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Abstract

We develop new methods for the stabilization (stability analysis) of a linear system with general time-varying distributed delays existing at the states, inputs and outputs of the system. The time-varying delay function in this paper can be any function whose value is bounded by an interval. Furthermore, the distributed delay kernels can be any $L^2$ function over a bounded interval where the kernel functions are handled directly without using approximations of any kind. By constructing a Krasovskii functional via the application of a novel integral inequality, sufficient conditions for the existence of a dissipative state feedback controller for the system are derived in terms of matrix inequalities without utilizing the generalized reciprocally convex combination lemmas. The proposed synthesis (stability) condition, which takes dissipativity into account, can be either solved directly by the standard numerical solvers of semidefinite programming if they are convex, or reshaped into linear matrix inequalities, or solved by a proposed iterative algorithm. To the best of our knowledge, no existing methods may handle the synthesis (stability) problem investigated in this paper. Finally, numerical examples are presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed methodologies.
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1. Introduction

Time delays exist in systems affected by transportation and aftereffects Briat (2014). In certain real-time applications such as the model in Anthonis et al. (2007), delays can be time-varying. A particular class of delays $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^\mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2$, $r_2 > 0$, where $[r_1, r_2]^\mathbb{R}$ is the set containing any function defined between $\mathbb{R}$ onto $[r_1, r_2]$, is of great research interests. Indeed, since $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^\mathbb{R}$ can be any function defined between $\mathbb{R}$ onto $[r_1, r_2]$, this type of delays can be applied to model sampled-data Fridman et al. (2004) or networked control systems (NCSs) Hespanha et al. (2007), or even a time-varying delay which is bounded but non-deterministic Huang & Nguang (2008). This strongly motives one to develop new methods for the stability analysis and synthesis of time-varying delay systems with $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^\mathbb{R}$.

One can find many existing results pertaining to the stability analysis Jiang (2006); Park et al. (2011); Seuret et al. (2013); Park et al. (2015); Van Hien & Trinh (2015); Kwon et al. (2016); Zhao et al. (2018); Zhi et al. (2017); Li et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2017a); Lee et al. (2014, 2016, 2017b,a); Qian et al.
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(2018) and stabilization Jiang (2005); Fridman (2006); Li et al. (2017); Mohajerpoor et al. (2017, 2018) of linear time-varying delay systems based on the Krasovskii approach Gu & Liu (2009); Briat (2014); Fridman (2014), where the delays have the form of $x(t - r(t)), r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]$. Furthermore, it has been shown in Gao et al. (2008, 2010) that the method of the Krasovskii approach for linear systems with a delay $x(t - r(t))$ can be successfully utilized to handle the synthesis problems of NCSs. It is worthy mention that unlike the cases of constant delays, frequency domain based approaches Breda et al. (2005, 2015); Michiels & Niculescu (2014); Gehring et al. (2014); Vyhlídal & Zítek (2014) may not be feasible to the stabilization (stability analysis) of a system with a time-varying delay $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]$ if the exact expression of $r(t)$ is unknown.

It has been pointed out in Goebel et al. (2010, 2011) that the digital communication channel of NCSs with stochastic packet delays and loss can be modeled by distributed delays. Moreover, distributed delays with a time-varying delay function can be encountered in the modeling of machine tool vibration Wang et al. (2019). To the best of the author’s knowledge however, no existing methods can handle the stabilization (stability analysis) of systems with time-varying $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]$ distributed delays at system’s states, inputs, and outputs with non-constants delay kernel functions. In Theorem 2 of Zhou et al. (2012), a method of stabilizing systems in the form of $\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + \int_0^t B(\tau)u(t+\tau)d\tau$ is proposed. Nevertheless, all the poles of $A$ in Zhou et al. (2012) are assumed to be located on the imaginary axis, and the delay function wherein is assumed to be $r(\cdot) \in [0, r_2]$. The stability of positive linear systems with distributed time-varying delays is investigated in Ngoc (2013); Cui et al. (2018). Although the method in Ngoc (2013) does include criteria which can determine the stability of non-positive linear systems, the delay structure $r(\cdot) \in [0, r_2]$, in Ngoc (2013) is still restrictive. On the other hand, the synthesis (stability analysis) methods in Münz et al. (2009); Goebel et al. (2011); Gouaisbaut et al. (2015); Seuret et al. (2015); Feng & Nguang (2016), which are proposed to handle linear distributed delay systems with constant delay values, may not be easily extended to cope with the situation of unknown time-varying delays $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]$. This is especially true for the approximation approaches in Münz et al. (2009); Goebel et al. (2011); Gouaisbaut et al. (2015); Seuret et al. (2015) since the resulting approximation coefficients can become nonlinear with respect to $r(t)$ if the distributed delay kernels are approximated over the interval $[-r(t), 0]$. Consequently, it is crucial to develop methods for the stabilization (stability analysis) of linear systems with general distributed time-varying delays with the delay function $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2], 0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2, r_2 > 0$.

In this paper, new approaches of controller designs of a state feedback controller for a linear system with general distributed time-varying delays are developed based on the construction of Krasovskii functionals, where the expression of the time-varying delay function $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]$ is unknown but bounded by given values $0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2, r_2 > 0$. The distributed delay terms can be found in the states, inputs and outputs of the considered system, where the delay kernels can be any $L^2$ function over an interval. On the other hand, a novel integral inequality is proposed whose lower bound’s symmetric matrix is not a function of $r(t)$ but with finite dimensions. By using this inequality to construct a general Krasovskii functional, sufficient conditions for the existence of a state feedback controller, which ensure that the system is stable and dissipative with a supply function, are derived in terms of matrix inequalities summarized in the first theorem of this paper. For the synthesis condition in the first theorem, it has a bilinear matrix inequality (BMI) if a stabilization problem is considered, whereas the inequality becomes convex when non-stabilization problems are concerned. To tackle the problem of non-convexity, a second theorem is formulated via the application of Projection Lemma Gahinet & Apkarian (1994) where convex dissipative synthesis condition is presented.
in terms of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs). Furthermore, an algorithm is constructed to solve the BMI in the first theorem iteratively, where it can be initiated by a feasible solution of the synthesis condition in the second theorem. To the best of our knowledge, no existing methods can handle the synthesis problem researched in this paper. Finally, two numerical examples are presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed methodologies.

The major contributions of this paper are summarized as follows

- We believe the dissipative synthesis (dissipative analysis) problem investigated in this paper cannot be deal with by any existing method. Moreover, the considered system model is sufficiently general with the consideration of dissipativity, and the proposed synthesis method does not require the application of a nonconvex optimization solver.
- The handling of delay kernels in this paper, which is based on the application of decompositions, allows one to consider any $L^2$ function over an interval, even that interval is related to $r(t)$. This avoids the use of any form of approximations so that no nonlinear function of $r(t)$ will be introduced.
- The proposed integral inequality allows us to construct functionals with general structures for the delay system without the applications of generalized reciprocally convex combination lemmas Seuret et al. (2018) which cannot be utilized in general to deal with the situations in this paper.

The layout of the rest of the paper is outlined as follows. The synthesis problem considered in this paper is first formulated in Section 2. Secondly, some important lemmas and definition are presented in Section 3 which include the presentation of a novel integral inequality. Next, the main results on dissipative synthesis are presented in Section 4 which are summarized in Theorem 1 and 2 and Algorithm 1. Numerical examples and their associated testing results were presented in Section 5 prior to the final conclusion.

**Notation**

Let $\mathcal{Y}^X = \{ f(\cdot) : f(\cdot) \text{ is a function from } X \text{ onto } \mathcal{Y} \}$ and $\mathbb{R}_a = \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq a \}$ and $\mathbb{S}^n = \{ X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : X = X^\top \}$. We define the function space $C(X ; \mathbb{R}^n) = \left\{ f(\cdot) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{X} : f(\cdot) \text{ is continuous on } X \right\}$ and $C^k([a,b] ; \mathbb{R}^n) = \left\{ f(\cdot) \in C([a,b] ; \mathbb{R}^n) : \frac{d^k f(x)}{dx^k} \in C([a,b] ; \mathbb{R}^n) \right\}$ where the derivatives at $a$ and $b$ are one sided. Moreover, $L_f(X ; \mathcal{Y})$ denotes the space of all functions which are Lebesgue integrable from $X$ onto $\mathcal{Y}$. We frequently utilize the notations of universal quantifier $\forall$ and the existential quantifier $\exists$ throughout this paper. $\text{Sy}(X) := X + X^\top$ stands for the sum of a matrix with its transpose. $\text{Col}_{i=1}^n x_i := \begin{bmatrix} \text{Row}_{i=1}^n x_i^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top = [x_1^\top \cdots x_n^\top]^\top$ stands for a column vector containing a sequence of mathematical objects (scalars, vectors, matrices etc.). The symbol $*$ is used to indicate $[\ast] Y X = X^\top Y X$ or $X^\top Y [\ast] = X Y X^\top$ or $[A,B,C]^\ast = [A^\top, B^\top, C^\top]$. $O_{n \times m}$ denotes a $n \times m$ zero matrix which can be abbreviated into $O_n$ with $n = m$, while $0_n$ represents a $n \times 1$ column vector. We frequently use $X \oplus Y = [X \quad Y]$ to denote the diagonal sum of two matrices. $\otimes$ stands for the Kronecker product. The order of matrix operations in this paper is matrix (scalars) multiplications $> \otimes > \oplus > +$. Finally, empty matrices, which follow the same definition in Matlab, are applied in this paper to render our results more adaptable to the handling of different problems in the context of control and stability analysis. All the matrix operations concerning empty matrices follow the same rules in Matlab. Note that we define $\text{Col}_{i=1}^n = []$ when $n < 1$, where $[]$ is an empty matrix with an appropriate column dimension based on specific contexts.

3
2. Problem formulations

Consider a linear distributed system

\[
\dot{x}(t) = A_1 x(t) + \int_{r_1(t)}^{0} A_2(\tau) x(t + \tau) d\tau + B_1 u(t) + \int_{r_1(t)}^{0} B_2(\tau) u(t + \tau) d\tau + D_1 w(t), \quad t \geq t_0
\]

\[
z(t) = C_1 x(t) + \int_{r_1(t)}^{0} C_2(\tau) x(t + \tau) d\tau + B_3 u(t) + \int_{r_1(t)}^{0} D_2(\tau) u(t + \tau) d\tau + D_3 w(t),
\]

\[\forall \theta \in [-r_2, 0], \quad x(t_0 + \theta) = \phi(\theta), \quad r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^R\]

with any time-varying delay \(r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^R\) to be stabilized, where \(t_0 \in \mathbb{R}\) and \(\phi(\cdot) \in C([-r_2, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)\), and \(r_2 > 0, r_2 \geq r_1 \geq 0\) are given constants. Furthermore, \(x: [t_0 - r_2, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n\) denotes input signals, \(w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n\) represents disturbance, \(z(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n\) is the regulated output. The size of the given state space parameters in (1) is determined by the values of \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(m; p; q \in \mathbb{N}_0\). Finally, the matrix-valued distributed delay terms \(A_2(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, C_2(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) and \(B_2(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}, B_3(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}\) satisfy the following assumptions:

**Assumption 1.** There exist \(f_1(\cdot) \in C^1([-r_2, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{d_1}), f_2(\cdot) \in C^1([-r_2, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{d_2}), \phi_1(\cdot) \in L^2([-r_2, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{d_1}), \phi_2(\cdot) \in L^2([-r_2, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{d_2}), m_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times k_1}, m_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2 \times k_2}, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, A_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_2}, B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}, B_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k_2}, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, C_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k_2}, B_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}\) such that

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_1, 0], \quad \tilde{A}_2(\tau) = A_2 \left( \frac{\phi_1(\tau)}{f_1(\tau)} \right) \otimes I_n,
\]

\[
\tilde{B}_2(\tau) = B_2 \left( \frac{\phi_1(\tau)}{f_1(\tau)} \right) \otimes I_p,
\]

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_2, -r_1], \quad \tilde{A}_2(\tau) = A_3 \left( \frac{\phi_2(\tau)}{f_2(\tau)} \right) \otimes I_n,
\]

\[
\tilde{B}_2(\tau) = B_3 \left( \frac{\phi_2(\tau)}{f_2(\tau)} \right) \otimes I_p,
\]

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_1, 0], \quad \tilde{C}_2(\tau) = C_2 \left( \frac{\phi_1(\tau)}{f_1(\tau)} \right) \otimes I_n,
\]

\[
\tilde{B}_3(\tau) = B_5 \left( \frac{\phi_1(\tau)}{f_1(\tau)} \right) \otimes I_p,
\]

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_2, -r_1], \quad \tilde{C}_2(\tau) = C_3 \left( \frac{\phi_2(\tau)}{f_2(\tau)} \right) \otimes I_n,
\]

\[
\tilde{B}_5(\tau) = B_6 \left( \frac{\phi_2(\tau)}{f_2(\tau)} \right) \otimes I_p
\]

where \(d_1 = d_1 + \delta_1, d_2 = d_2 + \delta_2\) with \(d_1; d_2; \delta_1; \delta_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0\), and the derivatives in (6) at \(\tau = 0\) and \(\tau = -r_2\) are one-sided derivatives.

**Remark 1.** The decompositions in (2)–(5) provide an effective way to handle the distributed delay terms in (1) by using groups of “basis” functions to decompose them without appealing to the application of approximations. The potential choice of the functions in (2)–(5) will be further discussed in the next section in light of the construction of a Krasovskii functional related to \(f_1(\cdot)\) and \(f_2(\cdot)\).

**Remark 2.** No point-wise time-varying delay term \(x(t - r(\tau))\) is considered in (1) at this stage since its presence can cause significant ramifications to the derivations of synthesis conditions via the application of Krasovskii approach. Given the existing methods in the literature, many future works can be done even for the synthesis problem of a simple system \(\dot{x}(t) = A_1 x(t) + A_2 x(t - r(t)), r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^R\). Thus we leave the problem concerning both \(x(t - r(t))\) and distributed time-varying delays to future research.
2.1. Implications of Assumption 1

Now in this subsection, we want to show that the conditions in Assumption 1 simply mean that the entries of the distributed delay terms in (1) can be any \(L^2\) function defined over \([-r_2,0]\).

Without losing generality, it is true that one can always find appropriate matrix coefficients and \(L^2\) functions such that the distributed delay terms in (1) can be written as

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_1,0], \quad A_2(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_1} A_{2,i} \varphi_i(\tau), \quad C_2(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_1} C_{2,i} \varphi_i(\tau), \quad \tilde{B}_2(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_2} B_{2,i} \varphi_i(\tau), \quad \tilde{B}_5(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_1} B_{5,i} \varphi_i(\tau) \quad (9)
\]

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_2,-r_1], \quad A_2(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_2} A_{3,i} h_i(\tau), \quad C_2(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_2} C_{3,i} h_i(\tau), \quad \tilde{B}_2(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_2} B_{3,i} h_i(\tau), \quad \tilde{B}_5(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_2} B_{6,i} h_i(\tau) \quad (10)
\]

where \(f_i(\cdot)\) and \(g_i(\cdot)\) satisfy

\[
G_1 > 0 \text{ or } G_1 = \|0\|_0, \quad G_2 > 0 \text{ or } G_2 = \|0\|_0 \quad (11)
\]

\[
G_1 = \int_{-r_1}^{0} g(\tau)g^T(\tau)\,d\tau, \quad G_2 = \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} h(\tau)h^T(\tau)\,d\tau, \quad G(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_1} g_i(\tau), \quad h(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_2} h_i(\tau) \quad (12)
\]

with \(\kappa_1;\kappa_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0\). Note that by Theorem 7.2.10 in Horn & Johnson (2012), the conditions \(G_1 > 0\) and \(G_2 > 0\) in (11) indicate that the functions in \(\{g_i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{\kappa_1}\) and \(\{h_i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{\kappa_2}\) are linearly independent in a Lebesgue sense over \([-r_1,0]\) and \([-r_2,-r_1]\), respectively. Note that also that the conditions of \(G_1 = \|0\|_0\) and \(G_2 = \|0\|_0\) in (11) corresponds to \(g(\cdot) = \|0\|_1\) and \(h(\cdot) = \|0\|_1\) whose use can be very beneficial for enhancing the adaptability of the proposed synthesis condition in the following section.

Now the expressions in (9)–(10) can be further rewritten as

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_1,0], \quad A_2(\tau) = \left[\begin{array}{c c}
\text{Row} A_{2,i} \\
\text{Row} C_{2,i}
\end{array}\right] (g(\tau) \otimes I_n), \quad C_2(\tau) = \left[\begin{array}{c c}
\text{Row} C_{2,i} \\
\text{Row} B_{2,i}
\end{array}\right] (g(\tau) \otimes I_n)
\]

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_2,-r_1], \quad A_2(\tau) = \left[\begin{array}{c c}
\text{Row} A_{3,i} \\
\text{Row} C_{3,i}
\end{array}\right] (h(\tau) \otimes I_n), \quad C_2(\tau) = \left[\begin{array}{c c}
\text{Row} C_{3,i} \\
\text{Row} B_{3,i}
\end{array}\right] (h(\tau) \otimes I_n)
\]

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_1,0], \quad \tilde{B}_2(\tau) = \left[\begin{array}{c c}
\text{Row} B_{2,i} \\
\text{Row} C_{2,i}
\end{array}\right] (g(\tau) \otimes I_p), \quad \tilde{B}_5(\tau) = \left[\begin{array}{c c}
\text{Row} C_{5,i} \\
\text{Row} B_{5,i}
\end{array}\right] (g(\tau) \otimes I_p)
\]

\[
\forall \tau \in [-r_2,-r_1], \quad \tilde{B}_2(\tau) = \left[\begin{array}{c c}
\text{Row} B_{3,i} \\
\text{Row} C_{3,i}
\end{array}\right] (h(\tau) \otimes I_p), \quad \tilde{B}_5(\tau) = \left[\begin{array}{c c}
\text{Row} C_{6,i} \\
\text{Row} B_{6,i}
\end{array}\right] (h(\tau) \otimes I_p).
\]

Again without losing generality, the inequality in (11) can be rewritten into the form of (7) via the relation

\[
g(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(\tau) \\ f_1(\tau) \end{bmatrix}^T, \quad h(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_2(\tau) \\ f_2(\tau) \end{bmatrix}^T \quad (14)
\]

where \(f_1(\cdot) \in \mathbb{C}^1([-r_2,0];\mathbb{R}^{d_1}), f_2(\cdot) \in \mathbb{C}^1([-r_2,0];\mathbb{R}^{d_2}), \varphi_1(\cdot) \in \mathbb{L}^2([-r_2,0];\mathbb{R}^{d_1}), \varphi_2(\cdot) \in \mathbb{L}^2([-r_2,0];\mathbb{R}^{d_2})\) with \(\kappa_1 = d + \delta_1\) and \(\kappa_2 = d_2 + \delta_2\). Note that the relations in (14) are always constructible since one can arbitrarily add more differentiable functions to \(g_i(\tau)\) and \(h_i(\tau)\) in (13) accompanied with extra zero coefficients without changing the configuration of the distributed delay terms in (1). On the other hand, it is also true that one can also arbitrarily increase the dimension of \(\varphi_1(\cdot), \varphi_2(\cdot)\) in (14) with more \(L^2\) functions which can cover the corresponding new “functions” introduced by the differentiations of \(f_1(\tau)\) and \(f_2(\tau)\) without changing the configuration of the distributed delay terms in (1).

Given all we have presented in this subsection, it shows that one can always find appropriate parameters and functions to satisfy all the conditions in Assumption 1. Finally, given the mathematical structure of the decompositions in (2)–(5), it infers that the entries of the distributed delay terms in (1) can contain any \(L^2\) functions over \([-r_2,0]\).
2.2. Formulation of closed-loop system

The following property of the Kronecker product will be used throughout the paper.

**Lemma 1.** \( \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \forall Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}, \forall Z \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times r}, \)

\[
(X \otimes I_q)(Y \otimes Z) = (XY) \otimes (I_qZ) = (XY) \otimes (ZI_r) = (X \otimes Z)(Y \otimes I_r).
\]

Moreover, \( \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \) we have

\[
\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \otimes X = \begin{bmatrix} A \otimes X & B \otimes X \\ C \otimes X & D \otimes X \end{bmatrix}
\]

for any \( A, B, C, D \) with appropriate dimensions which make the block matrix at the left hand of the equality in (16) to be compatible.

Given \( r_2 > r_1 > 0 \) and utilizing Assumption 1 with Lemma 1, then the closed-loop system of (1), resulted from the stabilization by a static feedback controller \( u(t) = Kx(t) \) with \( K \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n} \), can be expressed as

\[
\dot{x}(t) = (A + B_1[(I_{3+n} \otimes K) \oplus O_q])x(t)
\]

\[
z(t) = (C + B_2[(I_{3+n} \otimes K) \oplus O_q])x(t), \ t \geq t_0
\]

\[
\forall \theta \in [-r_2, 0], \ x(t_0 + \theta) = \phi(\theta)
\]

with \( t_0 \) and \( \phi(\cdot) \) in (1), where \( \kappa = \kappa_1 + 2\kappa_2 \) and

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{O}(n, n_1, r_1) & A_1 & A_2(\sqrt{G_1} \otimes I_n) & A_3(\sqrt{G_2} \otimes I_n) & O_{n \times n_2} & D_1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{O}(n, p, r_1, r_2) & B_1 & B_2(\sqrt{G_1} \otimes I_p) & B_3(\sqrt{G_2} \otimes I_p) & O_{n \times n_2} & O_{n \times q} \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
C = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{O}(m, n, r_1, r_2) & C_1 & C_2(\sqrt{G_1} \otimes I_n) & C_3(\sqrt{G_2} \otimes I_n) & O_{m \times n_2} & D_2 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{O}(m, p, r_1, r_2) & B_4 & B_5(\sqrt{G_1} \otimes I_p) & B_6(\sqrt{G_2} \otimes I_p) & O_{m \times n_2} & O_{m \times q} \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\chi(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{I}(r_1, r_2)x(t - r_1) \\ \int_{r_1}^{0} (\sqrt{G_1}^{-1} \tilde{f}_1(\tau) \otimes I_n) x(t + \tau) \, d\tau \\ \int_{r_1}^{-r_2(t)} (\sqrt{G_2}^{-1} \tilde{f}_2(\tau) \otimes I_n) x(t + \tau) \, d\tau \\ \int_{-r_1}^{-r_2(t)} (\sqrt{G_2}^{-1} \tilde{f}_2(\tau) \otimes I_n) x(t + \tau) \, d\tau \\ w(t) \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\tilde{f}_1(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(\tau) \\ f_1(\tau) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{f}_2(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_2(\tau) \\ f_2(\tau) \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\tilde{O}(n, p, r_1, r_2) = \begin{cases} O_{n \times 2p} & \text{for } r_2 > r_1 > 0 \\ O_{n \times p} & \text{for } r_1 = r_2 > 0 \\ O_{n \times p} & \text{for } r_1 = r_2 = 0 \\ O_{n \times p} & \text{for } r_1 = 0, r_2 > 0 \\ O_{n \times p} & \text{for } r_1 > 0, r_2 = 0 \\ O_{n \times p} & \text{for } r_1 = 0, r_2 = 0. \end{cases}
\]

Note that \( \sqrt{X} \) stands for the unique square root of \( X > 0 \) and the terms in (18)--(21) are obtained by the following relations:

\[
\left( \tilde{f}_1(\tau) \otimes I_p \right) K = I_{\kappa_1} \tilde{f}_1(\tau) \otimes K I_n = \left( \sqrt{G_1} \otimes I_p \right) \left( I_{\kappa_1} \otimes K \right) \left( \sqrt{G_1}^{-1} \tilde{f}_1(\tau) \otimes I_n \right)
\]
which themselves can be obtained via (15) with the fact that $G_1$ and $G_2$ in (7) are invertible\(^1\). Moreover, the corresponding closed-loop systems with $r_1 = r_2 > 0$ and $r_1 = 0$, $r_2 > 0$ can be obtained by letting $r_1 = r_2 > 0$, $d_2 = \delta_2 = 0$, and $r_1 = 0$, $r_2 > 0$, $d_1 = \delta_1 = 0$ in (18)–(22), respectively.

**Remark 3.** By introducing the functions $\tilde{O}(n,p,r_1, r_2)$, $\mathbf{1}(r_1, r_2)$ and $\tilde{1}(r_1, r_2)$ in (23)–(22), the model in (17) can represent several cases with different combinations of $r_1$ and $r_2$ without introducing redundant terms into the parameters in (18)–(21) and $\chi(t)$ in (22). This is critically important in deriving well-posed synthesis conditions in this paper. (See further the discussion in Remark 6 after the presentation of Theorem 1)

### 3. Important lemmas and definition

In this section, some lemmas and definition are presented which are crucial for the derivations of the results in the next section. A novel integral inequality is also derived to handle time-varying delays in the context of constructing Krasovskii functionals.

The following property of the commutation matrix Magnus & Neudecker (1979) with the Kronecker products will be used throughout this paper.

**Lemma 2.**

\[
\forall X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad \forall Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \quad K_{(n,d)} (X \otimes Y) K_{(d,m)} = Y \otimes X
\]

\[
\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad K_{(n,m)}^{-1} = K_{(m,n)} = K_{(m,n)}^T
\]

where $K_{(n,d)}$ is the commutation matrix defined by

\[
\forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \quad K_{(n,d)} \text{vec}(A) = \text{vec} (A^T)
\]

which follows the definition in Magnus & Neudecker (1979), where \(\text{vec}(\cdot)\) stands for the vectorization of a matrix. See Section 4.2 of Dhrymes (2013) for the definition and more details of \(\text{vec}(\cdot)\).

**Remark 4.** Note that for $K_{(n,d)}$, we have $K_{(n,1)} = K_{(1,n)} = I_n$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ which gives the identity

\[
K_{(n,d)} (f(\tau) \otimes I_n) = K_{(n,d)} (f(\tau) \otimes I_n) K_{(1,n)} = I_n \otimes f(\tau)
\]

with $f(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The commutation matrix can be numerically implemented by $K_{(n,d)} = \text{vecperm}(d,n)$ in Matlab where \(\text{vecperm}\) is a function in The Matrix Computation Toolbox for MATLAB Higham (2002).

Two integral inequalities are presented as follows. The first one is taken from eq.(5) in Theorem 1 of Feng & Nguang (2018), and the second inequality is specifically proposed in this paper to deal with time-varying delays when it comes to constructing Krasovskii functional. Firstly, we define the following weighted Lebesgue function space

\[
\mathbb{L}_2^d((\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{R}^d) := \left\{ \phi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{L}_f((\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{R}^d) : \|\phi(\cdot)\|_{2,\infty} < \infty \right\}
\]

with $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\|\phi(\cdot)\|_{2,\infty} := \int_{\mathcal{K}} \varpi(\tau) \phi(\tau) d\tau$ where $\varpi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{L}_f((\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ and the function $\varpi(\cdot)$ has only countably infinite or finite number of zero values. Furthermore, $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm \infty\}$ and the Lebesgue measure of $\mathcal{K}$ is non-zero.

\(^1\)Note that $\sqrt{X^{-T}} = (\sqrt{X})^{-1}$ for any $X > 0$ based on the application of eigendecomposition of $X > 0$
Lemma 3. Let \( \varpi(\cdot) \) in (28) with \( d \in \mathbb{N} \) be given. Suppose that \( U \in \mathbb{S}_n^\omega \) with \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( f(\cdot) \in \mathbb{L}_\infty^\omega(\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{R}^d) \) satisfying
\[
\int_\mathcal{K} \varpi(\tau) f(\tau)^T(\tau) \, d\tau > 0, \tag{29}
\]
then we have
\[
\int_\mathcal{K} \varpi(\tau) x^T(\tau) U x(\tau) \, d\tau \geq \int_\mathcal{K} \varpi(\tau) x^T(\tau) F^T(\tau) \, d\tau (F^{-1} \otimes U) \int_\mathcal{K} \varpi(\tau) F(\tau) x(\tau) \, d\tau \tag{30}
\]
for all \( x(\cdot) \in \mathbb{L}_\infty^\omega(\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \), where \( F(\tau) = f(\tau) \otimes I_n \) and \( F = \int_\mathcal{K} \varpi(\tau) f(\tau)^T(\tau) \, d\tau \).

Note that \( F \) here is defined differently compared to the definition of \( F \) in Theorem 1 of Feng & Nguang (2018).

Lemma 4. Let \( \varpi(\cdot) \) in (28) with \( d \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \mathcal{K} = [a, b] \) with \( 0 \leq a < b \) be given. Assume \( U \in \mathbb{S}_n^\omega \) with \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( f(\tau) : = \text{Col}_{i=1}^n f_i(\tau) \in \mathbb{L}_\infty^\omega([a, b] \cap \mathbb{R}^d) \) satisfying
\[
\int_a^b \varpi(\tau) f(\tau)^T(\tau) \, d\tau > 0, \tag{31}
\]
then we have
\[
\int_a^b \varpi(\tau) x^T(\tau) U x(\tau) \, d\tau \geq [a] \left( \begin{bmatrix} U & Y \\ * & U \end{bmatrix} \otimes F^{-1} \right) \left( \begin{bmatrix} \int_a^b (I_n \otimes f(\tau)) x(\tau) \varpi(\tau) \, d\tau \\ \int_a^b (I_n \otimes f(\tau)) x(\tau) \varpi(\tau) \, d\tau \end{bmatrix} \right) \left( \begin{bmatrix} \int_a^b (f(\tau) \otimes I_n) x(\tau) \varpi(\tau) \, d\tau \\ \int_a^b (f(\tau) \otimes I_n) x(\tau) \varpi(\tau) \, d\tau \end{bmatrix} \right) \tag{32}
\]
for all \( x(\cdot) \in \mathbb{L}_\infty^\omega(\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \) and for any \( Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) satisfying \( [U, Y] \succeq 0 \), where \( F = \int_a^b \varpi(\tau) f(\tau)^T(\tau) \, d\tau \).

Proof. The proof is based on the insights illustrated in Seuret et al. (2016). Consider the equality
\[
\int_a^b \varpi(\tau) x^T(\tau) U x(\tau) \, d\tau = \int_a^b \varpi(\tau) \left[ \begin{bmatrix} x(\tau) \\ 0_n \end{bmatrix} \right]^T \left[ \begin{bmatrix} U & Y \\ * & U \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[ \begin{bmatrix} x(\tau) \\ 0_n \end{bmatrix} \right] \, d\tau \\
+ \int_a^b \varpi(\tau) \left[ \begin{bmatrix} 0_n \\ x(\tau) \end{bmatrix} \right]^T \left[ \begin{bmatrix} U & Y \\ * & U \end{bmatrix} \right] \left[ \begin{bmatrix} 0_n \\ x(\tau) \end{bmatrix} \right] \, d\tau = \int_a^b y^T(\tau) \left[ \begin{bmatrix} U & Y \\ * & U \end{bmatrix} \right] y(\tau) \, d\tau \tag{33}
\]
which holds for any \( Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) with
\[
\mathbb{R}^{2n} \ni y(\tau) : = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x(\tau) \\ 0_n \end{bmatrix}, \forall \tau \in [a, b] \right\} \\
\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0_n \\ x(\tau) \end{bmatrix}, \forall \tau \in [a, b] \right\}. \tag{34}
\]
Assume that \( Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) satisfies \( [U, Y] \succeq 0 \), then one can apply (30) with (26)–(27) to the rightmost integral in (33) with \( \mathcal{K} = [a, b] \) and \( f(\cdot) \in \mathbb{L}_\infty^\omega(\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{R}^d) \) satisfying (31), which yields
\[
\int_a^b \varpi(\tau) x^T(\tau) U x(\tau) \, d\tau = \int_a^b \varpi(\tau) y^T(\tau) \left[ \begin{bmatrix} U & Y \\ * & U \end{bmatrix} \right] y(\tau) \, d\tau \\
= \int_a^b \varpi(\tau) y^T(\tau) \left( \int_a^b \varpi(\tau) (f(\tau) \otimes I_{2n}) y(\tau) \, d\tau \right) \tag{34}
\]
respectively. Since \((\phi)\)

\[ \text{Proof.} \]

for any \(\phi\) by the definition of the Kronecker product. Substituting (35) into (35) and using (27) yield (32).

Remark 5. Note that the matrix \(F\) in (32) is related to the values of \(a; b\), but independent from \(\varphi\) which can be a function of other variables. This is an extremely important property which can be exploited in the derivations of tractable dissipative conditions in the next section.

A stability criterion based on the Krasovskii approach and the definition of dissipativity are presented as follows.

Lemma 5. Let \(w(t) \equiv 0_q\) in (17) and \(r_2 \geq r_1 \geq 0, r_2 > 0\) be given, then the trivial solution of (17) \(x(t) \equiv 0_n\) is uniformly asymptotically stable if there exist \(\epsilon_1; \epsilon_2; \epsilon_3 > 0\) and a differentiable functional \(v: \mathbb{C}([-r_2, 0] \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) with \(v(0_n) = 0\) such that

\[ \epsilon_1 \| \phi(0) \|_2^2 \leq v(\phi) \leq \epsilon_2 \| \phi(\cdot) \|_{\infty}^2, \]

\[ \frac{d^+}{dt} v(x_\theta(t)) \bigg|_{t=t_0, x_{\theta}(t)} = -\epsilon_3 \| \phi(0) \|_2 \]

for any \(\phi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{C}([-r_2, 0] \cap \mathbb{R}^n)\) in (17), where \(t_0\) is given in (17) and \(\| \phi(\cdot) \|_{\infty}^2 := \sup_{-r_2 \leq t \leq 0} \| \phi(t) \|_2 \) and \(\frac{d^+}{dt} f(x) := \limsup_{\eta \to 0} \frac{f(x + \eta) - f(x)}{\eta} \). Furthermore, \(x_{\theta}(\cdot)\) in (38) is defined by \(\forall t \geq t_0, \forall \theta \in [-r_2, 0]\), \(x_{\theta}(\theta) = x(t + \theta)\) in which \(x: [t_0 - r_2, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\) satisfies (17) with \(w(t) \equiv 0_q\).

Proof. Let \(u(\cdot), v(\cdot), w(\cdot)\) in Theorem 3 of Gu et al. (2003) to be quadratic functions with \(\epsilon_1; \epsilon_2; \epsilon_3 > 0\), respectively. Since (17) with \(w(t) \equiv 0_q\) is a special case of the general time-varying delay system considered in Theorem 3 of Gu et al. (2003), then Lemma 5 can be established.

The following definition of the dissipativity of (17) is based on the general definition of dissipativity in Willems (1972).

Definition 1. Given \(r_2 \geq r_1 \geq 0\) with \(r_2 > 0\), the closed-loop system (17) with a supply rate function \(s(z(t), w(t))\) is said to be dissipative if there exists a differentiable functional \(v: \mathbb{C}([-r_2, 0] \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) such that

\[ \forall t \geq t_0, \quad \phi(x_{\theta}(\cdot)) - s(z(t), w(t)) \leq 0 \]

with \(t_0\) in (17) and \(z(t), w(t)\) in (17). Moreover, \(x_{\theta}(\cdot)\) in (39) is defined by the equality \(\forall t \geq t_0, \forall \theta \in [-r_2, 0]\), \(x_{\theta}(\theta) = x(t + \theta)\) with \(x(t)\) satisfying (17).
Note that (39) is equivalent to the original definition of dissipativity, given $v : C([-r_2, 0] \cap \mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable. To characterize dissipativity, a quadratic supply function

$$s(z(t), w(t)) = \begin{bmatrix} z(t) \\ w(t) \end{bmatrix}^T J_1^{-1} J_2 \begin{bmatrix} z(t) \\ w(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad S_m \supset J_1^{-1} J_2 \leq 0, \quad J_1^{-1} \succ 0, \quad J_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$$

is applied in this paper where the structure of (40) is constructed in this paper based the general quadratic constraints applied in Scherer et al. (1997) together with the idea of factorizing the matrix $U_j$ in Scherer et al. (1997). Note that (40) is able to characterize numerous performance criteria such as

- $L^2$ gain performance: $J_1 = -\gamma I_m$, $J_2 = O_{m \times q}$, $J_3 = \gamma I_q$ where $\gamma > 0$.

- Passivity: $J_1 \in S^m_{>0}$, $J_2 = 0_m$, $J_2 = I_m$, $J_3 = 0_m$ with $m = q$.

### 4. Main results on dissipative controller synthesis

The main results on dissipative controller synthesis are presented in this section, which are summarized in two theorems and an algorithm. Specifically, the second theorem is proposed as a convexification of the bilinear term in a condition of the first Theorem which can be further solved iteratively by the proposed algorithm.

**Theorem 1.** Let $r_2 > r_1 > 0$ and all the parameters in Assumption 1 be given, then the closed-loop system (17) with the supply rate function in (40) is dissipative and the trivial solution of (17) with $w(t) \equiv 0_q$ is uniformly asymptotically stable if there exist $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $P_1 \in \mathbb{S}^n$, $P_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times e}$, $P_3 \in \mathbb{S}^e$ with $\rho = (d_1 + d_2)n$ and $Q_1; Q_2; R_1; R_2 \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ P_1 & P_3 \end{bmatrix} + (O_{n \times [I_{d_1} \otimes Q_1] + [I_{d_2} \otimes Q_2]} \otimes I_{d_1} \otimes Q_2) > 0,$$

(41)

$$Q_1 \geq 0, \quad Q_2 \geq 0, \quad R_1 \geq 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} R_2 & Y \\ * & R_2 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0,$$

(42)

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi \Sigma^T J_1^T \\ * \end{bmatrix} = \Sigma Y \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & I_m \end{bmatrix} + \Phi < 0$$

(43)

where $\Psi = C + B_2 [(I_{3+n} \otimes K) \otimes 0_q]$ with $C$ and $B_2$ in (20) and (21), and

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} O_{2n \times n} & O_{2n \times q} \\ I_n & O_{n \times q} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ P_1 & P_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A + B_1 [(I_{3+n} \otimes K) \otimes 0_q] \otimes I_n \otimes 0_{n \times q} \\ J_2 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} O_{(3n+n) \times m} & \Sigma \end{bmatrix} \Xi$$

(44)

$$\Xi = \begin{bmatrix} [Q_1 - Q_2 - r_3 R_2] \oplus [I(r_1, r_2)Q_2] \oplus [I(r_1, r_2)(-Q_1 - r_1 R_1)] \oplus (I_{r_1} \otimes R_1) \\ \oplus \left( \begin{bmatrix} K_{(n_2, n)} & 0_{e \times n} \\ K_{(n_2, n)}^T & 0_{n \times e} \end{bmatrix} \right) \left( \begin{bmatrix} R_2 & Y \\ R_2 & R_2 \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_{n_2} \right) \left( \begin{bmatrix} K_{(n_2, n)} & 0_{e \times n} \\ K_{(n_2, n)}^T & 0_{n \times e} \end{bmatrix} \right) \otimes J_3 \right)$$

(46)

$$\tilde{P} = \begin{bmatrix} -F_1^{-1} f_1(0) \\ \sqrt{F_2^{-1} f_2(-r_1)} \\ \sqrt{F_2^{-1} f_2(-r_1)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} F_1 f_1(0) \\ F_2 f_2(-r_2) \\ F_2 f_2(-r_1) \end{bmatrix}$$

(47)
with $A, B_1$ in (18)–(19) and $\mathbb{1}(r_1, r_2), \hat{\mathbb{1}}(r_1, r_2)$ in (23) and $G_1, G_2$ in (7). Moreover, $F_1 = \int_{-r_1}^{0} f_1(\tau)f_1^T(\tau)d\tau$ and $F_2 = \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} f_2(\tau)f_2^T(\tau)d\tau$ and the rest of the parameters in (43) is defined as

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} O_{n \times 2n} & P_1 & P_2 & O_{n \times q} & O_{n \times m} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Pi = [A + B_1 [(I_{3+n} \otimes K) \oplus O_q] O_{n \times m}] \quad (48)$$

and

$$\Phi = \text{Sy} \left( \begin{bmatrix} O_{2n \times q} & P_2 \hat{\mathbb{1}} & O_{q \times (q+m)} \\ \hat{\mathbb{1}} & O_{(q+m) \times m} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \Sigma \otimes O_{n \times m} \end{bmatrix} - \Xi \otimes (-J_1) \right) \quad (49)$$

Furthermore, with $r_1 = r_2$, $d_2 = \delta_2 = 0$ and $Q_2 = R_2 = Y = O_n$, then the inequalities in (41)–(43) are a dissipative synthesis condition for the closed system with $r_1 = r_2 > 0$. Finally, with $r_2 > 0$, $r_1 = 0$, $d_1 = \delta_1 = 0$ and $Q_1 = R_1 = O_n$, then the inequalities in (41)–(43) are a dissipative synthesis condition for the closed loop system (17) with $r_2 > 0, r_1 = 0$.

**Proof.** The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the construction of the Krassovskii functional:

$$v(x(t), \theta) = \eta^T(t) \begin{bmatrix} P_1 \hat{\mathbb{1}} & P_2 \hat{\mathbb{1}} & \hat{\mathbb{1}} \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} \eta(t) + \int_{-r_1}^{0} x^T(t+\tau) \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 + r_1(\tau + r_1) R_1 \end{bmatrix} x(t+\tau) d\tau$$

$$+ \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} x^T(t+\tau) \begin{bmatrix} Q_2 + r_3(\tau + r_2) R_2 \end{bmatrix} x(t+\tau) d\tau \quad (50)$$

where $x_1(\cdot)$ follows the same definition in (39) and $P_1 \in \mathbb{S}^n, P_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}, \hat{\mathbb{1}} \in \mathbb{S}^q$ and $Q_1; Q_2; R_1; R_2 \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and

$$\eta(t) := \text{Col} \left[ x(t), \int_{-r_1}^{0} \left( \sqrt{F_1^{-1}} f_1(\tau) \otimes I_n \right) x(t+\tau) d\tau, \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} \left( \sqrt{F_2^{-1}} f_2(\tau) \otimes I_n \right) x(t+\tau) d\tau \right] \quad (51)$$

with $F_1 = \int_{-r_1}^{0} f_1(\tau) f_1^T(\tau) d\tau$ and $F_2 = \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} f_2(\tau) f_2^T(\tau) d\tau$. Note that given the conditions in (7), both $\sqrt{F_1^{-1}}$ and $\sqrt{F_2^{-1}}$ are well defined.

We will first prove the results of the synthesis condition with $r_2 > r_1 > 0$, then the synthesis conditions for the cases of $r_1 = r_2 > 0$ and $r_1 = 0, r_2 > 0$ can be easily obtained based on the condition for $r_2 > r_1 > 0$.

Now given $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ in (17) with $r_2 > r_1 > 0$, differentiating $v(x(t), \theta)$ along the trajectory of (17) and consider (40) produces

$$\forall t \geq t_0, \quad \dot{v}(x(t), \theta) = s(x(t), w(t))$$

$$= \chi^T(t) \text{Sy} \left( \begin{bmatrix} O_{2n \times n} & O_{2n \times 0} & I_n \\ O_{q \times n} & O_{q \times 0} & \hat{\mathbb{1}}^T \\ O_{q \times q} & O_{q \times 0} & \mathbb{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & P_2 & \hat{\mathbb{1}} \otimes I_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A + B_1 [(I_{3+n} \otimes K) \oplus O_q] \end{bmatrix} \chi(t) \right)$$

$$+ x^T(t) (Q_1 + r_1 R_1) x(t) - x^T(t - r_2) Q_2 x(t - r_2) - x^T(t - r_1) (Q_1 - Q_2 - r_3 R_2) x(t - r_1)$$

$$- w^T(t) J_3 w(t) - \int_{-r_1}^{0} x^T(t+\tau) R_1 x(t+\tau) d\tau - \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} x^T(t+\tau) R_2 x(t+\tau) d\tau$$

$$- \chi^T(t) \Sigma^T \tilde{J} J_1^{-1} \tilde{J} \Sigma \chi(t) \quad (52)$$

where $\chi(t)$ is given in (22) and $\Sigma, \tilde{J}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{1}}$ are defined in the statements of Theorem 1. Note that $\hat{\mathbb{1}}$ in (47) is obtained by the relations

$$\int_{-r_1}^{0} \left( \sqrt{F_1^{-1}} f_1(\tau) \otimes I_n \right) x(t+\tau) d\tau = (\sqrt{F_1^{-1}} f_1(0) \otimes I_n) x(t)$$
\[
\int_{-r_1}^{-r_1} \left( \sqrt{F_1^{-1} f_2(-r_1) \otimes I_n} \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau = \left( \sqrt{F_2^{-1} M \sqrt{G_1} \otimes I_n} \right) \int_{-r_1}^{0} \left( \sqrt{G_1^{-1} f_1(\tau) \otimes I_n} \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau
\]

which are derived via (6)–(7) and (15)–(16). Note that also the parameters \( A, B_1, C \) and \( B_2 \) in (52) are given in (18)–(21).

Let \( R_1 \preceq 0 \) and \( [R_2, Y] \succeq 0 \) with \( Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \), and apply (30) and (32) with \( \varphi(\tau) = 1 \) and appropriate \( f(\tau) \) to the integral terms \( \int_{-r_1}^{0} x^\top(t + \tau) R_1 x(t + \tau) d\tau \) and \( \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} x^\top(t + \tau) R_2 x(t + \tau) d\tau \) in (52), respectively. Then we have

\[
\int_{-r_1}^{0} x^\top(t + \tau) R_1 x(t + \tau) d\tau \geq [s] (I_{n_1} \otimes R_1) \left( \int_{-r_1}^{0} \left( \sqrt{G_1^{-1} f_1(\tau) \otimes I_n} \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau \right),
\]

\[
\int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} x^\top(t + \tau) R_2 x(t + \tau) d\tau \geq [s] \left( \begin{bmatrix} R_2 & Y \\ R_2 & I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \left( \begin{bmatrix} I_n \otimes \sqrt{G_2^{-1} f_2(\tau) \otimes I_n} \\ I_n \otimes \sqrt{G_2^{-1} f_2(\tau) \otimes I_n} \end{bmatrix} \right) \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} x(t + \tau) d\tau,
\]

Given the definition of \( I(r_1, r_2) \) and \( \hat{I}(r_1, r_2) \) in (23) and \( \hat{O}(n, p, r_1, r_2) \) in (22) with \( r_2 > r_1 > 0 \), applying the inequalities in (55)–(56) with (42) to (52) produces

\[
\forall t \geq t_0, \quad \hat{v}(\mathbf{x}_t) - s(\mathbf{z}(t), \mathbf{w}(t)) \leq \chi^\top(t) \left( \Psi - \Sigma J_1^{-1} J_1^{-1} J_1 \right) \chi(t)
\]

where \( \Psi \) is given in (44) and \( \chi(t) \) is given in (22). It is obvious to conclude that if (42) and \( \Psi - \Sigma J_1^{-1} J_1 \otimes \Sigma < 0 \) are satisfied, then

\[
\exists \epsilon_3 > 0 : \forall t \geq t_0, \quad \hat{v}(\mathbf{x}_t) - s(\mathbf{z}(t), \mathbf{w}(t)) \leq -\epsilon_3 \| \mathbf{x}(t) \|_2.
\]

Moreover, considering the structure of \( \Psi - \Sigma J_1^{-1} J_1 \otimes \Sigma < 0 \), one can conclude that (58) infers

\[
\exists \epsilon_3 > 0, \quad \frac{d}{dt} \hat{v}(\mathbf{x}_t) \bigg|_{t=t_0, \mathbf{x}_t(t) = \phi(t)} \leq -\epsilon_3 \| \phi(0) \|_2
\]

for any \( \phi(\cdot) \in C([-r_2, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \) in (17) with \( t = t_0 \) and \( \mathbf{w}(t) \equiv 0 \). Note that \( \mathbf{x}_t(\cdot) \) in (59) is in line with the definition in (38). As a result, it is obvious that the existence of the feasible solutions of (42) and \( \Psi - \Sigma J_1^{-1} J_1 \otimes \Sigma < 0 \) infers that (50) satisfies (39) and (38). Finally, applying the Schur complement to \( \Psi - \Sigma J_1^{-1} J_1 \otimes \Sigma < 0 \) with (42) and \( J_1^{-1} < 0 \) gives (43). Therefore we have proved that the existence of the feasible solutions of (42) and (43) infer the existence of a functional (50) and \( \epsilon_3 > 0 \) satisfying (39) and (38).
Now we start to show that there exist \( \epsilon_1 > 0 \) and \( \epsilon_2 > 0 \) such that \((50)\) satisfies \((37)\) if \((41)\) and \((42)\) are satisfied. Let \( \| \phi(\cdot) \|^2_\infty := \sup_{r_2 \leq r \leq 0} \| \phi(\tau) \|^2_\infty \) and consider the structure of \((50)\) with \( t = t_0 \), it follows that there exists \( \lambda > 0 \) such that

\[
v(x_{t_0}(\cdot)) = v(\phi(\cdot)) \leq \eta^T(t_0) \lambda \eta(t_0) + \int_{-r_2}^0 \phi^T(\tau) \lambda \phi(\tau) d\tau \leq \lambda \| \phi(0) \|^2_\infty + \lambda r_2 \| \phi(\cdot) \|^2_\infty
\]

\[
+ \int_{-r_2}^0 \phi^T(\tau) (\sqrt{F_1^{-1}} f_1(\tau) \otimes I_n) \phi(\tau) d\tau
\]

\[
+ \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} \phi^T(\tau) (\sqrt{F_2^{-1}} f_2(\tau) \otimes I_n) \phi(\tau) d\tau \leq (\lambda + \lambda r_2) \| \phi(\cdot) \|^2_\infty
\]

\[
\leq (\lambda + \lambda r_2) \| \phi(\cdot) \|^2_\infty + \lambda \int_{-r_2}^0 \phi^T(\tau) \phi(\tau) d\tau \leq (\lambda + 2\lambda r_2) \| \phi(\cdot) \|^2_\infty
\]

for any \( \phi(\cdot) \in C([-r_2, 0], R^n) \) in \((17)\), where \((60)\) is derived via the property of quadratic forms: \( \forall X \in \mathbb{S}^n, \exists \lambda > 0 : \forall x \in R^n \setminus \{0\}, x^T (\lambda I_n - X) x > 0 \) together with the application of \((30)\) with \( \varpi(\tau) = 1 \) and appropriate \( f(\tau) \). Consequently, the inequality in \((60)\) shows that it is possible to find an upper bound for \((50)\) which satisfies \((37)\) with \( \epsilon_2 > 0 \).

Now we want to prove that the existence of the feasible solutions of \((41)\) and \((42)\) infer that \((50)\) satisfies \((37)\) with certain \( \epsilon_1 > 0 \) and \( \epsilon_2 > 0 \). Applying \((30)\) to \((50)\) with \( \varpi(\tau) = 1 \) and appropriate \( f(\tau) \) produces

\[
\int_{-r_2}^0 x^T(t + \tau) Q_1 x(t + \tau) d\tau \geq \| [I_{d_1} \otimes Q_1] \int_{-r_2}^0 \left( \sqrt{F_1^{-1}} f_1(\tau) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau,
\]

\[
\int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} x^T(t + \tau) Q_2 x(t + \tau) d\tau \geq \| [I_{d_2} \otimes Q_2] \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} \left( \sqrt{F_2^{-1}} f_2(\tau) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau
\]

provided that \((42)\) holds. Moreover, by utilizing \((61)\) to \((50)\) with \((42)\) and \((60)\), it is clear to see that the existence of the feasible solutions of \((41)\) and \((42)\) infer that \((50)\) satisfies \((37)\) with some \( \epsilon_1; \epsilon_2 > 0 \).

In conclusion, we have shown that the existence of the feasible solutions of \((41)\)–\((43)\) infers the existence of a functional \((50)\) and \( \epsilon_1; \epsilon_2 > 0 \) satisfying the dissipative condition in \((39)\), and the stability criteria in \((37)\)–\((38)\). As a result, it shows that the existence of the feasible solutions of \((41)\)–\((43)\) infers that the trivial solution of \((17)\) with \( w(t) \equiv 0 \) is uniformly asymptotically stable, and \((17)\) with \((40)\) is dissipative.

Now consider the case of \( r_1 = r_2 \) where \((17)\) becomes a linear distributed delay system with a constant delay value. It is not difficult to show that the corresponding synthesis condition constructed via \((50)\) with \( r_1 = r_2 \) can be obtained by letting \( d_2 = d_2 = 0 \) in \((41)\)–\((43)\) with \( Q_2 = R_2 = Y = O_n \). Meanwhile, the corresponding synthesis condition constructed with \( r_1 = 0 \) and \( r_2 > 0 \) can be obtained by letting \( d_1 = d_1 = 0 \) in \((41)\)–\((43)\) with \( Q_1 = R_1 = O_n \).

\[\blacksquare\]

**Remark 6.** The use of \( I(r_1, r_2), \hat{I}(r_1, r_2) \) in \((23)\) and \((46)\), and \( \hat{O}(n, p, r_1, r_2) \) in \((22)\) greatly enhances the capacity of the proposed synthesis condition in Theorem 1 via the application of empty matrices. Without the presence of these three functions, the synthesis condition with \( r_2 > r_1 > 0 \) may not be directly applied to the cases of \( r_1 = r_2 \) or \( r_1 = 0, r_2 > 0 \). This is due to the changes of the mathematical structures of the closed-loop systems \((17)\) and the Krasovskii functionals \((50)\) with \( r_1 = r_2 \) or \( r_1 = 0, r_2 > 0 \). We believe that the applications of these functions in formulating synthesis (stability) conditions can be adopted by most Krasovskii functional approaches. As a result, the synthesis (stability) conditions of systems with constant \((r_1 = r_2)\) and time-varying delays can be formulated together without introducing ill-posed structures.

**Remark 7.** By analyzing the derivation of the synthesis condition in Theorem 1, the significance of the application of \((32)\) can be easily grasped. Indeed, without using \((32)\) at the step in \((56)\), consider the situation when \((30)\) is applied to \( \int_{-r_1}^{-r_2} x^T(t + \tau) Q_2 x(t + \tau) d\tau \) and \( \int_{-r_1}^{0} x^T(t + \tau) Q_2 x(t + \tau) d\tau \), which
gives the inequalities
\[
\int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} x^T(t + \tau)Q_2 x(t + \tau) d\tau \geq \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\int_{-r_1}^{-r_1} \left( \tilde{F}_1(r(t)) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau \\
\int_{-r_2}^{-r_2} \left( \tilde{F}_2(r(t)) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau
\end{array} \right]^T \times \left[ \begin{array}{cc}
\tilde{F}_1^{-1}(r(t)) \otimes Q_2 & O_{d_1n \times d_2n} \\
O_{d_2n \times d_1n} & \tilde{F}_2^{-1}(r(t)) \otimes Q_2
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\int_{-r_1}^{-r_1} \left( \tilde{F}_1(r(t)) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau \\
\int_{-r_2}^{-r_2} \left( \tilde{F}_2(r(t)) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau
\end{array} \right]
\]  
(62)

where \( \tilde{F}_1(r(t)) = \int_{-r_1}^{-r_1} \tilde{F}_2(r(t)) \tilde{F}_2^T(r(t)) d\tau \) and \( \tilde{F}_2(r(t)) = \int_{-r_2}^{-r_2} \tilde{F}_2(r(t)) \tilde{F}_2^T(r(t)) d\tau \). Now combine the inequalities in (62), we have
\[
\int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} x^T(t + \tau)Q_2 x(t + \tau) d\tau \geq \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\int_{-r_1}^{-r_1} \left( \tilde{F}_1(r(t)) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau \\
\int_{-r_2}^{-r_2} \left( \tilde{F}_2(r(t)) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau
\end{array} \right]^T \times \left[ \begin{array}{cc}
\tilde{F}_1^{-1}(r(t)) \otimes Q_2 & O_{d_1n \times d_2n} \\
O_{d_2n \times d_1n} & \tilde{F}_2^{-1}(r(t)) \otimes Q_2
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\int_{-r_1}^{-r_1} \left( \tilde{F}_1(r(t)) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau \\
\int_{-r_2}^{-r_2} \left( \tilde{F}_2(r(t)) \otimes I_n \right) x(t + \tau) d\tau
\end{array} \right]
\]  
(63)

which also furnishes a lower bound for \( \int_{-r_2}^{-r_1} x^T(t + \tau)Q_2 x(t + \tau) d\tau \). Conventionally, the reciprocally convex combination lemma Park et al. (2011) or its derivatives Seuret & Gouaisbaut (2017b); Zhang et al. (2017a,b); Seuret & Gouaisbaut (2017a) can be applied to a matrix in the form of \( \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{O_n} & X \\ O_n & \frac{1}{X} \end{bmatrix} \) to construct a tractable lower bound with a finite dimension. However, the structure of \( \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{O_n} & X \\ O_n & \frac{1}{X} \end{bmatrix} \) may not be guaranteed by
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{F}_1^{-1}(r(t)) \otimes Q_2 & O_{d_1n \times d_2n} \\
O_{d_2n \times d_1n} & \tilde{F}_2^{-1}(r(t)) \otimes Q_2
\end{bmatrix}
\]  
(64)
since the terms of \( \tilde{F}_1^{-1}(r(t)) \) and \( \tilde{F}_2^{-1}(r(t)) \) are nonlinear with respect to \( r(t) \in [r_1, r_2] \) in general. On the other hand, if (63) is applied directly to replace the step of (55), then the corresponding condition (43) will become infinite dimensional and also nonlinear in general with respect to \( r(t) \in [r_1, r_2] \). This shows the contribution of the integral inequality in (32) by which (56) can be constructed where the symmetric matrix in the lower bound is of finite dimensional.

**Remark 8.** Theoretically, \( f_1(\tau) \) and \( f_2(\tau) \) in (51) can be any differentiable function since the decompositions in (2)–(5) are always achievable via the proper choices of \( \varphi_1(\tau) \) and \( \varphi_2(\tau) \). This gives great flexibility to the structure of the Krasovskii functional (50) in this paper. On the other hand, \( f_1(\tau) \) and \( f_2(\tau) \) can be chosen considering the elements in the distributed delay terms of (1).

The inequality in (43) is bilinear if a synthesis problem is concerned, where it cannot be solved directly via standard semidefinite programming solvers. In the following theorem, a convex dissipative synthesis condition is derived via the application of Projection Lemma Gahinet & Apkarian (1994) whose feasible solutions infer the existence of the feasible solutions of the conditions in Theorem 1.

**Lemma 6 (Projection Lemma).** Gahinet & Apkarian (1994) Given \( n; p; q \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \Pi \in \mathbb{S}^n \), \( P \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n} \), \( Q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n} \), there exists \( \Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q} \) such that the following two propositions are equivalent:
\[
\Pi + P^T \Theta^T Q + Q^T \Theta P \prec 0,
\]  
(65)

\(^2\)If \( \tilde{f}_1(\tau) = \tilde{f}_2(\tau) \) and they only contain Legendre polynomials with appropriate structures, then the reciprocally convex combination lemma or its derivatives can be applied to (64). Nevertheless, this is a very special case of the \( \tilde{f}_1(\tau) \), \( \tilde{f}_2(\tau) \) considered in this paper.
\[ P_{\perp}^T \Pi P_{\perp} \prec 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{\perp}^T \Pi Q_{\perp} \prec 0, \quad (66) \]

where the columns of \( P_{\perp} \) and \( Q_{\perp} \) contain bases of null space of matrix \( P \) and \( Q \), respectively, which means that \( PP_{\perp} = 0 \) and \( QQ_{\perp} = 0 \).


**Theorem 2.** Given \( r_2 > r_1 > 0 \) and the functions and parameters in Assumption 1 with \( \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{3+\kappa} \subset \mathbb{R} \), then the closed-loop system (17) with the supply rate function in (40) is dissipative and the trivial solution of (17) with \( \mathbf{w}(t) \equiv \mathbf{0}_q \) is uniformly asymptotically stable if there exists \( \hat{P}_1 \in \mathbb{S}^n, \hat{P}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}, \hat{P}_3 \in \mathbb{S}^q \) and \( Q_1; \hat{Q}_2; \hat{R}_1; \hat{R}_2; X \in \mathbb{S}^n \) and \( \hat{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q} \) and \( V \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n} \) such that

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{P}_1 & \hat{P}_2 \\
\hat{P}_3 & 0
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
0_n \oplus [I_d \oplus Q_1] \oplus [I_d \oplus Q_2]
\end{bmatrix} \succ 0,
\]

\[
\hat{Q}_1 \succeq 0, \quad \hat{Q}_2 \succeq 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{R}_2^T & \hat{Y}
\end{bmatrix} \succeq 0,
\]

\[
\mathbf{Sy}\left( \begin{bmatrix}
I_n \\
n_{(q+m) \times n}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{Ca}^{3+\kappa} & I_n \\
O_{(q+m) \times n}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
-I & \hat{\Pi} \\
0 & \hat{\Phi}
\end{bmatrix} \right) + \begin{bmatrix}
0_n & \hat{\Phi}
\end{bmatrix} \prec 0
\]

where \( \hat{\Pi} = [A [(I_{3+\kappa} \otimes X) \oplus I_q] + B_1 [(I_{3+\kappa} \otimes V) \oplus O_q] O_{n \times m}] \) and \( \hat{\Phi} = [O_{n \times 2n} \hat{P}_1 \hat{P}_2 \hat{I} O_{n \times (q+m)}] \) with \( \hat{I} \) in (45) and

\[
\hat{\Phi} = \mathbf{Sy}\left( \begin{bmatrix}
O_{2n \times q} \\
\hat{P}_2 \\
\hat{Y} \hat{P}_3
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{\Sigma} & I_n \\
O_{(q+m) \times q}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{\Sigma} & O_m
\end{bmatrix}
\right)
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{Q}_1 - \hat{Q}_2 - r_3 \hat{R}_2 \\
\hat{I}(r_1, r_2) \hat{Q}_2 + \hat{I}(r_1, r_2)(-\hat{Q}_1 - r_1 \hat{R}_1) + [I_{n_{\Sigma}} \oplus \hat{R}_1]
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\oplus \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{R}_2 \\
\hat{Y}
\end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{n_{\Sigma}} \begin{bmatrix}
K_{(n, n_{\Sigma})} & O_{n \times 2n}
\end{bmatrix} \oplus J_3 \oplus (-J_1)
\]

with \( \hat{\Sigma} = C [(I_{3+\kappa} \otimes X) \oplus I_q] + B_2 [(I_{3+\kappa} \otimes V) \oplus O_q] \) and \( \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \mathbf{C} \) are given in (18)-(21). The controller gain is calculated via \( K = V X^{-1} \). Furthermore, with \( r_1 = r_2, d_2 = \delta_2 = 0 \) and \( \hat{Q}_2 = \hat{R}_2 = \hat{Y} = O_n \), then the inequalities in (67)-(69) are a dissipative synthesis condition for the closed system with \( r_1 = r_2 > 0 \). Finally, with \( r_2 > 0, r_1 = 0, d_1 = \delta_1 = 0 \) and \( \hat{Q}_1 = \hat{R}_1 = O_n \), then the inequalities in (67)-(69) are a dissipative synthesis condition for the closed loop system (17) with \( r_2 > 0, r_1 = 0 \).

Proof. First of all, note that the inequality \( \mathbf{Sy} (P^T \Pi) + \hat{\Phi} \prec 0 \) in (43) can be reformulated into

\[
\mathbf{Sy}(P^T \Pi) + \hat{\Phi} = \begin{bmatrix}
\Pi & 0_n \\
I_{3n+q+m} & \hat{\Phi}
\end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix}
O_n & \Pi \\
I_{3n+q+m} & \hat{\Phi}
\end{bmatrix} \prec 0
\]

which is equivalent to (43). It is easy to observe that the structure of (71) is similar to one of the inequalities in (66) as part of the statements of Projection Lemma. Given the fact that two matrix inequalities are presented in (66), thus a new matrix inequality must be constructed accordingly. Now consider the following inequality

\[
\Upsilon^T \begin{bmatrix}
O_n & \hat{\Phi}
\end{bmatrix} \Upsilon \prec 0
\]
with $Y^\top := \begin{bmatrix} 0_{(q+m)\times(4n+\kappa n)} & I_{q+m} \end{bmatrix}$, which can be further simplified into
\[
Y^\top \begin{bmatrix} O_n & P \\ * & \Phi \end{bmatrix} Y = \begin{bmatrix} -J_3 - SY(D_2^\top J_2) & D_2^\top J_1 \\ * & \Phi \end{bmatrix} < 0. \tag{73}
\]
Note that (73) is the very matrix produced by extracting the $2 \times 2$ block matrix at the bottom right of the matrices $SY(P^\top \Pi) + \Phi$ or $\Phi$. As a result, it is clear that (73) is automatically satisfied if (71) or (43) holds. Hence the new constructed inequality (73) has no impact to the solvability of the original condition in (43).

On the other hand, the following identities
\[
\begin{bmatrix} -I_n & \Pi \\ I_{3n+\kappa n+q+m} \end{bmatrix} = O_{n\times(3n+\kappa n+q+m)}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} -I_n & \Pi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Pi \\ I_{3n+\kappa n+q+m} \end{bmatrix}
\]
\[
\begin{bmatrix} I_{4n+\kappa n} & O_{(4n+\kappa n)\times(q+m)} \\ O_{(q+m)\times(4n+\kappa n)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} O_{(4n+\kappa n)\times(q+m)} \\ I_{q+m} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{4n+\kappa n} & O_{(4n+\kappa n)\times(q+m)} \end{bmatrix} Y = O_{(4n+\kappa n)\times(q+m)} \tag{74}
\]
which satisfy rank $([-I_n \quad \Pi]) = n$ and rank $(I_{4n+\kappa n} \quad O_{(4n+\kappa n)\times(q+m)})$ imply that the matrix terms in (74) can be utilized with Projection Lemma (Lemma 6) given the rank nullity theorem.

Applying Lemma 6 to (71) and (73) with (74) yields the conclusion that (71) and (73) are true if and only if
\[
\exists W \in \mathbb{R}^{(4n+\kappa n)\times n}: SY \begin{bmatrix} I_{4n+\kappa n} \\ O_{(q+m)\times(4n+\kappa n)} \end{bmatrix} W \begin{bmatrix} [-I_n & \Pi] \\ * & \Phi \end{bmatrix} < 0. \tag{75}
\]
Now the inequality in (75) is still bilinear due to the product between $W$ and $\Pi$. To convexify (75), consider
\[
W := \text{Col} \begin{bmatrix} W, \text{Col}_{i=1}^{3+\kappa} \alpha_i W \end{bmatrix} \tag{76}
\]
with $W \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{3+\kappa} \subset \mathbb{R}$. With (76), (75) becomes
\[
\Theta = SY \begin{bmatrix} W \\ \text{Col}_{i=1}^{3+\kappa} \alpha_i W \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} [-I_n & \Pi] \\ * & \Phi \end{bmatrix} < 0 \tag{77}
\]
which infers (71). Note that having the structural constraints in (76) infers that (77) is no longer an equivalent but only a sufficient condition implying (71) or (43). It is also important to stress that an invertible $W$ is automatically implied by (77) since the expression $-2W$ is the only element at the first diagonal block of $\Theta$.

Let $X^\top = W^{-1}$, we apply congruence transformations to the matrix inequalities in (41),(42) and (77) with the fact that an invertible $W$ is implied by (77). Then one can conclude that
\[
X^\top Q_1 X \succ 0, \quad X^\top Q_2 X \succ 0, \quad X^\top R_1 X \succ 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} X^\top & O_n \\ * & X^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R_2 & Y \\ * & R_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X & O_n \\ * & X \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, \tag{78}
\]
\[
[(I_{4+\kappa} \otimes X^\top) \oplus I_{q+m}] \Theta [(I_{4+\kappa} \otimes X) \oplus I_{q+m}] \prec 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ * & P_3 \end{bmatrix} (I_{1+d_1+d_2} \otimes X) \succ 0
\]
hold if and only if (41),(42) and (77) hold. Moreover, with (15) and the definitions $\tilde{Y} := X^\top YX$ and
\[
\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{P}_1 \\ \tilde{P}_2 \\ \tilde{P}_3 \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ * & P_3 \end{bmatrix} (I_{1+d_1+d_2} \otimes X), \quad \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Q}_1 & \tilde{Q}_2 \\ \tilde{R}_1 & \tilde{R}_2 \end{bmatrix} := X^\top [Q_1 X \quad Q_2 X \quad R_1 X \quad R_2 X], \tag{79}
\]
16
the inequalities in (78) can be rewritten into (67) and (68) and

\[
[*] \Theta (I_{4+n} \otimes X) \oplus I_{q+m} = \hat{\Theta} = SY \left( \begin{bmatrix} I_n & \text{Col}_{i=1}^{3+n} \alpha_i I_n \\ O \otimes_{(q+m) \times n} \end{bmatrix} [-X \quad \hat{I}] \right) + \left[ O_n \quad \hat{P} \quad \hat{\Phi} \right] < 0
\]

(80)

where

\[
\hat{P} = XP (I_{3+n} \otimes X) \oplus I_{q+m} = \begin{bmatrix} O_{n \times 2n} & \hat{P}_1 & \hat{P}_2 \hat{I} & O_{n \times q} & O_{n \times m} \end{bmatrix}
\]

(81)

and

\[
\hat{I} = \Pi (I_{3+n} \otimes X) \oplus I_{q+m} = \begin{bmatrix} \Pi \Pi (I_{3+n} \otimes X) \oplus I_{q} + B_1 (I_{3+n} \otimes X) \otimes I_q \\ \Pi \Pi (I_{3+n} \otimes X) \oplus I_{q} \end{bmatrix} O_{n \times m}
\]

(82)

with \( V = KX \) and \( \hat{\Phi} \) in (70). Note that (80) is the same as (69), and the form of \( \hat{\Phi} \) in (70) is derived via the relations \( \hat{T} (I_{n} \otimes X) = (I_{d_1} \otimes X) \hat{T} \) and

\[
\left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \hat{P} \otimes I_n & O_{q \times (q+m)} \\ I_{d_1} \otimes I_n & O_{q \times (q+m)} \end{array} \right] \Pi \Pi (I_{3+n} \otimes X) \oplus I_{q+m} = \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} (I_{d_1} \otimes I_n) \hat{P} \otimes I_n & O_{q \times (q+m)} \end{array} \right],
\]

(83)

\[
\Pi \Pi (I_{3+n} \otimes X) \oplus I_{q+m} = \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} X \otimes I_{n+k} & O_{n \times 2n} \\ X \otimes I_{n+k} & O_{n \times 2n} \end{array} \right],
\]

(84)

which are derived from the properties of matrices with (15),(16) and (26). Furthermore, since \(-2X\) is the only element at the first diagonal block of \( \Theta \) in (69), thus \( X \) is invertible if (69) holds. This is consistent with the fact that an invertible \( W \) is implied by the matrix inequality in (77).

As a result, we have shown the equivalence between (41)–(42) and (67)–(68). Meanwhile, it has been shown that (69) is equivalent to (77) which infers (43). Consequently, (41)–(43) are satisfied if (67)–(69) hold with some \( W \in S^n \) and \( \{ \alpha_i \}_{i=1}^{3+n} \subset \mathbb{R} \). Thus it demonstrates that the existence of the feasible solutions of (67)–(69) ensures that the trivial solution \( x(t) \equiv 0 \) of the closed-loop system (17) with \( w(t) \equiv 0 \) is uniformly asymptotically stable and (17) with (40) is dissipative.

Given the aforementioned procedure of constructing the constraints in (67)–(69), it is not difficult to show that a synthesis condition for the case of \( r_1 = r_2 \) can be obtained by letting \( d_2 = \delta_2 = 0 \) in (67)–(69) with \( Q_2 = \hat{R}_2 = \hat{Y} = O_n \) and \( r_1 = r_2 \), and a synthesis condition for the case of \( r_1 = 0 \) and \( r_2 > 0 \) can be obtained by letting \( d_1 = \delta_1 = 0 \) in (67)–(69) with \( Q_1 = \hat{R}_1 = O_n \) and \( r_1 = 0 \) and \( r_2 > 0 \).

**Remark 9.** Theorem 2 is specifically derived to handle a synthesis problem for (17). If an open-loop system is considered with \( B_1 = \hat{B}_2 (\tau) = O_{n \times p} \) and \( B_2 = \hat{B}_2 (\tau) = O_{m \times p} \), then Theorem 1 should be applied instead of Theorem 2 since the introduction of the slack variables in Theorem 2 does not introduce extra feasibility with reference to the optimization constraints in 1.

**Remark 10.** For \( \{ \alpha_i \}_{i=1}^{3+n} \subset \mathbb{R} \) in (69), some values of \( \alpha_i \) can be more significant than others in terms of their impact on the feasibility of (69). For example, the value of \( \alpha_3 \) may have a significant impact on the feasibility of (69) since it may determine the feasibility of the very diagonal block related to \( A_1 \) in (69). A simple assignment of \( \{ \alpha_i \}_{i=1}^{3+n} \subset \mathbb{R} \) can be \( \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0 \) and \( \alpha_3 = 0 \), \( i = 3 \ldots 3 + \kappa = 3 + d_1 + \delta_1 + 2d_2 + 2\delta_2 \) which allows one to only adjust the value of \( \alpha_3 \) to use Theorem 2.
4.1. An inner convex approximation solution of Theorem 1

By fixing the values of \( \{ \alpha_i \}_{i=1}^{3+\kappa} \subset \mathbb{R} \), Theorem 2 provides a convex synthesis solution of (17). Nevertheless, the simplification applied in (76) can make Theorem 2 to be more conservative than Theorem 1. In this subsection, an iterative algorithm is derived based on the method proposed in Dinh et al. (2012) to solve the conditions in Theorem 1 in an iterative fashion, where the algorithm can be initiated by a feasible solution of Theorem 2. Thus the advantage of both Theorem 1 and (2) are combined together in the proposed algorithm without solving nonlinear optimization constraints.

First of all, note that the inequality in (43) is nonconvex in general whereas (41) and (42) remain convex even when a synthesis problem is considered. Now it is obvious that (43) can be rewritten into

\[
\mathcal{U}(H, K) := \text{Sy} \left[ P^T \Pi \right] + \Phi = \text{Sy} \left( P^T B \left[ (I_{3+\kappa} \otimes K) \oplus O_{p+m} \right] \right) + \tilde{\Phi} < 0 \tag{85}
\]

with \( B = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & O_{n \times m} \end{bmatrix} \) and \( \tilde{\Phi} = \text{Sy} \left( P^T \left[ A \ O_{n \times m} \right] \right) + \Phi \), where \( P \) is given in (48), and \( A \) and \( B_1 \) are given in (18)–(19), and \( H := \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \end{bmatrix} \) with \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) in Theorem 1. Note that there are no products between decision variables in \( \tilde{\Phi} \) in (85), thus \( \tilde{\Phi} \) contains no non-convexities. Considering the results of Example 3 in Dinh et al. (2012), one can conclude that \( \Delta \left( \cdot, G, \Gamma, \tilde{\Gamma} \right) \), which is defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta \left( G, \tilde{G}, \Gamma, \tilde{\Gamma} \right) := & \left[ G^T - \tilde{G}^T \right] \left[ \Gamma \oplus (I_n - Z) \right]^{-1} \left[ G - \tilde{G} \right] \\
& + \text{Sy} \left( \tilde{G}^T \Gamma + G^T \tilde{\Gamma} - \tilde{G}^T \tilde{\Gamma} \right) + T 
\end{align*}
\tag{86}
\]

with \( Z \oplus (I_n - Z) > 0 \) satisfying

\[
\forall G, \tilde{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}, \forall \Gamma, \tilde{\Gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}, \ T + \text{Sy} \left( G^T \Gamma \right) \preceq \Delta \left( G, \tilde{G}, \Gamma, \tilde{\Gamma} \right), \ T + \text{Sy} \left( G^T \tilde{\Gamma} \right) = \Delta (G, G, \Gamma, \Gamma), \tag{87}
\]

is a psd-convex overestimate of \( \Delta (G, \Gamma) = T + \text{Sy} \left[ G^T \Gamma \right] \) with respect to the parameterization

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\vec{G} \\
\vec{\Gamma}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\vec{G} \\
\vec{\Gamma}
\end{bmatrix}. \tag{88}
\]

Let

\[
\begin{align*}
T &= \tilde{\Phi}, \ G &= P = \begin{bmatrix} O_{n \times 2n} & P_1 & P_2 & O_{n \times q} & O_{n \times m} \end{bmatrix}, \\
\tilde{G} &= \tilde{P} = \begin{bmatrix} O_{n \times 2n} & \tilde{P}_1 & \tilde{P}_2 & O_{n \times q} & O_{n \times m} \end{bmatrix}, \\
H &= \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \end{bmatrix}, \ \tilde{H} := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{P}_1 & \tilde{P}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \ \tilde{P}_1 \in S^n, \ \tilde{P}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times dn} \\
\Gamma &= BK, \ K = \left[ (I_{3+\kappa} \otimes K) \oplus O_{p+m} \right], \ \tilde{\Gamma} = BK, \ \tilde{K} = \left[ (I_{3+\kappa} \otimes \tilde{K}) \oplus O_{p+m} \right]
\end{align*}
\tag{89}
\]

in (86) with \( l = 3n + \kappa n + q + m \) and \( Z \oplus (I_n - Z) > 0 \) and \( \tilde{\Phi}, \ H \) and \( K \) in line with the definition in (85), one can conclude that

\[
\mathcal{U}(H, K) = \tilde{\Phi} + \text{Sy} \left( P^T B \left[ (I_{3+\kappa} \otimes K) \oplus O_{p+m} \right] \right) \preceq \mathcal{S} \left( H, H, K, \tilde{K} \right) \\
:= \tilde{\Phi} + \text{Sy} \left( \tilde{P}^T BK + P^T BK - \tilde{P}^T BK \right) + \left[ P^T - \tilde{P}^T \right] \left[ K^T B^T - \tilde{K}^T \tilde{B}^T \right] \left[ Z \oplus (I_n - Z) \right]^{-1} [s] \tag{90}
\]
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by (87), where $S(\cdot, \tilde{H}, \cdot, \tilde{K})$ is a psd-convex overestimate of $U(H, K)$ in (85) with respect to the parameterization

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{vec}(H) \\
\text{vec}(K)
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{vec}(\tilde{H}) \\
\text{vec}(\tilde{K})
\end{bmatrix}.
\]  

(91)

From (90), it is obvious that $S\left(H, \tilde{H}, K, \tilde{K}\right) \prec 0$ infers (85). Moreover, it is also true that $S\left(H, \tilde{H}, K, \tilde{K}\right) \prec 0$ holds if and only if

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Phi + S_y \left(\tilde{P}^T B K + P^T B \tilde{K} - \tilde{P}^T B \tilde{K}\right) & P^T - \tilde{P}^T & K^T B^T - \tilde{K}^T B^T \\
* & -Z & O_n \\
* & * & Z - I_n
\end{bmatrix} \prec 0
\]  

(92)

holds based on the application of the Schur complement given $Z \oplus (I_n - Z) > 0$. Now (85) is inferred by (92) which can be handled by standard numerical solvers of semidefinite programmings provided that the values of $\tilde{H}$ and $\tilde{K}$ are known.

By compiling all the aforementioned procedures according to the expositions in Dinh et al. (2012), an iterative algorithm is constructed in Algorithm 1 where $x$ consists of all the variables in $P_3, Q_1, Q_2, R_1, R_2$ in Theorem 1 and $Z$ in (92). Furthermore, $H, \tilde{H}, K$ and $\tilde{K}$ in Algorithm 1 are defined in (89) and $\rho_1, \rho_2$ and $\varepsilon$ are given constants to achieve regularizations and determine error tolerance, respectively.

**Algorithm 1**: An inner convex approximation solution for Theorem 1

```plaintext
begin
solve Theorem 2 with given $\varepsilon$, to obtain $K$ and then solve Theorem 1 with the previous $K$ to obtain $H = [P_1 \quad P_2]$.

update $H \leftarrow H, \quad \tilde{K} \leftarrow K$,
solve $\min_{x, H, \tilde{K}} \text{tr} \left[\rho_1[\star](H - \tilde{H}) + \rho_2[\star](K - \tilde{K})\right]$ subject to (41) and (92) obtain $H$ and $K$

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{vec}(H) \\
\text{vec}(K)
\end{bmatrix} -
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{vec}(\tilde{H}) \\
\text{vec}(\tilde{K})
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

\[\infty \geq \varepsilon\]

while $\infty \geq \varepsilon$ do

update $H \leftarrow H, \quad \tilde{K} \leftarrow K$;
solve $\min_{x, H, \tilde{K}} \text{tr} \left[\rho_1[\star](H - \tilde{H}) + \rho_2[\star](K - \tilde{K})\right]$ subject to (41) and (92) to obtain $H$ and $K$;

end

end
```

**Remark 11.** To initialize the iterative algorithm based on the results in Dinh et al. (2012), one has to obtain certain initial data which in our case are for $\tilde{H}$ and $\tilde{K}$. Hence a right candidate for the values of $\tilde{H}$ and $\tilde{K}$ must be part of a feasible solution of (41)–(43) in Theorem 1. Namely, $\tilde{P}_1 \leftarrow P_1, \quad \tilde{P}_2 \leftarrow P_2$ and $\tilde{K} \leftarrow K$ can be used for the initial data of $\tilde{H}$ and $\tilde{K}$ if $P_1, P_2$ and $K$ are the feasible solutions of (41)–(43).

**Remark 12.** When a convex objective function is considered in Theorem 1, for instance $L^2$ gain $\gamma > 0$ minimization, a termination condition Dinh et al. (2012) can be added to Algorithm 1 concerning the improvement of objective function between two successive iterations. Nonetheless, such a condition has not been concerned by the tests of our numerical examples in this paper.
Remark 13. The most challenging step in using Algorithm 1 is its initialization. Generally speaking, acquiring a feasible solution of Theorem 1 may not be an easy task. Nevertheless, as what has been proposed in Theorem 2, initial values of \( \tilde{P}_1, \tilde{P}_2 \) and \( \tilde{K} \) can be supplied by solving (67)–(69) with given values\(^3\) of \( \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{3+\kappa} \).

Remark 14. For the situations of \( r_2 > 0, r_1 = 0 \) or \( r_2 = r_1 > 0 \), Algorithm 1 can be directly utilized via the corresponding synthesis conditions with appropriate parameters as stated in the statements of Theorem 1 and 2.

5. Numerical examples

In this section, we present two numerical examples to demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed methodologies. The test is conducted in Matlab environment using Yalmip Löfberg (2004) as the optimization interface. Moreover, SDPT3 Toh et al. (2012) is applied as the numerical solver for semidefinite programings.

5.1. Stability analysis of a linear system with a time-varying distributed delay

Consider a distributed delay system

\[
\dot{x}(t) = 0.395x(t) - 5 \int_{-r(t)}^{0} \cos(12\tau)x(t + \tau)d\tau
\]

with \( r(\cdot) \in [r_1,r_2]^\mathbb{R} \) and \( r_2 > r_1 > 0 \). The system in (93) corresponds to \( A_1 = 0.395, \tilde{A}_2(\tau) = -5\cos(12\tau) \) for the model in (1) with \( n = 1 \) and \( p = m = q = 0 \). Note that the rest of the state space matrices in (1) for (93) are empty matrices. To the best of our knowledge, no existing methods, neither based on time nor frequency domain, are capable of analyzing the stability of (93) with an unknown function \( r(\cdot) \in [r_1,r_2]^\mathbb{R} \) and known \( r_2 > r_2 > 0 \).

Let \( \varphi_1(\cdot) = \varphi_2(\cdot) = [0,1] \) and

\[
f_1(\tau) = f_2(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \sin(12\tau) \\ \cos(12\tau) \end{bmatrix}
\]

with \( M_1 = M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 12 \\ 0 & -12 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \)

in Assumption 1 for (93), which corresponds to \( A_2 = A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -5 \end{bmatrix} \) for the distributed delay term in (93).

By applying Theorem 1 with (94) to (93) with \( A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -5 \end{bmatrix} \), the results of time-varying stability with \( r(\cdot) \in [r_1,r_2]^\mathbb{R} \) are presented in Table 1 where \( r_3 = r_2 - r_1 \) and NoDV s stand for the numbers of decision variables. Furthermore, a leftmost stable interval in Table 1 produced by Theorem 1 is the interval whose lower bound is the smallest \( r_1 \) to render Theorem 1 to be feasible with a fixed \( r_3 \). On the other hand, a rightmost stable interval produced by Theorem 1 is the interval whose upper bound is the largest \( r_2 \) to render Theorem 1 to be feasible with a fixed \( r_3 \).

The stability results in Table 1 are not complete in the sense that one may test more values of \( r_2 \) and \( r_1 \) to search stable intervals for (93) with \( r(\cdot) \in [r_1,r_2]^\mathbb{R} \). It is imperative to stress that the stability results produced by Theorem 1 hold for any \( r(t) \) bounded by \( [r_1,r_2] \) with no further limitation on the structure of \( r(t) \).

\(^3\)Note that as we have elaborated in Remark 10 that one may apply Theorem 2 with \( \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0 \) and \( \alpha_i = 0, i = 4 \ldots 3 + 3d \) which allow users to only adjust the value of \( \epsilon_3 \) to solve the conditions in Theorem 2.
Table 1: Detectable stable delay intervals $[r_1, r_2]$ for (93) for any $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^R$

5.2. Dissipative stabilization of systems with time-varying distributed delays

Consider a system of the form (1) with any $r(\cdot) \in [0.5, 1]^R$ and the state space matrices

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{A}_2(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3e^{\cos(\alpha \tau)} - 0.1e^{\sin(\alpha \tau)} - 0.4 & 0.01e^{\cos(\alpha \tau)} - 0.1e^{\sin(\alpha \tau)} + 1.0 \\ -1 & 0.4 - 0.3e^{\cos(\alpha \tau)} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{B}_2(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1e^{\sin(\alpha \tau)} - 0.1 \\ 0.12e^{\cos(\alpha \tau)} + 0.1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.01 \\ 0.02 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.1 & 0.2 \\ 0 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\tilde{C}_2(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.2e^{\sin(\alpha \tau)} - 0.11 \\ 0.14e^{\cos(\alpha \tau)} - 0.2e^{\sin(\alpha \tau)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0.1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\tilde{B}_5(\tau) = \tilde{B}_6(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0.1 + 0.15e^{\sin(\alpha \tau)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad D_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.12 \\ 0.1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (95)$$

Moreover, let

$$J_1 = -\gamma I_m, \quad \tilde{J} = I_m, \quad J_2 = O_{m \times q}, \quad J_3 = \gamma J_q$$

for the supply rate function in (40) to calculate the minimum value of $\mathbb{L}_2$ gain $\gamma$.

According to our best knowledge, no existing methods can find a controller for (1) with the parameters in (95). Note that since $r(t)$ is time-varying and the expression of $r(t)$ is unknown, hence the distributed delay kernels in (95) may not be approximated via the approaches in Münz et al. (2009); Seuret et al. (2015).

By observing the functions inside of $\tilde{A}_2(\cdot), \tilde{B}_2(\cdot), \tilde{C}_2(\cdot), \tilde{B}_5(\cdot), \tilde{B}_6(\cdot)$, we choose $f_1(\cdot), f_2(\cdot)$ and $\varphi_1(\cdot), \varphi_2(\cdot)$ in Assumption 1 to be

$$f_1(\tau) = f_2(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{\sin(\alpha \tau)} \\ e^{\cos(\alpha \tau)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \varphi_1(\tau) = \varphi_2(\tau) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\alpha \tau)e^{\sin(\alpha \tau)} \\ \sin(\alpha \tau)e^{\cos(\alpha \tau)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_1 = M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -a & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (97)$$

with $d = 3, n = m = 2, q = 1, \text{ and }$ $A_2 = A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -0.4 & 1 & -0.1 & -0.3 & 0.01 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0.4 & 0 & 0 & -0.1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -0.1 & 0.2 & 0 & 0 & -0.2 \end{bmatrix}$, $B_2 = B_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -0.1 & 0.1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1 & 0.12 \end{bmatrix},$ $C_2 = C_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -0.1 & 0.1 & 0.2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1 & 0.15 & 0.14 \end{bmatrix}$, $B_5 = B_6 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.1 & 0.15 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (98)$

Now apply Algorithm 1 to (17) with the parameters in (95)–(98) and with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$, $i = 4 \cdots 12$ and $\alpha_3 = 0.5$ for the initialization of Algorithm 1 via Theorem 2. The results on controller gains and the
corresponding min $\gamma$ are summarized in Table 2–3, where NIs stands for the number of iterations in the while loop of Algorithm 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller gain $K$</th>
<th>$[-2.6438]^{T}$</th>
<th>$[-2.6751]^{T}$</th>
<th>$[-2.6143]^{T}$</th>
<th>$[-2.5137]^{T}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min $\gamma$</td>
<td>0.15639</td>
<td>0.156361</td>
<td>0.156343</td>
<td>0.15633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: min $\gamma$ produced by different iterations with $a = 1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller gain $K$</th>
<th>$[-3.9924]^{T}$</th>
<th>$[-4.836]^{T}$</th>
<th>$[-5.1862]^{T}$</th>
<th>$[-5.3413]^{T}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min $\gamma$</td>
<td>0.16514</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.16493</td>
<td>0.1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: min $\gamma$ produced by different iterations with $a = 5$

**Remark 15.** Note that the min $\gamma$ values in Table 2–3 are valid for any $r(\cdot) \in [0.5, 1]^R$. This is also true for other potential dissipative constraints.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, new methods for the design of a dissipative state feedback controller for a linear system with distributed delays (1) have been proposed where the distributed delay kernels can be any $L^2$ function and the delay function $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^R$ is time-varying and bounded. The key step for the derivation of the synthesis condition in Theorem 1 is the application of the novel inequality proposed in Lemma 4 together with the decomposition scenario in Assumption 1, which results in constraints with finite dimensions as explained in Remark 7. Though (43) in Theorem 1 is bilinear, it has been shown in Theorem 2 that convex conditions (67)–(69) can be derived via the application of Projection Lemma. On the other hand, Algorithm 1 is further proposed to solve the conditions in Theorem 1 iteratively, which can be initiated through the feasible solutions of Theorem 2. Based on the application of empty matrices, it is also worthy of mentioning that our proposed synthesis conditions for time-varying delay $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^R$ can cover the situation of being a constant delay $r_1 = r_2$ or $r_1 = 0, r_2 > 0$. Finally, due to the generality of the distributed delay kernels and $r(\cdot) \in [r_1, r_2]^R$, the proposed methodologies in this paper may have strong potential to handle many delay related problems of real-time applications.

References


