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The aim of this paper is to determine the feedforward and state feedback suboptimal time control for a subset of bilinear systems, namely, the control sequence and reaching time. This paper proposes a method that uses Block pulse functions as an orthogonal base. The bilinear system is projected along that base. The mathematical integration is transformed into a product of matrices. An algebraic system of equations is obtained. This system together with specified constraints is treated as an optimization problem. The parameters to determine are the final time, the control sequence, and the state trajectories. The obtained results via the newly proposed method are compared to known analytical solutions.

1. Introduction

Most engineering applications are aimed at solving complex mathematical models. This usually comes with a computational burden and is of a major concern. Researchers are therefore striving to reduce that burden. This is particularly true for minimum time optimal control problems. Using Pontryagin maximum principle, the solution to this problem is known to be Bang-Bang, that is, control values switches between lower and upper boundaries. This type of control is required in some types of systems such as the thermostat switching between the on- and off-position. Time optimal control problems’ aim is driving systems from an initial state to a desired final state in minimum time while satisfying given constraints. To this day, time optimal control problem still attracts interest among researchers [1–3].

Most engineering systems are interpreted as models. These models often feature nonlinear components which are challenging during the resolution process. Thus, simplified nonlinear representations such as bilinear models have gained momentum. Bilinear models have been introduced since the 1960s and are approximate representations for a wide range of systems. The bilinear structure can be used to describe a nonlinear system while maintaining a linear structure: the bilinearity expresses a double linearity with respect to the state vector and [4]. A detailed review of bilinear systems can be found in [5]. This type of representation has been used extensively by researchers during the previous decade for a variety of fields: engineering, biology, and economics [6, 7].

Solving the minimum time control problem analytically means finding switching times through the resolution of the Hamiltonian equation. This is a computationally intensive task. Some researchers tried to solve it analytically through the determination of switching surfaces [8]. Due to mathematical difficulty, numerical algorithms have been developed and introduced such as GPOPS-II, which is based on orthogonal collocation at Legendre–Gauss or Legendre–Gauss–Radau points [9]. Other tools are based on the control parameterization enhancing technique [10] and the optimal switching (TOS) algorithm [11].

In this paper, we use orthogonal functions to solve the minimum time control problem. In fact, this mathematical tool was widely used in the past and still is in different ways such as solution determination for optimal control problems [12–14]. Using this technique, a transposition of state space equation on an orthogonal base of functions and transformation of bilinear nonlinearity and integration operation into a matrical product is made. These approximations bypass all the mathematical difficulties associated with nonlinearities.

Generally, two types of orthogonal base of functions are considered in the literature: piecewise orthogonal functions such as Walsh [15], Haar wavelets [16], and Block pulse functions [17] and orthogonal polynomials such as Legendre [18],
2. Time-Optimal Constrained Feedforward Control Problem

Consider the bilinear systems described by the following state space form:

\[
\dot{x}(t) = A_0x(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} A_i x(t) u_i(t) + Bu(t) \\
= A_0x(t) + A (u(t) \otimes x(t)) + Bu(t),
\]

where \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is the state vector, \( u = [u_1, \ldots, u_m]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m \) is the input control vector, \( A_0 \) and \( A_{ij} \) are square \((n \times n)\) matrices, \( B \) is an \((n \times m)\) matrix and \( A = [A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m] \) and \( B = [B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_m] \), \( B_{ij} \) are the column of the matrix \( B \), and \( \otimes \) is the Kronecker product [24].

We assume that the input variables \( u_i \) satisfy the instantaneous constraint

\[
u_{min} \leq u_i(t) \leq u_{max}.
\]

The target state being the origin

\[
x(t_f) = 0.
\]

To minimize the final time, the cost function is taken as [25]:

\[
J = t_f - t_0 = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} r \cdot dt,
\]

where \( r = 1 \).

Applying the Pontryagin Maximum Principle (PMP) [26], we define the Hamiltonian [27] equation for system (1)

\[
H(\cdot) = -1 + \lambda^T \left( A_0 x(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} A_i x(t) u_i(t) + Bu(t) \right).
\]

The canonical Hamilton equations are given by

\[
\dot{x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} H \quad \lambda = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} H.
\]

Maximizing the Hamiltonian equation, one obtains the following control law:

\[
u_i(t) = \begin{cases} u_{min}, & \text{if } \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} H = \lambda^T (A_i x + B_i) < 0 \\ u_{max}, & \text{if } \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} H = \lambda^T (A_i x + B_i) > 0. \end{cases}
\]

Thus, the obtained control is Bang-Bang which is a feedforward controller that switches abruptly between two states.

The main difficulty related to this control law formulation is the determination of the switching times \( t_{ij}, t_{ij} \) which are the times when the quantity \( \partial H / \partial u_i \) changes sign. It is still until today a difficult task to solve this problem. Even for linear systems only reduced-order systems as second-order systems have been treated in the literature [28]. To overcome this difficulty for the class of bilinear systems, an original approach, based on the formulation of the studied system and the associated optimization problem in an orthogonal functions base, is proposed and developed in the following sections. In the next section, the main properties of the orthogonal functions, which will be used to derive our main results, are recalled.

3. Orthogonal Functions-Block Pulse Functions

Orthogonal functions and their operational matrices have been used for modeling dynamic systems [29] and identification [15]. They have been largely used in quadratic optimal control for different dynamic systems [30, 31]. To our knowledge, until today, there are no works dealing with the problem of minimum time control for bilinear systems using orthogonal functions.

3.1. General Idea. Let \( \phi_i(t), \ i \in \mathbb{N} \) be a set of orthogonal polynomials or piecewise functions. Any analytical function absolutely integrable on the time interval \([t_0, t_f]\) can be expanded by the following infinite series:

\[
f(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f_i \phi_i(t),
\]
where the coefficients \( f_i \) are evaluated by the following scalar product:

\[
    f_i = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} f(\xi) \phi_i(\xi) \, d\xi. \tag{9}
\]

For numerical purposes, a truncation of (8) until a convenient number \( N \) of elementary functions is considered.

\[
    f(t) \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} f_i \phi_i(t) = F_N^T \Phi_N(t), \tag{10}
\]

where \( \Phi_N = [\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{N-1}] \) is the orthogonal base and \( F_N = [f_0 f_1 \cdots f_{N-1}] \) is the coefficient vector.

Integrating (10), one obtains

\[
    \int_0^t f(\xi) \, d\xi \equiv F_N^T P_N \Phi_N(t), \tag{11}
\]

where \( P_N \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \) is the operational matrix of integration depending on the considered orthogonal base [17].

As a result, the differential equations describing dynamic processes can be reduced into algebraic relations allowing important simplifications in problem synthesis.

The considered piecewise orthogonal functions and precisely the Block pulse functions are described in the following section.

3.2. Properties of Block Pulse Functions. Block pulse functions constitute a complete set of orthogonal functions. They are defined as follows [32]:

\[
    \phi_i(t) = \begin{cases} 
        1 & \text{if } t \in \left[ \frac{i}{N} (t_f - t_0), \frac{(i+1)}{N} (t_f - t_0) \right], \\
        0 & \text{otherwise.}
    \end{cases} \tag{12}
\]

A function \( f(t) \) can be approximated by relation (10), where \( \Phi_N \) is a vector of \( N \) Block pulse functions and the coefficients \( f_i \) of the vector \( F_N \) are given by the following formula:

\[
    f_i = \frac{N}{t_f - t_0} \int_{(i-1)N/t_f}^{(i+1)N/t_f} f(t) \, dt. \tag{13}
\]

Many interesting properties and tools of the approximation of an analytic function by a series of Block pulse functions have been defined in literature, as the operational matrix of integration, the operational matrix of product, the operational matrix of delay, and the operational matrix of derivative [17].

3.2.1. Block Pulse Operational Matrix of Integration. The integration of an analytic function \( f(t) \) using the operational matrix of integration for Block pulse functions is given by [17]

\[
    P_N = \frac{t_f - t_0}{N} \begin{bmatrix} 
        1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
        0 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
        \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
        0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 1/2
    \end{bmatrix}, \tag{14}
\]

3.2.2. Block Pulse Operational Matrix of Product. The product of orthogonal base vectors can be approximated through operational matrix of product denoted \( M_{IN} \). It is defined by [33]: \( \forall i, j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}, \phi_i(t) \phi_j(t) \equiv K_{ij} \phi_N(t) \), one has

\[
    \phi_i(t) \phi_N(t) \equiv M_{IN} \phi_N(t) \tag{15}
\]

with \( M_{IN} = [K_0 \cdots K_{N-1}]. \)

Using (15), one may obtain

\[
    \phi_N \phi_N = \begin{bmatrix} 
        \phi_0 \\
        \phi_1 \\
        \vdots \\
        \phi_{N-1}
    \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
        \phi_0 \phi_N(t) \\
        \phi_1 \phi_N(t) \\
        \vdots \\
        \phi_{N-1} \phi_N(t)
    \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
        M_{0N} \\
        M_{1N} \\
        \vdots \\
        M_{N-1N}
    \end{bmatrix} \phi_N(t) \equiv M_N \phi_N(t). \tag{16}
\]

4. Synthesis of an Open Loop Minimum Time Control Using Orthogonal Functions

In this work we have chosen to use the Block pulse orthogonal functions due to the fact that solutions for minimum time problems are of type Bang-Bang which has the same structure as Block pulse functions.

4.1. Studied System Transposition on Orthogonal Base. Consider bilinear system (1). To make use of the orthogonal functions properties and mainly the operational matrix of integration one needs to know the operating time interval \([t_0, t_f]\). For simplicity, in the rest of the work and without loss of generality, let \( t_0 = 0 \). We introduce here the following time variable change:

\[
    t = \tau t_f, \tag{17}
\]

where \( t_f \) denotes the final time to be minimized.

This change of variable allows a transformation of the time domain from \( t \in [0, t_f] \) to \( \tau \in [0, 1] \). Then system state becomes

\[
    x(t) = \tilde{x}(\tau). \tag{18}
\]

Notice that the latter variable change leads to a constant time interval \([0, 1]\) for the used series. The final time \( t_f \) becomes an additional unknown variable.

Consequently, we deduce

\[
    \dot{x}(\tau) = \frac{d\tilde{x}(\tau)}{d\tau} \cdot \frac{d\tau}{dt} = \frac{1}{t_f} \tilde{x}(\tau). \tag{19}
\]

The original state equation of system (1) is now equivalent to

\[
    \frac{1}{t_f} \tilde{x}(\tau) = A_0 \tilde{x}(\tau) + A (\tilde{u}(\tau) \otimes \tilde{x}(\tau)) + B \tilde{u}(\tau). \tag{20}
\]
The development of the state and input vectors on the considered base of Block pulse functions with the new time variable $\tau$ can be written as
\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{x}(\tau) &= \tilde{x}_N^T \phi_N(\tau) \\
\tilde{u}(\tau) &= \tilde{u}_N^T \phi_N(\tau).
\end{align*}
\] (21)

Integrating equation (20) leads to
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{t_f} (\tilde{x}(\tau) - \tilde{x}(0)) &= A_0 \int_0^\tau \tilde{x}(\xi) d\xi \\
&\quad + A \int_0^\tau \tilde{u}(\xi) \otimes \tilde{x}(\xi) d\xi \\
&\quad + B \int_0^\tau \tilde{u}(\xi) d\xi.
\end{align*}
\] (22)

Knowing that
\[
\int_0^\tau \tilde{x}(\xi) d\xi = \tilde{x}_N^T \int_0^\tau \phi_N(\xi) d\xi = \tilde{x}_N P_N \phi_N(\tau),
\] (23)

one can write
\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{x}_N^T - \tilde{x}_N^T_{0,0} &= t_f \left( A_0 \tilde{x}_N^T P_N + A \left( \tilde{u}_N^T \otimes \tilde{x}_N^T \right) M_N P_N + B \tilde{u}_N^T P_N \right),
\end{align*}
\] (25)

where $\tilde{x}_N_{0,0}$ is the transposition of the initial state over orthogonal functions. It depends on the chosen set of functions.

4.2. Optimization Problem Formulation Using Orthogonal Functions. To find the transition time from the initial to the target position, we need to solve the following nonlinear problem.

**OP1: Original Optimization Problem**

\[
\begin{align*}
\min (t_f) \\
\text{subject to:} \\
\dot{x}(t) &= A_0 x(t) + A (u(t) \otimes x(t)) + Bu(t) \\
u &\in [u_{\text{min}}, u_{\text{max}}] \\
x(0) &= x_0, \\
x(t_f) &= x_f.
\end{align*}
\] (26)

The problem transposition over Block pulse base leads to the following nonlinear optimization problem named “orthogonal functions optimization problem.” This algorithm determines the time optimal input for given bilinear system.

**OP2: Orthogonal Functions Optimization Problem**

\[
\min \left( tf \right) \quad \text{subject to:} \\
\tilde{x}(\tau) &= \tilde{x}_N^T \phi_N(\tau) \\
\tilde{u}(\tau) &= \tilde{u}_N^T \phi_N(\tau).
\] (28)

is subject to the following constraints:

(i) Initial condition is
\[
\tilde{x}_{N0} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}(0) & \tilde{x}(0) & \cdots & \tilde{x}(0) \end{bmatrix}.
\] (29)

(ii) Equality constraint is
\[
\tilde{x}_{Nf} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & \tilde{x}_f \end{bmatrix};
\] (30)

(iii) Inequality constraint is
\[
\tilde{u}_{N\text{min}} \leq \tilde{u}_N^T \leq \tilde{u}_{N\text{max}}.
\] (31)

(iv) Nonlinear equality constraint is
\[
\tilde{x}_N^T - \tilde{x}_{N0} = t_f \left( A_0 \tilde{x}_N^T P_N + A \left( \tilde{u}_N^T \otimes \tilde{x}_N^T \right) M_N P_N + B \tilde{u}_N^T P_N \right).
\] (32)

To solve this optimization problem, an interior point method such as the one implemented in the function “fmincon” under “Optimization” Toolbox of Matlab environment is used.

4.3. Simulation Results. In this subsection, two examples of bilinear systems are presented to evaluate the effectiveness of our developed approach.

4.3.1. Example I: First-Order Bilinear System. Consider the following bilinear system:

\[
\dot{x} = xu + u
\] (33)
4.3.2. Example 2: Boost Converter Bilinear System. Consider now the bilinear system representing a boost converter described in [8] and shown in Figure 2, where $R_1$, $R_2$, and $R_L$ are inductor, capacitor, and load resistance, respectively. Also, situations of switches are presented by $u(t)$; therefore, for zero value of input control, $T_1$ and $T_2$ are open and closed, respectively. $T_1$ and $T_2$ are two main switches which are connected with two antiparallel diodes.

Determining state space representation for the boost converter and transposing it in per-unit system are done in [8] where state variables of the system are chosen as

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
  x_1(t) \\
  x_2(t)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{T}{E} V_C & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{E} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i_L(t) \\ V_0(t) \end{bmatrix},
$$

where $i_L(t)$ and $V_0(t)$ are the inductor current and capacitor voltage and $E$ are a constant uncontrolled input voltages. Also, $C$ and $L$ are output capacitor and inductor of the converter, respectively. The normalisation of the state-space model of the boost converter can be expressed as

$$
\dot{x}_1 (\tau) = (u(\tau) - 1)x_2 (\tau) + V(\tau)
$$

$$
\dot{x}_2 (\tau) = (1 - u (\tau))x_1 (\tau) - \frac{x_2 (\tau)}{Q}
$$

with $\tau = t/\sqrt{LC}$ being normalized time and $Q = R_L\sqrt{C/L}$ being quality factor of the boost converter.

Thus, the state space form of the system is given by

$$
\dot{x} = A_0x + Axu + Bu,
$$

where

$$
A_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -0.48 \end{bmatrix},
A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},
B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.
$$

The system needs to be shifted from $x_0 = [1.4, 2]^T$ to $x_f = [1.93, 2]^T$ and the input $u$ must be within interval $[0, 1]$.

Note that the optimal control problem of this system has been treated analytically in [8]. Using the Block pulse functions optimization (OP2) developed in this paper we obtained the same results.

The behaviors of the input and states variables are shown in Figures 3(a) and 3(b), respectively. The final time is $t_f = 1.41$. From Figure 3(a), the control input is equal to 1 for $t \in [0, 0.9]$ and $-1$ for $t \in [0.9, 1.41]$.

It is clear that the obtained results are similar to the one in [8]. Thus, the proposed approach is demonstrated.

Figure 3(b) shows the state variables evolution of the considered system with the obtained optimal control signal.
5. State Feedback Suboptimal Time Control

In this part, an original state feedback suboptimal control approach is developed. The idea is based on the work in [22]. The formulation is done in Block pulse base and Kronecker product is used in order to determine the suboptimal controller.

Now consider the time optimization of the bilinear system provided with a state feedback control law \( u = -Kx \). Hence, the feedback control gain \( K \) has to be determined such that the final time is minimized. Then, the elaborated control structure is suboptimal.

5.1. Suboptimal Time Control Problem Formulation. Consider system (1) with the time variable change (17) and let \( \tilde{u}_N^* \) and \( \tilde{x}_N^* \) be the optimal coefficients of the Bang-Bang control and system states, respectively. In this part of the work, we aim to derive a constant vector \( K \) which confers the optimal open loop state trajectories to the considered closed loop. Hence, we state that

\[
\tilde{u}_N^* = -K\tilde{x}_N^*.
\]

Replacing the control law by its feedback form (38) in (25), one obtains

\[
\tilde{x}_N^{*T} - \tilde{x}_{N,0} = t_f \left( A_0 \tilde{x}_N^{*T} P_N \right) + A \left( -K\tilde{x}_N^{*T} \otimes \tilde{x}_N^{*T} \right) M_N P_N - BK\tilde{x}_N^{*T} P_N.
\]

Note here that for matrices \( D, E, F, \) and \( G \) with appropriate dimensions one has [24]

\[
(D \otimes E) (F \otimes G) = (DF) \otimes (EG);
\]
Using this property one has
\[
(K \cdot \tilde{x}_N^T) \otimes (I_N \cdot \tilde{x}_N^T) = (K \otimes I_N)(\tilde{x}_N^T \otimes \tilde{x}_N^T)
\]  
(41)

From (41) and (39), one obtains
\[
\tilde{x}_N^T \otimes \tilde{x}_N - \tilde{x}_N^T \otimes \tilde{x}_N = t_f (A_0 \tilde{x}_N^T P_N - A (K \otimes I_N)(\tilde{x}_N^T \otimes \tilde{x}_N^T) - A_0 \tilde{x}_N^T P_N - BK \tilde{x}_N^T P_N).
\]  
(42)

This can be rewritten as follows:
\[
A (K \otimes I_N)(\tilde{x}_N^T \otimes \tilde{x}_N^T) M_N P_N + BK \tilde{x}_N^T P_N = A_0 \tilde{x}_N^T P_N + \frac{1}{t_f} (\tilde{x}_N^T - \tilde{x}_N^T).
\]  
(43)

Applying that, for any matrices X, Y, and Z with appropriate dimensions [24]
\[
\text{vec}(XYZ) = (Z^T \otimes X) \text{vec}(Y),
\]  
(44)

one obtains
\[
\begin{aligned}
&\left[\left((\tilde{x}_N^T \otimes \tilde{x}_N^T)(M_N P_N)\right)^T \otimes A\right] \text{vec}(K \otimes I_N) \\
&\quad + \left((\tilde{x}_N^T P_N)^T \otimes B\right) \text{vec}(K)
\end{aligned}
\]  
(45)

Equation (45) can be rewritten as follows:
\[
\begin{aligned}
\prod_{n,m}(I_n) &= \left[\text{vec}(E_{n1}^{m} \otimes I_n) \cdots \text{vec}(E_{n1}^{m} \otimes I_n) \cdots \text{vec}(E_{n2}^m \otimes I_n) \cdots \text{vec}(E_{n2}^m \otimes I_n)\right],
\end{aligned}
\]  
(46)

where \(e_i^p\) denotes the \(p\)-dimension unit vector which has 1 in the \(i\)th element and zero elsewhere. Equation (56) can be expressed as follows:
\[
\mathcal{A}\Theta = \mathcal{B}
\]  
(47)

\[
\Theta = \text{vec}(K);
\]
\[
\mathcal{A} = \alpha \prod_{n,m}(I_n) + \beta;
\]
\[
\mathcal{B} = \text{vec}(A_0 \tilde{x}_N^T P_N + (1/t_f)(\tilde{x}_N^T - \tilde{x}_N^T));
\]
\[
\alpha = \left((\tilde{x}_N^T \otimes \tilde{x}_N^T)(M_N P_N)\right)^T \otimes A;
\]
\[
\beta = P_N \tilde{x}_N^T B.
\]

Equation (47) can be solved in the least square sense, when no constraints are requested for the control:
\[
K = \text{mat}(\mathcal{A}^+ \mathcal{B}),
\]  
(48)

where \((\cdot)^+\) stands for Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of a matrix and “mat” is the inverse of the “vec” operator
\[
\text{mat}(\nu) = \text{mat} \begin{bmatrix}
V_1 \\
V_2 \\
\vdots \\
V_i \\
\vdots \\
V_j \\
\end{bmatrix} = [V_1 \mid V_2 \mid \cdots \mid V_i \mid V_j],
\]  
(49)

where \(V_i\) are column vectors with same dimensions.

In the case where the feedback control has to respect upper and lower bounds (2), that is,
\[
u_{\min,N}^T \leq -K \nu \leq \nu_{\max,N}^T,
\]  
(50)

subject to the constraint

\[
\min_\Theta \frac{1}{2} \|\Delta \Theta - \gamma\|^2_2
\]  
(56)
This kind of optimization problem could be solved through “lsqin” routine of MATLAB software.

5.2. Simulation Example. This section evaluates the performances of developed suboptimal time control approach. The studied system is a chemical reactor detailed in [23]. It is described by the following state space bilinear model:

\[ \dot{x} = A_0 x + A x \otimes u + B u \]  

with

\[
A_0 = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{6} & 1 \\
0 & \frac{1}{6}
\end{bmatrix}, \\
A = \begin{bmatrix}
5 & 2 & 4 & 5 \\
2 & 1 & 5 & 4
\end{bmatrix}, \\
B = \begin{bmatrix}
-4 & 2 \\
-2 & -2
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

The system needs to be shifted from \( x_0 = [0, 3]^T \) to the origin of state space; the input \( u \) must be within interval \([-4, 4]\).

In Figure 4(a) simulation results for the control sequence show that the first input has two switching points \( t_1 = 4 \cdot 10^{-3} \) s and \( t_2 = 0.063 \) s, while the second input has only one switching point \( t = 0.033 \) s.

The state variables’ evolution is given in Figure 4(b). The computed final time is \( t_f = 0.15 \) s.

In [23], authors proposed a linear stabilizing state feedback for bilinear systems. Based on results of the chemical reactor therein, we propose in this paper to adopt that example while constraining control effort \((-20 \leq u \leq 40)\) to less values than obtained in [23]. We aim then to derive a state feedback that could enhance the time response of the system.

Using the suboptimal control structure, we found the suboptimal control given in Figure 5(a) and the closed loop trajectory given in Figure 5(b).

The obtained feedback gain given in Table 3 is clearly different from the one in [23]. Nevertheless, the obtained results are better.

In fact, these results are better in term of final time and overshoot value than those presented in [23]. It is clear that, for both states, there is less overshoot and better settling time.

Furthermore, we notice that the system trajectories shapes are too close in both the open loop with Bang-Bang input and the proposed closed loop state feedback.

6. Conclusion

In this paper a practical approach is developed to solve the problem of time optimal control of bilinear systems.

The proposed approach is based on the expansion of the system model on a complete set of orthogonal Block pulse functions. Two types of minimum time control law have been investigated. In the first time, the method has been implemented to determine the open loop minimum time control law. In the second time, a state feedback control law has
been derived in order to generate the minimum time optimal states of the considered system.

All the developed algorithms have been illustrated on different examples of minimum time optimal control and the obtained results are significant. Indeed they enable shorter time estimate compared with other published techniques [23].

Note that the proposed method can be generalized to consider other classes of more complex nonlinear systems and we intend to pursue our work in this way.
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