Finite-Horizon Bounded Amplitude Control of Linear Parameter Varying Systems (version A)

Technical Report of the ISIS Group

at the University of Notre Dame

ISIS-96-005

December 21, 1996

Christopher Bett and Michael Lemmon

Department of Electrical Engineering

University of Notre Dame

Notre Dame, IN 46556

Interdisciplinary Studies of Intelligent Systems

Finite-Horizon Bounded Amplitude Control of Linear Parameter Varying Systems

Christopher J. Bett* and Michael Lemmon†

Department of Electrical Eng.
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556

December 21, 1996

Abstract

This paper considers the problem of controlling continuous-time linear parameter varying (LPV) systems when performance is measured in terms of prespecified, finite-time bounds on plant signal amplitude. Such problems arise, for example, in finite time tasks where signal amplitude is more important than signal energy. The notion of finite horizon behaviour of LPV system is formally defined. Sufficient conditions for bounded amplitude performance of such systems are proven and used to derive synthesis conditions for state feedback controllers. These conditions are useful in that they can be reformulated as linear matrix inequality (LMI) conditions amenable to efficient numerical techniques. An illustrative numerical example is included. **NOTE: This report is a preliminary version of a full technical report which will appear in January 1997.**

*Corresponding author email: cbett@maddog.ee.nd.edu

†The authors gratefully acknowledge the partial financial support of the Army Research Office (DAAH04-95-1-0600, DAAH04-96-1-0134).

1 Introduction

NOTE: This report is a preliminary version of a full technical report which will appear in January 1997.

In any control system design problem, there is a performance objective which is to be achieved by the design. In the continuous-time $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ design paradigm, for example, performance is measured with respect to the induced $\mathcal{L}_2$ norm of the closed loop system which corresponds to the gain that the system applies to the *energy* of the input signal.

Another measure of system performance is the *peak value* of the output signal, especially in the presence of input signals which have bounded peak value but unbounded energy. Such control problems are prevalent in the literature: motor control problems with electrical (voltage or current) or mechanical (motion) restrictions and process control problems with chemical concentration restrictions are two examples. In each of these examples, violation of the restrictions could lead to performance degradation and possibly catastrophic failure of the system. In these problems, therefore, it is more important to control the peak value of the plant signals than the energy contained in the signals. In recent years, significant effort has been directed towards the problem of designing control systems which guarantee such prescribed bounds on peak signal values.

For discrete-time systems, the problem of controlling signal amplitudes is known as the ℓ_1-optimal control problem. First stated in [17], this problem is to design a controller which minimizes the effects of persistent (bounded amplitude) disturbances as measured by the induced ℓ_∞-norm (the peak-to-peak gain). A solution to the linear MIMO ℓ_1-optimal control problem appeared in [8], where optimal controllers are synthesized by solving a linear programming problem. Results for the discrete-time case have been extended to handle system uncertainty [6] [16] [13]. As with the solution to the deterministic case, controller synthesis amounts to solving linear programming problems.

While there have been significant advances in the discrete-time problem, the continuous-time problem has not enjoyed the same success. For continuous-time systems, the problem of controlling signal amplitude is denoted the $\mathcal{L}_1$ or induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ optimal control problem. In [7], it is shown that optimal solutions to this problem are irrational or infinite-dimensional, even for rational and finite-dimensional plants. Furthermore, solving the problem exactly involves solving a nonlinear programming problem and while approximate solutions, which are rational and finite dimensional, may be found via linear programming problems, the solutions are still of arbitrarily high order.

An alternative approach for the $\mathcal{L}_1$ optimal control problem was recently proposed in [11]. There, instead of synthesizing a controller to explicitly minimize the induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ norm of the system, an upper bound on the induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ norm is minimized. Although the solution is suboptimal, the solution method involves only the solution of a Riccati matrix inequality. This, in turn, may be expressed as a linear matrix inequality (LMI) problem [5], for which computationally efficient algorithms are available. Furthermore, the synthesized controller is guaranteed to have order no higher than the plant order. The results in [11] concern linear, time-invariant systems only.

In this paper, some of the results presented in [11] are extended to deal with linear parameter varying (LPV) systems [14]. LPV systems are linear dynamical systems whose coefficient matrices depend on a time-varying parameter in a (piecewise-)continuous fashion. The parameter varies over some known compact subset of Euclidean space, called the parameter set. LPV systems have been studied extensively, especially in the context of gain scheduling ([15],[12],[3], [2]). The extension of techniques from [11] to LPV systems also results in a solution method which involves solving a LMI problem with structure similar to the LMIs seen in [12], [3] and [2]. Thus, extending the results in this fashion not only extends the solution method to a larger class of systems; it also implies that the LMI-based

self-scheduled controller design techniques of [12], [3] and [2] might be used for bounded amplitude problems as well.

This paper also generalizes the notion of LPV system performance by introducing the notion of finite-horizon LPV system behaviour. In many applications, it is only necessary to consider system behaviour over finite time intervals. In these instances, parameter variations are often restricted to compact subsets of the parameter set. Tighter performance can often be guaranteed for finite time intervals if it is known that the parameter variations can be restricted in this way.

Motivation for the study of finite-horizon behaviour arises from the study of gain scheduled controllers which switch between control agents in a discrete fashion. Another important behavioural characterization arising in such problems concerns initial conditions of the plant state; results presented in [11] consider bounding a system norm which assumes zero initial conditions. This paper generalizes the induced norm conditions to include bounds on decay time for systems with initial conditions that violate performance constraints.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formally defines the notion of LPV systems, parameter variations and associated performance measures used in this paper. (Section 2 also presents the notation used throughout the paper.) Section 3 presents the bounded amplitude performance results related to a class of LPV systems. This section contains the main results of the paper (theorem 3.1) which states sufficient conditions for bounded amplitude performance of LPV systems. This result is proven and discussed with respect to practical implementation of the conditions. The section concludes with a reformulation of the condition as an LMI (theorem 3.2). Section 4 considers the problem of linear state-feedback controller synthesis. Theorem 4.1 states how the results of section 3 may be used to characterize a set of state-feedback controllers satisfying performance constraints. Practical implementation of the synthesis result is discussed around theorem

4.2 which shows the synthesis conditions may be expressed as LMIs. Section 5 presents a numerical example to illustrate the theoretical results.

Many of the definitions for LPV systems presented in this section are generalized from [4]; the induced- $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ norm results are generalizations of the LTI results reported in [11].

2 Mathematical Preliminaries

The section begins by formally defining a linear parameter varying (LPV) system and discussing various notions of parameter variation, specifically the notion of finite horizon behaviour. The performance measure considered in this section, the induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ norm, is defined for a LPV system with a special emphasis on finite horizon behaviour. Many of the definitions for LPV systems presented in this section are generalized from [4].

Definition 2.1 establishes the notation for $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ signal norms (finite and infinite horizon) used throughout the paper.

Definition 2.1 *For a finite constant $T > 0$, the finite-horizon infinity norm of a signal $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as*

$$\|f\|_{\infty,[0,T]} := \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f(t)\|$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean l_2 vector norm. The linear space $\mathcal{L}^n_\infty[0,T]$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}^n_\infty[0,T] := \left\{ f : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n \,\middle|\, \|f\|_{\infty,[0,T]} < \infty \right\}$$

The subset $\left\{ f : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n \,\middle|\, \|f\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \le 1 \right\} \subset \mathcal{L}^n_\infty[0,T]$ is denoted $\mathcal{BL}^n_\infty[0,T]$.

The infinite-horizon infinity norm of a signal $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as

$$\|f\|_{\infty,[0,\infty)} := \sup_{t\in[0,\infty)} \|f(t)\|$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean l_2 vector norm. The linear space $\mathcal{L}^n_\infty[0,\infty)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}^n_\infty[0,\infty) := \left\{ f : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n \,\middle|\, \|f\|_{\infty,[0,\infty)} < \infty \right\}$$

The subset $\left\{ f : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n \,\middle|\, \|f\|_{\infty,[0,\infty)} \leq 1 \right\} \subset \mathcal{L}^n_\infty[0,\infty)$ *is denoted* $\mathcal{BL}^n_\infty[0,\infty)$. *The spaces* $\mathcal{L}^n_\infty[0,\infty)$ *and* $\mathcal{BL}^n_\infty[0,\infty)$ *will often be denoted, respectively,* $\mathcal{L}^n_\infty$ *and* $\mathcal{BL}^n_\infty$.

Definitions 2.2-2.3 formally establish the notion of a linear parameter varying system used in this section.

Definition 2.2 (Parameter Variation Set) *Given a compact subset* $\tilde{\Theta} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$, *the* parameter variation set $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ *denotes the set of all continuous functions mapping* $\mathbb{R}^+$ *into* $\tilde{\Theta}$. *For a finite* $T > 0$ *and a compact subset* $\Theta \subseteq \tilde{\Theta}$, *the set* $\mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]$ *denotes the set of all continuous functions* $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ *which map* $[0,T]$ *into* Θ.

The notation $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ denotes a function in the parameter variation set; $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}$ denotes a vector in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^s$. These definitions are extended to functions which map finite time intervals to compact subsets of $\tilde{\Theta}$. It is clear that $\mathcal{F}_\Theta \subset \mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T] \subset \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$.

Note that both $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ and, for instance, $\mathcal{L}^n_\infty$ represent signal spaces. Technically, it can easily be argued that $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}} \subset \mathcal{L}^s_\infty$ since $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ consists of supremum bounded s-dimensional vectors which vary continuously in time. In this paper, the following convention is followed: $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$ will always refer to parameter signals or parameter variations; $\mathcal{L}^n_\infty$ will refer to signals in the plant input, output or state space.

Definition 2.3 (Linear Parameter Varying (LPV) System) *Given a compact set* $\tilde{\Theta} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$, *and continuous functions* $A : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n_w}$, $C : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^{n_z\times n}$, *and* $D : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^{n_z\times n_w}$, *an* n^{th} *order linear parameter varying (LPV) system is a dynamical system whose dynamics evolve as*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}(t) \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A(\theta(t)) & B(\theta(t)) \\ C(\theta(t)) & D(\theta(t)) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ w(t) \end{bmatrix} \tag{1}$$

where $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$.

Note that the LPV system is defined over the parameter variation set $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$. Certain properties of the LPV system may only be guaranteed while the parameter variations are confined to a subset of $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$. Previous results on LPV systems (see, for example, [3], [14], [10], [12]) restrict consideration to properties which can be guaranteed over the entire parameter set $\tilde{\Theta}$ and the associated parameter variation set. This restricts the class of systems for which the linear design techniques may be applied to systems where $\tilde{\Theta}$ is small or posesses sufficient structure in terms of the way that parameter variations enter the system dynamics.

In this paper, the concern is on the situation where specific properties of the LPV system can only be guaranteed for a compact subset $\Theta \subseteq \tilde{\Theta}$ of the parameter set. This presents the possibility that a given parameter variation may evolve out of Θ, causing the system state to evolve out of the performance specification envelope. As noted earlier, such situations may arise, for example, in gain scheduling applications employing *switched* control systems. In those instances, finite-horizon models may be more appropriate. Hence, there is a specific need for the study of finite horizon performance of LPV systems.

To the authors' knowledge, finite horizon peformance of LPV systems in the above context has not been studied. This is not to say that the results which follow are not specific cases of finite horizon nonlinear system behaviour. However, there are apparently no results available in the LPV framework.

The performance measure used in this paper is the induced $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ norm which, as defined below, is related to the peak-to-peak gain of the system. Definition 2.4 formally defines the the induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ norm for finite and infinite system behaviour.

Definition 2.4 *Let the LPV system of definition 2.3 be denoted by* $\Sigma(\tilde{\Theta}, A, B, C, D)$*, or simply,* $\Sigma_{\tilde{\Theta}}$*, if the state-space data is clear from the context. Then for any* $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$*,*

- *the linear time-varying system described in equation 1 is denoted* Σ_θ*,*

- $\Phi_\theta(t, t_0)$ *is the state-transition matrix of of* Σ_θ

- *for* $x(t_0) = 0$*, the causal linear input/output mapping,* $H_\theta : \mathcal{L}_\infty^{n_w} \to \mathcal{L}_\infty^{n_z}$*, of* Σ_θ *is defined as*

$$H_\theta w(t) = \int_{t_0}^{t} C(\theta(\tau))\Phi_\theta(t, \tau)B(\theta(\tau))w(\tau)d\tau + D(\theta(t))w(t)$$

- *for a finite* $T > 0$*, the finite-horizon induced-*$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ *norm of* H_θ *is given by*

$$\|H_\theta\|_{i\infty,[0,T]} := \sup_{w \in \mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}[0,T]} \|H_\theta w\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \tag{2}$$

- *the infinite-horizon induced-*$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ *norm of* H_θ *is given by*

$$\|H_\theta\|_{i\infty} := \sup_{w \in \mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}} \|H_\theta w\|_\infty \tag{3}$$

The set $H_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}}$ *is defined as*

$$H_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}} := \{H_\theta : \theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}\}$$

The shorthand $\|H_{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}}\|_{i\infty} \leq \gamma$ *for some* $\gamma > 0$ *means that for all* $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$*,* $\|H_\theta\|_{i\infty} \leq \gamma$*.*

3 Performance Analysis

In many applications, it is only necessary to consider system behaviour for a finite time interval. In these instances, one may often restrict attention to characteristics which can be established for compact subsets $\Theta \subseteq \tilde{\Theta}$ and obtain less restrictive conditions for system performance.

In this section, LPV systems of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= A(\theta)x + B(\theta)w \\ z &= Cx, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta$ and where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n}$ is a constant matrix, are considered. Bounded amplitude performance of these systems is considered for finite time intervals and for parameter variations over compact subsets $\Theta \subseteq \tilde{\Theta}$. Sufficient conditions are presented for a general LPV system to satisfy bounded amplitude performance specifications, and numerical techniques for evaluating these conditions are discussed.

The development begins with the following lemma which is useful for relating the size of a system output matrix, C, to a given induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ performance level.

Lemma 3.1 *Given constant $\gamma > 0$, a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and a matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n}$, then $x'C'Cx \leq \gamma^2$ for all x such that $x'Px \leq 1$ if and only if $\gamma^2 P \geq C'C$.*

When the output matrix, C, of a LPV system is constant, then lemma 3.1 relates the performance level, γ, to the size of C through a positive definite matrix P. The following theorem applies this result to specify conditions for finite-horizon bounded amplitude performance of the class of LPV systems characterized by equation 4. The theorem represents the main result of the paper.

Theorem 3.1 (Finite Horizon Performance) *Given constant $\gamma > 0$ and the LPV system, $\Sigma(\tilde{\Theta}, A, B, C, 0)$ with $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n}$ a constant matrix. Let $\Theta \subset \tilde{\Theta}$ be a compact subset. If there exist constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$ and a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ satisfying*

$$P \geq \frac{1}{\gamma^2} C'C \tag{5}$$

and

$$A'(\theta)P + PA(\theta) + (\alpha + \beta)\, P + \frac{1}{\alpha} PB(\theta)B'(\theta)P \leq 0 \tag{6}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$, then for any $T \in [0, \infty)$,

1. *for $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]$, the conditions $w \in \mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}[0,T]$ and $x'(0)Px(0) \leq 1$ imply that for all $t \in [0,T]$,*

$$x'(t)Px(t) \leq 1 \text{ and } z'(t)z(t) \leq \gamma^2 \tag{7}$$

2.

$$\|H_{\mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]}\|_{i\infty,[0,T]} \leq \gamma$$

Additionally, if $\beta > 0$, *then for any* $T \in [0, \infty)$,

3. for $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]$, *if* $w \in \mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}[0,T]$ *and* $x'(0)Px(0) = r_0 > 1$ *and if*

$$t_d := -\frac{1}{\beta}\log\left(\frac{1}{r_0}\right) \leq T$$

then

$$x'(t)Px(t) \leq 1 \text{ for all } t \in [t_d, T]$$

Proof: Let $\gamma > 0$. Given constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$ and a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, then for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\frac{1}{\alpha}PB(\theta)B'(\theta)P \geq 0$$

so that if equation 6 holds for all $\theta \in \Theta$, then

$$A'(\theta)P + PA(\theta) + (\alpha+\beta)P \leq -\frac{1}{\alpha}PB(\theta)B'(\theta)P \leq 0$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Thus, from the theory of Schur complements, equation 6 is true for all $\theta \in \Theta$ if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} A'(\theta)P + PA(\theta) + (\alpha+\beta)P & PB(\theta) \\ B'(\theta)P & -\alpha I \end{bmatrix} \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \Theta. \tag{8}$$

But equation 8 is satisfied if and only if for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \xi \\ \nu \end{bmatrix}' \begin{bmatrix} A'(\theta)P + PA(\theta) + (\alpha+\beta)P & PB(\theta) \\ B'(\theta)P & -\alpha I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \xi \\ \nu \end{bmatrix} \leq 0 \tag{9}$$

Equation 9 is true if and only if

$$\xi'(A'(\theta)P + PA(\theta) + \beta P)\xi + \nu'B'(\theta)P\xi + \xi'PB(\theta)\nu + \alpha(\xi'P\xi - 1) + \alpha(1 - \nu'\nu) \leq 0 \tag{10}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$. Equation 10, in turn, implies

$$\xi'(A'(\theta)P + PA(\theta))\xi + \nu' B'(\theta)P\xi + \xi' PB(\theta)\nu \leq -\beta \xi' P\xi \leq 0 \tag{11}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ such that

$$\xi' P\xi \geq 1 \text{ and } \nu'\nu \leq 1$$

To prove the first part of the theorem, consider any time $T \in [0, \infty)$ and any parameter variation $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]$. Now, define the function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ by $V(\xi) := \xi' P\xi$. Along the trajectories of Σ_θ, the time derivative of $V(x(t))$ is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt}V(x(t)) = x(t)'(A'(\theta(t))P + PA(\theta(t)))x(t) + w'(t)B'(\theta(t))Px(t) + x'(t)PB(\theta(t))w(t) \tag{12}$$

From the above argument, equation 6 and equation 11 imply

$$\frac{d}{dt}V(x(t)) \leq -\beta V(x(t)) \leq 0 \tag{13}$$

for any $x(t)$ and $w(t)$ satisfying $x(t)'Px(t) \geq 1$ and $w(t)'w(t) \leq 1$ with $t \in [0,T]$.

Now, suppose that for some $w \in \mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}[0,T]$ that there is a trajectory of Σ_θ with initial state $x(0)$ satisfying $V(x(0)) = x'(0)Px(0) \leq 1$ and $V(x(t_f)) = x'(t_f)Px(t_f) > 1$ for some $t_f \in (0,T]$. Since $V(x(t))$ is differentiable in t, the Mean Value Theorem can be used to imply the existence of a time $\tau \in (0, t_f)$ for which $V(x(\tau)) = x'(\tau)Px(\tau) \geq 1$ and $\dot{V}(x(\tau)) > 0$. This is a contradiction of equation 13, so $x'(t)Px(t) \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. By lemma 3.1 and equation 5, this is true if and only if

$$x'(t)C'Cx(t) = z'(t)z(t) \leq \gamma^2$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$ proving the first part of the theorem.

To prove the second part of the theorem, write

$$\begin{aligned}
\|H_{\mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]}\|_{i\infty,[0,T]} &\leq \sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]} \|H_\theta\|_{i\infty,[0,T]} \\
&= \sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]} \left(\sup_{w\in\mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}[0,T]} \|H_\theta w\|_{\infty,[0,T]}\right) \\
&= \sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]} \left(\sup_{w\in\mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}[0,T],t\in[0,T]} \|H_\theta w(t)\|\right) \\
&= \sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]} \left(\sup_{w\in\mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}[0,T],t\in[0,T]} \|z(t)\|\right)
\end{aligned}$$

But, from part 1, $\|z(t)\| = (z'(t)z(t))^{1/2} \leq \gamma$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ so that

$$\sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]} \left(\sup_{w\in\mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}[0,T],t\in[0,T]} \|z(t)\|\right) \leq \gamma$$

yielding the desired result.

To prove the last part of the theorem, assume that $\beta > 0$. For $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]$ and $w \in \mathcal{BL}_\infty^{n_w}[0,T]$, equation 13 then implies that along any trajectory of Σ_θ for $t \in [0,T]$,

$$V(x(t)) \leq V(x(0)) + \int_0^t -\beta V(x(\tau))d\tau$$

so that from the Bellman-Gronwall Lemma,

$$V(x(t)) \leq V(x(0))\exp(-\beta t) \tag{14}$$

Suppose that $V(x(0)) = x'(0)Px(0) = r_0 > 1$ and let

$$t_d := -\frac{1}{\beta}\log\left(\frac{1}{r_0}\right)$$

If $t_d \leq T$, then for all $t \in [t_d, T]$, from equation 14

$$V(x(t)) \leq r_0\exp(-\beta\left(-\frac{1}{\beta}\log\left(\frac{1}{r_0}\right)\right)) = 1$$

Equivalently,

$$x'(t)Px(t) \leq 1$$

for all $t \in [t_d, T]$. □

Theorem 3.1 demonstrates that sufficient conditions for finite-horizon bounded amplitude performance of a class of LPV systems may be characterized by a Riccati matrix inequality (equation 6) coupled with a constraint on the size of the output matrix (equation 5). These results are stated in parts 1 and 2 of the theorem.

As can be seen from parts 1 and 2 of the theorem, the initial state of the LPV system is an important condition for induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ performance. In previous work [11], the initial state of the system is assumed to be zero, so that transient effects are neglected. In part 3 of the theorem, it is seen that under appropriate conditions, the system state can be guaranteed to decay at a specific rate, β.

By assuming that $\beta = 0$ in the preceding theorem, comparisons may be drawn to the results presented in [11] and related work. Define

$$\bar{\alpha} := \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \{ -2 \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathrm{Re}(\mathrm{eig}(A(\theta))) \}.$$

Fix $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ and define Γ_α as the minimum γ such that inequalities 5 and 6 are satisfied over Θ. The results presented in [11] indicate that that Γ_α is a convex function of α and suggests that an alternating minimization procedure consisting of a line search over $(0, \bar{\alpha})$ with a minimization of γ at each point will achieve a minimum γ for the system. The results presented in [11] were stated for LTI systems, so they are valid for the LPV system evaluated at any *fixed* point $\theta \in \Theta$. It stands to reason that these characteristics will hold if the Riccati inequality is satisfied for *all* points $\theta \in \Theta$.

The constants α and β can be seen with respect to the maximum and minimum eigenvalues of $A(\theta)$ (taken over all points $\theta \in \Theta$). To see this, set $\beta = 0$, fix $\theta \in \Theta$ and consider inequality 6, rewritten as

$$P^{-1/2}(A(\theta) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha I)' P^{1/2} + P^{1/2}(A(\theta) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha I)P^{-1/2} + \frac{1}{\alpha} P^{1/2} B(\theta) B'(\theta) P^{1/2} \leq 0$$

It is clear from eigenvalue perturbation theory that if $\alpha > \bar{\alpha}$, $A(\theta) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha I$ will be unstable.

This implies that the matrix

$$P^{-1/2}(A(\theta)+\frac{1}{2}\alpha I)'P^{1/2}+P^{1/2}(A(\theta)+\frac{1}{2}\alpha I)P^{-1/2}$$

will be indefinite for any positive definite matrix P. Since $\frac{1}{\alpha}P^{1/2}B(\theta)B'(\theta)P^{1/2} \geq 0$ for any $\alpha > 0$, the inequality will have no feasible solution if $\alpha > \bar{\alpha}$.

On the other hand, $\beta > 0$ yields an exponential bounding function for the trajectory of the system, equation 14. Equation 14 may be used to derive

$$\|x(t)\| \leq \|x(0)\|\sqrt{\kappa(P)}\exp(-\frac{\beta}{2}t)$$

for $t \in [0,T]$, where κ is the condition number. This implies that β must be bounded above by $\min_{\theta\in\Theta}\mathrm{Re}(\mathrm{eig}(A(\theta)))$.

These observations suggest a procedure for characterizing the finite horizon behaviour of LPV systems. To determine the minimum γ for which conditions in inequalities 5 and 6 yield a positive definite matrix P, fix $\beta = 0$ and perform a line search over α, solving the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\alpha &= \min_{P=P'>0}\gamma \\ s.t. &\quad (5),\ (6),\ \theta\in\Theta \end{aligned}$$

for each fixed α, $\beta = 0$. Set $\gamma_{opt} = \min_\alpha \Gamma_\alpha$. Given appropriately bounded initial conditions $(x(0)'Px(0) \leq 1)$, γ_{opt} will be the maximum amplitude of the output $\|z(t)\|$ for $t \in [0,T]$.

If the initial conditions cannot be bounded in this fashion, then γ_{opt} *with a guarantees decay rate* β can be obtained by fixing $\beta > 0$ and repreating the above procedure. Note that the tradeoff is that one may no longer be able to guarantee the same level of performance after the transient decay.

Theorem 3.1 presents a set of simple conditions for LPV system performance, but it does not provide an efficient computational means of verifying the condition given by equation 6. Under appropriate assumptions on the nature of the parameter dependence and on the

structure of the parameter set Θ, however, sufficient conditions for satisfying equation 6 may be expressed as matrix inequalities which are linear in the variable P and which are independent of the parameter θ. This is extremely useful because it allows the use of commercially avaliable convex optimization techniques for the evaluation of the performance conditions. Theorem 3.2 provides an example of these conditions under the assumption that the elements of the system coefficient matrices are rational functions of the elements of θ and that the parameter set Θ is a hypercube in $\mathbb{R}^s$. The theorem states a sufficient condition for satisfying equation 6 for all $\theta \in \Theta$. The sufficient condition is a matrix inequality independent of θ and linear in P.

Theorem 3.2 *Given $\vartheta > 0$ and a compact set*

$$\Theta := \left\{ \theta \,\middle|\, \sup_{1 \le i \le s} |\theta_i| \le \vartheta \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$$

Let $\Delta(\theta) := diag(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_m)$ where for each $j = 1, \ldots, m$, $\delta_j = \theta_i$ for some $1 \le i \le s$. Suppose that the elements of A and B are rational functions of the elements of θ so that

$$\begin{aligned} A(\theta) &= A_s + B_p(I - \Delta(\theta)D_{qp})^{-1}\Delta(\theta)C_q \\ B(\theta) &= B_w + B_p(I - \Delta(\theta)D_{qp})^{-1}\Delta(\theta)D_{qw} \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

for constant matrices $A_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $B_w \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n_w}$, $C_q \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, $D_{qp} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ and $D_{qw} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n_w}$.

If there exist constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \ge 0$, a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and diagonal positive semi-definite matrices Λ and Π such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_s'P + PA_s + (\alpha+\beta)P + C_q'\Lambda C_q & PB_p + C_q'\Lambda D_{qp} & PB_w & PB_p \\ B_p'P + D_{qp}'\Lambda C_q & D_{qp}'\Lambda D_{qp} - \frac{1}{\vartheta^2}\Lambda & 0 & 0 \\ B_w'P & 0 & D_{qw}'\Pi D_{qw} - \alpha I & D_{qw}'\Pi D_{qp} \\ B_p'P & 0 & D_{qp}'\Pi D_{qw} & D_{qp}'\Pi D_{qp} - \frac{1}{\vartheta^2}\Pi \end{bmatrix} \le 0 \tag{16}$$

then for all $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$A'(\theta)P + PA(\theta) + (\alpha + \beta)P + \frac{1}{\alpha}PB(\theta)B'(\theta)P \leq 0 \tag{17}$$

The proof of this theorem is a straightforward application of the results presented in [5]. The proof is rather long and not very interesting; it is included in the appendix for completeness.

Note that inequality 16, coupled with inequality 5 are LMIs in P (for fixed α and β), $1/\gamma$ and the slack variables Λ and Π.

Note that the convexity of the performance measure $\tilde{\Gamma}_\alpha$, defined as the minimum γ such that the LMI conditions stated in theorem 3.2, is not guaranteed to be convex in α. Similar observations were reported in [11]. As in those results, numerical evidence suggests that the function is unimodal; thus, the procedure outlined above should apply here as well.

4 State Feedback Synthesis

This section concerns the synthesis of constant gain state feedback controllers so that a controlled LPV system will meet bounded amplitude performance specifications. The open loop LPV system is defined for a parameter set $\tilde{\Theta}$ of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}(t) \\ z(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A(\theta(t)) & B_1(\theta(t)) & B_2(\theta(t)) \\ C_1 & 0 & D_{12} \\ I & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ w(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} \tag{18}$$

where $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$. Here, $A : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B_1 : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_u}$ and $B_2 : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_w}$ are continuous mappings, $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n}$, I is an $n \times n$ identity matrix and $D_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_u}$.

The finite-horizon performance objective is to synthesize a constant gain state feedback controller $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n}$ such that for any $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta[0,T]$, the LPV system under feedback

$$u(t) = Kx(t) \tag{19}$$

satisfies

$$z'(t)z(t) \leq \gamma^2 \tag{20}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$.

Under the control specified in equation 19, the closed loop takes the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}(t) \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A(\theta(t)) + B_2(\theta(t))K & B_1(\theta(t)) \\ C_1 + D_{12}K & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ w(t) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{21}$$

where $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\Theta}}$, and so falls into the class of LPV systems considered in the previous section. The approach taken to derive appropriate state feedback controllers is to find controllers $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n}$ so that the LPV system in equation 21 satisfies the performance conditions of theorem 3.1.

Simple application of those results, however, results in synthesis conditions which are nonlinear in P and K; these nonlinearities cannot be removed through simple use of Schur complements as before. The primary result of this section is to show that a standard reparameterization

$$P = Q^{-1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad K = VQ^{-1}$$

results in synthesis equations linear in Q and V.

Theorem 4.1 *Given $\gamma > 0$ and an LPV system $\Sigma(\tilde{\Theta}, A, B, C, D)$ with*

$$B(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} B_1(\theta) & B_2(\theta) \end{bmatrix}, \; C(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 \\ I \end{bmatrix} \; \textit{and} \; D(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & D_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $B_1 : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n_u}$ *and* $B_2 : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n_w}$ *are continuous mappings,* $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z\times n}$*,* I *is an* $n \times n$ *identity matrix and* $D_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z\times n_u}$*. Let* $\Theta \subseteq \tilde{\Theta}$ *be a compact subset. Then for constants* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\beta \geq 0$*, there exists a positive definite matrix* $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ *and a matrix* $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u\times n}$ *such that*

$$P \geq \frac{1}{\gamma^2}(C_1 + D_{12}K)'(C_1 + D_{12}K) \tag{22}$$

and

$$[A(\theta) + B_2(\theta)K]' P + P[A(\theta) + B_2(\theta)K] + (\alpha + \beta)P + \frac{1}{\alpha}PB_1(\theta)B_1'(\theta)P \leq 0 \tag{23}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ *if and only if there exists a positive definite matrix* $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ *and a matrix* $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u\times n}$ *such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q & QC_1' + V'D_{12}' \\ C_1Q + D_{12}V & \gamma^2 I \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \tag{24}$$

and

$$QA'(\theta) + A(\theta)Q + (\alpha + \beta)Q + \frac{1}{\alpha}B_1(\theta)B_1'(\theta) + B_2(\theta)V + V'B_2'(\theta) \leq 0 \tag{25}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$*.*

Proof: A positive definite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and a matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u\times n}$ exist if and only if there exists a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and a matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u\times n}$ satisfying

$$P = Q^{-1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad K = VQ^{-1} \tag{26}$$

From the theory of Schur complements, a positive definite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and a matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u\times n}$ satisfy

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q & QC_1' + V'D_{12}' \\ C_1Q + D_{12}V & \gamma^2 I \end{bmatrix} \geq 0$$

if and only if

$$Q - \frac{1}{\gamma^2}(QC_1' + V'D_{12}')(C_1Q + D_{12}V) \geq 0 \tag{27}$$

Substituting from equation 26, equation 27 becomes

$$P^{-1} - \frac{1}{\gamma^2} P^{-1}(C_1 + D_{12}K)'(C_1 + D_{12}K)P^{-1} \geq 0$$

which holds if and only if

$$P \geq \frac{1}{\gamma^2}(C_1 + D_{12}K)'(C_1 + D_{12}K)$$

Furthermore, using equation 26, for constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& [A(\theta) + B_2(\theta)K]' P + P [A(\theta) + B_2(\theta)K] + (\alpha + \beta)P + \tfrac{1}{\alpha} P B_1(\theta) B_1'(\theta) P \\
= \; & [A(\theta) + B_2(\theta)K]' Q^{-1} + Q^{-1} [A(\theta) + B_2(\theta)K] + (\alpha + \beta)Q^{-1} + \tfrac{1}{\alpha} Q^{-1} B_1(\theta) B_1'(\theta) Q^{-1} \\
= \; & Q^{-1} \left(QA'(\theta) + A(\theta)Q + (\alpha + \beta)Q + \tfrac{1}{\alpha} B_1(\theta) B_1'(\theta) + B_2(\theta)V + V'B_2'(\theta) \right) Q^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $Q^{-1} > 0$,

$$[A(\theta) + B_2(\theta)K]' P + P [A(\theta) + B_2(\theta)K] + (\alpha + \beta)P + \frac{1}{\alpha} P B_1(\theta) B_1'(\theta) P \leq 0$$

if and only if

$$QA'(\theta) + A(\theta)Q + (\alpha + \beta)Q + \frac{1}{\alpha} B_1(\theta) B_1'(\theta) + B_2(\theta)V + V'B_2'(\theta) \leq 0$$

□

Theorem 4.1 presents a set of conditions on the controller gains for closed loop LPV system performance. By reparameterizing P and K according to equation 26, one obtains synthesis constraints which are linear in the unknowns Q and V. However, the constraints are θ-dependent which limits their usefulness from a computational standpoint. As with the analysis results presented earlier, under appropriate assumptions on the nature of the parameter dependence and on the structure of the parameter set Θ, a sufficient condition for satisfying equation 25 may be expressed as a matrix inequality which is independent of the parameter θ and linear in the variables Q and V. As a result, the synthesis of constant gain state-feedback controllers amounts to solving a pair of matrix inequalities, which are

independent of θ, for a positive definite matrix Q and a real matrix V. The following theorem states the matrix inequality condition for equation 25.

Theorem 4.2 *Given $\vartheta > 0$ and a compact set*

$$\Theta := \left\{ \theta | \sup_{1 \le i \le s} |\theta_i| \le \vartheta \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$$

Let $\Delta(\theta) := diag(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_m)$ where for each $j = 1, \ldots, m$, $\delta_j = \theta_i$ for some $1 \le i \le s$. Suppose that the elements of A, B_1 and B_2 are rational functions of the elements of θ so that

$$\begin{aligned} A(\theta) &= A_s + B_p(I - \Delta(\theta)D_{qp})^{-1}\Delta(\theta)C_q \\ B_1(\theta) &= B_w + B_p(I - \Delta(\theta)D_{qp})^{-1}\Delta(\theta)D_{qw} \\ B_2(\theta) &= B_u + B_p(I - \Delta(\theta)D_{qp})^{-1}\Delta(\theta)D_{qu} \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

for constant matrices $A_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $B_w \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_w}$, $C_q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $D_{qp} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $D_{qw} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_w}$ and $D_{qu} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_u}$.

If there exist constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \ge 0$, a positive definite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, a matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n}$ and diagonal positive semi-definite matrices Λ and Π such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} QA_s' + A_sQ + (\alpha+\beta)Q & QC_p' + V'D_{qu}' + B_p\Lambda D_{qp}' & B_w & B_p \\ +V'B_u' + B_uV + B_p\Lambda B_p' & & & \\ D_{qu}V + C_qQ + D_{qp}\Lambda B_p' & D_{qp}\Lambda D_{qp}' - \frac{1}{\vartheta^2}\Lambda & 0 & 0 \\ B_w' & 0 & D_{qw}'\Pi D_{qw} - \alpha I & D_{qw}'\Pi D_{qp} \\ B_p' & 0 & D_{qp}'\Pi D_{qw} & D_{qp}'\Pi D_{qp} - \frac{1}{\vartheta^2}\Pi \end{bmatrix} \le 0 \tag{29}$$

then for all $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$QA'(\theta) + A(\theta)Q + (\alpha+\beta)Q + \frac{1}{\alpha}B_1(\theta)B_1'(\theta) + B_2(\theta)V + V'B_2'(\theta) \le 0 \tag{30}$$

The proof is similar to the proof of theorem 3.2; it is contained in the appendix.

5 Example

In this section, the theoretical results of sections 3 and 4 are used to design a controller for a nonlinear process control model taken from [9]. This example is intended to illustrate the theoretical results developed above from a practical standpoint; the LMIs from theorems 3.2 and 4.2 are used for analysis and synthesis. **NOTE: A more complete analysis of this example will appear in the full technical report to appear in January 1997.**

The plant dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{p1} &= -x_{p1} + u_1 \\ \dot{x}_{p2} &= -x_{p2} + (1 + x_{p1}^2)u_2 \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The variables $x_{p1} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x_{p2} \in \mathbb{R}$ represent the state of the plant; $u_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ are the control inputs. Here, x_{p1} is the normalized temperature of the plant, x_{p2} is the normalized pressure of the plant, u_1 is the rate at which heat is applied to the plant and u_2 is the rate at which a pneumatic piston is displaced.

The plant is to be used in a process in which the plant must be cycled through various operating points in the plant state space. For the illustrative purposes of this example, the control objective under consideration is to move the plant from an initial state near the operating point $(x_{p1}, x_{p2}) = (2.5, 2)$ to a point near $(x_{p1}, x_{p2}) = (1, 3)$ in 1 second according to the reference trajectory generated by the following dynamical reference model by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{m1} &= x_{m1} - 1.63 - x_{m1}/(1 + 0.5 \sin 10(x_{m1} - 1.63)) \\ \dot{x}_{m2} &= 1 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

This reference model state trajectory is depicted in figure 1.

Defining the state error, $x := x_m - x_p$, the control objective is to synthesize an affine control

$$u = Kx + \tilde{u} \tag{33}$$



Figure 1: Reference trajectory for process control example

so that the performance output variable $z = C_1 x + D_{12} u$ satisfies the amplitude bound

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|z(t)\| \leq \gamma \tag{34}$$

where the performance weights are chosen as $C_1 = I$ and $D_{12} = 0.1I$.

An LPV model of the error dynamics is derived by linearizing the plant at points along the reference trajectory and grouping the state and control dependent elements of the realization matrices into a parameter vector

$$\begin{bmatrix} \theta_1(t) \\ \theta_2(t) \\ \theta_3(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2x_{m1} - x_{m1}/(1 + 0.5 \sin 10(x_{m1} - 1.63)) \\ x_{m2} + (2x_{m1}x_1 - x_1^2)u_2 \\ x_{m1}^2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{35}$$

The resulting LPV plant model is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ z \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A(\theta) & B_w(\theta) & B_u(\theta) \\ C_1 & 0 & D_{12} \\ I & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ w \\ u \end{bmatrix} \tag{36}$$

where $w = 1$ is introduced as a fictitous disturbance and

$$A(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_w(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 - 1.63 \\ \theta_2 + 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } B_u(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\theta_3 - 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{37}$$

The bias term, $\tilde{u}$, is fixed by choosing a nominal design point $\tilde{\theta}$ by examining the desired behaviour of the controlled plant and using

$$\tilde{u} = -B_u(\tilde{\theta})^{-1} B_w(\tilde{\theta}) w \tag{38}$$

Defining

$$\tilde{B}_w(\theta) = B_w(\theta) - B_u(\theta) B_u(\tilde{\theta})^{-1} B_w(\tilde{\theta}) \tag{39}$$

and $\hat{\theta} := \theta - \tilde{\theta}$, the LPV system dynamics may be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ z \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A(\tilde{\theta}) + A(\hat{\theta}) & \tilde{B}_w(\tilde{\theta}) + \hat{B}_w(\tilde{\theta}) & B_u(\tilde{\theta}) + B_u(\hat{\theta}) \\ C_1 & 0 & D_{12} \\ I & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ w \\ u - \tilde{u} \end{bmatrix} \tag{40}$$

Because the error system may be written as in equation 40, the synthesis problem and analysis problem are reduced to the state feedback problem discussed in section 4. The LMIs of theorems 3.2 and 4.2 may be used by rewriting the dynamics one last time as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ z \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \left(\left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} A_s & B_w & B_u \\ \hline C_z & D_{zw} & D_{zu} \\ \hline C_y & D_{yw} & D_{yu} \end{array}\right] + \left[\begin{array}{c} B_p \\ \hline D_{zp} \\ \hline D_{yp} \end{array}\right] [I - \Delta D_{qp}]^{-1} \Delta \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} C_q & D_{qw} & D_{qu} \end{array}\right] \right) \begin{bmatrix} x \\ w \\ u - \tilde{u} \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} A_s & B_w & B_u \\ \hline C_z & D_{zw} & D_{zu} \\ \hline C_y & D_{yw} & D_{yu} \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} A(\theta^{(l)}) & \tilde{B}_w(\theta^{(l)}) & B_u(\theta^{(l)}) \\ \hline C_1 & 0 & D_{12} \\ \hline I & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right], \quad D_{qp} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{41}$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} B_p \\ \hline D_{zp} \\ \hline D_{yp} \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right] \quad \text{and} \quad \left[\begin{array}{c|c|cc} C_q & D_{qw} & D_{qu} \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c|cc} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{array}\right] \tag{42}$$

with $\Delta = diag(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2, \hat{\theta}_3)$.

The derived state space data presented above was used in the LMI of theorem 4.2 to study the achievable performance of state feedback controllers. It was determined that $\vartheta = 1$ was a sufficient size for the parameter set, Θ, assumed for the theorem. The LMI problems were solved using Matlab with LMITOOL.

Figure 2 shows the achievable performance level versus α and β. These curves were computed by fixing β and then incrementing α, solving the LMI of equation 29 at each value of α to minimize γ. The resulting Q and V were used to compute controllers K.



Figure 2: Achievable performance

The optimal design for $\beta = 15$ and $\alpha = 40$ achieved a performance level of $\gamma = 0.367$. The synthesized controller,

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} 63.00 & 0 \\ 0 & 36.31 \end{bmatrix}$$

was simulated in the error system with initial conditions exceeding the performance level γ. Figure 3 depicts the resulting performance variable norm, $\|z(t)\|$. It is clear that the resulting output decays quickly to within the desired performance level. Furthermore, once the performance level γ is achieved, it is maintained throughout the trajectory.



Figure 3: Closed loop performance with $\gamma = 0.367$ and $\|z(0)\| > \gamma$

6 Conclusions

This paper has presented results for finite horizon bounded amplitude performance of LPV systems. The first set of main results, concerning the *analysis* of LPV system performance, culminated in theorems 3.1 and 3.2; the second set of main results concerning the *synthesis* of LPV system performance, culminated in theorems 4.1 and 4.2. These results demonstrate

that verification of induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ performance for LPV systems amounts to checking the feasibility of a set of matrix inequalities. Synthesis of state feedback controllers for induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ performance of a specific class of LPV systems amounts to finding a feasible point of a similarly structured set of matrix inequalities.

As noted in section 1, the induced-$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ results are extensions of results reported in [11] for LTI systems. One limitation of those results was that the controller optimization problem had not been proven convex. However, the authors report that numerical evidence supports such a conjecture, so this drawback does not appear to be serious.

Continued work along these lines involves extensions to self-scheduled controlers long the same lines as [12], [3] and [2]. Because these results are derived for finite horizon problems, the results also apply to multiple control agent switching systems.

A Proofs of Results

Proof of Lemma 3.1: $x'C'Cx \leq \gamma^2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x'Px \leq 1$ if and only if $\gamma^2 - x'C'Cx \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $1 - x'Px \geq 0$. Applying the $\mathcal{S}$-procedure [18], which is lossless in this case, this assertion is true if and only if there exists an $\alpha \geq 0$ such that

$$1 - \frac{1}{\gamma^2}x'C'Cx - \alpha(1 - x'Px) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

which simplifies to

$$x' \left[\alpha P - \frac{1}{\gamma^2}C'C\right] x + (1 - \alpha) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \tag{43}$$

Since equation 43 must be true even for $x = 0$, it can be true if and only if $\alpha \leq 1$. Equation 43 is true if and only if there exists a constant $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\alpha P \geq \frac{1}{\gamma^2}C'C$$

But this is true if and only if $\gamma^2 P \geq C'C$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2: Suppose that there exist constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$ and a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that for all $\theta \in \Theta$, equation 17 is satisfied. Since $PB(\theta)B'(\theta)P \geq 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, Schur complements implies that equation 17 is satisfied for all $\theta \in \Theta$ if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} A'(\theta)P + PA(\theta) + (\alpha + \beta)P & PB(\theta) \\ B'(\theta)P & -\alpha I \end{bmatrix} \leq 0 \tag{44}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$. But equation 44 is true if and only if

$$\xi'(A'(\theta)P + PA(\theta) + (\alpha + \beta)P)\xi + \nu'B'(\theta)P\xi + \xi'PB(\theta)\nu - \alpha\nu'\nu \leq 0 \tag{45}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$. Substituting from equation 15, one concludes that

equation 17 is satisfies for all $\theta \in \Theta$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}\xi'(A_s'P + PA_s + (\alpha+\beta)P)\xi &+ \nu' B_w' P\xi + \xi' P B_w \nu - \alpha\nu'\nu \\ &+ \xi' C_q' \Delta'(\theta) M'(\theta) B_p' P\xi + \xi' P B_p M(\theta)\Delta(\theta) C_q \xi \\ &+ \nu' D_{qw}' \Delta'(\theta) M'(\theta) B_p' P\xi + \xi' P B_p M(\theta)\Delta(\theta) D_{qw}\nu \leq 0\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$, where $M(\theta) := (I - \Delta(\theta)D_{qp})^{-1}$.

Now introduce the variables

$$\eta := M(\theta)\Delta(\theta)C_q\xi \quad \text{and} \quad \mu := M(\theta)\Delta(\theta)D_{qw}\nu$$

which may be rewritten, via algebra, as

$$\eta = \Delta(\theta)(C_q\xi + D_{qp}\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = \Delta(\theta)(D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu)$$

Since $\Delta(\theta)$ is diagonal, one may write

$$\begin{aligned}\eta' e_j e_j' \eta &= \delta_j^2 (C_q\xi + D_{qp}\eta)' e_j e_j' (C_q\xi + D_{qp}\eta) \qquad j = 1, \ldots, m \\ \mu' e_j e_j' \mu &= \delta_j^2 (D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu)' e_j e_j' (D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu) \qquad j = 1, \ldots, m\end{aligned}$$

where e_j $(j = 1, \ldots, m)$ denotes the jth standard basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Since $\theta \in \Theta$ if and only if

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq s} |\theta_i| \leq \vartheta$$

and since for any $j = 1, \ldots, m$, $\delta_j = \theta_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq s$ equation 46 is satisfied for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}\xi'(A_s'P + PA_s + (\alpha+\beta)P)\xi &+ \nu' B_w' P\xi + \xi' P B_w \nu - \alpha\nu'\nu \\ &+ \eta' B_p' P\xi + \xi' P B_p \eta + \mu' B_p' P\xi + \xi' P B_p \mu \leq 0\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\eta' e_j e_j' \eta \leq \vartheta^2 (C_q\xi + D_{qp}\eta)' e_j e_j' (C_q\xi + D_{qp}\eta) \quad j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{48}$$

$$\mu' e_j e_j' \mu \leq \vartheta^2 (D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu)' e_j e_j' (D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu) \quad j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{49}$$

Defining $\zeta := (\xi', \eta', \nu', \mu')'$, and

$$F_0 := \begin{bmatrix} A_s'P + PA_s + (\alpha+\beta)P & PB_p & PB_w & PB_p \\ B_p'P & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ B_w'P & 0 & -\alpha I & 0 \\ B_p'P & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$F_{\eta j} := \begin{bmatrix} -C_q' e_j e_j' C_q & -C_q' e_j e_j' D_{qp} & 0 & 0 \\ -D_{qp}' e_j e_j' C_q & \frac{1}{\vartheta^2} e_j e_j' - D_{qp}' e_j e_j' D_{qp} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad j = 1, \ldots, m$$

$$F_{\mu j} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -D_{qw}' e_j e_j' D_{qw} & -D_{qw}' e_j e_j' D_{qp} \\ 0 & 0 & -D_{qp}' e_j e_j' D_{qw} & \frac{1}{\vartheta^2} e_j e_j' - D_{qp}' e_j e_j' D_{qp} \end{bmatrix} \quad j = 1, \ldots, m$$

Then the conditions given by equations 47-49 become

$$\zeta' F_0 \zeta \leq 0 \tag{50}$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{2m+n+n_w}$ such that

$$\zeta' F_{\eta j} \zeta \leq 0 \quad j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{51}$$

$$\zeta' F_{\mu j} \zeta \leq 0 \quad j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{52}$$

A sufficient condition for equations 50-52 is the existence of nonnegative constants $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m$ and $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_m$ such that

$$\zeta' \left(F_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j F_{\eta j} - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \pi_j F_{\mu j} \right) \zeta \leq 0$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{2m+n+n_w}$ (this is just an application of the $\mathcal{S}$-procedure) or, equivalently,

$$F_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j F_{\eta j} - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \pi_j F_{\mu j} \leq 0 \tag{53}$$

Defining $\Lambda = diag(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m)$ and $\Pi = diag(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_m)$, it is easily seen that equation 53 is equivalent to the matrix inequality in equation 16, concluding the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 4.2: Suppose that there exist constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$, a positive definite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and a matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n}$ such that for all $\theta \in \Theta$, equation 30 is satisfied. Since $B(\theta)B'(\theta) \geq 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, Schur complements implies that equation 30 is satisfied for all $\theta \in \Theta$ if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} QA'(\theta) + A(\theta)Q + (\alpha+\beta)Q + V'B_2'(\theta) + B_2(\theta)V & B_1(\theta) \\ B_1'(\theta) & -\alpha I \end{bmatrix} \leq 0 \tag{54}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$. But equation 54 is true if and only if

$$\xi'(QA'(\theta) + A(\theta)Q + (\alpha+\beta)Q + V'B_2'(\theta) + B_2(\theta)V)\xi + \nu'B_1'(\theta)\xi + \xi'B_1(\theta)\nu - \alpha\nu'\nu \leq 0 \tag{55}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$. Substituting from equation 28, one concludes that equation 30 is satisfies for all $\theta \in \Theta$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \xi'(QA_s' + A_sQ + (\alpha+\beta)Q \;&+\; V'B_u' + B_uV)\xi + \nu'B_w'\xi + \xi'B_w\nu - \alpha\nu'\nu \\ &+\; \xi'QC_q'\Delta'(\theta)M'(\theta)B_p'\xi + \xi'B_pM(\theta)\Delta(\theta)C_qQ\xi \\ &+\; \xi'V'D_{qu}'\Delta'(\theta)M'(\theta)B_p'\xi + \xi'B_pM(\theta)\Delta(\theta)D_{qu}V\xi \\ &+\; \nu'D_{qw}'\Delta'(\theta)M'(\theta)B_p'\xi + \xi'B_pM(\theta)\Delta(\theta)D_{qw}\nu \leq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$, where $M(\theta) := (I - \Delta(\theta)D_{qp})^{-1}$.

Now introduce the variables

$$\eta := \Delta'(\theta)M'(\theta)B_p'\xi \quad \text{and} \quad \mu := M(\theta)\Delta(\theta)D_{qw}\nu$$

which may be rewritten, via algebra, as

$$\eta = \Delta'(\theta)(B_p'\xi + D_{qp}'\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = \Delta(\theta)(D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu)$$

Since $\Delta(\theta)$ is diagonal, one may write

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta' e_j e_j' \eta &= \delta_j^2 (B_p'\xi + D_{qp}'\eta)' e_j e_j' (B_p'\xi + D_{qp}'\eta) \qquad j = 1, \ldots, m \\
\mu' e_j e_j' \mu &= \delta_j^2 (D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu)' e_j e_j' (D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu) \qquad j = 1, \ldots, m
\end{aligned}$$

where e_j $(j = 1, \ldots, m)$ denotes the jth standard basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Since $\theta \in \Theta$ if and only if

$$\sup_{1 \le i \le s} |\theta_i| \le \vartheta$$

and since for any $j = 1, \ldots, m$, $\delta_j = \theta_i$ for some $1 \le i \le s$ equation 56 is satisfied for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi'(QA_s + A_sQ + (\alpha+\beta)Q &+ V'B_u' + B_uV)\xi + \nu' B_w'\xi + \xi' B_w \nu - \alpha \nu'\nu \\
&+ \eta'(C_qQ + D_{qu}V)\xi + \xi'(QC_q' + V'D_{qu}')\eta + \mu' B_p'\xi + \xi' B_p \mu \le 0
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\eta' e_j e_j' \eta \le \vartheta^2 (B_p'\xi + D_{qp}'\eta)' e_j e_j' (B_p'\xi + D_{qp}'\eta) \quad j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{58}$$

$$\mu' e_j e_j' \mu \le \vartheta^2 (D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu)' e_j e_j' (D_{qw}\nu + D_{qp}\mu) \quad j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{59}$$

Defining $\zeta := (\xi', \eta', \nu', \mu')'$, and

$$F_0 := \begin{bmatrix}
QA_s' + A_sQ + (\alpha+\beta)Q + V'B_u' + B_uV & QC_q' + V'D_{qu}' & B_w & B_p \\
D_{qu}V + C_qQ & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
B_w' & 0 & -\alpha I & 0 \\
B_p' & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}$$

$$F_{\eta j} := \begin{bmatrix}
-B_p e_j e_j' B_p' & -B_p e_j e_j' D_{qp}' & 0 & 0 \\
-D_{qp} e_j e_j' B_p' & \frac{1}{\vartheta^2} e_j e_j' - D_{qp} e_j e_j' D_{qp}' & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} \quad j = 1, \ldots, m$$

$$F_{\mu j} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -D'_{qw} e_j e'_j D_{qw} & -D'_{qw} e_j e'_j D_{qp} \\ 0 & 0 & -D'_{qp} e_j e'_j D_{qw} & \frac{1}{\vartheta^2} e_j e'_j - D'_{qp} e_j e'_j D_{qp} \end{bmatrix} \quad j = 1, \ldots, m$$

Then the conditions given by equations 57-59 become

$$\zeta' F_0 \zeta \leq 0 \tag{60}$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{2m+n+n_w}$ such that

$$\zeta' F_{\eta j} \zeta \leq 0 \quad j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{61}$$

$$\zeta' F_{\mu j} \zeta \leq 0 \quad j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{62}$$

A sufficient condition for equations 60-62 is the existence of nonnegative constants $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m$ and $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_m$ such that

$$\zeta' \left(F_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j F_{\eta j} - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \pi_j F_{\mu j} \right) \zeta \leq 0$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{2m+n+n_w}$ (this is just an application of the $\mathcal{S}$-procedure) or, equivalently,

$$F_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j F_{\eta j} - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \pi_j F_{\mu j} \leq 0 \tag{63}$$

Defining $\Lambda = diag(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m)$ and $\Pi = diag(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_m)$, it is easily seen that equation 63 is equivalent to the matrix inequality in equation 29, concluding the proof. □

References

[1] John Abedor, Krishan Nagpal, and Kameshwar Poolla. A linear matrix inequality approach to peak-to-peak gain minimization: Filtering and control. Technical report, University of California, Berkeley, 1994.

[2] P. Apkarian and P. Gahinet. A convex characterization of gain-scheduled H_∞ controllers. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 40(5):853–864, May 1995.

[3] G. Becker and A. Packard. Robust performance of linear parametrically varying systems using parametrically-dependent linear feedback. *Systems and Control Letters*, 23:205–215, 1994.

[4] Gregory Scott Becker. *Quadratic Stability and Performance of Linear Parameter Dependent Systems*. PhD thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 1993.

[5] Stephen Boyd, Laurent El Gaoui, Eric Feron, and Venkataramanan Balakrishnan. *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1994.

[6] M.A. Dahleh and I.J. Diaz-Bobillo. *Control of uncertain systems: a linear programming approach*. Prentice-Hall, 1995.

[7] M.A. Dahleh and J.B. Pearson. L^1-optimal compensators for continuous-time systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 32(10):889–895, October 1987.

[8] M.A. Dahleh and J.B. Pearson. l^1-optimal feedback controllers for MIMO discrete-time systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 32(4):314–322, April 1987.

[9] Akash Deshpande and Pravin Varaiya. Viable control of hybrid systems. In Panos Antsaklis, Wolf Kohn, Anil Nerode, and Shankar Sastry, editors, *Hybrid Systems II*, pages 128–147. Springer-Verlag, 1995. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Volume 999.

[10] Edward W. Kamen and Pramod P. Khargonekar. On the control of linear systems whos coefficients are functions of parameters. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, AC-29(1):25–33, January 1984.

[11] K. Nagpal, J. Abedor, and K. Poolla. An LMI approach to peak-to-peak gain minimization: filtering and control. In *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, pages 742–746, Baltimore, Maryland, June 1994.

[12] Andy Packard. Gain scheduling via linear fractional transformations. *Systems and Control Letters*, 22:79–92, 1994.

[13] Jeff S. Shamma. Optimization of the ℓ^∞-induced norm under full state feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 41(4):533–544, 1996.

[14] Jeff S. Shamma and Michael Athans. Guaranteed properties of gain scheduled control for linear parameter-varying plants. *Automatica*, 27(3):559–564, 1991.

[15] Jeff S. Shamma and Michael Athans. Gain scheduling: Potential hazards and possible remedies. *Control Systems Magazine*, 12(3):101–107, 1992.

[16] J.S. Shamma and K. Poolla. Optimal asymptotic robust performance via nonlinear controllers. *International Journal of Control*, 62(6):1367–1389, 1995.

[17] M. Vidyasagar. Optimal rejection of persistent bounded disturbances. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 31(6):527–535, June 1986.

[18] V.A. Yakubovich. The S-procedure in nonlinear control theory. *Vestnik Leningrad University Mathematics*, 4:73–93, 1977.