

# CONVERGENCE OF COPRIME FACTOR PERTURBATIONS FOR ROBUST STABILIZATION OF OSEEN SYSTEMS

JAN HEILAND

ABSTRACT. Linearization based controllers for incompressible flows have been proven to work in theory and in simulations. To realize such a controller numerically, the infinite dimensional system has to be linearized and discretized. The unavoidable consistency errors add a small but critical uncertainty to the controller model which will likely make it fail, especially when an observer is involved. Standard robust controller designs can compensate small uncertainties if they can be qualified as a coprime factor perturbation of the plant. We show that for the linearized Navier-Stokes equations, a linearization error can be expressed as a coprime factor perturbation and that this perturbation smoothly depends on the size of the linearization error. In particular, improving the linearization makes the perturbation smaller so that, eventually, standard robust controller will stabilize the system.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Linearization based compensator design for stabilizing a steady state of the Navier-Stokes equations has been thoroughly investigated in theory, see, e.g. [25] for early fundamental results and [15] for a recent extension to observer design, and proved to work in numerical simulations [3]. In view of applications that come with various sources of unmodelled effects, however, standard observer-based controllers are likely to fail because of their inherent lack of robustness [13] even in the finite-dimensional case.

For this paper we consider the situation that the infinite dimensional model can be stabilized via a linearization based controller. In order to realize a stabilizing control in a simulation, two approximation steps are imminent: the discretization of the continuous states both of the plant and the controller and a computation of the linearization. Both approximations can be arbitrarily close but will always introduce an error in the model used for the controller design. In this work we focus on the linearization error. We show that this error can be qualified via perturbations in coprime factorizations of the transfer functions which can be compensated for via  $H_\infty$  controller design; see [19] for the finite dimensional and [11] for the infinite dimensional case.

For that we consider a simulation setup (Section 2) for the control of the *flow around a cylinder*, which is a widely used benchmark for flow simulations [30]. We relax the modelled *Dirichlet* control conditions towards *Robin*-type conditions which allows for a direct integration in the variational formulations. We show that in this particular setup, which, however, is readily extendable to other flow control problems, the associated *Oseen* operator generates an analytic semigroup and that the input operator is bounded (Section 3). The boundedness is then used to infer the existence of a transfer function in frequency domain whereas the analyticity provides additional regularity of the solutions in time domain. For an output operator that makes the system uniformly detectable, we then show that a perturbation to the *Oseen* linearization amounts to a perturbation of coprime factors of the transfer function (Section 4). We characterize those perturbations




FIGURE 1. Computational domain of the cylinder wake.

and, by means of the analyticity and a state-space realization, show that the coprime factor perturbations tend to zero in the relevant norm as the linearization error approaches zero.

The implication of this general result is that standard  $H_\infty$ -robust output based controllers that are computed on the base of an inexact linearization will eventually stabilize the nominal system.

The *Oseen* linearization as a base for controller design for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations has been thoroughly analysed as, e.g., in [25, 27, 21] for Dirichlet boundary control in two and three dimensions and with mixed boundary conditions, in [1] in two and three dimensions including space discretizations and Riccati-based state feedback, in [15] in view of observer design, in [24] with extension methods for the Dirichlet control, and in the textbook [2] with fundamental results on spectral properties. As for robust control, the *Oseen* linearization has been investigated in [12, 2] in view of the operator  $H_\infty$ -Riccati equations. Separately, the need and applicability for  $H_\infty$ -robust controllers to account for discretization or linearization errors in flow control setups have been discussed in [4, 5].

For general distributed parameter systems, the design and advantages  $H_\infty$ -robust controllers have been thoroughly treated in [11] and analysed with respect to discretization and model reduction errors [9, 10, 22]. Those results were directed to systems with *bounded* input and output operators. For more general system class, the question of robust stabilizability and stable factorizations of transfer functions was treated in [8]. Finally, we mention the most general comprehensive notion for infinite-dimensional systems, namely *well-posed* or *regular* linear systems as treated in the fundamental work [29], in the text books [32, 34], and in the recent survey paper [35] that also covers some nonlinear systems and the Navier-Stokes equations.

With this paper we contribute two aspects to the existing theory: First, we review general results on regularity and controller design for the *Oseen* system and adapt them to the practically relevant setup with *Robin*-type boundary conditions and inexactness in the linearization. Second, derive a state space realization of the coprime factor perturbations to the transfer function that are caused by inexact linearizations. We then use the regularity to prove that these perturbations scale with the inexactness in the linearization in the relevant norm. While this smooth dependency is readily established in finite dimensional state space systems, in infinite dimensions, this has not been addressed yet.

## 2. PROBLEM SETUP

Before we define the semigroup setting, we introduce the considered Navier-Stokes Equations in strong form for an example application. We only consider the

two-dimensional case and comment on the extension to three dimensions whenever the results do not simply carry over.

**2.1. Derivation of the System Equations.** We consider the flow of an incompressible fluid in a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  with a boundary  $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\text{in}} \cup \Gamma_w \cup \Gamma_{\text{out}} \cup \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ , where  $\Gamma_{\text{in}}$  stands for the inflow boundary,  $\Gamma_w$  stands for physical walls,  $\Gamma_{\text{out}}$  denotes the outflow boundary, and  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  denote two boundaries where controls can be applied. An example is the cylinder wake with two boundary controls at the cylinder periphery as illustrated in Figure 1.

For time  $t > 0$ , we describe the system via the evolution of the velocity  $v$  and the pressure  $p$  of the flow via the Navier-Stokes equations

$$\begin{aligned} (1a) \quad & \dot{v} + (v \cdot \nabla)v + \operatorname{div} \sigma(v, p) = 0, \\ (1b) \quad & \operatorname{div} v = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

with the stress tensor

$$\sigma(v, p) := \nu(\nabla v + \nabla v^T) - pI,$$

where the parameter  $\nu > 0$  is the *dynamic viscosity*<sup>1</sup>.

As for the inflow and outflow boundary conditions, we apply

$$v = -ng_0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\text{in}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(v, p)n = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\text{out}},$$

where  $g_0$  models the spatial shape of the inflow profile and where  $n$  denotes the outward normal vector to the boundary. As for the controls, we prescribe

$$(2) \quad v = -ng_1 \cdot u_1 \text{ on } \Gamma_1 \quad \text{and} \quad v = -ng_2 \cdot u_2 \text{ on } \Gamma_2.$$

Here, the control input is modelled via the shape functions  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  and via scalar functions of time  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  as the control parameters.

At the walls we assume *no-slip* conditions, that is

$$v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_w.$$

In a system-theoretic formulation, the control of partial differential equations through Dirichlet boundary conditions as (2) does not fit the general setup of  $(A, B, C)$  systems with bounded  $B$  and  $C$ ; see [11, Ch. 3.3]. For such models the notions of *regularity* and *well-posedness* have been developed, see, e.g., [14] for an overview and a positive example. We avoid these difficulty by relaxing the present Dirichlet boundary (2) conditions to Robin-type conditions:

$$(3) \quad v = -ng_i u_i - \gamma \sigma(v, p)n \text{ on } \Gamma_i, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

with a parameter  $\gamma$  that is supposed to be small, cf., e.g., [16] for convergence properties of this relaxation in optimal control of stationary flows.

Next we assume that the corresponding steady state equations with zero control input have a solution  $(v_\infty, p_\infty)$  and we consider the difference states

$$v_\delta := v_\infty - v \quad \text{and} \quad p_\delta := p_\infty - p$$

subject to the linearized dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} (4a) \quad & \dot{v}_\delta + (v_\delta \cdot \nabla)v_\infty + (v_\infty \cdot \nabla)v_\delta + \operatorname{div} \sigma(v_\delta, p_\delta) = 0, \\ (4b) \quad & \operatorname{div} v_\delta = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that the density of the fluid is constant and equal to one

with boundary conditions

$$(4c) \quad \sigma(v_\delta, p_\delta)n + \frac{1}{\gamma}v_\delta = -\frac{1}{\gamma}ng_i \cdot u_i \text{ on } \Gamma_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2$$

$$(4d) \quad v_\delta = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\text{in}} \cup \Gamma_w$$

$$(4e) \quad \sigma(v_\delta, p_\delta)n = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\text{out}}.$$

System (4) is commonly referred to as *Oseen linearization* and provides a suitable model for controller design for incompressible flows around the working point; see, e.g. [31] for a general discussion of the *linearization principle* and [25, 26] for analytical results confirming that the linear controller will locally stabilize the associated nonlinear Navier-Stokes equations.

**2.2. Weak Formulation.** By testing with a test function  $w \in L^2(\Omega)$  that is sufficiently smooth, divergence free, and zero at the Dirichlet boundaries, one derives the standard weak formulation

$$(5) \quad (\dot{\delta}_v, w)_{L^2} + a_\gamma(\delta_v, w) + b_\infty(\delta_v, w) = -\frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \int_{\Gamma_1} g_1 u_1 w \, ds + \int_{\Gamma_2} g_2 u_2 w \, ds \right)$$

from system (4), with

$$(6a) \quad a_\gamma(v, w) := \int_{\Omega} \nu(\nabla v + \nabla v^\top) : (\nabla w + \nabla w^\top) \, dx + \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2} vw \, ds,$$

$$(6b) \quad b_\infty(v, w) := \int_{\Omega} ((v_\infty \cdot \nabla)v) \cdot w + ((v \cdot \nabla)v_\infty) \cdot w \, dx.$$

**2.3. Notation and Basic Definitions.** For  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  denoting a domain, we consider the *Sobolev* spaces  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$  – the space of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  valued functions that are square integrable over  $\Omega$  – and  $H^s(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$  – the subspace of  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$  of functions for which also all derivatives up to order  $s$  are contained in  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$  (in the case that  $s$  is a positive integer). For positive  $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{N}$ , the space  $H^s(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$  can be defined consistently; see [28] for an introduction into *Sobolev* spaces and the definitions of the corresponding norms. Here, we will use subscripts to depict the various norms whereas  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2}$  will denote the  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$  inner product.

As for the treatment of the flow equations, we introduce subspaces of divergence free functions that are zero at the Dirichlet boundaries

$$V^1 := \{z \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) : \operatorname{div} z = 0 \text{ and } z|_{\Gamma_w \cup \Gamma_{\text{in}}} = 0\},$$

$$V^0 := \{z \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) : \operatorname{div} z = 0 \text{ and } z \cdot n|_{\Gamma_w \cup \Gamma_{\text{in}}} = 0\};$$

see, e.g. [25], which are closed subspaces of  $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$  and  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$  in the corresponding norms. Note that by the identity mapping  $V^1$  is continuously and densely embedded in  $V^0$ . We use the notation  $V^1 \hookrightarrow V^0$  to stress on this topological inclusion as opposed to the algebraical subset. Furthermore,  $V^0$  is a closed subspace of the Hilbert space  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ , which, among others, means that there exists an orthogonal projector

$$\Pi: L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \text{ onto } V^0 \subset L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2),$$

and that we can identify  $V^0$  with its dual space  $V^{0*}$ .

For two Banach spaces  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ , we denote the space of bounded linear operators from  $V_1$  to  $V_2$  by  $\mathcal{L}(V_1, V_2)$ . Also we will refer to the notion of *strongly continuous semigroup* or  $C_0$ -semigroup as defined, e.g., in [11, Def. 2.1.2], and to an operator  $A$  being the *generator of an analytic  $C_0$ -semigroup* where *generator* is defined, e.g., in [11, Def. 2.1.8] and *analyticity of a  $C_0$ -semigroup*, e.g., in [7, Def. II-1.2.1].

Throughout the manuscript, a lower case  $c$  with, possibly, a subscript will denote a positive constant.

For generic linear time-invariant systems, we will use the shortcut  $(A, B, C)$  to refer to a state space realization. To connect it to a transfer function, we will write  $G \sim (A, B, C)$ . We will consider stable transfer functions  $G \in \mathcal{M}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_-(0)$  that, by definition, are also contained in  $\mathcal{M}\hat{\mathcal{A}}(0)$  and are thus holomorphic and bounded on the right half plane  $\mathbb{C}_0^+$ ; see [11, Def. 7.1.4, Lem. A.7.47]. Accordingly  $G \in \mathcal{M}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_-(0)$  can be measured in terms of the  $H_\infty$ -norm

$$\|G\|_{H_\infty} = \sup_{s \in \mathbb{C}_0^+} \|G(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U, Y)},$$

where  $U$  and  $Y$  are the input and the output space.

### 3. OSEEN AS LINEAR SYSTEM

For the linearization point that defines the *Oseen* system (5) we make the following regularity assumption.

**Assumption 3.1.** *The weak solution  $v_\infty$  to the steady-state with no control action and their approximation  $v_\infty + \delta_v$  exist and fulfill*

$$v_\infty, v_\infty + \delta_v \in H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2),$$

for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

This assumption is in line with the assumptions made in [21, (H5)]. Establishing the validity of this assumption for given setups is a delicate task. In the appendix of [21], the authors provide reasoning for the existence of  $v_\infty$  in a similar setup like the one considered here (see Figure 1). Once existence is confirmed, regularity can be derived from the general results presented in [18].

Informally, we introduce the *Oseen* operator  $A$  as

$$A: D(A) \subset V^0 \rightarrow V^0: v \mapsto \Pi(\nu \Delta v - (v_\infty \cdot \nabla)v - (v \cdot \nabla)v_\infty)$$

where

(7)

$$D(A) = \{v \in H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) : \exists p \in H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \text{ s.t. } \operatorname{div} \sigma(v, p) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)\}$$

for some  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ .

*Remark 3.2.* Because of corners in the domain and because of junctions of Dirichlet and Neumann-type conditions, solutions to the related Stokes problem, i.e. the case where  $v_\infty = 0$ , might be in  $H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ ,  $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1/2)$ , rather than in  $H^2$ . Accordingly, this domain of definition has been proposed for a similar setup [21]; cp. also Assumption 3.1. Also note that only the existence of such a  $p$  is needed without further specification, since the contribution of  $p$  in  $\sigma(v, p)$  is in the kernel of  $\Pi$ .

Formally, we define  $A$  in weak form via

$$(8) \quad (-Av, w)_{L^2} = a_\gamma(v, w) + b_\infty(v, w) \quad \text{for all } w \in V^1;$$

with the forms  $a_\gamma$  and  $b_\infty$  as defined in (6). Since the projector  $\Pi$  is self-adjoint in the  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ -inner product and since  $V^1 \subset V^0$  the projection of  $A$  is contained in the definition (9) by virtue of

$$(-Av, w)_{L^2} = (-Av, \Pi w)_{L^2} = (-\Pi^* Av, w)_{L^2} = (-\Pi Av, w)_{L^2} \quad \text{for all } w \in V^1.$$

Also note the sign of  $A$  that is chosen in view of writing the *Oseen* system as  $\dot{v} = Av + Bu$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** *If  $v_\infty$  fulfills Assumption 3.1, then for  $\gamma > 1/\nu$ , the Oseen operator  $A$  with Robin-type boundary conditions as defined in (8) with domain of definition  $D(A)$  as defined in (7) generates an analytic  $C_0$ -semigroup on  $V^0$ .*

*Proof.* We show that  $A$  meets the assumptions of [7, Ch. 2-I, Thm. 2.12.]. For that, we recall that  $V^1 \hookrightarrow V^0$  is a continuous embedding and that  $D(A)$  is chosen such that  $(-Az, \cdot)_{L^2}$  defines a continuous functional on  $V^0$ . Since  $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$  is of nonzero measure, the *Friedrich's inequality* (see, e.g, [20, Thm. 1.8]) combined with *Korn's inequality* ([20, p. 193]) that states the ellipticity for the symmetrized gradient  $\mathcal{E}_s(v) := \nabla v + \nabla v^T$  gives that the *Stokes* part  $a_\gamma$  of  $A$  is  $V^1$  coercive:

$$\begin{aligned} a_\gamma(z, z) &= \int_{\Omega} \nu \mathcal{E}_s(z) : \mathcal{E}_s(z) \, dx + \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2} zz \, ds \\ &\geq \nu \left( \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_s(z) : \mathcal{E}_s(z) \, dx + \int_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2} zz \, ds \right) \\ &\geq c_a \|z\|_{V^1}^2, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $z \in V^1$  and a constant  $c_a$  independent of  $z$ . By standard arguments, see e.g. [21, Thm. 2.8], it then follows that the bilinear form  $a_\gamma + b_\infty$  is  $V^1$ - $V^0$ -coercive so that  $A$  as defined in (8) is indeed a generator of an analytic  $C_0$ -semigroup.  $\square$

*Remark 3.4.* The direct estimate of the form  $b_\infty$  that is used in [21, Thm. 2.8] is specific to two dimensions. In the three dimensional case one may add the reasonable assumption that  $v_\infty \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$  to directly obtain the  $V^1$ - $V^0$ -coercivity of  $A$  or establish that  $A = A_a + A_b$ , where  $A_b$  is that part of  $A$  that is defined via  $b_\infty$ , is a closed operator with  $D(A_a^{1/2})$  as domain of definition and show analyticity with the help of [7, Ch. 3, Cor. 2.4].

For sufficiently smooth shape functions  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ , namely  $g_i \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma_i; \mathbb{R})$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , we define the input operator  $B = \Pi \tilde{B}$  where  $B$  is defined as

$$(9) \quad \tilde{B}u(w) = -\frac{1}{\gamma} \sum_{i=1,2} \int_{\Gamma_i} g_i w \, ds u_i$$

for the two dimensional input  $u = (u_1, u_2)$ . Note that, due to the evaluation of the trace,  $\tilde{B}$  is *not bounded* in  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$  whereas  $B = \Pi \tilde{B}$  is; see [4].

As for an output operator we consider  $C \in \mathcal{L}(V^0, \mathbb{R}^k)$  that can be, e.g.,  $k$  averaged velocity measurements over small subdomains of  $\Omega$ . By similar arguments that ensured  $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2, V^0)$  also boundary observation could be modelled with operators in  $\mathcal{L}(V^0, \mathbb{R}^k)$ . Finally, as we will show below, the analyticity of the generated semigroup provides additional regularity so that also output operators that are only bounded from  $V^1$  will not necessarily destroy the well posedness of the system.

By the preceding arguments we can state that the linear system

$$(10a) \quad \dot{v}(t) = Av(t) + Bu(t), \quad v(0) \in V^0$$

$$(10b) \quad y(t) = Cv(t)$$

with  $A: D(A) \subset V^0 \rightarrow V^0$  being the generator of an analytic  $C_0$ -semigroup, with  $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2, V^0)$  models the evolution of the difference state due to boundary input  $u$  in the linear approximation (4) and is observed via the output operator  $C \in \mathcal{L}(V^0, \mathbb{R}^k)$ .

*Remark 3.5.* Due to the boundedness of  $B$  and  $C$  with respect to the state space  $V^0$ , system (10) is of the form that is treated in [11]. In order to show smooth

dependencies of factorizations of the associated transfer function on system perturbations, we need to extend our considerations to a more general class, where additional state regularity may compensate a certain *unboundedness* of  $C$ .

#### 4. TRANSFER FUNCTIONS AND COPRIME FACTORIZATIONS

For a system  $(A, B, C)$  with bounded input and output operators and with  $A$  generating a  $C_0$ -semigroup, the associated *transfer function*

$$G(s) = C(sI - A)^{-1}B \in \mathcal{L}(U, Y)$$

where  $U$  and  $Y$  denote the input and output space, respectively, is well defined for all  $s \in \rho_\infty(A)$ , where  $\rho_\infty(A)$  is the maximal part of the resolvent set of  $A$  that contains an interval  $[r, \infty)$ ; see [11, Lem. 4.3.6].

**Theorem 4.1** ([11], Thm. 7.3.8). *Let  $(A, B, C)$  be a linear time-invariant system with state-space  $Z$ , with input space  $\mathbb{C}^m$  and output space  $\mathbb{C}^k$ , and with bounded input operator  $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^m, Z)$  and output operator  $C \in \mathcal{L}(Z, \mathbb{C}^k)$ . If  $(A, B, C)$  is exponentially detectable by  $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^k, X)$  then*

$$(11a) \quad N(s) = C(sI - A - LC)^{-1}B$$

$$(11b) \quad M(s) = I + C(sI - A - LC)^{-1}L$$

define a (left) coprime factorization  $G = M^{-1}N$  of  $G$  over  $\mathcal{MA}_-(0)$ .

*Remark 4.2.* The class of transfer functions that possess coprime factorizations over  $\mathcal{MA}_-(0)$  (see [11, Def. 7.2.7]) is called the *Callier-Desoer* class and is well suited for infinite dimensional linear time-invariant systems since, in particular, it contains transfer functions that are not rational as they occur, e.g., in the modelling of systems with delay.

A perturbation  $\delta_A$  of  $A$ , that is still stabilized by  $LC$ , transfers to the coprime factors as follows; cp. [4, Thm. 4].

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $(A, B, C)$  and  $(A + \delta_A, B, C)$  be linear time-invariant systems with state space  $Z$ , input space  $\mathbb{C}^m$ , and output space  $\mathbb{C}^k$  and with  $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^m, Z)$  and  $C \in \mathcal{L}(Z, \mathbb{C}^k)$ . If  $(A, B, C)$  and  $(A + \delta_A, B, C)$  are simultaneously exponentially detectable by  $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^k, X)$  then for  $G \sim (A, B, C)$  and  $G_\delta \sim (A + \delta_A, B, C)$  it holds that*

$$G = M^{-1}N \quad \text{and} \quad G_\delta = [M + \delta_M]^{-1}[N + \delta_N]$$

with  $N, M, \delta_N, \delta_M \in \mathcal{MA}_-(0)$  and

$$(12a) \quad \delta_N(s) = C\delta_A(sI - A - LC)^{-1}(sI - A - \delta_A - LC)^{-1}B,$$

$$(12b) \quad \delta_M(s) = C\delta_A(sI - A - LC)^{-1}(sI - A - \delta_A - LC)^{-1}L.$$

*Proof.* Applying formula (11) for the coprime factors to the perturbed system, we obtain

$$N(s) + \delta_N(s) = C(sI - A - \delta_A - LC)^{-1}B,$$

$$M(s) + \delta_M(s) = I + C(sI - A - \delta_A - LC)^{-1}L,$$

so that the formulas (12) for the differences follow from the operator identity

$$(sI - A - \delta_A - LC)^{-1} = (sI - A - LC)^{-1} + \delta_A(sI - A - LC)^{-1}(sI - A - \delta_A - LC)^{-1}$$

that holds under the assumption that  $LC$  stabilizes both  $A$  and  $A + \delta_A$ .  $\square$

The task is now to show that the size of  $\delta_N, \delta_M$  smoothly depends on the size of the perturbation  $\delta_A$  as this implies that for sufficiently accurate linearizations standard  $H_\infty$  robust controller will stabilize the system. In fact, in the finite dimensional case, the needed robustness is proportional to  $\|[\delta_N \ \delta_M]\|_{H_\infty}$ ; see [6].

Since  $A$  and  $\delta_A$  are not bounded in general, we cannot use closeness of  $A$  and  $\delta_A$  directly to estimate  $\delta_N$ . We will rather use a time-domain realization of  $\delta_N$  and  $\delta_M$  to show that, under regularity conditions that we will establish for the Oseen system, the norms of associated input to output or state maps go to zero as the Oseen linearization error approaches zero.

We will make use of the following fundamental result

**Theorem 4.4** (Thm. 1.3, [36]). *Let  $U$  and  $Y$  be Banach spaces and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an shift-invariant bounded operator from  $L^p([0, \infty), U)$  to  $L^p([0, \infty), Y)$ . Then there exists a unique bounded analytic  $\mathcal{L}(U, Y)$ -valued function  $H$  defined on  $\mathbb{C}_0^+$  such that for  $u$  and  $y$  with  $y = \mathcal{F}u$  it holds that  $\hat{y}(s) = H(s)\hat{u}(s)$  on  $\mathbb{C}_0^+$  and*

$$\sup_{s \in \mathbb{C}_0^+} \|H(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U, Y)} \leq \|\mathcal{F}\|,$$

where  $\hat{u}$  and  $\hat{y}$  are the Laplace-transformed signals  $u$  and  $y$ .

With the help of Theorem 4.4, we will establish existence of transferfunctions and estimates on their  $H_\infty$ -norm on the base of the input-to-state or input-to-output map  $\mathcal{F}$  in the time domain.

## 5. REGULARITY OF THE OSEEN-SEMIGROUP

The *Oseen operator* has been studied in similar contexts in [25, 1, 21]. We briefly review the basic analysis for the presented case of *Robin-type* boundary conditions that can be modelled with an input of *distributed type*, meaning that  $Bu$  is bounded in the state space  $V^0$ . Further, we provide results on regularity of solutions as we will need it for the definition of transfer functions and their perturbations.

For the *Oseen system* (10), we have the following regularity result:

**Lemma 5.1.** *If  $u \in L^2(0, \infty; \mathbb{R}^2)$  then for the solution  $v$  to the Oseen system (10) with  $v(0) = 0$ , it holds that for all  $T > 0$*

$$(13) \quad \|v\|_{L^2(0, T; V^1)} \leq c_T \|u\|_{L^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2; V^0)$  we have that  $Bu \in L^2(0, \infty; V^0)$  so that the regularity estimate follows from [1, Cor. 2.4.7] or [7, Thm. II-2.2.] noting that the general results treat  $D(A)$  as a topological subspace of the pivot space and noting that  $D(A) \subset V^1$  algebraically and topologically.  $\square$

Since  $c_T$  in (13) may depend on  $T$ , that estimate does not guarantee the bounded input-to-state map. However, for stable systems the estimates also hold for  $T = \infty$ .

**Corollary 5.2.** *Consider  $A, B$ , and  $C$  from the Oseen system (10) and let  $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^k, V^0)$  such that  $A + LC$  is exponentially stable. Then for  $u \in L^2(0, \infty; \mathbb{R}^2)$ , the solution  $v$  to*

$$\dot{v} = (A + LC)v + Bu, \quad v(0) = 0,$$

*obeys*

$$\|v\|_{L^2(0, \infty; V^1)} \leq c_\infty \|u\|_{L^2(0, \infty; \mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $C$  and  $L$  are bounded  $LC \in \mathcal{L}(V^0, V^0)$  is a bounded perturbation of  $A$ , so that  $A + LC$  still generates an analytic  $C_0$ -semigroup; see [23, Ch.3, Thm. 2.2]. Since  $A + LC$  is stable, it is of *negative type*, so that  $T$  in 13 can be set to  $T = \infty$ , see [1, Cor. 2.4.7].  $\square$

*Remark 5.3.* The estimates of Corollary 5.2 and Lemma 5.1 can also accomodate an initial condition  $v(0) \neq 0$  of sufficient regularity. In view of the estimates of the transfer function, however, only the  $v(0) = 0$  case is of relevance.

## 6. PERTURBED LINEARIZATION AND ROBUST STABILIZATION

In the case of a perturbation of the linearization point  $v_\infty \approx v_\infty + \delta_v$  the corresponding Oseen operator (8) will be perturbed as  $A \approx A + \delta_A$  where  $\delta_A$  is defined via

$$(14) \quad (\delta_A v, w)_{L^2} = \int_{\Omega} (\delta_v \cdot \nabla) v \cdot w + (v \cdot \nabla) \delta_v \cdot w \, dx \quad \text{for all } w \in V^1,$$

with a domain of definition that contains  $D(A)$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *If  $\delta_v \in H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ , then  $\delta_A \in \mathcal{L}(V^1, V^0)$  and*

$$\|\delta_A\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^1, V^0)} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\|\delta_v\|_{H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)} \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof.* We will make use of the estimate

$$(15) \quad \left| \int_{\Omega} (z \cdot \nabla) v \cdot w \, dx \right| \leq c_b \|z\|_{H^{s_1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)} \|v\|_{H^{1+s_2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)} \|w\|_{H^{s_3}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)}$$

that holds for  $s_1 + s_2 + s_3 > 1$ ; see [33, Lem. 2.1].

With the identification of  $V^0 = V^{0*}$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_A\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^1, V^0)} &= \sup_{w \in V^1, \|w\|=1} \|\delta_A w\|_{V^0} = \sup_{w \in V^1, \|w\|=1} \|\delta_A w\|_{V^{0*}} \\ &\leq \sup_{w \in V^1, \|w\|=1} \sup_{v \in V^0, \|v\|=1} |(\delta_A w, v)_{V^0}| \\ &\leq \sup_{w \in V^1, \|w\|=1} \sup_{v \in V^0, \|v\|=1} \left| \int_{\Omega} (\delta_v \cdot \nabla) v \cdot w + (v \cdot \nabla) \delta_v \cdot w \, dx \right| \end{aligned}$$

which by virtue of (15) and  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (\frac{3}{2} + \varepsilon_0, 0, 0)$  for the first and  $(s_1, s_2, s_3) = (1, \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon_0, 0)$  for the second summand can be estimated to give

$$\|\delta_A\|_{\mathcal{L}(V^1, V^0)} \leq c_{\delta_A} \|\delta_v\|_{H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)},$$

which proves the result.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.2.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 6.1 it holds that*

$$\delta_A \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(0, \infty; V^1), L^2(0, \infty; V^0))$$

and  $\|\delta_A\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(0, \infty; V^1), L^2(0, \infty; V^0))} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\|\delta_v\|_{H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)} \rightarrow 0$ .

*Remark 6.3.* In three dimensions, the estimate (15) holds for  $s_1 + s_2 + s_3 > \frac{3}{2}$ . As the result of Lemma 6.1 leaves no margin in the presented framework, the extension to three dimensions will either require additional regularity in  $v_\infty$  or lead to boundedness of  $\delta_A$  with respect to a stronger norm than the  $V^1$  norm.

We make another assumption on the system.

**Assumption 6.4.** *There exists an operator  $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^k, V^0)$  such that  $A + \delta_A + LC$  generates an exponentially stable  $C_0$ -semigroup  $S$ , with  $\|S(t)\|_{V^0} \leq M e^{-\omega t}$ , with constants  $M > 0$  and  $\omega > 0$  independent of  $\delta_A$  for all perturbations  $\delta_v$  with  $\|\delta_v\|_{H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)} < \varepsilon$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ .*

*Remark 6.5.* When considering robust output feedback stabilization it is necessary to assume that the unperturbed system is stabilizable and detectable. With the established boundedness of  $B$  and the assumed boundedness of  $C$ , the existence of such a stabilizing output injection  $L$  for the *Oseen* system, follows, e.g., from the results on Riccati based controllers as provided in [11, Ch. 6.2]. As  $A + LC$  is stabilized directly by the full state rather than through an observer, it has the stability margins of state feedback, cf. [13]. Thus stability for small perturbations  $\delta_A$  may well be assumed and the uniformity in the constants can be achieved by worst case estimates.

We can now state our main result.

**Theorem 6.6.** *Consider the perturbed Oseen system (10) and let  $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^k, V^0)$  and  $\delta_A$  as in Assumption 6.4. Then the associated transferfunction  $G_\delta$  has a co-prime factorization*

$$G_\delta = [N + \delta_N][M + \delta_M]^{-1},$$

where  $NM^{-1} = G$  is the transferfunction associated with the unperturbed system, and

$$\|\delta_N\|_{H_\infty} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\delta_M\|_{H_\infty} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\delta_v \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.3, the perturbed transfer functions can be factorized as  $G_\delta = [N + \delta_N][M + \delta_M]^{-1}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_N(s) &= C\delta_A(sI - A - LC)^{-1}(sI - A - \delta_A - LC)^{-1}B, \\ \delta_M(s) &= C\delta_A(sI - A - LC)^{-1}(sI - A - \delta_A - LC)^{-1}L. \end{aligned}$$

We realize  $\delta_N(s) = C\delta_A(sI - A - LC)^{-1}(sI - A - \delta_A - LC)^{-1}B$  as a cascaded system

$$(16) \quad \dot{v}_1 = (A + \delta_A + LC)v_1 + Bu$$

and

$$(17a) \quad \dot{v} = (A + LC)v + v_1$$

$$(17b) \quad y = C\delta_A v$$

and show that the overall input  $u$  to output  $y$  map is bounded with a constant that approaches zero as  $\delta_v \rightarrow 0$ .

For system (16), from the uniform stability of  $A + \delta_A + LC$  and the boundedness of  $B$ , we infer the uniform boundedness of

$$\mathcal{F}_1: L^2((0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow L^2((0, \infty); V^0): u \mapsto v_1,$$

so that

$$\|\mathcal{F}_1\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2((0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2); L^2((0, \infty); V^0))} < c_1$$

with a constant  $c_1$  independent of  $\delta_A$ .

By Corollary 5.2, we conclude that system (17) has a bounded input to state map

$$\mathcal{F}_2 \in \mathcal{L}(L^2((0, \infty); V^0); L^2((0, \infty); V^1)): v_1 \mapsto v.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{F}_2$  is defined by (17a) only so that its norm is independent of  $\delta_A$ .

By Corollary 6.2 and by the boundedness of  $C$ , we have that  $C\delta_A$  is bounded as a linear map from  $V^1$  in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  with a norm that approaches zero as  $\delta_v$  goes to zero.

Putting all together, we infer for the input to output map  $\mathcal{F} = C\delta_A\mathcal{F}_2\mathcal{F}_1: u \mapsto y$  via the connection of Systems (16) and (17) that

$$(18) \quad \|\mathcal{F}\|_{\mathbb{R}^k \leftarrow \mathbb{R}^2} \leq \|C\|_{\mathbb{R}^k \leftarrow V^0} \|\delta_A\|_{V^0 \leftarrow V^1} \|\mathcal{F}_2\|_{V^1 \leftarrow V^0} \|\mathcal{F}_1\|_{V^0 \leftarrow \mathbb{R}^2},$$

where we have used, e.g.,  $V^1 \leftarrow V^0$  as a shortcut for  $\mathcal{L}(L^2((0, \infty); V^0); L^2((0, \infty); V^1))$ . Thus, by Theorem 4.4, we obtain that

$$\|\delta_N\|_{H_\infty} \leq \|\mathcal{F}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2((0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2); L^2((0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^k))} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\|\delta_v\|_{H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)} \rightarrow 0$  and, thus,  $\|\delta_A\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2((0, \infty); V^0); L^2((0, \infty); V^1))} \rightarrow 0$ .

Since  $\delta_N$  and  $\delta_M$  only differs in *their input operator* in the corresponding first system (16) and since  $L$  is bounded as is  $B$ , the statement that  $\|\delta_M\|_{H_\infty} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\|\delta_v\|_{H^{3/2+\varepsilon_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)} \rightarrow 0$ , follows analogously.  $\square$

## 7. CONCLUSION

We have presented a general approach to qualify the linearization errors in the controller design via coprime factor uncertainties. For the *Oseen* system, we have shown that the disturbance in the coprime factors smoothly depend on the disturbance in the linearization. The developed realization of the coprime factor disturbances may even be used to quantify the disturbances. Accordingly, the coprime factor uncertainties approach zero in the relevant norm when the linearization gets more accurate. Thus the model will eventually reach a region, where a robust controller based on the inexact model will stabilize the actual system.

Although we have considered a particular setup, the arguments were general enough to be adapted to similar problems. In view of three dimensional setups, we have pointed out where the possible lack of regularity of solutions needs to be compensated.

The presented results were exclusively for the infinite dimensional system. Since it is known that discretization errors lead to similar coprime factors uncertainties, see, e.g. [10, 5], the results may become relevant for the controller design by space-discrete models. In order to define finite dimensional controllers that can compensate both linearization and discretization errors, among others, the interplay of these error sources needs further investigation. Another urgent issue is the existence of uniformly – with respect to the discretization – stabilizing feedback that is commonly assumed to show convergence of control laws; see, e.g. [17] and the remarks in [5] on the difficulties that come with the nonstandard Galerkin approximations as they are used for flow equations.

Finally, it seems worth investigating how the provided results can be extended to treat Dirichlet boundary feedback control as in [25, 27] without resorting to the Robin relaxation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Badra. *Stabilisation par Feedback et Approximation des Equations de Navier-Stokes*. PhD thesis, Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, 2006.
- [2] V. Barbu. *Stabilization of Navier-Stokes flows*. London: Springer, 2011.
- [3] P. Benner and J. Heiland. LQG-Balanced Truncation low-order controller for stabilization of laminar flows. In R. King, editor, *Active Flow and Combustion Control 2014*, volume 127 of *Notes on Numerical Fluid Mechanics and Multidisciplinary Design*, pages 365–379. Springer, Berlin, 2015.
- [4] P. Benner and J. Heiland. Robust stabilization of laminar flows in varying flow regimes. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 49(8):31–36, 2016. 2nd IFAC Workshop on Control of Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations.
- [5] P. Benner and J. Heiland. Convergence of approximations to Riccati-based boundary-feedback stabilization of laminar flows. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 50(1):12296 – 12300, 2017. 20th IFAC World Congress.
- [6] P. Benner, J. Heiland, and S. W. Werner. Robust controller versus numerical model uncertainties for stabilization of Navier-Stokes equations. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 52(2):25 – 29, 2019. 3rd IFAC Workshop on Control of Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations CPDE 2019.

- [7] A. Bensoussan, G. Da Prato, M. C. Delfour, and S. K. Mitter. *Representation and Control of Infinite-Dimensional Systems*. Birkhäuser, Basel, Switzerland, 2007.
- [8] R. F. Curtain. Robust stabilizability of normalized coprime factors: the infinite-dimensional case. *Internat. J. Control*, 51(6):1173–1190, 1990.
- [9] R. F. Curtain. Model reduction for control design for distributed parameter systems. In R. Smith and M. Demetriou, editors, *Research Directions in Distributed Parameter Systems*, pages 95–121. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2003.
- [10] R. F. Curtain. A robust LQG-controller design for DPS. *International Journal of Control*, 79(2):162–170, 2006.
- [11] R. F. Curtain and H. Zwart. *An Introduction to Infinite-Dimensional Linear Systems Theory*, volume 21 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [12] S. Dharmatti, J.-P. Raymond, and L. Thevenet.  $H^\infty$  feedback boundary stabilization of two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations. *SIAM J. Cont. Optim.*, 49(6):2318–2348, 2011.
- [13] J. Doyle. Guaranteed margins for LQG regulators. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 23(4):756–757, Aug 1978.
- [14] B. Guo and X. Zhang. The regularity of the wave equation with partial Dirichlet control and colocated observation. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 44(5):1598–1613, 2005.
- [15] X. He, W. Hu, and Y. Zhang. Observer-based feedback boundary stabilization of the Navier–Stokes equations. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 339:542 – 566, 2018.
- [16] L. S. Hou and S. S. Ravindran. A penalized Neumann control approach for solving an optimal Dirichlet control problem for the Navier–Stokes equations. *SIAM J. Cont. Optim.*, 36(5):1795–1814, Sept. 1998.
- [17] K. Ito. Strong convergence and convergence rates of approximation solutions for algebraic Riccati equations in Hilbert spaces. In *Distributed parameter systems, Proc. 3rd Int. Conf., Vorau/Austria*, pages 153–166, 1987.
- [18] V. Maz’ya and J. Rossmann. Mixed boundary value problems for the stationary Navier-Stokes system in polyhedral domains. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 194(2):669–712, 2009.
- [19] D. C. McFarlane and K. Glover. *Robust Controller Design Using Normalized Coprime Factor Plant Descriptions*, volume 138. Springer, 1990.
- [20] J. Nečas. *Direct Methods in the Theory of Elliptic Equations*. Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2012.
- [21] P. A. Nguyen and J.-P. Raymond. Boundary stabilization of the Navier–Stokes equations in the case of mixed boundary conditions. *SIAM J. Cont. Optim.*, 53(5):3006–3039, 2015.
- [22] L. Paunonen and D. Phan. Reduced order controller design for robust output regulation. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, page to appear, 2019.
- [23] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations.*, volume 44 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York etc., 1983.
- [24] S. S. Ravindran. Stabilization of Navier-Stokes equations by boundary feedback. *International Journal of Numerical Analysis and Modeling*, 4(3–4):608–624, 2007.
- [25] J.-P. Raymond. Feedback boundary stabilization of the two-dimensional Navier–Stokes equations. *SIAM J. Cont. Optim.*, 45(3):790–828, 2006.
- [26] J.-P. Raymond. A family of stabilization problems for the Oseen equations. In K. Kunisch, J. Sprekels, G. Leugering, and F. Tröltzsch, editors, *Control of Coupled Partial Differential Equations*, pages 269–291, Basel, 2007. Birkhäuser Basel.
- [27] J.-P. Raymond. Feedback boundary stabilization of the three-dimensional incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 87(6):627–669, 2007.
- [28] T. Roubíček. *Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations with Applications*. Birkhäuser, Basel, Switzerland, 2005.
- [29] D. Salamon. Infinite-dimensional linear systems with unbounded control and observation: a functional analytic approach. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 300(2):383–431, 1987.
- [30] M. Schäfer and S. Turek. Benchmark computations of laminar flow around a cylinder. (With support by F. Durst, E. Krause and R. Rannacher). In E. Hirschel, editor, *Flow Simulation with High-Performance Computers II. DFG priority research program results 1993-1995*, number 52 in *Notes Numer. Fluid Mech.*, pages 547–566. Vieweg, Wiesbaden, 1996.
- [31] E. D. Sontag. *Mathematical Control Theory. Deterministic Finite Dimensional Systems*. Springer, New York, NY, 1998.
- [32] O. J. Staffans. *Well-posed Linear Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [33] R. Temam. *Navier–Stokes Equations and Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, volume 66. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 2 edition, 1995.

- [34] M. Tucsnak and G. Weiss. *Observation and Control for Operator Semigroups*. Birkhäuser Advanced Texts. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009.
- [35] M. Tucsnak and G. Weiss. Survey paper: Well-posed systems-The LTI case and beyond. *Automatica*, 50(7):1757–1779, 2014.
- [36] G. Weiss. Representation of shift-invariant operators on  $L^2$  by  $H^\infty$  transfer functions: An elementary proof, a generalization to  $L^p$ , and a counterexample for  $L^\infty$ . *Math. Control Signals Syst.*, 4(2):193–203, 1991.