

Boundary input-to-state stabilization of a damped Euler-Bernoulli beam in the presence of a state-delay

Hugo Lhachemi, Robert Shorten

Abstract—This paper is concerned with the point torque boundary feedback stabilization of a damped Euler-Bernoulli beam model in the presence of a time-varying state-delay. First, a finite-dimensional truncated model is derived by spectral reduction. Then, for a given stabilizing state-feedback of the delay-free truncated model, an LMI-based sufficient condition on the maximum amplitude of the delay is employed to guarantee the stability of the closed-loop state-delayed truncated model. Second, we assess the exponential stability of the resulting closed-loop infinite-dimensional system under the assumption that the number of modes of the original infinite-dimensional system captured by the truncated model has been selected large enough. Finally, we consider in our control design the possible presence of a distributed perturbation, as well as additive boundary perturbations in the control inputs. In this case, we derive for the closed-loop system an exponential input-to-state estimate with fading memory of the distributed and boundary disturbances.

Index Terms—Distributed parameter system, Boundary control, State-delay, Euler-Bernoulli beam, Input-to-state stability, Boundary perturbations.

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of the stability properties of various partial differential equations (PDEs) models under either boundary or state delays is an active topic of research [6], [31]–[33], [35]. In this context, the stabilization of open-loop unstable PDEs in the presence of a delayed term has attracted much attention in recent years. In this context, one of the early works reported in the literature deals with the boundary feedback stabilization of an unstable reaction-diffusion equation under large constant input delays by means of a backstepping transformation [20]. More recently, a similar problem was tackled in [34] by resorting to finite-dimensional controller synthesis methods. First, a finite-dimensional model capturing the unstable modes of the original plant was derived via spectral decomposition. Then, the controller was obtained by resorting to a predictor feedback [21], which is an efficient tool for the feedback stabilization of finite-dimensional linear time-invariant systems with constant input delays. Finally, the stability of the resulting closed-loop infinite-dimensional system was assessed via the

use of an adequate Lyapunov functional. This control strategy was reused in [7] for the delay boundary stabilization of a linear Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation, and then generalized in [22], [23], [27] to a class of diagonal infinite-dimensional systems for either constant or time-varying input delays.

Going beyond the delay boundary stabilization of PDEs, the boundary stabilization of PDEs in the presence of a state-delay has also been the subject of a number of recent publications. In this context, most of the reported works deal with the boundary feedback stabilization of an unstable reaction-diffusion equation in the presence of a state-delay in the reaction term. The case of a constant state-delay with Dirichlet boundary conditions was reported in [8] where the control design was performed via a backstepping transformation. The case of a time-varying state-delay was investigated in [12] for Neumann-Dirichlet boundary conditions with Dirichlet actuation. The control design also took advantage of a backstepping transformation while resorting to an LMI-based argument for assessing the stability of the closed-loop system. This work was later extended in [11] for the stabilization of a cascade PDE-ODE system with either Dirichlet or Neumann actuation. The case of Robin boundary conditions was studied in [25] in the presence of both a time-varying state-delay and a distributed disturbance. Following in a similar manner to the idea reported in [34] for the delay boundary stabilization of a reaction-diffusion equation, the proposed control strategy consists in designing the controller on a finite-dimensional truncated model capturing a finite number of modes of the original plant. The subsequent stability analysis showed that the resulting closed-loop system is input-to-state stable (ISS) [36] with fading memory [18] of the distributed perturbation. It is worth noting that very few works have been reported on the extension of the aforementioned methods to other types of boundary control systems presenting a state-delay. Among the reported works in this field, one can find the case of a linear [14] and nonlinear [13] Schrödinger equation by means of a backstepping transformation and an LMI-based stability analysis. Extensions to other types of PDEs, such as wave and beam equations, remain open.

In this paper, we are concerned with the point torque boundary feedback stabilization of a damped Euler-Bernoulli beam in the presence of both a time-varying state-delay and additive perturbations. Specifically, we aim at achieving the boundary input-to-state stabilization of the system with respect to both distributed and boundary disturbances. The main motivation of such a goal relies in the fact that the

This publication has emanated from research supported in part by a research grant from Science Foundation Ireland (SFI) under grant number 16/RC/3872 and is co-funded under the European Regional Development Fund and by I-Form industry partners.

Hugo Lhachemi is with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland (e-mail: hugo.lhachemi@ucd.ie).

Robert Shorten is with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland, and also with the Dyson School of Design Engineering, Imperial College London, London, U.K. (e-mail: robert.shorten@ucd.ie).

ISS property, originally introduced by Sontag in [36], is one of the main tools for assessing the robustness of a system with respect to disturbances. This property can also be used for the establishment of small gain conditions ensuring the stability of interconnected systems [18]. The establishment of ISS properties for finite-dimensional systems was intensively studied during the last three decades. However, its extension to infinite-dimensional systems is more recent, particularly in the case of boundary perturbations, and remains highly challenging [1], [9], [10], [16]–[18], [24], [26], [28]–[30], [38], [39]. It is also worth noting that most of these works deal with the establishment of ISS properties with respect to boundary disturbances for open loop stable systems. The literature regarding the feedback input-to-state stabilization of open loop unstable infinite-dimensional systems with respect to boundary perturbations is less developed [37].

In this context, the present paper is concerned with the design of a point torque boundary feedback control law that ensures the exponential input-to-state stabilization, with respect to both distributed and boundary perturbations, of a damped Euler-Bernoulli beam presenting a time-varying state-delay. The adopted approach, which allows either one single command input (located at one of the two boundaries of the domain) or two command inputs, is organized as follows. First, a spectral decomposition of the studied beam model is carried out. This spectral decomposition is used for deriving a finite-dimensional truncated model of the beam capturing its unstable modes plus an adequately chosen number of slow stable modes. Specifically, by means of a small gain argument, the order of the truncated model is selected in order to ensure the robust stability of the residual infinite-dimensional system with respect to exponentially vanishing command inputs exhibiting a prescribed decay rate. In this context, the proposed control law consists in a state feedback of the truncated model. The stability of the resulting closed-loop truncated model in the presence of a state-delay is assessed via an LMI-based (sufficient) condition on the maximum amplitude of the state-delay. Under the assumption of an adequate choice of the order of the truncated model, we show that the resulting infinite-dimensional closed-loop system satisfies an exponential ISS-like estimate¹ with fading memory of the perturbations.

This paper is organized as follows. The problem setting and the resulting abstract boundary control system are introduced in Section II. After introducing the proposed control strategy, the main result of this paper is stated in Section III. The subsequent stability analysis is carried out in two steps: first in Section IV for the stability analysis of the truncated model and then in Section V for the stability analysis of the resulting closed-loop infinite-dimensional system. The obtained results are numerically illustrated in Section VI. Finally, concluding remarks are provided in Section VII.

II. PROBLEM SETTING AND ABSTRACT FORM

A. Notations and definitions

The sets of non-negative integers, positive integers, real, non-negative real, positive real, and complex numbers are

denoted by \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{N}^* , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}_+ , \mathbb{R}_+^* , and \mathbb{C} , respectively. The real and imaginary parts of a complex number z are denoted by $\operatorname{Re} z$ and $\operatorname{Im} z$, respectively. The field \mathbb{K} denotes either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . The set of n -dimensional vectors over \mathbb{K} is denoted by \mathbb{K}^n and is endowed with the Euclidean norm $\|x\| = \sqrt{x^*x}$. The set of $n \times m$ matrices over \mathbb{K} is denoted by $\mathbb{K}^{n \times m}$ and is endowed with the induced norm denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. For any symmetric matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $P \succ 0$ (resp. $P \succeq 0$) means that P is positive definite (resp. positive semi-definite). The set of symmetric positive definite matrices of order n is denoted by \mathbb{S}_n^{+*} . For any symmetric matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\lambda_m(P)$ and $\lambda_M(P)$ denote the smallest and largest eigenvalues of P , respectively.

The set of square-integrable functions (w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure) over the interval $(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is denoted by $L^2(0, 1)$ and is endowed with its natural inner product $[f, g] = \int_0^1 f(\xi) \overline{g(\xi)} d\xi$, providing a structure of Hilbert space. Denoting by f' , when it exists, the weak derivative of $f \in L^2(0, 1)$, we consider the Sobolev space $H^m(0, 1) \triangleq \{f \in L^2(0, 1) : f', f'', \dots, f^{(m)} \in L^2(0, 1)\}$. Finally, we introduce $H_0^1(0, 1) \triangleq \{f \in H^1(0, 1) : f(0) = f(1) = 0\}$.

B. Problem setting and control objective

As we have mentioned, our focus is the point torque boundary feedback stabilization of the following damped Euler Bernoulli beam model in the presence of a state-delay:

$$y_{tt}(t, x) = -y_{xxxx}(t, x) + 2\alpha y_{txx}(t, x) \quad (1a)$$

$$+ \beta_0 y(t, x) + \gamma y(t - h(t), x) + d_d(t, x) \quad (1b)$$

$$y(t, 0) = y(t, 1) = 0 \quad (1c)$$

$$y_{xx}(t, 0) = u_1(t) + d_{b,1}(t) \quad (1d)$$

$$y_{xx}(t, 1) = u_2(t) + d_{b,2}(t) \quad (1e)$$

$$y(\tau, x) = y_0(\tau, x), \quad \tau \in [-h_M, 0] \quad (1f)$$

$$y_t(\tau, x) = y_{t0}(\tau, x), \quad \tau \in [-h_M, 0] \quad (1g)$$

for $t > 0$ and $x \in (0, 1)$. Here we have the damping parameter $\alpha > 1$ and the coefficients $\beta_0 \geq 0$ and $\gamma > 0$. We also introduce the quantity $\beta = \beta_0 + \gamma > 0$ that will be used in the sequel. The boundary conditions (1d-1e) involve the point torque boundary control inputs $u_1, u_2 : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (with possibly one identically equal to zero), $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a time-varying delay, $d_d : \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a distributed disturbance, and $d_{b,1}, d_{b,2} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are boundary disturbances. We assume that there exist constants, $0 < h_m < h_M$, such that $h_m \leq h(t) \leq h_M$ for all $t \geq 0$. Finally, $y_0, y_{t0} : [-h_M, 0] \times (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are the initial conditions.

The tackled control objective consists of designing the boundary control inputs u_1, u_2 in order to ensure the closed-loop stability of the Euler-Bernoulli beam (1a-1g) for any continuous time varying delay such that $0 < h_m \leq h \leq h_M$ with $h_M > 0$ to be characterized. Moreover, this control strategy must ensure the ISS property of the closed-loop system with respect to both distributed and boundary perturbations.

¹We refer the reader to Remark 3.7 for the meaning of “ISS-like”.

C. Abstract form

We consider the state-space of the form of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = (H^2(0,1) \cap H_0^1(0,1)) \times L^2(0,1)$ with associated inner product defined for all $(y_1, y_2), (\hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2) \in \mathcal{H}$ by

$$\langle (y_1, y_2), (\hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2) \rangle = \int_0^1 y_1''(x) \overline{\hat{y}_1''(x)} + y_2(x) \overline{\hat{y}_2(x)} dx.$$

We also introduce the bounded map $\Pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by $\Pi(y_1, y_2) = (0, y_1)$.

Remark 2.1: The bounded nature of Π follows from the fact that, as $y_1 \in H^2(0,1) \cap H_0^1(0,1)$, it is continuously differentiable with $y_1(0) = y_1(1) = 0$. Rolle's theorem provides $a \in (0,1)$ such that $y_1'(a) = 0$. Then, for all $x \in [0,1]$, we have $y_1(x) = \int_0^x \int_a^\xi y_1''(s) ds d\xi$. We infer by Cauchy-Schwarz $|y_1(x)|^2 \leq \int_0^1 |y_1''(s)|^2 ds$. This yields $\|\Pi(y_1, y_2)\| = \sqrt{\int_0^1 |y_1(x)|^2 dx} \leq \|(y_1, y_2)\|$.

The beam model (1a-1g) can be written as the abstract boundary control system:

$$\frac{dX}{dt}(t) = \mathcal{A}X(t) + \gamma \Pi X(t - h(t)) + p_d(t) \quad (2a)$$

$$\mathcal{B}X(t) = w(t) \triangleq u(t) + d_b(t) \quad (2b)$$

$$X(\tau) = \Phi(\tau), \quad \tau \in [-h_M, 0] \quad (2c)$$

for $t > 0$ where $\mathcal{A}(y_1, y_2) = (y_2, -y_1'''' + 2\alpha y_2'' + \beta_0 y_1) \in \mathcal{H}$ defined on $D(\mathcal{A}) = (H^4(0,1) \cap H_0^1(0,1)) \times (H^2(0,1) \cap H_0^1(0,1))$ and $\mathcal{B}(y_1, y_2) = (y_1''(0), y_1''(1)) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ defined on $D(\mathcal{B}) = D(\mathcal{A})$. Here we have the state $X(t) = (y(t, \cdot), y_t(t, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{H}$, the control input $u(t) = (u_1(t), u_2(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the distributed disturbance $p_d(t) = (0, d_d(t, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{H}$, the boundary perturbation $d_b(t) = (d_{b,1}(t), d_{b,2}(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and the initial condition $\Phi(t) = (y_0(t, \cdot), y_{t0}(t, \cdot)) \in \mathcal{H}$.

Following the terminology of [3, Def. 3.3.2], $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is an abstract boundary control system. Indeed, the disturbance-free operator $\mathcal{A}_0 \triangleq \mathcal{A}|_{D(\mathcal{A}_0)}$ with $D(\mathcal{A}_0) \triangleq D(\mathcal{A}) \cap \ker(\mathcal{B})$ generates a C_0 -semigroup $S(t)$. Furthermore, introducing $L : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ defined for any $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by $[Lu](x) = \left(\frac{u_2 - u_1}{6} x^3 + \frac{u_1}{2} x^2 - \frac{2u_1 + u_2}{6} x, 0 \right)$ for any $x \in [0,1]$, $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{H})$ is a lifting operator in the sense that $R(L) \subset D(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathcal{A}L$ is bounded, and $BL = I_{\mathbb{R}^2}$.

In this paper, we consider the concept of mild solutions of the abstract boundary control problem (2a-2c). Assuming that $p_d \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$, $u, d_b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $h \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ with $0 < h_m \leq h \leq h_M$, and $\Phi \in C^0([-h_M, 0]; \mathcal{H})$, the mild solution $X \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ of (2a-2c) is uniquely defined by

$$X(t) = S(t)\{\Phi(0) - Lw(0)\} + Lw(t) + \int_0^t S(t-s)\{\mathcal{A}Lw(s) - L\dot{w}(s) + \gamma \Pi X(s - h(s)) + p_d(s)\} ds \quad (3)$$

for $t \geq 0$ with $w = u + d_b$ and the initial condition $X(\tau) = \Phi(\tau)$ for all $\tau \in [-h_M, 0]$.

D. Spectral properties of the beam

In preparation for control design, we rewrite (2a) under the following form:

$$\frac{dX}{dt}(t) = \mathcal{U}X(t) + \gamma \Pi \{X(t - h(t)) - X(t)\} + p_d(t), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{U} \triangleq \mathcal{A} + \gamma \Pi$ with $D(\mathcal{U}) = D(\mathcal{A})$, i.e., introducing $\beta = \beta_0 + \gamma > 0$, $\mathcal{U}(y_1, y_2) = (y_2, -y_1'''' + 2\alpha y_2'' + \beta y_1)$. We also introduce $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{A}_0 + \gamma \Pi$ defined on $D(\mathcal{U}_0) = D(\mathcal{A}_0)$ the disturbance-free operator associated with $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{B})$ and $T(t)$ the C_0 -semigroup generated by \mathcal{U}_0 . Then the mild solution (3) can be equivalently rewritten in function of T as (see Appendix A):

$$X(t) = T(t)\{\Phi(0) - Lw(0)\} + Lw(t) + \int_0^t T(t-s)\left\{\mathcal{U}Lw(s) - L\dot{w}(s) + \gamma \Pi\{X(s - h(s)) - X(s)\} + p_d(s)\right\} ds \quad (5)$$

for $t \geq 0$.

The eigenstructures of \mathcal{U}_0 are characterized by the following lemma. The proof is a straightforward extension to the case $\beta > 0$ of the approach reported in [3, Exercise 2.23] for $\beta = 0$.

Lemma 2.2: The point spectrum of \mathcal{U}_0 is given by $\sigma_p(\mathcal{U}_0) = \{\lambda_{n,\epsilon} : n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}\}$ with simple eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{n,\epsilon} = -\alpha n^2 \pi^2 + \epsilon \sqrt{(\alpha^2 - 1)n^4 \pi^4 + \beta} \in \mathbb{R} \quad (6)$$

and associated unit eigenvectors

$$\phi_{n,\epsilon} = \frac{1}{k_{n,\epsilon}} (\sin(n\pi \cdot), \lambda_{n,\epsilon} \sin(n\pi \cdot))$$

where $k_{n,\epsilon} > 0$ is given by $k_{n,\epsilon} = \sqrt{(n^4 \pi^4 + \lambda_{n,\epsilon}^2)/2}$.

Remark 2.3: From (6), it is easy to see that the following hold:

- $\lambda_{n,\epsilon}^2 + 2\alpha n^2 \pi^2 \lambda_{n,\epsilon} + (n^4 \pi^4 - \beta) = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $\epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}$;
- $\lambda_{n,\epsilon} < \lambda_{m,\epsilon}$ for all $n > m \geq 1$ and $\epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}$;
- $\lambda_{n,-1} < 0$ and $\lambda_{n,-1} < \lambda_{n,+1}$ for all $n \geq 1$;
- $\lambda_{n,+1} \geq 0$ if and only if $1 \leq n \leq \beta^{1/4}/\pi$.

In particular, the number of unstable eigenvalues of the disturbance-free operator \mathcal{U}_0 is given by $\lfloor \beta^{1/4}/\pi \rfloor$.

One of the key properties that will be used in the sequel is the concept of Riesz basis [2] which is recalled in the following definition.

Definition 2.4 (Riesz basis [2]): A sequence $\mathcal{F} = \{\varphi_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of vectors of a Hilbert space X over \mathbb{K} is a Riesz basis if

- 1) \mathcal{F} is maximal: $\overline{\text{span}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{F})} = X$, i.e., the closure of the vector space spanned by \mathcal{F} coincides with the whole space X ;
- 2) there exist $m_R, M_R \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ such that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $a_k \in \mathbb{K}$,

$$m_R \sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} |a_k|^2 \leq \left\| \sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} a_k \varphi_k \right\|^2 \leq M_R \sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} |a_k|^2. \quad (7)$$

We can now introduce the following lemma, which will be crucial in the sequel and whose proof is placed in Appendix B.

Lemma 2.5: $\mathcal{F}_\phi = \{\phi_{n,\epsilon} : n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}\}$ is a Riesz basis of \mathcal{H} .

In particular, following the terminology of [3, Def. 2.3.4], \mathcal{U}_0 is a Riesz-spectral operator. We introduce $\mathcal{F}_\psi = \{\psi_{n,\epsilon} : n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}\}$ the dual Riesz basis of \mathcal{F}_ϕ :

$$\psi_{n,\epsilon} = C_{n,\epsilon} \left(-\frac{\lambda_{n,-\epsilon}}{n^4 \pi^4} \sin(n\pi \cdot), \sin(n\pi \cdot) \right)$$

with

$$C_{n,\epsilon} = \frac{2k_{n,\epsilon}}{\lambda_{n,\epsilon} - \lambda_{n,-\epsilon}} = \frac{\epsilon k_{n,\epsilon}}{\sqrt{(\alpha^2 - 1)n^4\pi^4 + \beta}} \neq 0,$$

i.e., $\langle \phi_{n_1,\epsilon_1}, \psi_{n_2,\epsilon_2} \rangle = \delta_{(n_1,\epsilon_1),(n_2,\epsilon_2)} \in \{0,1\}$ with $\delta_{(n_1,\epsilon_1),(n_2,\epsilon_2)} = 1$ if and only if $(n_1, \epsilon_1) = (n_2, \epsilon_2)$. From the general theory of Riesz bases (see, e.g., [2]), we have

$$\forall z \in \mathcal{H}, z = \sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}}} \langle z, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle \phi_{n,\epsilon}$$

with

$$m_R \sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}}} |\langle z, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle|^2 \leq \|z\|^2 \leq M_R \sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}}} |\langle z, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle|^2 \quad (8)$$

where the constants $m_R, M_R > 0$ are provided in Appendix B. Furthermore, as \mathcal{U}_0 is a Riesz-spectral operator generating the C_0 -semigroup $T(t)$, we have [3, Thm. 2.3.5]

$$\forall z \in \mathcal{H}, \forall t \geq 0, T(t)z = \sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}}} e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}t} \langle z, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle \phi_{n,\epsilon} \quad (9)$$

III. SPECTRAL DECOMPOSITION, CONTROL STRATEGY, AND MAIN RESULT

A. Spectral decomposition

We define $c_{n,\epsilon}(t) = \langle X(t), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle$ the coefficients of projection of the system trajectory X into the Riesz basis \mathcal{F}_ϕ .

1) *Preliminary spectral decomposition:* Let $X = (x_1, x_2) \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ be a mild solution (3) of (2a-2c). Then $c_{n,\epsilon} \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ and, using (5), (9), and the integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}(t-s)} \langle L\dot{w}(s), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle ds \\ &= \langle Lw(t), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle - e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}t} \langle Lw(0), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle \\ & \quad + \lambda_{n,\epsilon} \int_0^t e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}(t-s)} \langle Lw(s), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle ds, \end{aligned}$$

we have for all $t \geq 0$

$$c_{n,\epsilon}(t) = e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}t} c_{n,\epsilon}(0) + \int_0^t e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}(t-s)} f(s) ds$$

with $f(t) = \langle -\lambda_{n,\epsilon}Lw(t) + \mathcal{U}Lw(t) + \gamma\Pi\{X(t-h(t)) - X(t)\} + p_d(t), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle$. As f is continuous, we have $c_{n,\epsilon} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ and the following ODE (see also [26]) is satisfied for all $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{c}_{n,\epsilon}(t) &= \lambda_{n,\epsilon}c_{n,\epsilon}(t) + \gamma\Delta_{n,\epsilon}(t) \\ & \quad - \lambda_{n,\epsilon} \langle L\{u(t) + d_b(t)\}, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle \\ & \quad + \langle \mathcal{U}L\{u(t) + d_b(t)\}, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle + p_{d,n,\epsilon}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where, using $\psi_{n,\epsilon} = (\psi_{n,\epsilon}^1, \psi_{n,\epsilon}^2)$, we have $\Delta_{n,\epsilon}(t) = \langle \Pi\{X(t-h(t)) - X(t)\}, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle = [x_1(t-h(t)) - x_1(t), \psi_{n,\epsilon}^2]$, and $p_{d,n,\epsilon}(t) = \langle p_d(t), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle = [d_d(t), \psi_{n,\epsilon}^2]$.

The main idea of the control design consists in using the spectral decomposition (10) to obtain a truncated finite-dimensional model capturing a sufficient number of modes of the original infinite-dimensional system (1a-1g). However, the

ODE (10) is not yet under a suitable form for control design because the term $\Delta_{n,\epsilon}$ depends on the state trajectory X . Thus we need to express this term in function of the coefficients of projection $c_{n,\epsilon}$.

2) *Expression of the term $\Delta_{n,\epsilon}$ in function of the coefficients of projection $c_{n,\epsilon}$:* First, we note that, for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\psi_{n,-1}^1 = -\frac{k_{n,-1}\lambda_{n,+1}}{k_{n,+1}\lambda_{n,-1}}\psi_{n,+1}^1, \quad \psi_{n,-1}^2 = -\frac{k_{n,-1}}{k_{n,+1}}\psi_{n,+1}^2,$$

where the above identity are well defined because $k_{n,+1} \neq 0$ and $\lambda_{n,-1} \neq 0$. We obtain that

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_{n,+1} \\ c_{n,-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -\frac{k_{n,-1}\lambda_{n,+1}}{k_{n,+1}\lambda_{n,-1}} & -\frac{k_{n,-1}}{k_{n,+1}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1'', (\psi_{n,+1}^1)'' \\ x_2, \psi_{n,+1}^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The determinant of the above square matrix is given by

$$\det_n = \frac{k_{n,-1}}{k_{n,+1}} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{n,+1}}{\lambda_{n,-1}} - 1 \right\} \neq 0,$$

thus

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1'', (\psi_{n,+1}^1)'' \\ x_2, \psi_{n,+1}^2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\det_n} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{k_{n,-1}}{k_{n,+1}} & -1 \\ \frac{k_{n,-1}\lambda_{n,+1}}{k_{n,+1}\lambda_{n,-1}} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_{n,+1} \\ c_{n,-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

and we infer that

$$[x_1'', (\psi_{n,+1}^1)'] = \frac{\lambda_{n,-1}}{k_{n,-1}} \times \frac{k_{n,-1}c_{n,+1} + k_{n,+1}c_{n,-1}}{\lambda_{n,-1} - \lambda_{n,+1}}.$$

Now, we note that

$$[x_1, \psi_{n,\epsilon}^2] = C_{n,\epsilon} [x_1, \sin(n\pi \cdot)] = \frac{\epsilon k_{n,\epsilon}}{k_{n,+1}} [x_1, \psi_{n,+1}^2]$$

and, using two integration by parts, the boundary conditions $x_1(t, 0) = x_1(t, 1) = 0$, and the identity $(\psi_{n,+1}^1)'' = \frac{C_{n,+1}\lambda_{n,-1}}{n^2\pi^2} \sin(n\pi \cdot)$,

$$\begin{aligned} [x_1, \psi_{n,+1}^2] &= C_{n,+1} \int_0^1 x_1(t, \xi) \sin(n\pi\xi) d\xi \\ &= -\frac{C_{n,+1}}{n^2\pi^2} \int_0^1 x_1''(t, \xi) \sin(n\pi\xi) d\xi \\ &= -\frac{1}{\lambda_{n,-1}} [x_1'', (\psi_{n,+1}^1)'] . \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} [x_1, \psi_{n,\epsilon}^2] &= -\frac{\epsilon k_{n,\epsilon}}{\lambda_{n,-1}k_{n,+1}} [x_1'', (\psi_{n,+1}^1)'] \\ &= -\frac{\epsilon k_{n,\epsilon}}{k_{n,-1}k_{n,+1}} \times \frac{k_{n,-1}c_{n,+1} + k_{n,+1}c_{n,-1}}{\lambda_{n,-1} - \lambda_{n,+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the term $\Delta_{n,\epsilon}(t)$ can be rewritten in function of the coefficients of projection $c_{n,-1}(t)$ and $c_{n,+1}(t)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{n,\epsilon}(t) &= -\epsilon \frac{k_{n,\epsilon}}{k_{n,-1}} \times \frac{c_{n,-1}(t-h(t)) - c_{n,-1}(t)}{\lambda_{n,-1} - \lambda_{n,+1}} \\ & \quad - \epsilon \frac{k_{n,\epsilon}}{k_{n,+1}} \times \frac{c_{n,+1}(t-h(t)) - c_{n,+1}(t)}{\lambda_{n,-1} - \lambda_{n,+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

3) *Spectral decomposition in suitable form for control design:* We can now derive from the preliminary spectral decomposition (10) and equation (11) a spectral decomposition that is suitable for control design. Let $\{e_1, e_2\}$ be the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^2 and define

$$b_{n,\epsilon,m} = -\lambda_{n,\epsilon} \langle Le_m, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{U}Le_m, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle \quad (12)$$

for $n \geq 1$, $\epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}$, and $1 \leq m \leq 2$. Introducing the following vectors and matrices:

$$c_n(t) = \begin{bmatrix} c_{n,-1}(t) \\ c_{n,+1}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad p_{d,n}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} p_{d,n,-1}(t) \\ p_{d,n,+1}(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Lambda_n = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{n,-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_{n,+1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_n = \begin{bmatrix} b_{n,-1,1} & b_{n,-1,2} \\ b_{n,+1,1} & b_{n,+1,2} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$M_n = \frac{\gamma}{\lambda_{n,-1} - \lambda_{n,+1}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{k_{n,-1}}{k_{n,+1}} \\ -\frac{k_{n,+1}}{k_{n,-1}} & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

we obtain the following spectral decomposition:

$$\dot{c}_n(t) = \Lambda_n c_n(t) + M_n \{c_n(t - h(t)) - c_n(t)\} + B_n \{u(t) + d_b(t)\} + p_{d,n}(t) \quad (14)$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$. The initial condition is given by

$$c_n(\tau) = c_{\Phi,n}(\tau) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \langle \Phi(\tau), \psi_{n,-1} \rangle \\ \langle \Phi(\tau), \psi_{n,+1} \rangle \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

for $\tau \in [-h_M, 0]$.

Remark 3.1: Even if the particularly selected lifting operator L associated with (\mathcal{A}, B) is not unique, the coefficients $b_{n,\epsilon,m}$ given by (12), and thus the resulting input matrices B_n , are actually independent of such a particular selection. See [22] for a detailed explanation.

B. Finite-dimensional truncated model

We can now introduce a truncated model of the Euler-Bernoulli beam model (1a-1g) capturing a finite number of modes. For a given integer $N_0 \geq 1$, which will be discussed in the sequel, we introduce the following vectors and matrices:

$$Y(t) = [c_1(t)^\top \dots c_{N_0}(t)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_0}, \quad (16a)$$

$$P_d(t) = [p_{d,1}(t)^\top \dots p_{d,N_0}(t)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_0}, \quad (16b)$$

$$Y_\Phi(\tau) = [c_{\Phi,1}(\tau)^\top \dots c_{\Phi,N_0}(\tau)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_0}, \quad (16c)$$

$$A = \text{diag}(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{N_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_0 \times 2N_0}, \quad (16d)$$

$$B = [B_1^\top \dots B_{N_0}^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_0 \times 2}, \quad (16e)$$

$$M = \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_{N_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_0 \times 2N_0}. \quad (16f)$$

Then, we infer from (14-15) that the following ODE holds:

$$\dot{Y}(t) = AY(t) + M\{Y(t - h(t)) - Y(t)\} + B\{u(t) + d_b(t)\} + P_d(t) \quad (17a)$$

$$Y(\tau) = Y_\Phi(\tau), \quad \tau \in [-h_M, 0] \quad (17b)$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

Denoting by $B_{c1}, B_{c2} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_0}$ the first and second columns of the matrix B , respectively, we have the controllability property stated below. This result assesses the existence of a matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2N_0}$ such that $A_{cl} \triangleq A + BK$ is Hurwitz with desired pole placement.

Lemma 3.2: For any given $N_0 \geq 1$, the pairs (A, B) , (A, B_{c1}) , and (A, B_{c2}) satisfy the Kalman condition.

Proof. Due to the diagonal nature of the matrix A and the fact that the eigenvalues of \mathcal{U}_0 are simple, the PBH test [40] ensures the satisfaction of the Kalman condition provided $b_{n,\epsilon,m} \neq 0$. This is indeed the case because, based on (12), straightforward computations show that $b_{n,\epsilon,1} = -n\pi C_{n,\epsilon} \neq 0$ and $b_{n,\epsilon,2} = (-1)^n n\pi C_{n,\epsilon} \neq 0$. \square

Remark 3.3: The proposed approach captures the case of a single boundary control input (either at $x = 0$ or at $x = 1$). Indeed, one can impose $u_m = 0$ by setting the m -th line of the feedback gain K as $0_{1 \times 2N_0}$.

C. Control strategy and main result

The proposed control strategy for stabilizing the Euler-Bernoulli beam model (1a-1g) consists in the two following steps. First, a feedback gain K is computed such that the feedback law $u = KY$ exponentially stabilizes the truncated model (17a-17b) for some value $h_M > 0$ of the maximum amplitude of the admissible state-delay h . Specifically, for a given feedback gain K , we provide an LMI-based (sufficient) condition on the value of h_M . Second, we ensure that the design performed on the truncated model successfully stabilizes the original infinite-dimensional system (1a-1g) under the assumption that the number of modes N_0 of the truncated model is large enough. More precisely, introducing for any $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^1([-h_M, 0]; \mathcal{H})$

$$\|\Phi\|_{1,h_M} = \sqrt{\|\Phi(0)\|^2 + \int_{-h_M}^0 \|\dot{\Phi}(\tau)\|^2 d\tau},$$

the main result of this paper is stated as follows.

Theorem 3.4: Let $N_0 \geq 1$ be such that $N_0 \geq \lfloor \beta^{1/4}/\pi \rfloor$ and²

$$\frac{60\alpha^2\gamma^2}{(\alpha^2 - 1)(N_0 + 1)^4\pi^4 + \beta} \times \frac{1}{\lambda_{N_0+1,+1}^2} < 1. \quad (18)$$

Consider the matrices A and B defined by (16d-16e). Let $K \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2N_0}$ be such that $A_{cl} = A + BK$ is Hurwitz and let $0 < h_m < h_M$ be such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{cl}^\top P_2 + P_2^\top A_{cl} & P_1 - P_2^\top + A_{cl}^\top P_3 & h_M P_2^\top M \\ P_1 - P_2 + P_3^\top A_{cl} & -P_3 - P_3^\top + h_M Q & h_M P_3^\top M \\ h_M M^\top P_2 & h_M M^\top P_3 & -h_M Q \end{bmatrix} \prec 0 \quad (19)$$

for some matrices $P_1, Q \in \mathbb{S}_{2N_0}^{++}$, and $P_2, P_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_0 \times 2N_0}$. Then, there exist constants $\kappa, C_0, C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that, for any distributed perturbation $d_d \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(0, 1))$, any boundary perturbation $d_b \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, any initial condition $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^1([-h_M, 0]; \mathcal{H})$, and any delay $h \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ with

²We recall that $\beta = \beta_0 + \gamma$ with α, β_0, γ the parameters of the studied Euler-Bernoulli beam model (1a-1g).

$h_m \leq h \leq h_M$, the mild solution $X \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ of (2a-2c) with $u = KY \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfies, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(y(t, \cdot), y_t(t, \cdot))\| &\leq C_0 e^{-\kappa t} \|(y_0, y_{t0})\|_{1, h_M} \\ &+ C_1 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_d(\tau)\| \\ &+ C_2 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

with control input $\|u(t)\| \leq \frac{\|K\|}{\sqrt{m_R}} \|(y(t, \cdot), y_t(t, \cdot))\|$, where $(y(t, \cdot), y_t(t, \cdot)) = X(t)$ and $(y_0, y_{t0}) = \Phi$.

Remark 3.5: The condition (18) is always satisfied for N_0 large enough because its left hand side goes to zero as $N_0 \rightarrow +\infty$. Furthermore, because A_{cl} is Hurwitz, there always exists a $h_M > 0$ such that the LMI (19) is feasible. This latter result will be assessed in the sequel; see Lemma 4.2 for details. Consequently, conclusions of Theorem 3.4 always hold true for N_0 large enough and $h_M > 0$ small enough.

Remark 3.6: From Remark 2.3, the condition $N_0 \geq \lceil \beta^{1/4}/\pi \rceil$ ensures that all the unstable modes of the Euler-Bernoulli beam model³ (1a-1g) are captured by the truncated model (17a-17b). In particular, $\lambda_{n,\epsilon} \leq \lambda_{N_0+1,+1} < 0$ for all $n \geq N_0 + 1$ and $\epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}$.

Remark 3.7: Note that the estimate (20) is not an ISS estimate in strict form because the system trajectory and the initial condition are not evaluated with the same norm. This issue can be overcome as follows. Assume that the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 hold but with the LMI condition (19) replaced by the small gain condition⁴

$$C_\lambda \|M\| \left(e^{\|A_{cl}\| h_M} - e^{-\lambda h_M} \right) < \lambda, \quad (21)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ and $C_\lambda \geq 1$ are any constants such that $\|e^{A_{cl}t}\| \leq C_\lambda e^{-\lambda t}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then there exist constants $\bar{\kappa}, \bar{C}_0, \bar{C}_1, \bar{C}_2 > 0$, independent of Φ, d_d, d_b, h , such that the mild solutions satisfy, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(y(t, \cdot), y_t(t, \cdot))\| &\leq \bar{C}_0 e^{-\bar{\kappa}t} \sup_{\tau \in [-h_M, 0]} \|(y_0(\tau, \cdot), y_{t0}(\tau, \cdot))\| \\ &+ \bar{C}_1 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\bar{\kappa}(t-\tau)} \|d_d(\tau)\| \\ &+ \bar{C}_2 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\bar{\kappa}(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

with control input $\|u(t)\| \leq \frac{\|K\|}{\sqrt{m_R}} \|(y(t, \cdot), y_t(t, \cdot))\|$ and where, comparing to Theorem 3.4, the regularity assumption on the initial condition is weakened to $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$.

The ISS estimate provided by (22) is sharper than the ISS-like estimate (20). However, the small gain condition (21) provides, in general, numerical values of h_M that are significantly lower than the ones provided by the LMI condition (19). In particular, any $h_M > 0$ satisfying the small gain condition (21) is such that

$$h_M < \frac{1}{\|A_{cl}\|} \log \left(1 + \frac{\mu_M(A_{cl})}{\|M\|} \right), \quad (23)$$

³More specifically all the unstable eigenvalues of the disturbance-free operator \mathcal{U}_0 .

⁴By a continuity argument in $h_M = 0$, there always exists $h_M > 0$ such that the small gain condition (21) holds.

where $0 < \mu_M(A_{cl}) = -\max \{\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \operatorname{sp}_{\mathbb{C}}(A_{cl})\}$.

Remark 3.8: From the proof of Theorem 3.4 reported in the sequel (see in particular Lemma 5.1), we can also derive the following result regarding the behavior of the open-loop system (i.e. $u = 0$). Assume that $\beta < \pi^4$ and that the small gain condition (18) holds for $N_0 = 0$. The former condition ensures that all the eigenvalues of the disturbance-free operator \mathcal{U}_0 are stable. Recalling that $\beta = \beta_0 + \gamma$, these two conditions are satisfied for small enough values of $\beta_0 \geq 0$ and $\gamma > 0$. Let $0 < h_m < h_M$ be arbitrary. Then there exist constants $\kappa, C_0, C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that, for any d_d, d_b, Φ, h satisfying the regularity assumptions of Theorem 3.4, the mild solution of (2a-2c) with $u = 0$ satisfies the estimate (20).

From Remark 2.1, we have for any $y = (y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{H}$ that $|y_1(x)| \leq \|y\|$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. This yields the following result regarding the uniform convergence of the displacements of the beam.

Corollary 3.8.1: Assume that the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 hold true. Then, we have for all $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |y(t, x)| &\leq C_0 e^{-\kappa t} \|(y_0(t, \cdot), y_{t0}(t, \cdot))\|_{1, h_M} \\ &+ C_1 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_d(\tau)\| \\ &+ C_2 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

D. Well-posedness of the closed-loop system

The well-posedness of the closed-loop system (2a-2c) with $u = KY$ in terms of mild solutions is assessed by the following lemma whose proof is placed in Appendix C.

Lemma 3.9: Let $0 < h_m < h_M$, $N_0 \geq 1$, and $K \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2N_0}$ be arbitrary. Let $d_d \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(0, 1))$, $d_b \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0([-h_M, 0]; \mathcal{H})$, and $h \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ with $h_m \leq h \leq h_M$ be arbitrary. Then, there exists a unique mild solution $X \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ of (2a-2c) with control input $u = KY \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$.

The above result establishes the validity of the spectral decomposition and associated truncated model, as reported in Subsections III-A and III-B, for the abstract boundary control system (2a-2c) when placed in closed loop with $u = KY$.

Remark 3.10: It is possible to extend the result stated in Theorem 3.4 to any boundary disturbance with relaxed regularity assumption $d_b \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$ by considering the concept of weak solution as introduced in [26]. Specifically, for any $d_d \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(0, 1))$, $d_b \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0([-h_M, 0]; \mathcal{H})$, and $h \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ with $0 < h_m \leq h \leq h_M$, we say that $X \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ is a weak solution of the closed-loop system (2a-2c) with $u = KY$ if for any $T > 0$ and any $z \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, T]; D(A_0^*)) \cap \mathcal{C}^1([0, T]; \mathcal{H})$ such that $A_0^* z \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, T]; \mathcal{H})$ and $z(T) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \left\langle X(t), A_0^* z(t) + \frac{dz}{dt}(t) \right\rangle dt \\ &= -\langle \Phi(0), z(0) \rangle + \int_0^T \langle Lw(t), A_0^* z(t) \rangle dt \\ &\quad - \int_0^T \langle ALw(t) + \gamma \Pi X(t - h(t)) + p_d(t), z(t) \rangle dt, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $w = KY + d_b$ with Y defined by (16a) and with the initial condition $X(\tau) = \Phi(\tau)$ for all $\tau \in [-h_M, 0]$. First, it can be shown that any mild solution is a weak solution. Second, using the test functions $z(t) = (t-T)\psi_{n,\epsilon}$ over $[0, T]$ and the identity $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{A}_0 + \gamma\Pi$ with Π bounded, it can be shown the uniqueness of the weak solutions. Finally, under the assumptions of Theorem 3.4, as the mild solutions of the closed-loop system (2a-2c) with $u = KY$ satisfy the estimate (20), a density argument similar to the one reported in [26, Proof of Thm. 3] can be used to prove the existence of the weak solutions associated with any⁵ $d_d \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(0, 1))$, $d_b \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^1([-h_M, 0])$, and $h \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ such that $h_m \leq h \leq h_M$. Moreover, these weak solutions satisfy the ISS-like estimate (20).

IV. STABILITY OF THE CLOSED-LOOP FINITE-DIMENSIONAL TRUNCATED MODEL

The objective of this section is to derive values of $h_M > 0$ that ensures the existence of an exponential ISS-like estimate for the truncated model (17a-17b) with $u = KY$ where $K \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2N_0}$ is selected such that $A_{cl} = A + BK$ is Hurwitz.

A. Preliminary lemmas

For $h_M > 0$, following [19, Chap. 4, Sec. 1.3], we introduce W the space of absolutely continuous functions $f : [-h_M, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with square-integrable derivative endowed with the norm $\|f\|_W \triangleq \sqrt{\|f(0)\|^2 + \int_{-h_M}^0 \|\dot{f}(\tau)\|^2 d\tau}$. The following Lemma is an exponential ISS-like version of a disturbance-free asymptotic stability result reported in [4], [5].

Lemma 4.1: Let $F, G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $0 < h_m < h_M$ be given. Assume that there exist $\kappa > 0$, $P_1, Q \in \mathbb{S}_n^{+*}$, and $P_2, P_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that $\Theta(h_M, \kappa) \prec 0$ with

$$\Theta(h_M, \kappa) = \begin{bmatrix} 2\kappa P_1 + F^\top P_2 + P_2^\top F & P_1 - P_2^\top + F^\top P_3 & h_M P_2^\top G \\ P_1 - P_2 + P_3^\top F & -P_3 - P_3^\top + h_M Q & h_M P_3^\top G \\ h_M G^\top P_2 & h_M G^\top P_3 & -h_M e^{-2\kappa h_M} Q \end{bmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

Then, there exist constants $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 > 0$ such that, for any $h \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}_+)$ with $h_m \leq h \leq h_M$, and any $d \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^n)$, the trajectory x of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Fx(t) + G\{x(t-h(t)) - x(t)\} + d(t) \\ x(\tau) &= x_0(\tau), \quad \tau \in [-h_M, 0] \end{aligned}$$

for $t \geq 0$ and with initial condition $x_0 \in W$ satisfies

$$\|x(t)\| \leq \gamma_0 e^{-\kappa t} \|x_0\|_W + \gamma_1 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d(\tau)\|$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Let $\kappa > 0$, $P_1, Q \in \mathbb{S}_n^{+*}$, and $P_2, P_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be such that $\Theta(h_M, \kappa) \prec 0$. By a continuity argument, we select $\sigma > \kappa$ such that $\Theta(h_M, \sigma) \prec 0$. We consider the Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional $V(t) = V_1(t) + V_2(t)$ with

$$V_1(t) = x(t)^\top P_1 x(t),$$

⁵In the context of Remark 3.7, these conclusions also hold, when substituting the ISS-like estimate (20) by the ISS estimate (22), for all initial condition $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^0([-h_M, 0])$.

$$V_2(t) = \int_{-h_M}^0 \int_{t+\theta}^t e^{2\sigma(s-t)} \dot{x}(s)^\top Q \dot{x}(s) ds d\theta.$$

Then, the computation of the time derivative yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(t) &= 2x(t)^\top P_1 \dot{x}(t) + h_M \dot{x}(t)^\top Q \dot{x}(t) - 2\sigma V_2(t) \\ &\quad - \int_{-h_M}^0 e^{2\sigma\theta} \dot{x}(t+\theta)^\top Q \dot{x}(t+\theta) d\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Now, noting that

$$\dot{x}(t) = Fx(t) - G \int_{t-h(t)}^t \dot{x}(\tau) d\tau + d(t) \quad (28)$$

for all $t \geq 0$, and introducing

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & 0 \\ P_2 & P_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $P_2, P_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are “slack variables” [4], [5], we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &x(t)^\top P_1 \dot{x}(t) \\ &\stackrel{(28)}{=} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} -\dot{x}(t) + Fx(t) - G \int_{t-h(t)}^t \dot{x}(\tau) d\tau + d(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ F & -I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ d(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + \int_{t-h(t)}^t \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -G \end{bmatrix} \dot{x}(\tau) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We estimate the two last terms. First, as $2a^\top b \leq \|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -G \end{bmatrix} \dot{x}(\tau) \\ &= 2 \left(e^{-\sigma(\tau-t)} Q^{-1/2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -G \end{bmatrix}^\top P \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} \right)^\top \\ &\quad \times \left(e^{\sigma(\tau-t)} Q^{1/2} \dot{x}(\tau) \right) \\ &\leq e^{-2\sigma(\tau-t)} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G \end{bmatrix}^\top P \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + e^{2\sigma(\tau-t)} \dot{x}(\tau)^\top Q \dot{x}(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$0 \leq \int_{t-h(t)}^t e^{-2\sigma\tau} \leq h(t) e^{-2\sigma(t-h(t))} \leq h_M e^{2\sigma h_M} e^{-2\sigma t},$$

we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \int_{t-h(t)}^t \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -G \end{bmatrix} \dot{x}(\tau) d\tau \\ &\leq h_M e^{2\sigma h_M} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G \end{bmatrix}^\top P \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + \int_{t-h(t)}^t e^{2\sigma(\tau-t)} \dot{x}(\tau)^\top Q \dot{x}(\tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate the term related to the disturbance input $d(t)$. For any constant $\epsilon > 0$, which will be specified later, the use of Young's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ d(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= x(t)^\top P_2^\top d(t) + \dot{x}(t)^\top P_3^\top d(t) \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} (\|x(t)\|^2 + \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2) + \frac{\|P_2^\top\|^2 + \|P_3^\top\|^2}{2\epsilon} \|d(t)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two latter estimates with (27) and (29), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \dot{V}(t) + 2\sigma V(t) \\ &\leq 2\sigma V_1(t) + 2 \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ F & -I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + h_M e^{2\sigma h_M} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G \end{bmatrix}^\top P \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + h_M \dot{x}(t)^\top Q \dot{x}(t) - \int_{t-h_M}^{t-h(t)} e^{2\sigma(\tau-t)} \dot{x}(\tau)^\top Q \dot{x}(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \epsilon \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} + \frac{\|P_2^\top\|^2 + \|P_3^\top\|^2}{\epsilon} \|d(t)\|^2 \\ &\leq \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top \{ \Xi + \epsilon I \} \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ \dot{x}(t) \end{bmatrix} + \frac{\|P_2^\top\|^2 + \|P_3^\top\|^2}{\epsilon} \|d(t)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where it has been used the fact that the integral term is always non negative because the integrand is non negative and $h(t) \leq h_M$, and where

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi &\triangleq P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ F & -I \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ F & -I \end{bmatrix}^\top P + \begin{bmatrix} 2\sigma P_1 & 0 \\ 0 & h_M Q \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + h_M e^{2\sigma h_M} P^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G \end{bmatrix} Q^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ G \end{bmatrix}^\top P. \end{aligned}$$

From $\Theta(h_M, \sigma) \prec 0$, the Schur complement shows $\Xi \prec 0$. Thus, we can select $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, independently of h and x_0 , such that $\Xi + \epsilon I \preceq 0$. This yields, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\dot{V}(t) + 2\sigma V(t) \leq \delta \|d(t)\|^2$$

with $\delta \triangleq (\|P_2^\top\|^2 + \|P_3^\top\|^2)/\epsilon$, giving

$$V(t) \leq e^{-2\sigma t} V(0) + \delta e^{-2\sigma t} \int_0^t e^{2\sigma \tau} \|d(\tau)\|^2 d\tau.$$

Introducing $\eta = \kappa/\sigma \in (0, 1)$, successive estimations show

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-2\sigma t} \int_0^t e^{2\sigma \tau} \|d(\tau)\|^2 d\tau \\ &= e^{-2\sigma t} \int_0^t e^{2\sigma(1-\eta)\tau} \times e^{2\sigma\eta\tau} \|d(\tau)\|^2 d\tau \\ &\leq e^{-2\sigma t} \frac{e^{2\sigma(1-\eta)t}}{2\sigma(1-\eta)} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\sigma\eta\tau} \|d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2(\sigma - \kappa)} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-2\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d(\tau)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using again $\kappa < \sigma$, we obtain the following estimate

$$V(t) \leq e^{-2\kappa t} V(0) + \frac{\delta}{2(\sigma - \kappa)} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-2\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d(\tau)\|^2$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Now the claimed conclusion follows from the fact that $\lambda_m(P_1) \|x(t)\|^2 \leq V(t) \leq \max(\lambda_m(P_1), h_M \lambda_m(Q)) \|x(t + \cdot)\|_W^2$ for all $t \geq 0$. \square

Assuming that the matrix F is Hurwitz, the following lemma ensures the feasibility of the LMI $\Theta(h_M, \kappa) \prec 0$ for sufficiently small values of $h_M, \kappa > 0$.

Lemma 4.2: Let $M, N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with M Hurwitz be given. Then there exist $h_M, \kappa > 0$ such that $\Theta(h_M, 0) \prec 0$ and $\Theta(h_M, \kappa) \prec 0$.

Proof. By a continuity argument, it is sufficient to show the existence of $h_M > 0$ such that $\Theta(h_M, 0) \prec 0$. To do so, let $P_2 \in \mathbb{S}_n^{++}$ be the unique solution of $F^\top P_2 + P_2 F = -I$. We define the matrices $P_1 = 2P_2 \in \mathbb{S}_n^{++}$, $P_3 = -(F^{-1})^\top P_2$, and $Q = I \in \mathbb{S}_n^{++}$. Then we have $\Theta(h_M, 0) \prec 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} -I & 0 & h_M P_2 G \\ 0 & -S_3 + h_M I & h_M P_3^\top G \\ h_M G^\top P_2 & h_M G^\top P_3 & -h_M I \end{bmatrix} \prec 0$$

with $S_3 = P_3 + P_3^\top = (F^{-1})^\top F^{-1} \succ 0$. Noting that $-h_M I \prec 0$, the Schur complement shows that the above LMI holds if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} -I & 0 \\ 0 & -S_3 + h_M I \end{bmatrix} + h_M \begin{bmatrix} P_2 G \\ P_3^\top G \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_2 G \\ P_3^\top G \end{bmatrix}^\top \prec 0. \quad (30)$$

As $-\text{diag}(I, S_3) \prec 0$, a continuity argument in $h_M = 0$ shows that (30) holds for sufficiently small $h_M > 0$. This completes the proof. \square

B. Application to the truncated model

We can now apply the results of the previous subsection to the truncated model (17a-17b) of the studied Euler-Bernoulli beam. In particular, in view of Lemmas 3.2, 4.1, and 4.2, and using the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|Bd_b(\tau) + Pd(\tau)\| \\ &\leq \|B\| \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\| + \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|Pd(\tau)\|, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain the following result.

Lemma 4.3: Let $N_0 \geq 1$ be given. Consider the matrices A and B defined by (16d-16e). Let $K \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2N_0}$ be such that $A_{cl} = A + BK$ is Hurwitz. Let $0 < h_m < h_M$ and $\sigma > 0$ be such that $\Theta(h_M, \sigma) \prec 0$ where $\Theta(h_M, \sigma)$ is defined by (26) with $F = A_{cl}$ and $G = M$ given by (16f). Then, there exist constants $C_3, C_4, C_5 > 0$ such that, for all $Y_\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^1([-h_M, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{N_0})$, $h \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ with $h_m \leq h \leq h_M$, $P_d \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^{N_0})$, and $d_b \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, the trajectory Y of (17a-17b) with command input $u = KY$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y(t)\| &\leq C_3 e^{-\sigma t} \|Y_\Phi\|_W + C_4 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\sigma(t-\tau)} \|P_d(\tau)\| \\ &\quad C_5 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\sigma(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\| \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

Remark 4.4: As discussed in Remark 3.7, it is possible to transform the ISS-like estimate (31) of Lemma 4.3 into an ISS estimate in strict form by replacing the LMI condition (26) with the small gain condition (21). This result relies on a small

gain version of Lemma 4.1 which can be derived similarly to [15, Thm. 2.5].

V. EXPONENTIAL INPUT-TO-STATE STABILITY OF THE CLOSED-LOOP INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL SYSTEM

Now we complete the stability analysis of the infinite-dimensional Euler Bernoulli beam model (1a-1g) when placed in closed loop with the feedback law $u = KY$.

A. Stability of the infinite-dimensional part of the system neglected in the control design

As the control design has been performed on the truncated model (17a-17b) that only captures a finite number of modes of the original infinite-dimensional system (1a-1g), one has to ensure that the stability of the residual infinite-dimensional system is preserved.

Lemma 5.1: Let $0 < h_m < h_M$ and $\sigma, C_6, C_7, C_8 > 0$ be arbitrary. Let $N_0 \geq \lfloor \beta^{1/4}/\pi \rfloor$ be such that

$$\frac{60\alpha^2\gamma^2}{(\alpha^2 - 1)(N_0 + 1)^4\pi^4 + \beta} \times \frac{1}{\lambda_{N_0+1,1}^2} < 1. \quad (32)$$

Then, there exist constants $\kappa \in (0, \sigma)$ and $C_9, C_{10}, C_{11} > 0$ such that, for any $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^1([-h_M, 0]; \mathcal{H})$, $d_d \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(0, 1))$, $d_b \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $h \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ such that $h_m \leq h \leq h_M$, and $u \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\| &\leq C_6 e^{-\sigma t} \|\Phi\|_{1, h_M} + C_7 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\sigma(t-\tau)} \|d_d(\tau)\| \\ &\quad + C_8 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-\sigma(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\|, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

the mild solution $X \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ of (2a-2c) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{n \geq N_0+1 \\ \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}}} |c_{n, \epsilon}(t)|^2 &\leq C_9 e^{-2\kappa t} \|\Phi\|_{1, h_M}^2 \\ &\quad + C_{10} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-2\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\quad + C_{11} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-2\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

for all $t \geq 0$, where $c_{n, \epsilon}(t) = \langle X(t), \psi_{n, \epsilon} \rangle$.

The proposed proof is inspired by the small gain analysis reported in [15] in the context of finite-dimensional systems.

Proof. We define $\eta = -\lambda_{N_0+1, +1}/2 > 0$. Throughout this proof, we always consider integers n such that $n \geq N_0 + 1$, which ensures that $\lambda_{n, \epsilon} \leq \lambda_{N_0+1, +1} = -2\eta < 0$ for all $\epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}$. Let $\kappa \in (0, \min(\eta, \sigma))$, that will be specified in the sequel, be arbitrary. For any $n \geq N_0 + 1$, $\epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}$, and $t \geq 0$, we introduce

$$v_n(t) = c_n(t) - c_n(t - h(t)), \quad (35a)$$

$$q_n(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \langle \mathcal{U}L\{u(t) + d_b(t)\}, \psi_{n, -1} \rangle \\ \langle \mathcal{U}L\{u(t) + d_b(t)\}, \psi_{n, +1} \rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad (35b)$$

$$r_n(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \langle L\{u(t) + d_b(t)\}, \psi_{n, -1} \rangle \\ \langle L\{u(t) + d_b(t)\}, \psi_{n, +1} \rangle \end{bmatrix}. \quad (35c)$$

Then, based on (14) and noting that $B_n\{u(t) + d_b(t)\} = q_n(t) - \Lambda_n r_n(t)$, we have for all $n \geq N_0 + 1$ and all $t \geq 0$

$$\dot{c}_n(t) = \Lambda_n c_n(t) - M_n v_n(t) \quad (36)$$

$$+ q_n(t) - \Lambda_n r_n(t) + p_{d, n}(t),$$

with initial condition given over $[-h_M, 0]$ by (15). We introduce for any $t \geq -h_M$ the series:

$$S_c(t) = \sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \|c_n(t)\|^2 = \sum_{\substack{n \geq N_0+1 \\ \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}}} |c_{n, \epsilon}(t)|^2$$

with, based on (8), $S_c(t) \leq \|\Phi(t)\|^2/m_R$ for all $t \in [-h_M, 0]$ while $S_c(t) \leq \|X(t)\|^2/m_R$ for all $t \geq 0$. Similarly, we introduce for all $t \geq 0$ the series:

$$\begin{aligned} S_p(t) &= \sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \|p_{d, n}(t)\|^2 \leq \|d_d(t)\|^2/m_R, \\ S_q(t) &= \sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \|q_n(t)\|^2 \leq \frac{2\|\mathcal{U}L\|^2}{m_R} (\|u(t)\|^2 + \|d_b(t)\|^2), \\ S_v(t) &= \sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \|v_n(t)\|^2 \leq 2\{S_c(t) + S_c(t - h(t))\}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, using (33) and $\kappa < \sigma$, we obtain that, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_q(t) &\leq \gamma_{1,1} e^{-2\kappa t} \|\Phi\|_{1, h_M}^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma_{1,2} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-2\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma_{1,3} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{-2\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where $\gamma_{1,1} = 6C_6^2\|\mathcal{U}L\|^2/m_R$, $\gamma_{1,2} = 6C_7^2\|\mathcal{U}L\|^2/m_R$, and $\gamma_{1,3} = 2\|\mathcal{U}L\|^2(1 + 3C_8^2)/m_R$.

We now introduce for any $t_1 < t_2$ and any continuous function $f : [t_1, t_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the notation

$$\mathcal{I}(f, t_1, t_2) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{-2\eta(t_2-\tau)} |f(\tau)| d\tau. \quad (38)$$

Then, the two following inequalities, which will be useful in the sequel, hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(f, t_1, t_2) &= e^{-2\kappa t_2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{-2(\eta-\kappa)(t_2-\tau)} \times e^{2\kappa\tau} |f(\tau)| d\tau \\ &\leq e^{-2\kappa t_2} \frac{1 - e^{-2(\eta-\kappa)(t_2-t_1)}}{2(\eta-\kappa)} \sup_{\tau \in [t_1, t_2]} e^{2\kappa\tau} |f(\tau)| \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

and, by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(f, t_1, t_2)^2 &\leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{-2\eta(t_2-\tau)} d\tau \times \mathcal{I}(f^2, t_1, t_2) \\ &\leq \frac{1 - e^{-2\eta(t_2-t_1)}}{2\eta} \mathcal{I}(f^2, t_1, t_2). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

For any $t \geq h_M$, we obtain by direct integration of (36) over the time interval $[t - h(t), t]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} v_n(t) &= (e^{\Lambda_n h(t)} - I) c_n(t - h(t)) - \Lambda_n \int_{t-h(t)}^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{t-h(t)}^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} \{-M_n v_n(\tau) + q_n(\tau) + p_{d, n}(\tau)\} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\Lambda_n = \text{diag}(\lambda_{n, -1}, \lambda_{n, +1})$ with $\lambda_{n, -1} < \lambda_{n, +1} < 0$ for $n \geq N_0 + 1$ and $h(t) \geq 0$, we have

$\|e^{\Lambda_n h(t)} - I\| \leq 1$ and $\|e^{\Lambda_n s}\| = e^{\lambda_{n,+1}s} \leq e^{-2\eta s}$ for all $s \geq 0$. Thus, using estimate (40), as well as estimate (53) derived in Appendix D, we have for all $t \geq h_M$

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_n(t)\|^2 &\leq 5\|c_n(t-h(t))\|^2 + 5m_{N_0+1}^2 \mathcal{I}(\|v_n\|, t-h(t), t)^2 \\ &\quad + 5 \left\| \Lambda_n \int_{t-h(t)}^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + 5\mathcal{I}(\|q_n\|, t-h(t), t)^2 + 5\mathcal{I}(\|p_{d,n}\|, t-h(t), t)^2 \\ &\leq 5\|c_n(t-h(t))\|^2 + 5\gamma_2 m_{N_0+1}^2 \mathcal{I}(\|v_n\|^2, t-h(t), t) \\ &\quad + 5 \left\| \Lambda_n \int_{t-h(t)}^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_2 \mathcal{I}(\|q_n\|^2, t-h(t), t) + 5\gamma_2 \mathcal{I}(\|p_{d,n}\|^2, t-h(t), t) \end{aligned}$$

with $\gamma_2 = (1 - e^{-2\eta h_M})/(2\eta)$. Then, summing for $n \geq N_0+1$ while using $0 < m_n \leq m_{N_0+1}$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} S_v(t) &\leq 5S_c(t-h(t)) + 5\gamma_2 m_{N_0+1}^2 \mathcal{I}(S_v, t-h(t), t) \quad (41) \\ &\quad + 5 \sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \left\| \Lambda_n \int_{t-h(t)}^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_2 \mathcal{I}(S_q, t-h(t), t) + 5\gamma_2 \mathcal{I}(S_p, t-h(t), t) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq h_M$. We estimate the third term on the right hand side of the above equation as follows. Let $0 \leq t_0 \leq t$ be given. First, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_n \int_{t_0}^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau &= \left[\int_{t_0}^t \lambda_{n,-1} e^{\lambda_{n,-1}(t-\tau)} \langle Lw(\tau), \psi_{n,-1} \rangle d\tau \right] \\ &\quad - \left[\int_{t_0}^t \lambda_{n,+1} e^{\lambda_{n,+1}(t-\tau)} \langle Lw(\tau), \psi_{n,+1} \rangle d\tau \right]. \end{aligned}$$

with $w = u + d_b$. Furthermore, as $\lambda_{n,-1} < \lambda_{n,+1} \leq -2\eta < -2\kappa < -\kappa < 0$ for $n \geq N_0+1$, and introducing $w = (w_1, w_2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{t_0}^t \lambda_{n,\epsilon} e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}(t-\tau)} \langle Lw(\tau), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle d\tau \right| \\ &\leq \int_{t_0}^t -\lambda_{n,\epsilon} e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}(t-\tau)} |\langle Lw(\tau), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle| d\tau \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^2 \int_{t_0}^t -\lambda_{n,\epsilon} e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}(t-\tau)} |\langle Le_m, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle| \|w_m(\tau)\| d\tau \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^2 |\langle Le_m, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle| \int_{t_0}^t -\lambda_{n,\epsilon} e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}(t-\tau)} \|w(\tau)\| d\tau \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^2 |\langle Le_m, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle| e^{-\kappa t} \\ &\quad \times \int_{t_0}^t -\lambda_{n,\epsilon} e^{(\lambda_{n,\epsilon} + \kappa)(t-\tau)} \times e^{\kappa \tau} \|w(\tau)\| d\tau \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}}{\lambda_{n,\epsilon} + \kappa} \sum_{m=1}^2 |\langle Le_m, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle| e^{-\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [t_0, t]} e^{\kappa \tau} \|w(\tau)\| \\ &\leq \frac{2\eta}{2\eta - \kappa} \sum_{m=1}^2 |\langle Le_m, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle| e^{-\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [t_0, t]} e^{\kappa \tau} \|w(\tau)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{t_0}^t \lambda_{n,\epsilon} e^{\lambda_{n,\epsilon}(t-\tau)} \langle Lw(\tau), \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle d\tau \right|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8\eta^2}{(2\eta - \kappa)^2} \sum_{m=1}^2 |\langle Le_m, \psi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle|^2 e^{-2\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [t_0, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} \|w(\tau)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, recalling that $w = u + d_b$ and using (8) and (33), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \left\| \Lambda_n \int_{t_0}^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \quad (42) \\ &\leq \gamma_{3,1} e^{-2\kappa t} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 + \gamma_{3,2} e^{-2\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma_{3,3} e^{-2\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

with $\gamma_{3,0} = \frac{16\eta^2}{m_R(2\eta - \kappa)^2} \sum_{m=1}^2 \|Le_m\|^2$, $\gamma_{3,1} = 3\gamma_{3,0}C_6^2$, $\gamma_{3,2} = 3\gamma_{3,0}C_7^2$, and $\gamma_{3,3} = \gamma_{3,0}(1 + 3C_8^2)$. Thus, using estimates (37), (39), and (42) with $t_0 = t - h(t)$ into (41), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} S_v(t) &\leq 5e^{2\kappa h_M} e^{-2\kappa h(t)} S_c(t-h(t)) \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{4,0} m_{N_0+1}^2 e^{-2\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [t-h(t), t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} S_v(\tau) \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{4,1} e^{-2\kappa t} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{4,2} e^{-2\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{4,3} e^{-2\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq h_M$ with $\gamma_{4,0} = (1 - e^{-2\eta h_M})(1 - e^{-2(\eta - \kappa)h_M})/(4\eta(\eta - \kappa))$, $\gamma_{4,1} = \gamma_{3,1} + \gamma_{1,1}\gamma_{4,0}$, $\gamma_{4,2} = \gamma_{3,2} + \gamma_{4,0}(\gamma_{1,2} + 1/m_R)$, and $\gamma_{4,3} = \gamma_{3,3} + \gamma_{1,3}\gamma_{4,0}$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\tau \in [h_M, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} S_v(\tau) \\ &\leq 5e^{2\kappa h_M} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} S_c(\tau) \quad (43) \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{4,0} m_{N_0+1}^2 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} S_v(\tau) + 5\gamma_{4,1} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{4,2} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 + 5\gamma_{4,3} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa \tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate the S_c -term in (43), we integrate (36) over the time interval $[0, t]$ for $t \geq 0$, yielding the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \|c_n(t)\| &\leq e^{-2\eta t} \|c_n(0)\| + m_{N_0+1} \mathcal{I}(\|v_n\|, 0, t) \\ &\quad + \left\| \Lambda_n \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\| \\ &\quad + \mathcal{I}(\|q_n\|, 0, t) + \mathcal{I}(\|p_{d,n}\|, 0, t), \end{aligned}$$

where we used estimate (53) derived in Appendix D and the fact that $\lambda_{n,\epsilon} \leq -2\eta$. Using (40), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|c_n(t)\|^2 &\leq 5e^{-4\eta t} \|c_n(0)\|^2 + \frac{5}{2\eta} m_{N_0+1}^2 \mathcal{I}(\|v_n\|^2, 0, t) \\ &\quad + 5 \left\| \Lambda_n \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{5}{2\eta} \mathcal{I}(\|q_n\|^2, 0, t) + \frac{5}{2\eta} \mathcal{I}(\|p_{d,n}\|^2, 0, t)$$

and thus, using (39), (42) with $t_0 = 0$, and $S_c(0) \leq \|\Phi(0)\|^2/m_R$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_c(t) &\leq 5e^{-2\kappa t} S_c(0) + \frac{5}{2\eta} m_{N_0+1}^2 \mathcal{I}(S_v, 0, t) \\ &\quad + 5 \sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \left\| \Lambda_n \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{5}{2\eta} \mathcal{I}(S_q, 0, t) + \frac{5}{2\eta} \mathcal{I}(S_p, 0, t) \\ &\leq 5\gamma_{5,0} m_{N_0+1}^2 e^{-2\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} S_v(\tau) \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{5,1} e^{-2\kappa t} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{5,2} e^{-2\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{5,3} e^{-2\kappa t} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$, with $\gamma_{5,0} = 1/(4\eta(\eta - \kappa))$, $\gamma_{5,1} = \gamma_{3,1} + \gamma_{1,1}\gamma_{5,0} + 1/m_R$, $\gamma_{5,2} = \gamma_{3,2} + \gamma_{5,0}(\gamma_{1,2} + 1/m_R)$, and $\gamma_{5,3} = \gamma_{3,3} + \gamma_{1,3}\gamma_{5,0}$. This yields the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} S_c(\tau) \\ &\leq 5\gamma_{5,0} m_{N_0+1}^2 \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} S_v(\tau) \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{5,1} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 + 5\gamma_{5,2} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 5\gamma_{5,3} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Now, introducing the quantity:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= 5m_{N_0+1}^2 (\gamma_{4,0} + 5e^{2\kappa h_M} \gamma_{5,0}) \\ &= \frac{10\alpha^2 \gamma^2}{(\alpha^2 - 1)(N_0 + 1)^4 \pi^4 + \beta} \\ &\quad \times \frac{(1 - e^{-2\eta h_M})(1 - e^{-2(\eta - \kappa)h_M}) + 5e^{2\kappa h_M}}{4\eta(\eta - \kappa)}, \end{aligned}$$

the combination of (43-44) yields, for all $t \geq h_M$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\tau \in [h_M, t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} S_v(\tau) \\ &\leq \delta \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} S_v(\tau) + \gamma_{6,1} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma_{6,2} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 + \gamma_{6,3} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_{6,i} = 5(\gamma_{4,i} + 5e^{2\kappa h_M} \gamma_{5,i})$. From the small gain condition (32), a continuity argument in $\kappa = 0$ shows the existence of a constant $\kappa \in (0, \min(\eta, \sigma))$, independent of Φ, d_d, d_b, h, u , such that $\delta < 1$. Selecting such a κ for the remaining of the proof, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\tau \in [h_M, t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} S_v(\tau) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} \sup_{\tau \in [0, h_M]} e^{2\kappa\tau} S_v(\tau) + \frac{\gamma_{6,1}}{1 - \delta} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma_{6,2}}{1 - \delta} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 + \frac{\gamma_{6,3}}{1 - \delta} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

for all $t \geq h_M$.

Now, based on (36), direct estimations reported in Appendix E show the existence of constants $\gamma_{7,0}, \gamma_{7,1}, \gamma_{7,2}, \gamma_{7,3} > 0$, independent of Φ, d_d, d_b, h, u , such that $S_c(\tau) \leq \gamma_{7,0} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2$ for all $\tau \in [-h_M, 0]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} S_c(t) &\leq \gamma_{7,1} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 + \gamma_{7,2} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma_{7,3} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq h_M$. Consequently, we have for all $0 \leq t \leq h_M$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} S_v(\tau) &\leq 4e^{2\kappa h_M} \sup_{\tau \in [-h_M, t]} S_c(\tau) \\ &\leq 4(\gamma_{7,0} + \gamma_{7,1}) e^{2\kappa h_M} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 \\ &\quad + 4\gamma_{7,2} e^{2\kappa h_M} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\quad + 4\gamma_{7,3} e^{2\kappa h_M} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

From estimates (45) and (47), we infer the existence of constants $\gamma_{8,1}, \gamma_{8,2}, \gamma_{8,3} > 0$, independent of Φ, d_d, d_b, h, u , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} S_v(\tau) &\leq \gamma_{8,1} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M}^2 + \gamma_{8,2} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_d(\tau)\|^2 \\ &\quad + \gamma_{8,3} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{2\kappa\tau} \|d_b(\tau)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Substituting (48) into (44), we obtain the existence of constants $C_9, C_{10}, C_{11} > 0$, independent of Φ, d_d, d_b, h, u , such that the claimed estimate (34) holds. \square

B. Proof of the main result

We are now ready to prove the main result of this paper.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. We select $N_0 \geq 1$ large enough such that $N_0 \geq \lfloor \beta^{1/4}/\pi \rfloor$ and (18) holds. With the matrices A and B defined by (16d-16e), Lemma 3.2 ensures the existence of a feedback gain $K \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2N_0}$ such that $A_{cl} = A + BK$ is Hurwitz. Then, based on Lemma 4.2, let $0 < h_m < h_M$ be such that the LMI (19) is feasible. By a continuity argument, there exists $\sigma > 0$ such that $\Theta(h_M, \sigma) < 0$ where $\Theta(h_M, \sigma)$ is defined by (26) with $F = A_{cl}$ and $G = M$ given by (16f). Then, Lemma 4.3 provides constants $C_3, C_4, C_5 > 0$ such that, for any distributed perturbation $d_d \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(0, 1))$, any boundary perturbation $d_b \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, any initial condition $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^1([-h_M, 0]; \mathcal{H})$, and any delay $h \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ with $h_m \leq h \leq h_M$, the mild solution $X \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ of (2a-2c) with $u = KY \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\sum_{\substack{1 \leq n \leq N_0 \\ \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}}} |c_{n,\epsilon}(t)|^2} &\leq \frac{C_3}{\sqrt{m_R}} e^{-\sigma t} \|\Phi\|_{1,h_M} \\ &\quad + \frac{C_4}{\sqrt{m_R}} \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{-\sigma(t-\tau)} \|d_d(\tau)\| \\ &\quad + C_5 \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{-\sigma(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\| \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

for all $t \geq 0$, where we recall that m_R, M_R are constants associated with the Riesz basis \mathcal{F}_ϕ , see Definition 2.4 and

Lemma 2.5. Now, with $u = KY$, we infer the existence of constants $C_6, C_7, C_8 > 0$, independent of Φ, d_d, d_b, h , such that the estimate (33) holds. Applying Lemma 5.1, we have constants $\kappa \in (0, \sigma)$ and $C_9, C_{10}, C_{11} > 0$, independent of Φ, d_d, d_b, h , such that the estimate (34) holds. Putting together (34) and (49), and using the Riesz basis inequality (8),

$$\begin{aligned} \|X(t)\| &\leq \sqrt{M_R \sum_{\substack{n \leq 1 \\ \epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}}} |c_{n,\epsilon}(t)|^2} \\ &\leq C_0 e^{-\kappa t} \|\Phi(\tau)\|_{1,h_M} + C_1 \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_d(\tau)\|, \\ &\quad + C_2 \sup_{\tau \in [0,t]} e^{-\kappa(t-\tau)} \|d_b(\tau)\|, \end{aligned}$$

with $C_0 = \sqrt{M_R}(C_3/\sqrt{m_R} + \sqrt{C_9})$, $C_1 = \sqrt{M_R}(C_4/\sqrt{m_R} + \sqrt{C_{10}})$, and $C_2 = \sqrt{M_R}(C_5 + \sqrt{C_{11}})$ which are constants independent of Φ, d_d, d_b, h . This completes the proof. \square

VI. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

In this section, we describe a numerical example that illustrates the main result of this paper, namely: Theorem 3.4. For numerical computations, we set $\alpha = 1.5$, $\beta_0 = 50$, and $\gamma = 50$. For this choice of parameters, we have one unstable eigenvalue for \mathcal{U}_0 . Selecting $N_0 = 2$, the small gain condition (18) is satisfied. Depending on the selected actuation configuration, i.e. either one or two control inputs (see Remark 3.3), we compute first a feedback gain $K \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2N_0}$ such that the eigenvalues of $A + BK$ are given by $\{-5, -6, -7, -8\}$. Then, we compute the corresponding value $h_M > 0$ of the maximum amplitude of the admissible state-delay h provided by the LMI (19). Obviously, the obtained value of h_M depends on the selected actuation scheme. The numerical computations yield the results reported hereafter⁶. Note that, due to the invariance of the beam model (1a-1g) under the change of variable $x \leftarrow 1 - x$, the numerical results obtained for the two single input configurations are equivalent.

- One control input located at $x = 0$:

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} -1.7614 & 0.0276 & 11.8714 & -0.0360 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

with $h_M = 0.038$.

- Two control inputs located respectively at $x = 0$ and $x = 1$.

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} 2.0076 & 0.4186 & 5.0313 & 0.1129 \\ 1.9972 & 0.4278 & -4.5575 & -0.0178 \end{bmatrix}$$

with $h_M = 0.239$.

We observe that the use of two control inputs allows a significantly larger value of h_M . This indicates that, in our numerical setting, the two control inputs configuration is much more robust with respect to state-delays than the single input configuration.

Note that the above values of h_M yield the satisfaction of the ISS-like estimate (20). However, as discussed in Remark 3.7, one can get the ISS estimate (22) when considering

⁶The provided values h of h_M are such that the LMI (19) is feasible for $h_M = h$ while no feasible solution was found for $h_M = h + 0.001$ using MATLAB 2017b LMI solvers.




Fig. 1. Time evolution of the displacement $y(t, x)$ for the open-loop system

the small gain condition (21) instead of the LMI condition (19). However, this yields much more conservative results since, based on the upper estimate (23), we must have $h_M < 0.0070$ in the single input configuration while $h_M < 0.0148$ in the two inputs configuration.

For numerical illustration, we consider the two control inputs setting and we set the parameters of the simulation as follows: initial conditions $y_0(t, x) = 2(1 - t)^2 x(1 - x)$ and $y_{t0}(t, x) = -(1 - t)^2 \sin(4\pi x)(1 + 2x)$; time varying delay $h(t) = 0.12 + 0.1 \sin(6\pi t)$; distributed perturbation $d_d(t, x) = 3 \exp(-2(t - 5)^2)(2 + \cos(2\pi x))$; and boundary perturbations $d_{b,1}(t) = \cos(2\pi t) \exp(-2(t - 5)^2)$ and $d_{b,2}(t) = -\sin(3\pi t) \exp(-2(t - 5)^2)$. In particular, the perturbations are vanishing ones with maximum amplitudes at time $t = 5$ s. The used numerical scheme consists in the modal approximation of the Euler-Bernoulli beam model (1a-1g) using its first 40 modes.

The time domain evolution of the open-loop system is depicted in Fig. 1, illustrating the unstable behavior of the studied Euler-Bernoulli beam. In this configuration, numerical computations show that both single input configurations fail to ensure the stability of the Euler-Bernoulli beam in closed-loop. This is due to the fact that the maximum amplitude of the considered input delay is 0.22, which is significantly higher than the guaranteed bound $h_M = 0.037$ obtained via the LMI condition. Conversely, the temporal behavior of the closed-loop system in the two control inputs configuration is depicted in Fig 2. We observe that the proposed control strategy achieves the exponential stabilization of the studied Euler-Bernoulli beam by quickly damping out the initial condition with control inputs converging to zero. Furthermore, the impact of the vanishing distributed and boundary perturbations, whose maximum intensity occur at time $t = 5$ s, is rapidly eliminated as t increases. These numerical results are in conformity with the fading memory nature of the estimates (20) and (24).

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper discussed the point torque boundary feedback stabilization of a damped Euler-Bernoulli beam in the presence of a state-delay. The proposed control law takes the form of a state feedback computed based on a finite-dimensional truncated model of the original infinite-dimensional system. In order to ensure the exponential stability of the closed-loop truncated model in the presence of the state-delay, an LMI-based sufficient condition was derived on the maximum amplitude of the state-delay. Then, provided the fact that the truncated model captures a sufficiently large number of modes (including the unstable ones), the stability of the closed-loop infinite-dimensional system was assessed by resorting to a small gain argument. In the presence of both distributed and boundary disturbances, the derived stability result takes the form of an ISS-like estimate with fading memory of the perturbations. The validity of the proposed control strategy was illustrated with numerical simulations.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF (5)

Introducing $D = \gamma\pi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, it is a general result that [3, Thm. 3.2.1]:

$$T(t)z = S(t)z + \int_0^t T(t-s)DS(s)z \, ds \quad (50)$$

for all $z \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $t \geq 0$. Introducing $a_0 = \Phi(0) - Lw(0)$, $f(t) = \mathcal{A}Lw(t) - L\dot{w}(t) + DX(t-h(t)) + p_d(t)$, and $g(t) = f(t) - DX(t)$, the use of (50) into (3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) &= S(t)a_0 + Lw(t) + \int_0^t S(t-s)f(s) \, ds \\ &= T(t)a_0 + Lw(t) + \int_0^t T(t-s)g(s) \, ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t T(t-s)D\{-S(s)a_0 + X(s)\} \, ds - \mathcal{J}(t) \end{aligned}$$


with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(t) &= \int_0^t \int_0^{t-s} T(t-s-\tau)DS(\tau)f(s) \, d\tau \, ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_0^{t-s} T(\tau)DS(t-s-\tau)f(s) \, d\tau \, ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_0^{t-\tau} T(\tau)DS(t-s-\tau)f(s) \, ds \, d\tau \\ &= \int_0^t T(\tau)D \int_0^{t-\tau} S(t-s-\tau)f(s) \, ds \, d\tau \\ &= \int_0^t T(t-\xi)D \int_0^\xi S(\xi-s)f(s) \, ds \, d\xi \end{aligned}$$


where two changes of variables and Fubini's theorem have been used. Combining the above identities, we obtain that

$$X(t) = T(t)a_0 + Lw(t) + \int_0^t T(t-s)\{g(s) + DLw(s)\} \, ds.$$


Recalling that $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{A} + D$ with $D = \gamma\Pi$, we obtain the identity (5). Similarly, using $T(t)z = S(t)z + \int_0^t S(t-s)DT(s)z \, ds$ (see [3, Thm. 3.2.1]), we have that (5) implies (3).



(a) Displacement $y(t, x)$



(b) Speed of displacement $y_t(t, x)$



(c) Command inputs u_1 and u_2

Fig. 2. Time evolution of the closed-loop system with two command inputs u_1 and u_2

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF LEMMA 2.5

We first show that \mathcal{F}_ϕ is maximal in \mathcal{H} . To do so, let $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $\langle z, \phi_{n,\epsilon} \rangle = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $\epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} -n^2\pi^2 & \lambda_{n,-1} \\ -n^2\pi^2 & \lambda_{n,+1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} [z_1'', \sin(n\pi\cdot)] \\ [z_2, \sin(n\pi\cdot)] \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

As $\lambda_{n,-1} \neq \lambda_{n,+1}$, we deduce that $[z_1'', \sin(n\pi\cdot)] = [z_2, \sin(n\pi\cdot)] = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. As $\{\sin(n\pi\cdot) : n \geq 1\}$ is maximal in $L^2(0,1)$, we infer that $z_1'' = z_2 = 0$. From $z_1 \in H_0^1(0,1)$, we deduce that $z = 0$ showing that \mathcal{F}_ϕ is maximal in \mathcal{H} .

We now show that \mathcal{F}_ϕ satisfies a Riesz basis inequality of the type (7). First, it is straightforward to note that $\langle \phi_{n_1,\epsilon_1}, \phi_{n_2,\epsilon_2} \rangle = 0$ for any $n_1 \neq n_2$ and any $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \{-1, +1\}$. Let $N \geq 1$ and $a_{n,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{C}$ be arbitrary. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N a_{n,-1} \phi_{n,-1} + a_{n,+1} \phi_{n,+1} \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \|a_{n,-1} \phi_{n,-1} + a_{n,+1} \phi_{n,+1}\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N |a_{n,-1}|^2 + |a_{n,+1}|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(a_{n,-1} \overline{a_{n,+1}} \langle \phi_{n,-1}, \phi_{n,+1} \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\langle \phi_{n,-1}, \phi_{n,+1} \rangle = \frac{2n^4\pi^4 - \beta}{2k_{n,-1}k_{n,+1}} = \frac{n^4\pi^4 - \beta/2}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 n^8 \pi^8 + \beta^2/4}}.$$

As $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow (x - \beta/2)/\sqrt{\alpha^2 x^2 + \beta^2/4}$ is strictly increasing with $\varphi(x) \rightarrow 1/\alpha < 1$ when $x \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\varphi(\pi^4) \geq -\beta/\sqrt{4\alpha^2 \pi^8 + \beta^2} > -1$, we have $|\langle \phi_{n,-1}, \phi_{n,+1} \rangle| \leq C_R = \max(1/\alpha, \beta/\sqrt{4\alpha^2 \pi^8 + \beta^2}) < 1$ for all $n \geq 1$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} & |a_{n,-1}|^2 + |a_{n,+1}|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(a_{n,-1} \overline{a_{n,+1}} \langle \phi_{n,-1}, \phi_{n,+1} \rangle) \\ & \leq |a_{n,-1}|^2 + |a_{n,+1}|^2 + 2C_R |a_{n,-1}| |a_{n,+1}| \\ & \leq (1 + C_R) (|a_{n,-1}|^2 + |a_{n,+1}|^2) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & |a_{n,-1}|^2 + |a_{n,+1}|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(a_{n,-1} \overline{a_{n,+1}} \langle \phi_{n,-1}, \phi_{n,+1} \rangle) \\ & \geq |a_{n,-1}|^2 + |a_{n,+1}|^2 - 2C_R |a_{n,-1}| |a_{n,+1}| \\ & \geq (1 - C_R) (|a_{n,-1}|^2 + |a_{n,+1}|^2). \end{aligned}$$

The claimed Riesz basis inequality holds with $m_R = 1 - C_R \in (0, 1)$ and $M_R = 1 + C_R > 1$.

APPENDIX C

WELL-POSEDNESS OF THE ABSTRACT SYSTEM (2A-2C)
WITH $u = KY$

Let $d_d \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(0,1))$, $d_b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\Phi \in C^0([-h_M, 0]; \mathcal{H})$, and $h \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ with $0 < h_m \leq h \leq h_M$ be given. First, we show that $X \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ such that $Y \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^{2N_0})$ is a mild solution of (2a-2c) with $u = KY$ if and only if $X \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ and satisfies for all $t \geq 0$

$$X(t) = S(t)\{\Phi(0) - L\tilde{w}(0)\} + L\tilde{w}(t) \quad (51)$$

$$+ \int_0^t S(t-s)\{\mathcal{A}L\tilde{w}(s) - L\dot{\tilde{w}}(s) + \gamma\Pi X(s-h(s)) + p_d(s)\} ds$$

with $\tilde{w} = Kv + d_b$,

$$v(t) = e^{(A_{cl}-M)t} Y_\phi(0) \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + \int_0^t e^{(A_{cl}-M)(t-\tau)} MY(\tau - h(\tau)) d\tau \\ & + \int_0^t e^{(A_{cl}-M)(t-\tau)} \{Bd_b(\tau) + P_d(\tau)\} d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

the initial condition $X(\tau) = \Phi(\tau)$ for all $\tau \in [-h_M, 0]$, and where the quantities appearing in (52) are defined by (16a-16f). On one hand, if X is a mild solution of (2a-2c) with $u = KY \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$, then the developments of Section III show that Y satisfies the ODE (17a-17b), which provides after integration (52) with $v = Y$. Then (51) holds with $\tilde{w} = w$. On the other hand, assume that $X \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ satisfies (51). Then, we obtain from (52) that $v \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^{2N_0})$ and $\dot{v}(t) = (A_{cl}-M)v(t) + MY(t-h(t)) + Bd_b(t) + P_d(t)$. Reproducing the developments of Section III regarding the derivation of the ODE (17a-17b), we obtain from (51) that $\dot{Y}(t) = (A-M)Y(t) + MY(t-h(t)) + B\{Kv(t) + d_b(t)\} + P_d(t)$. Consequently we have $\dot{v}(t) - \dot{Y}(t) = (A-M)(v(t) - Y(t))$ with the initial condition $v(0) - Y(0) = Y_\Phi(0) - Y_\Phi(0) = 0$. Thus $v = Y \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^{2N_0})$, showing that X is a mild solution of (2a-2c) with $u = KY$.

To conclude, it is sufficient to show the existence and uniqueness of a function $X \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ satisfying (51-52). As $\Phi \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ and noting that for any $k \geq 0$, $0 \leq t \leq (k+1)h_m$ implies that $-h_M < -h_m \leq t - h(t) \leq kh_m$, the existence and uniqueness of such a $X \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{H})$ is immediate by a classical induction argument and [3, Lem. 3.1.5]. Moreover, we deduce from (52) that the control input is such that $u = KY \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^2)$.

APPENDIX D
ESTIMATE OF $\|M_n\|$

Considering M_n defined by (13), we show that the following estimate holds:

$$\forall n \geq 1, \quad \|M_n\| \leq m_n \triangleq \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha\gamma}{\sqrt{(\alpha^2 - 1)n^4\pi^4 + \beta^2}}. \quad (53)$$

To do so, we recall that, for any real matrix P , $\|P\| = \sqrt{\lambda_M(P^\top P)}$. Let $a \neq 0$ and consider the matrix

$$P_a = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & a \\ -1/a & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

As the eigenvalues of $P_a^\top P_a$ are given by 0 and $2 + a^2 + 1/a^2$, we infer $\|P_a\| = \sqrt{2 + a^2 + 1/a^2}$. Thus we have

$$\|M_n\| = \frac{\gamma}{|\lambda_{n,-1} - \lambda_{n,+1}|} \sqrt{2 + \frac{k_{n,-1}^2}{k_{n,+1}^2} + \frac{k_{n,+1}^2}{k_{n,-1}^2}}.$$

As $\alpha > 1$, straightforward computations show that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 + \frac{k_{n,-1}^2}{k_{n,+1}^2} + \frac{k_{n,+1}^2}{k_{n,-1}^2} &= 4\alpha^2 \frac{(\alpha n^4 \pi^4 + \beta/(2\alpha))^2}{\alpha^2 n^8 \pi^8 + \beta^2/4} \\ &\leq 4\alpha^2 \frac{(\alpha n^4 \pi^4 + \beta/2)^2}{\alpha^2 n^8 \pi^8 + \beta^2/4} \leq 8\alpha^2, \end{aligned}$$

where is has been used that $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. The claimed estimate (53) follows from (6).

APPENDIX E ESTABLISHMENT OF ESTIMATE (46)

In this appendix, we always consider integers $n \geq N_0 + 1$. Thus we have $\lambda_{n,\epsilon} \leq \lambda_{N_0+1,+1} = -2\eta < 0$ for all $\epsilon \in \{-1, +1\}$. From the definition of v_n given by (35a) and the ODE (36), we have, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_n(t) &= e^{\Lambda_n t} c_n(0) - \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} M_n c_n(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} M_n \tilde{c}_n(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} \{q_n(\tau) - \Lambda_n r_n(\tau) + p_{d,n}(\tau)\} d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_n(t) = c_n(t - h(t))$. Noting that, for all $t \geq 0$, $\|e^{\Lambda_n t}\| = e^{\lambda_{n,+1} t} \leq e^{-2\eta t} \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|c_n(t)\| &\leq \|c_n(0)\| + m_{N_0+1} \mathcal{I}(\|c_n\|, 0, t) \\ &\quad + m_{N_0+1} \mathcal{I}(\|\tilde{c}_n\|, 0, t) + \left\| \Lambda_n \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\| \\ &\quad + \mathcal{I}(\|q_n\|, 0, t) + \mathcal{I}(\|p_{d,n}\|, 0, t) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$, where we have used (53) and with the notation \mathcal{I} defined by (38). Then, we obtain for all $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|c_n(t)\|^2 &\leq 6\|c_n(0)\|^2 + \frac{3m_{N_0+1}^2}{\eta} \mathcal{I}(\|c_n\|^2, 0, t) \\ &\quad + \frac{3m_{N_0+1}^2}{\eta} \mathcal{I}(\|\tilde{c}_n\|^2, 0, t) \\ &\quad + 6 \left\| \Lambda_n \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{\eta} \mathcal{I}(\|q_n\|^2, 0, t) + \frac{3}{\eta} \mathcal{I}(\|p_{d,n}\|^2, 0, t), \end{aligned}$$

where estimate (40) has been used. Summing for $n \geq N_0 + 1$ and then using (39) with $\kappa = 0$, we have, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_c(t) &\leq 6S_c(0) + \frac{3m_{N_0+1}^2}{\eta} \mathcal{I}(S_c, 0, t) \\ &\quad + \frac{3m_{N_0+1}^2}{\eta} \mathcal{I}(S_c(\cdot - h(\cdot)), 0, t) \\ &\quad + 6 \sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \left\| \Lambda_n \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{\eta} \mathcal{I}(S_q, 0, t) + \frac{3}{\eta} \mathcal{I}(S_p, 0, t) \\ &\leq 6S_c(0) + \xi_2 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} S_c(\tau) + \xi_2 \sup_{\tau \in [-h_M, t-h_m]} S_c(\tau) \\ &\quad + 6 \sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \left\| \Lambda_n \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \xi_3 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} S_q(\tau) + \xi_3 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} S_p(\tau) \end{aligned}$$

with $\xi_2 = 3m_{N_0+1}^2/(2\eta^2)$ and $\xi_3 = 3/(2\eta^2)$. Using assumption (32), we infer that $\xi_2 < 1$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} S_c(\tau) &\leq \frac{6}{1 - \xi_2} S_c(0) + \frac{\xi_2}{1 - \xi_2} \sup_{\tau \in [-h_M, t-h_m]} S_c(\tau) \\ &\quad + \frac{6}{1 - \xi_2} \sum_{n \geq N_0+1} \left\| \Lambda_n \int_0^t e^{\Lambda_n(t-\tau)} r_n(\tau) d\tau \right\|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\xi_3}{1 - \xi_2} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} S_q(\tau) + \frac{\xi_3}{1 - \xi_2} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} S_p(\tau) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Recalling that $S_c(0) \leq \|\Phi(0)\|^2/m_R$ and $S_p(t) \leq \|d_d(t)\|^2/m_R$, the use of estimates (37) and (42) for $t_0 = 0$ show that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} S_c(\tau) &\leq \xi_4 \sup_{\tau \in [-h_M, t-h_m]} S_c(\tau) + \xi_5 \|\Phi\|_{1, h_M}^2 \quad (54) \\ &\quad + \xi_6 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} \|d_d(\tau)\| + \xi_7 \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} \|d_b(\tau)\|, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq 0$ with $\xi_4 = \xi_2/(1 - \xi_2)$, $\xi_5 = (6/m_R + 6\gamma_{3,1} + \xi_{3,1,1})/(1 - \xi_2)$, $\xi_6 = (6\gamma_{3,2} + \xi_{3,1,2} + \xi_{3,2}/m_R)/(1 - \xi_2)$, and $\xi_7 = (6\gamma_{3,3} + \xi_{3,1,3})/(1 - \xi_2)$. Now, as for any $\tau \in [-h_m, 0]$, $\Phi(\tau) = \Phi(0) + \int_0^\tau \dot{\Phi}(s) ds$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(\tau)\| &\leq \|\Phi(0)\| + \int_{-h_M}^0 \|\dot{\Phi}(s)\| ds \\ &\leq \|\Phi(0)\| + \sqrt{h_M} \sqrt{\int_{-h_M}^0 \|\dot{\Phi}(s)\|^2 ds} \\ &\leq (1 + \sqrt{h_M}) \|\Phi\|_{1, h_M}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus we have the estimate $S_c(\tau) \leq \|\Phi(\tau)\|^2/m_R \leq (1 + \sqrt{h_M})^2 \|\Phi\|_{1, h_M}^2/m_R$ for all $\tau \in [-h_M, 0]$. Based on (54), one can recursively estimate the quantities $\sup_{\tau \in [0, kh_m]} S_c(\tau)$ for increasing values of $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$. This procedure provides the claimed estimate (46) when reaching $k = \lceil h_M/h_m \rceil \geq 1$.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. B. Argomedeo, E. Witrant, and C. Prieur, “ D^1 -Input-to-state stability of a time-varying nonhomogeneous diffusive equation subject to boundary disturbances,” in *American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2012. IEEE, 2012, pp. 2978–2983.
- [2] O. Christensen *et al.*, *An Introduction to Frames and Riesz Bases*. Springer, 2016.
- [3] R. F. Curtain and H. Zwart, *An Introduction to Infinite-Dimensional Linear Systems Theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 21.
- [4] E. Fridman, “A new Lyapunov technique for robust control of systems with uncertain non-small delays,” *IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 165–179, 2006.
- [5] —, “Tutorial on Lyapunov-based methods for time-delay systems,” *European Journal of Control*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 271–283, 2014.
- [6] E. Fridman and Y. Orlov, “Exponential stability of linear distributed parameter systems with time-varying delays,” *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 194–201, 2009.
- [7] P. Guzmán, S. Marx, and E. Cerpa, “Stabilization of the linear Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation with a delayed boundary control,” *IFAC PapersOnLine*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 70–75, 2019.
- [8] T. Hashimoto and M. Krstic, “Stabilization of reaction diffusion equations with state delay using boundary control input,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 4041–4047, 2016.
- [9] B. Jacob, R. Nabiullin, J. R. Partington, and F. L. Schwenninger, “Infinite-dimensional input-to-state stability and orlicz spaces,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 868–889, 2018.

- [10] B. Jacob, F. L. Schwenninger, and H. Zwart, "On continuity of solutions for parabolic control systems and input-to-state stability," *Journal of differential equations*, vol. 266, no. 10, pp. 6284–6306, 2019.
- [11] W. Kang and E. Fridman, "Boundary control of delayed ODE-heat cascade under actuator saturation," *Automatica*, vol. 83, pp. 252–261, 2017.
- [12] —, "Boundary control of reaction-diffusion equation with state-delay in the presence of saturation," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 12 002–12 007, 2017.
- [13] —, "Boundary constrained control of delayed nonlinear Schrödinger equation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 3873–3880, 2018.
- [14] —, "Regional stabilization of linear delayed schrödinger equation by constrained boundary control," in *2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 3330–3335.
- [15] I. Karafyllis and M. Krstic, "Delay-robustness of linear predictor feedback without restriction on delay rate," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 6, pp. 1761–1767, 2013.
- [16] —, "ISS with respect to boundary disturbances for 1-D parabolic PDEs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 3712–3724, 2016.
- [17] —, "ISS in different norms for 1-D parabolic PDEs with boundary disturbances," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 1716–1751, 2017.
- [18] —, *Input-to-state stability for PDEs*. Springer, 2019.
- [19] V. Kolmanovskii and A. Myshkis, *Applied Theory of Functional Differential Equations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 85.
- [20] M. Krstic, "Control of an unstable reaction-diffusion PDE with long input delay," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 58, no. 10-11, pp. 773–782, 2009.
- [21] —, *Delay Compensation for Nonlinear, Adaptive, and PDE Systems*. Springer, 2009.
- [22] H. Lhachemi and C. Prieur, "Feedback stabilization of a class of diagonal infinite-dimensional systems with delay boundary control," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.05086*, 2019.
- [23] H. Lhachemi, C. Prieur, and R. Shorten, "An LMI condition for the robustness of constant-delay linear predictor feedback with respect to uncertain time-varying input delays," *Automatica*, vol. 109, p. 108551, 2019.
- [24] H. Lhachemi, D. Saussié, G. Zhu, and R. Shorten, "Input-to-state stability of a clamped-free damped string in the presence of distributed and boundary disturbances," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, in press, 2019.
- [25] H. Lhachemi and R. Shorten, "Boundary feedback stabilization of a reaction-diffusion equation with Robin boundary conditions and state-delay," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.10761*, 2019.
- [26] —, "ISS property with respect to boundary disturbances for a class of Riesz-spectral boundary control systems," *Automatica*, vol. 109, p. 108504, 2019.
- [27] H. Lhachemi, R. Shorten, and C. Prieur, "Control law realification for the feedback stabilization of a class of diagonal infinite-dimensional systems with delay boundary control," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 930–935, 2019.
- [28] A. Mironchenko, I. Karafyllis, and M. Krstic, "Monotonicity methods for input-to-state stability of nonlinear parabolic PDEs with boundary disturbances," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 510–532, 2019.
- [29] A. Mironchenko and F. Wirth, "Restatements of input-to-state stability in infinite dimensions: what goes wrong," in *Proc. of 22th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Systems and Networks (MTNS 2016)*, 2016, pp. 667–674.
- [30] —, "Characterizations of input-to-state stability for infinite-dimensional systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 1692–1707, 2018.
- [31] S. Nicaise, C. Pignotti *et al.*, "Stabilization of the wave equation with boundary or internal distributed delay," *Differential and Integral Equations*, vol. 21, no. 9-10, pp. 935–958, 2008.
- [32] S. Nicaise and J. Valein, "Stabilization of the wave equation on 1-D networks with a delay term in the nodal feedbacks," *NHM*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 425–479, 2007.
- [33] S. Nicaise, J. Valein, and E. Fridman, "Stability of the heat and of the wave equations with boundary time-varying delays," *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 559, 2009.
- [34] C. Prieur and E. Trélat, "Feedback stabilization of a 1-d linear reaction-diffusion equation with delay boundary control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 1415–1425, 2019.
- [35] O. Solomon and E. Fridman, "Stability and passivity analysis of semilinear diffusion PDEs with time-delays," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 88, no. 1, pp. 180–192, 2015.
- [36] E. D. Sontag, "Smooth stabilization implies coprime factorization," *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 435–443, 1989.
- [37] A. Tanwani, C. Prieur, and S. Tarbouriech, "Disturbance-to-state stabilization and quantized control for linear hyperbolic systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.00302*, 2017.
- [38] J. Zheng and G. Zhu, "A De Giorgi iteration-based approach for the establishment of ISS properties for Burgers' equation with boundary and in-domain disturbances," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, in press, 2018.
- [39] —, "Input-to-state stability with respect to boundary disturbances for a class of semi-linear parabolic equations," *Automatica*, vol. 97, pp. 271–277, 2018.
- [40] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, K. Glover *et al.*, *Robust and optimal control*. Prentice hall New Jersey, 1996, vol. 40.