15th Triennial World Congress, Barcelona, Spain

STABILIZATION OF SINGULARLY PERTURBED SYSTEMS WITH DELAY: A LMI APPROACH

Emilia Fridman *

* *Dept. of Electrical Eng. - Systems, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel*
e-mail:emilia@eng.tau.ac.il

Abstract: For linear singularly perturbed system with delay sufficient conditions for stability for all small enough values of singular perturbation parameter ε are obtained in the general case, when delay and ε are independent. The sufficient delay-dependent conditions are given in terms of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) by applying an appropriate Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional. LMIs are derived by using a descriptor model transformation and Park's inequality for bounding cross terms. A memoryless state-feedback stabilizing controller is obtained. Numerical examples illustrate the effectiveness of the new theory. *Copyright C 2001 IFAC*

Keywords: singular perturbations, time-delay systems, stability, LMI, delay-dependent criteria

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well-known that if the ordinary differential system of equations is asymptotically stable, then this property is robust with respect to small delays (see e.g. El'sgol'ts and Norkin (1973), Hale and Lunel (1993)). Examples of the systems, where small delays change the stability of the system are given in Hale and Lunel (1999) (see also references therein). All these examples are infinite-dimensional systems, e.g. difference systems, neutral type systems with unstable difference operator or systems of partial differential equations. Another example of a system, sensitive to small delays, is a descriptor system . Recently a new example has been given of a finite dimensional system that may be destabilized by introduction of small delay in the loop (Fridman, 2002a). This is a singularly perturbed system. Consider the following simple example:

$$\varepsilon \dot{x}(t) = u(t), \quad u(t) = -x(t-h), \tag{1}$$

where $x(t) \in R$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small parameter. Eq. (1) is stable for $h = 0$, however for small delays $h = \varepsilon g$ with $g > \pi/2$ this system becomes unstable (see e.g. El'sgol'ts and Norkin (1973)).

Stability of singularly perturbed systems with delays has been studied in two cases: 1) h is proportional to ε and 2) ε and h are independent. The first case, being less general than the second one, is encountered in many publications (see e.g. Glizer and Fridman (2000) and references therein). The second case has been studied in the frequency domain in Luse (1987), Pan *et al.* (1996) (see also references therein). A Lyapunov-based approach to the problem leading to LMIs has been introduced in Fridman (2002a) for the general case of independent delay and ε. LMI conditions are only sufficient and, thus more conservative. However the method of LMIs is better (than the frequency domain methods) adapted for robust stability of systems with uncertainties and for other control problems (see e.g. Li and de Souza, 1997).

LMI stability conditions of Fridman (2002a) are based on the conservative model transformation of regular systems with delay used by many authors (see Li and de Souza, 1997; Kolmanovskii *et al.*, 1999 and references therein). The conservatism of Fridman (2002a) , as well as in the regular case (see e.g. Kharitonov and Melchor-Aguilar, 2000; Niculescu and Gu, 2001) is twofold: the transformed equation is not equivalent to the corresponding differential equation and the bounds placed upon cross terms are wasteful. Recently a new (equivalent to the original equation) model transformation - a descriptor one - has been introduced for stability analysis of regular systems with delay Fridman (2001). Moreover, a new bounding of the cross terms and new delay-dependent stability criterion have been obtained in Park (1999).

In the present paper we adopt the methods of Fridman (2001) and Park (1999) for constructing appropriate Lyapunov-Krasovskii functionals and deriving LMI stability conditions for singularly perturbed systems with delay in the case of independent delay and ε. We show that if a certain ε-independent LMI is feasible than the system is asymptotically stable for all small enough $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Moreover, given $\varepsilon > 0$ we obtain ε-dependent LMI conditions for stability. We construct an ε-independent state-feedback controller, that stabilizes the system for all small enough $\varepsilon \geq 0$, by solving ε-independent LMI. The latter LMI corresponds to the state-feedback stabilization of the corresponding descriptor system.

Notation: Throughout the paper the superscript 'T' stands for matrix transposition, $\mathcal{R}^n$ denotes the n dimensional Euclidean space with vector norm $|\cdot|$, $\mathcal{R}^{n\times m}$ is the set of $n \times m$ real matrices, and the notation $P > 0$, for $P \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times n}$ means that P is symmetric and positive definite. We also denote $x_t(\theta) = x(t+\theta)$ ($\theta \in [-h, 0]$).

2. LMI STABILITY CONDITIONS

2.1. Delay-dependent conditions for $\varepsilon > 0$. Given the following system:

$$E_\varepsilon \dot{x}(t) = A_0 x(t) + A_1 x(t-h), \tag{2}$$

where $x(t) = col\{x_1(t), x_2(t)\}$, $x_1(t) \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1}$, $x_2(t) \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2}$ is the system state vector, The matrix E_ε is given by

$$E_\varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon I_{n_2} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small parameter. The time delay $h > 0$ is assumed to be known. We took for simplicity one delay, but all the results are easily generalized for the case of any finite number of delays.

Denote $n \stackrel{\Delta}{=} n_1 + n_2$. The matrices A_0 and A_1 are constant $n \times n$ matrices of appropriate dimensions. The matrices in (2) have the following structure:

$$A_i = \begin{bmatrix} A_{i1} & A_{i2} \\ A_{i3} & A_{i4} \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 0, 1. \tag{4}$$

In this section we require A_{04} to be nonsingular.

Consider the fast system

$$\dot{x}_2(t) = A_{04} x_2(t) + A_{14} x_2(t-g), \quad g \in [0, \infty) \tag{5}$$

with characteristic equation

$$\Delta(\lambda) = \det(\lambda I - A_{04} - A_{14} e^{-\lambda g}). \tag{6}$$

A necessary condition for robust stability of (2) is given by

Lemma 1. (Fridman, 2002a) Let (2) is stable for all small enough ε and h. Then for all $g \geq 0$ characteristic equation (6) has no roots with positive real parts.

According to this lemma we derive criterion for asymptotic stability which is delay-independent in the fast variables and delay-dependent in the slow ones. Following (Fridman, 2002a) we represent (2) in the equivalent form:

$$\begin{aligned} &\dot{x}_1(t) = y(t), \\ &\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon \dot{x}_2(t) \\ y(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{03} + A_{13} & A_{04} \\ A_{01} + A_{11} & A_{02} \end{bmatrix} x(t) \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} A_{14} \\ A_{12} \end{bmatrix} x_2(t-h) - \begin{bmatrix} A_{13} \\ A_{11} \end{bmatrix} \int_{-h}^{0} y(t+s) ds. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The latter system can be represented in the form:

$$\bar{E}_\varepsilon \dot{\bar{x}}(t) = \bar{A}_0 \bar{x}(t) + \bar{A}_1 \bar{x}(t-h) - H \int_{-h}^{0} y(t+s) ds, \tag{8}$$

where

$$\bar{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ y \end{bmatrix}, \ \bar{E}_\varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon I_{n_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0_{n_1 \times n_1} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\bar{A}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{n_1} \\ A_{03} + A_{13} & A_{04} & 0 \\ A_{01} + A_{11} & A_{02} & -I_{n_1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

$$\bar{A}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_{14} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{12} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -A_{13} \\ -A_{11} \end{bmatrix}.$$

A Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional for the system (7) has the form:

$$V(t) = \bar{x}^T(t)\bar{E}_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon \bar{x}(t) + \int_{t-h}^{t} x_1^T(\tau) S\, x_1(\tau) d\tau + \int_{t-h}^{t} x_2^T(\tau) U\, x_2(\tau) d\tau + \int_{-h}^{0}\int_{t+\theta}^{t} y^T(s)[A_{13}^T \ A_{11}^T] R_3 \begin{bmatrix} A_{13} \\ A_{11} \end{bmatrix} y(s) ds d\theta \tag{10}$$

where P_ε has the structure of

$$P_\varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} P_{1\varepsilon} & 0 \\ P_2 & P_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_{1\varepsilon} = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & \varepsilon P_{12}^T \\ P_{12} & P_{13} \end{bmatrix} \tag{11}$$

with $P_{11} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, $P_{13} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $P_3 \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ and $0 < S \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, $0 < U \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $0 < R_3 \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$. The first term of (10) corresponds to the descriptor system, the second and the fourth terms - to the delay-dependent conditions with respect to x_1 and the third - to the delay-independent conditions with respect to x_2. For $\varepsilon = 0$ Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional of (10) corresponds to descriptor system of (8) with $\varepsilon = 0$ Fridman (2002b). We obtain the following:

Theorem 2. (i) Given $\varepsilon > 0$, $h > 0$, the system (2) is asymptotically stable if there exist matrices $P_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_1+n)\times(n_1+n)}$ of (11) $0 < P_{11} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, $0 < P_{13} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $P_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n}$, $P_3 \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ such that $E_\varepsilon P_{1\varepsilon} > 0$ and matrices $S = S^T \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, $U = U^T \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $W \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_1+n)\times(n_1+n)}$ and $R = R^T \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_1+n)\times(n_1+n)}$, that satisfy the following LMI:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Psi}_\varepsilon & hX & -W^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ A_{13} \\ A_{11} \end{bmatrix} & P_\varepsilon^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ A_{14} \\ A_{12} \end{bmatrix} \\ * & -hR & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & -S & 0 \\ * & * & * & -U \end{bmatrix} < 0, \tag{12}$$

where

$$X = W^T + P_\varepsilon^T,$$

$$\bar{\Psi}_\varepsilon = \Psi_\varepsilon + W^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ A_{13} & 0 & 0 \\ A_{11} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_{13}^T & A_{11}^T \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} W$$

and

$$\Psi_\varepsilon \triangleq P_\varepsilon^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{n_1} \\ A_{03} + A_{13} & A_{04} & 0 \\ A_{01} + A_{11} & A_{02} & -I_{n_1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{n_1} \\ A_{03} + A_{13} & A_{04} & 0 \\ A_{01} + A_{11} & A_{02} & -I_{n_1} \end{bmatrix}^T P_\varepsilon + \begin{bmatrix} S & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & U & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & h[0 \ A_{13}^T \ A_{11}^T] R \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ A_{13} \\ A_{11} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

(ii) Given $h > 0$, if there exists R_0 of (11) $0 < P_{11} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, $0 < P_{13} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $P_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n}$, $P_3 \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ and matrices $S = S^T \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, $U = U^T \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $W \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_1+n)\times(n_1+n)}$ and $R = R^T \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_1+n)\times(n_1+n)}$, such that (12) is feasible for $\varepsilon = 0$ then (2) is asymptotically stable for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 \le \bar{h} \le h$.

Proof (i) Differentiating the first term of (10) with respect to t we have:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\bar{x}^T(t)\bar{E}_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon \bar{x}(t) = 2\bar{x}^T(t) P_\varepsilon \bar{E}_\varepsilon \dot{\bar{x}}(t). \tag{14}$$

Substituting (7) into (14) and applying bounding of Park (1999) we obtain, similarly to Fridman (2002a) , Fridman and Shaked (2001), that if (12) holds, then $dV/dt < 0$ and (2) is internally stable.

(ii) If (12) is feasible for $\varepsilon = 0$, then it is feasible for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ and thus due to (i) (2) is asymptotically stable for these values of $\varepsilon > 0$. LMI (12) is convex with respect to h. Hence, if it is feasible for some h then it is feasible for all $0 \le \bar{h} < h$. □

2.2. Delay-dependent stability of the descriptor system. We will show that (12) for $\varepsilon = 0$ guarantees asymptotic stability of the descriptor system (2), where $\varepsilon = 0$. The following lemma will be useful:

Lemma 1 (Fridman, 2002b). Assume that the difference equation

$$\mathcal{D}x_t = x(t) + A_{04}^{-1} A_{14} x(t-g) = 0$$

is asymptotically stable, or equivalently Hale and Lunel (1993) assume that all the eigenvalues of $A_{04}^{-1} A_{14}$ are inside a unit circle. Then if there exist positive numbers α, β, γ and a continuous functional $V : C_{n+n_1}[-h, 0] \to \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$\beta|\phi_1(0)|^2 \le V(\phi) \le \gamma|\phi|^2, \quad \dot{V}(\phi) \le -\alpha|\phi(0)|^2, \tag{15}$$

and the function $\bar{V}(t) = V(\bar{x}_t)$ is absolutely continuous for $\bar{x}_t$ satisfying (7) with $\varepsilon = 0$, then (7) (and thus (2) with $\varepsilon = 0$) is asymptotically stable.

Consider the descriptor system (2) with $\varepsilon = 0$. If (12) holds for $\varepsilon = 0$, then the Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional of (10) with $\varepsilon = 0$ is nonnegative and has a negative-definite derivative. By Lemma 3 the latter guarantees the asymptotic stability of the descriptor system provided that all the eigenvalues of $A_{04}^{-1}A_{14}$ are inside a unit circle. We show next that (12) with $\varepsilon = 0$ yields the following inequality:

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{04}^T P_{13} + P_{13}A_{04} + U & P_{13}A_{14} \\ A_{14}^T P_{13} & -U \end{bmatrix} < 0, \qquad (16)$$

that guarantees the stability of the fast system (5) for all delays $g \geq 0$. Hence A_{04} is Hurwitz and all the eigenvalues of $A_{04}^{-1}A_{14}$ are inside a unit circle (Fridman, 2002a).

Lemma 4. If (12) with $\varepsilon = 0$ is feasible, then (16) is feasible, the fast system (5) is asymptotically stable for all delays $g \geq 0$, A_{04} is Hurwitz and all the eigenvalues of $A_{04}^{-1}A_{14}$ are inside a unit circle.

Proof. It is obvious from the requirement of $0 < P_{11}$, $0 < P_{13}$, and the fact that in (12) $-P_3 - P_3^T$ must be negative definite, that P_0 is nonsingular. Defining

$$P_0^{-1} = Q_0 = \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & 0 \\ Q_2 & Q_3 \end{bmatrix}, \; Q_1 = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & 0 \\ Q_{12} & Q_{13} \end{bmatrix}, \; (17)$$

where $Q_{11} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, $Q_{13} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $Q_{12} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ and $\Delta = diag\{Q, I_{2n+n_1}\}$ we multiply (12) by Δ^T and Δ on the left and on the right, respectively. Since the term (2,2) of the matrix is equal to zero, the latter inequality implies

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q_{13}A_{04}^T + A_{04}Q_{13} + Q_{13}UQ_{13} & A_{14} \\ Q_{13}A_{14}^T & -U \end{bmatrix} < 0 \qquad (18)$$

Multiplying (18) by $diag\{P_{13}, I_{n_2}\}$ from the left and the right we obtain (16). From (16) it follows that A_{04} is Hurwitz and all the eigenvalues of $A_{04}^{-1}A_{14}$ are inside a unit circle (Fridman, 2002a). □

From Theorem 2, Lemmas 3 and 4 we obtain

Corollary 5. Given $h > 0$, if there exists P_0 of (11) $0 < P_{11} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, $0 < P_{13} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $P_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n}$, $P_{12} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ and matrices $S = S^T \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1 \times n}$, $U = U^T \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $W \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_1+n)\times(n_1+n)}$ and $R = R^T \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_1+n)\times(n_1+n)}$, such that (12) is feasible for $\varepsilon = 0$ then (2) is asymptotically stable for all small enough $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \bar{h} \leq h$.

Remark 1. For stability of descriptor system (2) with $\varepsilon = 0$ it is sufficient to require feasibility of (12) for $\varepsilon = 0$ with $P_{11} > 0$, where P_{13} may be non-symmetric. Positivity of P_{13} guarantees stability of (2) for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$.

Example 1 Fridman (2002a). Consider the system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= x_2(t) + x_1(t-h), \\ \varepsilon\dot{x}_2 &= -x_2(t) + 0.5x_2(t-h) - 2x_1(t). \end{aligned} \qquad (19)$$

For $h = 0$ this system is asymptotically stable for all small enough ε since A1 and A2 hold. It is well-known (see e.g. Hale and Lunel, 1993) that the fast system $\dot{x}_2(t) = -x_2(t) + 0.5x_2(t-g)$ is asymptotically stable for all g. Thus necessary condition for robust stability with respect to small ε is satisfied. It was shown in Fridman (2002a) that the system is robustly asymptotically stable with respect to small ε and h and for $\varepsilon = 0.5$, $h = 0$ the system is unstable. The conditions of Fridman (2002a) are conservative. Thus for $\varepsilon = 0$ (19) is delay-independently stable (Fridman, 2002b), while LMI of Fridman (2002a) for $\varepsilon = 0$ is feasible only for $h \leq 0.44$.

Applying Theorem 2 we find that for $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.3$ the system is asymptotically stable for all delays, while for $\varepsilon = 0.4$ the system is asymptotically stable for $0 \leq h \leq 0.0048$ (compare with $0 \leq h \leq 0.001$ obtained in Fridman, 2002a). For $\varepsilon = 0.5$ LMI (12) is not feasible for $h \to 0$ since the system is unstable for $h = 0$. We see that the results of the present paper are essentially less conservative than those of Fridman (2002a). This is due to new (descriptor) model transformation of the system and Park's bounds of the cross terms.

2.2. Delay-independent condition

Theorem 6. . Given $\varepsilon \geq 0$ the system (2) is asymptotically stable for all $h \geq 0$ if there exist matrix P_ε of the form

$$P_\varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & \varepsilon P_2^T \\ P_2 & P_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

with $n_1 \times n_1$-matrix $P_1 > 0$ and $n_2 \times n_2$-matrix P_3 and $n \times n$ matrices $U = U^T$, $R = R^T$ that satisfy the following LMI:

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_\varepsilon^T A_0 + A_0^T P_\varepsilon + Q & P_\varepsilon^T A_1 \\ * & -U \end{bmatrix} < 0 \qquad (20)$$

If (20) is feasible for $\varepsilon = 0$, then system (2) is delay-independently asymptotically stable for all small enough $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

Proof is obtained by similar to Theorem 2 arguments by using Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional of the form

$$V(t) = x^T(t)E_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon x(t) + \int_{t-h}^{t} x^T(\tau)U x(\tau)d\tau . \qquad \square$$

Another delay-independent condition follows from Theorem 2. For

$$W = P_\varepsilon, \; R = \frac{\delta}{h} I_{2n}, \tag{21}$$

LMI (12) implies for $\delta \to 0^+$ the following delay-independent LMI:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Psi}_\varepsilon & P_\varepsilon^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ A_{13} \\ A_{11} \end{bmatrix} & P_\varepsilon^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ A_{14} \\ A_{12} \end{bmatrix} \\ * & -S & 0 \\ * & * & -U \end{bmatrix} < 0, \tag{22}$$

where

$$\bar{\Psi}_\varepsilon = P_\varepsilon^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{n_1} \\ A_{03} & A_{04} & 0 \\ A_{01} & A_{02} & -I_{n_1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{n_1} \\ A_{03} & A_{04} & 0 \\ A_{01} & A_{02} & -I_{n_1} \end{bmatrix}^T P_\varepsilon$$
$$+ \begin{bmatrix} S & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & U & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If LMI (22) is feasible then (12) is feasible for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ and W and R given by (21). Thus, from Theorem 2 the following corollary follows:

Corollary 7. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, system (2) is asymptotically stable for all $g \geq 0, h \geq 0$, if there exist $0 < P_1 = P_1^T$, P_2, P_3, and $Q = Q^T$, $S = S^T$, that satisfy (22).

3. DELAY-DEPENDENT ROBUST STABILIZATION BY MEMORYLESS STATE-FEEDBACK

We apply the results of the previous section to the stabilization problem. Given the system

$$E_\varepsilon \dot{x}(t) = A_0 x(t) + A_1 x(t-h) + B_2 u(t), \tag{23}$$

where E_ε is defined by (3). In this section we do not assume that A_{04} is nonsingular. Similarly to the case without delay ($A_1 = 0$), we call such a system as a *non-standard* singularly perturbed system. In the case of singular A_{04} open-loop system (23), where $\varepsilon = 0$, without delay, i.e. with $A_1 = 0$, have index more than one (see e.g. Dai, 1989). Hence, index of system (23) with $u = 0$ and with delay, which is defined in Fridman (2002b) to be equal to the index of (23) with $A_1 = 0$, is higher than one. Such a system have an impulse solution (Fridman, 2002b). The non-singularity of A_{04} guarantees the existence and the uniqueness of solution to initial value problem for (23) with $u = 0$ (Fridman, 2002b).

We look for the state-feedback ε-independent gain matrix K which, via the control law

$$u(t) = K x(t), \quad K = [K_1, K_2] \tag{24}$$

stabilizes system (23) for all small enough ε. We derive delay-dependent conditions since they are less conservative. Substituting (24) into (23), we obtain the structure of (2) with $A_0 + B_2 K$ instead of A_0. In order to obtain an LMI we have to restrict ourselves to the case of $W_0 = \delta P_0$, where $\delta \in \mathcal{R}^{(n+n_1)\times(n+n_1)}$ is a diagonal matrix. Note that for $\delta = -I$ (12) yields the delay-independent condition of Corollary 7. As it was mentioned in the proof of Lemma , P_0 is nonsingular. Defining $P_0^{-1} = Q_0$ by (17) and $\Delta = diag\{Q, I_{2n+n_1}\}$ we multiply (12) by Δ^T and Δ, on the left and on the right, respectively. Applying the Schur formula to the quadratic term and denoting $KQ = Y$ we obtain the following:

Theorem 8. Consider the system of (23), (3). The state-feedback law of (24) asymptotically stabilizes (23), (3) for all small enough $\varepsilon \geq 0$ if for some prescribed diagonal matrix $\delta \in \mathcal{R}^{(n+n_1)\times(n+n_1)}$, there exist $0 < Q_1 \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times n}$, $0 < \bar{S} = S^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1\times n_1}$, $0 < \bar{U} = U^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}^{n_2\times n_2}$, $Q_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1\times n}$ and $Q_3 \in \mathcal{R}^{n_1\times n_1}$ of (17), $0 < \bar{R} = R^{-1} \in \mathcal{R}^{(n+n_1)\times(n+n_1)}$, $Y \in \mathcal{R}^{\ell\times n}$ that satisfy

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Xi_1 + \Xi_2 & h(\delta + I)\bar{R} & \delta \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ A_{13} \\ A_{11} \end{bmatrix} \bar{S} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ A_{14} \\ A_{12} \end{bmatrix} \bar{U} & Q^T \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & Q^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_{n_2} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & hQ^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_{13}^T & A_{11}^T \end{bmatrix} \\ * & -h\bar{R} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & -\bar{S} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & -\bar{U} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & -\bar{S} & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & * & -\bar{U} & 0 \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & -h\bar{R} \end{bmatrix} < 0, \tag{25}$$

where

$$
\Xi_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{n_1} \\ A_{03} + (I+\delta)A_{13} & A_{04} & 0 \\ A_{01} + (I+\delta)A_{11} & A_{02} & -I_{n_1} \end{bmatrix} Q
+ Q^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{n_1} \\ A_{03} + (I+\delta)A_{13} & A_{04} & 0 \\ A_{01} + (I+\delta)A_{11} & A_{02} & -I_{n_1} \end{bmatrix}^T ,
$$

$$
\Xi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix} [Y \; 0_{n_1}] + \begin{bmatrix} Y^T \\ 0_{n_1} \end{bmatrix} [0 \; B_2^T]
$$

The state-feedback gain is then given by $K = YQ_1^{-1}$.

The LMI in Theorems 2 and 8 are affine in the system matrices. They can thus be applied also to the case where these matrices are uncertain and are known to reside within a given polytope.

Example 2: We consider the system

$$
E_\varepsilon \dot{x}(t) = A_1 x(t-h) + Bu(t), \tag{26}
$$

where

$$
E_\varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} -0.5 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.
$$

Note that in this example $A_{04} = 0$. Applying Theorem 8 for e.g. $h = 1$ we find the stabilizing state-feedback $u = Kx$, where $K = [42.4 \; -19401]$. Applying next Theorem 2 to the closed loop system (26), $u = Kx$, we verify that the closed-loop system is asymptotically stable for $h \leq 1.39$ and all $\varepsilon \geq 0$. For $h = 1.4$ LMIs of these theorems are not feasible for all values of $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

4. CONCLUSIONS

A LMI solution is proposed for the problem of stability and robust state-feedback stabilization of linear time-invariant singularly perturbed systems with delay. An advantage of the new method that, unlike conventional singularly perturbed methods (see e.g. Kokotovic *et al.*, 1986), it gives sufficient conditions for stability for prechosen $\varepsilon > 0$ in terms of ε-dependent LMI. A new less conservative criterion than in (Fridman 2002a) for stability is derived. It is based on the new Lyapunov function of Fridman (2001).

References

Dai, L. (1989) Singular Control Systems, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

El'sgol'ts, L. and S. Norkin (1973). Introduction to the theory and applications of differential equations with deviating arguments, Mathematics in Science and Engineering, **105**, Academic Press, New York.

E. Fridman, (2001). New Lyapunov-Krasovskii functionals for stability of linear retarded and neutral type systems, *Systems & Control Letters*, **43**, 309-319.

E. Fridman, (2002a). Effects of small delays on stability of singularly perturbed systems, *Automatica*, **38**, no. 5.

E. Fridman, (2002b). Stability of linear descriptor systems with delay: a Lyapunov-based approach, to appear in *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*

Fridman, E. and U. Shaked, (2002). A descriptor system approach to H_∞ control of linear time-delay systems, *IEEE Trans. on Automat. Contr.*, **47**, no. 2.

Glizer. V. and E. Fridman, (2000). H_∞ control of linear singularly perturbed systems with small state delay, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **250**, 49-85.

Gu, K. and S-I. Niculescu, (2001). Further remarks on additional dynamics in various model transformations of linear delay systems, *IEEE Trans. on Automat. Contr.*, **46**, 3, 497-500.

Hale, J. and S. Lunel, (1993). *Introduction to functional differential equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

Hale, J. and S. Lunel, (1999). Effects of small delays on stability and control, *Rapport nr. WS-528*, Vrije University, Amsterdam.

Kharitonov, V. and D. Melchor-Aguilar, (2000). On delay-dependent stability conditions, Systems & Control Letters, **40**, 71-76.

Kokotovic, P., Khalil, H. and J. O'Reilly, (1986). *Singular Perturbation Methods in Control : Analysis and Design.* Academic Press, New York.

Kolmanovskii, V., Niculescu, S. I. and J. P. Richard, (1999). On the Liapunov-Krasovskii functionals for stability analysis of linear delay systems. *Int. J. Control*, **72**, 374-384.

Li, X and C. de Souza, (1997). Criteria for robust stability and stabilization of uncertain linear systems with state delay, *Automatica*, **33**, 1657-1662.

D. W. Luse, (1987). Multivariable singularly perturbed feedback systems with time delay. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, **32**, 990-994.

Pan, S.-T., Hsiao, F-H. and C-C. Teng , (1996). Stability bound of multiple time delay singularly perturbed systems, *Electronic Letters*, **32**, 1327-1328.

Park, P. (1999). A Delay-Dependent Stability Criterion for Systems with Uncertain Time-Invariant Delays, *IEEE Trans. on Automat. Control*, **44**, 876-877.