

Fig. 4. Norms of estimated parameters in the presence of uncertainties.




Fig. 5. (LQR + MRAC) response with uncertainties.

confirmation of the CMRAC conjecture taken place. The better transient performance provided by CMRAC can be attributed to the inclusion of the output prediction error into the adaptive laws.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this technical note, we presented theoretically justified state-feedback CMRAC tracking design methodology for MIMO dynamical systems with partially known dynamics. Efficiency of the design was demonstrated using short period dynamics of an aircraft. Future research will encompass extensions of the proposed method to output feedback.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. A. Duarte and K. S. Narendra, *Combined Direct and Indirect Approach to Adaptive Control*, Center for Syst. Sci., Yale Univ., New Haven, CT, 1987, Tech. Rep. 8711.
- [2] M. A. Duarte and K. S. Narendra, "Combined direct and indirect approach to adaptive control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 1071–1075, Oct. 1989.
- [3] M. A. Duarte and K. S. Narendra, "A new approach to model reference adaptive control," *Int. J. Adapt. Control and Signal Process.*, vol. 3, pp. 53–73, 1989.
- [4] M. A. Duarte *et al.*, "Experimental evaluation of combined model reference adaptive controller in a pH regulation process," *Int. J. Adapt. Control and Signal Process.*, vol. 16, pp. 85–106, 2002.
- [5] M. A. Duarte *et al.*, "Control of longitudinal movement of a plane using combined model reference adaptive control," *Int. J. Aircraft Eng. and Aerosp. Technol.*, vol. 77, no. 3, pp. 199–213, 2005.
- [6] J.-J. E. Slotine, "Adaptive robot control: A new perspective," in *Proc. 26th Conf. Decision and Control*, Los Angeles, CA, Dec. 1987.
- [7] J. J. E. Slotine and W. Li, "On the adaptive control of robot manipulators," *Int. J. Robotics Res.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 49–59, 1987.
- [8] J.-J. E. Slotine and W. Li, "Composite adaptive control of robot manipulators," *Automatica*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 509–519, 1989.
- [9] J. Nakanishi, J. A. Farrell, and S. Schaal, "A locally weighted learning composite adaptive controller with structure adaptation," in *Proc. IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. Intelligent Robotics and Systems*, Lausanne, Switzerland, Oct. 2002, EPFL.
- [10] J. Nakanishi, J. A. Farrell, and S. Schaal, "Composite adaptive control with locally weighted statistical learning," *Neural Netw.*, vol. 18, pp. 71–90, 2005.
- [11] K. S. K. S. Narendra and A. M. Annaswamy, *Stable Adaptive Systems*. New York: Dover, 2005.
- [12] P. A. Ioannou and B. Fidan, *Adaptive Control Tutorial*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 2006.
- [13] J.-J. E. Slotine and W. Li, *Applied Nonlinear Control*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1995.
- [14] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 2002.
- [15] J. B. Pomet and L. Praly, "Adaptive nonlinear regulation: Estimation from the Lyapunov equation," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 729–740, 1992.
- [16] B. L. Stevens and F. L. Lewis, *Aircraft Control and Simulation*, 2nd ed. New York: Wiley, 2003.
- [17] E. Rimon and K. S. Narendra, "A new adaptive estimator for linear systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 410–412, 1992.

On the Existence of Stable, Causal Multipliers for Systems With Slope-Restricted Nonlinearities

Matthew C. Turner, Murray Kerr, and
Ian Postlethwaite, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The stability of a feedback interconnection of a linear time invariant (LTI) system and a slope-restricted nonlinearity is revisited. Unlike the normal treatment of this problem, in which multipliers are explicitly chosen and then stability conditions checked, this technical note derives existence conditions for a sub-class of these multipliers, namely those which are \mathcal{L}_1 bounded, stable, causal and of order equal to the LTI part of the system. It is proved that for the single-input-single-output case, these existence conditions can be expressed as a set of linear matrix inequalities and thus can be solved efficiently with modern optimization software. Examples illustrate the effectiveness of the results.

Index Terms—Linear matrix inequalities (LMIs), linear time invariant (LTI), single-input-single-output (SISO).

I. INTRODUCTION

Many researchers have studied the feedback interconnection of a linear time invariant (LTI) system and a nonlinearity of a given form; for example, see [4], [5], [7], [12], [15], [19], and [20] and the references therein. When all that is known is that the nonlinearity is sector bounded, the Circle Criterion gives an efficient method for stability analysis. When the nonlinearity is also time invariant, the Popov Criterion may be used to study stability. When, in addition, the nonlinearity

Manuscript received January 27, 2009; revised January 28, 2009 and June 24, 2009. First published October 16, 2009; current version published November 04, 2009. This work was supported by the U.K. Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council. Recommended by Associate Editor G. Chesi.

M. C. Turner and I. Postlethwaite are with the Department of Engineering, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH, U.K. (e-mail: mct6@le.ac.uk; ixp@le.ac.uk).

M. Kerr was with the Department of Engineering, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH, U.K. He is now with the Deimos Space SL, Madrid 28760, Spain (e-mail: murray.kerr@deimos-space.com).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2009.2031581

is slope restricted, it is well known that asymptotic stability can be established by proving the existence of an \mathcal{L}_1 bounded diagonally dominant multiplier [11], [12], [17], [21]. Such systems are of tremendous importance in control engineering because many control problems of practical interest are fundamentally of this form. One is particularly reminded of constrained control problems, where the saturation element is the nonlinearity under consideration (see, for example, [6], [8], and [13]); and the anti-windup problem, where effectively the deadzone nonlinearity is typically used (see, for example, [3], [20], and the references therein).

Recently, the integral quadratic constraint (IQC) method [2], [11], [12] has become a convenient way of both framing and solving problems involving systems containing LTI parts and slope-restricted nonlinearities. Reference [2] is particularly relevant as this allows the stability analysis problem to be solved by seeking multipliers which are \mathcal{L}_1 bounded and diagonally dominant (rather than just diagonal), enabling the conservatism of the previous results to be reduced. Work by Safanov *et al.* [7], [10] proved that the whole class of multipliers which one can choose for stability analysis does not even have to be symmetric and thus, by judicious choice of multiplier, one could prove stability of systems which were hitherto not *proven* to be stable despite being suspected of being so.

Although the work of [2], [7] and [10] proves that there exists a very large class of multipliers which can enable a system of the above type to be proved stable, there is currently no *systematic* way of choosing these multipliers. Typically, engineering judgement is used to “guess” the multiplier structure (e.g., the order, the pole location and so on) and then, for example, the IQC toolbox [11] can be used to check whether indeed a given system can be proved stable—with that particular selection of multiplier. A similar approach is proposed in [9] where again the engineer is required to choose multipliers of a given form and then iterate in order to compute a satisfactory solution. While these approaches seem effective for simple systems and while useful improvements in the stability margins/ \mathcal{L}_2 gains have been demonstrated, there is a concern that for more complex systems, a more systematic way of choosing multipliers is required.

In contrast to the above, Park [15] has studied the same problem with a new type of Lur’e-Postnikov Lyapunov function. The examples included in [15] demonstrate that the method proposed therein is one of the least conservative methods for the Lur’e problem and, moreover, it is convex. The solution given in [15] is derived in a similar manner to the standard Popov criterion, although the manipulations involved are more intricate and care is required in casting the problem as a linear matrix inequality. Effectively, Park’s method imposes a certain choice of multiplier on the system and hence, although it is more general than the Popov Criterion, does not exploit the full freedom in multiplier choice which is present in the work of [21] (or the later results of [2], [9], [10]).

This technical note improves on the current results (notably [15]) by translating the choice of multipliers to an *existence* problem using LMIs. Although some conservatism is introduced in this translation (the multipliers are restricted to be causal and of order equal to that of the linear part of the system), the method proposed is systematic and requires no ad-hoc choices to be made when the criterion is applied. We emphasise that we do not actually wish to *compute* these multipliers, we simply wish to prove that they exist—which is all that is required in order to prove stability. The problem is cast in an IQC framework and then a nonlinear change of variables as proposed by [18], along with standard “tricks” popular in convex optimisation, are used to “linearise” the matrix inequalities. We only treat SISO systems in this technical note but the results are, in principle, extendable to multivariable systems.

Notation: Notation is standard throughout. The \mathcal{L}_2 norm of a vector valued function $x(t)$ is defined as $\|x\|_2 := \int_0^\infty \|x(t)\|^2 dt$ where $\|x\|$




Fig. 1. System under consideration.

denotes a vector’s Euclidean norm; the space of functions where this norm is finite is denoted \mathcal{L}_2 . Likewise, the \mathcal{L}_1 norm is defined as $\|x\|_1 := \int_0^\infty \|x(t)\| dt$; the space where this norm is finite is denoted \mathcal{L}_1 . The space of real rational transfer function matrices, bounded on the imaginary axis is denoted by \mathcal{RL}_∞ ; the subspace of \mathcal{RL}_∞ which is analytically continuous in the right half complex plane is denoted \mathcal{RH}_∞ . With some abuse of notation we say that a transfer function matrix $H(s) \in \mathcal{L}_1$ if its impulse response, $h(t)$ is in \mathcal{L}_1 . An operator H is described as bounded if $\|H(u)\| \leq \gamma \|u\|$ for all $u \in \mathcal{L}_2$ and some $\gamma > 0$. A function $\phi(\cdot)$ is said to have a slope restriction $[0, \alpha]$ if

$$0 \leq \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(y)}{x - y} \leq \alpha \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

We use the shorthand notation $\phi \in \partial[0, \alpha]$ to indicate that a function has this property. The slope restriction is stronger than the related sector condition [14]: simply multiply all terms of the slope inequality by $(x - y)^2 > 0$ and set $y = 0$. Then if $\phi(0) = 0$, it follows that

$$\phi(x)x \leq \alpha x^2$$

and thus every slope restricted nonlinearity is also sector bounded.

II. IQC FRAMEWORK

Consider Fig. 1, in which $P(s)$ is the LTI part of the system with state-space realization

$$P(s) \sim \begin{bmatrix} A_p & B_p \\ C_p & D_p \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where $A_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, $C_p \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$, $D_p \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 1}$, and $\phi: \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a static nonlinearity satisfying the following assumption:

Assumption 1: $\phi(\cdot): \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following properties:

- i) it is bounded, odd and $\phi(0) = 0$;
- ii) It has slope restriction $\partial\phi \in [0, \alpha]$.

A $\phi(\cdot)$ which satisfies such properties is said to belong to \mathcal{N}_S . Without loss of generality, the lower gradient of the slope is assumed to be zero; if this is not the case, loop-shifting can be used to pose an equivalent problem where the “loop-shifted” nonlinearity, $\tilde{\phi}$ is such that $\partial\tilde{\phi} \in [0, \tilde{\alpha}]$. It is now reasonably well known [2], [11], [12] that $\phi(\cdot) \in \mathcal{N}_S$ satisfies the IQC defined by

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}(j\omega) \\ \hat{u}(j\omega) \end{bmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}(j\omega) \\ \hat{u}(j\omega) \end{bmatrix} d\omega \geq 0 \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{u}(j\omega)$ and $\hat{y}(j\omega)$ are the Fourier Transforms of $u(t)$ and $y(t)$, respectively, and $\Pi(j\omega)$ is given by

$$\Pi(j\omega) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \alpha M^*(j\omega) \\ \alpha M(j\omega) & -M^*(j\omega) - M(j\omega) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

The transfer function $M(s)$ —the “multiplier”—belongs to the following class, \mathcal{M}_S , of functions, normally referred to as the Zames-Falb multipliers [21].

Definition 1: A transfer function $M(s) := H_0 - H(s) \in \mathcal{RL}_\infty$ is said to belong to the set \mathcal{M}_S if $H_0 > 0$ and $H(s) \in \mathcal{L}_1$ is such that $\|H(s)\|_1 \leq H_0$.

When $M(s) \in \mathcal{M}_S$, the IQC (2)–(3) captures the largest class of “multipliers” for $\phi(\cdot) \in \mathcal{N}_S$. In the more general case that $\phi(\cdot)$ is vector valued, [2] has provided more general multipliers and more recently [10] has derived the largest class of multipliers. For our work, $M(s) \in \mathcal{M}_S$ will be sufficient. The basic stability result (stated in an IQC context) for the system in Fig. 1 can therefore be stated by rewriting the results in [2], [12] as the following Theorem.

Theorem 1: Consider Fig. 1 where $P(s) \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{N}_S$ satisfies the IQC defined by (2) and (3) where $M(s) \in \mathcal{M}_S$. Assume that the closed loop system is well-posed. Then the system is asymptotically stable if

$$\begin{bmatrix} P(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{bmatrix} P(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4)$$

Thus stability of the system essentially reduces to finding suitable $H_0 > 0$ and $H(s) \in \mathcal{L}_1$ such that inequality (4) holds. Our first result, which is derived in a similar manner to [2] shows how (4) can be interpreted as a (nonlinear) matrix inequality.

Proposition 1: The system depicted in Fig. 1 is stable if there exists a real symmetric matrix $P = P'$, a scalar $H_0 > 0$ and a transfer function

$$U(s) \sim \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_u & B_u \\ \hline C_u & D_u \end{array} \right] \quad (5)$$

where $\|U(s)\|_1 \leq 1$ such that the following matrix inequality is satisfied:

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_I'P + PA_I & PB_I + C_I'H_0 \\ * & -H_0D_I - D_I'H_0 \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (6)$$

where the matrices A_I, B_I, C_I, D_I are defined in the Appendix.

Proof: See the Appendix.

Remark 1: Inequality (6) closely resembles the Circle Criterion but instead of the original plant matrices (A_p, B_p, C_p, D_p) , an “extended” set of matrices (A_I, B_I, C_I, D_I) is involved instead. In fact, when $U(s) \equiv 0$, inequality (6) does indeed reduce to the Circle Criterion.

III. MAIN RESULTS

The results as they appear in Proposition 1 are not convenient for checking existence of multipliers because they involve, explicitly, the state-space matrices of the multiplier in inequality (6). Moreover, the transfer function $U(s)$ must be checked to ensure that $\|U(s)\|_1 \leq 1$. In general, $U(s)$ may be of arbitrary order and may be non-causal. In order to manipulate inequality (6) into a more tractable form, we restrict our attention to a limited class of multipliers.

Assumption 2: The transfer function $U(s)$ is stable with state-space realization $U(s) \sim (A_u, B_u, C_u, D_u)$ where $A_u \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B_u \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, $C_u \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$, and $D_u \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 1}$.

The above assumption ensures that $U(s)$ is stable, causal and is of the same order as $P(s)$.

In [18], it was proven that a transfer function matrix $U(s)$ is such that $\|U(s)\|_1 \leq 1$, if there exist a matrix $Y = Y' > 0$ and scalars $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$, such that the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_u'Y + YA_u + \lambda Y & YB_u \\ * & -\mu I \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda Y & 0 & C_u' \\ * & (1 - \mu)I & D_u' \\ * & * & 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (8)$$

Although this is conservative in the sense that the above inequalities are only *sufficient* for $\|U(s)\|_1 \leq 1$, they are straightforward to check and may be combined conveniently with inequality (6). Thus, the aim is to combine the “stability” inequality (6) with the “ \mathcal{L}_1 ” inequalities (7) and (8) to arrive at a convenient way of proving the existence of a multiplier which ensures the stability of the system depicted in Fig. 1. The following is the main result of the technical note.

Proposition 2: Under Assumption 2, Theorem 1 is satisfied if there exist positive definite symmetric matrices $\mathbf{S}_{11} > 0$, $\mathbf{P}_{11} > 0$, (unstructured) matrices $\mathbf{A}_u, \mathbf{B}_u, \mathbf{C}_u, \mathbf{D}_u$, and scalars $\mu > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, such that inequalities (9), (10) and (11) are satisfied—see (9)–(11), shown at the bottom of the page.

Proof: There exists a transfer function $U(s)$, where $\|U(s)\|_1 < 1$, if inequalities (7) and (8) are satisfied. Furthermore, from Proposition 1, we know that if in addition to $\|U(s)\|_1 < 1$, inequality (6) holds, then Fig. 1 is stable. Thus, the proof is essentially one of converting inequalities (6), (7) and (8) into those given in the Proposition. It proceeds in several stages.

Main Congruence Transformation: Taking inspiration from [18], we consider the matrix $P = P' > 0$, with $P = P'$ following from Proposition 1, and its inverse $P^{-1} =: Q$. By Assumption 2, $U(s)$ is the same order as $P(s)$ and thus it follows that $Q, P \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$. Partitioning these into $n \times n$ submatrices, it follows that

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{12}' & Q_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}' & P_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

where $P_{11}, P_{22}, P_{12}, Q_{11}, Q_{22}, Q_{12}$ are all full rank. Next, consider the full-rank matrices

$$\Pi_1 := \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & I \\ Q_{12}' & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \Pi_2 := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ P_{11} & P_{12} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

It follows by direct calculation that $\Pi_1'P = \Pi_2$.

Main Stability LMI: Applying the congruence transformation $\text{diag}(\Pi_1', I)$ to inequality (6) we obtain, after some manipulations, inequality (14). Applying a further congruence transformation $\text{diag}(Q_{11}^{-1}, I, I) =: \text{diag}(S_{11}, I, I)$ then leads to inequality (15)—see

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{11}A_p + A_p'\mathbf{S}_{11} & \mathbf{S}_{11}A_p + A_p'\mathbf{P}_{11} - \alpha C_p'B_u' + \mathbf{A}_u' & \mathbf{S}_{11}B_p + \alpha C_p' - \alpha C_p'D_u + C_u' \\ * & A_p'\mathbf{P}_{11} + \mathbf{P}_{11}A_p - \mathbf{B}_u\alpha C_p - \alpha C_p'B_u' & \mathbf{P}_{11}B_p + \mathbf{B}_u(I - \alpha D_p) + \alpha C_p' - \alpha C_p'D_u' \\ * & * & -(I - \mathbf{D}_u)(I - \alpha D_p) - (I - \alpha D_p)'(I - \mathbf{D}_u)' \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{A}_u - \mathbf{A}_u' + \lambda(\mathbf{P}_{11} - \mathbf{S}_{11}) & \mathbf{B}_u \\ * & -\mu \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda(\mathbf{P}_{11} - \mathbf{S}_{11}) & 0 & C_u' \\ * & 1 - \mu & D_u' \\ * & * & 1 \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad (11)$$

(14) and (15), shown at the bottom of the page. Dividing this inequality by $H_0 > 0$ (as H_0 is scalar), and defining

$$\mathbf{S}_{11} := \frac{S_{11}}{H_0} \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{11} := \frac{P_{11}}{H_0} \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_u := \frac{P_{12}A_u Q'_{12} S_{11}}{H_0} \quad (18)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_u := \frac{P_{12}B_u}{H_0} \quad (19)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_u := C_u Q'_{12} S_{11} \quad (20)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_u := D_u \quad (21)$$

then yields the first LMI in the Theorem.

First \mathcal{L}_1 LMI: Assuming that $Y = P_{22}/H_0$ in inequality (7) and using the congruence transformation $\text{diag}(Q_{12}, I)$ gives inequality (22). Next, from (12) it follows that $Q_{12}P_{22} = -Q_{11}P_{12}$. Using this in the above equation and noting further from (12) that $Q_{11}P_{12}Q'_{12} = Q_{11}(I - P_{11}Q_{11})$, then yields inequality (23). Using the congruence transformation $\text{diag}(Q_{11}^{-1}, I) = \text{diag}(S_{11}, I)$, then yields inequality (24). Using (16)–(19), finally yields inequality (10) in the proposition—see (22)–(24), shown at the bottom of the page.

Second \mathcal{L}_1 LMI: Replacing Y with P_{22}/H_0 in inequality (8) and applying the congruence transformation $\text{diag}(Q_{11}^{-1}Q_{12}, I, I)$ gives, after similar working to the above, the following inequality:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{-\lambda(S_{11}-P_{11})}{H_0} & 0 & S_{11}Q_{12}C'_u \\ * & 1-\mu & D'_u \\ * & * & 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (25)$$

Making this inequality strict and recalling (16)–(21) then yields inequality (11).

Ensuring $p > 0$: $P > 0$ is equivalent to $\Pi'_1 P \Pi_1 > 0$, which can be written as

$$\Pi'_1 P \Pi_1 = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & I \\ I & P_{11} \end{bmatrix} > 0. \quad (26)$$

This is equivalent, by the Schur complement, to $P_{11} - S_{11} > 0$. As $H_0 > 0$, this will hold if and only if $\mathbf{P}_{11} - \mathbf{S}_{11} > 0$, which is guaranteed by inequality (11). \square

Remark 2—Conservatism: Proposition 2 is conservative: the system in Fig. 1 may be stable even if the inequalities in Proposition 2 are not satisfied. There are two main sources of conservatism.

- 1) The class of multipliers is restrictive: in general $M(s) \in \mathcal{M}_S$ need only be such that $M(s) \in \mathcal{RL}_\infty$ and $\|H(s)\|_1 \leq H_0$. However, as Proposition 2 is proved under Assumption 2, which restricts the multiplier to be stable, causal and of order equal to that of the plant, significant conservatism may be present. Nevertheless, this class of multipliers is still more general than those considered in existing convex results, such as the Circle and Popov Criteria and Park's results. Therefore the stability results offered by Proposition 2 will be *no more conservative* than existing results and possibly much less (see later examples). For fixed $\alpha > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, the inequalities in Proposition 2 are convex and easy to solve; we trade conservatism for efficiency.
- 2) To enforce the \mathcal{L}_1 bound $\|U(s)\|_1 \leq 1$, we make use of inequalities (7) and (8) which may be very conservative. Additional conservatism is introduced because P_{22} is part of the main Lyapunov matrix, P , and is used in $Y = P_{22}/H_0 > 0$ to enforce the \mathcal{L}_1 bound. Thus, inequality (11) in Proposition 2 is often better replaced with

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\lambda(\mathbf{S}_{11} - \mathbf{P}_{11}) & 0 & \mathbf{C}_u' \\ * & \gamma_1 - \mu & \mathbf{D}_u' \\ * & * & \gamma_1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \quad (27)$$

where $\gamma_1 > 1$ is chosen slightly greater than unity to “relax” the LMI's. Normally when the multipliers are re-constructed, $\|U(s)\|_1$ is less than unity. \square

Remark 3—Convexity: For fixed $\alpha > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, the inequalities (9)–(11) in Proposition 2 are LMIs and easily solved by standard convex optimisation software. Thus, if the slope of the nonlinearity is known, closed-loop stability can be easily determined. Alter-

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_p Q_{11} + Q_{11} A'_p & A_p + Q_{11} A'_p P_{11} & B_p + \alpha Q_{11} C'_p H_0 \\ * & -\alpha Q_{11} C'_p B'_u P_{12} v + Q_{12} A'_u P'_{12} & -\alpha Q_{11} C'_p D'_u H_0 + Q_{12} C'_u H_0 \\ * & P_{11} A_p + A'_p P_{11} & P_{11} B_p + P_{12} B_u (I - \alpha D_p) \\ * & -\alpha P_{12} B_u C_p - \alpha C'_p B'_u P'_{12} & + \alpha C'_p H_0 - \alpha C'_p D'_u H_0 \\ * & * & -(I - \alpha D_p)' (I - D'_u) H_0 \\ * & * & -H_0 (I - D_u) (I - \alpha D_p) \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_{11} A_p + A'_p S_{11} & S_{11} A_p + A'_p P_{11} & S_{11} B_p + \alpha C'_p H_0 \\ * & -\alpha C'_p B'_u P'_{12} + S_{11} Q_{12} A'_u P'_{12} & -\alpha C'_p D'_u H_0 + S_{11} Q_{12} C'_u H_0 \\ * & P_{11} A_p + A'_p P_{11} & P_{11} B_p + P_{12} B_u (I - \alpha D_p) \\ * & -\alpha P_{12} B_u C_p - \alpha C'_p B'_u P'_{12} & + \alpha C'_p H_0 - \alpha C'_p D'_u H_0 \\ * & * & -(I - \alpha D_p)' (I - D'_u) H_0 \\ * & * & -H_0 (I - D_u) (I - \alpha D_p) \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{Q_{12} A'_u P_{22} Q'_{12}}{H_0} + \frac{Q_{12} P_{22} A_u Q'_{12}}{H_0} + \frac{\lambda Q_{12} P_{22} Q'_{12}}{H_0} & \frac{Q_{12} P_{22} B_u}{H_0} \\ * & -\mu \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{-Q_{12} A'_u P'_{12} Q_{11}}{H_0} - \frac{Q_{11} P_{12} A_u Q'_{12}}{H_0} - \frac{\lambda(Q_{11} - Q_{11} P_{11} Q_{11})}{H_0} & \frac{-Q_{11} P_{12} B_u}{H_0} \\ * & -\mu \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{-S_{11} Q_{12} A'_u P'_{12}}{H_0} - \frac{P_{12} A_u Q'_{12} S_{11}}{H_0} - \frac{\lambda(S_{11} - P_{11})}{H_0} & \frac{P_{12} B_u}{H_0} \\ * & -\mu \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (24)$$

TABLE I
TRANSFER FUNCTIONS $P(s)$

Example	$P(s)$	Source
1	$P_1(s) = -\frac{s^2-0.2s-0.1}{s^3+2s^2+s+1}$	[4]
2	$P_2(s) = -P_1(s)$	[15]
3	$P_3(s) = -\frac{s^2}{s^4+0.2s^3+6s^2+0.1s+1}$	new
4	$P_4(s) = -P_3(s)$	new
5	$P_5(s) = -\frac{s^2}{s^4+0.0003s^3+10s^2+0.0021s+9}$	[1]
6	$P_6(s) = -P_5(s)$	new

TABLE II
SECTOR/SLOPE BOUNDS OBTAINABLE USING VARIOUS STABILITY CRITERIA

Criteria	Ex 1	Ex 2	Ex 3	Ex 4	Ex 5	Ex 6
Circle	1.2431	0.7640	0.3081	0.3263	0.00040	0.00039
Park	4.5894	1.0894	0.7083	0.7883	0.00183	0.00183
Prop. 2	4.5894	1.0894	10,000+	3.4661	662.5063	1.6599

natively, if the objective is to compute the maximum slope, $\alpha > 0$, for which stability holds, the optimization problem is only quasi-convex. In this case, a bisection algorithm (similar to that for computing generalised eigenvalues) can be used in conjunction with LMI solvers to compute the largest $\alpha > 0$ yielding stability. Note that a lower bound on α will be zero and an upper bound will be the gain margin of the open-loop system. In the authors' experience, commencing the bisection just below the gain margin gives fast convergence. $\lambda > 0$ must be chosen by the designer; it usually suffices to choose it reasonably small (e.g., $\lambda = 10^{-5}$) although some tuning maybe required. \square

IV. EXAMPLES

This section compares the results obtained using the method proposed in this technical note to existing methods in the literature. Similar to [15], we consider several systems $P(s)$ and attempt to compute the maximum size slope (or sector) for which we are able to guarantee stability. The methods to which we compare our result are the standard Circle Criterion and the method of Park [15]. Park's method contains the Popov Criterion as a special case and has been demonstrated to be less conservative than the methods of Haddad and Kapila [4], Suykens *et al.* [19] and Chen and Wen [1]. Park's method is also convex, making it easy to compute solutions. The transfer functions of the systems we consider are listed in Table I (our positive feedback convention, means the transfer functions have opposite sign to those given in [15]).

The results of the comparison are shown in Table II. The slope size is taken to be equivalent to the sector size when comparing to the Circle Criterion. Examples 1 and 2 confirm that our results are no less conservative than Park's, but are a notable improvement on the Circle Criterion. Examples 3 and 4 are interesting because, although Park's slope-size is an improvement on the Circle Criterion, Proposition 2 yields an even larger slope, especially in the case of the third example where we were unable to find a finite slope for which stability was not predicted. The fifth and sixth examples are challenging and feature plants with very low damping. In both cases, the results with Park's algorithm are far superior to the Circle Criterion, but our results improve upon Park's by several orders of magnitude. Examples 3-6 clearly show the benefit of using a wider class of multipliers and the accompanying LMI-based algorithm from Proposition 2. 2697

Remark 4—Multiplier Reconstruction: It is emphasized that the results here (Proposition 2) *do not require the multiplier to be reconstructed*; they simply prove the existence of a multiplier which would

TABLE III
MULTIPLIERS COMPUTED USING OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM

Example	Multiplier
1	$M_1(s) = \frac{10^{-5}(5.892s^3+16.38s^2+15.53s+3.604)}{s^3+6.41s^2+0.1608s+0.5167}$
2	$M_2(s) = \frac{10^{-4}(3.639s^3+2.544s^2+4.532s+2.095)}{s^3+1.023s^2+1.241s+1.207}$
3	$M_3(s) = \frac{10^{-4}(0.006139s^4+1.386s^3+0.2522s^2+4.422s+0.05631)}{s^4+0.3502s^3+9934s^2+4.361s+0.9694}$
4	$M_4(s) = \frac{10^{-4}(0.08608s^4+1.269s^3+0.4604s^2+0.8023s+0.06704)}{s^4+0.2134s^3+2.538s^2+0.1417s+1.018}$
5	$M_5(s) = \frac{10^{-6}(0.1027s^4+7.169s^3+1.06s^2+47.15s+1.25)}{s^4+0.8191s^3+729.4s^2+6.069s+6.676}$
6	$M_6(s) = \frac{10^{-6}(0.8107s^4+5.921s^3+9.256s^2+33.91s+7.618)}{s^4+0.1378s^3+7.928s^2+0.1903s+8.625}$

then imply stability. However, given solutions to the inequalities in Proposition 2, one can then construct a multiplier. In particular, by selecting an (arbitrary) $H_0 > 0$, from (16) and (17) we have

$$P_{11} = H_0 \mathbf{P}_{11}, \quad S_{11} = H_0 \mathbf{S}_{11}. \tag{28}$$

Using (12) with $P_{22} = I$, it then follows that

$$P_{12}P'_{12} = P_{11}S^{-1}_{11}P_{11} - P_{11} \tag{29}$$

$$Q'_{12}S_{11} = P_{12}^{-1}(S_{11} - P_{11}). \tag{30}$$

Together with (18)–(21), these can then be used to determine $U(s) \sim (A_u, B_u, C_u, D_u)$. A list of multipliers returned by the optimisation process is given in Table III. The gain of these multipliers can be scaled by a positive scalar without affecting the result (this is equivalent to changing $H_0 > 0$). Finally, it should be mentioned that poor numerical conditioning may arise in the *reconstruction* of multipliers; another reason for simply proving their existence, rather than computing them explicitly. \square

Results as nonconservative as the above could be obtained using the IQC method of [11] or the multiplier method of [9]. However both those papers essentially assume a form of multiplier and require the designer to pick parameters (such as order, pole location, and so on), making the process somewhat iterative. Proposition 2 is a convex (or quasi-convex) routine which makes it straightforward to assess stability with our more limited class of multipliers. We also note that the results obtained using this potentially conservative form of multiplier are, in the examples considered, not very conservative at all.

V. CONCLUSION

This technical note has proposed a new method for testing stability of a feedback interconnection involving an LTI part and a slope-restricted nonlinearity. The approach is based on the multiplier/IQC machinery but, as the optimisation procedure involved simply involves the solution of a set of linear matrix inequalities, it is believed to be computationally attractive compared to [9] and [11], where a certain amount of iteration and choice is involved. It also appears superior to other Lyapunov based literature, of which [15] seems to be best. This is because, as shown in [15], Park's method is equivalent to choosing IQC's of a particular form whereas our method allows optimization over a larger class of multipliers.

It would be logical to extend these results to MIMO systems, although: 1) it is more difficult to obtain *linear* matrix inequalities in the MIMO version of Proposition 2 and 2) as noted in [10], the class of MIMO multipliers is wider than was previously thought and may be difficult to characterise (nonconservatively) in a similar way to that done here.

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\alpha P(j\omega) + I \\ I \\ U(j\omega)(-\alpha P(j\omega) + I) \\ -I \end{bmatrix}^* \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -H_0 & 0 & 0 \\ -H_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -H_0 \\ 0 & 0 & -H_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}}_W \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha P(j\omega) + I \\ I \\ U(j\omega)(-\alpha P(j\omega) + I) \\ -I \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\alpha P(j\omega) + I \\ I \\ U(j\omega)(-\alpha P(j\omega) + I) \\ -I \end{bmatrix} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} A_p & 0 & B_p & \\ -B_u \alpha C_p & A_u & B_u(I - \alpha D_p) & \\ \hline -\alpha C_p & 0 & I - \alpha D_p & \\ 0 & 0 & I & \\ -D_u \alpha C_p & C_u & D_u(I - \alpha D_p) & \\ 0 & 0 & -I & \end{array} \right] \quad (35)$$

APPENDIX A KYP LEMMA [2], [16]

Lemma 1 (KYP Lemma): The frequency domain inequality

$$\begin{bmatrix} L(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix}^* W \begin{bmatrix} L(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R} \quad (31)$$

holds if and only if there exists a matrix $P = P'$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}'P + P\tilde{A} & P\tilde{B} \\ \tilde{B}'P & \end{bmatrix} + [\tilde{C} \quad \tilde{D}]'W[\tilde{C} \quad \tilde{D}] < 0 \quad (32)$$

where $[L(s)' \quad I]' \sim (\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D})$.

Note that inequality (31) is identical to

$$\begin{bmatrix} -L(j\omega) \\ -I \end{bmatrix}^* W \begin{bmatrix} -L(j\omega) \\ -I \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R} \quad (33)$$

so it is equivalent for $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D})$ to be a state-space realization of $[-L(s)' \quad -I]'$.

APPENDIX B PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

Letting $H(s) = H_0 U(s)$, it follows that $M(s) \in \mathcal{M}_S$ if $U(s) \in \mathcal{L}_1$ is such that $\|U(s)\|_1 \leq 1$. Thus, inequality (4) can be rewritten as inequality (34). With $U(s)$ given as in (5), the state-space realization in (35) can then be derived—see (34) and (35), shown at the top of the page. From the KYP Lemma, it then follows that inequality (34) is satisfied if and only if there exists a $P = P'$ such that inequality (32) is satisfied. Using the definitions of $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D}$ and W , this then reduces to inequality (6) in Proposition 1 where a state-space realization for (A_I, B_I, C_I, D_I) is given by

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} A_p & 0 & B_p & \\ -B_u \alpha C_p & A_u & B_u(I - \alpha D_p) & \\ \hline \alpha(I - D_u)C_p & C_u & (I - D_u)(I - \alpha D_p) & \end{array} \right]. \quad (36)$$

REFERENCES

- [1] X. Chen and T. Wen, "Robustness analysis of LTI systems with structured incrementally sector bounded nonlinearities," in *Proc. American Control Conf.*, 1995, pp. 3883–3887.
- [2] F. J. D'Amato, M. A. Rotea, A. V. Megretski, and U. T. nonlinearities, "New results for analysis of systems with repeated nonlinearities," *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 739–747, 2001.
- [3] J. M. Gomes da Silva, Jr and S. Tarbouriech, "Anti-windup design with guaranteed regions of stability for discrete-time linear systems," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 184–192, 2006.
- [4] W. M. Haddad and V. Kapila, "Absolute stability criteria for multiple slope-restricted nonlinearities," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 361–365, Mar. 1995.
- [5] W. P. Heath and A. G. Wills, "Zames Falb multipliers for quadratic programming," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 1948–1951, Oct. 2007.
- [6] T. Hu and Z. Lin, *Control systems with actuator saturation: Analysis and design*. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser, 2001.
- [7] V. V. Kulkarni and M. G. Safanov, "All multipliers for repeated monotone nonlinearities," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 1209–1212, Jul. 2002.
- [8] Z. Lin, R. Mantri, and A. Saberi, "Semi-global output regulation for linear systems subject to input saturation—a low and high gain design," *Control Theory and Adv. Technol.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 2209–2232, 1995.
- [9] R. Mancera and M. G. Safanov, "An algorithm to compute multipliers for repeated monotone nonlinearities," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision and Control*, Las Vegas, NV, Dec. 2002, pp. 4162–4166.
- [10] R. Mancera and M. G. Safanov, "All repeated multipliers for MIMO nonlinearities," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 54, no. X, pp. 389–397, 2005.
- [11] A. V. Megretski, C. Y. Kao, U. T. Jonsson, and A. Rantzer, *A Guide to IQC β : A Matlab Toolbox for Robust Stability and Performance Analysis* MIT, Cambridge, MA, 2004.
- [12] A. V. Megretski and A. Rantzer, "System analysis via integral quadratic constraints," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 819–830, Jun. 1997.
- [13] T. Nguyen and F. Jabbari, "Output feedback controllers for disturbance attenuation with actuator amplitude and rate saturation," *Automatica*, vol. 36, no. 9, pp. 1339–1346, 2000.
- [14] T. Pare, A. Hassibi, and J. How, "A KYP lemma and invariance principle for systems with multiple hysteresis nonlinearities," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 74, no. 11, pp. 1140–1157, 2001.
- [15] P. G. Park, "Stability criteria of sector and slope restricted Lur'e systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 308–313, Feb. 2002.
- [16] A. Rantzer, "On the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov lemma," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 7–10, 1996.
- [17] M. G. Safanov and V. V. Kulkarni, "Zames Falb multipliers for MIMO nonlinearities," *Int. J. Robust and Nonlin. Control*, vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 1025–1038, 2000.
- [18] C. Scherer, P. Gahinet, and M. Chilali, "Multiobjective output feedback control via LMI optimisation," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 896–911, Jul. 1997.
- [19] J. A. K. Suykens, J. Vandewalle, and B. De Moor, "An absolute stability criterion for the Lur'e problem with sector and slope restricted nonlinearities," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst.*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp. 1007–1009, Oct. 1998.
- [20] *Advanced Strategies in Control Systems With Input and Output Constraints*. LNCIS, S. Tarbouriech, G. Garcia, and A. Glattfelder, Eds. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 2007, vol. 346.
- [21] G. Zames and P. L. Falb, "Stability conditions for systems with monotone and slope restricted nonlinearities," *SIAM J. Control*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 89–108, 1968.