

A PROBABILISTIC SCHEDULING ALGORITHM FOR NETWORKED CONTROL SYSTEMS

MEGHNA SINGH AND ATREYEE KUNDU

ABSTRACT. This paper deals with the design of scheduling logics for Networked Control Systems (NCSs) whose communication networks have limited capacity. We assume that only a subset of the plants can communicate with their controllers at any time instant. Our contributions are twofold. First, we present a probabilistic algorithm to design scheduling logics that, under certain conditions on the plant and controller dynamics and the capacity of the network, ensure stochastic stability of each plant in an NCS. Second, given the plant dynamics and the capacity of the network, we design static state-feedback controllers such that the conditions for stability under our scheduling logics are satisfied. The main apparatus for our analysis is a Markovian jump linear system representation of the individual plants in an NCS. Our stability conditions involve sets of matrix inequalities. We present numerical experiments to demonstrate our results.

§ 1. INTRODUCTION

Networked Control Systems (NCSs) are an integral part of modern day Cyber-Physical Systems (CPS) and Internet of Things (IoT) applications. While these applications typically involve a large number of plants, bandwidth of shared communication networks is often limited. The scenario in which the number of plants sharing a communication network is higher than the capacity of the network is called *medium access constraint*. This scenario motivates the need to allocate the communication network to each plant in a manner so that good qualitative and quantitative properties of the plants are preserved. This task of efficient allocation of a shared communication network is commonly referred to as a *scheduling problem* and the corresponding allocation scheme is called a *scheduling logic*. In this paper we study algorithmic design of scheduling logics for NCSs.

The existing classes of scheduling logics can be classified broadly into two categories: *static* and *dynamic*. In case of the former, a finite length allocation scheme of the network is determined offline and is applied eternally in a periodic manner, while in case of the latter, the allocation of the shared network is determined based on some information about the plant (e.g., states, outputs, access status of sensors and actuators, etc.), see [7] for a detailed discussion. In this paper we consider a shift in paradigm and present probabilistic scheduling logics for NCSs.

We study an NCS consisting of multiple discrete-time linear plants whose feedback loops are closed through a shared communication network. A block diagram of such an NCS is shown in Figure 1. We assume that the plants are unstable in open-loop and exponentially stable in closed-loop. Due to a limited communication capacity of the network, only a few plants can exchange information with their controllers at any instant of time. Consequently, the remaining plants operate in open-loop at every time instant. Our contributions are twofold:

- We present an algorithm to design scheduling logics. At every instant of time, our algorithm allocates the shared network to subsets of the plants with certain probabilities. We present necessary and sufficient conditions on the plant dynamics and the capacity of the shared network under which a scheduling logic obtained from our algorithm ensures stochastic stability of each plant in the NCS.
- Given plant dynamics and capacity of the shared network, we present an algorithm to design static state-feedback controllers such that the plants, their controllers and the shared network together satisfy our stability conditions.

Date: April 5, 2022.

MS is with the Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, PES University Bangalore, India, e-mail: meghsingh2212@gmail.com. AK is with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, India, Email: atreyee@ee.iitkgp.ac.in.




FIGURE 1. Block diagram of NCS

The proposed stability conditions are derived using a Markovian jump linear systems modelling of the individual plants. They involve matrix inequalities and can be verified by using standard matrix inequality solver toolboxes.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In §2 we formulate the problem under consideration. Our results appear in §3. We also describe various features of our results in this section. Numerical experiments are presented in §4. We conclude in §5 with a brief discussion on future research direction.

Notation. \mathbb{R} is the set of real numbers and \mathbb{N} is the set of natural numbers, $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For two scalars a and b , $a \% b$ denotes the remainder of the operation a/b . For a finite set C , its cardinality is denoted by $|C|$. For a vector v , $\|v\|$ denotes its Euclidean norm. For symmetric block matrices, \star acts as ellipsis for the terms that are introduced by symmetry, $\text{diag}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_n)$ denotes a block-diagonal matrix with diagonal elements Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_n . $0_{d \times d}$ and $I_{d \times d}$ denote d -dimensional 0-matrix and identity matrix, respectively. We will operate in a probabilistic space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where Ω is the sample space, \mathcal{F} is the σ -algebra of events, and \mathbb{P} is the probability measure.

§2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

We consider an NCS with N plants whose dynamics are given by

$$(1) \quad x_i(t+1) = A_i x_i(t) + B_i u_i(t), \quad x_i(0) = x_i^0, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

where $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ and $u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ are the vectors of states and inputs of the i -th plant at time t , respectively, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Each plant i employs a state-feedback controller $u_i(t) = K_i x_i(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The matrices $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times d_i}$, $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times m_i}$ and $K_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times d_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are constants.

Assumption 1. *The open-loop dynamics of each plant is unstable and each controller is stabilizing. More specifically, the matrices $A_i + B_i K_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are Schur stable and the matrices A_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are unstable.¹*

The controllers are remotely located and each plant communicates with its controller through a shared communication network. The network has a limited communication capacity in the sense that at any time instant, only M plants ($0 < M < N$) can access the network. Consequently, the remaining $N - M$ plants operate in open loop.

Assumption 2. *The communication network is ideal in the sense that exchange of information between plants and their controllers is not affected by communication uncertainties.*

¹A matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is Schur stable if all its eigenvalues are inside the open unit disk. We call A unstable if it is not Schur stable.

Let i_s and i_u denote the stable and unstable modes of the i -th plant, respectively, $A_{i_s} = A_i + B_i K_i$ and $A_{i_u} = A_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. We let

$$\mathcal{S} = \{s \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}^M \mid \text{the elements of } s \text{ are distinct}\}$$

be the set of all subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ with cardinality M . We call a function $\gamma : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, that specifies, at every time t , M plants of the NCS which access the shared network at that time, as a *scheduling logic*. Let r_i^0 denote the initial mode of operation of plant i , i.e., $r_i^0 = i_s$, if $i \in \gamma(0)$ and $r_i^0 = i_u$, if $i \notin \gamma(0)$. We will focus on stochastic stability of the plants.

Definition 1. *The i -th plant in (1) is stochastically stable if for every initial condition $x_i^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ and initial mode of operation $r_i^0 \in \{i_s, i_u\}$, we have that $\mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{+\infty} \|x_i(t)\|^2 \mid x_i^0, r_i^0 \right\} < +\infty$.*

Our first objective is:

Problem 1. *Given the matrices A_i , B_i , K_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and the number M , design a scheduling logic, γ , that preserves stochastic stability of each plant i in the NCS.*

Towards solving Problem 1, we will first present a probabilistic algorithm. We will then identify conditions on the matrices A_{i_s} , A_{i_u} , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and the network capacity, M , such that stochastic stability of each plant i in the NCS is ensured under a scheduling logic obtained from our algorithm.

Our second objective is:

Problem 2. *Given the matrices A_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and the network capacity, M , design static state-feedback controllers, K_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, such that the conditions for stability under our scheduling logics are satisfied.*

Towards designing suitable state-feedback controllers, we will solve a set of feasibility problems involving LMIs.

§ 3. MAIN RESULTS

§ 3.1. Stabilizing scheduling logics. We first present our solution to Problem 1. We will operate under the following assumption:

Assumption 3. The total number of plants, N and the capacity of the shared communication network, M together satisfy $N \% M = 0$.

Assumption 3 ensures that the total number of plants, N , in the NCS is divisible by the capacity of the shared network, M . In other words, the N plants can be divided into an integer number of chunks of M plants. Let $v = N/M$. Towards designing a scheduling logic, we rely on disjoint sets

$c_1, c_2, \dots, c_v \in \mathcal{S}$ and scalars $p_{c_1}, p_{c_2}, \dots, p_{c_v} \in]0, 1[$ that satisfy $\sum_{j=1}^v p_{c_j} = 1$.

Suppose that c_1, c_2, \dots, c_v and $p_{c_1}, p_{c_2}, \dots, p_{c_v}$ are fixed. A scheduling logic, γ , is generated as follows: at each time instant $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, we allocate the shared network to the plants in c_j with probability p_{c_j} , $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$. This procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1.² The following

Algorithm 1 Design of a scheduling logic

- 1: Set $v = N/M$.
 - 2: Pick $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_v \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $c_j \cap c_k = \emptyset$ for all $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, v$, $j \neq k$.
 - 3: Pick $p_{c_1}, p_{c_2}, \dots, p_{c_v} \in]0, 1[$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^v p_{c_j} = 1$.
 - 4: **for** $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 5: Set $\gamma(t) = c_j$ with probability p_{c_j} .
 - 6: **end for**
-

²We will discuss how to choose the quantities c_1, c_2, \dots, c_v and $p_{c_1}, p_{c_2}, \dots, p_{c_v}$ favourably in a moment.

theorem provides necessary and sufficient conditions on the matrices, $A_i, B_i, K_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and the capacity of the network, M , under which a scheduling logic, γ , obtained from Algorithm 1 ensures stochastic stability of each plant in the NCS.

Theorem 1. *Consider an NCS described in §2. Suppose that Assumption 3 holds. Let γ be a scheduling logic obtained from Algorithm 1. Each plant i in (1) is stochastically stable under γ if and only if the following conditions hold: for each $i \in c_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$, there exist symmetric and positive definite matrices $P_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times d_i}, k = i_s, i_u$, such that*

$$(2) \quad A_k^\top \mathcal{P}^i A_k - P_k < 0,$$

where $\mathcal{P}^i = p_{c_j} P_{i_s} + (1 - p_{c_j}) P_{i_u}$.

Remark 1. *Condition (2) involves properties of the matrices A_i, B_i and $K_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, the disjoint sets $c_j, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ and the probabilities $p_{c_j}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$. It relies on the existence of symmetric and positive definite matrices, $P_k, k = i_s, i_u, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ that together with the matrices $A_i, B_i, K_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and the probabilities $p_{c_j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ corresponding to the subset $c_j, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ that plant i appears in, satisfy a set of matrix inequalities. Notice that with the quantities $A_i, B_i, K_i, c_j, p_{c_j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ known, the set of inequalities in (2) can be solved by employing standard Linear Matrix Inequalities solvers.*

Remark 2. *Fix a scheduling logic, γ , obtained from Algorithm 1. Theorem 1 is necessary and sufficient in the following sense: if condition (2) holds, then γ is stabilizing, and if γ is stabilizing, then condition (2) holds.*

Towards proving Theorem 1, we will utilize the following auxiliary result:

Lemma 1. *Suppose that Assumption 3 holds. Then the following are true:*

- i) $\bigcup_{j=1}^v c_j = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and
- ii) *for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, there exists exactly one $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ such that $i \in c_j$.*

Proof. i) Assume, by contradiction, that $\bigcup_{j=1}^v c_j \neq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. By construction of $c_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$,

it must then be true that $\bigcup_{j=1}^c c_j \subset \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. We have $|c_j| = M$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$. Thus,

$\left| \bigcup_{j=1}^v c_j \right| = vM = (N/M)M$. Since $N\%M = 0$, we have $\left| \bigcup_{j=1}^v c_j \right| = N$. Then it must hold that there exist $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_q \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ such that $\ell \in c_{j_m}$ for each $m = 1, 2, \dots, q$. But this contradicts the fact that $c_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ are disjoint sets. Consequently, it must be true that $\bigcup_{j=1}^v c_j = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$.

ii) Since $v = N/M$ and the sets $c_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$, are disjoint, the assertion follows at once. \square

Proof. (of Theorem 1): Fix a scheduling logic, γ , obtained from Algorithm 1. We will show that condition (2) is necessary and sufficient for stability of each plant i in (1) under γ .

Fix $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ and $i \in c_j$. By Lemma 1 ii), i appears in exactly one c_j . We model the plant i under γ as follows:

$$(3) \quad x_i(t+1) = A_{\sigma_i(t)} x_i(t), \quad \sigma_i(t) \in \{i_s, i_u\}.$$

Notice that (3) is a Markovian jump linear system whose set of subsystems is $\{i_s, i_u\}$ and the transition function $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \{i_s, i_u\}$ satisfies $\sigma_i(t) = i_s$, if $i \in \gamma(t)$ and $\sigma_i(t) = i_u$, if $i \notin \gamma(t)$. In particular, σ_i is a Markov chain, defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, taking values in $\{i_s, i_u\}$ with transition probability matrix

$\Pi_i = \begin{pmatrix} \pi_{i_s i_s} & \pi_{i_s i_u} \\ \pi_{i_u i_s} & \pi_{i_u i_u} \end{pmatrix}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{i_s i_s} &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i(t+1) = i_s \mid \sigma_i(t) = i_s) = p_{c_j}, \\ \pi_{i_s i_u} &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i(t+1) = i_u \mid \sigma_i(t) = i_s) = 1 - p_{c_j}, \\ \pi_{i_u i_s} &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i(t+1) = i_s \mid \sigma_i(t) = i_u) = p_{c_j}, \\ \pi_{i_u i_u} &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i(t+1) = i_u \mid \sigma_i(t) = i_u) = 1 - p_{c_j}, \end{aligned} \quad i \in c_j.$$

By [9, Lemma 2], the switched system (3) is stochastically stable if and only if the following conditions hold:

$$(4) \quad A_{i_s}^\top (\pi_{i_s i_s} P_{i_s} + \pi_{i_s i_u} P_{i_u}) A_{i_s} - P_{i_s} < 0,$$

and

$$(5) \quad A_{i_u}^\top (\pi_{i_u i_s} P_{i_s} + \pi_{i_u i_u} P_{i_u}) A_{i_u} - P_{i_u} < 0,$$

where $P_{i_s}, P_{i_u} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times d_i}$ are symmetric and positive definite matrices. We have $\pi_{i_s i_s} P_{i_s} + \pi_{i_s i_u} P_{i_u} = p_{c_j} P_{i_s} + (1 - p_{c_j}) P_{i_u} = \pi_{i_u i_s} P_{i_s} + \pi_{i_u i_u} P_{i_u} = P^i$. Clearly, stochastic stability of plant i is equivalent to the conditions (4)-(5).

Since $i \in c_j$ and $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ were chosen arbitrarily, stochastic stability of each plant $i \in \bigcup_{j=1}^v c_j$ under γ is immediate. In view of Lemma 1 i), this completes our proof of Theorem 1. \square

Remark 3. Recall that a Markovian jump linear system is a switched system [4, Section 1.1.2] with linear subsystems; its switching logic is stochastic and can be described by a Markov chain. Switched systems with both deterministic and stochastic switching logics have been employed to design scheduling algorithms for NCSs with communication limitations and uncertainties earlier in the literature, see e.g., [2, Remark 11] for a detailed discussion. The primary difference of our work with the existing literature is that our scheduling algorithm is probabilistic while most of the existing design of scheduling logics by employing switched systems modelling of plants relies on purely deterministic techniques. In case of the latter, stochastic behaviour of the switching logics arises from probabilistic assumptions on the communication uncertainties typically leading to non-homogeneous Markov chains, see e.g., [3] where a probabilistic data loss model is considered. In the current work stochastic behaviour of the switching logics arises from probabilistic scheduling logic and the switching logics are time homogeneous Markov chains.

Remark 4. Qualitative and quantitative properties of continuous-time linear plants communicating with their controllers under a *pre-specified* stochastic scheduling logic have been studied in [5]. The problem considered in this paper differs from the said setting due to the following two reasons: (a) we focus on *designing* stabilizing probabilistic scheduling logics, and (b) our plant dynamics evolve in discrete-time.

Remark 5. Notice that our design of scheduling logics is neither static nor dynamic (a description of these terms are given in Section 1). Indeed, we neither repeat a finite length allocation scheme nor take properties of the plants or other components in the NCS into consideration at every time instant. This is not surprising as the proposed design technique is solely probabilistic.

For selecting disjoint sets $c_j, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ and the probabilities $p_{c_j}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ such that condition (2) holds, we employ an exhaustive search over all combinations of v -many disjoint sets $\bar{c}_j \in \mathcal{S}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ and probabilities $\bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j} \in]0, 1[, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^v \bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j} = 1$ holds.³ The interval $]0, 1[$ is sampled with a (small enough) step size $h > 0$. Let r be the biggest integer satisfying $rh < 1$. For all combinations of v -many disjoint sets $\bar{c}_j \in \mathcal{S}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ and all choices of $\bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j} \in \{h, 2h, 3h, \dots, rh\}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^v \bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j} = 1$, we solve a feasibility problem for all plants $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. It outputs, if exist, symmetric and positive definite matrices, $P_k, k = i_s, i_u, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ that together with the matrices $A_i, B_i, K_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and the probabilities $\bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j}$,

³A search over all combinations of v -many disjoint sets $\bar{c}_j \in \mathcal{S}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ suffices in view of Lemma 1.

$j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ satisfy condition (2). If an output is obtained, then we assign $c_j = \bar{c}_j$ and $p_{c_j} = \bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$. Otherwise, we do not have suitable inputs for Algorithm 1. The procedure is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Selection of c_j and p_{c_j} , $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$

```

1: Construct the set  $\mathcal{S}$ .
2: Fix a step size  $h > 0$  (small enough). Compute  $r$  as the biggest integer satisfying  $rh < 1$ .
3: for all  $\bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2, \dots, \bar{c}_v \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\bar{c}_j \cap \bar{c}_k = \emptyset$  for all  $j, k = 1, 2, \dots, v, j \neq k$  do
4:   for  $\bar{p}_{\bar{c}_1} = h, 2h, \dots, rh$  do
5:     for  $\bar{p}_{\bar{c}_2} = h, 2h, \dots, rh$  do
6:        $\vdots$ 
7:     for  $\bar{p}_{\bar{c}_v} = h, 2h, \dots, rh$  do
8:       if  $\sum_{j=1}^v \bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j} = 1$  then
9:         Solve the following feasibility problem for  $P_k, k = i_s, i_u, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ :
(6)          minimize 1
              subject to
              
$$\begin{cases} A_{i_s}^\top (\bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j} P_{i_s} + (1 - \bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j}) P_{i_u}) A_{i_s} \\ -P_{i_s} < 0, \\ A_{i_u}^\top (\bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j} P_{i_s} + (1 - \bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j}) P_{i_u}) A_{i_u} \\ -P_{i_u} < 0, \\ P_{i_s} = P_{i_s}^\top, P_{i_s} > 0, \\ P_{i_u} = P_{i_u}^\top, P_{i_u} > 0, \\ \kappa I_{d_i \times d_i} \leq P_{i_s}, P_{i_u} \leq I_{d_i \times d_i}, \\ \kappa > 0 \text{ (small)}, \\ i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \end{cases}$$

10:        If a solution to (6) is obtained, then go to Step 16.
11:      end if
12:    end for
13:  end for
14: end for
15: end for
16: Set  $c_j = \bar{c}_j$  and  $p_{c_j} = \bar{p}_{\bar{c}_j}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$  and exit.

```

Remark 6. Notice that the conditions $\kappa I_{d_i \times d_i} \leq P_{i_s}, P_{i_u} \leq I_{d_i \times d_i}$ in the feasibility problem (6) is not inherent to the set of inequalities (2). It is included for numerical reasons. In particular, $\kappa I_{d_i \times d_i} \leq P_{i_s}, P_{i_u}$ limits the condition numbers of P_{i_s} and P_{i_u} to κ^{-1} , and the condition $P_{i_s}, P_{i_u} \leq I_{d_i \times d_i}$ guarantees that the set of feasible P_{i_s}, P_{i_u} is bounded. Here, we have $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Remark 7. Algorithm 2 has a large computational complexity when the number of plants, N and their dimensions, $d_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are large. However, selection of c_j and $p_{c_j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ is an offline process. Indeed, they are to be chosen only once prior to the generation of a scheduling logic.

Suppose that suitable sets c_j and scalars $p_{c_j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ are obtained from Algorithm 2. A next natural question is: how do we choose an element c_j with a probability $p_{c_j}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ at every instant of time $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$? Clearly, using a standard random number $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ generator is not sufficient as we have a probability p_{c_j} associated to every c_j . We employ Algorithm 3 for this purpose. It involves four steps: First, a time horizon $\{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$ is fixed, where $T \in \mathbb{N}$ is a large number. Second, the frequency of occurrence of each c_j in $\{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$ is computed as $f_{c_j} = p_{c_j} \times T, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$. Notice that $\sum_{j=1}^v f_{c_j} = \sum_{j=1}^v p_{c_j} \times T = T \sum_{j=1}^v p_{c_j} = T$. Third, a set $TEMP$ is created with f_{c_j} -many instances of $c_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$. It follows that $|TEMP| = T$. Fourth, at

Algorithm 3 Implementation of Algorithm 1

```

1: Fix  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  (large enough).
2: for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$  do
3:   Set the frequency of occurrence of  $c_j$  as  $f_{c_j} = p_{c_j} \times T$ .
4: end for
5: Construct a set  $TEMP$  that contains  $f_{c_j}$  instances of  $c_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ , i.e.,
   
$$TEMP = \bigcup_{j=1}^v \{c_j^1, c_j^2, \dots, c_j^{f_{c_j}}\}.$$

6: for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$  do
7:   Pick an element  $r$  from  $TEMP$  uniformly at random, set  $\gamma(t) = r$  and  $TEMP = TEMP \setminus \{r\}$ .
8: end for

```

each time $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$, an element r from $TEMP$ is chosen uniformly at random, is assigned to $\gamma(t)$, and the set $TEMP$ is updated to be $TEMP \setminus \{r\}$. Clearly, the sequence $\gamma(0), \gamma(1), \dots, \gamma(T - 1)$ obeys the frequency of occurrence, f_{c_j} , for the set c_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$. Our procedure for implementing Algorithm 1, however, has a large memory requirement when the numbers v and T are very large.

Remark 8. Recall that we have been operating under Assumption 3. The requirement for this assumption is purely technical and specific to our key apparatus of analysis. With $N\%M \neq 0$ and the probabilistic logic for the selection of plants employed in Algorithm 1, the individual plants cannot be modelled as Markovian jump linear systems whose transition process is a time homogeneous Markov chain. Indeed, consider the Markovian jump linear system modelling of each plant in NCS under a scheduling logic, γ , obtained from Algorithm 1 as employed in our proof of Theorem 1. We could use a time homogeneous Markov chain under the assertion of Lemma 1 ii). If $N\%M \neq 0$ and $v = \lceil N/M \rceil$, then there exists at least one $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ that appears in more than one c_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$. Consequently, the probability of transition to mode i_s are possibly multiple for different $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ such that i appears in c_j . As a result, the transition probability matrix, Π_i , is no longer constant. A time inhomogeneous Markov chain with a time-varying transition probability matrix is suitable for the setting where no restriction on how the numbers N and M are connected is imposed. This general case is beyond the scope of this paper and we identify it as a topic for future work.

Remark 9. In this paper we have proposed a probabilistic algorithm for scheduling NCSs. Our tool is new and differs from the techniques existing currently in the literature. We highlight the following features:

- (a) In terms of offline computations required prior to the implementation of the scheduling logic, our technique is close to a static scheduling mechanism. Indeed, in case of the latter, a finite length allocation scheme is computed offline and is repeated eternally, while we compute a finite set of disjoint sets and probabilities for their activation and use the quantities eternally.
- (b) Unlike a dynamic scheduling mechanism, our technique does not consider properties of the plants and/or the communication network and/or other components in the NCS at every instant of time.
- (c) Our technique does not adapt to unforeseen/sudden faults in the system. The mechanism needs to be interrupted externally, and a new set of disjoint sets and their associated probabilities are to be fed.

Notice that the matrices $A_i, B_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and the capacity of the network, M are beyond our control, whereas there is an element of choice associated to the matrices $K_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, the sets $c_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ and the probabilities $p_{c_j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$. We address this matter in our solution to Problem 2.

We now present Algorithm 4 to design state-feedback controllers, $K_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, for the plants in the NCS. This is our solution to Problem 2. The algorithm first employs the matrices $A_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, the chosen disjoint sets $c_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ and their corresponding probabilities of allocation of the shared network, $p_{c_j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$, to obtain symmetric and positive definite matrices, $P_{i_s}, P_{i_u}, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ that satisfy condition (2) with $k = i_u, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. It then utilizes

the matrices $A_i, B_i, P_{i_s}, P_{i_u}, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, to arrive at suitable controllers, $K_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ such that condition (2) holds with $k = i_s, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. A set of feasibility problems is employed for this design. The matrix inequalities involved in Algorithm 4 can be solved by employing standard linear matrix inequalities and bilinear matrix inequalities toolboxes. The following theorem asserts that state-feedback controllers obtained from Algorithm 4 meet our requirements.

Algorithm 4 Design of static state-feedback controllers

```

1: for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  do
2:   Solve the following feasibility problem for  $P_{i_s}, P_{i_u} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times d_i}$ :
(7)      minimize 1
           subject to  $\begin{cases} A_{i_u}^\top \mathcal{P}^i A_{i_u} - P_{i_u} < 0, \\ P_{i_s} = P_{i_s}^\top, P_{i_u} = P_{i_u}^\top, \\ P_{i_s}, P_{i_u} > 0, \\ \kappa I_{d_i \times d_i} \leq P_{i_s}, P_{i_u} \leq I_{d_i \times d_i}, \kappa > 0 \text{ (small)}. \end{cases}$ 

3:   if the feasibility problem (7) admits a solution then
4:     Solve the following feasibility problem for  $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times d_i}$ :
(8)      minimize 1
           subject to  $\begin{cases} (A_i P_{i_s}^{-1} + B_i Y_i)^\top (\mathcal{P}^i)^{-1} (A_i P_{i_s}^{-1} + B_i Y_i) \\ -P_{i_s}^{-1} < 0. \end{cases}$ 

5:   if the feasibility problem (8) admits a solution then
6:     Compute  $K_i$  as follows:
(9)       $K_i = Y_i P_{i_s}$ .

7:   end if
8: end if
9: end for

```

Theorem 2. Consider an NCS described in §2. Suppose that Assumption 3 holds. Let the matrices $A_i, B_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, the sets $c_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ and the probabilities $p_{c_j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, v$, be given. Suppose that the state-feedback controllers, $K_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are computed as (9). Then condition (2) holds.

Proof. Fix $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ and $i \in c_j$. Suppose that there exists a solution P_{i_s}, P_{i_u} to the feasibility problem (7). By Schur complement, the inequality

$$(10) \quad A_{i_u}^\top \mathcal{P}^i A_{i_u} - P_{i_u} < 0$$

is equivalent to $\begin{pmatrix} -\mathcal{P}^i & \mathcal{P}^i A_{i_u} \\ \star & -P_{i_u} \end{pmatrix} < 0$. We need to design K_i such that the following inequality holds:

$$(11) \quad \begin{pmatrix} -\mathcal{P}^i & \mathcal{P}^i A_{i_s} \\ \star & -P_{i_s} \end{pmatrix} < 0.$$

Let K_i be computed as described in (9). We perform a congruence transform to the left-hand side of (11) by $\text{diag}((\mathcal{P}^i)^{-1}, P_{i_s}^{-1})$ and obtain $\begin{pmatrix} -(\mathcal{P}^i)^{-1} & (A_i P_{i_s}^{-1} + B_i Y_i) \\ \star & -P_{i_s}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$. From (11) it follows that the above quantity is negative definite. By Schur complement, we have

$$(12) \quad (A_i P_{i_s}^{-1} + B_i Y_i)^\top (\mathcal{P}^i)^{-1} (A_i P_{i_s}^{-1} + B_i Y_i) - P_{i_s}^{-1} < 0.$$

Consequently, if the feasibility problem (8) admits a solution Y_i , then K_i computed as (9) satisfies (11). Conditions (10) and (12) together lead to (2).

Since $i \in c_j$ was chosen arbitrarily, it follows that condition (2) holds for each plant $i \in c_j$. Moreover, since $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ was chosen arbitrarily, we have that condition (2) holds for each plant $i \in \bigcup_{j=1}^v c_j$. By Lemma 1 i), the assertion of Theorem 2 follows. \square

Remark 10. Our design of static state-feedback controllers in Algorithm 4 involves standard linear algebraic techniques for stabilization of Markovian jump linear systems. The analysis is similar in spirit to [9], where stability of a Markovian jump linear system was considered. We deal with a more general setting of *simultaneous* design of state-feedback controllers for N such systems.

We now present numerical experiments to demonstrate our results.

§4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

Our first experiment involves linearized models of benchmark control systems.

Experiment 1. Consider an NCS with number of plants, $N = 2$ and capacity of the shared communication network, $M = 1$.

- Plant $i = 1$ is a discretized version of a linearized batch reactor system presented in [8, §IVA] with sampling time 0.05 units of time. We have

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1.0795 & -0.0045 & 0.2896 & -0.2367 \\ -0.0272 & 0.8101 & -0.0032 & 0.0323 \\ 0.0447 & 0.1886 & 0.7317 & 0.2354 \\ 0.0010 & 0.1888 & 0.0545 & 0.9115 \end{pmatrix}, B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0006 & -0.0239 \\ 0.2567 & 0.0002 \\ 0.0837 & -0.1346 \\ 0.0837 & -0.0046 \end{pmatrix},$$

- Plant $i = 2$ is a discretized version of a linearized inverted pendulum system presented in [6, §4] with sampling time 0.05 units of time. We have

$$A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1.0123 & 0.0502 \\ 0.4920 & 1.0123 \end{pmatrix}, B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0123 \\ 0.4920 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that the plants are open-loop unstable and $N\%M = 0$. We compute $v = N/M = 2$. Let $c_1 = \{1\}$, $c_2 = \{2\}$ and $p_{c_1} = p_{c_2} = 0.5$. We first design static state-feedback controllers, K_i , $i = 1, 2$ such that condition (2) holds for each i in (1). We employ Algorithm 4 for this purpose. We obtain

$$K_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0152761 & -0.8159748 & -0.2394377 & -0.7514747 \\ 2.3245781 & 0.0798596 & 1.622477 & -1.0654847 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$K_2 = (-2.3973087 \quad -1.4308615).$$

We have

$$P_{1s} = \begin{pmatrix} 974.82022 & 115.25221 & 693.51383 & -223.88521 \\ 115.25221 & 1022.0729 & 160.38138 & 109.95335 \\ 693.51383 & 160.38138 & 768.15463 & -219.94088 \\ -223.88521 & 109.95335 & -219.94088 & 1250.1576 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P_{1u} = \begin{pmatrix} 1678.8234 & 300.05968 & 1271.4766 & -378.75625 \\ 300.05968 & 1465.4904 & 391.07683 & 368.29291 \\ 1271.4766 & 391.07683 & 1213.8238 & -279.44358 \\ -378.75625 & 368.29291 & -279.44358 & 1483.7789 \end{pmatrix},$$



$$Y_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0005645 & -0.0006647 & -0.0008519 & -0.0005914 \\ 0.0024236 & -0.0001203 & -0.0001764 & -0.0004387 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$P_{2s} = \begin{pmatrix} 1717.7113 & 138.39564 \\ 138.39564 & 50.218134 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P_{2u} = \begin{pmatrix} 2580.3612 & 512.67656 \\ 512.67656 & 184.31981 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Y_2 = (0.0011569 \quad -0.0316812).$$

FIGURE 2. $\|x_1(t)\|^2$ versus t FIGURE 3. $\|x_2(t)\|^2$ versus t

It follows that

$$A_{1_s}^\top \mathcal{P}^1 A_{1_s} - P_{1_s} = \begin{pmatrix} -51.553004 & -7.8596573 & -69.500984 & -13.199701 \\ -7.8596573 & -480.12758 & -40.530729 & 37.248709 \\ -69.500984 & -40.530729 & -230.28674 & 106.35376 \\ -13.199701 & 37.248709 & 106.35376 & -300.5394 \end{pmatrix} < 0_{d_1 \times d_1},$$

$$A_{1_u}^\top \mathcal{P}^1 A_{1_u} - P_{1_u} = \begin{pmatrix} -48.482389 & 0.1252562 & -62.165288 & -15.778984 \\ 0.1252562 & -428.29213 & -25.838462 & 53.124646 \\ -62.165288 & -25.838462 & -182.71532 & 86.522247 \\ -15.778984 & 53.124646 & 86.522247 & -289.02844 \end{pmatrix} < 0_{d_1 \times d_1},$$

and

$$A_{2_s}^\top \mathcal{P}^2 A_{2_s} - P_{2_s} = \begin{pmatrix} -26.390428 & -3.0495068 \\ -3.0495068 & -30.242636 \end{pmatrix} < 0_{d_2 \times d_2},$$

$$A_{2_u}^\top \mathcal{P}^2 A_{2_u} - P_{2_u} = \begin{pmatrix} -25.479355 & -3.4282391 \\ -3.4282391 & -25.646787 \end{pmatrix} < 0_{d_2 \times d_2}.$$

We then employ Algorithm 3 to generate probabilistic scheduling logics. We set $T = 1000$. It follows that $f_{c_1} = 500$ and $f_{c_2} = 500$. We generate 10 different sequences $\gamma(0), \gamma(1), \dots, \gamma(999)$. Corresponding to each sequence, we pick 10 different initial conditions $x_i^0 \in [-10, +10]^{d_i}$, $i = 1, 2$ and plot $\|x_i(t)\|^2$, $i = 1, 2$. The resulting trajectories (up to time $t = 100$) are illustrated in Figures 2 and 3. Stochastic stability of each plant in the NCS under consideration follows.

Our next experiment is geared towards testing scalability of the proposed techniques.

Experiment 2. We fix capacity of the shared network as $M = 10$ and carry out the following procedure for various values of the total number of plants, N , such that Assumption 3 holds:

- (i) We generate unstable matrices $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 5}$ and vectors $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 1}$ with entries from the interval $[-2, 2]$ and the set $\{0, 1\}$, respectively, chosen uniformly at random and ensuring that each pair of matrices (A_i, B_i) , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ is controllable.
- (ii) We compute $v = N/M$, construct the set \mathcal{S} containing all subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ with M distinct elements, choose a step size $h = 0.001$, and compute r to be biggest integer satisfying $rh < 1$.
- (iii) For all distinct sets $c_j \in \mathcal{S}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ and probabilities $p_{c_j} \in \{h, 2h, \dots, rh\}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^v p_{c_j} = 1$, we employ Algorithm 4 until a suitable set of state-feedback controllers, K_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are designed. We note the corresponding c_j and p_{c_j} , $j = 1, 2, \dots, v$ and proceed to Step (iv). If no such set of controllers is found, then we report a failure.
- (iv) We employ Algorithm 3 to generate probabilistic scheduling logics. We set $T = 1000$ and generate a sequence $\gamma(0), \gamma(1), \dots, \gamma(999)$.

The above set of steps was implemented by employing the LMI solver toolbox and PENBMI toolbox in MATLAB R2020a on an Intel i7-8550U, 8 GB RAM, 1 TB HDD PC with Windows 10 operating system. The time taken to conduct the experiment for various choices of N are summarized in Table 1. Not surprisingly, we observe that the computation time under consideration increases as the number of plants in an NCS increases.

N	M	Result	Time taken (in sec)
100	10	Success	93
200	10	Success	1183
500	10	Success	10367
700	10	Success	33710
1000	10	Success	75726

TABLE 1. Data for numerical experiment

§5. CONCLUSION

In this paper we presented a probabilistic algorithm to design scheduling logics for NCSs whose shared communication networks have limited capacity. We operated under the assumption that communication between plants and their controllers is not affected by any form of communication uncertainties. A next natural research direction is the design of probabilistic algorithms that construct scheduling logics for NCSs under communication uncertainties like time delays, data losses, quantization errors, etc. This matter is currently under investigation and will be reported elsewhere.

REFERENCES

- [1] S.-L. DAI, H. LIN, AND S. S. GE, *Scheduling-and-control codesign for a collection of networked control systems with uncertain delays*, IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology, 18 (2010), pp. 66–78.
- [2] A. KUNDU AND D. E. QUEVEDO, *Stabilizing scheduling policies for networked control systems*, IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems, 7 (2020), pp. 163–175.
- [3] A. KUNDU AND D. E. QUEVEDO, *Design of periodic scheduling and control for networked systems under random data loss*, IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems, (2021). 8 (4), 1788–1798.
- [4] D. LIBERZON, *Switching in systems and control*, Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2003.
- [5] K. LIU, E. FRIDMAN, AND K. H. JOHANSSON, *Networked control with stochastic scheduling*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control, 60 (2015), pp. 3071–3076.
- [6] H. REHBINDER AND M. SANFRIDSON, *Scheduling of a limited communication channel for optimal control*, Automatica, 40 (2004), p. 4917500.
- [7] G. C. WALSH AND H. YE, *Scheduling of networked control systems*, IEEE Control Systems Magazine, 21 (2001), pp. 57–65.
- [8] G. C. WALSH, H. YE, AND L. G. BUSHNELL, *Stability analysis of networked control systems*, IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology, 10 (2002), pp. 438–446.

- [9] L. ZHANG AND E.-K. BOUKAS, *Stability and stabilization of Markovian jump linear systems with partly unknown transition probabilities*, Automatica J. IFAC, 45 (2009), pp. 463–468.