

On observer-based Asymptotic Stabilization of Non-uniformly Observable Systems via hybrid and smooth control: a Case Study

M. Maghenem W. Pasillas-Lépine A. Loría M. Aguado-Rojas *

May 26, 2022

Abstract

For systems that are not observable at the very equilibrium of interest to be stabilized, output-feedback stabilization is considerably challenging. In this paper we solve this control problem for the case-study of a second-order system that is bilinear and affine, both in the input and the output, but it is unobservable at the target equilibrium. The case-study is representative of a well-studied class of non-uniformly observable systems and stems from automotive control. Our main contribution is a novel certainty-equivalence hybrid controller that achieves asymptotic stabilization semiglobally. The controller relies on a switched observer that estimates the state, provided that the latter is ‘kept away’ from the singular equilibrium. To achieve both competing tasks, stabilization and estimation, the controller also relies on the keen construction of a piecewise-constant, converging, reference. Our main results are illustrated via numerical simulations on a meaningful example.

1 Introduction

“Stabilizing a system and estimating the state are two competing processes that need to happen simultaneously in order to stabilize a partially measured system in closed loop” [1]. This statement cannot be overestimated. It is particularly meaningful when the control goal is to stabilize an equilibrium at, and near which, observability is lost. The study of such systems, for about three decades, has yielded an ever-growing literature—see, *e.g.*, [1–5]. It is that beyond the significant mathematical difficulty imposed solely by designing observer design [6–8], the stabilization problem is well-motivated by concrete engineering applications, such as sensorless motor control [9], bioreactor systems [10, 11], electrical systems [12], and automotive applications [13], in which stabilization covers importance beyond intellectual curiosity.

Despite elegant solutions for particular instances such as that studied in [14], the asymptotic output-feedback stabilization of an unobservable equilibrium for nonlinear systems remains, in general, an open question. This is the case for the representative case-study, of interest here and given by the equations

$$\dot{z}_1 = -az_1z_2 + u \tag{1a}$$

$$\dot{z}_2 = (cz_2 + d)z_1, \quad z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1b}$$

where a , c , and $d > 0$, u is the control input, and $y = Cz = z_1$ is the measured output.

*M. Maghenem is with GIPSA-Lab, University of Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, France (e-mail: mohamed.maghenem@cnrs.fr). W. Pasillas-Lépine and A. Loría are with L2S, CNRS, Univ Paris-Saclay, Centrale-Supélec, France (e-mails: wiliam.pasillas-lepine@centralesupelec.fr and antonio.loria@cnrs.fr). M. Aguado-Rojas is with Hitachi Astemo. The work of M. Maghenem and of A. Loría is supported by the French ANR via project HANDY, contract number ANR-18-CE40-0010.

This system belongs to the well-studied class of bilinear systems of the form $\dot{x} = A(y)x + Bu$ —cf. [4], is not observable on $\{y = 0\}$ and has the interest that, up to a change of time-scale, it represents the dynamics of the so-called extended-braking stiffness [13, 15]. This variable, represented by z_2 in (1b), is a state whose regulation translates into maximizing the braking force in the antilock braking system (ABS) of a vehicle’s rolling tire [16]. Stabilizing the origin $\{(z_1, z_2) = (0, 0)\}$ for (1), measuring only z_1 (which tantamounts to the linear acceleration of the tire at the wheel-ground contact point, relative to the longitudinal acceleration of the vehicle) is the open problem that we solve here.

In line with the keen assertion of [1], the estimation and stabilization tasks are competing processes for (1). On one hand, as explained in [17], the state estimator relies on the plant’s output to provide certain persistency of excitation in order for the estimation errors to converge. This is a well-documented estimation mechanism employed for bilinear systems [4, 18]. A way to excite the system is via hybrid control, by constructing a switching reference for the plant’s state [15, 19], but this, of course, prevents stabilization. To overcome this conundrum, in this paper we propose a novel hybrid controller that relies on the exponentially convergent observer previously proposed in [13, 15] and on the construction of a piecewise-constant, decreasing reference (more precisely, a function taking values in a discrete set formed by the elements of a decreasing sequence). Thus, the controller is hybrid in nature and successfully stabilizes the origin semiglobally and asymptotically. Our contribution is a natural follow up on long-standing work led by the second author [5, 13, 15, 17], but there no intellectual intersection with these references, devoted entirely to the observer-design problem. In addition, relatively to them, we provide here explicit exponential bounds on the observer’s estimation errors.

2 Switched-observer design

We revisit the switched observer for system (1) originally introduced in [13] and we refine the main result therein by providing an explicit estimation of the convergence rate. This is a fundamental step for the hybrid control design, which stands as one of our main contributions.

Let $\hat{z} := (\hat{z}_1, \hat{z}_2)$ denote the estimate of $z := (z_1, z_2)$ and consider the observer

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{z}}_1 &= -az_1\hat{z}_2 - u + k_1(z_1)z_1(z_1 - \hat{z}_1) \\ \dot{\hat{z}}_2 &= cz_1\hat{z}_2 + dz_1 + k_2(z_1)z_1(z_1 - \hat{z}_1),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$k_i(z_1) := \begin{cases} k_i^+ & \text{if } z_1 > 0 \\ k_i^- & \text{if } z_1 < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } z_1 = 0, \end{cases} \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.$$

and, following [15], we set

$$\begin{aligned}k_1^+ &> c, & k_2^+ &< -\frac{c}{a}k_1^+, & k_2^- &< -\frac{c}{a}k_1^-, \\ k_1^- &= 2c - k_1^+, & ck_1^+ + ak_2^+ &= ck_1^- + ak_2^-.\end{aligned}$$

Then, the dynamics of the estimation error $\tilde{z}_i := \hat{z}_i - z_i$ is given by the linear time-varying system

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\tilde{z}}_1 \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_2 \end{bmatrix} = z_1(t) \begin{bmatrix} -k_1(z_1(t)) & -a \\ -k_2(z_1(t)) & c \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{z}_1 \\ \tilde{z}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

and depends on the measurable output trajectory $t \mapsto z_1(t)$.

Now, we consider the following hypothesis on the measured output z_1 .

Assumption 1 *There exist positive constants τ_d , τ_s , \underline{z} , and \bar{z} , and an infinite union of disjoint intervals, denoted I_d , such that:*

- $|z_1(t)| \geq \underline{z}$ for all $t \in I_d$,
- $|z_1(t)| \leq \bar{z}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus I_d$,
- the length of each connected interval in I_d is no smaller than τ_d , and
- the length of each connected interval in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus I_d$ is smaller than τ_s .

Assumption 1 relaxes the hypotheses imposed in [5]. Next, for the purpose of analysis, we introduce the new time scale—cf. [5],

$$\tau := \int_{t_o}^t |z_1(s)| ds =: f_{z_1}(t), \quad (4)$$

which, under Assumption 1, is well defined since there exist μ and $T > 0$ such that

$$\int_{t_o}^t |z_1(s)| ds \geq \mu(t - t_o) \quad \forall t \geq t_o + T, \quad \forall t_o \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

In the new time-scale, the system (3) is equivalent to

$$\tilde{w}' := \frac{d\tilde{w}}{d\tau} = A(w_1(\tau))\tilde{w} \quad \forall \tau \in \text{Im}(f_{z_1}), \quad (6)$$

where $w_1 : \text{Im}(f_{z_1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{w} : \text{Im}(f_{z_1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ are given by

$$w_1(\tau) := \begin{cases} z_1(f_{z_1}^-(\tau)) & \text{if } \text{card}(f_{z_1}^-(\tau)) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

$$\tilde{w}(\tau) := \begin{cases} \tilde{z}(f_{z_1}^-(\tau)) & \text{if } \text{card}(f_{z_1}^-(\tau)) = 1 \\ \tilde{z}(\min\{f_{z_1}^-(\tau)\}) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and

$$A(w_1) := \begin{cases} A_+ & \text{if } w_1 > 0 \\ A_- & \text{if } w_1 < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } w_1 = 0, \end{cases}$$

where A_+ and A_- correspond, respectively, to the matrix in (3) with $k_i = k_i^+$ and $k_i = k_i^-$. Note that, by definition, $w_1(\tau) = 0$ only for τ in a null-measure set. Hence,

$$A(w_1(\tau)) \in \{A_1, A_2\} \quad \text{for almost all } \tau \in \text{Im}(f_{z_1}).$$

Furthermore, under Assumption 1, $\text{Im}(f_{z_1}) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\tau \mapsto w_1(\tau)$ has the following property,

Property 1 *There exist an infinite union of disjoint intervals, denoted \bar{I}_d , such that*

- $|w_1(\tau)| > 0$ for all $t \in \bar{I}_d$,
- the length of each connected interval in \bar{I}_d is no smaller than $(\tau_d \underline{z})$,
- the length of each connected interval in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus \bar{I}_d$ is smaller than $(\tau_s \bar{z})$.

Lemma 1 *If the non-autonomous system (6) possesses Property 1, the trajectories of (6) satisfy the uniform exponential stability bound*

$$|\tilde{w}(\tau)| \leq \kappa_1 |\tilde{w}(0)| \exp^{-\kappa_2 \tau} \quad \forall \tau \geq 0,$$

where, given $\lambda > 0$, κ_1 and κ_2 are defined as

$$\kappa_1 := \gamma \frac{\bar{k} + 2\bar{c}^2 \gamma}{\rho(1 + \bar{k})}, \quad \kappa_2 := -\frac{\ln(\rho)}{L}, \quad (9)$$

where

$$\gamma := \frac{\lambda_{\max}(P)}{\lambda_{\min}(P)}, \quad \bar{c} := \exp^{\max\{|A_1|, |A_2|\} \bar{z} \tau_s}, \quad (10a)$$

$$k := \max\{|K_1|, |K_2|\}, \quad \bar{k} := \frac{\lambda_{\max}(P) \bar{c}^2 k^2}{\lambda}, \quad (10b)$$

L is such that

$$\rho := \frac{2\gamma \bar{c}^2 \exp^{-2\lambda L} + \bar{k}}{1 + \bar{k}} < 1, \quad (11)$$

and $K_1, K_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are such that, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we have

$$\left| \exp^{(A_i + K_i C)\tau} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\bar{c}} \exp^{-2\lambda(\tau - \frac{\tau_d \bar{z}}{2})} \quad \forall \tau \geq \frac{\tau_d \bar{z}}{2}. \quad (12)$$

Remark 1 *In view of Lemma 1, under Assumption 1—see (5), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{z}(t)| &\leq \kappa_1 |\tilde{z}(t_o)| \exp^{-\kappa_2 \int_{t_o}^t |z_1(s)| ds} \\ &\leq \kappa_1 |\tilde{z}(t_o)| \exp^{-\kappa_2 \mu(t - t_o)} \quad \forall t \geq t_o + T, \quad t_o \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Remark 2 *According to [21, Lemma 9] and when the pairs (A_1, C) and (A_2, C) are observable, we can always compute $K_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $K_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, (12) holds.*

Proof of Lemma 1: Let [5, Theorem 1] generate a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ such that

$$A_i^\top P + P A_i = -C^\top C \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2\},$$

where $C := [1 \ 0]$. Then, the derivative of

$$V_{obs}(\tilde{w}) := \tilde{w}^\top P \tilde{w}$$

along the solutions to the switched linear system in (6) verifies

$$V'_{obs}(\tilde{w}) = -\tilde{w}^\top C^\top C \tilde{w},$$

which implies local stability of the origin for (6). As a result, system (6) is a linear system that switches between two modes defined by the matrices A_1 and A_2 , which are both Hurwitz, admit a common (non-strict) Lyapunov function V_{obs} , and the pairs (A_1, C) and (A_2, C) are observable.

More precisely, we use [21, Lemma 9] to assert that we can compute $K_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $K_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, (12) holds and, after the proof of [21, Lemma 5], we conclude that there exists a map $w_1 \mapsto K(w_1) \in \{K_1, K_2, 0\}$ such that, along each map $\tau \mapsto w_1(\tau)$ enjoying Property 1, we have

$$|\Phi_{\bar{z}_1}(\tau, 0)| \leq \bar{c} \exp^{-\lambda\tau} \quad \forall \tau \geq 0,$$

where $\Phi_{\bar{z}_1}$ is the transition matrix of the system

$$\tilde{w}' = [A(w_1(\tau)) + K(w_1(\tau))C] \tilde{w}.$$

Now, using the proof of [21, Theorem 4], we conclude that

$$|\tilde{w}(0)| \leq \kappa_1 \rho^{\frac{\tau}{L}} |\tilde{w}(0)| \quad \forall \tau \geq 0.$$

As a result, for $\kappa_2 := -\frac{\ln(\rho)}{L}$, we conclude that

$$|\tilde{w}(\tau)| \leq |\tilde{w}(0)| \kappa_1 \exp^{-\kappa_2 \tau} \quad \forall \tau \geq 0.$$

3 Observer-based Hybrid Control Algorithm

The difficulty in stabilizing the origin for (1) via output feedback resides in that, roughly speaking, the observer (2) relies on the output $z_1(t)$ remaining away from the origin, which is in clear conflict with the control objective. Our main contribution is to show that this paradox may be circumvented using a keen hybrid controller that drives the system's trajectories to zero, while generating attenuating oscillations via hybrid feedback.

We use a simple certainty-equivalence control law

$$u := az_1 \hat{z}_2 - k(z_1 - z^*), \tag{14}$$

in which, z^* is a piece-wise constant and vanishing reference trajectory, that is carefully designed in function of the bound on the estimation errors $|\tilde{z}(t)|$. More precisely, the design of z^* is driven by the analysis of the closed-loop of (1a) using the controller in (14), driven by the estimation error \tilde{z}_2 .

Defining the tracking error $z_{1e} := z_1 - z^*$, this corresponds to

$$\dot{z}_{1e} = -(k + a\tilde{z}_2)z_{1e} + az^* \tilde{z}_2. \tag{15}$$

Note that the latter constitutes a linear time-invariant system with a bounded perturbation \tilde{z}_2 . Indeed, after [5], one can compute a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ such that the time derivative of

$$V_{obs}(\tilde{z}) := \tilde{z}^\top P \tilde{z}, \tag{16}$$

along the solutions to (3), verifies

$$\dot{V}_{obs}(\tilde{z}(t)) \leq 0 \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{17}$$

Then, we pose the following hypothesis, which holds for many physical systems, such as the ABS dynamics (1).

Assumption 2 *The initial condition $z(0)$ satisfies $|z(0)| \leq R$ where $R > 0$ is known.*

Under Assumption 2, we may fix $\hat{z}(0)$ such that $|\tilde{z}(0)| \leq \tilde{R}$, where $\tilde{R} > 0$ is known. Therefore, from (17) we have

$$V_{obs}(\tilde{z}(0)) \leq \lambda_{\max}(P)\tilde{R}^2,$$

which implies that

$$\tilde{z}_2(t)^2 \leq \gamma^2 \tilde{z}(0)^2 \leq \gamma^2 \tilde{R}^2 \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (18)$$

with $\gamma := \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(P)}{\lambda_{\min}(P)}}$.

This is useful to estimate an ultimate bound on the tracking errors z_{1e} . Indeed, using the function $V(z_{1e}) := (1/2)z_{1e}^2$ and setting

$$k := \gamma a \tilde{R} + k', \quad k' > 0, \quad (19)$$

we see that, in view of (18), the derivative of V along the trajectories of (15) satisfies

$$\dot{V}(z_{1e}) \leq -k' z_{1e}^2 + a |z^*|_{\infty} |\tilde{z}_2|_{\infty} |z_{1e}|, \quad (20)$$

where $|\phi|_{\infty} := \text{ess sup}_{t \geq 0} |\phi(t)|$.

Roughly speaking, we have that the tracking errors converge to a ball of radius that depend on the bounds on $|z^*(t)|$ and $|\tilde{z}_2(t)|$. Therefore, the achievement of the control goal resides, as mentioned above, on the appropriate design of a reference z^* that, on the one hand, converges to zero and, on the other hand, it does so at a rate sufficiently “slow” that Assumption 1 holds on specific windows of time. As a result, the estimation errors at the end of each window diminish the size they had at the beginning of the window at a specific rate.

To that end, we design the reference z^* as a piecewise-constant function taking values, sequentially, in the set

$$S^* := \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \left\{ -\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i}, \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i} \right\}, \quad (21)$$

where $z_{in}^* > 0$ is an initialization value and i denotes an increasing cycle index. More precisely, z^* changes value according to the following algorithm:

Initialization step: We initially set $z^*(t) = z_{in}^*$ for all $t \in [0, t_1]$, where t_1 is to be defined, and \hat{z}_2 such that, under Assumption 2, we have

$$|\tilde{z}_2(t)| \leq \gamma \tilde{R} \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

From (18) and (20), we conclude the existence of $T > 0$ such that

$$|z_{1e}(t)| \leq \frac{2a\tilde{R}}{\sqrt{k'}} |z^*(t)| \quad \forall t \geq T,$$

so, by setting $k' \geq 16a^2\tilde{R}^2$, it follows that

$$|z_{1e}(t)| \leq z_{in}^*/2 \quad \forall t \geq T,$$

so $z_1(t) \in [\frac{z_{in}^*}{2}, z_{in}^*]$ and, consequently, Assumption 1 holds. On the other hand, there exist $\kappa_{1o}, \kappa_{2o} > 0$ such that—see (13),

$$|\tilde{z}(t)| \leq |\tilde{z}(0)| \kappa_{1o} \exp\left(-\frac{\kappa_{2o} z_{in}^* t}{2}\right) \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

so, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $T_o \geq T > 0$ such that

$$|\tilde{z}(t)| \leq g(0)(\varepsilon/\gamma) \quad \forall t \geq T_o, \quad g(0) := 1,$$

and, from the first inequality in (18), we have $|\tilde{z}_2(t)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $t \geq T_o$. Next, we define $t_1 := T_o$ and generate the first cycle.

Remark 3 Note that on the interval $[0, T_o]$, z_2 remains bounded since z_1 is bounded and the dynamics of z_2 is linear in z_2 . Furthermore, z_2 remains away from the singular point $-\frac{d}{c}$ provided that $z_2(0) > -\frac{d}{c}$. The latter property always hold for real-world ABS systems.

First cycle: From $t_1 := T_o$, we set z^* to satisfy $|z^*| = \frac{z_{in}^*}{2}$, moreover, the tracking error z_{1e} satisfies (20) with $|\tilde{z}_2| \leq \varepsilon$. As a result, a limit cycle is generated by switching z^* between $-z_{in}^*/2$ and $z_{in}^*/2$ each time $\hat{z}_2(t)$ reaches $d/2c$ or $-d/2c$, as described below:

1. If $\hat{z}_2(t_1) \leq 0$, $z^*(t_1)$ is set to $z_{in}^*/2$. Then, at $t'_1 \geq t_1$ such that $\hat{z}_2(t'_1) = \frac{d}{2c}$, which means that $z_2(t'_1) \in [\frac{d}{2c} - \varepsilon, \frac{d}{2c} + \varepsilon]$, the reference z^* is set to $z^*(t'_1) = -\frac{z_{in}^*}{2}$. Then, at $t''_1 \geq t'_1$ such that $\hat{z}_2(t''_1) = -\frac{d}{2c}$, which means that $z_2(t''_1) \in [-\varepsilon - \frac{d}{2c}, \varepsilon - \frac{d}{2c}]$, the reference z^* is set back to $\frac{z_{in}^*}{2}$.
2. If $\hat{z}_2(t_1) \geq 0$, the reference is set to $z^*(t_1) = -z_{in}^*/2$ and the same switching rules as above apply *mutatis mutandis*.

Along this cycle, Assumption 1 holds on $[t_1, +\infty)$; thus, there exist positive constants $(\kappa_{11}, \kappa_{21})$ such that

$$|\tilde{z}(t)| \leq \kappa_{11} |\tilde{z}(t_1)| \exp^{-\kappa_{21} \int_{t_1}^t |z_1(s)| ds} \quad \forall t \geq t_1.$$

The first cycle is ended at $t_2 := T_o + T_1 > 0$, where T_1 is chosen so that

$$|\hat{z}_2(t)| \leq d/2c \quad \text{and} \quad |\tilde{z}(t)| \leq (\varepsilon/\gamma)g(1) \quad \forall t \geq t_2,$$

where $g(1) \in (0, 1)$. Thus, from t_2 , we start a new cycle. Moreover, the latter is repeated successively by defining $t_i := T_o + T_1 + \dots + T_{i-1}$ and the i th cycle as follows.

i th cycle: From $t_i = T_o + T_1 + \dots + T_{i-1}$, the reference z^* is set to satisfy $|z^*| = z_{in}^*/2^i$, moreover, z_{1e} satisfies (20) with $|\tilde{z}_2| \leq \varepsilon g(i-1)$ for some $g(i-1) \in (0, 1)$. As a result, a limit cycle is created by switching z^* between $-z_{in}^*/2^i$ and $z_{in}^*/2^i$ each time $\hat{z}_2(t)$ equals to $d/2^i c$ or to $-d/2^i c$, as described below:

1. If $\hat{z}_2(t_i) \leq 0$, $z^*(t_i)$ is set to $z_{in}^*/2^i$. Then, at $t'_i \geq t_i$ such that $\hat{z}_2(t'_i) = \frac{d}{2^i c}$, which means that $z_2(t'_i) \in [\frac{d}{2^i c} - \varepsilon, \frac{d}{2^i c} + \varepsilon]$, the reference z^* is set to $z^*(t'_i) = -\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i}$. Then, at $t''_i \geq t'_i$ such that $\hat{z}_2(t''_i) = -\frac{d}{2^i c}$, which means that $z_2(t''_i) \in [-\frac{d}{2^i c} - \varepsilon, -\frac{d}{2^i c} + \varepsilon]$, the reference z^* is set back to $\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i}$.
2. Similarly, if $\hat{z}_2(t_i) \geq 0$, the reference is set to $z^*(t_i) = -z_{in}^*/2^i$ and the same switching rules as in the previous item are applied.

During the i th cycle, Assumption 1 holds on $[t_i, +\infty)$, so there exist positive constants $(\kappa_{1i}, \kappa_{2i})$ such that

$$|\tilde{z}(t)| \leq \kappa_{1i} |\tilde{z}(t_i)| \exp^{-\kappa_{2i} \int_{t_i}^t |z_1(s)| ds} \quad \forall t \geq t_i.$$

The cycle ends at $t_{i+1} := T_o + T_1 + \dots + T_i > 0$, where T_i is chosen so that

$$|\hat{z}_2(t)| \leq d/2^i c \quad \text{and} \quad |\tilde{z}(t)| \leq (\varepsilon/\gamma)g(i) \quad \forall t \geq t_{i+1},$$

where $g(i) \in (0, 1)$. Hence, a new cycle starts over and the algorithm carries on.

During each cycle, the measured output z_1 satisfies Assumption 1 and the observer is “excited” enough to make $|\tilde{z}|$ decrease. On the other hand, the certainty-equivalence controller (14) makes $|z_{1e}|$ decrease too. The design of the switched reference z^* ensures that $|\tilde{z}|$, at the beginning of the $(i+1)$ th cycle, shrinks the size it has at the beginning of the i th cycle, provided that the sequence g is well designed. In addition to switching, the reference decreases to zero so that z_1 also converge.

4 Main Statement

The ABS system (1), under the previously described control algorithm may be implemented and formally analyzed as a hybrid system. To make a precise statement on asymptotic stability of the origin we rely on the framework of definition of hybrid systems, as laid in [20]. Following the latter, we first show that the closed-loop composed of the plant (1), the controller (14), and the observer (2), may be expressed as a hybrid system that consists in the combination of a constrained differential and a constrained difference equations,

$$\mathcal{H} : \begin{cases} \dot{x} = F(x) & x \in C \\ x^+ = G(x) & x \in D, \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

where the state variable $x \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ has a continuous evolution while in the flow set $C \subset \mathcal{X}$ and it is allowed to jump if in the jump set $D \subset \mathcal{X}$. The continuous- and the discrete-time evolution of x are governed by the flow and the jump maps $F : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}$ and $G : D \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, respectively. Furthermore, the closed-loop state is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} x &:= (\tau, i, z, \tilde{z}, z^*) \in \mathcal{X}, \\ \mathcal{X} &:= \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \times \left(-\frac{d}{c}, +\infty\right) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times S^*. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the jump and flow sets are defined as follows. The flow set $C := \text{cl}(\mathcal{X} \setminus D)$, where $\text{cl}(\cdot)$ denotes *closure relative to* \mathcal{X} and the jump set $D := D_c \cup D_{nc}$. The set D_c , which determines the jump conditions *within* the i th cycle, is given by

$$D_c := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X} : |\hat{z}_2| \geq \frac{d|z^*|}{cz_{in}^*}, \hat{z}_2 z^* \geq 0 \right\} \quad (23)$$

and the set D_{nc} , which determines the jump condition *from* the i th to the $(i+1)$ th cycle, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{nc} := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X} : |\hat{z}_2| \leq \frac{d|z^*|}{cz_{in}^*}, \hat{z}_2 z^* \leq 0, \right. \\ \left. |\Phi_i(\tau, 0)^\top P \Phi_i(\tau, 0)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \lambda_{\min}(P)^{\frac{1}{2}} h(i) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where Φ_i is the transition matrix corresponding to the system

$$\frac{d\tilde{w}}{d\tau} = A(w_1(\tau + \tau_i))\tilde{w} \quad \tau \geq 0, \quad (25)$$

and $\tau_i := \int_0^{t_i} |z_1(s)| ds$. Moreover $h(0) := \varepsilon/(\gamma\tilde{R})$, and

$$h(i) := \frac{g(i)}{g(i-1)} \in (0, 1) \quad \forall i \geq 1.$$

The definition of the jump sets D_c and D_{nc} follows the rationale developed in the previous section, but certain technical aspects are also considered in order to cast the analysis in the framework of [20]. The respective first inequalities in D_c and D_{nc} correspond to the switch conditions explained in Section 3. The constraint $\hat{z}_2 z^* \leq 0$, which requires that the signs of \hat{z}_2 and z^* be different, is imposed in the definition of D_{nc} , while the opposite is used to define D_c , to render the intersection of these sets empty (the apparent intersection $\{\hat{z}_2 = z^* = 0\}$ is void since $z^* \neq 0$ by design). A somewhat more natural manner to define the jump sets D_{nc} and D_c , which is in more strict concordance with the algorithm loosely described in the previous section, would not include such condition and would simply impose a strict inequality in either set. However, such definition would lead to the hybrid system being not well-posed [20].

The third inequality in the definition of D_{nc} ,

$$|\Phi_i(\tau, 0)^\top P \Phi_i(\tau, 0)| \leq \lambda_{\min}(P) h(i)^2, \quad (26)$$

is a conservative, yet verifiable, condition that essentially tests the size of the otherwise non-measurable estimation errors $\tilde{z}(t) \equiv \tilde{w}(\tau)$. To better see this, consider the function V_{obs} in (16). Its total derivative along the solutions to (6) satisfies $\dot{V}_{obs}(\tilde{w}(\tau)) \leq 0$, so $V_{obs}(\tilde{w}(\tau)) \leq V_{obs}(\tilde{w}(0))$ for all $\tau \geq 0$. Hence, equivalently,

$$\tilde{w}(\tau)^\top P \tilde{w}(\tau) \leq \tilde{w}(0)^\top P \tilde{w}(0).$$

Therefore, using $\tilde{w}(\tau) = \Phi_i(\tau, 0)\tilde{w}(0)$, we see that (26) implies that, for any $\tilde{w}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\tilde{w}(\tau)^\top P \tilde{w}(\tau) \leq \lambda_{\min}(P) h(i)^2 \tilde{w}(0)^2,$$

that is, $|\tilde{w}(\tau)|^2 \leq h(i)^2 |\tilde{w}(0)|^2$.

Then, with these definitions of the flow and jump sets, we introduce the flow map

$$F(x) := \begin{bmatrix} |z_1| \\ 0 \\ \begin{bmatrix} -(k + a\tilde{z}_2)z_{1e} + az^*\tilde{z}_2 \\ (cz_2 + d)z_1 \end{bmatrix} \\ z_1 \begin{bmatrix} -k_1(z_1) & -a \\ -k_2(z_1) & c \end{bmatrix} \tilde{z} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

Note that in the definition of F , the dynamics of the discrete variables (i, z^*) is null, the dynamics of τ corresponds to (4). Finally, the dynamics of z and \tilde{z} are simply repeated from (15) and (3), respectively.

On the other hand, the jump map is given by

$$G(x) := \begin{bmatrix} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0 & \text{if } x \in D_{nc} \\ \tau & \text{if } x \in D_c \end{array} \right\} \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} i+1 & \text{if } x \in D_{nc} \\ i & \text{if } x \in D_c \end{array} \right\} \\ z \\ \tilde{z} \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} z^*/2 & \text{if } x \in D_{nc} \\ -z^* & \text{if } x \in D_c \end{array} \right\} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

The map G is designed to reset the value of τ to 0 each time a new cycle starts and updates the cycle index i . The variables z and \tilde{z} are continuous variables, so they do not change their values during jumps. According to the algorithm previously explained, the variable z^* halves its size in absolute value whenever a jump to a new cycle occurs, otherwise (while switching within a cycle), z^* only alternates sign. It is important to note that since $D_c \cap D_{nc} = \emptyset$, then the map G is continuous on D . This is important for the system to be well-posed [20].

In addition, the initial state $x_o := (\tau_o, i_o, z_o, \tilde{z}_o, z_o^*) \in \mathcal{X}$ is defined as follows. By assumption, a number R is known such that $|z_o| \leq R$. Then, the estimation errors \tilde{z}_o are set so that $|\tilde{z}_o| \leq \tilde{R}$ for a given $\tilde{R} > 0$. Hence, when a reliable estimate of $|z_o|$ is available, the Initialization step described on p. 6 may be skipped by defining the initial cycle index as $i_o := \max\{0, \kappa_1(\tilde{R})\}$, where

$$\kappa_1(\tilde{R}) := \max \left\{ i \in \mathbb{Z} : \tilde{R} \leq \frac{\varepsilon g(i-1)}{\gamma} \right\}.$$

Furthermore, according to (4), $\tau_o = 0$. Finally, the vanishing reference trajectory z^* is initialized to

$$z_o^* := \begin{cases} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i_o}} & \text{if } \hat{z}_{2o} < 0 \\ -\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i_o}} & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right\} & \text{if } i_o \geq 1 \\ z_{in}^* & \text{if } i_o = 0. \end{cases}$$

Our main statement establishes semi-global attractivity of the set $\mathcal{A} := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : z = \tilde{z} = 0\}$ for the closed-loop system. That is, that for any ball of initial conditions of radius R , there exists a control gain $k(R)$, as defined in (19), such that all trajectories converge to the set \mathcal{A} . In particular, the domain of attraction may be enlarged by increasing the control gain.

Theorem 1 *Consider the closed-loop hybrid system $\mathcal{H} = (C, F, D, G)$ defined by (22)–(24), (27), and (28). Let $R, \tilde{R} > 0$ be such that $|z_o| \leq R$ and $|\tilde{z}_o| \leq \tilde{R}$, and let (i_o, z_o^*, τ_o) be defined as above. Then, for each R and \tilde{R} , we can find $k > 0$ such that*

(i) *each solution to¹ \mathcal{H} satisfies*

$$\lim_{(t+j) \rightarrow +\infty} |x(t, j)|_{\mathcal{A}} = 0,$$

provided that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} g(i) = 0$.

(ii) *the set \mathcal{A} is locally stable provided that $\exists \delta > 0$, sufficiently small, such that $|\tilde{z}_o| \leq \delta$; in the sense that, there exists a class \mathcal{K} function κ^2 such that $|(z, \tilde{z})|_{\infty} \leq \kappa(|z_o| + \delta)$.*

(iii) *the system \mathcal{H} is well posed—see [20], and its solutions are uniformly non-Zeno, that is, there exist $T > 0$ and $J \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, on any time period of length T , at most J jumps can occur.*

In a general setting, the assumption in item (ii) is restrictive. However, this is not the case for commercial ABS systems, for which the initial condition z_{1o} is usually known and there exists a small ε such that $z_{2o} \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$. Note that, in this case, items (i) and (ii) imply semi-global asymptotic stability in the hybrid sense [20]. This, together with item (iii) goes well beyond that of mere convergence of estimation errors \tilde{z} and the state variable z since it guarantees certain robustness—see the latter reference for details.

¹Note that $(t, j) \mapsto x(t, j)$ are defined as absolutely continuous functions mapping their hybrid domain, $\text{dom } x \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{N}$, into \mathbb{R}^2 . See [20] for details.

²i.e. κ is continuous, strictly increasing, and $\kappa(0) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of item (i): To guarantee asymptotic convergence of z to zero, we first show that Assumption 1 holds on the i th cycle, for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Let $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ be arbitrarily fixed and consider the behavior of the solutions to \mathcal{H} for all $t \in \mathcal{I}_i$, that is, during the duration of the i th cycle. Over the interval \mathcal{I}_i , the solutions to \mathcal{H} coincide with those of the hybrid system $\mathcal{H}_i := (F_i, G_i, C_i, D_i)$, with state vector

$$x := (z, \tilde{z}, z^*) \in \mathcal{X}_i := \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \left\{ -\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i}, \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i} \right\},$$

with flow map

$$F_i(x) := \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -(k + a\tilde{z})z_{1e} + az^*\tilde{z}_2 \\ (cz_2 + d)z_1 \end{bmatrix} \\ z_1 \begin{bmatrix} -k_1(z_1) & -a \\ -k_2(z_1) & c \end{bmatrix} \tilde{z} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

with jump map $G_i(x) := [z^\top \ \tilde{z}^\top \ -z^*]^\top$, with jump set $D_i := D_{i1} \cup D_{i2}$, where

$$D_{i1} := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X}_i : \hat{z}_2 \geq \frac{d/c}{2^i}, z^* = \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i} \right\},$$

$$D_{i2} := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X}_i : \hat{z}_2 \leq -\frac{d/c}{2^i}, z^* = -\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i} \right\},$$

with $C_i := \text{cl}(\mathcal{X}_i \setminus D_i)$, and with initial conditions

$$x_o := (z_o, \tilde{z}_o, z_o^*),$$

such that

$$|\tilde{z}_o| \leq \frac{\varepsilon g(i-1)}{\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad z_o^* = \begin{cases} \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i} & \text{if } \hat{z}_{o2} < 0 \\ -\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

The solutions to \mathcal{H}_i (and consequently to \mathcal{H} over \mathcal{I}_i), within the i th cycle, jump according to the conditions defining $D_{i1} \cup D_{i2}$ and satisfy the following.

Lemma 2 *Consider the hybrid system \mathcal{H}_i such that (29) holds and let the parameter k satisfy (19) with $2k' \geq a^2\varepsilon^2$. Then,*

(i) *the set*

$$\mathcal{D}_i := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X}_i : |z_1| \leq \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} + \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} g(i-1) \right\} \quad (30)$$

is forward invariant and finite-time attractive;

(ii) *let $x_o \in \mathcal{D}_i$ and let the parameter k satisfy (19) with $2k' \geq a^2\varepsilon^2$. Then, there exists $T_{lmin} > 0$ (independent of i) such that the time between each pair of consecutive jumps of the solution starting from x_o is larger than T_{lmin} .*

Furthermore, after Lemma 2 the following also holds (see the appendix for the proofs).

Lemma 3 Consider the hybrid system $\mathcal{H}_i(C_i, F_i, D_i, G_i)$ such that (29) holds and the parameter k satisfy (19). Then, for k' sufficiently large and independent of i , there exist positive constants $(\tau_{di}, \tau_{si}, \bar{z}_i, \underline{z}_i)$ so that Assumption 1 holds.

By Lemma 3, Assumption 1 and, consequently, Property 1, hold. Therefore, from Lemma 1 it follows that there exist positive constants κ_{1i} , κ_{2i} , T_i , and μ_i such that

$$|\tilde{z}(t)| \leq \kappa_{1i} |\tilde{z}(t_i)| \exp^{-\kappa_{2i} \mu_i (t - t_i)} \quad \forall t \geq t_i + T_i,$$

where t_i is the beginning the interval \mathcal{I}_i . Hence, in view of the second condition in (24), the interval of duration of the i th cycle, \mathcal{I}_i , is finite. Now, we use Lemmata 2 and 3 to complete the proof of Item (i) of the theorem. We show that, for each $i_o \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, there exists $i^* \geq i_o$ and $t_{i^*} \in \mathcal{I}_{i^*}$, *i.e.*, during the Cycle i^* , such that $x(t_{i^*}) \in \mathcal{D}_{i^*}$. By the definition of \mathcal{D}_i , the convergence of $z_1(t)$ follows.

Let $i_o \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $t_{i_o} \geq 0$ be the time at which Cycle i_o starts. Assume, without loss of generality, that $z_1(t_{i_o}) > 0$, but $x(t) \notin \mathcal{D}_{i_o}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{I}_{i_o}$, that $z_2(t_{i_o}) \leq 0$, and that $z^*(t_{i_o}) > 0$ —the same reasoning that will follow applies to any other choice of initial conditions. For the considered choice of initial conditions, $\hat{z}_2(t)$ increases until one of the following two scenarios occurs:

1. There exist a time instant when $\hat{z}_2(t) = \frac{d/c}{2^{i_o}}$, in which case, $\text{sign}(z^*(t))$ becomes negative, so the jump to Cycle $i_o + 1$ does not occur before $\hat{z}_2(t)$ becomes, again, smaller or equal than $\frac{d/c}{2^{i_o}}$. For this to happen, $z_2(t)$ must decrease, that is, $z_1(t)$ must become negative—see (1b)—and, consequently, $x(t)$ must enter the set \mathcal{D}_{i_o} .
2. A jump to Cycle $i_o + 1$ occurs before \hat{z}_2 passes $\frac{d/c}{2^{i_o}}$. In this case, either the previous scenario occurs with i_o replaced by $i_o + 1$ and $x(t)$ enters \mathcal{D}_{i_o+1} within Cycle $i_o + 1$, or a jump to Cycle $i_o + 2$ occurs before \hat{z}_2 passes $\frac{d/c}{2^{i_o+1}}$. However, at some point, there must exist $i^* \geq i_o$ such that $x(t)$ enters \mathcal{D}_{i^*} within Cycle i^* .

Next, we show that $z_2(t)$ also converges, by establishing an upperbound in the latter for all $t \in \mathcal{I}_{i^*}$ such that $z_1(t) \in \mathcal{D}_{i^*}$ and when $\hat{z}_2(t_{i^*}) = \frac{d/c}{2^{i^*-1}}$ and $z^*(t_{i^*}) = -\frac{z_{i^*}^*}{2^{i^*}}$. The latter must happen at some point while in Cycle i^* . Note that, using the proof of Lemma 3, the overshoot of $z_2(t)$ occurs during the interval $[0, T_{lmin}]$, where T_{lmin} corresponds to the time it takes $z_1(t)$ to acquire the same sign as $z^*(t)$ —in this case, to becomes negative. By virtue of the comparison lemma, it is enough to construct a bound on the solution of

$$\dot{z}_2 = \left[\max_{z_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{i^*}} |z_1| \right] [cz_2 + d], \quad z_2(0) = \frac{d/c + \varepsilon}{2^{i^*-1}},$$

over the interval $[0, T_{lmin}]$. Clearly, we deduce an upperbound on z_2 that converges to zero as i^* goes to infinity.

Proof of item (ii): By definition, the control algorithm is initiated at Cycle i_o with $i_o := \max\{0, \kappa_1(\delta)\}$. Furthermore, when δ is sufficiently small, we conclude that $i_o := \kappa_1(\delta)$. Therefore, by definition of κ_1 and (18), we conclude that

$$|\tilde{z}(t, j)| \leq \min\{\varepsilon g(i_o - 1), \gamma \delta\} \quad \forall (t, j) \in \text{dom } \tilde{z}.$$

Next, to find an upper bound for z_1 , we distinguish between two cases:

- If $x_o \in \mathcal{D}_{i_o}$, where \mathcal{D}_{i_o} is defined in (30) and is forward invariant. Then, we know that, there exists a class \mathcal{K} function κ_2 such that

$$\mathcal{D}_{i_o} \subset \kappa_2(|\delta|)[-1, 1].$$

Indeed, it is easy to see that when δ goes to zero, i_o goes to infinity, and thus \mathcal{D}_{i_o} goes $\{0\}$.

- If $\mathcal{D}_{i_o} \subset \{x \in \mathcal{X} : z_1 \in [-|z_{1o}|, |z_{1o}|]\}$, we use the fact that \mathcal{D}_{i_o} is finite-time attractive — see Item (i) in Lemma 2. Furthermore, since the flows are unique and z_1 is a continuous variable, we conclude that $[-|z_{1o}|, |z_{1o}|]$ must be forward invariant. Hence, we obtain that

$$|z_1(t, j)| \leq |z_{1o}| \quad \forall (t, j) \in \text{dom } z_1. \quad (31)$$

Finally, to complete the proof, we establish an upper bound on z_2 . Assume, without loss of generality, that $z_{2o} > 0$ and

$$z_o^* = -2^{-i_o} z_{in}^* = -2^{-\kappa_1(\delta)} z_{in}^* =: \kappa_3(\delta).$$

Then, consider the following two cases:

- If $z_{1o} \in \mathcal{D}_{i_o}$, we conclude that the overshoot of $|z_2|$ occurs only on the interval $[0, T_{1*}]$, on which $|z_1| \leq \kappa_2(\delta)$, and before z_1 becomes negative.
- When $\mathcal{D}_{i_o} \subset \{x \in \mathcal{X} : z_1 \in [-|z_{1o}|, |z_{1o}|]\}$, we conclude that (31) holds. Hence, the overshoot of z_2 occurs only on the interval $[0, T_{2*}]$, on which $|z_1| \leq |z_{1o}|$, and before z_1 becomes negative.

Hence, after the comparison Lemma, it suffices to assess the behavior of the solutions of

$$\dot{z}_2 = \max\{|z_{1o}|, \kappa_2(|\delta|)\} (cz_2 + d) \quad \text{with } z_2(0) = |z_{2o}|,$$

over the interval $[0, T_*]$, where $T_* := \max\{T_{1*}, T_{2*}\}$ is an upper bound on the time that $|z_1|$ takes to flow from $\max\{|z_{1o}|, \kappa_2(|\delta|)\}$ to zero.

To complete the proof, we show that T_* can be chosen as a class \mathcal{K} function of $|(z_o, \tilde{z}_o)|$. To do so, we use the Lyapunov function $v(z_{1e}) := z_{1e}^2$, whose time derivative along the solutions to \mathcal{H}_i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v} &= -2k'v + 2az^* \tilde{z}_2 z_{1e} \\ &\leq -2k'v + 2a\varepsilon \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i_o}} g(i_o - 1) |z_{1e}|. \end{aligned}$$

By assuming, for example that $k' \geq 1$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v} &\leq -k'v + z^{*2} \frac{a^2 \varepsilon^2}{4^{i_o}} g(i_o + 1)^2 \\ &\leq -k'v + z^{*2} \frac{a^2 \varepsilon^2}{4^{\kappa_1(\delta)}} \\ &\leq -k'v + a^2 \kappa_3(\delta)^4. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, to obtain T_* , we can solve the system $\dot{v} = -k'v + a^2 \kappa_3(\delta)^4$. From $v(0) := [\max\{|z_{1o}|, \kappa_2(\delta)\} + z^*]^2$ until $v(t) \leq z^{*2}$. Hence, we can see that T_* is upper bounded by a class \mathcal{K} function of $(|z_o| + \delta)$.

Proof of item (iii): After [20], system \mathcal{H} is well-posed if the sets C and D are closed relative to \mathcal{X} and F and G are continuous on C and D , respectively. It is easy to conclude that our closed-loop hybrid system \mathcal{H} satisfies the hybrid basic conditions which require the sets C and D to be closed and the maps F and G to be continuous. Note that both C and D are closed subsets relative to \mathcal{X} , F is smooth and G is continuous on $D = D_c \cup D_{nc}$ since both D_c and D_{nc} are closed relative to \mathcal{X} and their intersection is empty.

Next, we show that the closed-loop solutions are uniformly non-Zeno. To do so, we note that within a same Cycle i , and between each two consecutive jumps, $\hat{z}_2(t)$ flows from $-\frac{d}{2^{i-1}c}$ to $\frac{d}{2^{i-1}c}$ back and forth. The latter flow phase takes a time we denote by T_{li} . After Item (ii) in Lemma 2, there exists a uniform lower bound $T_{lmin} > 0$ such that $T_{li} \geq T_{lmin}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, provided that $z_{1o} \in \mathcal{D}_i$. In general, after Item (i) of Lemma 2, z_1 must reach \mathcal{D}_i in finite time while in Cycle i ; otherwise, only one jump occurs within Cycle i .

On the other hand, for a jump from Cycle i to Cycle $i+1$ to occur, the variable τ must flow so that $|\Phi_i(\tau, 0)^\top P \Phi_i(\tau, 0)|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ decreases from $|P|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to $\frac{\lambda_{min}(P)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}$, where Φ_i is the transition matrix associated with system (25). We show the existence of a strictly positive lower bound on the time the latter decrease process takes. To that end, we use $V = |\tilde{w}|^2$ and the fact that

$$\tilde{w}^\top \left[A(w_1(\tau)) + A(w_1(\tau))^\top \right] \tilde{w} \geq -\eta |\tilde{w}|^2 \quad \forall \tau \geq 0, \tilde{w} \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $\eta := \max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \{|A_i + A_i^\top|\}$. Then, $V'(\tau) \geq -aV(\tau)$ for all $\tau \geq 0$, which, by virtue of the comparison Lemma, implies that $V(\tau) \geq \exp^{-a\tau} V(0)$ and, in turn, for each $\tilde{w}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\tilde{w}(0)^\top \Phi_i(\tau, 0)^\top P \Phi_i(\tau, 0) \tilde{w}(0) \geq \exp^{-a\tau} |\tilde{w}(0)|^2,$$

hence, since for our case $|P| > \lambda_{min}(P)$ there exists $\tau^* > 0$ such that, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, and for all $\tau \in [0, \tau^*]$,

$$|\Phi_i(\tau, 0)^\top P \Phi_i(\tau, 0)| \geq \lambda_{min}(P) \geq \lambda_{min}(P) h(i).$$

5 A numerical example

To illustrate our theoretical findings, we performed some numerical simulations on a model of extended braking stiffness dynamics, described in detail in [15]. The switching logic is determined by the conditions in (23) and (24), with $a = 375$, $c = 24$, and $d = 12.5$. The scenario defined by these parameters corresponding to that of a hard braking on a dry road. We took, moreover, a gain $k = 500$ for the controller and gains $k_1^+ = 40$ and $k_2^+ = -3$ for the observer. The initial wheel acceleration reference z_o^* was set to 75 and the sequence h was chosen as

$$h(i) := \begin{cases} 1/(1 + \frac{1}{4^i}) & \text{if } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 8\}, \\ 1/2 & \text{if } i \in \{9, 10, \dots\}. \end{cases}$$

This choice of h results from extensive numerical tests, which showed that the natural choice $h(i) \equiv 1/2$, which satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1, leads to relatively slow convergence of z , while $h(i) = 1/(1 + \frac{1}{4^i})$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ violates the condition $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} g(i) = 0$, with $g(i) = \prod_1^i h(j)$, in Item (i) of Theorem 1.

The numerical results are illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2. The NE plot in Fig. 1 shows (in black) the trajectories of the measured output, z_1 , and the corresponding estimate generated by the observer (in blue). The yellow (apparently) solid lines correspond to the piece-wise constant reference z^* taking values in the discrete set S^* defined in (21), hence the ‘‘staircase-type’’




Figure 1: System's and observer's response




Figure 2: System's response on the phase-plane

graph. It is noticeable that, *e.g.*, approximately $\forall t \in (0, 8)$, $|z^*(t)| \approx 75$, while $\forall t \in (15, 28)$ $|z^*(t)| \approx 2.3$. Other values are discernible over other intervals. These correspond to the duration of the different cycles triggered as explained in Section 3. Within each cycle, the reference keeps switching between the positive and negative value of the same constant. In the zoomed windows, one can appreciate that, even if the system's output does not attain the imposed reference (because the latter switches) the observer keeps tracking the plant's states; the trajectories of z_2 and \hat{z}_2 are depicted in the NW plot. It is the “persistent excitation” induced by the switchings that the observer keeps up with a close estimate of the states. Then, as described in the algorithm, successive cycles, at the beginning of which the reference z^* is halved, are generated. Thus, the reference, the plant's states and the observer errors, all tend to zero asymptotically. In Fig. 2 one may appreciate the stabilization mechanism by looking at the response on the phase plane.

6 Discussion and Future Work

Simultaneous estimation and stabilization at an equilibrium where observability is lost is a challenging, but not impossible task, at least for certain bilinear systems. Although in this work we focus on a particular plant, our results set the basis for future work oriented towards broadening the applicability of our switching-observer-based hybrid controller to other bilinear and, more generally, non-uniformly observable systems. Furthermore, an intriguing problem remains open even for the case-study addressed here, how to construct a smooth output-feedback observer-based controller. The following statement shows that such task is not out of reach. We prove the existence of a smooth output feedback law $t \mapsto u_c(z_{1[0,t]})$ guaranteeing semi-global asymptotic stability of the set $\{z = 0\}$ for the closed-loop of the ABS given by

$$\text{ABS}_c : \begin{cases} \dot{z}_1 &= -az_1z_2 + u_c(z_{1[0,t]}) \\ \dot{z}_2 &= (cz_2 + d)z_1. \end{cases}$$

Note that we use $z_{1[0,t]}$ to denote the restriction of z to $[0, t]$. Furthermore, we denote by $u_c(z_{1[0,t]})$ the image, using the functional u_c , of the function $z_{1[0,t]}$.

Theorem 2 *Consider the control ABS system in (1) and let $R > 0$ such that $|z_o| \leq R$. Then, there exists $t \mapsto u_c(z_{1[0,t]})$ smooth such that the following properties hold for the resulting closed-loop system ABS_c .*

- (i) *Each solution z satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} |z(t)| = 0$.*
- (ii) *The origin is locally stable provided that $|z_o|$ is known.*

6.1 Proof of Theorem 2

According to Theorem 1, we are able to find a piece-wise continuous input signal $t \mapsto u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})$ given by

$$u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]}) := az_1(t)\hat{z}_2(z_{1[0,t]}) - k [z_1(t) - z^*(z_{1[0,t]})],$$

where $t \mapsto z^*(z_{1[0,t]}) \in S^*$ is a piecewise-constant signal computed according to Section 3. Moreover, $t \mapsto \hat{z}_2(z_{1[0,t]}) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous signal chosen according to Section 4.

Using Theorem 1, we conclude that the closed-loop of the ABS system using $t \mapsto u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})$, given by

$$\text{ABS}_{pc} : \begin{cases} \dot{z}_1 &= -az_1z_2 + u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]}) \\ \dot{z}_2 &= (cz_2 + d)z_1, \end{cases}$$

satisfies items (i) and (ii) in Theorem 2.

Now, to show the existence of a smooth output-feedback law $t \mapsto u_c(z_{1[0,t]})$, we combine some arguments from functional analysis.

First, we note that since $|z_o| \leq R$, the solutions to ABS_{pc} are globally bounded and so is the signal $t \mapsto u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})$. Furthermore, the control ABS system in (1) has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= f(z) + [1 \ 0]^\top u, \\ f(z) &:= [-az_1z_2 \ (cz_2 + d)z_1], \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

with f locally Lipschitz.

Now, given $T > 0$, using the density of the subset of smooth functions in $L^1([0, T])$, we conclude the existence of a sequence of smooth functions $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, with $u_i : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, that

converges to the restriction of $t \mapsto u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})$ to $[0, T]$. Note that the smoothness of $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, its L^1 convergence to $t \mapsto u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})$, and boundedness of $t \mapsto u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})$, imply that the sequence is $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is uniformly bounded; hence, by passing to an appropriate sub-sequence, we let

$$w(t) := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_i(t) \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Note that $\int_0^T |w(t) - u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})| dt = 0$. Hence, it is easy to show that since f is locally Lipschitz, then, for a same initial condition, the inputs $t \mapsto w(t)$ and $t \mapsto u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})$ generate the same solution to (32) on the interval $[0, T]$.

Next, we apply the previous reasoning on each interval $[i-1, i+1] \frac{T}{2}$, we end up with a sequence of smooth functions $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, with $w_i : [i-1, i+1] \frac{T}{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that each inputs $t \mapsto w_i(t)$ and $t \mapsto u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})$ generate the same solution to (32) on the interval $[i-1, i+1] \frac{T}{2}$, provided that a same initial condition is used.

Finally, we generate the smooth input $t \mapsto u_c(z_{1[0,t]})$ by connecting the w_i functions using the smooth functions $\rho_i : [(i-1)T, iT] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, which is strictly increasing, $\rho(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [(i-1)T/2, iT/2]$, $\rho((i+1)T/2) = 1$, and $\rho'((i+1)T/2) = 0$. Hence, we define

$$u_c(z_{1[0,t]}) := (1 - \rho_i(t))w_i(t) + \rho_i(t)w_{i+1}(t),$$

for all $t \in [i-1, i+1] \frac{T}{2}$.

Note that, from a same initial condition, the inputs $t \mapsto u_c(z_{1[0,t]})$ and $t \mapsto u_{pc}(z_{1[0,t]})$ generate the same solution, which completes the proof.

.1 Proof of Lemma 2

.1.1 Proof of Item (i)

We first use the fact that $|\tilde{z}_0| \leq \frac{\varepsilon g(i-1)}{\gamma}$, together with (18), to conclude that

$$|\tilde{z}(t, j)| \leq \varepsilon g(i-1) \quad \forall (t, j) \geq \text{dom } \tilde{z}.$$

Next, we use the Lyapunov function $v(z_1) := z_1^2$, whose time derivative along the solutions to \mathcal{H}_i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v} &= -2k'z_1^2 + 2k'z_1z^* + 2az_1z^*\tilde{z}_2 \\ &\leq -k'v + 2k'z^{*2} + 2a^2z^{*2}\tilde{z}_2^2 \\ &\leq -k'v + \frac{2k'z_{in}^{*2}}{4^i} + \frac{2a^2\varepsilon^2z_{in}^{*2}}{4^i}g(i-1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v(t, j) &\leq v(0, 0) \exp^{-k't} + \frac{2z_{in}^{*2}}{2^{2i}} \left[1 - \exp^{-k't} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{a^2\varepsilon^2z_{in}^{*2}}{(2k')4^{(i-1)}}g(i-1)^2 \left[1 - \exp^{-k't} \right], \end{aligned}$$

so, by choosing k' such that $k' \geq \frac{a^2\varepsilon^2}{2}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} v(t, j) &\leq v(0, 0) \exp^{-k't} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{z_{in}^{*2}}{2^{2(i-1)}} + \frac{z_{in}^{*2}}{4^{(i-1)}}g(i-1)^2 \right] \left[1 - \exp^{-k't} \right] \\ &\leq \max \left\{ v(0, 0), \left[\frac{z_{in}^{*2}}{2^{2(i-1)}} + \frac{z_{in}^{*2}}{2^{2(i-1)}}g(i-1)^2 \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the set \mathcal{D}_i is finite-time attractive and forward invariant.

.1.2 Proof of Item (ii)

If $x_{oi} \in \mathcal{D}_i$, using the comparison Lemma, a lower bound on the time between each two consecutive jumps of \mathcal{H}_i can be obtained by computing the time the solution to

$$\dot{z}_2 = - \left(\frac{2z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} \right) (cz_2 + d), \quad (33)$$

with initial conditions $z_{o2} = \frac{d/c - \varepsilon}{2^{i-1}}$, takes to reach $\frac{-d/c + \varepsilon}{2^{i-1}}$.

To compute the latter time, we introduce the new time scale $\tau := \left(\frac{2z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} \right) t$, to obtain in the new time scale $\dot{z}'_2 = -cz_2 - d$. By solving the latter equation, we obtain

$$z_2(\tau) = \sigma_i \exp^{-c\tau} - \frac{d}{c} [1 - \exp^{-c\tau}], \quad \sigma_i := \left[\frac{d/c - \varepsilon}{2^{i-1}} \right]$$

and we use the latter to solve $z_2(\tau) = \sigma_i$ for τ . Reordering terms, we obtain $\exp^{-c\tau} [d/c + \sigma_i] = d/c - \sigma_i$. Hence,

$$\tau = \frac{1}{c} \ln \left[\frac{d/c + \sigma_i}{d/c - \sigma_i} \right] = \frac{1}{c} \ln \left[1 + 2 \frac{\sigma_i}{d/c - \sigma_i} \right].$$

This implies that, in the original time scale, the length of the interval $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ between two jumps of the solution to (33), denoted T_{li} , satisfies

$$T_{li} \geq \frac{2^{i-1}}{2cz_{in}^*} \ln \left[1 + 2 \frac{\sigma_i}{d/c - \sigma_i} \right],$$

which is separated from zero, *i.e.*,

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{li} \geq \frac{1}{dz_{in}^*} \left[\frac{d}{c} - \varepsilon \right] > 0.$$

.2 Proof of Lemma 3

Let $x_o \in \mathcal{D}_i$ and let $\hat{z}_{o2} = \frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}}$. There is no loss of generality since if $x_o \notin \mathcal{D}_i$ Assumption 1 trivially holds over the i th cycle and if $\hat{z}_{o2} \neq \frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}}$, $\hat{z}_2(t, j) = \frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}}$ for some $t + j < \infty$. Moreover, the following reasoning applies *mutatis mutandis* if $\hat{z}_{o2} = -\frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}}$. We also use the fact that $|\tilde{z}_o| \leq g(i-1) \frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma}$ together with (18) to conclude that

$$|\tilde{z}(t, j)| \leq \varepsilon g(i-1) \quad \forall (t, j) \in \text{dom } \tilde{z}. \quad (34)$$

1. At this point, we estimate a lower bound on the flow time that \hat{z}_2 takes to flow from $\frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}}$ to $\frac{-d/c}{2^{i-1}}$. Using (34), we conclude that such a time is lower bounded by the time z_2 takes to flow from $\frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{i-1}}$ to $\frac{-d/c}{2^{i-1}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{i-1}}$ when

$$z_1 = - \left(\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} + \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} g(i-1) \right).$$

Let us denote such time by T_{li} , which can be easily obtained by solving the ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{z}_2 = - \left(\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} + \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} g(i-1) \right) (cz_2 + d),$$

with $z_{2o} = \frac{d/c - \varepsilon}{2^{i-1}}$. After Item (ii) of Lemma 2 there exists $T_{lmin} > 0$ such that $T_{li} \geq T_{lmin}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$.

2. During the phase when \hat{z}_2 flows from $\frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}}$ to $\frac{-d/c}{2^{i-1}}$, $z^* = -\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^i}$. Next, we show how to choose $k' > 0$ to conclude that z_{1e} must take at most $\frac{T_{li}}{2}$ units of time to enter the ball of radius $\frac{|z^*|}{2}$. To that end, we use the Lyapunov function

$$v(z_{1e}) := z_{1e}^2,$$

whose time derivative along the solutions to \mathcal{H}_i satisfies

$$\dot{v} \leq -2k'v + \frac{2az_{in}^*}{2^i} \varepsilon g(i-1) |z_{1e}|.$$

By assuming, for example that $k' \geq 1$, we conclude that

$$\dot{v} \leq -k'v + \frac{a^2 \varepsilon^2 z_{in}^{*2}}{2^{2i}} g(i-1)^2,$$

As a result, for each $t \geq 0$ such that $(t, 0) \in \text{dom } x$, we have

$$v(t, 0) \leq v(0, 0) \exp^{-k't} + \left[\frac{a \varepsilon z_{in}^*}{2^i \sqrt{k'}} g(i-1) \right]^2 \left[1 - \exp^{-k't} \right].$$

As a result, by choosing k' large such that $k' \geq 4a^2 \varepsilon^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v(t, 0) &\leq v(0, 0) \exp^{-k't} + \left[\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i+1}} g(i-1) \right]^2 \left[1 - \exp^{-k't} \right] \\ &\leq \left[\frac{2z_{in}^*}{2^i} + \frac{2z_{in}^*}{2^i} g(i-1) \right]^2 \exp^{-k't} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i+1}} g(i-1) \right]^2 \left[1 - \exp^{-k't} \right] \\ &\leq 9z^{*2} \exp^{-k't} + \frac{z^{*2}}{4} \left[1 - \exp^{-k't} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, by taking k' such that

$$k' \geq -\frac{2 \ln(2^{-5})}{T_{lmin}},$$

we conclude that

$$z_{1e}(t, 0)^2 \leq \left(\frac{z^*}{2} \right)^2 \quad \forall t \in \left[\frac{T_{li}}{2}, T_{li} \right]. \quad (35)$$

Hence, during the interval where \hat{z}_2 flows from $\frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}}$ to $\frac{-d/c}{2^{i-1}}$, we have $z_1 \in [z^*, z^*/2]$ for all t belonging to a sub interval of length larger than $T_{li}/2$.

3. Next, we estimate an upper bound on the time that \hat{z}_2 takes to flow from $\frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}}$ to $-\frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}}$. Using (34) and (35), we conclude that such a time is upper bounded by the time that z_2 takes to flow from $\frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{i-1}}$ to $-\frac{d/c}{2^{i-1}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{i-1}}$ when

$$z_1(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} + \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}}g(i-1) & \forall t \in \left[0, \frac{T_{li}}{2}\right] \\ -\frac{|z^*|}{2} & \forall t \geq \frac{T_{li}}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Let us denote such a time by T_{ui} . Note that T_{ui} can be easily obtained by solving the linear switched dynamics:

$$\dot{z}_2 = \begin{cases} \left[\frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} + \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}}g(i-1) \right] (cz_2 + d) & \forall t \in \left[0, \frac{T_{li}}{2}\right] \\ -\frac{|z^*|}{2}(cz_2 + d) & \forall t \geq \frac{T_{li}}{2}, \end{cases}$$

from the initial condition $z_{2o} = \frac{d/c+\varepsilon}{2^{i-1}}$.

Finally, we conclude that Assumption 1 holds on Cycle i with

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{di} &:= \frac{T_{li}}{2}, & \tau_{si} &:= T_{ui} - \frac{T_{li}}{2}, \\ \bar{z}_i &:= \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}} + \frac{z_{in}^*}{2^{i-1}}g(i-1), & \underline{z}_i &:= \frac{|z^*|}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

References

- [1] L. Brivadis, J.-P. Gauthier, and L. Sacchelli, “Output feedback stabilization of non-uniformly observable systems,” <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03589760>, Gif sur Yvette, France, Feb. 2022.
- [2] J.-P. Gauthier and I. Kupka, “Observability and observers for nonlinear systems,” *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 975–994, 1994.
- [3] —, *Deterministic Observation Theory and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [4] G. Besançon, Ed., *Nonlinear Observers and Applications*, ser. Series Lecture Notes in Control and Information Science. London: Springer Verlag, 2007, vol. 363.
- [5] M. Aguado-Rojas, T.-B. Hoang, W. Pasillas-Lépine, A. Loría, and W. Respondek, “A switching observer for a class of non-uniformly observable systems via singular time-rescaling,” *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 12, pp. 6071–6076, 2021.
- [6] P. Dufour, S. Flila, and H. Hammouri, “Observer design for MIMO non-uniformly observable systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 511–516, 2012.
- [7] M. Farza, T. Ménard, A. Ltaief, I. Bouraoui, M. M’Saad, and T. Maatoug, “Extended high gain observer design for a class of mimo non-uniformly observable systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 86, pp. 138–146, 2017.

- [8] J. A. Moreno and G. Besançon, “On multi-valued observers for a class of single-valued systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 123, p. 109334, 2021.
- [9] S. Ibarra-Rojas, J. Moreno, and G. Espinosa-Pérez, “Global observability analysis of sensorless induction motors,” *Automatica*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1079–1085, 2004.
- [10] J. A. Moreno and J. Alvarez, “On the estimation problem of a class of continuous bioreactors with unknown input,” *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 30, pp. 34–49, 2015, cAB/DYCOPS 2013.
- [11] A. Rapaport and D. Dochain, “A robust asymptotic observer for systems that converge to unobservable states. a batch reactor case study,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2019.
- [12] P. Riedinger, M. Sigalotti, and J. Daafouz, “On the observability of the flying capacitor converter,” in *2009 European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2009, pp. 3605–3610.
- [13] T. B. Hoàng, W. Pasillas-Lépine, A. De Bernardinis, and M. Netto, “Extended braking stiffness estimation based on a switched observer, with an application to wheel-acceleration control,” *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 2384–2392, 2014.
- [14] L. Brivadis and L. Sacchelli, “A switching technique for output feedback stabilization at an unobservable target,” in *IEEE Conf. Dec. Control*, 2021, pp. 3942–3947.
- [15] M. Aguado-Rojas, W. Pasillas-Lépine, and A. Loría, “A hybrid controller for ABS-based on extended-braking-stiffness estimation,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 452 – 457, 2019, 9th IFAC Symposium on Advances in Automotive Control AAC 2019.
- [16] M. Sugai, H. Yamaguchi, M. Miyashita, T. Umeno, and K. Asano, “New control technique for maximizing braking force on antilock braking system,” *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 32, no. 4-5, pp. 299–312, 1999.
- [17] M. Aguado-Rojas, W. Pasillas-Lépine, and A. Loría, “Extended-braking-stiffness estimation under varying road-adherence conditions,” *IEEE Trans. on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1964–1971, 2020.
- [18] A. Loría, E. Panteley, and A. Zavala, “Adaptive observers for robust synchronization of chaotic systems,” *IEEE Trans. on Circ. Syst. I: Regular Papers*, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 2703–2716, 2009.
- [19] M. Corno, M. Gerard, M. Verhaegen, and E. Holweg, “Hybrid abs control using force measurement,” *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 1223–1235, Sept 2012.
- [20] R. Goebel, R. G. Sanfelice, and A. R. Teel, *Hybrid Dynamical Systems: Modeling, Stability, and Robustness*. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [21] J. P. Hespanha, “Uniform stability of switched linear systems: extensions of La Salle’s invariance principle,” *IEEE Trans. on Automat. Contr.*, vol. 49, pp. 470–482, 2004.