

©2008 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. However, permission to reprint/republish this material for advertising or promotional purposes or for creating new collective works for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or to reuse any copyrighted component of this work in other works must be obtained from the IEEE.

# Optimal PWM Control of Switched-Capacitor DC–DC Power Converters via Model Transformation and Enhancing Control Techniques

Charlotte Yuk-Fan Ho, *Student Member, IEEE*, Bingo Wing-Kuen Ling, Yan-Qun Liu, Peter Kwong-Shun Tam, and Kok-Lay Teo, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—This paper presents an efficient and effective method for an optimal pulsewidth-modulated (PWM) control of switched-capacitor dc–dc power converters. Optimal switching instants are determined based on minimizing the output ripple magnitude, the output leakage voltage and the sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to both the input voltage and the load resistance. This optimal PWM control strategy has several advantages over conventional PWM control strategies: 1) it does not involve a linearization, so a large-signal analysis is performed; and 2) it guarantees the optimality. The problem is solved via both the model transformation and the optimal enhancing control techniques. A practical example of the PWM control of a switched-capacitor dc–dc power converter is presented.

**Index Terms**—Model transformation technique, optimal enhancing control technique, optimal pulsewidth-modulated (PWM) control, switched-capacitor dc–dc power converters.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**M**ANY consumer and industrial electronic products, such as liquid crystal display (LCD) drivers [1], pocket computer systems [2], etc, require more than one voltage sources. Hence, dc–dc power converters are required for these applications. For some applications, dc–dc power converters require both low electromagnetic interference (EMI) and electromagnetic compatibility (EMC). In these cases, inductors are not recommended to be employed for the realization. Capacitors are used instead. These dc–dc power converters are called switched-capacitor dc–dc power converters or inductorless dc–dc power converters. As they could achieve both

low EMI and EMC requirements for many consumer and industrial electronic products, solving unaddressed problems on switched-capacitor dc–dc power converters would be beneficial to the community.

Switched-capacitor dc–dc power converters consist of some transistors and capacitors, in which the capacitors are energy storage components. At certain switching instants, some of the capacitors are switched to an input energy source so that energy is stored in these capacitors. At the same time, another set of capacitors are switched to the output load and deliver energy. When the switches turn on and turn off alternatively, those capacitors which have released energy before, are now switched to the input energy source and charged up, whilst, those capacitors which have stored energy before, are now switched to the output load and deliver energy. Because of this operating principle, ripples usually occur at the output load voltage, while the ripple magnitude of the output load voltage is dependent on the capacitances of the capacitors, the resistance of the load, and the switching instants. Since almost all the applications require a steady voltage for their operations, the output ripple magnitude should be minimized.

Simultaneously, reverse-recovery currents of the diodes and the transistors, as well as their parasitic capacitances, would make the output load voltage jumping at the switching instants. Such jumps at the output load voltage are called the output leakage voltage. Similarly, the output leakage voltage should also be minimized.

At the same time, the load resistance would affect the time constant of the discharging circuit, and the input voltage would affect the voltages across the capacitors in the charging circuit, both the load resistance and the input voltage would affect the output load voltage. From the practical point of view, the output load voltage should remain unchanged even though the load resistance and the input voltage are changed. Hence, it is preferred to have a low sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to both the input voltage and the load resistance. Therefore, the sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to both the input voltage and the load resistance should also be minimized.

There are some existing methods for minimizing the output ripple magnitude of a switched-capacitor dc–dc power converter, such as multirate control method [16], linear quadratic regulation (LQR) control methods [17]–[19], intelligent control method [20], and PWM control methods [21]–[25], etc. On the other side, some methods have been proposed for regulating the

Manuscript received February 1, 2006; revised June 28, 2007. This work was supported by The Hong Kong Polytechnic University under Project G-YD26, by the Centre for Multimedia Signal Processing, by The Hong Kong Polytechnic University under CRGC Project PolyU 5105/01E, by the Research Grants Council of Hong Kong, and by the Australian Research Council. This paper was recommended by Associate Editor M. D. Ilic.

C. Y.-F. Ho is with the School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary College, University of London, London E1 4NS, U.K. (e-mail: c.ho@qmul.ac.uk).

B. W.-K. Ling is with the Department of Electronic Engineering, King's College London, London WC2R 2LS, U.K. (e-mail: wing-kuen.ling@kcl.ac.uk).

Y.-Q. Liu is with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Melbourne, VIC 3001, Australia (e-mail: yanqun.liu@rmit.edu.au).

P. K.-S. Tam is with the Department of Electronic and Information Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong (e-mail: enptam@eie.polyu.edu.hk).

K.-L. Teo is with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Curtin University of Technology, Perth CRICOS 00301J, Australia (e-mail: K.L.Teo@curtin.edu.au).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TCSI.2008.916442

output load voltage, such as PWM control method [32], noise shaping method [33], pseudocontinuous control method [34], interleaved discharging method [35], and constant frequency charge pump method [36], etc. Among them, PWM control methods are the common method for both minimizing the output ripple magnitude and regulating the output load voltage subject to the change in the input voltage and the load resistance. This is because these methods exploit both the switching and the nonlinear phenomena of the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converters [21]–[25], [32]. The implementations of the PWM control methods can also be simple [23]. However, there is one fundamental question for the PWM control methods: *How to determine the switching instants so that the output ripple magnitude, the output leakage voltage and the sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to both the input voltage and the load resistance are minimized?* This problem is not trivial and has not been completely solved yet. The conventional PWM control methods [21]–[25] are based on small signal approximation. That is, the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter is modeled as a linear time invariant system via perturbing the equations around a fixed point or employing a state space averaging model. Nevertheless, these approaches are only a local approximation of the problem and the obtained switching instants are not guaranteed to be optimal. For conventional optimal control methods [17]–[19], optimal control signals are determined so that a smooth cost function is minimized subject to some smooth constraints. Note that this optimal PWM control is different from the conventional optimal control. The goal for this optimal PWM control is to determine the optimal switching instants, but not to determine the optimal control input signals. Moreover, the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter switches among different topologies, so the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter is actually time varying. Furthermore, initial conditions of the circuit corresponding to each topology are nonzero at the steady state, so the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter is nonlinear. An inadequate selection of the switching instants and the nonlinear time-varying nature of the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converters may result to instability problems [3]–[5] or the occurrence of chaotic behaviors [6]–[15].

The paper is organized as follows. The system model and the problem formulation are presented in, respectively, Section II and Section III. A solution method is discussed in Section IV. A practical example of PWM control of a switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter is presented in Section V. Finally, a conclusion is drawn in Section VI.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL

Consider a switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter in which it switches among different topologies with the dynamics of the circuit corresponding to each topology is characterized by an affine linear time invariant model. Without loss of generality, we assume that there are totally  $N$  topologies and  $N - 1$  switching instants within a time period, denoted as  $[0, T)$ . Those switching instants are denoted as  $t_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ . Denote  $t_0 = 0$  and  $t_N = T$ . During the  $i^{\text{th}}$  time interval  $[t_{i-1}, t_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , let the state space

representation of the circuit corresponding to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  topology be  $S_i = (\mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{B}_i, \mathbf{C}_i, \mathbf{D}_i)$  as follows:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(t) \quad (1a)$$

$$y(t) = \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}(t) \quad (1b)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$  and  $\mathbf{D}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p}$ , in which  $\mathbb{R}^{k \times q}$  represents the set of  $k \times q$  real matrices, the state vector  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$  represents the voltages across the capacitors,  $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times 1}$  represent the voltage across the load resistor and the input voltages of the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter, respectively, where  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  denote the sets of  $n$ -dimensional real vectors and real numbers, respectively.

## III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

The output ripple magnitude of the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  time interval  $[t_{i-1}, t_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  is  $\max_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)} y(t) - \min_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)} y(t)$ .

Hence, the output ripple magnitude of the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter can be defined as  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} (\max_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)} y(t) - \min_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)} y(t))$ . For a switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter, it is preferred to have small values of the output ripple magnitude. Hence,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \left( \max_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)} y(t) - \min_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)} y(t) \right)$$

should be minimized.

At the  $i^{\text{th}}$  switching instant, where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ , a state leakage voltage, denoted as  $\Delta \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0)$ , is expected. Without loss of generality, it can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0) \\ = \mathbf{x}(t_i) - \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0) = \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i(\mathbf{x}(t_i - 0)) - \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$  is supposed to be a continuously differentiable function. In general, the state leakage voltage is too complicated to be represented mathematically. Instead, we approximate  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$  experimentally. Firstly, capacitors are charged up to different voltages. Then these capacitors are detached from the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter and the voltage changes across these capacitors are recorded instantaneously. The voltage changes and the voltages across these capacitors correspond to the values of  $\Delta \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0)$  and  $\mathbf{x}(t_i - 0)$ , respectively. By fitting a polynomial to approximate the relationship between  $\Delta \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0)$  and  $\mathbf{x}(t_i - 0)$ , an approximation of  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$  could be obtained accordingly. And the output load voltage at the switching instants is

$$\begin{aligned} y(t_i) &= \mathbf{C}_i \boldsymbol{\varphi}_i(\mathbf{x}(t_i - 0)) + \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}(t_i) \\ &= y(t_i - 0) + \Delta y(t_i - 0) \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ . The output leakage voltage at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  switching instant for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$  is  $|y(t_i) - y(t_i - 0)|$ , so the output leakage voltage of the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter can be defined as

$\max_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} |y(t_i) - y(t_i - 0)|$ , where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the absolute operator. Similarly, it is preferred to have small values of the output leakage voltage. Hence,  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} |y(t_i) - y(t_i - 0)|$  should be minimized.

Denote the load resistance as  $R_L$  and the gradient operator as  $\nabla$ . Then, the sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to the load resistance and the input voltage at a particular time instant  $t$  within the  $i^{\text{th}}$  time interval  $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  are, respectively,  $dy(t)/dR_L$  and  $|\nabla_{\mathbf{u}(t)} y(t)|_{\infty}$ . Hence, the sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to the load resistance and the input voltage can be defined as, respectively,  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \max_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]} |dy(t)/dR_L|$  and  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \max_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]} |\nabla_{\mathbf{u}(t)} y(t)|_{\infty}$ . As discussed in Section I, these two terms should be minimized.

Let  $\xi = [t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{N-1}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ , and

$$\mathfrak{S} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} : t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{N-1} \leq t_N\}. \quad (3)$$

The optimal PWM control problem becomes the determination of the optimal switching instants  $\xi \in \mathfrak{S}$  so that the output ripple magnitude, the output leakage voltage and the sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to both the load resistance and the input voltage are minimized. This problem is a multiple-objectives optimization problem. The most common method for solving a multiple-objectives optimization problem is to convert it to a single-objective optimization problem with the cost function being a weighted combination of these multiple objectives. Denote  $\beta'_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 4$  as the weights for combining these multiple objectives. Then the problem can be expressed follows.

**Problem (P)**

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\xi \in \mathfrak{S}} J(\xi) = & \beta'_1 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \left( \max_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]} y(t) - \min_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]} y(t) \right) \\ & + \beta'_2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} |y(t_i) - y(t_i - 0)| \\ & + \beta'_3 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \max_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]} \left| \frac{dy(t)}{dR_L} \right| \\ & + \beta'_4 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \max_{t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]} |\nabla_{\mathbf{u}(t)} y(t)|_{\infty} \end{aligned} \quad (4a)$$

subject to

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i],$$

and, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  (4b)

$$y(t) = \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i],$$

and, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  (4c)

$$\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0 \quad (4d)$$

$$\mathbf{x}(t_i) = \varphi_i(\mathbf{x}(t_i - 0)) = \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0) + \Delta \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0),$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ . (4e)

#### IV. SOLUTION METHOD

##### A. Model Transformation Method

Problem (P) is a min-max problem, which involves a non-differentiable cost function. To address this problem, since 1) minimizing the maximum value of a function  $f(t, \mathbf{u})$  over the

index set  $\Omega$  is equivalent to minimizing a parameter  $v$  subject to all functional values over the index set being smaller than or equal to  $v$ , that is  $\min_{\mathbf{u}} \max_{t \in \Omega} f(t, \mathbf{u})$  is equivalent to  $\min_{\mathbf{u}} v$  subject to  $f(t, \mathbf{u}) \leq v \forall t \in \Omega$ , and 2) maximizing the minimum value of a function over the index set is equivalent to minimizing a parameter  $v$  subject to the negative of all functional values over the index set being smaller than or equal to  $v$ , that is  $\max_{\mathbf{u}} \min_{t \in \Omega} f(t, \mathbf{u})$  is equivalent to  $\min_{\mathbf{u}} v$  subject to  $-f(t, \mathbf{u}) \leq v \forall t \in \Omega$ , minimizing the maximum absolute value of a function over the index set is equivalent to minimizing a parameter  $v$  subject to both the positive and the negative of all functional values over the index set being smaller than or equal to  $v$ , that is  $\min_{\mathbf{u}} \max_{t \in \Omega} |f(t, \mathbf{u})|$  is equivalent to  $\min_{\mathbf{u}} v$  subject to both  $f(t, \mathbf{u}) \leq v \forall t \in \Omega$  and  $-f(t, \mathbf{u}) \leq v \forall t \in \Omega$ . Also, minimizing the difference between the maximum and minimum values of a function over the index set is equivalent to minimizing a parameter  $v_1$  subject to all functional values over the index set being smaller than or equal to  $v_1$  and minimizing a parameter  $v_2$  subject to the negative of all functional values over the index set being smaller than or equal to  $v_2$ , that is  $\min_{\mathbf{u}} (\max_{t \in \Omega} f(t, \mathbf{u}) - \min_{t \in \Omega} f(t, \mathbf{u}))$  is equivalent to  $\min_{\mathbf{u}} v_1$  subject to  $f(t, \mathbf{u}) \leq v_1 \forall t \in \Omega$  and  $\min_{\mathbf{u}} v_2$  subject to  $-f(t, \mathbf{u}) \leq v_2 \forall t \in \Omega$ . Hence, **Problem (P)** can be converted into a smooth continuous constrained optimization problem. Denote the set of the 5-D real vectors as  $\mathbb{R}^5$ . Let  $\mathbf{v} \equiv [v_1 \ v_2 \ v_3 \ v_4 \ v_5]^T$  be a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^5$ . Similarly, denote  $\beta_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$  as the weights for combining the multiple objectives. Denote  $\mathbf{u}(t) \equiv [u_1(t) \ \dots \ u_p(t)]^T$ . Then, **Problem (P)** is equivalent to

**Problem (Q)**

$$\min_{\xi \in \mathfrak{S}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^5} \hat{J}(\xi, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^5 \beta_i v_i \quad (5a)$$

subject to

$$y(t) \leq v_1 \quad \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i] \quad \text{and, for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (5b)$$

$$-y(t) \leq v_2 \quad \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i] \quad \text{and, for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (5c)$$

$$y(t_i) - y(t_i - 0) \leq v_3, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1 \quad (5d)$$

$$y(t_i - 0) - y(t_i) \leq v_3, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1 \quad (5e)$$

$$\frac{dy(t)}{dR_L} \leq v_4 \quad \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i] \quad \text{and, for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (5f)$$

$$-\frac{dy(t)}{dR_L} \leq v_4 \quad \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i] \quad \text{and, for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (5g)$$

$$\frac{\partial y(t)}{\partial u_k(t)} \leq v_5 \quad \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i], \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N$$

and for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, p$  (5h)

$$-\frac{\partial y(t)}{\partial u_k(t)} \leq v_5 \quad \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i], \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N$$

and, for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, p$  (5i)

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$$

and, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  (5j)

$$y(t) = \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}(t), \quad \text{for } t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$$

and, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$

$$\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0 \quad (5l)$$

$$\mathbf{x}(t_1) = \varphi_i(\mathbf{x}(t_i - 0)) = \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0) + \Delta \mathbf{x}(t_i - 0),$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ . (5m)

This approach for solving optimization problems with a min–max cost function is called the model transformation method [26].

### B. Enhancing Control Method

Since the switching instants are generally located nonuniformly in the switching period, it is required to map the original time instant  $t$  to a transformed time instant  $s$  so that there is a one-to-one correspondence between  $t$  and  $s$ , and the transformed switching instants are uniformly located in the real number line. To achieve this goal, we need the original switching instants  $t_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$  being mapped to the consecutive integer instants  $i$ , and  $\forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$ ,  $t$  being mapped linearly to  $s \in [i - 1, i)$ . First, denote

$$\chi_{[i-1, i)}(s) = \begin{cases} 1, & s \in [i - 1, i) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  as a unit square pulse with the time support located at the time interval  $[i - 1, i)$ . Define the switching durations as  $\tau_i \equiv t_i - t_{i-1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Define a vector  $\boldsymbol{\tau} = [\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_N]^T$ . Define  $\mu(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\tau}) : [0, N) \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  as a rectangular pulse train with the magnitude of the pulse train within the time interval  $[i - 1, i)$  being constant and equal to  $\tau_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , that is

$$\mu(s|\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \tau_i \chi_{[i-1, i)}(s). \quad (6)$$

Let  $\Lambda = \left\{ \mu(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\tau}) : \tau_i \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^N \tau_i = T \right\}$ . Define  $U : \boldsymbol{\tau} \mapsto \mu(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\tau})$  as follows:

$$U(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \mu. \quad (7)$$

$U$  is a function that maps the vector  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  to the rectangular pulse train function  $\mu(s|\boldsymbol{\tau})$ . It is worth noting that the switching instants of  $\mu(s|\boldsymbol{\tau})$  are uniformly located at the consecutive integer instants  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ . The original switching durations  $\tau_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  are the magnitudes of the function  $\mu(s|\boldsymbol{\tau})$  for  $s \in [i - 1, i)$ , that is  $\mu(s|\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \tau_i$  for  $s \in [i - 1, i)$  and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . However,  $\mu(s|\boldsymbol{\tau})$  is not continuous and the relationship between  $t$  and  $s$  is not invertible. To address this problem, define  $t(\cdot|\mu) : [0, N) \rightarrow [0, T)$  as a piecewise linear function with the slope of the function in the time interval  $[i - 1, i)$  being constant and equal to  $\tau_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , that is

$$t(s|\mu) = \int_0^s \mu(\theta|\boldsymbol{\tau}) d\theta. \quad (8)$$

Noting that the switching instants of  $t(s|\mu)$  are also uniformly located at the consecutive integer instants  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ , the original switching instants  $t_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$  are the value of  $t(s|\mu)$  at the switching instants  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ , that is  $t(i|\mu) = t_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ ,  $t(s|\mu)$  is continuous and there is a linear relationship between any time instant  $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$  and a nonnegative real number  $s \in [i - 1, i)$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Let  $\mathbf{z}(s|\mu)$  and  $w(s|\mu)$  be, respectively, the transformed state vector and the transformed output, in which the switching instants of both  $\mathbf{z}(s|\mu)$  and  $w(s|\mu)$  are uniformly located at the consecutive integer instants, that is  $\mathbf{z}(s|\mu) = \mathbf{x}(t(s|\mu)|\boldsymbol{\tau})$  and  $w(s|\mu) = \mathbf{y}(t(s|\mu)|\boldsymbol{\tau})$ . Since  $d/dst(s|\mu) = \mu(s|\boldsymbol{\tau})$  for  $i - 1 < s < i$  and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , define the following problem.

#### Problem (R)

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathfrak{S}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{R}^5} \tilde{J}(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^5 \beta_i v_i, \quad (9a)$$

subject to

$$w(t(s|\mu)) \leq v_1, \quad \text{for } s \in [i - 1, i); \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (9b)$$

$$-w(t(s|\mu)) \leq v_2, \quad \text{for } s \in [i - 1, i); \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (9c)$$

$$w(t(i|\mu)) - w(t(i - 0|\mu)) \leq v_3 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1 \quad (9d)$$

$$w(t(i - 0|\mu)) - w(t(i|\mu)) \leq v_3 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1 \quad (9e)$$

$$\frac{dw(t(s|\mu))}{dR_L} \leq v_4 \quad \text{and } s \in [i - 1, i); \quad ; i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (9f)$$

$$-\frac{dw(t(s|\mu))}{dR_L} \leq v_4, \quad \text{for } s \in [i - 1, i); \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (9g)$$

$$\frac{\partial w(t(s|\mu))}{\partial u_k(t(s|\mu))} \leq v_5 \quad \text{for } s \in [i - 1, i) \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N; ,$$

$$k = 1, 2, \dots, p \quad (9h)$$

$$-\frac{\partial w(t(s|\mu))}{\partial u_k(t(s|\mu))} \leq v_5 \quad \text{for } s \in [i - 1, i) \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N; ,$$

$$k = 1, 2, \dots, p \quad (9i)$$

$$\frac{d}{ds} \mathbf{z}(s|\mu) = \mu(s|\boldsymbol{\tau}) (\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{z}(t(s|\mu)) + \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(t(s|\mu))),$$

for  $s \in [i - 1, i)$  and, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  (9j)

$$w(t(s|\mu)) = \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{z}(t(s|\mu)) + \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}(t(s|\mu)), \text{ for } s \in [i - 1, i);$$

$$i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (9k)$$

$$\mathbf{z}(t(0|\mu)) = \mathbf{x}_0 \quad (9l)$$

$$\mathbf{z}(t(i|\mu)) = \varphi_i(\mathbf{z}(t(i - 0|\mu))) = \mathbf{z}(t(i - 0|\mu))$$

$$+ \Delta \mathbf{z}(t(i - 0|\mu)), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1. \quad (9m)$$

**Theorem 1:** **Problem (Q)** and **Problem (R)** are equivalent in the sense that  $(\boldsymbol{\xi}^*, \mathbf{v}^*)$  is a solution of **Problem (Q)** if and only if  $(\mu^*, \mathbf{v}^*)$  is a solution of **Problem (R)**, where  $U(\boldsymbol{\tau}^*) = \mu^*$ , in which  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^* = [\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*, \dots, \tau_N^*]^T$ ,

$\xi^* = [t_1^*, t_2^*, \dots, t_{N-1}^*]^T$  and  $\tau_i^* = t_i^* - t_{i-1}^*$ . Furthermore,  $\hat{J}(\xi^*, \mathbf{v}^*) = \tilde{J}(\mu^*, \mathbf{v}^*)$ .

*Proof:* It is clear that  $(\xi^*, \mathbf{v}^*)$  satisfies (5b)–(5m) if and only if  $U(\tau^*) = \mu^*$ . Hence,  $(\xi^*, \mathbf{v}^*)$  is a solution of **Problem (Q)** if and only if  $(\mu^*, \mathbf{v}^*)$  is a solution of **Problem (R)**. Furthermore, from (5a) and (9a), we can easily verify that  $\hat{J}(\xi^*, \mathbf{v}^*) = \tilde{J}(\mu^*, \mathbf{v}^*)$ . ■

This method is called the enhancing control method [26]–[28].

### C. Solving State Jump Problem

The discontinuities of the state variables are handled by computing the state variables segment by segment [29]. The value of the initial condition of the current segment can be computed by the value of the state variables at the end of the previous segment. To find  $\mathbf{z}(t(i|\mu))$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ , we first compute the value of  $\mathbf{z}(t(1-0|\mu))$  using the initial condition  $\mathbf{z}(t(0|\mu))$ . Then  $\mathbf{z}(t(1|\mu))$  can be evaluated by the equation  $\mathbf{z}(t(1|\mu)) = \varphi_1(\mathbf{z}(t(1-0|\mu)))$ . Similarly,  $\mathbf{z}(t(2-0|\mu))$  can be computed using  $\mathbf{z}(t(1|\mu))$ , and  $\mathbf{z}(t(2|\mu))$  can be evaluated by the equation  $\mathbf{z}(t(2|\mu)) = \varphi_2(\mathbf{z}(t(2-0|\mu)))$ . These procedures are repeated until all the values of  $\mathbf{z}(t(i|\mu))$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$  are computed.

### D. Evaluation of the Sensitivity of the Output Load Voltage

Since the response of the circuit corresponding to each topology depends on the matrix exponential and it is difficult to evaluate the sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to both the input voltage and the load resistance based on the matrix exponential, the Cayley Hamilton Theorem is applied. Suppose that  $\mathbf{A}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  are diagonalizable. Denote the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{A}_i$  as  $\lambda_{i,k}$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Define

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{i,1}(t) \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_{i,n}(t) \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & \lambda_{i,1}^{n-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & \lambda_{i,n}^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} e^{\lambda_{i,1}t} \\ \vdots \\ e^{\lambda_{i,n}t} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \kappa_{i,1,1} & \cdots & \kappa_{i,1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \kappa_{i,n,1} & \cdots & \kappa_{i,n,n} \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & \lambda_{i,1}^{n-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & \lambda_{i,n}^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}^{-1}$$

for  $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$  and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Then by the Cayley Hamilton Theorem

$$e^{\mathbf{A}_i t} = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{i,j}(t) \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}t} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1}$$

for  $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$  and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{x}(t_{i-1}) \\ &+ \int_{t_{i-1}}^t \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(\tau) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= \mathbf{C}_i \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{x}(t_{i-1}) \\ &+ \mathbf{C}_i \int_{t_{i-1}}^t \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(\tau) d\tau \\ &+ \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}(t) \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$  and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t_i-0) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t_i-t_{i-1})} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{x}(t_{i-1}) \\ &+ \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i-0} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t_i-\tau)} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(\tau) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} y(t_i-0) &= \mathbf{C}_i \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t_i-t_{i-1})} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{x}(t_{i-1}) \\ &+ \mathbf{C}_i \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i-0} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t_i-\tau)} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(\tau) d\tau \\ &+ \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}(t_i-0) \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ . Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_i(t) &\equiv [\tilde{d}_{i,1}(t) \quad \cdots \quad \tilde{d}_{i,p}(t)]^T \\ &\equiv \mathbf{C}_i \int_{t_{i-1}}^t \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{B}_i d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$  and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , and denote

$$\mathbf{D}_i \equiv [d_{i,1} \quad \cdots \quad d_{i,p}]^T, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial y(t)}{\partial u_k(t)} &\approx \tilde{d}_{i,k}(t) + d_{i,k} \quad \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i) \\ &\text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N; \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, p. \end{aligned} \quad (10a)$$

Denote

$$\mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} a_{1,1}^{i,j-1} & \cdots & a_{1,n}^{i,j-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n,1}^{i,j-1} & \cdots & a_{n,n}^{i,j-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_i &\equiv \begin{bmatrix} b_{i,1,1} & \cdots & b_{i,1,p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{i,n,1} & \cdots & b_{i,n,p} \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{C}_i &\equiv [c_{i,1} \quad \cdots \quad c_{i,n}] \\ \mathbf{x}_i(t_{i-1}) &\equiv [x_{i,1}(t_{i-1}) \quad \cdots \quad x_{i,n}(t_{i-1})]^T \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Then, the first set of equations at the bottom of the page are true, and  $\mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}(t) = \sum_{q=1}^p d_q u_q(t) \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$  and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Hence, see the second set of equations at the bottom of the page, and  $\partial/\partial R_L \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}(t) = \sum_{q=1}^p (\partial d_q / \partial R_L) u_q(t) \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$  and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Consequently, we have (10b), shown at the bottom of the next page.

By substituting (10) into **Problem (R)**, the problem can be solved efficiently via many CAD tools, such as MISER3 [30].

## V. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

Since few works have been done on the determination of the switching instants based on minimizing the output ripple magnitude, the output leakage voltage and the sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to both the input voltage and

the load resistance, it is difficult to have a fair comparison. This is because it is unfair if we compare this optimal PWM control method to those control methods with different control strategies (such as those methods which do not determine the optimal switching instants, but determine the optimal control input signals), nonoptimal control methods (such as those methods in which the switching instants are not optimal), or optimal control methods with different cost functions and constraints (such as those methods in which the switching instants are optimized based on other criteria, but not on the minimization of the output ripple magnitude, the output leakage voltage and the sensitivity of the output load voltage with respect to both the input voltage and the load resistance). In order to illustrate the effectiveness of this optimal PWM control method, we consider a switched-capacitor dc–dc power converter discussed in [31] as an illustrative example. This switched-capacitor dc–dc power converter [31] is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_i \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{x}(t_{i-1}) &= \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} x_{i,m}(t_{i-1}) \\ \mathbf{C}_i \int_{t_{i-1}}^t \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(\tau) d\tau &= \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} b_{i,m,q} u_q(\tau) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial R_L} \mathbf{C}_i \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{x}(t_{i-1}) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} \left( \frac{\partial a_{l,m}^{i,j-1}}{\partial R_L} \right) x_{i,m}(t_{i-1}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} (t-t_{i-1}) \left( \frac{\partial \lambda_{i,k}}{\partial R_L} \right) e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} x_{i,m}(t_{i-1}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n c_{i,l} \left( \frac{\partial \kappa_{i,j,k}}{\partial R_L} \right) e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} x_{i,m}(t_{i-1}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( \frac{\partial c_{i,l}}{\partial R_L} \right) \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} x_{i,m}(t_{i-1}) \\ &\frac{\partial}{\partial R_L} \mathbf{C}_i \int_{t_{i-1}}^t \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} \mathbf{A}_i^{j-1} \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(\tau) d\tau \\ &= \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t \left( \frac{\partial c_{i,l}}{\partial R_L} \right) \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} b_{i,m,q} u_q(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t c_{i,l} \left( \frac{\partial \kappa_{i,j,k}}{\partial R_L} \right) e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} b_{i,m,q} u_q(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} (t-\tau) \left( \frac{\partial \lambda_{i,k}}{\partial R_L} \right) e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} b_{i,m,q} u_q(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} \left( \frac{\partial a_{l,m}^{i,j-1}}{\partial R_L} \right) b_{i,m,q} u_q(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} \left( \frac{\partial b_{i,m,q}}{\partial R_L} \right) u_q(\tau) d\tau \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 1. Circuit schematics of each topology of the switched-capacitor dc-dc power converter [31]. (a) Topology 1. (b) Topology 2.

chosen because of its simplicity and practical applications in industries.

Referring to the example in [31] which switches between two topologies, the circuit corresponding to each topology is char-

acterized by an affine linear time invariant state space model as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}_1 = \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\alpha_1}{C_1(R_{C1}+2R_{on})} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{R_L+R_{C0}}{C_2} & \frac{R_L}{C_0} \\ 0 & \frac{R_L}{C_0} & -\frac{R_L+R_{C2}+2R_{on}}{C_0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (11a)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_2 = \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{R_L+R_{C0}}{C_1} & 0 & \frac{R_L}{C_0} \\ 0 & -\frac{\alpha_2}{C_2(R_{C2}+2R_{on})} & 0 \\ \frac{R_L}{C_0} & 0 & -\frac{R_L+R_{C1}+2R_{on}}{C_0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (11b)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\alpha_1}{C_1(R_{C1}+2R_{on})} & -\frac{R_L+R_{C0}}{C_2} & \frac{R_L}{C_0} \end{bmatrix}^T \quad (11c)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_2 = \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{R_L+R_{C0}}{C_1} & \frac{\alpha_2}{C_2(R_{C2}+2R_{on})} & \frac{R_L}{C_0} \end{bmatrix}^T \quad (11d)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_1 = \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & R_L R_{C0} & R_L(R_{C2}+2R_{on}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (11e)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_2 = \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \begin{bmatrix} R_L R_{C0} & 0 & R_L(R_{C1}+2R_{on}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (11f)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_1 = \frac{R_{C0} R_L}{\alpha_1} \quad (11g)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_2 = \frac{R_{C0} R_L}{\alpha_2} \quad (11h)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial y(t)}{\partial R_L} &= \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} \left( \frac{\partial a_{l,m}^{i,j-1}}{\partial R_L} \right) x_{i,m}(t_{i-1}) \\ &+ \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} (t-t_{i-1}) \left( \frac{\partial \lambda_{i,k}}{\partial R_L} \right) e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} x_{i,m}(t_{i-1}) \\ &+ \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n c_{i,l} \left( \frac{\partial \kappa_{i,j,k}}{\partial R_L} \right) e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} x_{i,m}(t_{i-1}) \\ &+ \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( \frac{\partial c_{i,l}}{\partial R_L} \right) \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-t_{i-1})} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} x_{i,m}(t_{i-1}) \\ &+ \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t \left( \frac{\partial c_{i,l}}{\partial R_L} \right) \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} b_{i,m,q} u_q(\tau) d\tau \\ &+ \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t c_{i,l} \left( \frac{\partial \kappa_{i,j,k}}{\partial R_L} \right) e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} b_{i,m,q} u_q(\tau) d\tau \\ &+ \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} (t-\tau) \left( \frac{\partial \lambda_{i,k}}{\partial R_L} \right) e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} b_{i,m,q} u_q(\tau) d\tau \\ &+ \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} \left( \frac{\partial a_{l,m}^{i,j-1}}{\partial R_L} \right) b_{i,m,q} u_q(\tau) d\tau \\ &+ \sum_{q=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^t c_{i,l} \kappa_{i,j,k} e^{\lambda_{i,k}(t-\tau)} a_{l,m}^{i,j-1} \left( \frac{\partial b_{i,m,q}}{\partial R_L} \right) u_q(\tau) d\tau \\ &+ \sum_{q=1}^p \left( \frac{\partial d_q}{\partial R_L} \right) u_q(t) \quad \forall t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \end{aligned} \quad (10b)$$






Fig. 2. Transient and steady-state voltages across capacitors and the load resistor of the switched-capacitor dc–dc power converter [31].

where

$$\alpha_1 = R_{C0}R_L + (R_{C2} + 2R_{on})(R_L + R_{C0}) \quad (12a)$$

$$\alpha_2 = R_{C0}R_L + (R_{C1} + 2R_{on})(R_L + R_{C0}). \quad (12b)$$

In this example,  $N = 2$ . Fig. 1 shows the circuit schematic corresponding to each topology. The values of the resistors and capacitors, as well as the input voltage, are shown in the circuit schematic, where  $R_{on} = 0.01\Omega$  for all the diodes and transistors. We operate the circuit with switching frequency equal to 550 kHz, that is  $T = t_N = 1.8182 \times 10^{-6}$  s. We select this switching frequency because there will be a strong electronic magnetic interference and large ripple magnitudes if we operate the circuit at higher or lower switching frequencies. We assume that the circuit is initially at rest, that is  $\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{0}$ , as the usual case in the real situation. All the weights for combining the multiple objectives are chosen to be 1 to avoid having bias on a particular objective. Since the output leakage voltage is smaller than the output ripple magnitude, we neglect the effect of the output leakage voltage in the cost function, that is,  $y(t_1) = y(t_1 - 0)$ . By applying this optimal PWM control method, we found that  $t_1 = 1.5209 \times 10^{-6}$  s and the output ripple magnitude is  $3.6242 \times 10^{-4}$  V. The corresponding duty cycle is 0.8365. Although  $C_1 = C_2$  and  $R_{C1} = R_{C2}$ , it is worth noting that the optimal duty cycle does not operate at 0.5. This is because the charging time constant is different from the discharging time constant due to the nonzero load resistance as well as parasitic switch resistance and capacitance. Both the transient and steady-state responses of all capacitors, as well as the output load voltages are shown in Fig. 2. It can be seen from the figure, that the steady-state voltages across  $C_0, C_1, C_2$  and  $R_L$  are approximately, 3.6, 1.8, 1.8, and 3.6 V, respectively. Hence, the circuit behaves normally as a voltage doubler.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we apply the model transformation and the enhancing control methods to determine the optimal switching instants for PWM control of switched-capacitor dc–dc power converters. The advantages of applying this optimal PWM control method are to avoid the process of a linearization and guarantee the optimality, while the existing PWM control methods are only local approximations of the problem and do not solve the problem completely.

## REFERENCES

- [1] T. Ying, W.-H. Ki, and M. Chan, “Area-efficient CMOS charge pumps for LCD drivers,” *IEEE J. Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 1721–1725, Aug. 2003.
- [2] J. Liu, Z. Chen, and Z. Du, “A new design of power supplies for pocket computer systems,” *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 228–235, Feb. 1998.
- [3] O. Dranga, B. Buti, and I. Nagy, “Stability analysis of a feedback-controlled resonant dc–dc converter,” *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 141–152, Feb. 2003.
- [4] S. K. Mazumder, A. H. Nayfeh, and D. Boroyevich, “Theoretical and experimental investigation of the fast- and slow-scale instabilities of a dc–dc converter,” *IEEE Trans. Power Electron.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 201–216, Mar. 2001.
- [5] Y. Berkovich and A. Ioinovici, “Large-signal stability-oriented design of boost regulators based on a Lyapunov criterion with nonlinear integral,” *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Fundam. Theory Appl.*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 1610–1619, Nov. 2002.
- [6] S. Banerjee and K. Chakrabarty, “Nonlinear modeling and bifurcations in the boost converter,” *IEEE Trans. Power Electron.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 252–260, Mar. 1998.
- [7] D. C. Hamill, J. H. B. Deane, and D. J. Jefferies, “Modeling of chaotic dc–dc converters by iterated nonlinear mappings,” *IEEE Trans. Power Electron.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 25–36, Jan. 1992.

- [8] G. Yuan, S. Banerjee, E. Ott, and J. A. Yorke, "Border—Collision bifurcations in the buck converter," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Fundam. Theory Appl.*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 707–716, Jul. 1998.
- [9] M. di Bernardo and F. Vasca, "Discrete-time maps for the analysis of bifurcations and chaos in dc–dc converters," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Fundam. Theory Appl.*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 130–143, Feb. 2000.
- [10] K. W. E. Cheng, M. Liu, and J. Wu, "Experimental study of bifurcation and chaos in the buck-boost converter," *Proc. IEE B, Elect. Power Appl.*, vol. 150, no. 1, pp. 45–61, 2003.
- [11] W. C. Y. Chan and C. K. Tse, "Study of bifurcations in current-programmed dc–dc boost converters: From quasi-periodicity to period-doubling," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Fundam. Theory Appl.*, vol. 44, no. 12, pp. 1129–1142, Dec. 1997.
- [12] C. K. Tse, S. C. Fung, and M. W. Kwan, "Experimental confirmation of chaos in a current-programmed Ćuk converter," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Fundam. Theory Appl.*, vol. 43, no. 7, pp. 605–608, Jul. 1996.
- [13] K. W. E. Cheng, M. Liu, and J. Wu, "Chaos study and parameter-space analysis of the dc–dc buck-boost converter," *Proc. IEE B, Elect. Power Appl.*, vol. 150, no. 2, pp. 126–138, 2003.
- [14] C. Batlle, I. Massana, and A. Miralles, "Lyapunov exponents for bilinear systems. Application to the buck converter," *Int. J. Bifurc. Chaos*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 713–722, 2003.
- [15] D. C. Hamill and D. J. Jeffries, "Subharmonics and chaos in a controlled switched-mode power converter," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 1059–1061, Aug. 1988.
- [16] A. Khayatian and D. G. Taylor, "Multirate modeling and control design for switched-mode power converters," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 39, no. 9, pp. 1848–1852, Sep. 1994.
- [17] F. H. F. Leung, P. K. S. Tam, and C. K. Li, "An improved LQR-based controller for switching dc–dc converters," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 521–528, Oct. 1993.
- [18] F. H. F. Leung, P. K. S. Tam, and C. K. Li, "The control of switching dc–dc converters—A general LQR problem," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 65–71, Feb. 1991.
- [19] F. Garofalo, P. Marino, S. Scala, and F. Vasca, "Control of dc–dc converters with linear optimal feedback and nonlinear feedforward," *IEEE Trans. Power Electron.*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 607–615, Nov. 1994.
- [20] J. Sun, H. Takano, and M. Nakaoka, "Series and parallel transformer resonant dc–dc converter using optimal digital servo and repetitive learning control schemes," *Proc. IEE B, Elect. Power Appl.*, vol. 146, no. 5, pp. 530–538, 1999.
- [21] H. Chung and A. Ioinovici, "Design of feedback gain vector of two-state basic PWM multifeedback regulators for large-signal stability," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Fundam. Theory Appl.*, vol. 44, no. 8, pp. 676–683, Aug. 1997.
- [22] Y. Zhou, C. K. Tse, S.-S. Qiu, and F. C. M. Lau, "Applying resonant parametric perturbation to control chaos in the buck dc–dc converter with phase shift and frequency mismatch considerations," *Int. J. Bifurc. Chaos*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 3459–3471, 2003.
- [23] L. Benadero, A. E. Aroudi, G. Olivar, E. Toribio, and E. Gómez, "Two-dimensional bifurcation diagrams. Background pattern of fundamental dc–dc converters with PWM control," *Int. J. Bifurc. Chaos*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 427–451, 2003.
- [24] G. Garcerá, E. Figueres, and A. Mocholí, "Novel three-controller average current mode control of dc–dc PWM converters with improved robustness and dynamic response," *IEEE Trans. Power Electron.*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 516–528, May 2000.
- [25] L. Calderone, L. Pinola, and V. Varoli, "Optimal feedforward compensation for PWM dc–dc converters with "linear" and "quadratic" conversion ratio," *IEEE Trans. Power Electron.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 349–355, Mar. 1992.
- [26] K. L. Teo, C. J. Goh, and K. H. Wong, *A Unified Computational Approach to Optimal Control Problems*. London, U.K.: Longman Scientific and Technical, 1991, vol. 55, Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics.
- [27] K. L. Teo, L. S. Jennings, H. W. J. Lee, and V. Rehbock, "The control parameterization enhancing transform for constrained optimal control problems," *J. Austral. Math. Soc., Ser. B*, vol. 40, pp. 314–335, 1999.
- [28] X. Q. Yang, A. I. Mees, M. E. Fisher, and L. S. Jennings, *Progress in Optimization II Contributions from Australasia*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- [29] Y. Liu, K. L. Teo, L. S. Jennings, and S. Wang, "On a class of optimal control problems with state jumps," *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 98, no. 1, pp. 65–82, 1998.
- [30] L. S. Jennings, M. E. Fisher, K. L. Teo, and C. J. Goh, "MISER3: Solving optimal control problems—An update," in *Advances in Engineering Software*. Oxford, U.K.: Elsevier, 1991, vol. 13, pp. 190–196.
- [31] H. Chung and Y. K. Mok, "Development of a switched-capacitor dc–dc boost converter with continuous input current waveform," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Fundam. Theory Appl.*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 756–759, Jun. 1999.
- [32] G. Zhu and A. Ioinovici, "DC-to-DC converter with no magnetic elements and enhanced regulation," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pt. 1, pp. 499–506, Apr. 1997.
- [33] A. Rao, W. McIntyre, U.-K. Moon, and G. C. Temes, "Noise-shaping techniques applied to switched-capacitor voltage regulators," *IEEE J. Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 422–429, Feb. 2005.
- [34] H. Lee and P. K. T. Mok, "An SC voltage doubler with pseudocontinuous output regulation using a three-stage switchable opamp," *IEEE J. Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 1216–1229, Jun. 2007.
- [35] J. Han, A. von Jouanne, and G. C. Temes, "A new approach to reducing output ripple in switched-capacitor-based step-down dc–dc converters," *IEEE Trans. Power Electron.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 1548–1555, Nov. 2006.
- [36] B. R. Gregoire, "A compact switched-capacitor regulated charge pump power supply," *IEEE J. Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 41, no. 8, pp. 1944–1953, Aug. 2006.



**Yuk-Fan Ho** (S'01) received the B.Eng. (Hons) degree in electrical and electronic engineering from the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, and the M.Phil. degree in electronic and information engineering from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, in 2000, and 2003, respectively. She is working toward Ph.D. degree at the Queen Mary College, University of London, London, U.K.

Her research interests include investigations of discrete-time systems with nonsmooth nonlinearities, applications of fuzzy and impulsive control theory, applications of continuous constrained optimization theory, as well as filter banks and wavelets theory.



**Wing-Kuen Ling** received the B.Eng. (Hons) and M.Phil. degrees in electrical and electronic engineering from the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, in 1997 and 2000, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in electronic and information engineering from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, in 2003.

In 2004, he joined the King's College London, London, U.K., as a Lecturer. His research interests include investigations of discrete-time systems with nonsmooth nonlinearities, applications of fuzzy and impulsive control theory, applications of continuous constrained optimization theory, as well as filter banks and wavelets theory.

Dr. Ling has served as Technical Committee Chair of several IEEE international conferences.



**Yan-Qun Liu** received the Ph.D. degree in mathematics from the University of Western Australia, Australia, in 1997. From 1997 to 1999, he was a research associate with the School of Mathematics and Statistics, Curtin University of Technology, Perth, WA, Australia.

From 2000 to 2003, he was a Research Fellow in the Department of Applied Mathematics, and from 2003 to 2004, a Senior Research Fellow in the Department of Electronic and Information Engineering, both at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, China. Currently, he is a Lecturer in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) University, Melbourne, Australia. His research interests include optimization, optimal control, and signal processing.



**Peter Kwong-Shun Tam** (S'74–M'76) received the B.E., M.E., and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Newcastle, Newcastle, Australia, in 1971, 1973, and 1976, respectively, all in electrical engineering.

From 1976 to 1980, he held a number of industrial and academic positions in Australia. In 1980, he joined the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China, as a senior lecturer, where he was an Associate Professor in the Department of Electronic and Information Engineering. His research interests include signal processing,

automatic control, fuzzy systems, and neural networks.

Dr. Tam has participated in the organization of a number of symposiums and conferences.



**Kok-Lay Teo** (M'74–SM'87) was born in Johore, Malaysia, in 1946. He received the B.Sc. degree in telecommunications engineering from Ngee Ann Technical College, Singapore, in 1969 and the M.A.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from the University of Ottawa, ON, Canada, in 1971 and 1974, respectively.

From 1974 to 1985, he was with the Department of Applied Mathematics, University of New South Wales, Australia, and from 1985 to 1987, he was with the Department of Industrial and Systems

Engineering, National University of Singapore, Singapore. In 1988, he returned to Australia as an associate professor in the Department of Mathematics, University of Western Australia, Australia. In 1996, he joined the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Curtin University of Technology, Perth, WA, Australia, as a Professor. From 1999 to 2004, he was chair professor of Applied Mathematics and head of Department of Applied Mathematics at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China. Currently, he is professor of Applied Mathematics and head of Department of Mathematics and Statistics at Curtin University of technology. He was delivered several keynote and fully funded invited lectures and published five books, over 250 journal papers, and a number of conference papers. The software package MISER3.3, used for solving general constrained optimal control problems, was developed by the research team under his leadership. His research interests include both the theoretical and practical aspects of optimal control and optimization and their practical applications, such as in signal processing in telecommunications and financial portfolio optimization.

Dr. Teo is Editor-In-Chief of the *Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization*. He also serves as an Associate Editor of a number of international journals, including *Automatica*, *Nonlinear Dynamics and System Theory*, *Journal of Global Optimization Engineering and Optimization*, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamics Systems (Series A and Series B)*, and *Dynamics of Continuous, Discrete and Impulsive Systems (Series A and Series B)*. He has also edited special issues for several journals, including *Annals of Operations Research*, *Journal of Global Optimization*, and *Dynamics of Continuous, Discrete and Impulsive Systems (Series A and Series B)*.