Comments on " H_{∞} Output Feedback Control Design of Fuzzy Dynamic Systems Via LMI"¹⁾

BU Qing-Zhong MAO Jian-Qin

(The 7th Research Division, Beijing University of Aeronautics & Astronautics, Beijing 100083)

(E-mail: bubuaa@sina.com)

Abstract We point out a mistake and the incorrect conclusion of the paper " H_{∞} output feedback control design of fuzzy dynamic systems via LMI" in Acta Automatica Sinica 2001, 27(4). We also give the correction of the mistake.

Key words Fuzzy dynamic systems, H_{∞} output feedback control, linear matrix inequality (LMI), asymptotical stability

1 Introduction

In the paper " H_{∞} output feedback control design of fuzzy dynamic systems via LMI" in Acta Automatica Sinica 2001,27(4)^[1], the authors discussed the H_{∞} output feedback control problem for fuzzy dynamic systems. Unfortunately, the conclusion of its Theorem 2, which refers to asymptotical stability of H_{∞} output feedback control problem for fuzzy dynamic systems, is incorrect.

2 Description of the problem

The mistake of the paper is found in the proof of its Theorem 2 regarding the asymptotical stability of the closed loop system, where the following equation is used (see equ. (37) of [1]):

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{l}^{-1} \Delta \hat{A}_{l}^{T} \Delta \hat{A}_{l} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{l}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & C_{cl} \end{bmatrix}^{T} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta A_{l} & \Delta B_{l} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{T} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & B_{cl} \end{bmatrix}^{T} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & B_{cl} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta A_{l} & \Delta B_{l} \\ 0 & B_{cl} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & C_{cl} \end{bmatrix}$$
(1)

Directly calculating the right hand side of (1) yields

$$\varepsilon_{l}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & C_{cl} \end{bmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta A_{l} & \Delta B_{l} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & B_{cl} \end{bmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & B_{cl} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta A_{l} & \Delta B_{l} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & C_{cl} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta A_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta A_{l} & \Delta A_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta B_{l} C_{cl} \\ C_{cl}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta B_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta A_{l} & C_{cl}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta B_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta B_{l} C_{cl} \end{bmatrix} \tag{2}$$

However, since

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{l}^{-1} \Delta \hat{\boldsymbol{A}}_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta \hat{\boldsymbol{A}}_{l} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta A_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta A_{l} + \Delta C_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} B_{cl}^{\mathrm{T}} B_{cl} \Delta C_{l} & \Delta A_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta B_{l} C_{cl} \\ C_{cl}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta B_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta A_{l} & C_{cl}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta B_{l}^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta B_{l} C_{cl} \end{bmatrix}$$
(3)

it immediately follows from (2) and (3) that (1) is incorrect. Thus, the corresponding conclusion of Theorem 2 of [1] becomes untenable and, of course, should be corrected. In fact, from the above analysis it is easy to see that Theorem 2 of [1] is valid only when ΔC_l =0. It should also be pointed out that the simulation provided in [1] exactly satisfies this condition and thus does not reveal the limitation.

3 Correction of Theorem 2 of [1]

If we directly use the following estimate of $\Delta \hat{A}_i^T P_i + P_i \Delta \hat{A}_i$:

¹⁾ Supported by National Defense Research Project(J1600D001)

Received April 19, 2002; in revised form June 17, 2002

收稿日期 2002-04-19;收修改稿日期 2002-06-17

^{*} Dr. Feng Gang replied by E-mail: "I believe the comments are correct and we would like to thank the authors of the comments for their interest and for pointing out the errors of our paper."

$$\Delta \hat{A}_{l}^{T} P_{l} + P_{l} \Delta \hat{A}_{l} \leqslant \varepsilon_{l} P_{l} P_{l} + \varepsilon_{l}^{-1} \Delta \hat{A}_{l}^{T} \Delta \hat{A}_{l}$$

$$\tag{4}$$

then the term $\Delta C_l^T B_{cl}^T B_{cl} \Delta C_l$, which appears in (2) and leads to the incorrect conclusion in [1], will prevent us from further processing. Instead of using the method in [1], we can first decompose ΔA_i in (4) as follows:

$$\Delta \hat{A}_{l} = \Delta \hat{A}_{l1} + \Delta \hat{A}_{l2} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta A_{l} & \Delta B_{l}C_{cl} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ B_{cl}\Delta C_{l} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta A_{l} & \Delta B_{l} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & C_{cl} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & B_{cl} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \Delta C_{l} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(5)

Then using lemma 2 of [1], we can estimate $\Delta \hat{A}_{l1}^{T} P_{l} + P_{l} \Delta \hat{A}_{l1}$ and $\Delta \hat{A}_{l2}^{T} P_{l} + P_{l} \Delta \hat{A}_{l2}$, respectively, without introducing the term $\Delta C_l^{\mathrm{T}} B_{cl}^{\mathrm{T}} B_{cl} \Delta C_l$. Now we give a correction to Theorem 2 of [1] as follows.

Given a fuzzy dynamic system described as in (21) of [1], its feedback controller described as in (22) of [1], an approximate upper bound of the uncertainties of (21) of [1] defined by (29) of [1], and the H_{∞} performance bound $\gamma>0$ as a constant, if there exist a set of constants $\epsilon_{i1}>0$, $\epsilon_{i2}>0$, and a set of variables \bar{A}_l , \bar{B}_l , \bar{C}_l , \bar{E}_{l0} , \bar{E}_{l1} , \bar{E}_{l2} , X_l and Y_l satisfying the following inequalities:

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{1l} & M_{2l} \\ M_{2l}^T & M_{3l} \end{bmatrix} < 0, \begin{bmatrix} X_l & I \\ I & Y_l \end{bmatrix} > 0, P(\tau_i^+) \leqslant P(\tau_i^-), i = 1, 2, \dots, \overline{T}$$

where

$$\begin{split} M_{1l} &= \begin{bmatrix} \Omega_{l11} & \Omega_{l21}^{\mathsf{T}} \\ \Omega_{l21} & \Omega_{l22} \end{bmatrix} \\ M_{3l} &= \operatorname{diag} \left\{ -\epsilon_{l}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \overline{E}_{l1} & X_{l} \\ X_{l} & I \end{bmatrix}, -\epsilon_{l} \begin{bmatrix} I & Y_{l} \\ Y_{l} & \overline{E}_{l2} \end{bmatrix}, \frac{-\gamma^{2}I}{2}, \frac{-\gamma^{2}I}{2}, \frac{-I}{2}, \frac{-I}{2}, \frac{-I}{\epsilon_{l2}}, \frac{-I}{\epsilon_{l2}}, -\epsilon_{l2}I \right\} \\ M_{2l} &= \begin{bmatrix} X_{l} & I & \Omega_{l51}^{\mathsf{T}} & \overline{E}_{l0}^{\mathsf{T}} & B_{wl} & E_{Bwl} & (C_{ul}X_{l})^{\mathsf{T}} & (E_{Cul}X_{l})^{\mathsf{T}} & I & 0 & (E_{cl}X_{l})^{\mathsf{T}} \\ I & Y_{l} & E_{Al}^{\mathsf{T}} & (Y_{l}E_{Al})^{\mathsf{T}} & Y_{l}B_{wl} & Y_{l}E_{Bwl} & C_{zl}^{\mathsf{T}} & E_{Cl}^{\mathsf{T}} & Y_{l} & \overline{B}_{l} & E_{cl}^{\mathsf{T}} \end{bmatrix} \\ \Omega_{l11} &= A_{l}X_{l} + X_{l}A_{l}^{\mathsf{T}} + B_{l}\overline{C}_{l} + (B_{l}\overline{C}_{l})^{\mathsf{T}}, \Omega_{l22} &= A_{l}^{\mathsf{T}}Y_{l} + Y_{l}A_{l} + \overline{B}_{l}C_{l} - (\overline{B}_{l}C_{l})^{\mathsf{T}} \\ \Omega_{l21} &= \overline{A}_{l} + A_{l}^{\mathsf{T}}, \Omega_{l51} &= E_{Al}X_{l} + E_{Bl}\overline{C}_{l}, \ l &= 1, 2, \cdots, m \end{split}$$

then the closed loop system (23) of [1] is asymptotically stable with H_{∞} performance bound 7. Furthermore, if the matrices M_l and N_l are in the form of full rank decomposition

$$M_i N_i^{\mathrm{T}} = I - X_i Y_i$$

then a parameterization of H_∞ output feedback controller can be determined as

$$C_{cl} = \overline{C}_l M_l^{+^{\mathrm{T}}}$$
, $B_{cl} = N_l^+ \overline{B}_l$, $A_{cl} = N_l^+ (\overline{A}_l - (N_l B_{cl} C_l X_l + Y_l B_l C_{cl} M_l^{\mathrm{T}} + Y_l A_l X_l)) M_l^{+^{\mathrm{T}}}$ where M_l^+ and N_l^+ denote the Moore-Penrose general inverses of M_l and N_l , respectively.

Conclusion

In this note a possible careless mistake which leads to the incorrect conclusion of [1] is pointed out, and its correction is given.

There is much work that needs to be discussed for the problem of stability and performance of the closed system by using switching control. Some classical results have been discussed in detail in [2] and the related results and techniques in [3] and [4] are beneficial to this issue.

References

- Zhang Ning, Feng Gang. H_{∞} output feedback control design of fuzzy dynamic systems via LMI. Acta Automatica Sinica, $2001, 27(4): 495 \sim 509$
- Sun Zeng-Qi, Deng Zhi-Dong, Zhang Zai-Xing. Intelligent Control Theory and Technology. Beijing: Tsinghua University Press and Guangxi Science and Technology Press

- Cao S G, Rees N W, Feng G. Stability analysis and design for a class of continuous-time fuzzy control systems. International Journal of Control, 1996,64(6): 1069~1087
- 4 Feng G, Cao S G, Rees N W. An approach to H_{∞} control of a class of nonlinear systems. Automatica, 1996,32 (10): $1469 \sim 1474$

BU Qing-Zhong Received his master degree from Inner Mongolia University, P. R. China, in 1993. He is now a Ph. D. candidate in control theory and control engineering at Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics (BUAA). His research interests include robust control and intelligent control.

MAO Jian-Qin Fellow of IEE, Senior Member of IEEE, professor of Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics. Her current research interests include robust control and applications, modeling and control of the complex systems with applications by using computing intelligence, active vibration control based on the smart materials and smart structures, etc.

与"基于 LMI 的模糊动态系统 H。输出反馈控制设计"一文商榷

卜庆忠 毛剑琴

(北京航空航天大学第七研究室 北京 100083)

(E-mail: bubuaa@sina.com)

摘 要 本文指出了《自动化学报》2001年27卷4期上刊登的文章"基于LMI的模糊动态系统 H_{∞} 输出反馈控制设计"中某些结论的不妥之处,并给出了修改.

关键词 模糊动力系统, H_∞ 输出反馈控制,线性矩阵不等式(LMI),渐近稳定性中**图分类号** TP13