

Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for State Feedback Equivalence to Negative Imaginary Systems

Kanghong Shi, Ian R. Petersen, *Fellow, IEEE*, and Igor G. Vladimirov

Abstract—In this paper, we present necessary and sufficient conditions under which a linear time-invariant (LTI) system is state feedback equivalent to a negative imaginary (NI) system. More precisely, we show that a minimal LTI strictly proper system can be rendered NI using full state feedback if and only if it can be output transformed into a system, which has relative degree less than or equal to two and is weakly minimum phase. We also considered the problems of state feedback equivalence to output strictly negative imaginary systems and strongly strict negative imaginary systems. Then we apply the NI state feedback equivalence result to robustly stabilize an uncertain system with strictly negative imaginary uncertainty. An example is provided to illustrate the proposed results, for the purpose of stabilizing an uncertain system.

Index Terms—Negative imaginary systems, feedback equivalence, stabilization, controller synthesis, robust control.

I. INTRODUCTION

Negative imaginary (NI) systems theory was introduced in [1], [2] and has attracted attention in the past decade [3]–[8]. Motivated by the control of flexible structures [9]–[11], NI systems theory has been applied in many fields including nano-positioning control [12]–[15] and the control of lightly damped structures [7], [16], [17], etc. Typical mechanical NI systems are systems with colocated force actuators and position sensors. In this sense, NI systems theory provides an alternative to positive real (PR) systems theory [18], as PR systems theory uses negative velocity feedback control while NI systems theory uses positive position feedback control. In comparison with PR systems theory, one advantage of NI systems theory is that it allows systems to have relative degrees of zero, one and two, while PR systems can only have relative degrees of zero and one.

Roughly speaking, a square transfer matrix is NI if it is stable and its Hermitian imaginary part is negative semidefinite for all frequencies $\omega \geq 0$. For a single-input single-output (SISO) NI system, its frequency response has a phase lag between 0 to 2π radians for all frequencies $\omega > 0$. It is shown using a set of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) in the NI lemma that a system is NI if it is dissipative, with the supply rate being the inner product of its input and the derivative of its output [3], [4], [19]. An NI system $R(s)$ can be robustly stabilized using a positive feedback strictly negative imaginary (SNI) controller $R_s(s)$, where

$R(\infty)R_s(\infty) = 0$ and $R_s(\infty) \geq 0$, if and only if the DC loop gain of the interconnection is strictly less than unity; i.e., $\lambda_{\max}(R(0)R_s(0)) < 1$; see [1].

The problem of rendering a system PR using state feedback control in order to achieve stabilization has been investigated in many papers (see [20], [21], etc). For example, [21] renders a linear system PR and this result is then generalized to nonlinear systems in [22] using passivity theory. Further nonlinear generalizations of these ideas are presented in the papers [23]–[26]. In these papers, such PR or passivity state feedback equivalence results are then applied to stabilize systems with specific nonlinearities. One of the necessary and sufficient conditions for state feedback equivalence to a passive or PR system is that the original system must have relative degree one. This restriction stems from the nature of passivity and PR systems and, as a result, rules out a wide variety of control systems with relative degree two, such as mechanical systems with force actuators and position sensors. To overcome this limitation and to complement the existing results that are based on passivity and PR systems theory, we consider the problem of state feedback equivalence to NI systems.

In this paper, we investigate the conditions under which a linear system with the minimal realization $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})$ is state feedback equivalent to an NI system. Suppose the system has no zeros at the origin. We show that such a system can be rendered NI via the use of state feedback if and only if (a) it can be output transformed into a system with relative degree less than or equal to two; and (b) the transformed system is weakly minimum phase (see for example [27] for details of the terminology in feedback stabilization). The idea of applying an output transformation comes from the fact that the system in question does not always have a relative degree vector in general and hence does not always have a normal form. However, we show that the property of NI state feedback equivalence is invariant to a nonsingular output transformation because its effect can be compensated by an additional input transformation. Moreover, we show that a system can be rendered output strictly negative imaginary (OSNI) if and only if it can be rendered NI. In particular, we show that a system is state feedback equivalent to a strongly strict negative imaginary (SSNI) system if and only if it has a relative degree vector $\{1, \dots, 1\}$ and is minimum phase. The proposed NI state feedback equivalence results are then applied to robustly stabilize an uncertain system with SNI uncertainty.

The contribution of this paper is to provide conditions under which a system is state feedback equivalent to an NI system, an OSNI system or an SSNI system. This work, together with the preliminary conference paper [28], is the first in the literature where NI state feedback equivalence is investigated. In [28],

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council under grant DP190102158.

K. Shi, I. R. Petersen and I. G. Vladimirov are with the School of Engineering, College of Engineering and Computer Science, Australian National University, Canberra, Acton, ACT 2601, Australia. kanghong.shi@anu.edu.au, ian.petersen@anu.edu.au, igor.vladimirov@anu.edu.au.

we consider cases where a system has relative degree of either one or two, which rules out the case that a system has mixed relative degrees one and two. In this paper, we consider the general case which allows the system to have mixed relative degrees. Also, the relative degree condition is an assumption in [28], while it is a part of the necessary and sufficient conditions in this paper. This makes the present paper a complete result for the NI state feedback equivalence problem. This paper also contributes to the literature by providing a method to stabilize systems with relative degree less than or equal to two.

This paper is organised as follows: Section II provides the essential background on NI systems theory. Section III contains the main results of this paper, where we derive necessary and sufficient conditions under which it is possible to render a system NI using state feedback control. Formulas for the required state feedback matrices are provided in the proofs. In Section IV, an SSNI state feedback equivalence result is also provided. Section V applies the NI state feedback equivalence results presented in Section III in stabilizing an uncertain system with SNI uncertainty. Section VI illustrates the presented results with a numerical example. Section VII concludes the paper.

Notation: The notation in this paper is standard. \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{C} denote the fields of real and complex numbers, respectively. \mathbb{N} denotes the set of nonnegative integers. $j\mathbb{R}$ denotes the set of purely imaginary numbers. $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ denote the spaces of real and complex matrices of dimension $m \times n$, respectively. $\Re[\cdot]$ is the real part of a complex number. A^T and A^* denote the transpose and complex conjugate transpose of a matrix A , respectively. A^{-T} denotes the transpose of the inverse of A ; i.e., $A^{-T} = (A^{-1})^T = (A^T)^{-1}$. $\ker(A)$ denotes the kernel of A . $\text{spec}(A)$ denotes the spectrum of A . $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ denotes the largest eigenvalue of a matrix A with real spectrum. For a symmetric or Hermitian matrix P , $P > 0$ ($P \geq 0$) denotes the property that the matrix P is positive definite (positive semidefinite) and $P < 0$ ($P \leq 0$) denotes the property that the matrix P is negative definite (negative semidefinite). For a positive definite matrix P , we denote by $P^{\frac{1}{2}}$, the unique positive definite square root of P . $OLHP$ and $CLHP$ are the open and closed left half-planes of the complex plane, respectively.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Definition 1: (Negative Imaginary Systems) [3] A square real-rational proper transfer function matrix $R(s)$ is said to be negative imaginary if:

1. $R(s)$ has no poles at the origin and in $\Re[s] > 0$;
2. $j[R(j\omega) - R^*(j\omega)] \geq 0$ for all $\omega \in (0, \infty)$ except for values of ω where $j\omega$ is a pole of $R(s)$;
3. if $j\omega_0$ with $\omega_0 \in (0, \infty)$ is a pole of $R(s)$, then it is a simple pole and the residue matrix $K_0 = \lim_{s \rightarrow j\omega_0} (s - j\omega_0)jR(s)$ is Hermitian and positive semidefinite.

Definition 2: (Strictly Negative Imaginary Systems) [3] A square real-rational proper transfer function matrix $R(s)$ is said to be strictly negative imaginary if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $R(s)$ has no poles in $\Re[s] \geq 0$;

2. $j[R(j\omega) - R^*(j\omega)] > 0$ for all $\omega \in (0, \infty)$.

Definition 3: (Output Strictly Negative Imaginary Systems) [29] A square real-rational proper transfer function matrix $R(s)$ is said to be output strictly negative imaginary if there exists a scalar $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$j\omega[R(j\omega) - R(j\omega)^*] - \epsilon\omega^2 \bar{R}(j\omega)^* \bar{R}(j\omega) \geq 0$$

$\forall \omega \in \mathbb{R} \cup \infty$ where $\bar{R}(j\omega) = R(j\omega) - R(\infty)$. In this case, we say $R(s)$ is OSNI with a level of output strictness ϵ .

Definition 4: (Strongly Strictly Negative Imaginary Systems) [30] A square real-rational proper transfer function matrix $R(s)$ is said to be strongly strictly negative imaginary if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $R(s)$ is SNI.
2. $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} j\omega[R(j\omega) - R^*(j\omega)] > 0$ and $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} j\frac{1}{\omega}[R(j\omega) - R^*(j\omega)] > 0$.

Lemma 1: (NI Lemma) [3] Let (A, B, C, D) be a minimal state-space realisation of an $p \times p$ real-rational proper transfer function matrix $R(s)$ where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Then $R(s)$ is NI if and only if:

1. $\det(A) \neq 0$, $D = D^T$;
2. There exists a matrix $Y = Y^T > 0$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$AY + YA^T \leq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad B + AY C^T = 0.$$

Lemma 2: (SSNI Lemma) [30] Given a square transfer function matrix $R(s) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ with a state-space realisation (A, B, C, D) , where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Suppose $R(s) + R(-s)^T$ has normal rank p and (A, B, C, D) has no observable uncontrollable modes. Then A is Hurwitz and $R(s)$ is SSNI if and only if $D = D^T$ and there exists a matrix $Y = Y^T > 0$ that satisfies conditions

$$AY + YA^T < 0, \quad \text{and} \quad B + AY C^T = 0.$$

Lemma 3: (OSNI Lemma) [29] Let (A, B, C, D) be a minimal state-space realisation of an $p \times p$ real-rational proper transfer function matrix $R(s)$ where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a scalar. Then $R(s)$ is OSNI with a level of output strictness ϵ if and only if $D = D^T$ and there exists a matrix $Y = Y^T > 0$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$AY + YA^T + \epsilon(CAY)^T CAY \leq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad B + AY C^T = 0.$$

Definition 5: (Lyapunov Stability) [31] A square matrix A is said to be Lyapunov stable if $\text{spec}(A) \subset CLHP$ and every purely imaginary eigenvalue of A is semisimple.

Lemma 4: (Lyapunov Stability Theorem - Asymptotic Stability) [32] Consider a continuous-time homogeneous linear time-invariant (LTI) system

$$\dot{x} = Ax, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1)$$

the following statements are equivalent:

1. The system (1) is asymptotically stable.
2. All of the eigenvalues of A have strictly negative real parts.
3. For every symmetric positive definite matrix Q , there exists a unique solution P to the following Lyapunov equation

$$A^T P + P A = -Q \quad (2)$$

such that \mathcal{P} is symmetric and positive definite.

4. There exists a symmetric positive definite matrix \mathcal{P} for which the following Lyapunov matrix inequality holds:

$$\mathcal{A}^T \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{P} \mathcal{A} < 0.$$

Lemma 5: (Lyapunov Stability Theorem - Lyapunov Stability) [31] Let $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and assume there exists a positive semidefinite matrix $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and a positive definite matrix $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that (2) is satisfied, then \mathcal{A} is Lyapunov stable.

Lemma 6: (Eigenvector Test for Controllability) [32] The pair (A, B) is controllable if and only if there is no eigenvector of A^T in the kernel of B^T .

Lemma 7: (Eigenvector Test for Observability) [32] The pair (A, C) is observable if and only if no eigenvector of A is in the kernel of C .

Lemma 8: (Internal Stability of Interconnected NI Systems) [3] Consider an NI transfer function matrix $R(s)$ and an SNI transfer function matrix $R_s(s)$ that satisfy $R(\infty)R_s(\infty) = 0$ and $R_s(\infty) \geq 0$. Then the positive feedback interconnection $[R(s), R_s(s)]$ is internally stable if and only if $\lambda_{max}(R(0)R_s(0)) < 1$. (e.g., see [1] for the definition of internal stability and positive feedback interconnection.)

III. STATE FEEDBACK EQUIVALENCE TO AN NI SYSTEM

Consider a system with the state-space model:

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu, \quad (3a)$$

$$y = Cx, \quad (3b)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the input and $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the output. Here, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$. We assume that $\text{rank}(B) = \text{rank}(C) = p$.

For the system (3), we provide the following definitions.

Definition 6: (see also [27], [33]) A vector $r = \{r_1, \dots, r_p\} \in \mathbb{N}^p$ is called the relative degree vector of system (3) if the following conditions are satisfied.

1. For all $i = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_i A^j B &= 0 \quad \text{for } j = 0, \dots, r_i - 2; \\ \text{and } H(r)_i &:= C_i A^{r_i-1} B \neq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

2. $\det(H(r)) \neq 0$.

Here C_i denotes the i -th row of the matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and

$$H(r) = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 A^{r_1-1} B \\ \vdots \\ C_p A^{r_p-1} B \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

Condition 1 in this definition indicates that the i -th output has its r_i -th time derivative depending explicitly on the inputs.

As is explained in [33], in the case that (3) is a MIMO system; i.e., $p \geq 2$, Condition 2 in Definition 6 is not always satisfied. The components in the relative degree vector r are invariant under a nonsingular state transformation. However, a nonsingular output transformation can change the components in the vector r and in some cases transform the realization (A, B, C) to (A, B, \tilde{C}) , where $\tilde{C} = T_y C$, $T_y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\det(T_y) \neq 0$, which satisfies Condition 2 in Definition 6.

Note that there does not always exist such an output transformation that transforms the system (3) into a form with a relative degree vector. In [33], the notion of a leading incomplete relative degree vector is introduced as follows.

Definition 7: [33] A vector $r = \{r_1, \dots, r_p\} \in \mathbb{N}^p$ is called a leading incomplete relative degree (LIRD) vector of the system (3) if the following conditions are satisfied.

1. For all $i = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_i A^j B &= 0 \quad \text{for } j = 0, \dots, r_i - 2; \\ \text{and } C_i A^{r_i-1} B &\neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

2. $r_i \leq r_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, p - 1$.

3. For any set of pairwise distinct indices $i_1, \dots, i_q \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ such that $r_{i_1} = r_{i_2} = \dots = r_{i_q}$, the rows $H(r)_{i_1}, \dots, H(r)_{i_q}$ are linearly independent, where $H(r)$ is defined in (5) and $H(r)_i$ is defined in (4).

As is explained in [33] and [34], if a LIRD vector is such that all rows in $H(r)$ are linearly independent, then this LIRD vector is a relative degree vector as defined in Definition 6. This relationship can also be observed by comparing Definitions 6 and 7.

Lemma 9: [34] For any controllable system with the realization (A, B, C) , there exists a nonsingular output transformation such that the transformed system has an LIRD vector.

Proof: This follows directly from Remark 4 and Lemma 4 in [34]. ■

In this paper, we derive conditions for the NI state feedback equivalence of the system (3) by investigating the normal form of an auxiliary system, which is obtained by applying an output transformation to the original system. This leads to a transformed system with a relative degree vector. We show later in this paper that the existence of such an output transformation is one of the necessary conditions for NI state feedback equivalence. First, let us provide the definition for state feedback equivalence to an NI system.

Definition 8: A system in the form of (3) is said to be state feedback equivalent to an NI system if there exists a state feedback control law

$$u = K_x x + K_v v,$$

where $K_x \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and $K_v \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, is such that the resulting closed-loop system with the new input $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, is minimal and NI.

Note that state feedback equivalence problems do not allow for a change of output. However, they allow for a free change of inputs. We show in the following two lemmas that for a system of the form of (3), its NI state feedback equivalence property is invariant to a nonsingular output transformation.

Lemma 10: Suppose $T \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is nonsingular. Then the transfer matrix $TR(s)T^T$ is NI if and only if $R(s)$ is NI.

Proof: The proof is based on Definition 1. $R(s)$ is NI if and only if Conditions 1, 2 and 3 in Definition 1 are satisfied. However, the positive definiteness (semi-definiteness) of the matrices in Conditions 1, 2 and 3 in Definition 1 is invariant to the transformation $TR(s)T^T$. This completes the proof. ■

Lemma 11: Consider the system (3) and the state, input and output transformations $\tilde{x} = T_x x$, $\tilde{u} = T_u u$ and $\tilde{y} = T_y y$, where $T_x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $T_u \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $T_y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ are

nonsingular. Then the system (3) is state feedback equivalent to an NI system if and only if the transformed system is also state feedback equivalent to an NI system.

Proof: If the transformed system with state \tilde{x} , input \tilde{u} and output \tilde{y} is state feedback equivalent to an NI system, then there exists a control law

$$\tilde{u} = K_x \tilde{x} + K_v \tilde{v},$$

under which the system with input \tilde{v} and output \tilde{y} is minimal and NI. According to Lemma 10, now the system with output $y = T_y^{-1} \tilde{y}$ and input $v = T_y^T \tilde{v}$ is also minimal and NI. This means that the original system with state x , input u and output y is also state feedback equivalent to an NI system. The corresponding feedback control law can be derived as shown in the following:

$$u = T_u^{-1} \tilde{u} = T_u^{-1} (K_x \tilde{x} + K_v \tilde{v}) = T_u^{-1} (K_x T_x x + K_v T_y^{-T} v).$$

This completes the sufficiency part of the proof. Since the state, input and output transformation matrices T_x , T_u and T_y are all nonsingular, the necessity part of the proof follows in the same manner as the sufficiency part with the inverses of the transformations considered. ■

In this paper, we consider systems whose relative degree vector only consists of numbers less than or equal to two, as we show later that this is one of the necessary conditions for state feedback equivalence to NI systems.

Definition 9: The system (3) is said to have relative degree less than or equal to two if it has a relative degree vector $r = \{r_1, \dots, r_p\}$, where $1 \leq r_i \leq 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p$.

Consider the case that there exists an output transformation $\tilde{y} = T_y y$, where $T_y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\det(T_y) \neq 0$, that transforms the system (3) into a form with a relative degree vector $r = \{r_1, \dots, r_p\}$. Let $\tilde{C} = T_y C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, then the transformed system takes the form:

$$\dot{\tilde{x}} = \mathcal{A} \tilde{x} + \mathcal{B} u, \quad (6a)$$

$$\tilde{y} = \tilde{C} \tilde{x}, \quad (6b)$$

where $\text{rank}(\mathcal{B}) = \text{rank}(\tilde{C}) = p$.

Lemma 12: Suppose the system (6) has relative degree less than or equal to two. Then there exist input and state transformations that transform (6) into the following normal form:

$$\dot{z} = A_{00} z + A_{01} x_1 + A_{02} x_2 + A_{03} x_3, \quad (7a)$$

$$\dot{x}_1 = A_{10} z + A_{11} x_1 + A_{12} x_2 + A_{13} x_3 + u_1, \quad (7b)$$

$$\dot{x}_2 = x_3, \quad (7c)$$

$$\dot{x}_3 = A_{30} z + A_{31} x_1 + A_{32} x_2 + A_{33} x_3 + u_2, \quad (7d)$$

$$\tilde{y} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7e)$$

where $\tilde{x} = \begin{bmatrix} z \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $\tilde{u} = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the

input and $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the output of the transformed system. Here, $x_1, u_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$ and $x_2, x_3, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$, where $0 \leq p_1 \leq p$ and $p_2 := p - p_1$. Also, $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$, where $m := n - p - p_2$.

Proof: Without loss of generality, suppose the components in the relative degree vector r of the system (6) are sorted in nondecreasing order, i.e., $r = \{1, \dots, 1, 2, \dots, 2\}$. Let p_1 ($0 \leq p_1 \leq p$) be the number of ones in r and $p_2 = p - p_1$ be the number of twos in r . Also, define the following matrices:

$$\tilde{C}_O = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{C}_{p_1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times n}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{C}_T = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_{p_1+1} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{C}_p \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times n},$$

where \tilde{C}_i is the i -th row in the matrix \tilde{C} . Hence, \tilde{C}_O is the block matrix in \tilde{C} which determines the output entries corresponding to the ones in r . \tilde{C}_T is the block matrix in \tilde{C} which determines the output entries corresponding to the twos in r . According to Definition 6, we have that $\text{rank}(\tilde{C}_O \mathcal{B}) = p_1$, $\tilde{C}_T \mathcal{B} = 0$ and $\text{rank}(\tilde{C}_T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{B}) = p_2$. Also, Condition 2 in Definition 6 implies that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_O \mathcal{B} \\ \tilde{C}_T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix} \neq 0. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, the rows of the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_O \\ \tilde{C}_T \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix}$ are linearly independent. Since $\text{rank}(\mathcal{C}) = p$ and $\det T_y \neq 0$, then $\text{rank}(\tilde{C}) = p$. Hence, \tilde{C}_T has full row rank. Also, according to Condition 1 in Definition 6, we have that $\tilde{C}_T \mathcal{B} = 0$. Then we can prove by contradiction that the rows of \tilde{C}_T are linearly independent of the rows of $\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_O \\ \tilde{C}_T \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix}$. Indeed, suppose there exists a row $(\tilde{C}_T)_\kappa$ of \tilde{C}_T , which is a linear combination of the rows of $\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_O \\ \tilde{C}_T \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix}$. Then $(\tilde{C}_T)_\kappa \mathcal{B} \neq 0$ according to (8), which contradicts the equation $\tilde{C}_T \mathcal{B} = 0$. Therefore, the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_O \\ \tilde{C}_T \end{bmatrix}$ has full

row rank. Define the new state as

$$x_1 = \tilde{C}_O x,$$

$$x_2 = \tilde{C}_T x,$$

$$x_3 = \dot{x}_2 = \tilde{C}_T \mathcal{A} x.$$

We also need a complementary state $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ where $m := n - p - p_2 \geq 0$. Let $z = \tilde{C}_z x$, where \tilde{C}_z is such that

$$T_x = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_z \\ \tilde{C}_O \\ \tilde{C}_T \end{bmatrix}$$

is nonsingular, and also $\tilde{C}_z \mathcal{B} = 0$. Let $\tilde{x} = T_x x$ be the new state. Also, let

$$\tilde{u} = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_O \\ \tilde{C}_T \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{B} u.$$

According to (8), the input transformation matrix $T_u = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_O \\ \tilde{C}_T \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}$ is nonsingular. The new system has a state-space

model

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} = T_x \mathcal{A} T_x^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u_1 \\ 0 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9a)$$

$$\tilde{y} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9b)$$

By considering the blocks of $T_x \mathcal{A} T_x^{-1}$ including the relation $\dot{x}_2 = x_3$, we can write (9) in the form (7). This completes the proof. ■

We now consider necessary and sufficient conditions under which the system (7) is state feedback equivalent to an NI system. For the system (7), choose the control inputs u_1 and u_2 to be

$$u_1 = v_1 + (K_{10} - A_{10})z + (K_{11} - A_{11})x_1 + (K_{12} - A_{12})x_2 + (K_{13} - A_{13})x_3, \quad (10)$$

and

$$u_2 = v_2 + (K_{20} - A_{30})z + (K_{21} - A_{31})x_1 + (K_{22} - A_{32})x_2 + (K_{23} - A_{33})x_3, \quad (11)$$

which allows the system (7) to be represented in the form

$$\dot{\tilde{x}} = A\tilde{x} + B\tilde{v}, \quad (12a)$$

$$\tilde{y} = C\tilde{x}, \quad (12b)$$

where $\tilde{v} = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is the new input and

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{00} & A_{01} & A_{02} & A_{03} \\ K_{10} & K_{11} & K_{12} & K_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I \\ K_{20} & K_{21} & K_{22} & K_{23} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

We need to find the state feedback matrices

$$\begin{aligned} K_{10} &\in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times m}, K_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_1}, K_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}, \\ K_{13} &\in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}, K_{20} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times m}, K_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_1}, \\ K_{22} &\in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_2}, \text{ and } K_{23} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_2} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

such that the system (12) is minimal and NI. The following lemma provides necessary and sufficient conditions for such state feedback matrices to exist.

Lemma 13: Suppose the system (7) satisfies $\det A_{00} \neq 0$. Then it is state feedback equivalent to an NI system if and only if it is controllable and A_{00} is Lyapunov stable.

Proof: The system (7) is state feedback equivalent to an NI system if and only if there exist state feedback matrices (16) such that the system (12) is NI and the realization (A, B, C) in (13)-(15) is minimal.

First, we prove that the controllability of the system (7) is equivalent to the controllability of the system (12). Define

$$\check{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{00} & A_{01} & A_{02} & A_{03} \\ A_{10} & A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I \\ A_{30} & A_{31} & A_{32} & A_{33} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we need to prove that the controllability of (\check{A}, B) is equivalent to that of (A, B) . According to Lemma 6, the controllability of (\check{A}, B) implies that any non-zero vector in the kernel of B^T is not an eigenvector of \check{A}^T . Considering the structure of B in (14), a non-zero vector $\eta \in \ker(B^T)$ must

take the form $\eta = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ 0 \\ \eta_3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, where $\eta_1 \neq 0$ or $\eta_3 \neq 0$. Therefore,

for any scalar λ_c , we have that $\check{A}^T \eta \neq \lambda_c \eta$. Substituting for \check{A} , we obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{00}^T \eta_1 \\ A_{01}^T \eta_1 \\ A_{02}^T \eta_1 \\ A_{03}^T \eta_1 + \eta_3 \end{bmatrix} \neq \lambda_c \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ 0 \\ \eta_3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (17)$$

for any scalar λ_c . This condition depends only on the matrices A_{00} , A_{01} , A_{02} and A_{03} , which forms the common first block row of the matrices \check{A} and A . Hence, the controllability of (\check{A}, B) is equivalent to that of (A, B) .

Sufficiency. According to Lemma 6, (17) is satisfied if and only if for any eigenvector η_1 of A_{00}^T with eigenvalue λ_c , $A_{01}^T \eta_1 \neq 0$ or $\begin{bmatrix} A_{02}^T \eta_1 \\ A_{03}^T \eta_1 + \eta_3 \end{bmatrix} \neq \lambda_c \begin{bmatrix} \eta_3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$. The condition $A_{01}^T \eta_1 \neq 0$ holds if and only if (A_{00}, A_{01}) is controllable. The condition $\begin{bmatrix} A_{02}^T \eta_1 \\ A_{03}^T \eta_1 + \eta_3 \end{bmatrix} \neq \lambda_c \begin{bmatrix} \eta_3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ holds if and only if for any $\eta_3 = -A_{03}^T \eta_1$, we have that $A_{02}^T \eta_1 \neq \lambda_c \eta_3 = -\lambda_c A_{03}^T \eta_1 = -A_{03}^T A_{00}^T \eta_1$. That is $(A_{03}^T A_{00}^T + A_{02}^T) \eta_1 \neq 0$, which holds if and only if $(A_{00}, A_{00} A_{03} + A_{02})$ is controllable. Therefore, we conclude that (A, B) is controllable if and only if (A_{00}, A_{01}) or $(A_{00}, A_{00} A_{03} + A_{02})$ is controllable.

We now derive necessary and sufficient conditions under which (A, C) is observable. Given the structure of C in (15), any non-zero vector $\sigma \in \ker(C)$ must take the form $\sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sigma_4 \end{bmatrix}$, where $\sigma_1 \neq 0$ or $\sigma_4 \neq 0$. According to Lemma 7, (A, C) is observable if and only if $A\sigma \neq \lambda_o \sigma$ for any scalar λ_o . Substituting A from (13), we obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{00}\sigma_1 + A_{03}\sigma_4 \\ K_{10}\sigma_1 + K_{13}\sigma_4 \\ \sigma_4 \\ K_{20}\sigma_1 + K_{23}\sigma_4 \end{bmatrix} \neq \lambda_o \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sigma_4 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

When $\sigma_4 \neq 0$, (18) is always true. Now we consider the case that $\sigma_1 \neq 0$ and $\sigma_4 = 0$. In this case, (18) becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{00}\sigma_1 \\ K_{10}\sigma_1 \\ 0 \\ K_{20}\sigma_1 \end{bmatrix} \neq \lambda_o \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which holds if and only if for any vector σ_1 that is an eigenvector of A_{00} , $K_{10}\sigma_1 \neq 0$ or $K_{20}\sigma_1 \neq 0$. Therefore, according to Lemma 7, we conclude that (A, C) is observable if and only if (A_{00}, K_{10}) or (A_{00}, K_{20}) is observable.

The nonsingular matrix A_{00} is Lyapunov stable (see Definition 5) if and only if there exists a state transformation $A_{00} \mapsto SA_{00}S^{-1}$ which allows A_{00} to be represented, without loss of generality, as $A_{00} = \text{diag}(A_{00}^a, A_{00}^b)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{spec}(A_{00}^a) &\subset j\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \quad \text{spec}(A_{00}^b) \subset OLHP, \\ \text{and } A_{00}^a + (A_{00}^a)^T &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Here $A_{00}^a \in \mathbb{R}^{m_a \times m_a}$ and $A_{00}^b \in \mathbb{R}^{m_b \times m_b}$, where $0 \leq m_a \leq m$ and $m_b := m - m_a$. The conditions in (19) are achievable according to the proof of Proposition 11.9.6 in [31]. Decomposing A_{01} , A_{02} , A_{03} , K_{10} and K_{20} accordingly using the same state-space transformation, we can write (12) as

$$\dot{z}_1 = A_{00}^a z_1 + A_{01}^a x_1 + A_{02}^a x_2 + A_{03}^a x_3, \quad (20a)$$

$$\dot{z}_2 = A_{00}^b z_2 + A_{01}^b x_1 + A_{02}^b x_2 + A_{03}^b x_3, \quad (20b)$$

$$\dot{x}_1 = K_{10}^a z_1 + K_{10}^b z_2 + K_{11}x_1 + K_{12}x_2 + K_{13}x_3 + v_1, \quad (20c)$$

$$\dot{x}_2 = x_3, \quad (20d)$$

$$\dot{x}_3 = K_{20}^a z_1 + K_{20}^b z_2 + K_{21}x_1 + K_{22}x_2 + K_{23}x_3 + v_2, \quad (20e)$$

$$y = C \begin{bmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20f)$$

Since A_{00}^b is Hurwitz, there exist $\mathcal{Y}_1^b = (\mathcal{Y}_1^b)^T > 0$ and $Q_b = Q_b^T > 0$ such that

$$A_{00}^b \mathcal{Y}_1^b + \mathcal{Y}_1^b (A_{00}^b)^T = -Q_b.$$

Let K_{20} be defined as

$$K_{20} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{20}^a & K_{20}^b \end{bmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

where

$$K_{20}^a = -A_{02}^{aT} (A_{00}^a)^{-T} - (A_{03}^a)^T, \quad (22)$$

and

$$K_{20}^b = \left(-A_{02}^{bT} (A_{00}^b)^{-T} - (A_{03}^b)^T + \mathcal{H} \right) (\mathcal{Y}_1^b)^{-1}. \quad (23)$$

Here, \mathcal{H} is contained in the set

$$S_{\mathcal{H}} = \{ \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times m_b} : \mathcal{H}^T \mathcal{H} \leq Q_b \}. \quad (24)$$

If $(A_{00}, A_{00}A_{03} + A_{02})$ is controllable, we can always find \mathcal{H} such that (A_{00}, K_{20}) is observable. This is proved in the following. According to Lemma 6, the controllability of $(A_{00}, A_{00}A_{03} + A_{02})$ implies that no eigenvector of $\text{diag}((A_{00}^a)^T, (A_{00}^b)^T)$ is in the kernel of $[(A_{03}^a)^T (A_{00}^a)^T + (A_{02}^a)^T \quad (A_{03}^b)^T (A_{00}^b)^T + (A_{02}^b)^T]$. This implies that both $(A_{00}^a, A_{00}^a A_{03}^a + A_{02}^a)$ and $(A_{00}^b, A_{00}^b A_{03}^b + A_{02}^b)$ are controllable, which can be proved by applying the eigenvector tests in Lemma 6 to the vectors $\begin{bmatrix} \eta_a \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \eta_b \end{bmatrix}$, where η_a and η_b are eigenvectors of $(A_{00}^a)^T$ and $(A_{00}^b)^T$,

respectively. According to Lemma 7, (A_{00}, K_{20}) is observable if and only if for any non-zero vector $\delta_K = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_a \\ \delta_b \end{bmatrix}$, which is an eigenvector of A_{00} , we have $K_{20}\delta_K \neq 0$. Since A_{00}^a and A_{00}^b have no common eigenvalues, then δ_K is an eigenvector of A_{00} only if $\delta_a = 0$ or $\delta_b = 0$. We consider two cases:

Case 1. $\delta_a \neq 0$ and $\delta_b = 0$. In this case, δ_a is an eigenvector of A_{00}^a ; i.e., $A_{00}^a \delta_a = \lambda_a \delta_a$ for some scalar λ_a . Since $A_{00}^a + (A_{00}^a)^T = 0$, we have $(A_{00}^a)^T \delta_a = -\lambda_a \delta_a$. Hence, $(A_{00}^a)^{-T} \delta_a = -\frac{1}{\lambda_a} \delta_a$. Also, because $(A_{00}^a, A_{00}^a A_{03}^a + A_{02}^a)$ is controllable, $((A_{03}^a)^T (A_{00}^a)^T + (A_{02}^a)^T) \delta_a \neq 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} K_{20} \delta_K &= K_{20}^a \delta_a = \left(-(A_{02}^a)^T (A_{00}^a)^{-T} - (A_{03}^a)^T \right) \delta_a \\ &= - \left((A_{03}^a)^T (A_{00}^a)^T + (A_{02}^a)^T \right) (A_{00}^a)^{-T} \delta_a \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_a} \left((A_{03}^a)^T (A_{00}^a)^T + (A_{02}^a)^T \right) \delta_a \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $\delta_a = 0$ and $\delta_b \neq 0$. In this case, δ_b is an eigenvector of A_{00}^b . Because $-(A_{02}^b)^T (A_{00}^b)^{-T} - (A_{03}^b)^T$ in (23) is fixed, and $S_{\mathcal{H}}$ has nonempty interior due to the positive definiteness of Q_b , then we can always find \mathcal{H} such that

$$\begin{aligned} K_{20} \delta_K &= K_{20}^b \delta_b \\ &= \left(-(A_{02}^b)^T (A_{00}^b)^{-T} - (A_{03}^b)^T + \mathcal{H} \right) (\mathcal{Y}_1^b)^{-1} \delta_b \\ &\neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all δ_b that are eigenvalues of A_{00}^b . We conclude that there exists \mathcal{H} such that (A_{00}, K_{20}) is observable. We will choose such a matrix \mathcal{H} in the following proof.

Let K_{10} be defined as

$$K_{10} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{10}^a & K_{10}^b \end{bmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

where

$$K_{10}^a = -A_{01}^{aT} (A_{00}^a)^{-T}, \quad (26)$$

and

$$K_{10}^b = \left(-A_{01}^{bT} (A_{00}^b)^{-T} - K_{13} \mathcal{H} \right) (\mathcal{Y}_1^b)^{-1}. \quad (27)$$

Here K_{13} is contained in the set

$$S_K = \{ K_{13} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2} : K_{13} K_{13}^T \leq 2I \}. \quad (28)$$

If (A_{00}, A_{01}) is controllable, we can always find K_{13} such that (A_{00}, K_{10}) is observable. This is proved in the following. According to Lemma 6, the controllability of (A_{00}, A_{01}) implies that no eigenvector of $\text{diag}((A_{00}^a)^T, (A_{00}^b)^T)$ is in $\ker([(A_{01}^a)^T \quad (A_{01}^b)^T])$. This implies that both (A_{00}^a, A_{01}^a) and (A_{00}^b, A_{01}^b) are controllable, which can be proved by applying the eigenvector tests in Lemma 6 to the vectors $\begin{bmatrix} \eta_a \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$

and $\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \eta_b \end{bmatrix}$, where η_a and η_b are eigenvectors of $(A_{00}^a)^T$ and $(A_{00}^b)^T$, respectively. According to Lemma 7, (A_{00}, K_{10}) is observable if and only if for any non-zero vector $\phi_K = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_a \\ \phi_b \end{bmatrix}$, which is an eigenvector of A_{00} , we have that $K_{10}\phi_K \neq 0$. Since A_{00}^a and A_{00}^b have no common eigenvalues, then ϕ_K is an eigenvector of A_{00} only if $\phi_a = 0$ or $\phi_b = 0$. We consider two cases:

Case 1. $\phi_a \neq 0$ and $\phi_b = 0$. In this case, ϕ_a is an eigenvector of A_{00}^a ; i.e., $A_{00}^a \phi_a = \mu_a \phi_a$ for some scalar μ_a .

Since $A_{00}^a + (A_{00}^a)^T = 0$, we have $(A_{00}^a)^T \phi_a = -\mu_a \phi_a$. Hence, $(A_{00}^a)^{-T} \phi_a = -\frac{1}{\mu_a} \phi_a$. Also, because (A_{00}^a, A_{01}^a) is controllable, $(A_{01}^a)^T \phi_a \neq 0$. Therefore,

$$K_{10} \phi_K = K_{10}^a \phi_a = -(A_{01}^a)^T (A_{00}^a)^{-T} \phi_a = \frac{1}{\mu_a} (A_{01}^a)^T \phi_a \neq 0.$$

Case 2. $\phi_a = 0$ and $\phi_b \neq 0$. In this case, ϕ_b is an eigenvector of A_{00}^b . Because $-(A_{01}^b)^T (A_{00}^b)^{-T}$ is fixed and the set S_K has a nonempty interior, then we can always find K_{13} , together with an \mathcal{H} that makes (A_{00}, K_{20}) observable, such that

$$\begin{aligned} K_{13} \phi_K &= K_{13}^b \phi_b \\ &= \left(-A_{01}^b{}^T (A_{00}^b)^{-T} - K_{13} \mathcal{H} \right) (\mathcal{Y}_1^b)^{-1} \phi_b \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all ϕ_b that are eigenvectors of A_{00}^b . Therefore, with this particular choice of K_{13} , we have that (A_{00}, K_{10}) is observable.

Now recall that (A, B) is controllable if and only if (A_{00}, A_{01}) or $(A_{00}, A_{00}A_{03} + A_{02})$ is controllable. Also, (A, C) is observable if and only if (A_{00}, K_{10}) or (A_{00}, K_{20}) is observable. Since the controllability of (A_{00}, A_{01}) implies the observability of (A_{00}, K_{10}) and the controllability of $(A_{00}, A_{00}A_{03} + A_{02})$ implies the observability of (A_{00}, K_{20}) , then the controllability of (A, B) implies the observability of (A, C) , when suitable \mathcal{H} and K_{13} are chosen.

Therefore, with those choices of \mathcal{H} and K_{13} , the controllability of the system (7) implies that the realisation (A, B, C) in (13), (14) and (15) is minimal.

Choose the other state feedback matrices as follows:

$$K_{11} = K_{10} A_{00}^{-1} A_{01} - \mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}, \quad (29)$$

$$K_{12} = K_{10} A_{00}^{-1} A_{02}, \quad (30)$$

$$K_{21} = K_{20} A_{00}^{-1} A_{01}, \quad (31)$$

$$K_{22} = K_{20} A_{00}^{-1} A_{02} - \mathcal{Y}_3^{-1}, \quad (32)$$

$$K_{23} = -\frac{1}{2} I, \quad (33)$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_1}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_2}$ can be any symmetric positive definite matrices; i.e., $\mathcal{Y}_2 = \mathcal{Y}_2^T > 0$ and $\mathcal{Y}_3 = \mathcal{Y}_3^T > 0$. We will apply Lemma 1 in the following in order to prove that the system (12) is an NI system. We construct the matrix Y as follows:

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y_{11} & -A_{00}^{-1} A_{01} \mathcal{Y}_2 & -A_{00}^{-1} A_{02} \mathcal{Y}_3 & 0 \\ -\mathcal{Y}_2 A_{01}^T A_{00}^{-T} & \mathcal{Y}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ -\mathcal{Y}_3 A_{02}^T A_{00}^{-T} & 0 & \mathcal{Y}_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad (34)$$

where $Y_{11} = \mathcal{Y}_1 + A_{00}^{-1} A_{01} \mathcal{Y}_2 A_{01}^T A_{00}^{-T} + A_{00}^{-1} A_{02} \mathcal{Y}_3 A_{02}^T A_{00}^{-T}$. Here, $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \text{diag}(y_1^a I, \mathcal{Y}_1^b)$ with $y_1^a > 0$ being a scalar. It can be verified that $Y > 0$ using the Schur complement theorem.

In order to verify Condition 1 in Lemma 1, we note that for the determinant of the matrix A in (13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{p_2} \det A &= \det \begin{bmatrix} A_{00} & A_{01} & A_{02} & A_{03} \\ K_{10} & K_{11} & K_{12} & K_{13} \\ K_{20} & K_{21} & K_{22} & K_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \det \begin{bmatrix} A_{00} & A_{01} & A_{02} \\ K_{10} & K_{11} & K_{12} \\ K_{20} & K_{21} & K_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \det A_{00} \det \left(\begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} \\ K_{21} & K_{22} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} K_{10} \\ K_{20} \end{bmatrix} A_{00}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} A_{01} & A_{02} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \det A_{00} \det \begin{bmatrix} -\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{Y}_3^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \det A_{00} \det(-\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}) \det(-\mathcal{Y}_3^{-1}) \\ &\neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the equalities also use (29)-(32). Also, the input feedthrough matrix in the system (12) is zero, and hence symmetric. Hence, Condition 1 in Lemma 1 is satisfied. For Condition 2 in Lemma 1, with Y defined in (34), we have

$$AY = \begin{bmatrix} y_1^a A_{00}^a & 0 & 0 & 0 & A_{03}^a \\ 0 & A_{00}^b \mathcal{Y}_1^b & 0 & 0 & A_{03}^b \\ 0 & -K_{13} \mathcal{H} & -I & 0 & K_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I \\ -(A_{03}^a)^T & \mathcal{H} - (A_{03}^b)^T & 0 & -I & K_{23} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (35)$$

Therefore, we have that

$$AYC^T = -B, \quad (36)$$

and

$$AY + Y A^T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{Q}_b & -\mathcal{H}^T K_{13}^T & 0 & \mathcal{H}^T \\ 0 & -K_{13} \mathcal{H} & -2I & 0 & K_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{H} & K_{13}^T & 0 & K_{23} + K_{23}^T \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \begin{bmatrix} -\mathcal{Q}_b & -\mathcal{H}^T K_{13}^T & \mathcal{H}^T \\ -K_{13} \mathcal{H} & -2I & K_{13} \\ \mathcal{H} & K_{13}^T & K_{23} + K_{23}^T \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} -\mathcal{Q}_b & -\mathcal{H}^T K_{13}^T & \mathcal{H}^T \\ -K_{13} \mathcal{H} & -2I & K_{13} \\ \mathcal{H} & K_{13}^T & -I \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where (33) is used. For the matrix $-M$, we have that $I > 0$ and the Schur complement of the block I is

$$\begin{aligned} (-M)/I &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q}_b & \mathcal{H}^T K_{13}^T \\ K_{13} \mathcal{H} & 2I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}^T \\ K_{13} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} & K_{13}^T \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q}_b - \mathcal{H}^T \mathcal{H} & 0 \\ 0 & 2I - K_{13} K_{13}^T \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where (24) and (28) are also used. Therefore, we have that $M \leq 0$. Hence $AY + Y A^T \leq 0$, and Condition 2 in Lemma 1 is satisfied. Hence, the system (12) is an NI system with a minimal realisation.

Necessity. If the realisation (A, B, C) in (13), (14) and (15) is minimal and NI, then according to the proof of Lemma 1 (see Lemma 7 in [3]), there exists an $X = X^T > 0$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} XA + A^T X & XB - A^T C^T \\ B^T X - CA & -(CB + B^T C^T) \end{bmatrix} \leq 0.$$

Therefore, for any z, x_1, x_2, x_3 and v , we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} z \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ v \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} XA + A^T X & XB - A^T C^T \\ B^T X - CA & -(CB + B^T C^T) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ v \end{bmatrix} \leq 0. \quad (37)$$

Let $X = \begin{bmatrix} X_{11} & X_{12} & X_{13} & X_{14} \\ X_{12}^T & X_{22} & X_{23} & X_{24} \\ X_{13}^T & X_{23}^T & X_{33} & X_{34} \\ X_{14}^T & X_{24}^T & X_{34}^T & X_{44} \end{bmatrix}$ and substitute (13), (14)

and (15) into (37). Also, take $x_1 = 0, x_2 = x_3 = 0$ and $\tilde{v} = \begin{bmatrix} -K_{10} \\ -K_{20} \end{bmatrix} z$. We get

$$z^T (X_{11} A_{00} + A_{00}^T X_{11}) z \leq 0$$

for any z , which implies that $X_{11} A_{00} + A_{00}^T X_{11} \leq 0$. Considering $X = X^T > 0$, we have $X_{11} > 0$. Also, since $\det A_{00} \neq 0$, then according to Lemma 5, A_{00} is Lyapunov stable. This completes the proof. ■

To facilitate the description of the necessary and sufficient conditions for state feedback equivalence to a system in the general form (3), we recall the following terminology (see [27], [35]). In the case when the system (6) has relative degree less than or equal to two, the system (7) is said to be the *normal form* of (6). The dynamics (7a), which are not controlled by the input u directly or through chains of integrators, are called the *internal dynamics*. The other part of the state, described by (7b)-(7d), are called the *external dynamics*. Setting the states described by the external dynamics to be zero in the internal dynamics, we obtain the *zero dynamics*:

$$\dot{z} = A_{00} z. \quad (38)$$

We now provide the definition of the weakly minimum phase property.

Definition 10: (Weakly Minimum Phase) [21], [22] The system (6) of relative degree less than or equal to two is said to be weakly minimum phase if its zero dynamics (38) are Lyapunov stable.

Theorem 1: Suppose the system (3) satisfying $\text{rank}(B) = \text{rank}(C) = p$ is minimal with no zero at the origin. Then it is state feedback equivalent to an NI system if and only if there exists an output transformation $\tilde{y} = T_y y$, where $T_y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\det T_y \neq 0$, such that the transformed system has relative degree less than or equal to two, and the transformed system is weakly minimum phase.

Proof: Sufficiency. The sufficiency part of the proof directly follows from Lemmas 11, 12 and 13. According to Lemma 12, the system (3) can always be transformed into the form (7) using nonsingular input, output and state transformations. Since the system (3) has no zero at the origin, then $\det A_{00} \neq 0$ because nonsingular input, output and state

transformations do not change the zeros of a system. Also, since the transformed system is weakly minimum phase, then A_{00} is Lyapunov stable. Since the input, output and state transformations are all nonsingular, the minimality of the system (3) is preserved in (7). According to Lemma 13, the output transformed system (7) is state feedback equivalent to an NI system. According to Lemma 11, the original system (3) is also state feedback equivalent to an NI system. This completes the sufficiency part of the proof.

Necessity. We first prove that if the system (3) is state feedback equivalent to an NI system, then there exists an output transformation $\tilde{y} = T_y y$ that transforms the system (3) into a system with relative degree less than or equal to two.

If the system (3) is state feedback equivalent to an NI system, then according to Lemma 10, it is still feedback equivalent NI after a nonsingular output transformation. We apply an output transformation to the system (A, B, C) in order that the transformed system has a leading incomplete relative degree vector. Since the output transformed system is feedback equivalent to an NI system, then under a state feedback control law, we can make it NI with a minimal realization $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C})$.

Since the system with realization $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C})$ has a leading incomplete relative degree vector r , we denote by $p_1 \geq 0$ the number of components in r that equal to one; i.e., $r_1, \dots, r_{p_1} = 1$, and $r_{p_1+1}, \dots, r_p \geq 2$. We decompose the matrix \hat{C} as

$$\hat{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_O \\ \hat{C}_G \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\hat{C}_O \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times n}$ and $\hat{C}_G \in \mathbb{R}^{(p-p_1) \times n}$. Here, \hat{C}_O determines the output entries corresponding to the ones in r , and \hat{C}_G determines the output entries corresponding to the components greater than one in r . According to Definition 7, $\text{rank}(\hat{C}_O \hat{B}) = p_1$ and $\hat{C}_G \hat{B} = 0$.

According to the proof of Lemma 1 (see [3]), the fact that $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C})$ is NI implies that there exists $X = X^T > 0$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \hat{A} + \hat{A}^T X & X \hat{B} - \hat{A}^T \hat{C}^T \\ \hat{B}^T X - \hat{C} \hat{A} & -(\hat{C} \hat{B} + \hat{B}^T \hat{C}^T) \end{bmatrix} \leq 0. \quad (39)$$

Decomposing \hat{B} accordingly as $\hat{B} = [\hat{B}_O \ \hat{B}_G]$ where $\hat{B}_O \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_1}$ and $\hat{B}_G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p-p_1)}$, the inequality (39) can be expanded to be

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \hat{A} + \hat{A}^T X & X \hat{B}_O - \hat{A}^T \hat{C}_O^T & X \hat{B}_G - \hat{A}^T \hat{C}_G^T \\ \hat{B}_O^T X - \hat{C}_O \hat{A} & -(\hat{C}_O \hat{B}_O + \hat{B}_O^T \hat{C}_O^T) & -\hat{C}_O \hat{B}_G \\ \hat{B}_G^T X - \hat{C}_G \hat{A} & -\hat{B}_G^T \hat{C}_O^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \leq 0, \quad (40)$$

where the condition $\hat{C}_G \hat{B} = 0$ is also used. The condition (40) implies that $\hat{C}_O \hat{B}_G = 0$ and $\hat{B}_G^T X - \hat{C}_G \hat{A} = 0$. We have that $\text{rank}(\hat{B}_G) = p - p_1$ because $\text{rank}(\hat{B}) = \text{rank}(B) = p$. Then, $\hat{B}_G^T X - \hat{C}_G \hat{A} = 0$ implies that $\hat{C}_G \hat{A} \hat{B}_G = \hat{B}_G^T X \hat{B}_G > 0$. The positive definiteness of $\hat{C}_G \hat{A} \hat{B}_G$ implies that the largest component in the leading incomplete relative degree vector r of the system is two. Moreover, we have that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_O \hat{B} \\ \hat{C}_G \hat{A} \hat{B} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_O \hat{B}_O & 0 \\ \hat{C}_G \hat{A} \hat{B}_O & \hat{C}_G \hat{A} \hat{B}_G \end{bmatrix}. \quad (41)$$

Since $\hat{C}_O \hat{B}_G = 0$ and $\text{rank}(\hat{C}_O \hat{B}) = p_1$, we have that $\det(\hat{C}_O \hat{B}_O) \neq 0$. Considering that $\hat{C}_O \hat{B}_O$ and $\hat{C}_G \hat{A} \hat{B}_G$ in

(41) are both nonsingular, we have that $\det \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_O \hat{B} \\ \hat{C}_G \hat{A} \hat{B} \end{bmatrix} \neq 0$.

This implies that the leading incomplete relative degree vector r of the realization $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C})$ is indeed a relative degree vector, whose components are either one or two. Therefore, we conclude that the system (3) can be output transformed into a system with a relative degree vector $r = \{r_1, \dots, r_p\}$ with $1 \leq r_i \leq 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p$. Therefore, the system (3) can be transformed into the form (7) using input, output and state transformations. The necessity part of Lemma 13 implies that the weakly minimum phase property of the output transformed system is another necessary condition. This completes the necessity part of the proof. ■

We also derive necessary and sufficient conditions under which the system (3) can be rendered OSNI.

Definition 11: A system in the form of (3) is said to be state feedback equivalent to an OSNI system if there exists a state feedback control law

$$u = K_x x + K_v v,$$

where $K_x \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and $K_v \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, such that the closed-loop system with the new input $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is minimal and OSNI.

Lemma 14: If the transfer matrix $R(s)$ is OSNI, then $TR(s)T^T$ is also OSNI, where $T \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\det T \neq 0$.

Proof: The proof follows from Definition 3. If $R(s)$ is OSNI, then we have that

$$j\omega[R(j\omega) - R(j\omega)^*] - \epsilon\omega^2 \bar{R}(j\omega)^* \bar{R}(j\omega) \geq 0,$$

$\forall \omega \in \mathbb{R} \cup \infty$ where $\bar{R}(j\omega) = R(j\omega) - R(\infty)$. We have that $T^T T \leq \lambda_{\max}(T^T T)I$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & j\omega[R(j\omega) - (R(j\omega))^*] - \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda_{\max}(T^T T)} \omega^2 \bar{R}(j\omega)^* T^T T \bar{R}(j\omega) \\ & \geq j\omega[R(j\omega) - (R(j\omega))^*] - \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda_{\max}(T^T T)} \omega^2 \bar{R}(j\omega)^* T^T T \bar{R}(j\omega) \\ & + \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda_{\max}(T^T T)} \omega^2 \bar{R}(j\omega)^* (T^T T - \lambda_{\max}(T^T T)I) \bar{R}(j\omega) \\ & = j\omega[R(j\omega) - R(j\omega)^*] - \epsilon\omega^2 \bar{R}(j\omega)^* \bar{R}(j\omega) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The transfer matrix $TR(s)T^T$ satisfies Definition 3 via (42). Therefore, the transformed system $TR(s)T^T$ is OSNI with the output strictness $\frac{\epsilon}{\lambda_{\max}(T^T T)}$. ■

We show in the following that the same conditions in Theorem 1 also lead to state feedback equivalence to an OSNI system.

Lemma 15: Suppose the system (7) has $\det A_{00} \neq 0$. Then it is state feedback equivalent to an OSNI system if and only if it is controllable and A_{00} is Lyapunov stable.

Proof: The necessity part this lemma follows from the necessity part of Lemma 13 because OSNI systems belong to the class of NI systems.

For the sufficiency part, we need to show that the condition

$$AY + Y A^T + \epsilon(CAY)^T CAY \leq 0$$

in Lemma 3 is satisfied for some scalar $\epsilon > 0$ in addition to what is shown in the sufficiency proof of Lemma 13. Following from the sufficiency proof of Lemma 13, we add a restriction on the choice of K_{13} such that $K_{13}^T K_{13} = I$. Note

that this additional restriction does not change the results in Lemma 13. Using C and AY in (20f) and (35), we have that

$$CAY = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -K_{13}\mathcal{H} & -I & 0 & K_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$(CAY)^T CAY = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{H}^T \mathcal{H} & \mathcal{H}^T K_{13}^T & 0 & -\mathcal{H}^T \\ 0 & K_{13} \mathcal{H} & I & 0 & -K_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{H} & -K_{13}^T & 0 & 2I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence,

$$AY + Y A^T + \epsilon(CAY)^T CAY$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -Q_b + \epsilon \mathcal{H}^T \mathcal{H} & -(1-\epsilon) \mathcal{H}^T K_{13}^T & 0 & (1-\epsilon) \mathcal{H}^T \\ 0 & -(1-\epsilon) K_{13} \mathcal{H} & -(2-\epsilon) I & 0 & (1-\epsilon) K_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (1-\epsilon) \mathcal{H} & -(1-\epsilon) K_{13}^T & 0 & (1-2\epsilon) I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let

$$\tilde{M} = \begin{bmatrix} -Q_b + \epsilon \mathcal{H}^T \mathcal{H} & -(1-\epsilon) \mathcal{H}^T K_{13}^T & (1-\epsilon) \mathcal{H}^T \\ -(1-\epsilon) K_{13} \mathcal{H} & -(2-\epsilon) I & (1-\epsilon) K_{13} \\ (1-\epsilon) \mathcal{H} & (1-\epsilon) K_{13}^T & -(1-2\epsilon) I \end{bmatrix}.$$

We apply the Schur complement theorem in the following to find the range of ϵ . We choose $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and therefore $-(1-2\epsilon)I < 0$. The Schur complement of the block $-(1-2\epsilon)I$ of $-\tilde{M}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & (-\tilde{M}) / [(1-2\epsilon)I] \\ & = \begin{bmatrix} Q_b - \epsilon \mathcal{H}^T \mathcal{H} & (1-\epsilon) \mathcal{H}^T K_{13}^T \\ (1-\epsilon) K_{13} \mathcal{H} & (2-\epsilon) I \end{bmatrix} \\ & \quad - \frac{(1-\epsilon)^4}{1-2\epsilon} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}^T \\ K_{13} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} & K_{13}^T \end{bmatrix} \\ & = \begin{bmatrix} Q_b - \left(\epsilon + \frac{(1-\epsilon)^4}{1-2\epsilon}\right) \mathcal{H}^T \mathcal{H} & \left(1-\epsilon - \frac{(1-\epsilon)^4}{1-2\epsilon}\right) \mathcal{H}^T K_{13}^T \\ \left(1-\epsilon - \frac{(1-\epsilon)^4}{1-2\epsilon}\right) K_{13} \mathcal{H} & \left(2-\epsilon - \frac{(1-\epsilon)^4}{1-2\epsilon}\right) I \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

which is positive semi-definite when $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2}(3 - \sqrt{5})]$. In this case, $AY + Y A^T + \epsilon(CAY)^T CAY \leq 0$. Therefore, the system with the realization (A, B, C) in (13), (14) and (15) is OSNI. ■

Theorem 2: Suppose the system (3) is minimal with no zero at the origin. Then it is state feedback equivalent to an OSNI system if and only if there exists an output transformation $\tilde{y} = T_y y$, where $T_y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\det T_y \neq 0$, such that the transformed system has relative degree less than or equal to two, and the transformed system is weakly minimum phase.

Proof: This proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1 except that Lemmas 14 and 15 are used instead of Lemmas 10 and 13. ■

Considering the results in Theorem 1 and 2, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1: Suppose the system (3) is minimal with no zero at the origin. Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. The system (3) is state feedback equivalent to an NI system;

2. The system (3) is state feedback equivalent to an OSNI system;

3. There exists an output transformation $\tilde{y} = T_y y$, where $T_y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\det T_y \neq 0$, such that the transformed system has relative degree less than or equal to two, and the transformed system is weakly minimum phase.

IV. STATE FEEDBACK EQUIVALENCE TO AN SSNI SYSTEM

In this section, we derive necessary and sufficient conditions under which a system in the form of (3) is state feedback equivalent to an SSNI system. First, we define state feedback equivalence to an SSNI system as follows.

Definition 12: A system in the form of (3) is said to be state feedback equivalent to an SSNI system if there exists a state feedback control law

$$u = K_x x + K_v v,$$

where $K_x \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and $K_v \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, such that the closed-loop system with the new input $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is SSNI.

It will be shown later in this section that having a relative degree vector $r = \{1, \dots, 1\}$ is one of the necessary conditions for this system to be state feedback equivalent to an SSNI system. Therefore, we start with the derivation of the normal form for the system (3) with a relative degree vector $r = \{1, \dots, 1\}$.

Lemma 16: Suppose the system (3) satisfying $\text{rank}(B) = \text{rank}(C) = p$ has a relative degree vector $r = \{1, \dots, 1\}$. Then there exists input and state transformations such that the resulting transformed system is of the form

$$\dot{z} = A_{00}z + A_{01}y, \quad (43a)$$

$$\dot{x}_1 = A_{10}z + A_{11}x_1 + \tilde{u}, \quad (43b)$$

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ x_1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (43c)$$

Proof: If (3) has a relative degree vector $r = \{1, \dots, 1\}$, then $\det(CB) \neq 0$. The rest of the proof follows from Lemma 12 with $p_1 = p$ and $p_2 = 0$. ■

Choose the input u to be

$$\tilde{u} = (v + (K_1 - A_{10})z + (K_2 - A_{11})y),$$

and the system (43) takes the form

$$\dot{z} = A_{00}z + A_{01}y, \quad (44a)$$

$$\dot{y} = K_1 z + K_2 y + v, \quad (44b)$$

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ y \end{bmatrix}. \quad (44c)$$

We need to find the state feedback matrices $K_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ and $K_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ such that the system (44) is SSNI.

Lemma 17: [28] Suppose the system (44) has (A_{00}, A_{01}) controllable. Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. A_{00} is Hurwitz;
2. There exist K_1 and K_2 such that the system (44) is an SSNI system with realisation (A, B, C) , where A is Hurwitz, and the transfer function $R(s) := C(sI - A)^{-1}B$ is such that $R(s) + R(-s)^T$ has full normal rank.

Proof: Let us define the following:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{00} & A_{01} \\ K_1 & K_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (45)$$

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

From the proof of Lemma 13, (A, B) is controllable if and only if (A_{00}, A_{01}) is controllable. Therefore, there are no observable uncontrollable modes in this system.

Sufficiency. Let A_{00} be Hurwitz. Then according to Lemma 4, we can always find a matrix $\mathcal{Y}_1 > 0$ such that

$$A_{00}\mathcal{Y}_1 + \mathcal{Y}_1 A_{00}^T + \frac{1}{2}A_{00}^{-1}A_{01}A_{01}^T A_{00}^{-T} < 0$$

is satisfied. In the sequel, we will find a matrix K_1 such that

$$A_{00}\mathcal{Y}_1 + \mathcal{Y}_1 A_{00}^T + \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{Y}_1 K_1^T + A_{00}^{-1}A_{01})(K_1 \mathcal{Y}_1 + A_{01}^T A_{00}^{-T}) < 0 \quad (48)$$

is satisfied. One possible choice is $K_1 = -A_{01}^T A_{00}^{-T} \mathcal{Y}_1^{-1}$, which simplifies (48) to be $A_{00}\mathcal{Y}_1 + \mathcal{Y}_1 A_{00}^T < 0$. Let $K_2 = K_1 A_{00}^{-1} A_{01} - \mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}$, where $\mathcal{Y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ can be any symmetric positive definite matrix; i.e., $\mathcal{Y}_2 = \mathcal{Y}_2^T > 0$. We apply Lemma 2 in the following to prove that the system (44) is an SSNI system. We construct the matrix Y as follows:

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Y}_1 + A_{00}^{-1}A_{01}\mathcal{Y}_2 A_{01}^T A_{00}^{-T} & -A_{00}^{-1}A_{01}\mathcal{Y}_2 \\ -\mathcal{Y}_2 A_{01}^T A_{00}^{-T} & \mathcal{Y}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have $Y > 0$ because $\mathcal{Y}_2 > 0$ and the Schur complement of the block \mathcal{Y}_2 is \mathcal{Y}_1 , which is positive definite. Now, we have $B + AY C^T = 0$ and

$$AY + Y A^T = \begin{bmatrix} A_{00}\mathcal{Y}_1 + \mathcal{Y}_1 A_{00}^T & \mathcal{Y}_1 K_1^T + A_{00}^{-1}A_{01} \\ K_1 \mathcal{Y}_1 + A_{01}^T A_{00}^{-T} & -2I \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have $-2I < 0$ and the Schur complement of the block $2I$ in the matrix $-(AY + Y A^T)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & (-(AY + Y A^T))/(2I) \\ &= -A_{00}\mathcal{Y}_1 - \mathcal{Y}_1 A_{00}^T \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{Y}_1 K_1^T + A_{00}^{-1}A_{01})(K_1 \mathcal{Y}_1 + A_{01}^T A_{00}^{-T}) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

according to (48). Hence $AY + Y A^T < 0$. According to Lemma 4, A^T is Hurwitz. Therefore A is Hurwitz. Now we prove that $R(s) + R(-s)^T$ has full normal rank. For A , B and C given by (45)-(47), we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(s) &= C(sI - A)^{-1}B \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} sI - A_{00} & -A_{01} \\ -K_1 & sI - K_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (sI - K_1(sI - A_{00})^{-1}A_{01} - K_2)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Substituting $s = 0$ in (49), we have

$$R(0) = (K_1 A_{00}^{-1} A_{01} - K_2)^{-1} = \mathcal{Y}_2 > 0.$$

Hence $R(s) + R(-s)^T$ must have full normal rank. Therefore, according to Lemma 2, the system (44) is SSNI.

Necessity. If A is Hurwitz, $R(s) + R(-s)^T$ has full normal rank and the system (44) is SSNI, then according to Lemma

such that the nominal closed-loop system is NI. Suppose the state-space model of the uncertain system in Fig. 1 is

$$\dot{x} = \mathcal{A}x + \mathcal{B}(u + w), \quad (53a)$$

$$y = \mathcal{C}x, \quad (53b)$$

$$w = \Delta y, \quad (53c)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are the state, input and output of the nominal plant. Here, (53c) models the uncertainty, and the uncertainty transfer function $\Delta(s)$ is assumed to be SNI with $\Delta(\infty) \geq 0$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\Delta(0)) \leq \gamma$ for some constant $\gamma > 0$.

The general idea used to stabilize the system (53) is to choose a control law u such that the system described by (53a) and (53b) is NI with input w and output y . Therefore, since $\Delta(s)$ is SNI, the system (53) forms a positive feedback interconnection of an NI system and an SNI system, whose equilibrium is asymptotically stable if the DC gain condition in Lemma 8 is satisfied.

Theorem 4: Consider the uncertain system (53). Suppose the realization $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})$ is minimal with no zero at the origin. If there exists an output transformation $\tilde{y} = T_y y$, where $T_y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\det T_y \neq 0$, such that the realization $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, T_y \mathcal{C})$ has relative degree less than or equal to two and is weakly minimum phase, then there exist $K_x \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and $K_w \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ such that the control law

$$u = K_x x + K_w w$$

stabilizes the system (53).

Proof: According to Theorem 1 and its proof, the conditions here imply that the nominal plant in (53), described by

$$\dot{x} = \mathcal{A}x + \mathcal{B}u,$$

$$y = \mathcal{C}x,$$

is state feedback equivalent to an NI system. Suppose the corresponding state feedback control law is

$$u = K_x x + K_v v.$$

Therefore, the nominal plant, described by (53a) and (53b), is NI with input w and output y under the control law

$$u = K_x x + K_w w,$$

where $K_w = K_v - I$. Now the system (53) is an interconnection of the nominal closed-loop NI system and the SNI uncertainty. To stabilize this interconnection, we investigate the DC gain conditions of Lemma 8. As is shown in the proof of Theorem 1, the output transformed system $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, T_y \mathcal{C})$ is rendered NI with a transfer function $\hat{R}(s)$ where $\hat{R}(s) = C(sI - A)^{-1}B$ with A , B and C given by (13), (14) and (15). We have that $\hat{R}(\infty) = 0$. With the state feedback matrices given in the proof of Theorem 1, we also have that

$$\hat{R}(0) = -CA^{-1}B = CA^{-1}AYC^T = CYC^T = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Y}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{Y}_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where we also use (34) and (36). Since the NI state feedback equivalence of the realization $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})$ follows from the NI state feedback equivalence of the output transformed system

$(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, T_y \mathcal{C})$, using Lemma 10, then the nominal closed-loop system can be rendered to be an NI system whose transfer function is $R(s) = T_y^{-1} \hat{R}(s) T_y^{-T}$. Since \mathcal{Y}_2 and \mathcal{Y}_3 can be any positive definite matrices, we choose them to be such that

$$\lambda_{\max} \left(T_y^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Y}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{Y}_3 \end{bmatrix} T_y^{-T} \right) < \frac{1}{\gamma}. \quad (54)$$

Therefore, $\lambda_{\max}(R(0)) < \frac{1}{\gamma}$. Hence, $\lambda_{\max}(R(0)\Delta(0)) < 1$. According to Lemma 8, it now follows that the system (53) is asymptotically stable. This completes the proof. ■

Remark 1: In the case that the uncertainty (53c) in the system (53) is NI, we can render the nominal closed-loop system (53a) and (53b) OSNI using the results of Theorem 2 in order to achieve stabilization (see [8], [29] for the corresponding OSNI stability results).

VI. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

In this section, we demonstrate the procedure of stabilizing an uncertain system by rendering the nominal closed-loop system NI with the DC gain conditions of Lemma 8 satisfied. Consider an uncertain system with the following state-space model:

$$\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} (w + u), \quad (55a)$$

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x, \quad (55b)$$

$$w = \Delta y, \quad (55c)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^4$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are the state, input and output of the nominal plant. Here, (55c) models the uncertainty, and the uncertainty transfer function $\Delta(s)$ is assumed to be SNI with $\Delta(\infty) \geq 0$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\Delta(0)) \leq 1$. We aim to find a state feedback control law such that the system (55) is asymptotically stable. Let us define the following:

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have that $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, which is singular. However, the system can be output transformed into a form with a relative degree vector. We use the output transformation $\tilde{y} = T_y y$ with $T_y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. The transformed system has a relative degree vector $r = \{1, 2\}$. To transform the system into its normal form as shown in (7), we also use a state transformation

$\tilde{x} = T_x x$ with $T_x = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ and an input transformation $\tilde{u} = T_u u$ with $T_u = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$. Letting $w = 0$, the transformed system has the state-space realization:

$$\dot{\tilde{x}} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 2 & 2 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{u}, \quad (56a)$$

$$\tilde{y} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x}, \quad (56b)$$

where $\tilde{x} = \begin{bmatrix} z \\ \tilde{x}_1 \\ \tilde{x}_2 \\ \tilde{x}_3 \end{bmatrix}$ is the state, $\tilde{u} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{u}_1 \\ \tilde{u}_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is the input and

$\tilde{y} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_1 \\ \tilde{y}_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is the output. The system (56) is in a normal form and it can be verified that it is minimal. It can be also observed that it has no zero at the origin and is weakly minimum phase. Therefore, according to Theorem 4, the uncertain system (53) is stabilizable. We construct the state feedback control law according to the proof in Theorem 1. Comparing the normal form (56) of the example to the general normal form (7), we have that $A_{00} = -1$, $A_{01} = 2$, $A_{02} = 2$ and $A_{03} = -1$ in the system (56). Then, using the formulas (21)-(23), (25)-(27) and (29)-(33) with $\mathcal{Y}_1^b = 1$, $\mathcal{H} = 1$ and $K_{13} = 1$, we obtain that $K_{10} = 1$, $K_{11} = -2 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{Y}_2}$, $K_{12} = -2$, $K_{20} = 4$, $K_{21} = -8$, $K_{22} = -8 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{Y}_3}$ and $K_{23} = -\frac{1}{2}$. Then, choose the control inputs \tilde{u}_1 and \tilde{u}_2 as given in (10) and (11). That is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_1 &= \tilde{v}_1 + (K_{10} - 1)z + K_{11}\tilde{x}_1 + (K_{12} - 1)\tilde{x}_2 \\ &\quad + (K_{13} + 1)\tilde{x}_3, \\ &= \tilde{v}_1 - \left(2 + \frac{1}{\mathcal{Y}_2}\right)\tilde{x}_1 - 3\tilde{x}_2 + 2\tilde{x}_3, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_2 > 0$ is a scalar, and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_2 &= \tilde{v}_2 + (K_{20} - 1)z + (K_{21} + 1)\tilde{x}_1 + (K_{22} - 1)\tilde{x}_2 \\ &\quad + (K_{23} - 1)\tilde{x}_3, \\ &= \tilde{v}_2 + 3z - 7\tilde{x}_1 - \left(9 + \frac{1}{\mathcal{Y}_3}\right)\tilde{x}_2 - \frac{3}{2}\tilde{x}_3, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_3 > 0$ is a scalar. Here, $\tilde{v} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{v}_1 \\ \tilde{v}_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is the new input of the output transformed system such that the transfer function from \tilde{v} to \tilde{y} is NI. To ensure that the DC gain of the closed-loop system (55) is less than unity, we need to satisfy (54). A suitable choice is $\mathcal{Y}_2 = \frac{1}{4}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_3 = \frac{1}{4}$. Therefore, we have that

$$\tilde{u} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -6 & -3 & 2 \\ 3 & -7 & -13 & -\frac{3}{2} \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x} + \tilde{v}.$$

According to Lemma 11, the NI property of the system from input \tilde{v} to output \tilde{y} implies that the system from input $v = T_y^T \tilde{v}$

to y is also NI. Therefore, we choose the control input of the nominal plant (55a) and (55b) to be

$$\begin{aligned} u &= T_u^{-1} \tilde{u} \\ &= T_u^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -6 & -3 & 2 \\ 3 & -7 & -13 & -\frac{3}{2} \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x} + T_u^{-1} \tilde{v} \\ &= T_u^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -6 & -3 & 2 \\ 3 & -7 & -13 & -\frac{3}{2} \end{bmatrix} T_x x + T_u^{-1} T_y^{-T} v \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -3 & -1 & -2 \\ -3 & -6 & 14.5 & -1.5 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} v. \end{aligned}$$

Under this input, the nominal plant given in (55a) and (55b) with $w = 0$ is NI. In the case that w is regarded as the external input of the nominal plant (55a) and (55b), following the proof of Theorem 4, let

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -3 & -1 & -2 \\ -3 & -6 & 14.5 & -1.5 \end{bmatrix} x + \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} - I \right) w \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -3 & -1 & -2 \\ -3 & -6 & 14.5 & -1.5 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix} w. \end{aligned}$$

With this control input, the uncertain system (55) becomes

$$\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -4 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -4 & 0 & -2 \\ -3 & -8 & 12.5 & -2.5 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} w, \quad (57a)$$

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x, \quad (57b)$$

$$w = \Delta y. \quad (57c)$$

The transfer function matrix of the nominal closed-loop system (57a) and (57b) is

$$R(s) = \frac{1}{2s^4 + 15s^3 + 63s^2 + 156s + 32} \times \begin{bmatrix} 2s^3 + 3s^2 + 33s + 8 & 2s^3 + 5s^2 + 29s + 8 \\ 2s^3 + 3s^2 + 17s + 8 & 2s^3 + 7s^2 + 27s + 16 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It can be verified that all poles of this transfer function matrix have negative real parts. Also, we have $j[R(j\omega) - R(j\omega)^*] \geq 0$ for all $\omega > 0$. Therefore, the nominal closed-loop system (57a) and (57b) is NI. In addition, we have that

$$R(0) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.25 & 0.25 \\ 0.25 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, $\lambda_{\max}(R(0)) = 0.6545$. Therefore, $\lambda_{\max}(R(0)\Delta(0)) \leq \lambda_{\max}(R(0))\lambda_{\max}(\Delta(0)) < 1$. Hence, according to Lemma 8, the system (57) is asymptotically stable.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have provided necessary and sufficient conditions under which a linear system can be rendered NI. As stated in Theorem 1, a minimal linear system (3) with no zeros at the origin is state feedback equivalent to an NI system if and only if it can be output transformed to a system, which has relative degree less than or equal to two and is weakly minimum phase. Similar OSNI and SSNI state feedback equivalence results are presented in Theorems 2 and

3. The NI state feedback equivalence results are then applied to robustly stabilize a system with SNI uncertainty. An example is also provided to illustrate the process of rendering a system NI in order to stabilize an uncertain system.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Lanzon and I. R. Petersen, "Stability robustness of a feedback interconnection of systems with negative imaginary frequency response," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 1042–1046, 2008.
- [2] I. R. Petersen and A. Lanzon, "Feedback control of negative-imaginary systems," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 54–72, 2010.
- [3] J. Xiong, I. R. Petersen, and A. Lanzon, "A negative imaginary lemma and the stability of interconnections of linear negative imaginary systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp. 2342–2347, 2010.
- [4] Z. Song, A. Lanzon, S. Patra, and I. R. Petersen, "A negative-imaginary lemma without minimality assumptions and robust state-feedback synthesis for uncertain negative-imaginary systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 1269–1276, 2012.
- [5] M. A. Mabrok, A. G. Kallapur, I. R. Petersen, and A. Lanzon, "Generalizing negative imaginary systems theory to include free body dynamics: Control of highly resonant structures with free body motion," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 2692–2707, 2014.
- [6] J. Wang, A. Lanzon, and I. R. Petersen, "Robust cooperative control of multiple heterogeneous negative-imaginary systems," *Automatica*, vol. 61, pp. 64–72, 2015.
- [7] B. Bhikkaji, S. R. Moheimani, and I. R. Petersen, "A negative imaginary approach to modeling and control of a collocated structure," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 717–727, 2011.
- [8] P. Bhowmick and S. Patra, "On LTI output strictly negative-imaginary systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 100, pp. 32–42, 2017.
- [9] A. Preumont, *Vibration control of active structures: an introduction*. Springer, 2018, vol. 246.
- [10] D. Halim and S. R. Moheimani, "Spatial resonant control of flexible structures-application to a piezoelectric laminate beam," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 37–53, 2001.
- [11] H. Pota, S. R. Moheimani, and M. Smith, "Resonant controllers for smart structures," *Smart Materials and Structures*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 1, 2002.
- [12] M. A. Mabrok, A. G. Kallapur, I. R. Petersen, and A. Lanzon, "Spectral conditions for negative imaginary systems with applications to nanopositioning," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 895–903, 2013.
- [13] S. K. Das, H. R. Pota, and I. R. Petersen, "A MIMO double resonant controller design for nanopositioners," *IEEE Transactions on Nanotechnology*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 224–237, 2014.
- [14] —, "Resonant controller design for a piezoelectric tube scanner: A mixed negative-imaginary and small-gain approach," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1899–1906, 2014.
- [15] —, "Multivariable negative-imaginary controller design for damping and cross coupling reduction of nanopositioners: a reference model matching approach," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 3123–3134, 2015.
- [16] C. Cai and G. Hagen, "Stability analysis for a string of coupled stable subsystems with negative imaginary frequency response," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 8, pp. 1958–1963, 2010.
- [17] M. A. Rahman, A. Al Mamun, K. Yao, and S. K. Das, "Design and implementation of feedback resonance compensator in hard disk drive servo system: A mixed passivity, negative-imaginary and small-gain approach in discrete time," *Journal of Control, Automation and Electrical Systems*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 390–402, 2015.
- [18] B. Brogliato, R. Lozano, B. Maschke, and O. Egheland, "Dissipative systems analysis and control," *Theory and Applications*, vol. 2, 2007.
- [19] M. A. Mabrok, M. A. Alyami, and E. E. Mahmoud, "On the dissipativity property of negative imaginary systems," *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 2020.
- [20] P. Kokotovic and H. Sussmann, "A positive real condition for global stabilization of nonlinear systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 125–133, 1989.
- [21] A. Saberi, P. Kokotovic, and H. Sussmann, "Global stabilization of partially linear composite systems," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 1491–1503, 1990.
- [22] C. Byrnes, A. Isidori, and J. Willems, "Passivity, feedback equivalence, and the global stabilization of minimum phase nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 36, no. 11, pp. 1228–1240, 1991.
- [23] C. I. Byrnes and A. Isidori, "Asymptotic stabilization of minimum phase nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 36, no. 10, pp. 1122–1137, 1991.
- [24] G. Santosuosso, "Passivity of nonlinear systems with input-output feedthrough," *Automatica*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 693–697, 1997.
- [25] W. Lin, "Feedback stabilization of general nonlinear control systems: a passive system approach," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 41–52, 1995.
- [26] Z.-P. Jiang, D. J. Hill, and A. L. Fradkov, "A passification approach to adaptive nonlinear stabilization," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 73–84, 1996.
- [27] A. Isidori, *Nonlinear control systems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [28] K. Shi, I. R. Petersen, and I. G. Vladimirov, "Negative imaginary state feedback equivalence for systems of relative degree one and relative degree two," *To appear in the proceedings of the 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC 2021), Dec 2021, Austin, Texas, USA, Full version available as arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.05249*, 2021.
- [29] P. Bhowmick and A. Lanzon, "Output strictly negative imaginary systems and its connections to dissipativity theory," in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 6754–6759.
- [30] A. Lanzon, S. Patra, I. R. Petersen, and Z. Song, "A strongly strict negative-imaginary lemma for non-minimal linear systems," *Communications in Information and Systems*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 139–142, 2011.
- [31] D. S. Bernstein, *Matrix mathematics: theory, facts, and formulas*. Princeton university press, 2009.
- [32] J. P. Hespanha, *Linear systems theory*. Princeton university press, 2018.
- [33] V. Fomichev, A. Kraev, and A. Rogovskii, "Generalization of the notion of relative degree and its properties," *Differential Equations*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 1061–1071, 2016.
- [34] A. Kraev, A. Rogovskii, and V. Fomichev, "On a generalization of relative degree," *Differential Equations*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 1122–1127, 2014.
- [35] H. K. Khalil and J. W. Grizzle, *Nonlinear systems*. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2002, vol. 3.