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ABSTRACT

Artificial neural networks are black-box models that can be used to model nonlinear dynamical systems. This article presents a synthesis method for full dynamic state feedback controllers and state and output observers that have guaranteed properties for systems approximated by dynamic artificial neural networks. The resulting control designs are applicable to the practical situation in which the steady-state values for the control input are not known. Dynamic artificial neural networks are written in the standard nonlinear operator form, also known in the literature as the Luré formulation. A generalized form of the Luré formulation is adopted to allow for the representation of deep ℓ-layer networks, ℓ ≥ 1. Sufficient conditions for controller synthesis and observer design are derived in the form of linear matrix inequalities, using a quadratic Lyapunov function. The synthesis method is demonstrated for the control of pH in two tanks in series and a numerical example.
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1. Introduction

Artificial neural networks (ANNs) have been used in nonlinear system identification and control for decades (Himmelblau, 2008; Pearson, 1995) due to their ability to universally approximate any static nonlinear function (Cybenko, 1989; Funahashi, 1989). Dynamic model structures that incorporate ANNs, known as dynamic artificial neural networks (DANNs), can universally approximate any nonlinear dynamic relationship (e.g., see Kim, Ríos-Patrón, & Braatz, 2018 and citations therein). This universality property holds for many DANN model structures, including neural state space models (NSSMs) (Suykens, De Moor, & Vandewalle, 1995), global input–output models (GIOMs) (Levin & Narendra, 1995), and dynamic recurrent neural networks (DRNNs) (Hopfield, 1982; Michel, Farrell, & Porod, 1989).

Stability and performance analysis for open- and closed-loop DANNs has been of long-term interest. DANNs can be represented as systems with linear time-invariant dynamics in feedback with a static nonlinear operator that is diagonal, continuous, and sector bounded (Ríos-Patrón & Braatz, 1998). Block diagram algebra can be used to represent DANNs in standard nonlinear operator form (SNOF), for which sufficient stability criteria can exploit properties of the activation functions such as sector boundedness and slope restriction (Kim et al., 2018). This SNOF representation is closely related to Luré systems (Luré & Postnikov, 1944), and is general enough to be applicable to deep neural networks. The SNOF is the underlying structure in several neural network-based analyses, such as a recent work on safety verification and robustness of neural networks (Fazlyab, Morari, & Pappas, 2020) and stability certification of deep learning-based controllers (Nguyen et al., 2020).

The literature on stability analysis for Luré systems is vast. A standard method to examine the absolute stability of a Luré system is the search for the existence of appropriate Lyapunov functions. The quadratic and the Luré–Postnikov functions are popular Lyapunov function candidates (Khalil, 2002). Alternative formulations include the modified Luré–Postnikov functions which are quadratic in the states and the nonlinearity and include an additional integral term (Drummond, Valmorbida, & Duncan, 2018; Park, 2002), as well as a Lyapunov function which includes cross terms between the state and the cone bounded nonlinearity (Gonzaga, Jungers, & Daafouz, 2012). Luré–Postnikov and their modified counterpart function candidates may reduce conservatism by taking properties of the nonlinearity into account, such as slope restrictions. The reduced conservatism comes at the expense of more complicated matrix inequality formulations unless simplifications in the system formulation or the Lyapunov functions are introduced.
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A common simplification in the Luré literature is to omit the term that allows for the nonlinearity to be an input to its own argument \(D_{\mathcal{Y}} = 0 \) in \(q = C_{\mathcal{Y}}X + D_{\mathcal{Y}}p\), where \(p = \phi(q)\) (Gonzaga et al., 2012; Park, 2002). This omission, while greatly simplifying the derivations of stability proofs, prevents the existing work from being applicable to \(\ell\)-layer neural networks, \(\ell > 1\). When solving the controller synthesis problem for Luré systems, higher order matrix inequalities arise, which requires special handling in order to obtain linear matrix inequality (LMI) design criteria. The approaches are demonstrated for state observers and dynamic output feedback controllers (Kim & Braatz, 2014) and observer-based robust feedback controllers (Diwadkar et al., 2015).

We have presented sufficient criteria for dynamic state feedback controller synthesis and state observer design for continuous-time DANNs reformulated as Luré systems for the important case where \(D_{\mathcal{Y}} = 0\) (Nikolakopoulou, Hong, & Braatz, 2020). Additionally, we have derived criteria for dynamic output feedback controller synthesis and output observers for discrete-time DANNs (Nikolakopoulou, Hong, & Braatz, 2021). These works were demonstrated on case studies for single-node neural network models. This article is a major extension of the aforementioned conference papers (Nikolakopoulou et al., 2020, 2021). Based on the discrete-time Luré reformulation, we derive LMI criteria for full dynamic state feedback controller synthesis. Moreover, we derive LMI criteria for nonlinear full dynamic state feedback controller design. Additionally, we present an alternative formulation for the observer design than used in the conference articles (Nikolakopoulou et al., 2020, 2021) and derive LMI design criteria. The approaches are demonstrated for the design of observers and control systems in two numerical examples.

This article is structured as follows. Section 2 presents some preliminaries. Section 3 introduces alternative representations for DANNs, including deep networks, and we show that the \(D_{\mathcal{Y}} = 0\) assumption made in literature studies to simplify the theoretical analysis also greatly restricts the applicability of such results for analyzing DANNs. Section 4 discusses a set of LMIs for obtaining stabilizing dynamic state feedback controllers for DANNs formulated in SNOF and as Luré systems sector bounded in \([-1, 1]\). Section 5 derives LMI criteria for designing state observers that maximize the decay rate of the observer error dynamics. LMI criteria to obtain output observers with guaranteed L2-gain (from an unmeasured disturbance to the process output) are presented in Section 6. The theoretical results are illustrated in two case studies in Section 7. Lastly, conclusions are summarized in Section 8.

2. Background

2.1. Notation

The superscript \(\top\) stands for the matrix transpose. \(\mathbb{Z}_{+}\) is the set of non-negative integers, \(\mathbb{R}^n\) denotes the \(n\)-dimensional Euclidean space, \(e_i \in \mathbb{R}^n\) is the \(i\)th unit vector, and \(\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}\) is the set of all \(n \times m\) real matrices. Positive and negative definiteness of a matrix are denoted by \(>\) and \(<\) respectively, and positive and negative semidefiniteness by \(\geq\) and \(\leq\) respectively. The set of symmetric \(n \times n\) matrices is denoted by \(\mathbb{S}^n = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid X = X^\top\}\). The notation \(\mathbb{S}^n_{++}\) is used to denote the set of symmetric positive definite matrices \(\mathbb{S}^n_{++} = \{X \in \mathbb{S}^n \mid X > 0\}\). The set of diagonal \(n \times n\) matrices with elements \(x_i\) is denoted by \(\mathbb{D}^n = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid X = \text{diag}(x_i), \ i = 1, \ldots, n\} \). The notations \(\mathbb{D}^n_{++}\) and \(\mathbb{D}^n_{++}\) are used to denote the set of diagonal positive definite matrices \(\mathbb{D}^n_{++} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid X > 0\}\) and diagonal positive semidefinite matrices \(\mathbb{D}^n_{++} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid X \geq 0\}\) respectively. The variable \(x\) at the \(k\)th time instance is described by \(x_k\). Corresponding symmetric matrix elements are replaced by \(s\). The Euclidean norm of vector \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n\) is denoted by \(\|x\|\). For a nonlinear function applied element-wise to the vector \(q \in \mathbb{R}^{n}\) such that \(\psi(q) = [\phi_1(q_1) \cdots \phi_n(q_n)]^\top\), define

- Sector boundedness: \(\phi_{\sigma_{1\sigma_{2}}}(q)\) is used to describe the set \(\{\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p \mid \phi_{\sigma_{1\sigma_{2}}}(\phi_{\sigma_{1\sigma_{2}}}) \leq 0, \forall \sigma_{1}, i = 1, \ldots, n_1\}\).
- Slope restriction: \(\phi_{\sigma_{1\sigma_{2}}}(q)\) is used to describe the set \(\{\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p \mid \mu_{1}\sigma_{1} \leq \phi_{\sigma_{1\sigma_{2}}}, \forall \sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}, i = 1, \ldots, n_1\}\).

Definition 1 (Stability in the Sense of Lyapunov). Given a nonlinear time-varying discrete-time system of the form

\[ x(k+1) = f(k, x(k)), \quad x(k_0) = x_0, \]

where \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\), the equilibrium state 0 of (1) is stable in the sense of Lyapunov if, for every \(\epsilon > 0\), there exists a \(\delta(\epsilon, k_0) > 0\) such that, if \(\|x_0\| < \delta\), then \(\|x(k)\| < \epsilon\) for all \(k > k_0\).

Definition 2 (Local Asymptotic Stability). The equilibrium state 0 of (1) is locally asymptotically stable if (a) the state 0 is stable in the sense of Lyapunov and (b) there exists a \(\delta(k_0) > 0\) such that, if \(\|x_0\| < \delta\), then \(x(k) \rightarrow 0\) as \(k \rightarrow \infty\).

Definition 3 (Global Asymptotic Stability). The equilibrium state 0 of (1) is globally asymptotically stable (g.a.s) if the state is asymptotically stable for any \(\delta > 0\).

2.2. Matrix inequalities

A strict linear matrix inequality has the form

\[ F(x) = F_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i F_i > 0, \]

where \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n\) is the variable and the matrices \(F_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n, i} = 1, \ldots, m\) are known. For a nonstrict LMI, the condition that \(F(x) > 0\) is replaced by \(F(x) \geq 0\). LMIs are convex, and formulating optimizations with convex objective functions subject to LMI constraints is appealing due to the existence of efficient algorithms (Bland, Goldfarb, & Todd, 1981; Nesterov & Nemirovskii, 1994) and readily available software that can solve such problems, e.g. Chiang (2019). Common techniques used in LMI methodologies for the derivation of performance and controller synthesis criteria, such as the Schur-complement lemma and the S-procedure, are used in the proofs. Readers who would like more details on these techniques are referred to Boyd, El Ghaoui, Feron, and Balakrishnan (1994).

2.3. S-procedure

The S-procedure for quadratic forms (Boyd et al., 1994; Gusev & Likhtarnikov, 2006) for the strict case states that, if there exist \(t_1 > 0, \ldots, t_p > 0\) such that \(T_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{p} t_i T_i > 0\), then \(x^T T_0 x > 0, \forall x \neq 0 \exists x^T T_i x > 0\). For the nonstrict case, the S-procedure indicates that if there exist \(t_1 > 0, \ldots, t_p > 0\) such that \(T_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{p} t_i T_i \geq 0\), then \(x^T T_0 x \geq 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \ldots, p\).
2.4. Luré system

The Luré system for the discrete-time case is often encountered in the form (Diawdar et al., 2015; Gonzaga et al., 2012; Kim & Braatz, 2014; Park, 2002; Suykens et al., 1999)

\[ x_{k+1} = A x_k + B_p p_k, \]
\[ q_k = C x_k, \]
\[ p_{k,i} = φ_i(q_{k,i}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n_q, \]

where subscript \( k \) refers to the \( k \)th instance, \( x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \) is the vector of system states, \( p_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p} \) is the vector of the nonlinearities, \( q_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q} \) is the argument vector of the nonlinear operator, \( φ_i \) is the \( i \)th diagonal element of the nonlinear operator \( \psi \in \Phi_{\xi_1, \xi_2}, \xi_2 > \xi_1, \) with \( φ(0) = 0 \). Eq. (3) is in the form of a recurrent neural network with one hidden layer, \( n_q \) nodes, activation functions \( φ_i(\cdot) \), and matrices \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}, B_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_p}, C_q \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_x} \).

2.5. Problem statement

The Luré system (3) only describes neural networks with one hidden layer. This article considers analysis and observer and controller design for more general system descriptions (6) and (12) which are applicable to neural networks with multiple hidden layers.

3. Alternative representations of dynamic artificial neural networks

In systems applications, neural networks with more than one layer may be employed for predictive modeling. Multilayer neural networks can be written directly as a SNOF. Here we demonstrate the reformulation for the general \( ℓ \)-layer recurrent deep network

\[ p_{k} = \phi_1(W^0_q x_k + W^0_u u_k + b^0), \]
\[ p_{k}^{(\ell+1)} = \phi_{\ell+1}(W^p p_k + b^1), \quad j = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1, \]
\[ x_{k+1} = A x_k + B_q u_k + W^q p_k + b^\ell, \]

or equivalently

\[ p_k = [p_k^1 \cdots p_k^{\ell}]^T = \varphi(q_k), \]
\[ q_k = \begin{bmatrix} q_k^1 \\ \vdots \\ q_k^{\ell} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} W^0_q x_k + W^0_u u_k + b^0 \\ W^1 p_k^{(\ell)} + b^1 \\ \vdots \\ W^{\ell-1} p_k^{(\ell-1)} + b^{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix}, \]
\[ x_{k+1} = A x_k + B_u u_k + W^q p_k + b^\ell, \]

where \( u_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \) is the exogenous input, \( q_k^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q} \) is the pre-activation vector of the \( j \)th layer, \( n_q \) is the number of nodes in the \( j \)th layer, \( W^0_q \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_x} \) and \( W^0_u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_u} \) are the weight matrices of the first layer corresponding to the neural network inputs \( x_k \) and \( u_k \), \( W^q \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_q} \) and \( b^q \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q} \) are the weight matrix and bias vector of the \((j+1)\)th layer, and \( x_{k+1} \) is the neural network output. The nonlinear function \( \varphi \) is applied element-wise to \( q_k \).

The \( ℓ \)-layer neural network (4) is reformulated as a SNOF with a non-zero \( D_p \) matrix,

\[ x_{k+1} = A x_k + B_p p_k + B_q u_k + b_c, \quad x(0) = x_0, \]
\[ q_k = C x_k + D_p p_k + D_q u_k + d_c, \]
\[ p_{k,i} = φ_i(q_{k,i}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n_q = \sum_{j=1}^\ell n_j, \]

2.5. Problem statement

The Luré system (3) only describes neural networks with one hidden layer. This article considers analysis and observer and controller design for more general system descriptions (6) and (12) which are applicable to neural networks with multiple hidden layers.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activation function</th>
<th>Sector bound</th>
<th>Slope restriction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sigmoid</td>
<td>[0, 0.25]</td>
<td>(0, 0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanh</td>
<td>[0, 1]</td>
<td>(0, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReLU</td>
<td>[0, 1]</td>
<td>(0, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaky ReLU, ( a &lt; 1 )</td>
<td>[0, 1]</td>
<td>(0, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exponential, ( a \geq 0 )</td>
<td>[0, 1]</td>
<td>(0, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoftPlus</td>
<td>[0, 1]</td>
<td>(0, 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where

\[ B_p = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T, \quad b_c = b^1, \quad C_q = W^q_a \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T, \]

\[ D_{qp} = \begin{bmatrix} W^q_a & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & W^{\ell-1} \\ \hline \end{bmatrix}, \quad d_{qc} = \begin{bmatrix} b^0 \\ \vdots \\ b^{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix}. \]

and \( \psi \in \Phi_{\xi_1, \xi_2}, \xi_2 > \xi_1. \) Measured and unmeasured disturbances can be modeled as part of the exogenous input vector \( u_k \). In the formulation (6), \( x_k \) represents the system states and not the neural network states. This representation is not limited to recurrent neural networks. For example, neural nets with backward connectivity would be described by a \( D_p \) matrix that has its upper triangular area populated as well. The above analysis illustrates the value of considering the more general formulation of (3) when analyzing and designing estimators and control systems for neural network systems. Sector boundedness and slope restriction characteristics of common DANN activation functions are given in Table 1. The sector bounds for the sigmoid and the SoftPlus functions refer to the sector bounds of the resulting function, \( f(\cdot) \), after the original function has been shifted by a constant such that \( f(0) = 0 \).

A loop transformation with constant gains from the sector \([\xi_1, \xi_2,] \) to \([-1, 1] \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n_q \) can be used. This transformation requires well-posedness of (6), i.e. \( \det(I - D_{qp} \Delta) \neq 0 \) for all \( \Delta = \text{diag}(\Delta_i) \), with \( \xi_1 \leq \Delta_i \leq \xi_2 \).

The transformation results in

\[ x_{k+1} = A x_k + B_p \tilde{p}_k + B_u u_k + b_c, \quad x(0) = x_0, \]
\[ q_k = C x_k + D_p \tilde{p}_k + D_q u_k + d_c, \]
\[ \tilde{p}_{k,i} = δ_i(k)q_{k,i}, \quad |δ_i(k)| \leq 1, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n_q, \]

where

\[ \tilde{p}_{k,i} \triangleq \frac{2}{\xi_2 - \xi_1}(p_{k,i} - \xi_1 q_{k,i}) - q_{k,i}. \]

Define

\[ \Delta \triangleq \text{diag}\{|\xi_1 + \xi_2| / 2\}, \quad \tilde{\Delta} \triangleq \text{diag}\{|\xi_2 - \xi_1| / 2\}, \]

then the transformed matrices are (Nikolakopoulos et al., 2020)

\[ \tilde{A} = A + B_p A(I - D_{qp} \Delta)^{-1} C_q, \]
\[ \tilde{B}_p = B_p \tilde{A} + B_p A(I - D_{qp} \Delta)^{-1} D_{qp} \tilde{A}, \]
\[ \tilde{B}_u = B_u + B_p A(I - D_{qp} \Delta)^{-1} D_{qu}, \]
\[ b_c = b_c + B_p A(I - D_{qp} \Delta)^{-1} d_c, \]
\[ \tilde{C}_q = (I - D_{qp} \Delta)^{-1} C_q, \]
\[ \tilde{D}_{qp} = (I - D_{qp} \Delta)^{-1} D_{qp}, \]
\[ \tilde{D}_{qu} = (I - D_{qp} \Delta)^{-1} D_{qu}, \]
\[ \tilde{d}_c = (I - D_{qp} \Delta)^{-1} d_c. \]

The perturbation \( δ_i(k) \) can be used interchangeably with \( |\tilde{p}_{k,i}| = |\tilde{φ}_i(\cdot)| \leq |σ_i|, \) both suggesting that \( |\tilde{p}_{k,i}| \leq |q_{k,i}|. \) More details on the derivation and the matrix transformations can be found in Nikolakopoulos et al. (2020).
4. Controller synthesis

Here, we formulate the dynamic state feedback synthesis problem for discrete-time DANNs reformulated as Luré systems, sector bounded in $[-1, 1]$. A state feedback control law in deviation variables is $u - u_{ss} = K(x - x_{ss})$, with $u_{ss}$ being the value of the control input at steady state. However, the true relationship between $u_{ss}$ and $x_{ss}$ is not known in practical applications, especially under the presence of model uncertainty. Incorporating an integrator into the state feedback, which results in a dynamic state feedback controller, removes the need to know this relationship.

Consider the system described by

$$\begin{align*}
x_{k+1} &= A x_k + B_p p_k + B_q u_k + B_d d_k + b_c, \quad x(0) = x_0, \\
I_{k+1} &= I_k + C_y x_k - r_k, \quad I_0 = 0, \\
q_k &= C_q x_k + D_{qp} p_k + D_{qu} u_k + D_{qd} d_k + d_{qf}, \\
p_k &= \psi(q_k), \quad p_{i,k} = \tilde{\psi}(q_{i,k}), \quad |\psi(\sigma)| \leq |\sigma|,
\end{align*}$$

(12)

where $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the control input vector, $d_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$ is the measured disturbance vector, $I_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the integrator state vector, $r_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the desired output setpoint vector which can be constant or time-varying, constant at steady state. In a Lyapunov framework, we derive criteria for the stability of (12) in deviation variables. For global asymptotic stability, $x_k \equiv x_k - x_{ss} \to 0$ as $k \to +\infty$. Any assumed value for $x_{ss}$ implicitly assumes some known steady-state value for the disturbance $d = d_{ss}$ since $x_{ss}$ changes if the steady-state disturbance changes. Additionally, define the deviation variables $\forall i = 1, \ldots, n_q$.

$$\begin{align*}
\tilde{p}_i &\triangleq p_i - p_{i,ss} = \psi(q_i) - \tilde{\psi}(q_{i,ss}) = \tilde{\phi}(q_i - q_{i,ss}), \\
\tilde{p} &\triangleq \tilde{p}_{n_q} = \psi(q) - \tilde{\psi}(q_{ss}) = \tilde{\phi}(q - q_{ss}).
\end{align*}$$

Below are some easy-to-prove lemmas used in the proofs of theorems later in this article.

**Lemma 1.** For all $\phi_i$ that is slope restricted in $[\mu_{i,1}, \mu_{i,2}]$, $\tilde{\phi} := \phi(\cdot; q_{i,ss})$ is sector bounded in $[\mu_{i,1}, \mu_{i,2}]$.

**Lemma 2.** If $\psi \in \Phi_{sb}^{[1,2]}$ and $\psi \in \Phi_{sb}^{[1,2]}$, then $\tilde{\phi} \in \Phi_{sb}^{[1,2]}$.

Rewriting (12) in terms of deviation variables and applying Lemma 2 gives

$$\begin{align*}
\tilde{x}_{k+1} &= \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ C_y & I \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_k + \begin{bmatrix} B_p & B_0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{p}_k + \begin{bmatrix} B_0 & B_0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{u}_k, \\
q_k &= [C_q \ 0] \tilde{x}_k + D_{qp} \tilde{p}_k + D_{qu} \tilde{u}_k, \\
p_{k,i} &= \tilde{\phi}(q_{i,k}), \quad |\tilde{\phi}(\sigma)| \leq |\sigma|,
\end{align*}$$

(13)

where $\tilde{x}_k = [x_k \ I_k]$ and $I$ is the identity matrix. For a full dynamic state feedback control law $\tilde{u}_k = K_p x_k + K_i \tilde{I}_k = K \tilde{x}_k$, $K = [K_p \ K_i]$, (13) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{align*}
\tilde{x}_{k+1} &= \tilde{A} \tilde{x}_k + B_p \tilde{p}_k, \\
\tilde{q}_k &= \tilde{C} \tilde{x}_k + D_{qp} \tilde{p}_k, \\
p_{k,i} &= \tilde{\phi}(q_{i,k}), \quad |\tilde{\phi}(\sigma)| \leq |\sigma|,
\end{align*}$$

(14)

where

$$\begin{align*}
\tilde{A} &\triangleq A' + B'_p \tilde{K}, \quad \tilde{C} \triangleq C_y' + D_{qp} \tilde{K}, \\
A' &\triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ C_y & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad B'_p = \begin{bmatrix} B_0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C'_y = [C_q \ 0].
\end{align*}$$

(15)

4.1. Full dynamic state feedback controller for a SNOF sector bounded in $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$

This section derives criteria for stabilizing controller synthesis for systems of the structure (14) with different sector bounds:

$$\begin{align*}
\tilde{x}_{k+1} &= \tilde{A} \tilde{x}_k + B'_p \tilde{p}_k, \\
\tilde{q}_k &= \tilde{C} \tilde{x}_k + D_{qp} \tilde{p}_k, \\
p_{k,i} &= \tilde{\phi}(q_{i,k}), \quad \tilde{\phi}(q_{i,k}) \in \Phi_{sb}^{[\xi_1, \xi_2]}, \quad \xi_2 > \xi_1, \\
\end{align*}$$

(16)

where the matrices are defined as in (15). Sufficient criteria for stabilizing controller synthesis of (16) result in nonlinear matrix inequalities. Assuming less general sector bounds or employing a loop transformation allows for simplifications that can lead to lower order matrix inequalities (Diwadkar et al., 2015; Kim & Braatz, 2014; Suykens et al., 1999). Many common DNN activation functions (see Table 1) are sector bounded in $[0, \xi]$, $\xi > 0$ (with the exception of leaky ReLU which is sector bounded in $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$, $0 < \xi_1 < \xi_2$). Stabilizing controller synthesis criteria for such systems could be obtained by the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** A sufficient condition for the global asymptotic stability of the controlled system (16) with $\xi_2 = \xi > \xi_1 = 0$ is the existence of $Q \in \mathbb{S}^{n_q \times n_q}$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_q}$, and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times (n_q + n_p)}$ that satisfy the LMI

$$\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} -Q & * \\ * & -M + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma D_{qp} M \end{bmatrix} &< 0,
\end{align*}$$

(17)

where $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\xi_i)$. The controller matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times (n_q + n_p)}$ is constructed from $K = Y Q^{-1}$.

**Proof.** Given the Lyapunov function

$$V(\tilde{x}_k) = \tilde{x}_k' P \tilde{x}_k, \quad P > 0,$$

(18)

a sufficient condition for (16) with $\xi_2 = \xi > \xi_1 = 0$ to be g.a.s. is for the inequality

$$\Delta V(\tilde{x}_k) \triangleq V(\tilde{x}_{k+1}) - V(\tilde{x}_k) < 0, \quad \forall k \geq 0,$$

(19)

to be satisfied (Hahn, 1958) for all $\tilde{x}_k$, $p_{i,k}$ that satisfy the sector bounds

$$\begin{align*}
p_{k,i} &\leq \xi, \quad \xi \geq 0, \quad \forall k \geq 0, \ i = 1, \ldots, n_q.
\end{align*}$$

(20)

The inequality (19) can be written equivalently as the quadratic form

$$\Delta V(\tilde{x}_k) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_k \\ \tilde{p}_k \end{bmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}' P \tilde{A} - P & * \\ * & \tilde{B}'_p P \tilde{B}_p \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_k \\ \tilde{p}_k \end{bmatrix} < 0,$$

(21)

and (20) can be written as

$$\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_k \\ \tilde{p}_k \end{bmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} \Sigma E_{i,i} \\ \frac{1}{2} \Sigma E_{i,i}' & -\frac{1}{2} E_{i,i}' E_{i,i} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_k \\ \tilde{p}_k \end{bmatrix} &\leq 0,
\end{align*}$$

(22)

where the subscript $i$ in $\tilde{C}_i$ and $D_{qi}$ denotes their $i$th row, and $E_i$ is a matrix with all its elements equal to zero but $E_{i,i} = 1$. Application of the S-procedure to (21) and (22) gives the sufficient condition

$$\begin{align*}
F_{i} &\triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}' P \tilde{A} - P & * \\ \tilde{B}'_p P \tilde{A} + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma \tilde{M} E_{i,i} \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{B}'_p P \tilde{B}_p - M & * \\ \frac{1}{2} \Sigma D_{qp} \tilde{M} + \frac{1}{2} D_{qp}' \Sigma M \\ \end{bmatrix} < 0,
\end{align*}$$

(23)
where $M = \text{diag}(|m_i|) \succeq 0$ and $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\xi_i) > 0$. To reduce the order of the matrix inequality (23), rewrite as

$$F_1 = Q - SR^{-1}S^T \prec 0, \quad S \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A^T P & 0 \\ B_p^T P & \tilde{p} \end{bmatrix}, \quad R = -P,$$

$$Q \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -P & \ast \\ \frac{1}{2} \Sigma M \tilde{C}_q & -M + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma MD_{qp} + \frac{1}{2} D_{qp}^T \Sigma \end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

Then the Schur complement lemma is applied to give

$$F_1 < 0 \iff F_2 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -P & \ast \\ \frac{1}{2} \Sigma M \tilde{C}_q & -(M + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma MD_{qp}) \end{bmatrix} \prec 0. \quad (25)$$

Then a congruence transformation on $F_2$ with $X = \text{diag}(P^{-1}, M^{-1}, P^{-1})$ results in

$$F_2 < 0 \iff X^T F_2 X < 0 \iff \begin{bmatrix} -Q & \ast \\ \frac{1}{2} \Sigma \tilde{C}_q Q & -M + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma D_{qp} \tilde{M} \end{bmatrix} \prec 0, \quad (26)$$

where $Q \triangleq P^{-1} = Q^T > 0$, and $\tilde{M} \triangleq M^{-1} > 0$. The implementation of the congruence transformation replaces the requirement $M \succeq 0$ with $M > 0$. Substituting (15) into (26) and defining $Y \triangleq KQ$ results in the LMI (17).

Lyapunov stability is established when (17) is nonstrict, i.e., $S_{F_0[\xi], 0} \leq 0$. LMI (17) has $M = \begin{bmatrix} (n_x + n_y)(n_x + n_y + 1) & n_x + n_y(n_x + n_y) \\ n_x + n_y(n_x + n_y) & n_y \end{bmatrix}$ associated variables and $S_{F_0[\xi], 0} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$, where $m = 2(n_x + n_y) + n_y$. LMI feasibility criteria are computed using semidefinite programming (SDP). The complexity upper bound for decreasing the duality gap of an SDP by a factor of $e^{-1}$ is known to be $O((m + m^2) \log(e))$ (Legat, 2002; Monteiro & Todd, 2000; Monteiro & Zanjácomo, 1999). Assuming a sector bound $[0, \xi]$, $\xi > 0$, results in significantly simpler matrix inequality criteria compared to the general case of a sector bound $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$, $\xi_2 > \xi_1$. LMI criteria for systems of the same structure but with a nonlinear operator sector bounded in $[-1, 1]$ are derived in Section 4.2, which are similar in complexity as for the sector bound $[0, \xi]$, $\xi > 0$, but have different matrix sparsity.

4.2. Full dynamic state error feedback controller for a luré system sector bounded in $[-1, 1]$

This section considers the design of a full dynamic state error feedback controller that stabilizes the closed-loop dynamics. A stabilizing controller is not unique.

Theorem 2. A sufficient condition for the global asymptotic stability of the controlled system (14) is the existence of $Q \in \mathbb{S}^{n_x+n_y}_+, M \in \mathbb{S}^{n_y}_+$, and $Y \in \mathbb{S}^{n_x+n_y}_+$ that satisfy the LMI

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q & \ast & \ast & \ast \\ 0 & -M & \ast & \ast \\ A^T Y + B_p^T M & B_{qp}^T Y & -Q & \ast \\ \tilde{C}_q Y + D_{qp}^T M & D_{qp}^T Y & 0 & -\tilde{M} \end{bmatrix} \prec 0. \quad (27)$$

The controller matrix $\hat{K} \in \mathbb{S}^{n_x+n_y}_+$ is constructed from $\hat{K} = YY^{-1}$.

Proof. Given the Lyapunov function (18) a sufficient condition for (14) to be g.a.s. is for the inequality (19) to be satisfied (Hahn, 1958) for all $\tilde{z}_k, \tilde{p}_k,i$ that satisfy the sector boundedness property

$$\tilde{p}_k,i^T \tilde{p}_k,i \leq \tilde{q}_k,i^T \tilde{q}_k,i, \quad \forall k \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n_q. \quad (28)$$

The inequality (19) can be written equivalently as the quadratic form (21) and (28) can be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{z}_k^T & -\tilde{C}_q^T \tilde{C}_q, i \\ \tilde{p}_k & \ast \\ -D_{qp}^T \tilde{C}_q, i & E_i - D_{qp}^T D_{qp}, i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{z}_k \\ \tilde{p}_k \end{bmatrix} \leq 0. \quad (29)$$

Application of the S-procedure to (21) and (29) gives the sufficient condition

$$F_1 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A^T P A - \tilde{C}_q^T \tilde{C}_q, i \\ B_p^T P A + D_{qp}^T \tilde{C}_q, i \\ B_p^T P A - \tilde{C}_q^T \tilde{C}_q, i \\ \tilde{C}_q^T \tilde{C}_q, i \end{bmatrix} < 0. \quad (30)$$

where $M = \text{diag}(|m_i|) \succeq 0$. In (30), higher order terms such as $A^T P A$ are present. To reduce the order of (30), rewrite as

$$F_1 = Q - SR^{-1}S^T \prec 0, \quad S \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A^T P + \tilde{C}_q^T \tilde{C}_q, i \\ B_p^T P A + D_{qp}^T \tilde{C}_q, i \\ B_p^T P A - \tilde{C}_q^T \tilde{C}_q, i \\ \tilde{C}_q^T \tilde{C}_q, i \end{bmatrix} < 0. \quad (31)$$

Then the Schur complement lemma is applied to give

$$F_1 < 0 \iff F_2 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} -P & \ast & \ast & \ast \\ 0 & -M & \ast & \ast \\ \tilde{A}_p^T M & \tilde{B}_p^T M & -\tilde{M} & \ast \\ \tilde{C}_q^T \tilde{C}_q, i & D_{qp}^T M & 0 & -\tilde{M} \end{bmatrix} \prec 0. \quad (32)$$

In order for the Schur complement lemma to hold, $M$ must be positive definite rather than positive semidefinite. Then a congruence transformation on $F_2$ with $X = \text{diag}(P^{-1}, M^{-1}, P^{-1})$ results in

$$F_2 < 0 \iff X^T F_2 X < 0 \iff \begin{bmatrix} -Q & \ast & \ast & \ast \\ 0 & -\tilde{M} & \ast & \ast \\ A^T Q + B_p^T Y & B_p^T M & -Q & \ast \\ \tilde{C}_q^T \tilde{C}_q, i & D_{qp}^T M & 0 & -\tilde{M} \end{bmatrix} \prec 0, \quad (33)$$

where $Q \triangleq P^{-1} = Q^T > 0$, and $\tilde{M} \triangleq M^{-1} > 0$. Substituting (15) into (33) and defining $Y \triangleq KQ$ results in the LMI (27).

The size of (27) is $S \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n_x + n_y)(n_x + n_y + 1)} + n_x + n_y(n_x + n_y)$ associated variables. For an output controllable system, a dynamic output feedback controller would be $K = [\tilde{K}_C, \tilde{K}_D]$. Due to the structural constraint in $\tilde{K}$ imposed by $\tilde{C}_q$, the problem is nonconvex. Ways to solve this control synthesis problem are discussed in a recent paper (Nikolakopoulou et al., 2021).

4.3. Nonlinear dynamic feedback control for a luré system bounded in $[-1, 1]$

Consider a nonlinear full dynamic state feedback control law $\tilde{u}_k = K_x \tilde{z}_k + K_t \tilde{t}_k + K_p \tilde{p}_k = \tilde{K} \tilde{z}_k + K_p \tilde{p}_k$, $K = [K_p, K_t]$, and rewrite (13) as

$$\tilde{z}_{k+1} = \tilde{A} \tilde{z}_k + \tilde{B}_p \tilde{p}_k, \quad \tilde{q}_k = \tilde{C}_q \tilde{Z}_k + D_{qp} \tilde{p}_k, \quad \tilde{p}_k,i = \tilde{\phi}(\tilde{q}_k,i), \quad |\tilde{\phi}(\sigma)| \leq |\sigma|, \quad (34)$$

where $\tilde{B}_p \triangleq \tilde{B}_p + \tilde{B}_p^T K_p, \tilde{D}_{qp} \triangleq D_{qp} + D_{qui} K_p$, and all other matrices are defined as in (15).

Theorem 3. A sufficient condition for the global asymptotic stability of the controlled system (34) is the existence of $Q \in \mathbb{S}^{n_x+n_y}_+, M \in \mathbb{S}_+$, and $Y \in \mathbb{S}_+$ that satisfy the LMI

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q & \ast & \ast & \ast \\ 0 & -\tilde{M} & \ast & \ast \\ A^T Y + B_p^T M & B_p^T Y & -Q & \ast \\ \tilde{C}_q Y + D_{qp}^T M & D_{qp}^T Y & 0 & -\tilde{M} \end{bmatrix} \prec 0. \quad (35)$$
The controller matrices $\hat{K}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n_x \times (n_h + n_y)}$ and $K_a \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_q}$ are constructed from $\hat{K} = Y_1 Q^{-1}$ and $K_a = Y_2 M^{-1}$ respectively.

**Proof.** Given the Lyapunov function (18), a sufficient condition for (34) to be g.a.s. is for the inequality (19) to be satisfied for all $\hat{x}_{k,i}, \hat{p}_{k,i}$ that satisfy the sector bounds (28). Inequalities (19) and (28) can be written as their equivalent quadratic forms

$$\Delta V(\hat{x}_k) = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{z}_k \end{array} \right]^T \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \bar{A}^T P A - P & * \\ \bar{B}_p^T P A & \bar{B}_p^T P \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{z}_k \end{array} \right] < 0$$

and

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{z}_k \end{array} \right]^T \left[ \begin{array}{cc} -\bar{C}_q & \bar{C}_q,i \\ -\bar{D}_{q,i}^T \bar{C}_q,i & E_i - \bar{D}_{q,i}^T \bar{D}_{q,i} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{z}_k \end{array} \right] \leq 0.$$  

Application of the S-procedure to (37) and (38) gives the sufficient condition for the g.a.s. of (34)

$$F_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}^T P A - P \\ \bar{B}_p^T P A + \bar{D}_{q,i}^T \bar{M} \bar{C}_q \\ \bar{B}_p^T P + \bar{D}_{q,i}^T \bar{M} \bar{D}_{q,i} \end{bmatrix} > 0.$$  

where $M = \text{diag}(m_i) \geq 0$. To reduce the order of the matrix inequality (39), rewrite as

$$F_1 = Q - S R^{-1} S^T < 0.$$  

Then the Schur complement lemma is applied to give

$$F_1 < 0 \iff F_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -P & * & * \\ 0 & -M & * \\ P A & M & -P \\ C_q Q & \bar{D}_{q,i} M & 0 & -M \end{bmatrix} > 0.$$  

Then a congruence transformation on $F_2$ with $X = \text{diag}(P^{-1}, M^{-1}, P^{-1}, M^{-1})$ results in

$$F_2 < 0 \iff X^T F_2 X < 0 \iff \begin{bmatrix} -Q & * & * \\ 0 & -M & * \\ \bar{A}^T P A - (1 - \alpha) P & \bar{B}_p^T P A & \bar{B}_p^T \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_q \\ \bar{D}_{q,i} M \end{bmatrix} < 0.$$  

where $Q \triangleq P^{-1} = Q^T > 0$, and $M \triangleq M^{-1} > 0$. Substituting (15) and (33) into (42) and defining $Y_1 \triangleq X_1$ and $Y_2 \triangleq X_2 M$ results in the LMI (36). □

The size of (36) is $\text{SF}_{\text{nl}} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_x + n_y) \times (n_x + n_y) \times (n_x + n_y) \times (n_x + n_y)}$, which has $(n_x + n_y) \times (n_x + n_y) + n_q + n_u(n_x + n_y + n_q)$ associated variables. In a practical setting, the control law $u_k = K_{\hat{x}} \hat{x}_k + K_{\hat{p}} \hat{p}_k$ would be implemented as $u_k = K_{\hat{x}} (x_k - x_{k-1}) + K_{\hat{p}} (p_k - p_{k-1})$. While the desired reference value $x_0$ is known, a practical limitation is that implementation requires the value of $p_{ss}$ which is not known due to the unknown nature of $l_{ss}$.

5. State observer design

Consider a model of the similar structure as (12) with the inclusion of the output equation:

$$x_{k+1} = A x_k + B p_k + B_d u_k + B_d d_k + b_k, \quad x(0) = x_0,$$

$$q_k = C q_0 + D q_p p_k + D q_u u_k + D q_d d_k + d_q.$$  

$$y_k = C y_0 + D y_p p_k + D y_u u_k.$$  

$$p_{ki} = \phi_i(q_{ki}), \quad |\phi_i(\sigma)| \leq |\sigma|.$$  

where $y_k$ is the vector of outputs with available measurements. The corresponding observer dynamics are

$$\hat{x}_{k+1} = A \hat{x}_k + B \hat{p}_k + B_d u_k + B_d d_k + b_k + L_1(\hat{y}_k - y_k),$$

$$\hat{q}_k = C \hat{q}_0 + D q_p \hat{p}_k + D q_u u_k + D q_d d_k + d_q$$

$$+ L_2(\hat{y}_k - y_k),$$  

$$\hat{y}_k - y_k = C \hat{x}_k - x_k + D q_p \hat{p}_k + d_q,$$

initialized as $\hat{x}(0) = x_0$. The observer error dynamics are

$$\hat{x}_{k+1} - x_{k+1} = (A + L_1 C_y)(\hat{x}_k - x_k) + (B_L + L_2 D_y P \hat{p}_k - p_k),$$

$$\hat{q}_k - q_k = (C_q + L_2 C_y \hat{x}_k - x_k) + (D q_p + L_2 D_y P \hat{p}_k - p_k),$$

$$\hat{y}_k - y_k = C \hat{x}_k - x_k + D q_p \hat{p}_k + d_q,$$

where $SE_{42} = (A + L_1 C_y \hat{x}_k - x_k) + (B_L + L_2 D_y P \hat{p}_k - p_k).$

Theorem 4. A sufficient condition for the observer error dynamics (45) to have a decay rate of at least $\alpha$ is the existence of $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r \times n_r}$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r \times n_r}$, $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r \times n_r}$, and $W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r \times n_r}$ that satisfy the LMI (46) where

$$SE \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} SE_{11} & \ast & \ast \\ SE_{21} & SE_{22} & \ast \\ SE_{31} & SE_{32} & SE_{33} \\ SE_{34} & SE_{42} & SE_{43} & SE_{44} \end{bmatrix} \leq 0,$$

then the decay rate is at least $\alpha$ (Boyd et al., 1994). The inequality (50) can be written equivalently as the quadratic form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k \end{bmatrix}^T \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \bar{A}^T P A - (1 - \alpha) P & \bar{B}_p^T P A \\ \bar{B}_p^T P & \bar{B}_p^T \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{C}_q Q \\ \bar{D}_{q,i} M \end{array} \right] \leq 0.$$  

where

$$\hat{C}_q \triangleq \hat{x}_k - x_k, \quad \hat{A} \triangleq A + L_1 C_y, \quad \hat{B}_p \triangleq B_p + L_1 D_y P.$$  

Proof. Given a Lyapunov function $V(\hat{x}_k - x_k) = (\hat{x}_k - x_k)^T P(\hat{x}_k - x_k)$, $P > 0$, define

$$\Delta V(\hat{x}_k - x_k) = V(\hat{x}_{k+1} - x_{k+1}) - V(\hat{x}_k - x_k).$$  

If the observer error dynamics satisfy

$$\Delta V(\hat{x}_k - x_k) \leq -\alpha V(\hat{x}_k - x_k), \quad \forall k \geq 0,$$

for all $\hat{x}_{k,i} - x_{k-1,i}, \hat{p}_{k,i} - p_{k-1,i}$ that satisfy the sector bounds

$$|\hat{p}_{k,i} - p_{k-1,i}| \leq |\hat{q}_{k,i} - q_{k-1,i}|,$$

then the decay rate is at least $\alpha$ (Boyd et al., 1994). The inequality (50) can be written equivalently as the quadratic form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k \end{bmatrix}^T \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \bar{A}^T P A - (1 - \alpha) P & \bar{B}_p^T P A \\ \bar{B}_p^T P & \bar{B}_p^T \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{C}_q Q \\ \bar{D}_{q,i} M \end{array} \right] \leq 0.$$  

where

$$\hat{C}_q \triangleq \hat{x}_k - x_k, \quad \hat{A} \triangleq A + L_1 C_y, \quad \hat{B}_p \triangleq B_p + L_1 D_y P.$$  

(53)
and (51) can be written equivalently as
\[
\hat{\chi}_k^T \begin{bmatrix}
-\hat{C}_{q,i}^T \hat{C}_{q,i} & E_i - \hat{D}_{sp,i} \hat{D}_{sp,i} \\
-\hat{D}_{sp,i} \hat{C}_{q,i} & E_i - \hat{D}_{sp,i} \hat{D}_{sp,i}
\end{bmatrix} \hat{\chi}_k \leq 0,
\]  
where
\[
\hat{C}_q \triangleq C_q + L_2 C_y, \hat{D}_{sp} \triangleq D_{sp} + L_2 D_{yp}.
\]
(54)

Application of the S-procedure to (52) and (54) gives the sufficient condition
\[
SE_1 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} \hat{P} \hat{A} - (1 - \alpha) \hat{P} \\
\hat{C}_{q,i}^T \hat{M} \hat{C}_q
\end{bmatrix} & * \\
\hat{B}_{p} \hat{P} \hat{B}_{p} - \hat{M} & \hat{P} \hat{D}_{sp} \hat{M} \hat{D}_{sp}
\end{bmatrix} \leq 0,
\]  
where \(M = \text{diag}(m_i) \geq 0\). In (56), higher order terms such as \(\hat{A} \hat{P} \hat{A}\) are present. To reduce the order of (56) to an LMI, rewrite the matrix inequality as
\[
SE_1 = Q - SR^{-1}S \leq 0, \quad R \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
-P & 0 \\
0 & -M
\end{bmatrix}, \quad Q \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
-(1 - \alpha)P & 0 \\
0 & -M
\end{bmatrix}, \quad S \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} \hat{P} & \hat{C}_q^T M \\
\hat{B}_{p} \hat{P} & \hat{D}_{sp} \hat{M} \hat{D}_{sp}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
(57)

Then
\[
SE_1 \leq 0 \quad \text{if} \quad M > 0 \iff SE_1 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
-(1 - \alpha)P & 0 & * & * \\
0 & -M & * & * \\
\hat{A} \hat{P} & \hat{P} \hat{B}_{p} & \hat{P} \hat{D}_{sp} & 0 & -M
\end{bmatrix} \leq 0.
\]
(58)

Substituting (53) and (55) into (58) and defining \(W_1 \triangleq P L_1\) and \(W_2 \triangleq M L_2\) results in the LMI (46).

The size of (46) is \(SE \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+q) \times 2(n+q)}\) and has \(n(\alpha n + 1) + n_q + (n_q + n) n_q\) associated variables. The observer that maximizes the decay rate of (45) is given by the GEVP:
\[
\max_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\alpha \\
\alpha \lambda \end{array} \right) \\
s.t. \quad M = \text{diag}(m_i) > 0, \quad P = P^T > 0, \quad SE \leq 0.
\]
(59)

6. Output observer design

Consider a model of similar structure as (12), with an additional unmeasured disturbance \(w_k\) acting on the system
\[
x_{k+1} = Ax_k + B_p \hat{p}_k + B_u u_k + B_d d_k + B_c + c_k,
\]
\[
y_k = C_x x_k + D_{pp} \hat{p}_k + D_{qu} u_k + D_{dq} d_k + D_{qc} + D_{qy} y_k + D_{qc},
\]
\[
z_k = C_x x_k + D_{pp} \hat{p}_k + D_{qu} u_k + D_{qc} + D_{qy} y_k
\]
\[
p_{ki} = \phi(q_{ki}), \quad \|\phi(\sigma)\| \leq |\sigma|,
\]
with initial conditions \(x(0) = \hat{x}_0\), where \(y_k\) is the vector of outputs and \(z_k\) is the vector to be estimated. The corresponding observer dynamics are
\[
\hat{x}_{k+1} = A \hat{x}_k + B_p \hat{p}_k + B_u u_k + B_d d_k + B_c + L_1 (\hat{y}_k - y_k),
\]
\[
\hat{q}_k = C_x \hat{x}_k + D_{pp} \hat{p}_k + D_{qu} u_k + D_{dq} d_k + D_{qc},
\]
\[
\hat{y}_k = C_x \hat{x}_k + D_{pp} \hat{p}_k + D_{qu} u_k + D_{qc} + D_{qy} \hat{y}_k + D_{qc},
\]
\[
\hat{z}_k = C_x \hat{x}_k + D_{pp} \hat{p}_k + D_{qu} u_k + D_{qc} + D_{qy} \hat{y}_k
\]
\[
p_{ki} = \phi(q_{ki}), \quad \|\phi(\sigma)\| \leq |\sigma|,
\]
with initialized as \(\hat{x}(0) = \hat{x}_0\). The observer error dynamics are
\[
\hat{x}_{k+1} - x_{k+1} = (A + L_1 C_y) (\hat{x}_k - x_k) + (B_p + L_1 D_{yp}) (\hat{p}_k - p_k) - (B_u + L_1 D_{qu}) u_k
\]
\[
+ (B_d + L_1 D_{dq} + B_c + L_1 D_{qc}) d_k + (B_q + L_1 D_{qc} + B_q + L_1 D_{qc}) y_k + (L_1 D_{qc} + B_q + L_1 D_{qc}) y_k
\]
\[
\hat{q}_k - q_k = (C_y + L_2 C_y) (\hat{x}_k - x_k) - (D_{qu} + L_2 D_{qu}) y_k
\]
\[
+ (D_{pp} + L_2 D_{pp}) (\hat{p}_k - p_k) + (D_{qq} + L_2 D_{qq}) q_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{x}(0)\| \leq \gamma.
\]

Theorem 5. A sufficient condition for the observer error dynamics (62) to have an \(L_2\)-gain less than \(\gamma\) is the existence of \(P \in \mathbb{S}^{n+q}_+, M \in \mathbb{S}^{n_q}_+, W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_q}, \) and \(W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_q}\) that satisfy the LMI
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\begin{array}{c}
OE_{11} & * & * & * \\
OE_{21} & OE_{32} & * & * \\
OE_{41} & OE_{42} & OE_{43} & * \\
OE_{51} & OE_{52} & OE_{53} & OE_{54} & OE_{55}
\end{array}
\end{bmatrix} \leq 0,
\]  
where
\[
OE_{11} = -P + C_y^T C_x, \quad OE_{21} = D_{pp} C_x, \quad OE_{32} = D_{pp} C_x,
\]
\[
OE_{41} = -P - W_1 C_y, \quad OE_{42} = P B_{pp} + W_1 D_{pp}, \quad OE_{43} = -P B_q - W_2 D_{pp},
\]
\[
OE_{51} = M C_y + W_2 C_y, \quad OE_{52} = M D_{pp} + W_2 D_{pp}, \quad OE_{53} = -M D_{qu} - W_2 D_{qu},
\]
\[
OE_{54} = 0, \quad OE_{55} = -M.
\]
(63)

The observer matrices \(L_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_q}\) and \(L_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_q}\) are constructed from \(L_1 = P^{-1} W_1\) and \(L_2 = M^{-1} W_2\).

Proof. Given a Lyapunov function (48), define (49). If the observer error dynamics (62) satisfy
\[
\Delta V(\hat{x}_k - x_k + \hat{z}_k - z_k) (\hat{z}_k - z_k) - \gamma^2 w_k^T w_k \leq 0, \quad \forall k \geq 0,
\]
(65)
for all \(\hat{x}_k - x_k, \hat{z}_k - z_k\) that satisfy the sector bounds (51), then the \(L_2\)-gain is less than \(\gamma\) (Boyd et al., 1994). The inequality (65) can be written equivalently as
\[
\hat{z}_k^T \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A} \hat{P} & \hat{C}_q^T \\
\hat{B}_{p} \hat{P} & \hat{B}_{q} \hat{P}
\end{bmatrix} \hat{z}_k \leq 0,
\]
(66)
where
\[
\hat{z}_k \triangleq [\hat{x}_k - x_k - \hat{p}_k - p_k - w_k]^T, \quad \hat{A} \triangleq A + L_1 C_y, \quad \hat{B}_p \triangleq B_p + L_1 D_{pp}, \quad \hat{B}_q \triangleq B_q + L_1 D_{pp},
\]
and (51) can be written equivalently as
\[
\hat{z}_k^T \begin{bmatrix}
-\hat{C}_q^T \hat{C}_q & * & * \\
-\hat{D}_{sp,i} \hat{C}_q & \hat{D}_{sp,i} \hat{D}_{sp,i} & * \\
\hat{D}_{sp,i} \hat{C}_q & \hat{D}_{sp,i} \hat{D}_{sp,i} & *
\end{bmatrix} \hat{z}_k \leq 0,
\]
(68)
where
\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{C}_q & \triangleq C_q + L_2C_y, \quad \hat{D}_{qw} \triangleq D_{qw} + L_2D_{yp}, \\
\hat{D}_{qp} & \triangleq D_{qp} + L_2D_{yp},
\end{align*}
\] (69)
Application of the S-procedure to (66) and (68) gives the sufficient condition
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{OE}_{1,11} & \ast & \ast \\
\text{OE}_{1,21} & \ast & \ast \\
\text{OE}_{1,31} & \ast & \ast
\end{bmatrix} \leq 0,
\] (70)
where
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OE}_{1,11} & \triangleq \hat{A}^T\hat{P}\hat{A} - P + \hat{C}_q^T\hat{C}_q + \hat{C}_q^T M \hat{C}_q, \\
\text{OE}_{1,21} & \triangleq \hat{B}_p^T\hat{P}\hat{A} + \hat{D}_{qp}\hat{C}_q + \hat{C}_q^T M \hat{C}_q, \\
\text{OE}_{1,31} & \triangleq -\hat{B}_p^T\hat{P}\hat{B}_p + \hat{D}_{qw}\hat{D}_{qw} - \hat{C}_q^T M \hat{D}_{qw} - M, \\
\text{OE}_{1,32} & \triangleq -\hat{B}_p^T\hat{B}_p\hat{P} + \hat{D}_{qw}\hat{D}_{pq} - \hat{C}_q^T M \hat{D}_{qp},
\end{align*}
\] (71)
and \(M = \text{diag}(m_1) > 0\). To reduce the order of (70) to an LMI, rewrite the matrix inequality as
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OE}_{1} & \triangleq Q - SR^TS^T \leq 0, \\
Q & \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
-P & \ast & \ast \\
\hat{D}_{pq}^T\hat{C}_q & \hat{D}_{qp}D_{pq} - M & \hat{D}_{qw}\hat{D}_{pq} - \hat{C}_q^T M \hat{D}_{qw} - \hat{C}_q^T M \hat{D}_{qw}
\end{bmatrix}, \\
S & \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{A}^T\hat{P} & \hat{C}_q^T M \\
\hat{B}_p^T\hat{P} & \hat{D}_{qw}M
\end{bmatrix}, \\
R & \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
-P & 0 \\
0 & -M
\end{bmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\] (72)
Then
\[
\text{OE}_1 \leq 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \text{OE}_2 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} Q \quad S \\ S^T \quad R \end{bmatrix} \leq 0.
\] (73)
Substituting (67) and (69) into (73) and defining \(W_1 \triangleq \text{PL}_1\) and \(W_2 \triangleq \text{ML}_2\) results in the LMI (63) and (64). \(\Box\)

The size of (63) is \(O(2n_x + 2n_q + n_y)\times(2n_x + 2n_q + n_y)\) associated variables. The observer that minimizes the upper bound of the \(L_2\)-gain of (62) is given by the solution of the eigenvalue problem (EVP):
\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{P, W, M} \gamma^2 \\
\text{s.t.} \quad M = \text{diag}(m_1) > 0, \quad P = P^T > 0, \quad \text{OE} \leq 0.
\end{align*}
\] (74)

7. Case studies

7.1. Numerical example

Here the methodology is implemented for a numerical example with one input (\(u\)), two states (\(x_1, x_2\)), and one output (\(x_3\)). The system has the structure of a two-layer feedforward neural network with three nodes in the first layer and two nodes in the second layer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1</td>
<td>([0.1187, 0.1187] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2</td>
<td>([-0.0360, -0.0360])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI controller</td>
<td>([-0.0077, -0.0077])</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.1. Problem formulation

The model approximating the system is described by (6) with
\[
\begin{align*}
A & = \begin{bmatrix}
-0.5035 & 0.0550 \\
-0.0094 & -0.3834
\end{bmatrix}, \\
B_p & = \begin{bmatrix}
0_{1 \times 3} \\
0_{1 \times 3}
\end{bmatrix}, \\
B_c & = \begin{bmatrix}
0_{2 \times 1} \\
0_{2 \times 1}
\end{bmatrix}, \\
C_q & = \begin{bmatrix}
0_{1 \times 1} \\
0_{1 \times 1} \\
0_{1 \times 2} \\
0_{1 \times 2}
\end{bmatrix}, \\
D_{qw} & = \begin{bmatrix}
0_{3 \times 1} \\
0_{3 \times 1} \\
0_{3 \times 1} \\
0_{3 \times 1}
\end{bmatrix},
\end{align*}
\] (75)
where \(\phi\) is the tanh function. The true process has the structure (6) with the inclusion of an unmeasured disturbance \(w\) such that
\[
x_{k+1} = Ax_k + B_pu_k + B_cu_k + B_cw_k + b_c, \\
qu_k = C_qx_k + D_{qp}u_k + D_{qw}w_k + d_q, \\
p_{k+1} = \phi(q_{k+1}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, 5.
\] (76)
The unmeasured disturbance acting on the process (Fig. 1a) results in inaccurate estimates for the first state \(x_1\), as expected (Fig. 1c). The inaccurate estimate does not result in an offset in the control of the second state \(x_2\) (Fig. 1d), since both controllers have integral action. The second state is tightly controlled to the setpoint by both the LMI-based and PI controllers (Fig. 1d). The PI controller was designed to have nearly as fast of a closed-loop response speed in the controlled state \(x_3\) as the LMI-based controller (Fig. 1d), which results in some erratic behavior in both states (Figs. 1c,d). Designing the PI control to be less aggressive
would reduce the erratic behavior in the states $x_1$ and $x_2$ but would result in the closed-loop response in the controlled state $x_2$ to be more sluggish than the LMI-based controller.

7.2. pH control

This section demonstrates the theoretical results for a pH-neutralization process, which is both highly nonlinear and industrially important (Gustafsson, Skrifvars, Sandström, & Waller, 1995). The system is described by a two-layer neural network with four nodes in the first layer and two nodes in the second layer. The system has two inputs ($q_1, q_2$), two states ($c_1, c_2$), and one output ($c_2$).

7.2.1. Problem formulation

pH neutralization is often performed in multiple mixing tanks in series to gradually increase or decrease the pH to the desired levels (Riggs & Rhinehart, 1990). The pH neutralization reaction is $H^+ + OH^- \rightarrow H_2O$ and the incoming stream can be either a base or an acid.

Here, our goal is to control the pH of an incoming acid stream of pH 3 using two tanks in series (Fig. 2a). We control the pH of that stream by using a base of pH 11. Mass balances of species $H^+$ and $OH^-$ in the tanks describe the time evolution of the species. Alternatively, the molar concentration of the excess acid in the ith tank of $c_i = C_{iH^+} - C_{iOH^-}$ is a conserved quantity without reaction terms (Faanes & Skogestad, 2004; Gustafsson et al., 1995). The first-principles equations that describe the process of two tanks in series are

$$
\frac{dc_1}{dt} = \frac{V_1}{V_1}(c_{in}q_{in} + c_0q_{b1} - c_1q_1),
\frac{dc_2}{dt} = \frac{V_2}{V_1}(c_1q_1 + c_2q_{b2} - c_2q_2),
$$

where $V_i$ is the volume, $c_{in}$ is the excess acid in the inlet stream, $q_{in}$ is the flowrate of the incoming acid stream, $q_{b1}$ is the flowrate of the base, $c_0$ is the excess acid in the base stream, $q_1$ is the outflow from the tank, and the subscript i refers to the quantity corresponding to the ith tank. The flowrate of the incoming acid stream $q_{in}$ is modeled as an unmeasured disturbance. The remaining variables are process parameters given in Table 3. The pH is related to the excess acid concentration by $pH = \log_{10}(c_1/20 + \sqrt{10^{-14} + c_1^2})$.

System identification was carried out by randomly perturbing the system inputs within their expected operating range and recording measurements every 1 s. The perturbations were uniform random sequences. Data obtained from simulations were used to train the two-layer neural network,

$$
x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k + B_0w_k + B_ppk + b_c,
q_k = Cq_{x_k} + Dqu_{uk} + Du_{wk} + D_{qg}ppk + dq_c,
\rho_{k,i} = \tanh(q_{k,i}),
$$

where

$$
x_k = [c_{1,k} \ c_{2,k}]^T, \ u_k = [q_{1,k} \ q_{2,k}]^T, \ w_k = q_{m,k}.
$$

To account for model-plant mismatch as would occur in a real experimental implementation, the physical plant is represented by the first-principles equations (78) under the presence of the unmeasured disturbance $q_{in}$. The pH is measured only at the outlet of the second tank, and a Gaussian random noise was assumed to act on the measurement of $c_{z,m} = c_2 + N^0(0, \sigma_{c_2})$, where the standard deviation $\sigma_{c_2}$ is computed through $\sigma_{c_2} = \frac{\text{peak}_{\text{exp}}}{\text{data}_{\text{rms}}}$. We consider $3\sigma_{\text{data}} = 0.05$, which is a realistic value for pH probe measurements (Anon, 2010).

The estimate of the first state $\hat{c}_{1,k}$ and the measurement of the second state $c_{z,m,k}$ were used in the feedback controller such that

$$
u_k = K[x_k \ I_k]^T, \ \hat{x}_k = [\hat{c}_{1,k} \ c_{2,m,k}]^T - r_k,
$$

where $r_k$ is the reference at sampling instance $k$. The estimate of the first state $\hat{c}_{1,k}$ is used in (80) since there is no available pH measurement in the first tank. The estimate will be inaccurate when an unmeasured disturbance is affecting the system. Then, the first tank will not be exactly controlled at setpoint. However, exact setpoint tracking is not required in the first tank, as its role is to dampen in the effects of disturbances so that exact setpoint tracking is achieved in the second tank. In (80), the measurement for the second state is used due to its higher accuracy compared to its corresponding observed value when model-plant mismatch is introduced. An observer-based PI controller was also implemented for comparison purposes. The observer was introduced in the PI controller to inform the value of the pH in the first tank. Lastly, the PI controller error was calculated from the pH measurement (or observed value) and not the excess acid.

7.2.2. Results and discussion

The stabilizing controller was obtained by solving the nonstrict version of LMI (27), $\text{SF} \leq 0$, implying Lyapunov stability. The observer that minimizes the upper bound for the $L_2$-gain of the output $c_2$ to the unmeasured disturbance $q_{in}$ was obtained from (74), resulting in $\gamma_{\text{data}} = 0.0034$. The results are given in Table 4 and Fig. 2. A stabilizing controller is not unique, which provides some extra degrees of freedom that can be used by the designer. The PI controller was tuned using the IMC method (Morari & Zafiriou, 1989) and the controller parameters are given in Table 4.

In the physical system, up to a 5% hourly pump drift can occur in the incoming acid stream flowrate disturbance. This upper bound is adjusted to 5-minute intervals as shown in Fig. 2b. Simultaneously to the unmeasured disturbance, the setpoints in the first and second tank were varied consecutively. The excess disturbance introduced in the second tank was tuned by trial and error to achieve a similar behavior.

![Fig. 1. Closed-loop system behavior during step changes in the setpoint and under the presence of unmeasured ramp disturbance. (a) Unmeasured disturbance. (b) Control input. (c) State 1. (d) State 2.](image-url)
setpoint in tank (Fig. 2f) compared to the PI controller. Deviations from the
based controller is slightly slower at tracking the pH in the first
tank. The PI controller results in large variations in the pH value
around pH 7. These variations could be resolved with different
tuning around that setpoint which would then result in worse
performance in other regions of the operation. This behavior
attests to the process’s strong nonlinearity.

8. Conclusions

This article describes design criteria for dynamic state feedback controllers and state and output observers with guaranteed properties for systems described by DANNs. Starting from an available DANN model of a dynamical process, the DANN is re-
formulated into a Luré system sector bounded in $[-1,1]$ and then controller and observer matrices are derived using Lyapunov theory and linear matrix inequalities. Two steps that may introduce conservatism in this approach are (1) reformulating the DANN as a Luré, i.e., going from formulation (5) to (8), and (2) implementing the S-procedure to obtain, for example, (30) from (21) and (29). Although these steps may introduce
conservatism, they have been applied to derive stability results in the literature and have given quantitatively useful results in our case studies. The theoretical results were applied to a numerical example and a case study for the control of a highly nonlinear process in which two base flows are used to control the pH of two tanks in series. The LMI-based controls had improved closed-loop performance compared to PI controllers in both case studies.
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Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>$\begin{bmatrix} 0.1685 &amp; 0 &amp; 200 &amp; 0 \ 0.1 &amp; 0.3426 &amp; 10 &amp; 1500 \end{bmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1</td>
<td>$L_1 = [-8.9 \times 10^{-5}]^T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 2</td>
<td>$L_2 = [10 \times 10^{-5}]^T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI controller</td>
<td>$K = [2.42 \times 10^{-4}, 4 \times 10^{-4}]^T$, $\tau = [0.0013, 0.004]^T$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acid $c_1$ tracks the setpoint (Fig. 2e) with some offset due to a small difference between the estimated and the true value of $c_1$ for both the LMI-based and PI controllers. As already mentioned, this off-
set is expected due to the unmeasured disturbance. Because the purpose of the first tank is to act as a disturbance dampener, zero offset is not a performance requirement for that tank. The LMI-
based controller is slightly slower at tracking the pH in the first
tank (Figs. 2eg) compared to the PI controller. Deviations from the
setpoint in $c_2$ are observed around the times when the setpoint
in the first tank changes (Fig. 2f). The deviations are bigger for

Fig. 2. Closed-loop system behavior during step changes in the setpoint and under the presence of unmeasured ramp disturbance in the incoming acid stream flow rate $q$. (a) pH-neutralization process flow diagram. (b) Unmeasured deviation in the incoming acid stream flow rate $q$. (c) Incoming base flow rate in tank 1. (d) Incoming base flow rate in tank 2. (e) Excess acid in tank 1. (f) Excess acid measurement in tank 2. (g) pH in tank 1. (h) pH measurement in tank 2.
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