negligible.

Then, for the observer constructed in section 5, with initial conditions $x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & -1 & -2 \end{bmatrix}^T$ and for $\alpha = 10$, we get:


Fig. 1. The state vector of the given system

Fig. 2. The estimates (the outputs of the observer)

The figures $2 \div 4$ show that at $t = 0$, the state variables of the observer change their values impulsively due to the difference between the initial conditions of the system and the observer.

This is also the reason for the huge error of the estimation at $t = 0$. But, as it is for perfect observers, for $t > 0$ we have error equal almost 0 (due to the numerical realization of the ideal derivative) - as it can be seen on the figure 5.


Fig. 3. The error of the estimation of the first state variable


Fig. 4. The error of the estimation of the second state variable

Fig. 5. The error of the estimation of the state variable number 3-5

It is important to notice that choice of α does not influence the result.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND OPEN PROBLEMS

The problem of the design of a perfect reduced-order unknown-input observer for standard systems has been formulated and solved. The procedure of designing the observer using well-known canonical form has been proposed. Necessary and sufficient conditions for the solvability of the procedure were given. The method was illustrated by a numerical example and by the plots of the system states, observer outputs and errors.

The most important open problem are necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of the observer. Other open problems are extensions of the considerations for 2D systems and for the perfect functional reduced-order unknown-input observers.

REFERENCES

Darouach, M., M. Zasadzinski and S. J. Xu (1994). Full-order observers for linear systems with unkown inputs. **39**, 606–609.

Darouach, M., M. Zasadziński and M. Hayar (1996). Reduced-order observer design for descriptor systems with unknown inputs. **41**(7), 1068–1072.

Guan, Y. P. and M. Saif (1991). A novel approach to the design of unkown input observers. **36**, 632–635.

Hou, M. and P. C. Müller (1992). Design of observers for linear systems with unkown inputs. **37**, 871–875.

Hou, M. and P. C. Müller (1999). Observer design for descriptor systems. **44**, 164–169.

Kaczorek, T. (1993). *Linear Control Systems, vol. 1 and 2.* Research Studies Press and J. Wiley. New York.

Kaczorek, T. (1998). *Vectors and Matrices in Automation and Electrotechnics (in Polish).* WNT. Warszawa.

Kaczorek, T. (2000). Reduced-order perfect and standard observers for singular continuous-time linear systems. *Machine Intelligence & Robotic Control* **2**(3), 93–98.

Kaczorek, T. (2001*a*). Full-order perfect observers for continuous-time linear systems. *Bull. Pol. Acad. Tech. Sci.* **49**(4), 549–558.

Kaczorek, T. (2001*b*). Perfect observers for singular 2-d fornasini-marchesini models. **46**(10), 1671–1675.

Kaczorek, T. (2002). Minimal order perfect functional observers for singular linear systems. *Machine Intelligence & Robotic Control* **4**(2), 71–74.

Kaczorek, T. and M. Sławiński (2002). Perfect observers for standard linear systems. *Bull. Pol. Acad. Techn. Sci.*

Krzemiński, S. and T. Kaczorek (2003). Perfect reduced-order unknown-input observer for descriptor systems. 7th International Multiconference on Informatics, Systemics and Cybernetics, Orlando, Floryda, USA, .

Muller, P. C. and M. Hou (1993). On the observer design for descriptor systems. **38**(11), 1666–1670.

Paraskevopoulos, P. N. and F. N. Koumboulis (1992). Observers for singular systems. **37**(8), 1211–1215.

Shafai, B. and R. L. Carroll (1987). Design of a minimal-order observer for singular systems. **45**(3), 1075–1081.

Shampine, L.F., M.W. Reichelt and J.A. Kierzenka (1999). Solving index-1 dae in matlab and simulink. *SIAM Review* **41**(3), 538–552.

Syrmos, V. L. (1993). Computational observer design techniques for linear systems with unkown inputs using the concept of transmission zeros. **38**, 790–794.

Yang, C. W. and H. L. Ta (1989). Observer design for singular systems with unkown inputs. **49**, 1937–1946.

Yang, F. and R. W. Wilde (1988). Observer for linear systems with unknown inputs. **33**, 677–681.