STABILIZING GRAPH-DEPENDENT SWITCHED SYSTEMS WITH ALL UNSTABLE SUBSYSTEMS
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Abstract. We give sufficient conditions for stability of a continuous-time linear switched system with all unstable subsystems where switchings between subsystems are governed by an underlying graph. We also present a slow-fast switching mechanism on subsystems comprising simple loops of underlying graph to ensure stability of the switched system.

1. Introduction

We consider a continuous-time switched system which is a dynamical system that is piecewise continuous with finitely many subsystems. The switching between subsystems are determined by a switching signal which is a piecewise constant function. The signal is represented by the admissible switching from one subsystem to another using the architecture of an underlying directed graph and the times at which these switchings take place. The system can switch from one subsystem to another if there is an edge between the corresponding vertices on the underlying graph. Such systems have been studied in [2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19]. Switched systems have applications in electrical and power grid systems, where the underlying graph structure varies with time. The networks whose topology changes randomly have been studied in [1, 6, 7, 22, 23, 24]. Synchronization in oscillator networks with varying underlying topology is discussed in [18, 21]. We refer to an editorial by Belykh et al. [3] for a review on switched systems as an evolving dynamical systems and its potential applications.

The stability of a switched system not only depends on the properties of subsystems but also on the switching signal. It is known that a switched system with all stable subsystems can be unstable for a particular switching signal. On the other hand, there are conditions in the literature under which a switched system is stable for arbitrary signals, see Liberzon [17]. Using dwell time and average dwell time approach, sufficient conditions are present in the literature.
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to ensure stability of switched system with all stable subsystems, we refer to [2, 5, 11, 12, 13, 20]. In [9], stability results are presented for the case when all the subsystem matrices commute pairwise. Moreover, for switched systems where some unstable subsystems are present with atleast one stable subsystem, there are sufficient conditions under which the switched system can be stabilized. Stability of switched systems with both stable and unstable subsystems are discussed in [28], using average dwell time approach. For switched positive linear systems having both stable and unstable subsystems, stability results are given in [29]. Sufficient conditions in terms of the network topology and also using the concept of flee time from an unstable subsystem and dwell time in a stable system are given in [2]. In their paper, using the concept of standard decomposition, a concept of simple loop dwell time is introduced to get a slow-fast switching mechanism. Of course, such systems are not stable under arbitrary signals since for a constant switching signal keeps the system in the unstable subsystem, the switched system is unstable.

It is also known that even when all subsystems are unstable, the switched system can be stable for some switching signal [17]. In this case, finding sufficient conditions for stability of the switched system is challenging. Most of the results present in the literature use state-dependent switching [4, 16, 17, 25, 27]. There are few results with respect to time-dependent switching signals which we will now discuss. In 2018, Ma et al. [15] gave a sufficient condition for stability of a discrete-time switched system is proposed, which can be easily verified for linear systems. Xiang and Xiao in [26], for stability of a continuous-time linear switched system, a sufficient condition is proposed using discretized Lyapunov function approach. Their condition demands that the time spent by the system in each subsystem is bounded below and above by fixed quantities. In this paper, we provide another sufficient condition for stability of the switched system. These conditions are in terms of Jordan decomposition of the matrices governing the subsystems. Jordan decomposition technique was also used in [2] by the author and Karabacak [12] for situations when all subsystems are stable or atleast one subsystem is stable.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we give the necessary background material. In Section 3 we discuss results and give numerical examples illustrating the results. Finally, in Section 4 we summarize our results and discuss future directions.
2. Background

In this section, we give some preliminaries on directed graphs and describe a switched linear continuous-time system whose switching is given by an (infinite) path on an underlying graph. For an \( n \times n \) matrix \( M \), \( \|M\| \) will denote its spectral norm, \( \rho(M) \) its spectral radius, and \( \sigma_n(M) \geq 0 \) the smallest singular value of \( M \), that is, the square root of the smallest (real) eigenvalue of \( M'M \).

2.1. Graph-dependent switched system. A directed graph (or a digraph) consists of a set of vertices and directed edges from one vertex to another. For a graph with \( k \) vertices, we label them as \( v_1, \ldots, v_k \). The set of vertices \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \) is denoted by \( v(G) \). The edge set, denoted by \( E(G) \), is the collection of all tuples \((i, j)\), where there is an edge from vertex \( v_i \) to \( v_j \), for \( i, j \in k \). A path in the graph \( G \) is a sequence of vertices and directed edges such that from each vertex there is an edge to the next vertex in the sequence. The number of edges describing a path \( p \) is called the length of the path, denoted by \( \ell(p) \). A path whose terminal vertices are the same is called a loop. An acyclic graph is a graph without any loops. A loop having all distinct vertices is called a simple loop. Every loop can be uniquely expressed as a union of simple loops.

Let \( G \) be a directed graph with \( k \) vertices \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \) and no self-loops. Let \( \sigma : [0, \infty) \to \{1, \ldots, k\} \) be a piecewise constant right-continuous function with discontinuities \( 0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \cdots \), such that \( (\sigma(t_i), \sigma(t_{i+1})) \in E(G) \), for all \( i \geq 0 \). Let \( \sigma_i \) denote the value of \( \sigma \) in the time interval \([t_{i-1}, t_i)\), for \( n \geq 1 \). Thus \( \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_m \) is a path of length \( m \) in \( G \). We call such a signal \( \sigma \), a \( G \)-admissible signal. Each \( G \)-admissible signal comprises of the following: switching times \((t_n)_{n \geq 1} \) and an infinite path \((\sigma_n)_{n \geq 1} \) in \( G \). The collection of all \( G \)-admissible signals is denoted by \( S_G \). We now define two sub-classes of the collection of switching signals \( S_G \), which we will use in this article. Label the edges of \( G \) as \( e_1, \ldots, e_\ell \), where \( \ell \) is the number of edges in \( G \). Define

\[
S_G(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_\ell) = \{ \sigma \mid \text{time spent on edge } e_i \text{ is } \tau_i \},
\]

\[
S_G(I_1, \ldots, I_\ell) = \{ \sigma \mid \text{time } \tau_i \text{ spent on edge } e_i \text{ satisfies } \tau_i \in I_i \},
\]

where \( \tau_i > 0 \) and \( I_i \) is an open sub-interval of \((0, \infty)\), for each \( i = 1, \ldots, \ell \). Note that

\[
S_G(I_1, \ldots, I_\ell) = \bigcup_{\tau_i \in I_i} S_G(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_\ell).
\]
Let \(A_1, \ldots, A_k\) be \(n \times n\) matrices with real entries. We call a matrix \textit{stable} if all its eigenvalues have negative real part, and a matrix is called \textit{unstable} if it has at least one eigenvalue with positive real part. For \(\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_G\), consider the switched linear system in \(\mathbb{R}^n\) given by

\[
\dot{x}(t) = A_{\sigma(t)}x(t), \quad t \geq 0.
\]

The system (2) is called a \textit{switched system with a \(\mathcal{G}\)-admissible signal} \(\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_G\). For each \(i \geq 1\), the linear system \(\dot{x}(t) = A_{\sigma_i}x(t), t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)\), is called a subsystem of (2). A subsystem is known as \textit{stable} if \(A_{\sigma_i}\) is a stable matrix. If \(A_{\sigma_i}\) is an unstable matrix, the subsystem is known as \textit{unstable}. Throughout this article, we will assume that for each \(j \in k\), \(A_j\) is a diagonalizable (over \(\mathbb{C}\)) matrix, see Remark 2.1 about the diagonalizability hypothesis. The matrices \(A_1, \ldots, A_k\) are called subsystem matrices of the switched system. In this paper, we assume that zeno behavior does not occur, examples of such phenomenon are given in Liberzon [17].

A graph-dependent switched system (2) with \(\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_G\) is \textit{uniformly exponentially stable} if there exist positive constants \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) such that for all initial conditions \(x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n\), \(\|x(t)\| \leq \alpha e^{-\beta t}\|x(0)\|\). In this paper, we will discuss sufficient conditions which will guarantee uniform exponential stability of the switched system. Since we will only discuss uniform exponential stability, we will just call it \textit{stability} for convenience.

\textbf{Remark 2.1.} If \(A\) is a diagonalizable matrix (over \(\mathbb{C}\)) with eigenvalue matrix \(D\), then \(\|e^{Ds}\| \leq e^{\mu s}\), where \(\mu\) is the real part of the eigenvalue with the maximum real part. If \(A\) is not diagonalizable, then for each \(\lambda^* > \mu\), there exists \(\beta > 0\) such that \(\|e^{Ds}\| \leq \beta e^{\lambda^* s}\). We will refer to this later in the paper.

We will need the following lemmas later in this paper.

\textbf{Lemma 2.2.} If \(A\) is an invertible matrix then \(\|A^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\sigma_n(A)}\).

\textbf{Lemma 2.3.} If \(A\) and \(B\) are invertible matrices of size \(n\) with \(\|A\| \geq 1\), \(\|B\| \geq 1\) and \(\|AB\| < 1\) then \(\sigma_n(A) < 1\) and \(\sigma_n(B) < 1\).

\textbf{Proof.} The result follows from the inequality

\[\|AB\| \geq \max\{\sigma_n(A)\|B\|, \sigma_n(B)\|A\|\} \geq \max\{\sigma_n(A), \sigma_n(B)\}\]

\[\blacksquare\]

\textbf{Lemma 2.4.} For a given matrix \(A\), if \(\|A\| < 1\) then \(I - A\) is invertible. Moreover \(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A^k\) converges and equals \((I - A)^{-1}\).
3. Results

We consider switched system \((2)\) in which each subsystem is unstable, that is, each of the matrices \(A_1, \ldots, A_k\) is unstable. Let \(\lambda_i > 0\) be the real part of the eigenvalue of \(A_i\) with maximum real part, for each \(i = 1, \ldots, k\). We will consider only those signals \(\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_G\) with switching times \((t_n)_{n \geq 0}\) for which \((t_{n+1} - t_n)_{n \geq 0}\) is a bounded sequence. Referring to collections defined in \((1)\), every signal in these collections fulfil this assumption provided \(I_i\) is a bounded interval for each \(i = 1, \ldots, \ell\). We make the following two hypotheses H1 and H2 in view of Remark 3.1.

**H1:** The underlying graph \(G\) has at least one loop, that is it is not acyclic.

**H2:** The switching signal \(\sigma\) has infinitely many discontinuities \(t_n \to \infty\) as \(n \to \infty\).

**Remark 3.1.** If H1 and H2 are not satisfied, then there exists \(T \geq 0\) such that \(\sigma(t) = j\), for all \(t \geq T\), for some \(j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\). Hence the switched system is not stable. For the remainder of the paper, we will consider stability issue of switched systems with \(G\) and \(\sigma\) satisfying the above assumptions.

**Theorem 3.2.** If there exist invertible matrices \(P_1, \ldots, P_k\) such that \(P_i J_i P_i^{-1}\) is a Jordan decomposition of \(A_i\), for \(i = 1, \ldots, k\), and for each \((r, s) \in \mathcal{E}(G)\), there exists \(\eta_{(r,s)} > 0\) such that
\[
\|P_{(r,s)} e^{\eta_{(r,s)} J_r}\| < 1, \tag{3}
\]
where \(P_{(r,s)} = P_s^{-1} P_r\), then the switched system \((2)\) is stable for every switching signal \(\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_G(I_1, \ldots, I_k)\), where \(I_i\) is some open interval in \((0, \infty)\) containing \(\eta_{(r,s)}\) with \(e_i = (r, s)\), \(i = 1, \ldots, \ell\).

**Remarks 3.3.**
1) It should be noted that if \(\|P_{(r,s)}\| \geq 1\), then the left end point of \(I_i\) is strictly positive, where \(e_i = (r, s)\).
2) Using Lemma 2.4, inequalities \((3)\) implies invertibility of \(I - P_{(r,s)} e^{\eta_{(r,s)} J_r}\), for each \((r, s) \in \mathcal{E}(G)\).
3) If \(A_r\) was stable matrix and \(-\mu_r < 0\) is the real part of the eigenvalue closest to the imaginary axis, then \(\|P_{(r,s)} e^{t J_r}\| \leq \|P_{(r,s)}\| e^{-\mu_r t}\) will be less than 1 for all \(t > 0\) satisfying
\[
t > \frac{\ln \|P_{(r,s)}\|}{\mu_r},
\]
for any choice of \(P_r, P_s\). See Agarwal \([2]\), Karabacak \([12]\) and references therein for related bounds on dwell time in case of all stable subsystems.
Further we refer to [2] for stability of switched system having at least one stable subsystem and when the subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$ corresponding to unstable subsystems is acyclic.

**Proof of Theorem 3.2.** If for each $(r, s) \in E(\mathcal{G})$, there exists $\eta_{(r,s)} > 0$ such that
\[
\|P(r,s)e^{\eta_{(r,s)}J_r}\| < 1,
\]
then for each $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, there exist a bounded interval $I_i \subseteq (0, \infty)$ containing $\eta_{(r,s)}$ such that
\[
\|P(r,s)e^{\eta J_r}\| < 1,
\]
for all $\eta \in I_i$, where $e_i = (r, s)$. We show that the switched system [2] is stable for all $\sigma \in S_{\mathcal{G}}(I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$. For $t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n)$, the solution of the switched system [2] with initial condition $x(0)$ is given by $x(t) = e^{A_{\sigma_n}(t-t_{n-1})}e^{A_{\sigma_{n-1}}(t_{n-1}-t_{n-2})} \ldots e^{A_{\sigma_1}t_1}x(0)$.

Using Jordan decomposition $A_i = P_i J_i P_i^{-1}$, we get
\[
\|x(t)\| = \|e^{A_{\sigma_n}(t-t_{n-1})}e^{A_{\sigma_{n-1}}(t_{n-1}-t_{n-2})} \ldots e^{A_{\sigma_1}t_1}x(0)\|
\leq \|P_{\sigma_n}\|\|P_{\sigma_1}^{-1}\|\|D_{\sigma_n}(t-t_{n-1})\| \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \|P_{(\sigma_j, \sigma_{j+1})}e^{J_{\sigma_j}(t_j-t_{j-1})}\| \right) \|x(0)\|
\leq C a_n^\sigma \|x(0)\|
\]
where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of $\sigma$ and $n$ since $t_n - t_{n-1}$ is bounded above by a number for all $n$, and
\[
a_n^\sigma = \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \|P_{(\sigma_j, \sigma_{j+1})}e^{J_{\sigma_j}(t_j-t_{j-1})}\|.
\]
Each term in the product is less than $K < 1$ (by shrinking $I_1, \ldots, I_\ell$, if required), where
\[
K = \sup \{ \|P(r,s)e^{\ell J_r}\| \mid t \in I_i, \; e_i = (r, s) \in E(\mathcal{G}), \; i = 1, \ldots, \ell \}.
\]
Hence $a_n^\sigma \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ (at an exponential rate). Thus the switched system [2] is stable for every switching signal $\sigma \in S_{\mathcal{G}}(I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$.

**Remarks 3.4.** 1) Since $\mathcal{G}$ has a closed loop by H1, there exist at least one $(i,j) \in E(\mathcal{G})$ such that $\|P_{(i,j)}\| \geq 1$: If $i_1 \to i_2 \to \cdots \to i_p \to i_1$ is a loop in $\mathcal{G}$, then since
\[
P_{(i_p,i_1)}P_{(i_{p-1},i_p)} \ldots P_{(i_2,i_3)}P_{(i_1,i_2)} = I,
\]
we get $1 \leq \|P_{(i_p,i_1)}\|\|P_{(i_{p-1},i_p)}\| \cdots \|P_{(i_2,i_1)}\|\|P_{(i_1,i_2)}\|$.

Let $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ satisfy the hypothesis in the statement of Theorem 3.2 and let

$$E_1(G) = \{(i, j) \in E(G) \mid \|P_j^{-1}P_i\| \geq 1\} \neq \emptyset,$$

and let

$$E_2(G) = E(G) \setminus E_1(G).$$

For all $(r, s) \in E_2(G)$, $\|P_{(r,s)}e^{\eta_{(r,s)}J_r}\| \leq \|P_{(r,s)}\|e^{\eta_{(r,s)}\lambda_r} < 1$ provided

$$0 < \eta_{(r,s)} < \frac{-\ln\|P_{(r,s)}\|}{\lambda_r}.$$

Hence we can take $I_i = \left(0, -\frac{\ln\|P_{(r,s)}\|}{\lambda_r}\right)$ for $e_i = (r, s) \in E_2(G)$. Thus for a given set of matrices $P_1, \ldots, P_k$, it is enough to check hypothesis for $(r, s) \in E_1(G)$.

2) Let $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ satisfy the hypothesis in the statement of Theorem 3.2, then by Lemma 2.3 for $(r, s) \in E_1(G)$, $\sigma_n(e^{J_r}) < 1$ since $\|P_{(r,s)}\| \geq 1$. $\sigma_n(e^{J_r}) < 1$ holds if and only if $A_r$ has an eigenvalue with negative real part, using Lemma 2.2. Hence the hypothesis will never be satisfied if each of the matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ have none of their eigenvalues to the left of the imaginary axis.

Proposition 3.5. If $P_i, Q_i, J_i, K_i, i = 1, \ldots, k$ are matrices such that $A_i = P_iJ_iP_i^{-1}$ and $A_i = Q_iK_iQ_i^{-1}$ are Jordan decompositions of $A_i$ with $P_i$ and $Q_i$ having all columns with unit norm, then the following are equivalent:

1) For each $(r, s) \in E(G)$, there exists $\eta_{(r,s)} > 0$ such that

$$\|P_{(r,s)}e^{\eta_{(r,s)}J_r}\| < 1,$$

where $P_{(r,s)} = P_{s}^{-1}P_{r}$.

2) For each $(r, s) \in E(G)$, there exists $\zeta_{(r,s)} > 0$ such that

$$\|Q_{(r,s)}e^{\zeta_{(r,s)}K_r}\| < 1,$$

where $Q_{(r,s)} = Q_{s}^{-1}Q_{r}$.

Proof. For each $i = 1, \ldots, k$, since $J_i = R_iK_iR_i^T$, for some rotation matrix $R_i$, $P_iJ_iP_i^{-1} = P_iR_iK_iR_i^{-1}P_i^{-1} = Q_iK_iQ_i^{-1}$.

Hence $Q_i = P_iR_iU_i$ for some unitary matrix $U_i$. Thus for $(r, s) \in E(G)$,

$$\|P_{(r,s)}e^{\eta_{(r,s)}J_r}\| = \|U_s^{-1}R_s^{-1}Q_{(r,s)}R_sU_r e^{\eta_{(r,s)}J_r}\| = \|Q_{(r,s)}e^{\eta_{(r,s)}J_r}\|.$$

Take $\zeta_{(r,s)} = \eta_{(r,s)}$.  

□
Remark 3.6. In view of Proposition 3.5, if the eigenvector matrices $P_1,\ldots,P_k$ that satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 3.2 have unit norm columns, then the hypothesis of the theorem are satisfied for any choice of eigenvector matrices with unit norm columns. In Example 3.7, we will see that the hypothesis of Theorem 3.2 may not be satisfied by eigenvector matrices with unit norm, but may be satisfied with appropriate scaling of eigenvectors.

If the columns of the invertible matrices $P_1,\ldots,P_k$ have unit norm, then by Proposition 3.5, we can fix a choice of these matrices and thus the hypothesis of the theorem is equivalent to finding diagonal matrices $D_1,\ldots,D_k$ with all their diagonal entries non-zero such that

$$
\|D_\sigma^{-1}P_{(r,s)}D_re^{Jr\eta(r,s)}\| < 1,
$$

for some $\eta(r,s) > 0$, $(r,s) \in \mathcal{E}(G)$.

Example 3.7. In this example, the hypothesis of Theorem 3.2 is not satisfied if we take $P_i$ to have unit norm columns, whereas inequalities (6) are satisfied for some choice of $D_1,\ldots,D_k$.

Consider a switched system on a unidirectional ring with two vertices as the underlying graph and with planar subsystems with $A_1 = \text{diag}(-1, 1)$ and $A_1 = \text{diag}(1, -2)$. Both $A_1$ and $A_2$ are unstable. If we insist on columns of $P_i$ having unit norm, then $P_1 = P_2 = I$ with $J_1 = A_1$ and $J_2 = A_2$ (we can make this choice in view of Proposition 3.5). Clearly with these choices of $P_1$ and $P_2$, the hypothesis in Theorem 3.2 is not satisfied. But if we take

$$
D_1 = \text{diag}(e^2, e^{-3}), \ D_2 = I,
$$

inequalities (6) are satisfied, for all $\eta_{(1,2)} \in (2, 3)$ and $\eta_{(2,1)} \in (1.5, 2)$.

This example is special because if $T_1$ is the time spent in subsystem $A_1$ and $T_2$ is the time spent in subsystem $A_2$, then the switched system is stable if $T_2 < T_1 < 2T_2$ since then $\|e^{A_2T_2}e^{A_1T_1}\| = \|e^{A_2T_2+A_1T_1}\| < 1$. This example can be generalized to a unidirectional graph with $k$ vertices and pairwise commuting subsystem matrices $A_1,\ldots,A_k$. If there exist $T_1,\ldots,T_k > 0$ such that $\|e^{T_1A_1+\cdots+T_kA_k}\| < 1$, then the switched system is stable for some switching signal. In particular, if a convex combination of $A_1,\ldots,A_k$ is Hurwitz, then the switched system is stabilized. This condition of existence of convex Hurwitz combination appears in quadratic stability of switched system via state dependent switching, see Liberzon [17]. Further if each $A_1,\ldots,A_k$ is a diagonal matrix, then the switched system with unidirectional ring as the underlying graph is stable if and only if a convex combination of $A_1,\ldots,A_k$ is Hurwitz.
3.1. Few Estimates when \( \mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset \). Let the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2 be satisfied for a choice of \( P_1, \ldots, P_k \) and intervals \( I_i \), for each \( e_i = (r,s) \in \mathcal{E}_1(\mathcal{G}) \). Let \( s_1, \ldots, s_p \) be simple loops in \( \mathcal{G} \). For each \( i = 1, \ldots, p \), let \( \eta_i^{(r,s)} > 0 \) be the time that the system spends in each subsystem \( r \) before switching to subsystem \( s \) with \( (r,s) \in \mathcal{E}(s_i) \). We assume that \( \eta_i^{(r,s)} \in I_i \), for all \( e_i = (r,s) \in \mathcal{E}(s_i) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G}) \). For each \( e_i = (r,s) \in \mathcal{E}(s_i) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G}) \), let

\[
K_i^{(r,s)} = \sup\{\|P(r,s)e^{tJ_i}\| \mid t \in I_i\} < 1.
\]

In [2], a standard decomposition algorithm of paths \( \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n \) into simple loops and an indecomposable path was introduced which we describe in the following section.

3.1.1. Standard Decomposition Algorithm ([2]). Let \( \mathcal{G} \) be a directed graph with vertex set \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \). Consider a signal \( \sigma \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{G}) \), with associated switching times \( \{t_n\}_{n \geq 1} \) and an infinite path \( \{\sigma_n\}_{n \geq 1} \) in \( \mathcal{G} \), with edges \( e_n = (v_{\sigma_n}, v_{\sigma_n+1}) \), \( n \geq 1 \). We now describe the standard decomposition algorithm of \( \sigma^{(n)} = \sigma_1\sigma_2\cdots\sigma_n \).

Step 1: Let \( p_0 = \sigma_1\sigma_2\cdots\sigma_n \) with edges \( e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n-1} \), and let \( i(p_0) \) be the set consisting of subscripts \( j \) of all \( e_j \) that comprise \( p_0 \). Let \( r_2 \in i(p_0) \) be the minimum index such that \( \sigma_{r_2} = \sigma_{j+1} \) for some \( j < r_2 \) in the index set \( i(p_0) \). Let \( r_1 \in i(p_0) \) be such that \( r_1 < r_2 \) and \( \sigma_{r_1} = \sigma_{r_2+1} \). If such a pair does not exist, then the path \( P_0 \) is indecomposable and the algorithm stops. Otherwise, we proceed to Step 2. It is easy to see that the subpath \( p^0 = \sigma_{r_1}\sigma_{r_1+1}\cdots\sigma_{r_2} \) with edges \( e_{r_1}, \ldots, e_{r_2-1} \) of \( p_0 \) is a simple loop in \( \mathcal{G} \).

Step 2: Let \( p_1 = \sigma_1\cdots\sigma_{r_1}\sigma_{r_2+1}\cdots\sigma_n \) be the path obtained by deleting the edges of \( p^0 \) from \( p_0 \). If \( p_1 \) is indecomposable, the algorithm stops, otherwise repeat Step 1 by replacing \( p_0 \) by \( p_1 \).

Using this algorithm, \( \sigma^{(n)} \) can be decomposed into simple loops and an indecomposable path. Such a decomposition is called the standard decomposition.

Example 3.8. Let \( \sigma^{(7)} = 1232312 \) be a path in \( \mathcal{G} \), as shown in Figure 1. It can be checked that \( p^0 = \sigma_2\sigma_3\sigma_4 \), thus \( p_1 = \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_5\sigma_6\sigma_7 \). Then \( p^1 = \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_5\sigma_6 \), thus \( p_2 = \sigma_1\sigma_7 \) which is an indecomposable path. Thus \( \sigma^{(7)} \) is a union of simple loops \( p^0, p^1 \) and an indecomposable path \( p_2 \).
3.1.2. *Bound on the total time spent on edges in $E_2(G)$ on each simple loop.* For $i = 1, \ldots, p$, let

$$
M_i = \sum_{(r,s) \in E(s_i) \cap E_2(G)} \ln \|P_{(r,s)}\| < 0, \quad (7)
$$

$$
N_i = \sum_{(r,s) \in E(s_i) \cap E_1(G)} \ln K_i^{(r,s)} < 0, \quad (8)
$$

$$
\lambda_i = \max_{(r,s) \in E(s_i) \cap E_2(G)} \lambda_r > 0. \quad (9)
$$

Recall proof of Theorem 3.2 and with notation as before, since every finite path in $G$ can be decomposed into simple loops and a path of length at most $k - 1$ in standard decomposition, we get

$$
\ln a_n^\sigma = b_n^\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^p n_i^\sigma \left[ \sum_{(r,s) \in E(s_i)} \ln \|P_{(r,s)}e^{J_r\eta^{(r,s)}_i}\| \right] \leq b_n^\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^p n_i^\sigma [M_i + \lambda_i \eta^i + N_i]
$$

where $\eta^i = \sum_{(r,s) \in E(s_i) \cap E_2(G)} \eta^{(r,s)}_i$ and $b_n^\sigma$ is the term corresponding to the indecomposable path in the standard decomposition.

As $n \to \infty$, for some $i = 1, \ldots, p$, the number $n_i^\sigma$ of simple loops tends to $\infty$. Moreover $b_n^\sigma$ is finite. Hence $\ln a_n^\sigma \to -\infty$ when for all $i = 1, \ldots, p$,

$$
0 < \eta^i < -\frac{M_i + N_i}{\lambda_i}.
$$
Thus we have an upper bound on the total time spent on edges \((r, s) \in \mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G})\) that lie on the simple loop \(s_i\) in the standard decomposition. This gives a fast slow mechanism on these edges of the loop. This observation is only useful if \(\mathcal{E}(s_i) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset\). If the underlying graph \(\mathcal{G}\) is a unidirectional ring with two vertices, then using Proposition 2.2 and Remark 3.4(2), \(\mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G}) = \emptyset\).

3.1.3. Bound on the maximum time spent on edges in \(\mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G})\) on each simple loop. For \(i = 1, \ldots, p\), let

\[
\gamma^i = \sum_{(r, s) \in \mathcal{E}(s_i) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G})} \lambda_r > 0.
\]

Recall proof of Theorem 3.2 and with notation as before, since every path in \(\mathcal{G}\) can be decomposed into simple loops and a path of length at most \(k - 1\) in standard decomposition (Section 3.1.1), we get

\[
\ln a_n^\sigma = b_n^\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^p n_i^\sigma \left[ \sum_{(r, s) \in \mathcal{E}(s_i)} \ln \| P_{(r, s)} e^{J_r n_{(r, s)}} \| \right] 
\leq b_n^\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^p n_i^\sigma \left[ M_i + \gamma^i \zeta^i + N_i \right]
\]

where \(\zeta^i > 0\) is the maximum time spent on each edge \((r, s) \in \mathcal{E}(s_i) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G})\).

As \(n \to \infty\), for some \(i = 1, \ldots, p\), the number \(n_i^\sigma\) of simple loops tends to \(\infty\). Moreover \(b_n^\sigma\) is finite. Hence \(\ln a_n^\sigma \to -\infty\) when for all \(i = 1, \ldots, p\),

\[
0 < \zeta^i < -\frac{M_i + N_i}{\gamma^i}.
\]

Thus we have an upper bound on the time spent on edges \((r, s) \in \mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{G})\) and the simple loop \(s_i\).

3.2. Planar systems. In this section, we will focus on switched systems in \(\mathbb{R}^2\). A matrix \(A\) is called Schur stable if \(\rho(A) < 1\). As an aside, Schur stability of a matrix \(A\) is equivalent to the following: for each symmetric positive definite matrix \(Q\), there exists a unique positive definite \(P\) such that \(P - A^t P A - Q = 0\), see [8]. For a matrix \(A\) of size two, Schur stability of \(A\) is equivalent to the following two conditions: \(|\text{trace}(A)| < 1 + \det(A)\) and \(|\det(A)| < 1\), we refer to [11]. Moreover, for a real matrix \(A\), \(\|A\| < 1\) if and only if \(A^t A\) is Schur stable.

Example 3.9. Let \(\mathcal{G}\) be a unidirectional ring with two vertices. Suppose both \(A_1\) and \(A_2\) are unstable matrices of size two. Every \(\mathcal{G}\)-admissible switching signal \(\sigma\) switches between these two subsystems.
Let $A_i = P_i J_i P_i^{-1}$ be the Jordan decomposition of $A_i$, $i = 1, 2$. First note that $\|P_{(1,2)}\| \geq 1$ and $\|P_{(2,1)}\| \geq 1$. Also, $\|P_{(2,1)} e^{J_{2s_0}}\| \geq \sigma_2 (e^{J_{2s_0}})$ and $\|P_{(1,2)} e^{J_{1s_0}}\| \geq \sigma_2 (e^{J_{1s_0}})$, by Proposition 3.5. If $A_1$ has complex conjugate pair of eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \pm i \mu_1$ with $\lambda_1 > 0$ (since it is unstable), then $\|P_{(1,2)} e^{J_{1s_0}}\| \geq \sigma_2 (e^{J_{1s_0}}) = e^{\lambda_1 s_0} > 1$. Similarly for $A_2$. Hence for the hypothesis of Theorem 3.2 to be satisfied, both $A_1$ and $A_2$ have a pair of real eigenvalues, one positive (since it is stable) and other negative. Let $J_1 = \text{diag}(-\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ and $J_2 = \text{diag}(-\beta_1, \beta_2)$, with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$.

The conditions in Theorem 3.2 are:

\[ \|P_1^{-1} P_2 e^{J_{s_0}}\| < 1, \text{ and } \|P_2^{-1} P_1 e^{J_{t_0}}\| < 1, \]

for some $t_0, s_0 > 0$. It should be noted that the inequalities (11) are satisfied provided

\[
\begin{align*}
\|P_1^{-1} P_2 e^{J_{s_0}} P_2^{-1} P_1 e^{J_{t_0}}\| &= \|P_1^{-1} e^{A_{2s}} e^{A_{1t_0}} P_1\| < 1, \text{ and } \\
\|P_2^{-1} P_1 e^{J_{t_0}} P_1^{-1} P_2 e^{J_{s_0}}\| &= \|P_2^{-1} e^{A_{1t_0}} e^{A_{2s}} P_2\| < 1.
\end{align*}
\]

for some $P_1, P_2$. Note that $P_1 = PD_1$ and $P_2 = QD_2$, where $P$ and $Q$ are fixed matrices with all columns having unit norm and $D_1, D_2$ are diagonal matrices with all diagonal entries non-zero. Let $Q^{-1} P = (a_{ij})$. Then $P_2^{-1} P_1 = D_2^{-1} Q^{-1} P D_1$. If $D_1 = \text{diag}(p, q)$ and $D_2 = \text{diag}(r, s)$, then $P_2^{-1} P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} p/r & a_{12} q/r \\ a_{21} p/s & a_{22} q/s \end{pmatrix}$. The inequalities (11) are satisfied if and only if all of the following conditions hold true: $T_1 < 1 + D_1$, $D_1 < 1$, $T_2 < 1 + D_2$, and $D_2 < 1$, where

\[
\begin{align*}
(12) & \quad e^{-2\alpha_1 t_0} p^2 \left( a_{12}^2 \frac{1}{r^2} + a_{21}^2 \frac{1}{s^2} \right) + e^{2\alpha_2 t_0} q^2 \left( a_{12}^2 \frac{1}{r^2} + a_{22}^2 \frac{1}{s^2} \right), \\
D_1 &= e^{2(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) t_0} \left( \frac{pq}{rs} (a_{11} a_{22} - a_{12} a_{21}) \right)^2, \\
T_2 &= \frac{e^{-2\beta_1 s_0}}{s^2} \left( \frac{pq}{rs} \left( a_{21} p^2 + a_{22} q^2 \right) + e^{2\beta_2 s_0} \frac{1}{r^2} \left( (a_{11} p)^2 + (a_{12} q)^2 \right) \right), \\
D_2 &= e^{2(\beta_2 - \beta_1) s_0} \left( \frac{pq}{rs} (a_{11} a_{22} - a_{12} a_{21}) \right)^2.
\end{align*}
\]

Thus hypotheses of Theorem 3.2 are equivalent to solving four inequalities $T_1 < 1 + D_1$, $D_1 < 1$, $T_2 < 1 + D_2$, and $D_2 < 1$ in six variables: positive $t_0, s_0$ and non-zero $p, q, r, s$. In general, for planar switched system (2) with underlying graph $G$ having $\ell$ edges, we need to solve $2\ell$ inequalities in $2k + \ell$ variables.
Weaker sufficient conditions can be obtained using Frobenius norm\(^1\). Since the Frobenius norm \(\|\cdot\|_F\) is greater than the spectral norm, inequalities (11) are satisfied if

\[ \|P_1^{-1} P_2 e^{J^2 s_0}\|_F = T_2 < 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \|P_2^{-1} P_1 e^{J^1 t_0}\|_F = T_1 < 1. \]

Note that this is possible only if

\[ e^{2\alpha_2 t_0} q^2 \left( \frac{a_{12}^2}{r^2} + \frac{a_{22}^2}{s^2} \right) < 1, \quad \text{and} \quad e^{2\beta_2 s_0} s^2 \left( (a_{11} p)^2 + (a_{12} q)^2 \right) < (pq(a_{11} a_{22} - a_{12} a_{21}))^2. \]

If \( A_1 = J_1 = \text{diag}(\alpha, \beta) \) and \( A_2 = J_2 = \text{diag}(\gamma, \delta) \) are diagonal matrices, then \( P = I, \ Q = I, \ P_2^{-1} P_1 = \text{diag}(a, d) \) for some non-zero \( a, d \). Hence inequalities (11) are satisfied for some non-zero \( a, d \) and \( t, s > 0 \) if and only if

\[ \max\{|a| e^{\alpha t}, |d| e^{\beta t}, e^{\gamma s}/|a|, e^{\delta s}/|d|\} < 1. \]

Note that this is satisfied provided \( \alpha \gamma < 0 \) and \( \beta \delta < 0 \). Since both \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) are unstable, without loss of generality assume \( \alpha < 0 < \gamma \) and \( \delta < 0 < \beta \).

\( a, d, t, s \) exist if and only if \( \alpha \delta < \beta \gamma \) if and only if \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) have a Hurwitz convex combination.

Since \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) commute, this existence of a Hurwitz convex combination is a necessary and sufficient condition for stability, also see Example 3.7.

**Example 3.10.** Let \( A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix}, \ A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1.7636 & -1.6636 \\ 11.7636 & -11.6636 \end{pmatrix} \).

Take \( P_1 = I, \ P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & 0.5 \\ 10 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \ J_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -10 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.1 \end{pmatrix}, \ J_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix} \).

For \( s \in I_{(2,1)} = (0.5, 3) \) and \( t \in I_{(1,2)} = (1, 4) \), \( \|P_{(2,1)} e^{J_{2s}}\| < 1 \) and \( \|P_{(1,2)} e^{J_{1t}}\| < 1 \). See Figure 2\[\] The largest eigenvalue of convex combination of \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) is shown in Figure 3\[\] which shows that there exist a Hurwitz convex combination of these matrices.

**Example 3.11.** In these examples, hypotheses of Theorem 3.2 are not satisfied if we take \( P_i \) to have unit norm columns. Moreover inequalities (6) are not satisfied for any choice of diagonal matrices.

a) Consider a switched system with planar subsystems with matrices

\[ A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 3 & 0.4 \end{pmatrix}, \ A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & -1 \\ -0.1 & 0.6 \end{pmatrix}. \]

\[ ^1 \text{For a square matrix } M = (m_{ij}), \text{ size } n, \|M\|_F = \text{trace}(M^t M) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n |m_{ij}|^2. \]
Figure 2. (a) Plot of $\|P_{(1,2)}e^{J_1 s}\| - 1$ and (b) Plot of $\|P_{(2,1)}e^{J_2 s}\| - 1$.

Figure 3. Plot of the real part of the eigenvalue $sA_1 + (1 - s)A_2$ with largest real part.

Here

$$J_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2.45784 & 0 \\ 0 & -1.05784 \end{pmatrix}, \quad J_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -2.03791 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.637909 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Both $A_1$ and $A_2$ are unstable. Moreover, no convex combination of these matrices is Hurwitz.

b) Consider planar system with

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -5 \\ -12 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -2.5 & 5 \\ 7 & -4 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Here

$$J_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -4.81025 & 0 \\ 0 & 10.8102 \end{pmatrix}, \quad J_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -9.21343 & 0 \\ 0 & 2.71343 \end{pmatrix}.$$
Both $A_1$ and $A_2$ are unstable but have a Hurwitz convex combination.

![Figure 4](image)

**Figure 4.** (a) Plot of $\|P_{(1,2)}e^{J_1s}\|-1$, (b) Plot of $\|P_{(2,3)}e^{J_2s}\|-1$, and (c) Plot of $\|P_{(3,1)}e^{J_3s}\|-1$.

**Example 3.12.** Let

\[
A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0.9 & 0.1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.538462 & 1.38462 \\ 1.84615 & -4.53846 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 26.8725 & -98.6387 \\ 8.62228 & -31.8725 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Here $J_1 = \text{diag}(1, 0.1)$, $J_2 = \text{diag}(-5, 1)$, $J_1 = \text{diag}(1, -6)$. See Figure 4, hypothesis of Theorem 3.2 is satisfied for

\[
P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -0.769231 & 2.30769 \\ 3.07692 & 0.769231 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -0.23485 & 23.1004 \\ -0.0616001 & 7.69847 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Here $\|P_{(1,2)}\| < 1$, $\|P_{(2,3)}\| > 1$ and $\|P_{(3,1)}\| > 1$.

4. **Concluding Remarks**

In this paper, we have given sufficient stability conditions for switched systems having all subsystems unstable. Several examples are given to illustrate the applicability of theorem. Even though it is easy to check when the hypothesis of Theorem 3.2 are not valid using Remark 3.4 (2), it is not straightforward to find sufficient conditions only in terms of the subsystem matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ and the architecture of the underlying graph $\mathcal{G}$, under which the hypotheses hold true. For planar
systems, hypotheses of Theorem 3.2 can be reduced to simple computable conditions as discussed in Example 3.9. The comparison of the sufficient conditions presented here with the conditions available in the literature is an ongoing project. Further applicability of our results to large scale systems and estimating computation costs can be explored.
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