Event-Triggered Stabilization of Nonlinear Systems with Time-Varying Sensing and Actuation Delay

Erfan Nozari Pavankumar Tallapragada Jorge Cortés

Abstract—This paper studies the problem of stabilization of a single-input nonlinear system with time-varying delays in both sensing and actuation channels using event-triggered control. Our proposed strategy seeks to opportunistically minimize the communication cost of stabilization and its design uses predictor feedback to compensate for arbitrarily large known time-varying delays. We establish, using a Lyapunov approach, the global asymptotic stability of the closed-loop system as long as the open-loop system is globally input-to-state stabilizable in the absence of time delays and event-triggering. We further prove that the proposed event-triggered law has inter-event times that are uniformly lower bounded and hence does not exhibit Zeno behavior. For the particular case of a stabilizable linear system, we show global exponential stability of the closed-loop system and analyze the trade-off between the rate of exponential convergence and average communication frequency. We illustrate these results in simulation and also examine the properties of the proposed event-triggered strategy beyond the class of systems for which stabilization can be guaranteed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Time delay and bandwidth limits are common features of physical communication channels that have long made challenging the application of classical control strategies over networks. As networked control systems grow in scale, multiple plant-controller pairs share the same communication channels, further increasing the time delay and limited communication bandwidth imposed on every sub-network. This paper seeks to jointly address both aspects by proposing a predictor-based event-triggered control strategy for nonlinear systems with known time-varying delay in both sensing (plant to controller) and actuation (controller to plant) channels.

Literature review: There exists a vast literature on both event-triggered control and the control of time-delay systems. Here, we review the works most closely related to our treatment. Originating from event-based and discrete-event systems [2], the concept of event-triggered control (i.e., the update of the control signal in an opportunistic fashion) was proposed in [3], [4] and has found its way into the efficient use of sensing, computing, actuation, and communication resources in networked control systems, see [5]–[7] and references therein. Here, we particularly build on the Lyapunov-based exposition of [5] that stabilizes nonlinear systems in the absence of time delays.

The notion of predictor feedback, also called reduction method and finite spectrum assignment, is a powerful method in dealing with controlled systems with time delay in the communication channels [8]–[12]. In essence, a predictor feedback controller anticipates the future evolution of the plant using its forward model and sends the control signal early enough to compensate for the delay in the communication channel. Simulation techniques of predictor feedback can be found in [13], [14]. Our treatment here builds on the thorough Lyapunov-based analysis presented in [15].

The joint treatment of time delay and event-triggering is particularly challenging and has received less attention. By its opportunistic nature, an event-triggered controller keeps the control value unchanged until the plant is close to instability and then updates the control value according to the current state. Now, if time delays exist, the controller only has access to some past state of the plant (delayed sensing) and it takes some time for an updated control action to reach the plant (delayed actuation), jointly increasing the possibility of the updated control value being already obsolete when it is received by the plant, resulting in instability. Therefore, the controller needs to be sufficiently proactive and update the control value sufficiently ahead of time to maintain closed-loop stability. This makes the design problem challenging, especially when taking communication cost explicitly into account. The work [16] designs an event-triggered controller for linear time-invariant systems with a quadratic cost function that satisfies the feasibility constraints and [17] considers a general switched linear system subject to time-varying delay with polytopic uncertainty. In both papers, the continuous-time system is discretized with a fixed sample time that is assumed to be larger than the time delay, resulting in a delay-free discrete system for which the event-triggered controller is designed. These assumptions are relaxed in our event-triggered control design, making it applicable to a wide class of nonlinear systems with arbitrary known time delays.

Statement of contributions: The contributions of this work are threefold. First, we design an event-triggered controller for stabilization of single-input nonlinear systems with arbitrarily large sensing and actuation time delays. For this, we employ the method of predictor feedback to compensate for the delay in both channels and then co-design the control law and triggering strategy to guarantee the monotonic decay of a Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional. Our second contribution involves the closed-loop analysis of the event-triggered law, proving that the closed-loop system is globally asymptotically stable and the inter-event times are uniformly lower bounded (and thus no Zeno behavior may exist). Due to the importance of linear systems in numerous applications, we briefly discuss the simplifications of the design and analysis in this case. Our final contribution pertains to the study of the trade-off, intrinsic to event-triggering, between convergence rate and communication cost. Our analysis in this part is limited to
the case of linear systems where closed-form solutions are derivable for (exponential) convergence rate and minimum inter-event times. Finally, we present various simulations to illustrate the effectiveness of our design, both for and beyond the class of systems for which we provide rigorous guarantees.

II. PRELIMINARIES

This section introduces our notational conventions and briefly reviews basic notions on input-to-state stability. We denote by $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ the sets of reals and nonnegative reals, respectively. Given any vector or matrix, we use $| \cdot |$ to denote the (induced) Euclidean norm. We denote by $\mathcal{K}$ the set of strictly increasing continuous functions $\alpha : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $\alpha(0) = 0$. $\alpha$ belongs to $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ if $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(r) = \infty$. We denote by $\mathcal{K} \mathcal{L}$ the set of functions $\beta : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that, for each $s \in [0, \infty)$, $r \mapsto \beta(r, s)$ is nondecreasing and continuous and $\beta(0, s) = 0$ and, for each $r \in [0, \infty)$, $s \mapsto \beta(r, s)$ is monotonically decreasing with $\beta(r, s) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$. We use the notation $L_f S = \nabla S \cdot f$ for the Lie derivative of a function $S : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ along the trajectories of a vector field $f$ taking values in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

We follow [18] to review the definition of input-to-state stability of nonlinear systems and its Lyapunov characterization. Consider a nonlinear system of the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t)), \tag{1}$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuously differentiable and satisfies $f(0,0) = 0$. For simplicity, we assume that this system has a unique solution which does not exhibit finite escape time. System (1) is (globally) input-to-state stable (ISS) if there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K} \mathcal{L}$ such that for any measurable locally essentially bounded input $u : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and any initial condition $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, its solution satisfies

$$|x(t)| \leq \beta(|x(0)|, t) + \alpha(\sup_{t \geq 0} |u(t)|),$$

for all $t \geq 0$. For this system, a continuously differentiable function $S : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called an ISS-Lyapunov function if there exist $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \gamma, \rho \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \alpha_1(|x|) \leq S(x) \leq \alpha_2(|x|),$$

$$\forall (x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \quad L_f S(x, u) \leq -\gamma(|x|) + \rho(|u|). \tag{2}$$

According to [18] Theorem 1, the system (1) is ISS if and only if it admits an ISS-Lyapunov function.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider a single-input nonlinear time-invariant system with input delay modeled as

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(\phi(t))), \quad t \geq 0, \tag{3}$$

where the vector field $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuously differentiable and $f(0,0) = 0$. The function $\phi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ encodes the time-varying delay in the input/actuation channel and is assumed to be known. Therefore, the quantity $t - \phi(t) > 0$ is the amount of delay that it takes for a control message generated at time $t \geq 0$ to be applied to the plant (including inherent actuator delays, if any). We assume that $\{u(t)\}_{t=\phi(0)}^0$ is given and continuously differentiable and that the system [3] does not exhibit finite escape time for any initial condition and any bounded input. For simplicity, $\phi$ is continuously differentiable and $\dot{\phi}(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, so that the time argument of the control does not go back in time. We also assume that the delay $t - \phi(t)$ and its derivative are bounded, i.e., there exist $M_0, M_1, m_2 > 0$ such that

$$\forall t \geq 0 \quad t - \phi(t) \leq M_0 \quad \text{and} \quad m_2 \leq \dot{\phi}(t) \leq M_1. \tag{4}$$

Note that, in the case of a constant input delay $D$, we have $\phi(t) = t - D$, trivially satisfying the conditions (4) with $M_0 = D$ and $M_1 = m_2 = 1$. The system [3] is to be stabilized by a controller that receives state feedback through a sensing channel with delay

$$t - \psi(t) \geq 0, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Hence, the state value sent by the plant at any time $t \geq 0$ reaches the controller at time $\psi^{-1}(t)$. We assume the delay function $\psi$ is monotonically increasing, so it does not go backward in time, but we do not require it to be known.

We are interested in designing opportunistic state-triggered controllers to stabilize the system [3] that do not require the actuator to continuously adjust the forcing input. This is motivated by considerations about the efficient use of the available resources such as scenarios where communication between sensor, controller, and actuator is limited (e.g., shared communication network) and applying a continuously changing input is unfeasible. To address these challenges, we seek to design an event-triggered control that only updates the input to the system when necessary and further assume that the plant sends only a (temporally) discrete sequence of states $\{x(\tau_k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ to the controller, where $\{\tau_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is determined by the plant (and thus exogenous to our design) and $\tau_0 = 0$ for simplicity [4].

We assume that the origin is robustly globally asymptotically stablizable in the absence of delays and with continuous sensing and actuation. This assumption is justified by our focus on the challenges imposed by time delay and discrete asynchronous sensor-controller and controller-actuator communications. Formally, we assume that there exists a globally Lipschitz feedback law $K : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $K(0) = 0$, that makes the system

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), K(x(t)) + w(t)), \tag{5}$$

ISS with respect to additive input disturbances $w$. The availability of this feedback law is needed to tackle the more involved case, formulated as follows.

**Problem 1:** (Event-Triggered Stabilization under Communication Delay): Design the sequence of triggering times $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and the corresponding control values $\{u(\tau_k)\}_{k=0}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tau_k = \infty$ and the closed-loop system [3] is globally asymptotically stable using the piecewise constant control

$$u(t) = u(\tau_k), \quad t \in [\tau_k, \tau_{k+1}], \quad k \geq 0. \tag{6}$$

1. Therefore, the plant is also responsible to ensure that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau(t) = \infty$, as otherwise the state transmission would not be practically feasible.
2. Recall that $t_0 = \psi^{-1}(0)$ is fixed.
and the asynchronous delayed information \( \{x(\tau t)\}_{t=0}^\infty \) received, resp., at \( \{\psi^{-1}(\tau t)\}_{t=0}^\infty \).

The requirement \( \lim_{k \to \infty} k_k = \infty \) ensures that the resulting design is implementable by avoiding finite accumulation points for the triggering times.

IV. EVENT-TRIGGERED DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

In this section, we propose an event-triggered control policy to solve Problem [1]. We start our analysis with the simpler case where the controller receives state feedback continuously (i.e., \( \{x(t)\}_{t=0}^\infty \) instead of \( \{x(\tau t)\}_{t=0}^\infty \)) without delays, and later extend it to the general case. Our design is based on the predictor-based feedback control solution for stabilization [13], which we review in Section IV-A. We present our event-triggered control design in Section IV-B and analyze its convergence properties in Section IV-C.

A. Predictor Feedback Control for Time-Delay Systems

Here we review the continuous-time stabilization of the dynamics (3) by means of a predictor-based feedback control [13]. For convenience, we denote the inverse of \( \phi \) by

\[ \sigma(t) = \phi^{-1}(t), \]

for all \( t \geq 0 \). The inverse exists since \( \phi \) is strictly monotonically increasing. From (4), we have, for all \( t \geq \phi(0) \),

\[
\frac{1}{\sigma(t)} - t \geq m_0 \quad \text{and} \quad m_1 \leq \sigma(t) \leq M_2,
\]

for \( m_0 = \frac{1}{\sigma(0)} \), \( m_1 = \frac{1}{M_1} \), and \( M_2 = \frac{1}{m_2} \). To compensate for the delay, at any time \( t \geq \phi(0) \), the controller makes the following prediction of the future state of the plant,

\[ p(t) = x(\sigma(t)) = x(t^+) + \int_{\sigma(t^+)}^{t} \sigma(s)(p(s),u(s))ds, \]

where \( t^+ = \max\{t,0\} \). This integral is computable by the controller since it only requires knowledge of the initial or current state of the plant (gathered from the sensors) and the history of \( u(t) \) and \( p(t) \), both of which are available to the controller. Nevertheless, for general nonlinear vector fields \( f \), (7) may not have a closed-form solution and it has to be computed using numerical integration methods. The controller applies the control law \( K \) on the prediction \( p \) in order to compensate for the delay, i.e.,

\[ u(t) = K(p(t)), \quad t \geq 0. \]

The next result shows convergence for the closed-loop system.

Proposition 4.1: (Asymptotic Stabilization by Predictor Feedback [13]): Under the aforementioned assumptions, the closed-loop system (3) under the controller (8) is globally asymptotically stable, i.e., there exists \( \beta \in K\mathcal{L} \) such that for any \( x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and bounded \( \{u(t)\}_{t=\phi(0)}^\infty \), for all \( t \geq 0 \),

\[ |x(t)| + \sup_{\phi(t) \leq \tau \leq t} |u(\tau)| \leq \beta \left( |x(0)| + \sup_{\phi(0) \leq \tau \leq 0} |u(\tau)|, t \right). \]

\( \beta \) is the constant of the closed-loop system (3) with controller (8).

B. Design of Event-triggered Control Law

Following Section IV-A, we let the controller make the prediction \( p(t) \) according to (7) for all \( t \geq \phi(0) \). Since the controller can only update \( u(t) \) at discrete times \( \{t_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \), it uses the piecewise-constant control (6) and assigns the control

\[ u(t_k) = K(p(t_k)), \]

for all \( k \geq 0 \). In order to design the triggering times \( \{t_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \), we use Lyapunov stability tools to determine when the controller has to update \( u(t) \) to prevent instability. We define the triggering error for all \( t \geq \phi(0) \) as

\[ e(t) = \begin{cases} p(t_k) - p(t) & \text{if } t \in [t_k,t_{k+1}) \text{ for } k \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in [\phi(0),t_0), \end{cases} \]

so that \( u(t) = K(p(t) + e(t)) \), for \( t \geq 0 \). Let

\[ w(t) = u(t) - K(p(t) + e(t)), \quad t \geq \phi(0), \]

where \( w(t) = 0 \) for \( t \geq t_0 \) but \( w(t) \) may be nonzero for \( t \in [\phi(0),t_0) \). The closed-loop system can then be written as

\[ \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t),K(x(t) + e(\phi(t))) + w(\phi(t))), \]

for all \( t \geq 0 \). Let \( g(x,w) = f(x,K(x) + w) \) for all \( x, w \). By the assumption that \( \dot{x} = g(x,w) \) is ISS with respect to \( w \), there exists a continuously differentiable function \( S: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) and class \( \mathcal{K}_\infty \) functions \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \gamma, \) and \( \rho \) such that

\[ \alpha_1(|x(0)|) \leq S(x(t)) \leq \alpha_2(|x(0)|), \]

and \( \mathcal{L}_S(x,w) \leq \gamma(|x|) + \rho(|w|) \). Therefore, we have

\[ \mathcal{L}_f S(x(t),K(x(t) + e(\phi(t))) + w(\phi(t))) \]

\[ = \mathcal{L}_g S(x(t),K(x(t) + e(\phi(t))) + w(\phi(t)) - K(x(t))) \]

\[ \leq -\gamma(|x|) + \rho(|K(x(t) + e(\phi(t))) + w(\phi(t)) - K(x(t)))|, \]

We assume that \( \rho \) is such that \( \int_0^\infty \frac{\rho(r)}{r}dr < \infty \). This assumption is not restrictive and is satisfied by most well-known class \( \mathcal{K} \) functions. Then, define

\[ V(t) = S(x(t)) + \frac{\rho|w(\phi(t))|}{\alpha_2(|x(0)|)} \]

and \( b > 0 \) is a design parameter. The next result establishes an upper bound on the time derivative of \( V \).

Proposition 4.2: (Upper-bounding \( \dot{V}(t) \)) For the system (3) under the control defined by (6) and (9) and the predictor (7), we have

\[ \dot{V}(t) \leq -\gamma(|x(t)|) - \rho(2L(t) + \rho(2LKe(\phi(t)))), \]

for all \( t \neq \bar{t} \) and \( V(\bar{t}^-) \geq V(\bar{t}^+) \), where \( L_K \) is the Lipschitz constant of \( K \) and \( \bar{t} \in [0,\sigma(0)] \) is the greatest time such that \( w(t) = 0 \) for all \( t > \bar{t} \).

Proof. Using (12), we have

\[
\mathcal{L}_f S(x(t)) \leq -\gamma(|x(t)|) + |w(\phi(t))| + |K(x(t) + e(\phi(t)) - K(x(t))| \]

\[ \leq -\gamma(|x(t)| + |w(\phi(t))| + L_K|e(\phi(t))|) \]

\[ \leq -\gamma(|x(t)| + \rho(2w(\phi(t))) + \rho(2L_K|e(\phi(t))|). \]
Since $e^{-b(t\tau - \tau)}w(\phi(\tau))$ is bounded for $\tau \in [t, \sigma(t)]$ and any $t \geq 0$ and $[t, \sigma(t)]$ has finite measure, the sup-norm in (13b) equals the limit of the corresponding p-norm as $p \to \infty$, i.e.,

$$L(t) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left[ \int_t^{\sigma(t)} e^{2nb(t\tau - \tau)}w(\phi(\tau))^{2n} d\tau \right]^{\frac{1}{2n}} \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} L_n(t).$$

In fact, it can be shown that this convergence is uniform over $[0, t_1]$ for any $t_1 < t$. Therefore, since $L_n(t) = -bL_n(t) - \frac{L_n(t)}{2n} \leq \frac{w(\phi(t))}{2n} = \frac{w(\phi(t))}{2n} < 1$ for $t \in [0, t_1]$ and sufficiently large $n$ and $b$, and $t_1 \in [0, t]$ is arbitrary, it follows from [19] Thm 7.17 that $\tilde{L}(t) = -bL(t)$ for $t \in (0, \infty) \setminus \{t\}$. Combining this and (15), we get

$$V(t) \leq -\gamma(|x(t)|) + \rho(2w(|\phi(t)|)) + \rho(2L_K|e(\phi(t))|) + \frac{2}{b}2L(t)\rho(2L(t)) \leq -\gamma(|x(t)|) + \rho(2w(|\phi(t)|)) + \rho(2L_K|e(\phi(t))|) - 2\rho(L(t)),$$

for $t \in (0, \infty) \setminus \{t\}$. Equation (13) thus follows since $|w(\phi(t))| \leq L(t)$ (c.f. (13b)) and the fact that $\rho$ is strictly increasing. Finally, since $S(x(t))$ is continuous, $L(\tilde{r}) \geq 0$, and $L(\tilde{r}+) = 0$, we get $V(\tilde{r}) \geq V(\tilde{r}+).$ ■

Proposition 4.2 is the basis for our event-triggered design. Formally, we select $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and require

$$\rho(2L_K|e(\phi(t))|) \leq \theta \gamma(|x(t)|), \quad t \geq 0,$$

which can be equivalently written as

$$|e(t)| \leq \rho^{-1}(\theta\gamma(|p(t)|)) \frac{2L_K}{\rho(2L(t))}, \quad t \geq \phi(0). \quad (16)$$

Notice from (10) and the fact $t = 0$ that (16) holds on $[\phi(0), t_0]$. After each time $t_k$, the controller keeps evaluating (16) until it reaches equality. At this time, labeled $t_{k+1}$, the controller triggers the next event that sets $e(t_{k+1}) = 0$ and maintains (16). Notice that “larger” $\gamma$ and “smaller” $\rho$ (corresponding to “stronger” input-to-state stability in [21]) are then more desirable, as they allow the controller to update $u$ less often and reduce the communication cost. Our ensuing analysis shows global asymptotic stability of the closed-loop system and the existence of a uniform lower bound on the inter-event times.

C. Convergence Analysis under Event-Triggered Law

In this section we show that our event triggered law (16) solves Problem 1 by showing, in the following result, that the inter-event times are uniformly lower bounded (so, in particular, there is no finite accumulation point in time) and the closed-loop system achieves global asymptotic stability.

Theorem 4.3: (Uniform Lower Bound for the Inter-Event Times and Global Asymptotic Stability): Suppose that the class $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ function $\mathcal{G} : r \mapsto \gamma^{-1}(r)/\theta$ is (locally) Lipschitz. For the system (3) under the control (6) and the triggering condition (16),

(i) there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $t_{k+1} - t_k \geq \delta$ for all $k \geq 1$,

(ii) there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{L}$ such that for any $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and bounded $\{u(t)\}_{t=\phi(0)}$, we have for all $t \geq 0$,

$$|x(t)| + \sup_{\phi(t) \leq \tau \leq t} |u(\tau)| \leq \beta \left( |x(0)| + \sup_{\phi(0) \leq \tau \leq 0} |u(\tau)|, t \right). \quad (17)$$

Proof.

Let $[0, t_{\text{max}}]$ be the maximal interval of existence of the solutions of the closed-loop system. The proof involves three steps. First, we prove that (ii) holds for $t < t_{\text{max}}$. Then, we show that (i) holds until $t_{\text{max}}$, and finally that $t_{\text{max}} = \infty$.

Step 1: From Proposition 4.2 and (16), we have

$$V(t) \leq -\gamma \min(|x(t)|) - \rho(2L(t)) \leq -\gamma \min(|x(t)|) + L(t), \quad t \in [0, t_{\text{max}}) \setminus \{t\},$$

where $\gamma \min(r) = \min((1-\theta)\gamma(r), \rho(2r))$ for all $r \geq 0$, so $\gamma \min \in \mathcal{K}$. Also, note that

$$V(t) \leq \alpha_2(|x(t)|) + \alpha_0(L(t)) \leq 2\alpha_0(|x(t)| + L(t)),$$

where $\alpha_0(r) = \max(\alpha_2(r), \alpha_0(r))$ and $\alpha_0(r) = \frac{2}{b} \int_0^r \rho(2\sigma) d\sigma$ for all $r \geq 0$. Since $\alpha_0, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, we have $\alpha_{\text{max}} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, so $\alpha_{\text{max}} \in \mathcal{K}$. Hence, $V(t) \leq -\alpha_{\text{max}}(V(t)/2) \leq \pi(V(t)), \quad t \in [0, t_{\text{max}}] \setminus \{t\},$

where $\pi \in \mathcal{K}$. Therefore, using the Comparison Principle [20, Lemma 3.4], [20, Lemma 4.4], and $V(\tilde{r}) \geq V(\tilde{r}^+)$, there exists $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $V(t) \leq \beta_1(V(0), t)$, $t < t_{\text{max}}$. Therefore,

$$|x(t)| + L(t) \leq \beta_2(|x(0)| + L(0), t), \quad t < t_{\text{max}},$$

where $\beta_2(r, s) = \max(\beta_1(2\alpha_{\text{max}}(r), s))$ for any $r, s \geq 0$. Note that $\beta_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{L}$. Since we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} |u(\tau)| \leq L(t) \leq e^{bM_0} \sup_{\phi(t) \leq \tau \leq t} |u(\tau)|,$$

it then follows that

$$|x(t)| + \sup_{\phi(0) \leq \tau \leq 0} |u(\tau)| \leq \beta_3 \left( |x(0)| + \sup_{\phi(0) \leq \tau \leq 0} |u(\tau)|, t \right),$$

for all $t < t_{\text{max}}$ where $\beta_3(r, s) = \beta_3(e^{bM_0} r, s)$. It remains to translate this inequality to (17), which directly follows from [15] Lemmas 8.10 and 8.11.

Step 2: Equation (16) can be rewritten as

$$|p(t)| \geq \gamma^{-1} \left( \frac{\rho(2L_K|e(t)|)}{\theta} \right).$$

From step 1, the prediction $p(t) = x(\sigma(t))$ and its error $e(t) = p(t_k) - p(t)$ are bounded. Therefore, there exists $L_{\gamma^{-1}p/\theta} > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\gamma^{-1} \left( \frac{\rho(2L_K|e(t)|)}{\theta} \right) \leq 2L_{\gamma^{-1}p/\theta} L_K|e(t)|,$$

where $L_{\gamma^{-1}p/\theta}$ is the Lipschitz constant of $\mathcal{G}$ on the compact set that contains $\{e(t)\}_{t=\phi(0)}^{t_{\text{max}}}$. Hence, a sufficient (stronger) condition for (16) is

$$|p(t)| \geq 2L_{\gamma^{-1}p/\theta} L_K|e(t)|. \quad (18)$$

Note that (18) is only for the purpose of analysis and is not executed in place of (16). Clearly, if the inter-event times of (18) are lower bounded, so are the inter-event times of (16).
Let $r(t) = \|e(t)\|/(p(t))$ for any $t \geq 0$ (with $r(t) = 0$ if $p(t) = 0$). For any $k \geq 0$, we have $r(t_k) = 0$ and $t_{k+1} - t_k$ is greater than or equal to the time that it takes for $r(t)$ to go from 0 to $1/\pi L_{\gamma^{-1}}(p(t) e_K)$. Note that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$
\dot{r} = \frac{d}{dt}\frac{d}{d\|p\|} = 1/2 \frac{d(e^T p)}{d(p^T p)}^{1/2} \frac{d}{dt}(e^T \dot{e} + \dot{\|e\|})^{1/2} = -e^T \dot{p} \frac{d}{d\|p\|} \frac{d}{d\|p\|} \frac{d}{dt}(\|p\|) = (1 + r) \frac{d}{d\|p\|} \frac{d}{d\|p\|} \frac{d}{dt}(\|p\|)
$$

where the time arguments are dropped for better readability.

To upper bound the ratio $|\dot{p}(t)|/|p(t)|$, we have from (7) that $\dot{p}(t) = \dot{\sigma}(t) f(p(t), u(t))$ for all $t \geq \phi(0)$. By continuous differentiability of $f$ (which implies Lipschitz continuity on compacts) and global asymptotic stability of the closed loop system, there exists $L_f > 0$ such that

$$
|\dot{p}(t)| = |\dot{\sigma}(t) f(p(t), u(t))| \leq M_p |f(p(t), K(p(t) + e(t)))| \\
\leq M_2 L_f |f(p(t), K(p(t) + e(t)))| \\
\leq M_2 L_f |f(p(t)) + K|(|p(t) + e(t))| \\
\leq M_2 L_f |f(p(t)) + L_K |p(t) + e(t)|| \\
\Rightarrow \dot{r}(t) \leq M_2 (1 + r(t)) (L_f (1 + L_K) + L_f L_K r(t)).
$$

Thus, using the Comparison Principle [20 Lemma 3.4], we have $t_{k+1} - t_k \geq \delta, k \geq 0$ where $\delta$ is the time that it takes for the solution of

$$
\dot{r} = M_2 (1 + r)(L_f (1 + L_K) + L_f L_K r),
$$

(19)

to go from 0 to $1/\pi L_{\gamma^{-1}}(p(t) e_K)$.

**Step 3:** Since all system trajectories are bounded and $t_k \to t_\infty \to \infty$, we have $t_{\text{max}} = \infty$, completing the proof. ■

A particular corollary of Theorem 4.3 is that the proposed event-triggered law does not suffer from Zeno behavior, i.e., $t_k$ accumulating to a finite point $t_{\text{max}}$. Also, note that the lower bound $\delta$ in general depends on the initial conditions $x(0)$ and $\{u(t)\}_{t=\phi(0)}$ through the Lipschitz constant $L_{\gamma^{-1}p/\theta}$.

The results above assume perfect communications in the sensing channel. We next generalize them to the more general scenario formulated in Problem 1 where state information is delayed too. Let

$$
\bar{\ell} = \bar{\ell}(t) = \text{max}\{\ell \geq 0 | \tau_\ell \leq \psi(t)\};
$$

be the index of the last plant state transmission that has been received by the controller at time $t$. Then, the best estimate of $x(\sigma(t))$ available to the controller, namely,

$$
p(t) = x(\tau_\ell) + \int_{\phi(\tau_\ell)}^{t} \dot{\sigma}(s) f(p(s), u(s)) ds, \quad t \geq \psi^{-1}(0),
$$

(20)
is used as the prediction signal in place of $\{\hat{p}(t)\}_{t=\phi(0)}$. Since $p(t)$ is not available before $\psi^{-1}(0)$, the control signal $u(t)$ is updated as

$$
u(t) = \begin{cases} 
K(p(t_k)) & \text{if } t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}), k \geq 0, \\
0 & \text{if } t \in [t_0, t_0). 
\end{cases}
$$

(21)

where the first event time is now $t_0 = \psi^{-1}(0)$. The next result provides the same guarantees as Theorem 4.3 for this generalized scenario.

**Theorem 4.4:** Consider the plant dynamics (3) driven by the predictor-based event-triggered controller (21) with the predictor (20) and triggering condition (16). Under the aforementioned assumptions, the closed-loop system is globally asymptotically stable, namely, there exists $\tilde{\beta} \in K\mathcal{L}$ such that (17) holds for all $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, continuously differentiable $\{u(t)\}_{t=\phi(0)}$, and $t \geq 0$. Furthermore, there exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ such that $t_{k+1} - t_k \geq \delta$ for all $k \geq 0$.

**Proof:** By (22), $|x(t)| + U(t) \leq \Xi(|x(0)| + U(0)) + U(0)$

$$
\leq \left[\Xi(|x(0)| + U(0)) + U(0)\right] e^{-(t-t_0)}, \quad t \in [0, t_0].
$$

As soon as the controller receives $x(0)$ at $t_0$, it can estimate the state $x(t)$ by simulating the dynamics (3), i.e.,

$$
x(t) = x(0) + \int_0^t f(x(s), u(\phi(s))) ds.
$$

(23)

This estimation is updated whenever a new state $x(\tau_t)$ arrives and used to compute the predictor (7), which combined with (23) takes the form (20). Since the controller now has access to the same prediction signal $p(t)$ as before, the same Lyapunov analysis as above holds for $[t_0, \infty)$. Therefore, let $\tilde{\beta} \in K\mathcal{L}$ be such that (17) holds for $t \geq t_0$. By (22),

$$
|x(t)| + U(t) \leq \tilde{\beta}(\Xi(|x(0)| + U(0)) + U(0), t-t_0) \quad t \geq t_0.
$$

Therefore, (17) holds by choosing $\beta(r, t) = \max \{\tilde{\beta}(\Xi(r) + r, t-t_0), [\Xi(r) + r] e^{-(t-t_0)}\}$. Finally, since the triggering condition (16) has not changed, $t_{k+1} - t_k \geq \delta, k \geq 0$ for the same $\delta > 0$ as in Theorem 4.3 ■

While the controller can theoretically discard the received states $\{x(\tau_t)\}_{t=1}^\infty$ and rely on $x(0)$ for estimating state at all future times, closing the loop by using the most recent state value $x(\tau_t)$ has the clear advantage of preventing the estimator from drifting indefinitely due to noise and unmodeled dynamics, as seen later in Section VI

4Note that this only requires the controller to know $\psi(\tau_t)$ for every received state (not the full function $\psi$), which is realized by adding a time-stamp to every state transmission $x(\tau_t)$.
V. The Linear Case

In this section, we show how the general treatment of Section IV is specialized and simplified if the dynamics (5) is linear, i.e., when we have

\[ \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(\phi(t)), \quad t \geq 0, \]  

subject to initial conditions \( x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and bounded \( \{u(t)\}_{t=0}^{t} \). For simplicity, we restrict our attention to the case of perfect sensing channels, as the generalization to sensing channels with time delay and bandwidth limitation does not change the controller or stability guarantees (c.f. Theorem 4.4). Assuming that the pair \((A, B)\) is stabilizable, we can use pole placement to find a linear feedback law \( K : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) that makes (5) ISS. Moreover, (2) can be explicitly solved from (7) to obtain

\[ p(t) = e^{A(t-t_0)}x(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \hat{\sigma}(s)e^{A(s-t_0)}Bu(s)ds, \]

for all \( t \geq \phi(0) \) and the closed-loop system takes the form

\[ \dot{x}(t) = (A + BK)x(t) + Bu(\phi(t)) + BK(\phi(t)). \]

Furthermore, given an arbitrary \( Q = Q^T > 0 \), the continuously differentiable function \( S : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is given by \( S(x) = x^TPx \), where \( P = P^T > 0 \) is the unique solution to the Lyapunov equation \((A + BK)^TP + PA + BK = -Q\). It is clear that (11) holds with \( \alpha_1(r) = \lambda_{\min}(P)r^2 \) and \( \alpha_2(r) = \lambda_{\max}(P)r^2 \). To show (12), notice that using Young’s inequality (21),

\[ L_fS(x(t)) = -x(t)^TQx(t) + 2x(t)^TPBW(\theta) + BK(\phi(t)), \]

so (12) holds with \( \gamma(r) = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(Q)r^2 \) and \( \rho(r) = \frac{2PB^2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)} \). In this case, the trigger (16) takes the simpler form

\[ |e(t)| \leq \lambda_{\min}(Q)\sqrt{\frac{\phi}{4PB^2}} |p(t)|. \]

In addition to the simplifications, we show in the next section that the closed-loop system is globally exponentially stable in the linear case.

A. Exponential Stabilization under Event-triggered Control

In the next result we show that in the linear case we obtain the stronger feature of global exponential stability of the closed-loop system, though this requires a slightly different Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional.

**Theorem 5.1:** (Exponential Stability of the Linear Case): The system (5) subject to the piecewise-constant closed-loop control \( u(t) = Kp(t_k), \) \( t \in \{t_k, t_{k+1}\} \), with \( p(t) \) given in (25) and \( \{t_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \) determined according to (26) satisfies

\[ |x(t)|^2 + \int_{\phi(t)}^{t} u(\tau)^2d\tau \leq Ce^{-t\mu} \left[ |x(0)|^2 + \int_{\phi(0)}^{t} u(\tau)^2d\tau \right], \]

for some \( C > 0, \mu = (2-\theta)\lambda_{\min}(Q) \frac{4PB^2}{\lambda_{\max}(P)}, \) and all \( t \geq 0. \)

**Proof.** For \( t \geq 0, \) let \( L(t) = \int_{t}^{\infty} e^{\delta(t-t_0)}u(\phi(t))^2 d\tau. \) One can see that \( \dot{L}(t) = -w(\phi(t))^2 - bL(t), t \geq 0. \) Define \( V(t) = x(t)^TPx(t) + \frac{4PB^2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)} L(t) \), therefore, using (25),

\[ \dot{V} = -2\theta \lambda_{\min}(Q)|x(t)|^2 - \frac{4PB^2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)} w(\phi(t))^2 \]

\[ \leq -2\theta \lambda_{\min}(Q)|x(t)|^2 - \mu \dot{V}(t), \]

where \( \mu = \min \left\{ \frac{(2-\theta)\lambda_{\min}(Q)}{4\lambda_{\max}(P)} \right\} \). If \( b \) is chosen sufficiently large. Hence, by the Comparison Principle (20 Lemma 3.4), we have \( V(t) \leq e^{-\mu t}V(0), t \geq 0. \) Let \( W(t) = |x(t)|^2 + \int_{\phi(t)}^{t} u(\tau)^2d\tau. \) From (15) Theorems 6.4 and 6.5, we have \( c_1W(t) \leq V(t) \leq c_2W(t), \) for some \( c_1, c_2 > 0 \) and all \( t \geq 0. \) Hence, the result follows with \( C = c_2/c_1. \)

We see from Theorem 5.1 that the convergence rate \( \mu \) depends on both the ratio \( \frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}{\lambda_{\max}(P)} \) and the parameter \( \theta. \) The former can be increased by placing the eigenvalues of \( A + BK \) at larger negative values, though very large eigenvalues should be avoided due to noise amplification. Decreasing \( \theta, \) however, comes at the cost of faster control transmissions, a trade-off we study in detail next.

B. Optimizing the Communication-Conversion Trade-off

In this section, we analyze the trade-off between communication cost and convergence speed in our proposed event-triggered scheme. In general, it is clear from the Lyapunov analysis of Section IV that more transmissions (smaller \( \theta \)) hasten the decay of \( V(t) \) and help the convergence. This trade-off becomes clearer in the linear case since explicit expressions are derivable for convergence rate and minimum inter-event times. To this end, we define two objective functions and formulate the trade-off as a multi-objective optimization. Let \( \delta \) be the time that it takes for the solution of (19) to go from 0 to \( \frac{1}{2L_{\gamma,\nu} + L_{K}}. \) As shown in Section IV-C, the inter-event times are lower bounded by \( \delta, \) so it can be used to roughly measure the communication cost of the control scheme. For ease of notation, let

\[ a = M_2L_fL_K, \quad c = M_2L_f, \quad R = \frac{1}{2L_{\gamma,\nu} + L_{K}}, \]

where \( L_f = \sqrt{2(|A| + |B|)}, \) \( L_K = |K|, \) and \( L_{\gamma,\nu} = \frac{2|PB|}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)} \). Then, the solution of (19) with initial condition \( r(0) = 0 \) is given by \( r(t) = \frac{ce^\mu - e^\mu - a}{bce^\mu}. \) Solving \( r(\delta) = R \) for \( \delta \) gives \( \delta = \frac{b}{\ln\frac{c + x}{c} - \ln\frac{c}{c}}. \) The objective is to maximize \( \delta \) and \( \mu \) by tuning the optimization variables \( \theta \) and \( Q. \) For simplicity, let \( \theta = \nu^2 \) and \( Q = qI_n \) where \( \nu, \nu > 0. \) Then, \( \delta \) and \( \mu \) take the explicit form

\[ \delta(\nu) = \frac{1}{a-c} \ln \frac{c + \frac{\nu}{|P_s|}}{c + \frac{\nu}{|P_s|}} \]

\[ \mu(\nu) = \frac{2 - \nu^2}{4\nu^2} |P_s|, \]

where \( P_s = q^{-1}P \) is the solution of the Lyapunov equation \((A + BK)^TP + P(A + BK) = -I_n. \) Figure II(a) depicts
our design, along with our approach to tackle them. (b) The unique maximizer $\nu^*$ of the aggregate objective function $J(\nu)$ for different values of the weighting factor $\lambda$. As $\lambda$ goes from 0 to 1, more weight is given to the maximization of $\delta$, which increases $\nu^*$.

$\delta$ and $\mu$ as functions of $\nu$ and illustrates the communication-convergence trade-off.

To balance these two objectives, we define the aggregate objective function as a convex combination of $\delta$ and $\mu$, i.e.,

$$J(\nu) = \lambda \delta(\nu) + (1 - \lambda) \mu(\nu),$$

where $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ determines the (subjective) relative importance of convergence rate and communication cost. Notice that due to the difference between the (physical) units of $\delta$ and $\mu$, one might multiply either one by a unifying constant, but we are not doing this as it leads to an equivalent optimization problem with a different $\lambda$. It is straightforward to verify that $J$ is strongly convex and its unique maximizer is given by the positive real solution of$c_3 \nu^3 + c_2 \nu^2 + c_1 \nu + c_0 = 0$ where $c_3 = a(1 - \lambda)$, $c_2 = (a + c)|P_1 B|^2|K|(1 - \lambda)$, $c_1 = c|P_1 B|^2|K|^2(1 - \lambda)$, and $c_0 = -2 \lambda_{\max}(P_1)|P_1 B|^2|K|\lambda$. Figure 1(b) illustrates the optimizer of the aggregate objective function $J(\nu)$ for different values of the weighting factor $\lambda$.

VI. SIMULATIONS

Here we illustrate the performance of our event-triggered predictor-based design. Example 6.2 is a two-dimensional nonlinear system that satisfies all the hypotheses required to ensure global asymptotic convergence of the closed-loop system. Example 6.3 is a different two-dimensional nonlinear system which instead does not, but for which we observe convergence in simulation. We start by discussing some numerical challenges that arise because of the particular hybrid nature of our design, along with our approach to tackle them.

Remark 6.1: (Numerical implementation of event-triggered control law): The main challenge in the numerical simulation of the proposed event-trigger law is the computation of the prediction signal $p(t) = x(\sigma(t))$. To this end, at least three methods can be used, as follows:

(i) Open-loop: One can solve $\dot{p}(t) = \sigma(t)f(p(t), u(t))$ directly starting from $p(\phi(0)) = x(0)$. Then, the closed-loop system takes the form of a time-delay hybrid dynamical system with flow map

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(\phi(t))), \quad t \geq 0,$$

jump map $p_{tk}(t_k^n) = p(t_k^n)$, jump set $D = \{(x, p, p_{tk}) \mid |p_{tk} - p| = e^{-\theta \tau(\phi(p)|p|)}\}$, and flow set $C = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D$. This formulation is computationally efficient but, if the original system is unstable, it is prone to numerical instabilities. The reason, suggesting the name “open-loop”, is that the $(p, p_{tk})$-subsystem is completely decoupled from the $x$-subsystem. Therefore, if any mismatch occurs between $x(t)$ and $p(\phi(t))$ due to numerical errors, the $x$-subsystem tends to become unstable, and this is not “seen” by the $(p, p_{tk})$-subsystem.

(ii) Semi-closed-loop: One can add a feedback path from the $x$-subsystem to the $(p, p_{tk})$ subsystem by computing $p$ directly from (7) at every integration time step of $x$. This requires a numerical integration of $f(p(s), u(s))$ over the “history” of $(p, u)$ from $\phi(\tau_k)$ to $t$. This method is more computationally intensive but improves the numerical robustness. However, since we are still integrating over the history of $p$, any mismatch in the prediction takes more time to die out, which may not be tolerable for an unstable system.

(iii) Closed-loop: To further increase robustness, one can solve (27b) at every step of the integration of (27a) from $\phi(\tau_k)$ to $t$ with “initial” condition $p(\phi(\tau_k)) = x(\tau_k)$. This method is the most computationally intensive of the three, but does not propagate prediction mismatch and is quite robust to numerical errors. We use this method in Examples 6.2 and 6.3.

Example 6.2: (Compliant Nonlinear System): Consider the 2-dimensional system given by

$$f(x, u) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + x_2 \\ \tanh(x_1) + x_2 + u \end{bmatrix}, \quad \phi(t) = t - \frac{(t - 5)^2 + 2}{2(t - 5)^2 + 2}, \quad \tau_k = \ell \Delta_{\tau}, \quad \ell \geq 0, \quad \psi(t) = -D_{\psi},$$

where $\Delta_{\tau}$ and $D_{\psi}$ are constants. This system satisfies all the aforementioned assumptions with the feedback law $K(x) = -6x_1 - 5x_2 - \tanh(x_1)$ and

$$L_{f} = 2\sqrt{3}, \quad L_{K} = 7\sqrt{2}, \quad M_0 = 1, \quad (M_1, m_2) = 1 \pm \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{16},$$

$$S(x) = x^T P x, \quad \gamma(r) = \frac{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}{2} r^2, \quad \rho(r) = \frac{2|PB|^2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)} r^2,$$

where $P = P^T > 0$ is the solution of $(A + BK)^T P + P(A + BK) = -Q$ for $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $k = \begin{bmatrix} -6 & -5 \end{bmatrix}$, and arbitrary $Q = Q^T > 0$. A sample simulation result of this system is depicted in Figure 2(a). It is to be noted that for this example, (16) simplifies to $|e(t)| \leq \overline{p}|p(t)|$ with $\overline{p} = 0.015$, but the closed-loop system remains stable when increasing $\overline{p}$ until 0.7. Further, in order to study the effect of limitations in the sensing channel on closed-loop stability, we varied $\Delta_{\tau}$ and $D_{\psi}$ and computed $|x(25)|$ as a measure of asymptotic stability. The average result is depicted in Figure 2(b) for 10 random initial conditions, showing that unlike our theoretical expectation, large $\Delta_{\tau}$ and/or $D_{\psi}$ result in instability even in the absence of noise because of the numerical error that degrades the estimation (23) over time (c.f. Remark 6.1).
Simulation results of the non-compliant system of Example 6.3 with initial conditions drawn from standard normal distribution for the compliant system of Example 6.2. The red line shows an approximate border of stability.

Further, the control law $K(x) = -5x_1 - 5x_2 - x_3^2$ makes the closed-loop system ISS but is not globally Lipschitz, and the zero-input system exhibits finite escape time. The simulation results of this example are illustrated in Figure 2(c). It can be seen that although $V$ is significantly non-monotonic, the event-triggered controller is able to stabilize the system, showing that the proposed scheme is applicable to a wider class of systems than those satisfying the assumptions.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We have proposed a prediction-based event-triggered control scheme for the stabilization of nonlinear systems with sensing and actuation delays. We have shown that the closed-loop system is globally asymptotically stable and the inter-event times are uniformly lower bounded. We have particularized our results for the case of linear systems, providing explicit expressions for our design and analysis steps, and further studied the critical communication-convergence trade-off characteristic of event-triggered strategies. Finally, we have addressed the numerical challenges that arise in the computation of predictor feedback and demonstrated the effectiveness of our proposed approach in simulation. Among the numerous questions that remain open, we want to highlight the extension of the results to systems with disturbances and/or unknown input delays and the relaxation of the global Lipschitz requirement on the input-to-state stabilizer of the open-loop system.
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