

Static output feedback stabilization of uncertain rational nonlinear systems with input saturation

Thiago Alves Lima, Diego de S. Madeira, and Valessa V. Viana

Abstract—In this letter, the notion of robust strict QSR-dissipativity is applied to solve the static output feedback control problem for a class of continuous-time nonlinear rational systems subject to input saturation and bounded parametric uncertainties. A local dissipativity condition is combined with generalized sector conditions to formulate the stabilization problem in terms of linear matrix inequalities. The strategy applies to general static output feedback design without any restrictions on the plant output matrix. An optimization problem is formulated in order to compute the feedback gain matrix that maximizes the estimate on the closed-loop region of attraction. Numerical examples are provided to illustrate the applicability of this new approach in examples adapted from the literature.

Index Terms—Static output feedback, control saturation, dissipativity, robust control, nonlinear systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Saturating actuators are ubiquitous to real-world dynamical systems and are, by themselves, a nonlinearity to closed-loop systems that can degrade their performance or cause instability even when the open-loop system is modeled by linear methods [1]. Therefore, the consideration of such constraints is rather important when designing feedback control laws. Generally speaking, nonlinear models are closer to achieving the goal of well representing real systems than the much simpler linearized models around equilibrium points. However, their consideration increases the complexity of both open-loop analysis and closed-loop control design since, in contrast to the case of linear systems, most of the tools developed to nonlinear systems cannot be applied in a unified manner. Nonetheless, important contributions have been made in the last decades to provide the tools necessary to study such systems [2], [3].

Some important works dealt with the analysis and control of rational nonlinear systems with input saturation. An early paper coping with this problem was [4], where analysis conditions based on linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) were used for computing estimates on the region of attraction for rational control systems with saturating actuators. Later, in [5], state feedback design has been proposed for the special case of single-input systems. The design of this type of control law has also been tackled in [6], nonetheless with the consideration of multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems with parametric uncertainties. More recently, the co-design of dynamical controllers and anti-windup loops was studied in [7].

Thiago Alves Lima, Diego de S. Madeira, and Valessa V. Viana are with the Departamento de Engenharia Elétrica, Universidade Federal do Ceará, Fortaleza, Brazil.

Nevertheless, none of these works have provided tools for the static output feedback (SOF) stabilization of nonlinear systems with saturating inputs. In fact, it is well known that a definitive solution for the SOF stabilization problem is not a consensus in the control community even for the case of linear systems (see the survey [8]), thus justifying the apparent scarcity of works for the much more complex case of nonlinear systems. Recently, the work in [9] presented new necessary and sufficient conditions based on the notion of exponential QSR-dissipativity for the exponential stabilizability of nonlinear systems by linear static output feedback. Preliminary results regarding the development of a linear semidefinite programming (SDP) approach for the robust asymptotic stabilization of nonlinear systems based on [9] are available in [10].

In this paper, we follow the ideas from [9] to the stabilization of nonlinear rational systems. As an incremental contribution, we consider that the plant is affected by input saturation and parametric uncertainties, thus increasing the level of complexity of the control design problem. We solve the stabilization problem by using a combination of QSR-dissipativity and generalized sector conditions, while another condition is used to ensure the negativity of the Lyapunov function, thus guaranteeing the stability of the closed-loop with the designed control law. An optimization problem is also formulated to design the stabilizing gain to maximize estimations on the closed-loop region of attraction. As long as the authors know, this is the first work proposing a solution to the SOF stabilization problem of rational nonlinear systems with input saturation. Furthermore, it is important to highlight that, differently from most papers dealing with SOF design, the proposed method is non-interactive. Due to being special cases of the more general rational dependency, the developed conditions can easily be used to tackle polynomial and quadratic nonlinear systems, as will be shown in the paper. Such special cases of systems were considered along with saturating actuators in [11]–[14].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the problem formulation and statement are presented, whereas the class of studied nonlinear systems is minutely presented. Theoretical preliminaries and the main results are presented in Sections III and IV, respectively. Numerical examples from the literature are then used in Section V. Finally, Section VI closes the paper with a summary of conclusions and future works.

Notation. For a matrix Y in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, Y^\top in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ means its transpose, $Y_{(i)}$ denotes its i th row, while for v in \mathbb{R}^m , $v_{(i)}$ denotes its i th component. For matrices $W = W^\top$ and $Z = Z^\top$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $W \succ Z$ means that $W - Z$ is positive definite. Likewise, $W \succeq Z$ means that $W - Z$ is positive semi-definite.

\mathbb{S}_n^+ stands for the set of $n \times n$ symmetric positive definite matrices. $\mathbf{1}$, \mathbf{I} , and $\mathbf{0}$ denote all-ones, identity, and null matrices of appropriate dimensions, although their dimensions can be explicitly presented whenever relevant. The \star in the expression of a matrix denotes symmetric blocks. For matrices W and Z , $\text{diag}(W, Z)$ corresponds to the block-diagonal matrix. $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a (vector) function with domain \mathcal{X} and codomain \mathcal{Y} . $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is the Cartesian product of sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . \mathcal{C}^1 denotes the set of functions whose partial derivatives exist and are continuous, i.e., $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ means that f is continuously differentiable.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. System description

Consider the following uncertain nonlinear system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), \delta(t)) + g(x(t), \delta(t))\text{sat}(v(t)) \\ y(t) = h(x(t)) = Cx(t) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

defined for $t \geq 0$, where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state with initial condition $x(0) \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $\delta(t) \in \mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ is an uncertain bounded parameter vector which accounts for deviations of the model description around its nominal part, and where the system's output $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ has been restricted to a linear form such that $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ is a constant matrix. To stabilize (1), we consider that

$$v(t) = Ky(t) \quad (2)$$

is the system output feedback control law to be designed with static matrix gain $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, and that the constrained plant input is given by the decentralized saturation function $\text{sat}(v(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ defined as

$$\text{sat}(v_{(i)}) = \text{sign}(v_{(i)}) \min\{|v_{(i)}|, \bar{u}_{(i)}\}, \quad \bar{u}_{(i)} > 0, \quad (3)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$, where $\bar{u}_{(i)}$ denotes the amplitude bound in each actuator.

The set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a given polytope (with n_x vertices) of initial conditions $x(0)$ containing the origin for which one wants to study stability and stabilization of the closed-loop interconnection (1)-(2). From [15], such a polytope can be represented as the intersection of n_{xe} hyperplanes

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x | a_k^\top x \leq 1, k = 1, \dots, n_{xe}\}, \quad (4)$$

where the constant vectors $a_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be determined by fulfilling $a_k^\top x = 1$ at all groups of adjacent vertices of \mathcal{X} ¹. Furthermore, functions $f(x, \delta)$ and $g(x, \delta)$ are polynomial or rational functions on their arguments such that $(f, g) \in \mathcal{C}^1$, $f(0, \delta) = 0$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{D}$, and the origin $(x(t), u(t)) = (0, 0)$ is an equilibrium point of (1). Moreover, the computed control signal $v(t)$ is a measurable function, with $v(t) \in \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ for all $t \geq 0$, $0 \in \mathcal{V}$. Then, the described system obeys the conditions for the existence and uniqueness of solutions for all $x(0) \in \mathcal{X}$ (see, for example, [2]).

¹Set \mathcal{X} does need to be positively invariant. Furthermore, a description of a set \mathcal{D} similar to the one in (4) can also be obtained.

B. Differential Algebraic Representation - DAR

A dynamical system (1) can be represented in many different and equivalent ways. In the case of a rational model, a much convenient representation is the well-known Differential Algebraic Representation (DAR), which is referred to as providing less conservative results than Linear Fractional Representations (LFR) and Linear Parameter Varying (LPV) forms. A DAR is more general than an LFR and an LPV approach, and it usually leads two larger estimates of a domain of attraction [4], [6]. A DAR of an input-affine uncertain nonlinear system with input saturation such as (1) is given by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = A_1(x, \delta)x(t) + A_2(x, \delta)\pi(t) + A_3(x, \delta)\text{sat}(v(t)) \\ 0 = \Upsilon_1(x, \delta)x(t) + \Upsilon_2(x, \delta)\pi(t) + \Upsilon_3(x, \delta)\text{sat}(v(t)) \\ y = Cx(t) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $\pi(x, \text{sat}(v), \delta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\pi}$ is a suitably chosen vector of nonlinear functions. Matrices $A_1(x, \delta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $A_2(x, \delta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_\pi}$, $A_3(x, \delta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $\Upsilon_1(x, \delta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\pi \times n}$, $\Upsilon_2(x, \delta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\pi \times n_\pi}$, $\Upsilon_3(x, \delta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\pi \times m}$ are affine functions with respect to (x, δ) , while $\Upsilon_2(x, \delta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\pi \times n_\pi}$ is supposed to be a square full-rank matrix for all vectors $(x, \delta) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{D}$.

The DAR of a system is not unique and a state-space representation (1) is well-posed in its DAR form if $\Upsilon_2(x, \delta)$ is invertible, as from (5) we have that

$$\pi(x, \text{sat}(v), \delta) = -\Upsilon_2^{-1}(\Upsilon_1 x(t) + \Upsilon_3 \text{sat}(v(t))),$$

leading to

$$\dot{x} = (A_1 - A_2 \Upsilon_2^{-1} \Upsilon_1) x(t) + (A_3 - A_2 \Upsilon_2^{-1} \Upsilon_3) \text{sat}(v(t)).$$

Remark 1. Some papers, as the one in [16], have dealt with input-saturated quadratic nonlinear systems, which are systems that admit the following representation

$$\dot{x}(t) = (A + \mathcal{A}_q \mathcal{A}_x(x(t)))x(t) + B \text{sat}(v(t)), \quad (6)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{A}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n^2}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are constant matrices and

$$\mathcal{A}_x(x(t)) = \begin{bmatrix} x(t) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & x(t) & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & x(t) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times n}$$

introduces nonlinear behavior to the system. All the results in this paper can be directly applied to such systems by considering the DAR of system (6) with matrices $A_1 = A$, $A_2 = \mathcal{A}_q$, $A_3 = B$, $\Upsilon_1 = \mathcal{A}_x$, $\Upsilon_2 = -I_{n^2}$, $\Upsilon_3 = 0_{n^2 \times m}$.

C. Problem statement

The problem we intend to solve in this letter can be summarized as follows.

Problem 1. Given the DAR matrices $A_1, A_2, A_3, \Upsilon_1, \Upsilon_2, \Upsilon_3$, and C of the nonlinear system (1), polytopes \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D} , and the saturation amplitude bounds $\bar{u}_i, i = 1, \dots, m$, develop convex conditions in the form of linear matrix inequalities for the design of the static output feedback gain K such that the

asymptotic stability of the closed-loop system yielded from the connection (1)-(2) is ensured for some set of initial conditions $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore, we want to maximize estimates on the region of attraction of the saturated closed-loop system.

III. PRELIMINARIES

A. Dissipativity

A dynamical system such as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t)) + g(x(t), v(t)), \\ y(t) = Cx(t), \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

is said to be dissipative if it is completely reachable and there exists a nonnegative storage function $V(x(t))$, where $V : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $V \in C^1$, and a locally integrable supply rate $r(v(t), y(t))$ such that $\dot{V} \leq r(v, y)$. In this work, we employ the definition of strict QSR-dissipativity presented below [17].

Definition 1. A system is said to be strictly QSR-dissipative along all possible trajectories of (7) starting at $x(0)$, for all $t \geq 0$, if there exists $T(x) > 0$ such that

$$\dot{V}(x) + T(x) \leq y^\top Qy + 2y^\top Sv + v^\top Rv, \quad (8)$$

where $S \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ is real and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are real and symmetric.

In the case of input saturation, system (7) can be rewritten with $g(x(t), v(t)) = g_x(x(t))\text{sat}(v(t))$, and the satisfaction of (8) might be hard to verify. In this paper, we tackle this problem by using the sector nonlinearity modelling approach, where the saturation function is replaced by some identity of the control $v(t) = f_v(x(t))$ and a deadzone nonlinearity. Then, a sector condition is applied in order to help to verify (8) for some set of the state space. The basis for the application of this approach will be presented in the next subsection.

B. Generalized sector condition

Consider the deadzone nonlinearity φ , defined as follows

$$\varphi(v(t)) = \text{sat}(v(t)) - v(t), \quad (9)$$

and the following set

$$\mathcal{L}(\bar{u}) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m; \theta \in \mathbb{R}^m; -\bar{u} \leq v - \theta \leq \bar{u}\}. \quad (10)$$

where $\theta = f_\theta(x(t))$ is an auxiliary vector to be defined. We then recall the following Lemma from [1, p. 43].

Lemma 1. If v and θ belong to set $\mathcal{L}(\bar{u})$, then the deadzone nonlinearity $\varphi(v)$ satisfies the following inequality, which is true for any diagonal positive definite matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$

$$\varphi^\top(v)W(\varphi(v) + \theta) \leq 0. \quad (11)$$

By taking into account the DAR (5) and the identity (9), the following equivalent representation is obtained

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = A_1x(t) + A_2\pi(t) + A_3v(t) + A_3\varphi(v(t)) \\ 0 = \Upsilon_1x(t) + \Upsilon_2\pi(t) + \Upsilon_3v(t) + \Upsilon_3\varphi(v(t)) \\ y = Cx(t) \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where the matrices dependency on (x, δ) have been omitted for sake of simplicity of notation and the control input $v(t)$ was defined in (2). Such representation allows us to analyze the system stability and dissipativity properties using a combination of (8) and the generalized sector condition provided in Lemma 1. Due to being a nonlinear system, we need to analyse regional stability of (12)-(2), i.e., we need to design a control law while estimating a set of initial conditions for which the asymptotic stability of the closed loop is ensured.

C. Finsler's Lemma

Prior to the presentation of the main results, the celebrated Finsler's Lemma [18] is reviewed.

Lemma 2. Consider $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_s}$ a given polytopic set, and let $\Phi : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_q}$ and $\Gamma : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_r \times n_q}$ be given matrix functions, with Φ symmetric. Then, the following statements are equivalent

- i) $\forall w \in \mathcal{W}$ the condition that $z^\top \Phi(w)z > 0$ is satisfied $\forall z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q} : \Gamma(w)z = 0$.
- ii) $\forall w \in \mathcal{W}$ there exists a certain matrix function $\mathfrak{J} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_r}$ such that $\Phi(w) + \mathfrak{J}(w)\Gamma(w) + \Gamma(w)^\top \mathfrak{J}(w)^\top \succ 0$.

In order to obtain polytopic LMI conditions in the case that Γ and Φ are affine functions of w , one can apply form ii) of Finsler's Lemma with a constant decision variable matrix \mathfrak{J} . In this case, ii) is only sufficient to guarantee i). Note that Γ is an annihilator of vector z , which in general is not unique [19], [20], however can be easily determined for the analysis of systems represented in the DAR form (12), as will be clear later in the paper.

IV. MAIN RESULTS

The following theorem provides a solution to Problem 1.

Theorem 1 (SOF gain design). Given scalars $\sigma > 0$ and ρ , assume that there exist matrices P in \mathbb{S}_n^+ , N in \mathbb{S}_n^+ , R in \mathbb{S}_m^+ , symmetric matrix Q in $\mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, diagonal matrix W in \mathbb{S}_m^+ , matrices S in $\mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$, \bar{G} in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, \mathfrak{J} in $\mathbb{R}^{(n+n_\pi+2m) \times n_\pi}$, such that for all (x, δ) at the vertices of $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{D}$

$$\Phi + \mathfrak{J}\Gamma + \Gamma^\top \mathfrak{J}^\top \prec 0, \quad (13)$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q + \rho \mathbf{1}_{p \times m} S^\top + S \rho \mathbf{1}_{m \times p} & \star \\ R^\top \rho \mathbf{1}_{m \times p} & -R \end{bmatrix} \prec 0, \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & a_k \\ a_k^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, n_{x\epsilon}, \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & \bar{G}_{(i)}^\top \\ \star & 2W_{(i,i)}\sigma - \sigma^2 \bar{u}_{(i)}^2 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad (16)$$

hold with $\Gamma = [\Upsilon_1 \quad \Upsilon_2 \quad \Upsilon_3 \quad \Upsilon_3]$ and

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} A_1^\top P + PA_1 + N - C^\top QC & \star & \star & \star \\ A_2^\top P & 0 & \star & \star \\ A_3^\top P - S^\top C & 0 & -R & \star \\ A_3^\top P - \bar{G} & 0 & -W & -2W \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, the SOF gain $K = -R^{-1}S^\top$ asymptotically stabilizes the closed-loop system (1)-(2) around the origin, and the

ellipsoid $\varepsilon(P, 1) \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{L}(\bar{u})$, with $\varepsilon(P, 1) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; x^\top P x \leq 1\}$ and $\mathcal{L}(\bar{u}) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; |G_{(i)}x| \leq \bar{u}_{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, m\}$, $G = W^{-1}\bar{G}$, is an estimate of the closed-loop domain of attraction for all $\delta \in \mathcal{D}$.

Proof. First consider an auxiliary matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and application of Lemma 1 with $\theta = v - Gx$. If x belongs to the resulting set $\mathcal{L}(\bar{u})$, then following inequality holds for any diagonal positive definite matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$

$$-2\varphi^\top(v)W(\varphi^\top(v) + v - Gx) \geq 0. \quad (17)$$

Consider relation (16). Use the fact that

$$\left(\frac{\sigma}{\bar{u}_{(i)}^2} - W_{(i,i)}\right)^\top \frac{\bar{u}_{(i)}^2}{\sigma} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\bar{u}_{(i)}^2} - W_{(i,i)}\right) \succeq 0 \quad (18)$$

to obtain the relation $2W_{(i,i)}\sigma - \sigma^2\bar{u}_{(i)}^{-2} < W_{(i,i)}^\top \bar{u}_{(i)}^2 W_{(i,i)}$. Thus, satisfaction of (16) implies fulfillment of

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & \bar{G}_{(i)}^\top \\ \star & W_{(i,i)}^\top \bar{u}_{(i)}^2 W_{(i,i)} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (19)$$

Then, pre- and post-multiply (19) by $\text{diag}(I, W_{(i,i)}^{-1})$ to obtain relation

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & \bar{G}_{(i)}^\top \\ \star & \bar{u}_{(i)}^2 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad (20)$$

which ensures the inclusion of the ellipsoid $\varepsilon(P, 1)$ in the polyhedral set $\mathcal{L}(\bar{u})$. Additionally, from relation (15),

$$x^\top P x - (x^\top a_k)(a_k^\top x) \geq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, n_{xe}, \quad (21)$$

which ensures $\varepsilon(P, 1) \subset \mathcal{X}$. Therefore, by satisfying both (16) and (15), one ensures that $\varepsilon(P, 1) \subset \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{L}(\bar{u})$. Then, consider the quadratic Lyapunov function $V(x) = x^\top P x$, with P in \mathbb{S}_n^+ . If we can ensure that $\dot{V}(x) < 0$ along the trajectories of the closed-loop system (1)-(2) for all initial conditions in the vertices of $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{D}$, then it follows that $\varepsilon(P, 1) \subset \mathcal{H}$ is an estimation on the domain of attraction, while \mathcal{H} is a region of guaranteed asymptotic stability of the system. Consider again (17) and note that if

$$\dot{V}(x) + T(x) - 2\varphi^\top(v)W(\varphi^\top(v) + v - Gx) \leq y^\top Q y + 2y^\top S v + v^\top R v \quad (22)$$

is satisfied for matrices (Q, S, R) , then (8) is also satisfied for all $x \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{L}(\bar{u})$. By using $T(x) = x^\top N x$, N in \mathbb{S}_n^+ , change of variable $\bar{G} = W G$, and substitutions of $y = C x$, $\dot{x} = A_1 x(t) + A_2 \pi(t) + A_3 v(t) + A_3 \varphi(v(t))$, (22) can be equivalently rewritten as $z^\top \Phi z \leq 0$, with extended vector $z = [x^\top \ \pi^\top \ v^\top \ \varphi^\top(v)]^\top$, and where Φ has been defined in Theorem 1. Clearly, matrix Γ is a linear annihilator for the vector z . Then, from Lemma 2, $z^\top \Phi z \leq 0$ is satisfied for all $(x, \delta) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{D}$ if (13) is fulfilled at all vertices of the polytope $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{D}$ for some matrix \mathfrak{J} , leading to (13). Furthermore, if at the same time we guarantee that

$$y^\top Q y + 2y^\top S v + v^\top R v \leq 0, \quad (23)$$

then $\dot{V} < 0$ is also ensured for all $(x, \delta) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{D}$. By considering the extended vector $\zeta = [y^\top \ v^\top]^\top$, inequality (23) can be equivalently rewritten as $\zeta^\top M_d \zeta \leq 0$, with

$$M_d = \begin{bmatrix} Q & \star \\ S^\top & R \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consider the control law (2) with gain $K = -R^{-1}S^\top$. By noting that $C_s \zeta = 0$, with $C_s = [S^\top \ R]$, Lemma 2 can be applied. If there exists matrix $L_s \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+m) \times m}$ such that $M_d + L_s C_s + C_s^\top L_s^\top \preceq 0$, then $\zeta^\top M_d \zeta \leq 0$ is guaranteed for all $\zeta \neq 0$. Finally, condition (14) is obtained by making $L_s = [\rho \mathbf{1}_{m \times p} \quad -\mathbf{I}_{m \times m}]^\top$, with some auxiliary scalar ρ , thus completing the proof. \square

A. Maximization of the estimated region of attraction

An optimization problem can be formulated to design a static output feedback gain that stabilizes the closed-system (1)-(2) while maximizing the estimated region of attraction $\varepsilon(P, 1)$. When maximizing such region, different criteria can be adopted, such as maximization of the ellipsoid minor axis, volume maximization, maximization in desired directions, etc [1]. In this work, we adopted volume maximization, which is equivalent to minimization of the trace of matrix P . To this end, for given scalars σ and ρ in Theorem 1, the following optimization problem can be cast:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \text{trace}(P) \\ & \text{subject to (13), (14), (15), (16).} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we present three numerical examples to illustrate the use of the proposed solution. Initially, an example concerning static output feedback design for quadratic systems is presented. Then, a second example dealing with an uncertain rational nonlinear system from the literature is detailed. The final example consists again of SOF design for a polynomial nonlinear system.

TABLE I
EXAMPLE 1 - VALUES OF TRACE(P) FOR DIFFERENT STRATEGIES.

	This approach - SOF	[16] - QSF	[16] - LSF
$\bar{u} = 1$	10.8152	12.955	12.955
$\bar{u} = 10$	0.9114	0.8153	2.420

A. Example 1 - Quadratic nonlinear system

Consider the input saturated quadratic nonlinear system analysed in Example 2 from [16]. A general DAR for this type of system is presented in Remark 1. In [16], both a linear state feedback (LSF) and a nonlinear quadratic state feedback (QSF) for the system stabilisation with maximization of the estimation on the region of attraction have been designed. Here, we consider the design of the stabilizing SOF gain K with an output matrix $C = [1 \ 1]$. Two values for the input magnitude bound \bar{u} have been considered. In the case of saturation level $\bar{u} = 1$, by running optimization problem (24) with scalars $\sigma = 8$, $\rho = -2.48$, and polytope \mathcal{X} with limits $|x_1| \leq 0.5$,

TABLE II
EXAMPLE 2 - SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF SOME APPROACHES.

	[15]	[5]	[6]	Case 1 - This approach	Case 2 - This approach
States Polytope	$ x_1 \leq 0.15$ $ x_2 \leq 0.15$	$ x_1 \leq 0.19$ $ x_2 \leq 0.21$	$ x_1 \leq 0.19$ $ x_2 \leq 0.22$	$ x_1 \leq 0.380$ $ x_2 \leq 0.396$	$ x_1 \leq 1$ $ x_2 \leq 0.68$
Uncertainty Polytope	$ \delta_1 \leq 0.097$ $ \delta_2 \leq 0.990$	$ \delta_1 \leq 0.10$ $ \delta_2 \leq 0.99$	$ \delta_1 \leq 0.10$ $ \delta_2 \leq 0.99$	$ \delta_1 \leq 0.1$ $ \delta_2 \leq 1$	$ \delta_1 \leq 0.1$ $ \delta_2 \leq 1$
Stability area	0.090	< 0.159	0.167	0.256	0.492
$\log(\det(P))$	7.965	7.100	6.800	6.985	7.105

$|x_2| \leq 1$, we obtain the linear SOF gain $K = -2.4806$ that stabilizes the same system with the estimation on the region of attraction given by $x^\top P x \leq 1$, with

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 6.5751 & 3.3043 \\ 3.3043 & 4.2401 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For the second case of $\bar{u} = 10$, by running optimization problem (24) with scalars $\sigma = 7$, $\rho = -8$, and polytope \mathcal{X} with limits $|x_1| \leq 1.47$, $|x_2| \leq 2.52$, we obtain the linear SOF gain $K = -8.0014$ that stabilizes the system with a Lyapunov matrix P given by

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6800 & 0.2242 \\ 0.2242 & 0.2314 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In order to compare the size of the estimated region of attraction, we analyze the values of $\text{trace}(P)$ (which is inversely proportional to the size of the region of attraction [1]) obtained by applying the proposed method and the approaches for LSF and QSF from [16]. Table I presents the results for both saturation levels \bar{u} . Even though we apply the much simpler linear SOF, the proposed approach achieves the largest estimate on the region of attraction for the case with $\bar{u} = 1$. In the case of $\bar{u} = 10$, we achieve an estimate larger than the LSF and close to the nonlinear control law from [16].

B. Example 2 - Rational nonlinear system

Consider the uncertain nonlinear input saturated system analysed in [6], which corresponds to an inverted pendulum system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = x_2, \\ \dot{x}_2 = \frac{\delta_1}{1 + \delta_1} \left(\frac{2x_1x_2^2}{1 + x_2^2} + \frac{g}{l}x_1 - \frac{b\delta_2x_2}{M\delta_1} \right) + \frac{\text{sat}(v(t))}{1 + \delta_1}. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

The parameters $b = 0.5$, $l = 1$, $g = 9.8$ and $M = 2$ are the same considered in [6]. Also, we consider the same saturation limit $\bar{u} = 0.25$ and the same output $y(t) = x(t)$. A DAR of system (25) is given by

$$\pi = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_1}{1 + \delta_1} & \frac{x_2}{1 + \delta_1} & \frac{x_1x_2\delta_1}{(1 + \delta_1)(1 + x_2^2)} & \frac{x_1\delta_1}{1 + x_2^2} & \frac{x_2^2\delta_1}{1 + x_2^2} & \frac{\text{sat}(v(t))}{1 + \delta_1} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{g}{l}\delta_1 & -\frac{b}{M}\delta_2 & 2x_2 & 0 & 0 & -\delta_1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Upsilon_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \delta_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^\top, \quad A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Upsilon_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times 5} & 1 \end{bmatrix}^\top,$$




Fig. 1. Example 2 - Region of attraction (ellipsoid in red), polytope \mathcal{X} (green box), $\mathcal{L}(\bar{u})$ (between blue lines), region of guaranteed stability \mathcal{H} (in pink color), and closed-loop trajectories (in black) for Case 1.

$$\Upsilon_2 = \left[\begin{array}{c|ccc} -(1 + \delta_1)I_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline & x_2 & 0 & 0 \\ & -1 & -x_1 & 0 \\ & x_1 & -1 & 0 \\ & 0 & 0 & -1 - \delta_1 \end{array} \right].$$

By running optimization problem (24) we intend to design a static state feedback for stabilization of system (25). Two different cases of results with the proposed approach are presented. In Case 1, with $\sigma = 10^4$, $\rho = -1.33$, we obtain $K = [-1.33 \quad -1.33]$ and a Lyapunov matrix

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 45.4432 & 19.8532 \\ 19.8532 & 32.4331 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In Case 2, with $\sigma = 10^4$, $\rho = -1.383$, we obtain $K = [-1.3829 \quad -1.3829]$ and a Lyapunov matrix

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 50.1400 & 22.2023 \\ 22.2023 & 34.1131 \end{bmatrix}.$$

A summary of the results is presented in Table II. One of the analysed performance index presented in Table II is the $\log(\det(P))$, which is inversely proportional to the volume of the ellipsoid. Another measure taken into account was the area of the region of guaranteed stability. In this work and in [5], the stability region is given by \mathcal{H} , which is the intersection between the polytope \mathcal{X} and the sector region $\mathcal{L}(\bar{u})$. On the other hand, in both [6] and [15], the stability region is given

simply by the state polytope. The value 0.1596 presented in Table II for stability area of [5] is the polytope area, then the real stability area is smaller than 0.1596.

From Table II, one can note that while the domain of attraction obtained in Case 1 is barely smaller than the one in [6], the limits of the polytope \mathcal{X} obtained in this case are greater than all the compared strategies from others papers, which leads to a substantial increase on the stability region. Such results were obtained while also considering a slightly increased polytope of uncertainties \mathcal{D} . In Case 2, we obtained a slightly smaller estimation on the region of attraction than in Case 1, however we were able to find a larger polytope \mathcal{X} which led to the overall largest stability area among the compared results. Considering that the pendulum system is on a flat surface, the physical limit of the first state, which is the tangent of half the angle around equilibrium position (see [15]), is $-1 \leq x_1 \leq 1$. Therefore, the design conditions are feasible for all the physically possible values of x_1 .

As it can be checked in the table, the stability areas of Case 1 and Case 2 are much larger than that of all the compared strategies, while we recall that the results for these cases are obtained with larger uncertainty \mathcal{D} and state \mathcal{X} polytopes. Also, in the developed strategy, we apply sector conditions that lead to fewer conditions to be checked than that of [6], which applies the polytopic representation of the saturation, leading to the necessity to realise 2^m times more tests in the conditions. Figure 1 presents simulation results of Case 1 from Table II.

C. Example 3 - Polynomial nonlinear system

Consider the nonlinear input saturated system analysed in [5]

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1(t) = x_2, \\ \dot{x}_2(t) = (1 + x_1^2)x_1 + (2 + 8x_2^2)x_2 + \text{sat}(v(t)). \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

As [5] applied a state feedback strategy for stabilization, we adapted the example by choosing an output matrix $C = [0.55 \ 1.2]$ for the system. A DAR of this system is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &= [x_1^2 \ x_2^2], \Upsilon_1 = \text{diag}(x_1, x_2), \Upsilon_2 = -I_2, \Upsilon_3 = 0_{2 \times 1}, \\ A_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ x_1 & 8x_2 \end{bmatrix}, A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We consider the same bound on the saturation imposed in [5], $\bar{u} = 1$. Then, by running the optimization problem (24) with scalars $\sigma = 12$, $\rho = -4.48$, and polytope \mathcal{X} with limits $|x_1| \leq 0.61$ and $|x_2| \leq 0.35$, we obtain a SOF gain $K = -4.4680$ such that the closed-loop system is asymptotically stable with a Lyapunov matrix P given by

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 4.7781 & 5.0144 \\ 5.0144 & 13.5026 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

VI. CONCLUSION

This work proposed new non-interactive conditions expressed in the form of linear matrix inequalities for the design of stabilizing static output feedback gains for nonlinear systems affected by both uncertainties and input saturation. The

approach is aimed at rational nonlinear systems, however, as demonstrated in the paper, can also easily be applied to the less general cases of polynomial and quadratic nonlinear systems. A simple optimization problem leading to feedback gains that maximize the closed-loop region of attraction was also formulated. Furthermore, the application of the proposed method to nonlinear systems from the literature demonstrated the effectiveness of the proposed design conditions.

Ongoing research includes the application of equilibrium-independent dissipativity for feedback stabilization of nonzero equilibria using linear SDP strategies. Also, future work will envisage the use of rational Lyapunov functions in order to decrease conservatism of the conditions and also consideration of plants with more general outputs, that is, without imposing the linear form $y = Cx$.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Tarbouriech, G. Garcia, J. M. Gomes da Silva Jr., and I. Queinnec, *Stability and Stabilization of Linear Systems with Saturating Actuators*. London: Springer, 2011.
- [2] W. M. Haddad and V. Chellaboina, *Nonlinear dynamical systems and control: a Lyapunov-based approach*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton university press, 2008.
- [3] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [4] D. Coutinho and J. G. da Silva Jr., "Computing estimates of the region of attraction for rational control systems with saturating actuators," *IET Control Theory & Applications*, vol. 4, pp. 315–325(10), March 2010.
- [5] M. Oliveira, J. G. da Silva, and D. Coutinho, "State feedback design for rational nonlinear control systems with saturating inputs," in *2012 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 2331–2336.
- [6] S. Azizi, L. A. Torres, and R. M. Palhares, "Regional robust stabilisation and domain-of-attraction estimation for mimo uncertain nonlinear systems with input saturation," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 91, no. 1, pp. 215–229, 2018.
- [7] R. S. Castro, J. V. Flores, A. T. Salton, and J. M. Gomes da Silva Jr, "Controller and anti-windup co-design for the output regulation of rational systems subject to control saturation," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 1395–1417, 2021.
- [8] M. S. Sadabadi and D. Peaucelle, "From static output feedback to structured robust static output feedback: A survey," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 42, pp. 11–26, 2016.
- [9] D. de S. Madeira, "Necessary and sufficient dissipativity-based conditions for feedback stabilization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2021.3074850, 2021.
- [10] D. de S. Madeira and V. V. Viana, "An application of QSR-dissipativity to the problem of static output feedback robust stabilization of nonlinear systems," *Anais da Sociedade Brasileira de Automática*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2020.
- [11] G. Valmórbida, S. Tarbouriech, and G. Garcia, "State feedback design for input-saturating quadratic systems," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 1196–1202, 2010.
- [12] G. Valmórbida, S. Tarbouriech, and G. Garcia, "Design of polynomial control laws for polynomial systems subject to actuator saturation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 1758–1770, 2013.
- [13] M. Ran, Q. Wang, and C. Dong, "Stabilization of a class of nonlinear systems with actuator saturation via active disturbance rejection control," *Automatica*, vol. 63, pp. 302–310, 2016.
- [14] T. Jennawasin and D. Banjerdpongchai, "Design of state-feedback control for polynomial systems with quadratic performance criterion and control input constraints," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 117, pp. 53–59, 2018.
- [15] E. R. Rohr, L. F. A. Pereira, and D. F. Coutinho, "Robustness analysis of nonlinear systems subject to state feedback linearization," *Sba: Controle & Automação Sociedade Brasileira de Automatica*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 482–489, 2009.
- [16] G. Valmórbida, S. Tarbouriech, and G. Garcia, "State feedback design for input-saturating quadratic systems," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 1196–1202, 2010.
- [17] B. Brogliato, R. Lozano, B. Maschke, and O. Egeland, *Dissipative Systems Analysis and Control - Theory and Applications*. London, UK: Springer-Verlag, 2020.

-
- [18] M. C. de Oliveira and R. E. Skelton, "Stability tests for constrained linear systems," in *Perspectives in robust control*, S. R. Moheimani, Ed. London: Springer London, 2001, pp. 241–257.
 - [19] A. Trofino and T. Dezuo, "LMI stability conditions for uncertain rational nonlinear systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 24, no. 18, pp. 3124–3169, 2014.
 - [20] D. Coutinho, M. Fu, A. Trofino, and P. Danes, " \mathcal{L}_2 -gain analysis and control of uncertain nonlinear systems with bounded disturbance inputs," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control: IFAC-Affiliated Journal*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 88–110, 2008.