

# Sub-predictors and classical predictors for finite-dimensional observer-based control of parabolic PDEs

Rami Katz and Emilia Fridman, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—We study constant input delay compensation by using finite-dimensional observer-based controllers in the case of the 1D heat equation. We consider Neumann actuation with nonlocal measurement and employ modal decomposition with  $N+1$  modes in the observer. We introduce a chain of  $M$  sub-predictors that leads to a closed-loop ODE system coupled with infinite-dimensional tail. Given an input delay  $r$ , we present LMI stability conditions for finding  $M$  and  $N$  and the resulting exponential decay rate and prove that the LMIs are always feasible for any  $r$ . We also consider a classical observer-based predictor and show that the corresponding LMI stability conditions are feasible for any  $r$  provided  $N$  is large enough. A numerical example demonstrates that the classical predictor leads to a lower-dimensional observer. However, it is known to be hard for implementation due to the distributed input signal.

**Index Terms**—Distributed parameter systems, observer-based control, time-delay

## I. INTRODUCTION

Finite-dimensional observer-based controllers for parabolic systems were designed by the modal decomposition approach in [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. Recently, the first constructive LMI-based method for finite-dimensional observer-based controller was suggested in [6] for the 1D heat equation under nonlocal or Dirichlet actuation and nonlocal measurement. The observer dimension  $N$  and the resulting exponential decay rate were found from simple LMI conditions. Finite-dimensional observer-based control of the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation with boundary actuation and point measurement was studied in [7].

Robustness with respect to small delays and/or sampling intervals for the heat equation was studied in [8], [9] for distributed static output-feedback control, in [10] for boundary state-feedback and in [11], [12] for boundary controller based on PDE observer. Delayed implementation of finite-dimensional observer-based controllers for the 1D heat equation was introduced in [13], where in case of time-varying output delay, a combination of Lyapunov functionals with Halanay's inequality appeared to be an efficient tool.

To compensate large input/output delay, there are two main predictor methods: the classical predictor, which is based on a reduction approach [14] or the backstepping approach [15] and sub-predictors or chain of observers [16], [17], [18], [19]. The classical predictors for state-feedback control of PDEs were suggested in [15], [20], [21]. For the heat equation,

a PDE sub-predictor (an observer of the future state) was presented in [11]. A chain of observers for the estimation of heat equation with a large output delay was designed in [22].

In the recent paper [23], reduced-order LMI stability conditions were introduced for finite-dimensional observer-based control. This was presented for the heat equation with Neumann actuation and non-local measurement. The dimension of the LMIs does not grow with the dimension of the observer  $N$ . Moreover, feasibility of the LMIs for  $N$  implies their feasibility for  $N+1$ . In [23], the classical predictor was extended to finite-dimensional observer-based control. This predictor compensated delay in the finite-dimensional controller, whereas the infinite-dimensional part still depended on the large input delay. It was shown in a numerical example that the predictor allows for larger delays. However, the feasibility of LMIs for arbitrary delays was not proved due to complexity of the analysis in the presence of time-varying output delay.

The present paper is dedicated to predictor methods for finite-dimensional observer-based control of parabolic PDEs with constant input delay  $r$ . As in [23], we consider the 1D heat equation under Neumann actuation and non-local measurement. The main novelty is in use of sub-predictors for such a system. We show that for any  $r$  there exists a chain of  $M$  sub-predictors and a large enough number of modes  $N+1$  employed in observer that guarantee the stability of the closed-loop system. We present LMI stability conditions for finding  $M$ ,  $N$  and the resulting exponential decay rate. We prove that these LMIs are always feasible for all  $r$  and large enough  $M$  and  $N$ . We also consider the classical predictor which compensates the delay in the finite-dimensional part, as introduced in [23] (if the time-varying input/output delays are omitted). **This is the first time that feasibility guarantees for the resulting LMIs with arbitrary delays are proved for both sub-predictors and predictors. This proof is challenging, due to coupling in the closed-loop system.** A numerical example demonstrates that for the same  $N$ , the classical predictor allows larger delays found from the LMIs, whereas for the same delay they employ lower-dimensional observers than the sub-predictors. However, as is well-known [24], [25], [26], they are harder to implement, due to the distributed input term which should be carefully discretized. **This paper is an essential step towards the use of sub-predictors and classical predictors for delay compensation in PDEs, via finite-dimensional observers.**

*Notations and preliminaries:*  $L^2(0, 1)$  is the Hilbert space of Lebesgue measurable and square integrable functions

Supported by Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 673/19) and by Chana and Heinrich Manderman Chair at Tel Aviv University.

R. Katz (rami@benis.co.il) and E. Fridman (emilia@eng.tau.ac.il) are with the School of Electrical Engineering, Tel Aviv University, Israel.

$f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with the inner product  $\langle f, g \rangle := \int_0^1 f(x)g(x)dx$  and induced norm  $\|f\|^2 := \langle f, f \rangle$ .  $H^1(0, 1)$  is the space of functions  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with square integrable weak derivative, with the norm  $\|f\|_{H^1}^2 := \sum_{j=0}^1 \|f^{(j)}\|^2$ . The Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $|\cdot|$ . For  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $P > 0$  means that  $P$  is symmetric and positive definite. The sub-diagonal elements of a symmetric matrix will be denoted by  $*$ .  $\otimes$  is the standard Kronecker product. For  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $U > 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  let  $|x|_U^2 = x^T U x$ .  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is the set of nonnegative integers.

Recall that the Sturm-Liouville eigenvalue problem

$$\phi'' + \lambda \phi = 0, \quad x \in [0, 1], \quad \phi'(0) = \phi'(1) = 0, \quad (1)$$

induces a sequence of eigenvalues  $\lambda_n = n^2 \pi^2, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  with corresponding eigenfunctions

$$\phi_0(x) = 1, \quad \phi_n(x) = \sqrt{2} \cos(\sqrt{\lambda_n} x), \quad n \geq 1. \quad (2)$$

The eigenfunctions form a complete orthonormal system in  $L^2(0, 1)$ . Given  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $h \in L^2(0, 1)$  satisfying  $h \stackrel{L^2}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} h_n \phi_n$  we denote  $\|h\|_N^2 = \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} h_n^2$ .

## II. SUB-PREDICTORS VS CLASSICAL PREDICTORS

We consider the PDE

$$\begin{aligned} z_t(x, t) &= z_{xx}(x, t) + qz(x, t), \quad x \in [0, 1], \quad t \geq 0, \\ z_x(0, t) &= 0, \quad z_x(1, t) = u(t - r) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

under delayed Neumann actuation with known delay  $r$  and non-local measurement

$$y(t) = \langle c, z(\cdot, t) \rangle, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (4)$$

with  $c \in L^2(0, 1)$ . To compensate the delay, we will present in this section both sub-predictors and classical predictors.

Using modal decomposition, we present the solution to (3) as

$$z(x, t) \stackrel{L^2}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z_n(t) \phi_n(x), \quad z_n(t) = \langle z(\cdot, t), \phi_n \rangle \quad (5)$$

with  $\phi_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  given in (2). Differentiating under the integral, integrating by parts and using (1) and (2) we obtain (similar to [10] and the references therein)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_n(t) &= (-\lambda_n + q)z_n(t) + b_n u(t - r), \quad t \geq 0 \\ b_0 &= 1, \quad b_n = (-1)^n \sqrt{2}, \quad n \geq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Let  $\delta > 0$  be a desired decay rate. Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = \infty$ , there exists some  $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that

$$-\lambda_n + q < -\delta, \quad n > N_0. \quad (7)$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \text{diag} \{-\lambda_0 + q, \dots, -\lambda_{N_0} + q\}, \\ L_0 &= [l_0, \dots, l_{N_0}]^T, \quad B_0 := [b_0 \quad \dots \quad b_{N_0}]^T \\ C_0 &= [c_0, \dots, c_{N_0}], \quad c_n = \langle c, \phi_n \rangle, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Assume that

$$c_n \neq 0, \quad 0 \leq n \leq N_0. \quad (9)$$

Then  $(A_0, C_0)$  is observable, by the Hautus lemma. We choose  $L_0 = [l_0, \dots, l_{N_0}]^T$  which satisfies the following Lyapunov inequality:

$$P_0(A_0 - L_0 C_0) + (A_0 - L_0 C_0)^T P_0 < -2\delta P_0, \quad (10)$$

where  $0 < P_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_0+1) \times (N_0+1)}$ .

Similarly, by the Hautus lemma,  $b_n \neq 0, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  implies that  $(A_0, B_0)$  is controllable. Let  $K_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (N_0+1)}$  satisfy

$$P_c(A_0 - B_0 K_0) + (A_0 - B_0 K_0)^T P_c < -2\delta P_c, \quad (11)$$

where  $0 < P_c \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_0+1) \times (N_0+1)}$ .

In our finite-dimensional observer-based predictor design, the closed-loop system will be presented as a coupled system of ODEs and the infinite-dimensional tail. This complicates the proof of stabilization for all  $r > 0$  under higher-dimensional observers.

Given  $N \geq N_0$  denote

$$\begin{aligned} z^{N_0}(t) &= \text{col} \{z_i\}_{i=0}^{N_0}, \quad \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) = \text{col} \{\hat{z}_i\}_{i=N_0+1}^N, \\ A_1 &= \text{diag} \{-\lambda_{N_0+1} + q, \dots, -\lambda_N + q\}, \\ B_1 &= [b_{N_0+1}, \dots, b_N]^T, \quad C_1 = [c_{N_0+1}, \dots, c_N]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

### A. Sub-predictors

In order to deal with a large delay  $r$ , we subdivide  $r$  into  $M$  parts of equal size  $\frac{r}{M}$ , where  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_+, M \geq 1$ . We first consider  $M \geq 2$  and employ a chain of sub-predictors (observers of the future state)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{z}_1^{N_0}(t-r) &\mapsto \dots \mapsto \hat{z}_i^{N_0}(t - \frac{M-i+1}{M}r) \mapsto \dots \\ &\mapsto \hat{z}_M^{N_0}(t - \frac{1}{M}r) \mapsto z^{N_0}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Here  $\hat{z}_i^{N_0}(t - \frac{M-i+1}{M}r) \mapsto \hat{z}_{i+1}^{N_0}(t - \frac{M-i}{M}r)$  means that  $\hat{z}_i^{N_0}(t)$  predicts the value of  $\hat{z}_{i+1}^{N_0}(t + \frac{r}{M})$ . Similarly,  $\hat{z}_M^{N_0}(t)$  predicts the value of  $z^{N_0}(t + \frac{r}{M})$ . The sub-predictors satisfy the following ODEs for  $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{z}}_M^{N_0}(t) &= A_0 \hat{z}_M^{N_0}(t) + B_0 u(t - \frac{M-1}{M}r) \\ &\quad - L_0 \left[ C_0 \hat{z}_M^{N_0}(t - \frac{r}{M}) + C_1 \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) - y(t) \right], \\ \dot{\hat{z}}_i^{N_0}(t) &= A_0 \hat{z}_i^{N_0}(t) + B_0 u(t - \frac{i-1}{M}r) \\ &\quad - L_0 C_0 \left[ \hat{z}_i^{N_0}(t - \frac{r}{M}) - \hat{z}_{i+1}^{N_0}(t) \right], \quad 1 \leq i \leq M-1, \\ \hat{z}_i^{N_0}(t) &= 0, \quad t \leq 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq M, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

whereas  $\hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t)$  satisfies the following ODE

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{z}}^{N-N_0}(t) &= A_1 \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) + B_1 u(t - r), \\ \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) &= 0, \quad t \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The finite-dimensional observer  $\hat{z}(x, t)$  of the state  $z(x, t)$ , based on  $(M-1)(N_0+1) + N + 1$ -dimensional system of ODEs (14)-(15), is given by

$$\hat{z}(x, t) = \hat{z}_1^{N_0}(t-r) \cdot \text{col} \{ \phi_0(x), \dots, \phi_{N_0}(x) \} + \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) \cdot \text{col} \{ \phi_{N_0+1}(x), \dots, \phi_N(x) \}. \quad (16)$$

The controller is further chosen as

$$u(t) = -K_0 \hat{z}_1^{N_0}(t). \quad (17)$$

In particular, (14) implies  $u(t) = 0$  for  $t \leq 0$ .

For well-posedness we introduce the change of variables  $w(x,t) = z(x,t) - \frac{1}{2}x^2u(t-r)$ . Then, the closed-loop system is presented as

$$\begin{aligned} w_t(x,t) &= w_{xx}(x,t) + qw(x,t) + f(x,t), \quad x \in [0,1], \quad t \geq 0, \\ w_x(0,t) &= 0, \quad w_x(1,t) = 0, \\ f(x,t) &= -\frac{1}{2}x^2\dot{u}(t-r) + \left(\frac{q}{2}x^2 + 1\right)u(t-r), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

the ODEs (14) and (17). Let  $z(\cdot, 0) = w(\cdot, 0) \in H^1(0, 1)$ . We apply the step method on  $\{[jr, (j+1)r]\}_{j=0}^\infty$ . For  $t \in [0, r]$  we have that  $f(x, t) \equiv 0$ . By Theorems 6.3.1 and 6.3.3 in [27], (18) has a unique classical solution  $z = w \in C([0, r], L^2(0, 1)) \cap C^1((0, r], L^2(0, 1))$  such that  $w(\cdot, t) \in H^2(0, 1)$  with  $w_x(0, t) = w_x(1, t) = 0$  for  $t \in (0, r]$ . Furthermore, since  $u(t-r) \equiv 0$  for  $t \in [0, r]$ , (15) implies that  $\hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) \in C^1[0, r]$ . Since  $y \in C[0, r]$ , considering (14) on the subintervals  $\left\{ \left[ \frac{j}{M}r, \frac{(j+1)}{M}r \right] \right\}_{j=0}^{M-1}$ , it can be seen that  $\hat{z}_i^{N_0} \in C^1[0, r]$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq M$ . Furthermore,  $\hat{z}_1^{N_0}$  is Lipschitz for  $t \in [0, r]$ . Next, we consider  $t \in [r, 2r]$ . Since  $\hat{z}_1^{N_0}(t) \in C^1[0, r]$ , with  $\hat{z}_1^{N_0}(t)$  Lipschitz on  $[0, r]$ , we have that  $f(x, t)$  is Lipschitz on  $[r, 2r]$ . By Theorems 6.3.1 and 6.3.3 in [27], (18) has a unique classical solution for  $t \in [r, 2r]$ . Continuing step-by-step and using  $z(x, t) = w(x, t) + \frac{1}{2}x^2u(t-r)$ , (3) has a unique solution  $z \in C([0, \infty), L^2(0, 1)) \cap C^1((0, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{J}, L^2(0, 1))$ , where  $\mathcal{J} = \left\{ \frac{jr}{M} \right\}_{j=0}^\infty$ . Moreover,  $z(\cdot, t) \in H^2(0, 1)$  with  $z_x(0, t) = 0$ ,  $z_x(1, t) = u(t-r)$  for  $t \in [0, \infty)$ .

Define the estimation errors for  $1 \leq i \leq M-1$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{N-N_0}(t) &= \text{col} \{ z_{N_0+1}(t), \dots, z_N(t) \} - \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t), \\ e_M^{N_0}(t) &= z^{N_0}(t) - \hat{z}_M^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right), \\ e_i^{N_0}(t) &= \hat{z}_{i+1}^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{M-i}{M}r\right) - \hat{z}_i^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{M-i+1}{M}r\right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

From (14) and (19) we have

$$\hat{z}_1^{N_0}(t-r) + \sum_{i=1}^M e_i^{N_0}(t) = z^{N_0}(t). \quad (20)$$

In particular, if the errors  $e_i^{N_0}(t)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq M$  converge to zero, we have  $\hat{z}_1^{N_0}(t) \rightarrow z^{N_0}(t+r)$ , meaning that  $\hat{z}_1^{N_0}(t)$  sequentially forecasts the future system state  $z^{N_0}(t+r)$ . Using (4), (8) and (19), the innovation term in the ODE for  $\hat{z}_M^{N_0}(t)$  (see (14)), can be presented as

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 \hat{z}_M^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) + C_1 \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) - y(t) \\ = -C_0 e_M^{N_0}(t) - C_1 e^{N-N_0}(t) - \zeta(t), \\ \zeta(t) = \sum_{n=N+1}^\infty c_n z_n(t). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have

$$\zeta^2(t) \leq \|c\|_N^2 \sum_{n=N+1}^\infty z_n^2(t). \quad (22)$$

Using (6), (14) and (21) we obtain the following dynamics of the estimation errors for  $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e}_M^{N_0}(t) &= A_0 e_M^{N_0}(t) - L_0 C_0 e_M^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) \\ &\quad - L_0 C_1 e^{N-N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) - L_0 \zeta\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right), \\ \dot{e}_{M-1}^{N_0}(t) &= A_0 e_{M-1}^{N_0}(t) - L_0 C_0 e_{M-1}^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) \\ &\quad + L_0 C_0 e_M^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) + L_0 C_1 e^{N-N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) \\ &\quad + L_0 \zeta\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right), \\ \dot{e}_i^{N_0}(t) &= A_0 e_i^{N_0}(t) - L_0 C_0 e_i^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) \\ &\quad + L_0 C_0 e_{i+1}^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right), \quad 1 \leq i \leq M-2 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

and

$$e^{N-N_0}(t) = A_1 e^{N-N_0}(t). \quad (24)$$

From (6), (17) and (20),  $z^{N_0}(t)$  satisfies

$$\dot{z}^{N_0}(t) = (A_0 - B_0 K_0) z^{N_0}(t) + B_0 K_0 \sum_{i=1}^M e_i^{N_0}(t). \quad (25)$$

We introduce the notations

$$\begin{aligned} X_e(t) &= \text{col} \left\{ e_i^{N_0}(t) \right\}_{i=1}^M, \quad v_e(t) = X_e\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) - X_e(t), \\ F_e &= \text{diag} \{ I_{M-1} \otimes (A_0 - L_0 C_0) + J_{M-1}(0) \otimes L_0 C_0, A_0 - L_0 C_0 \}, \\ G_e &= \text{diag} \{ I_{M-1} \otimes (-L_0 C_0) + J_{M-1}(0) \otimes L_0 C_0, -L_0 C_0 \}, \\ \mathcal{L}_e &= \text{col} \{ 0_{(M-2)(N_0+1) \times 1}, L_0, -L_0 \}, \\ \mathcal{K}_e &= [K_0, \dots, K_0] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times M(N_0+1)} \end{aligned}$$

Where  $J_{M-1}(0)$  is a Jordan block of order  $M-1$  with zero diagonal. Note that (24) implies  $e^{N-N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) = e^{-A_1 \frac{r}{M}} e^{N-N_0}(t)$ . Then, using (6), (17), (23) and (25), the reduced-order (i.e., decoupled from  $\hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t)$ ) closed-loop system can be presented as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}^{N_0}(t) &= (A_0 - B_0 K_0) z^{N_0}(t) + B_0 \mathcal{K}_e X_e(t) \\ \dot{X}_e(t) &= F_e X_e(t) + G_e v_e(t) + \mathcal{L}_e \zeta\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{L}_e C_1 e^{-A_1 \frac{r}{M}} e^{N-N_0}(t), \\ \dot{z}_n(t) &= (-\lambda_n + q) z_n(t) - b_n K_0 z^{N_0}(t) \\ &\quad + b_n \mathcal{K}_e X_e(t), \quad n > N. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

In the case  $M=1$ ,  $\hat{z}^{N_0}(t)$  satisfies the first ODE in (14) and predicts  $z^{N_0}(t+r)$ . Here  $X_e(t) = e_1^{N_0}(t)$  and the closed-loop system has the form (24) and (26), where now

$$F_e = A_0 - L_0 C_0, \quad G_e = -L_0 C_0, \quad \mathcal{K}_e = K_0, \quad \mathcal{L}_e = -L_0.$$

Differently from the existing finite-dimensional controllers [6], [13], where the closed-loop systems is written in terms of the observer and the tail  $z_n(t)$  ( $n > N$ ), here (26) is presented in terms of the state  $z^{N_0}(t)$ , the estimation errors  $X_e(t)$  and the tail. This allows to eliminate the delay  $r$  from the ODEs of  $z^{N_0}(t)$  and  $z_n(t)$ ,  $n > N$  while decreasing it to  $\frac{r}{M}$  (which is small for large  $M$ ) in the ODE of  $X_e(t)$ .

**Remark 1:** In the case of sub-predictors for linear ODEs, the closed-loop system is given by (23) and (25), where  $\zeta = 0$  and  $e^{N-N_0} = 0$ . Thus, exponential stability of

$$\dot{e}_M^{N_0}(t) = (A_0 - L_0 C_0) e_M^{N_0}(t) - L_0 C_0 v_{e,M}(t), \quad (27)$$

where  $v_{e,M}(t) = e_M^{N_0}\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) - e_M^{N_0}(t)$ , guarantees the stability of the closed-loop system due to ISS of  $e_i^{N_0}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq M-1$ ) systems with respect to  $e_{i+1}^{N_0}$ . This is different from the infinite-dimensional closed-loop system (26), where the finite-dimensional part of the system is coupled via  $\zeta(t)$  with infinite-dimensional tail  $z_n(n > N)$ . Here the proof of stabilization for any delay  $r > 0$  provided  $M$  and  $N$  are large enough becomes challenging.

For  $L^2$ -stability analysis of (24) and (26) we define the Lyapunov functional

$$\begin{aligned} V(t) &:= V_0(t) + V_e(t) + V_Q(t) + p_e |e^{N-N_0}(t)|^2, \\ V_0(t) &= |z^{N_0}(t)|_{P_0}^2 + \sum_{n=N+1}^\infty z_n^2(t), \\ V_Q(t) &= Q \int_{t-\frac{r}{M}}^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} \zeta^2(s) ds, \\ V_e(t) &= |X_e(t)|_{P_e}^2 + V_{S_e, X_e}(t) + V_{R_e, X_e}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Here  $0 < P_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_0+1) \times (N_0+1)}$ ,  $0 < Q, p_e \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $0 < P_e \in \mathbb{R}^{M(N_0+1) \times M(N_0+1)}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} V_{S_e, X_e}(t) &:= \int_{t-\frac{r}{M}}^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} |X_e(s)|_{S_e}^2 ds, \\ V_{R_e, X_e}(t) &:= \frac{r}{M} \int_{-\frac{r}{M}}^0 \int_{t+\theta}^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} |\dot{X}_e(s)|_{R_e}^2 ds d\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where  $0 < S_0, R_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{M(N_0+1) \times M(N_0+1)}$ .  $V_0(t)$  compensates  $\zeta(t)$  using (22), whereas  $V_e(t)$  compensates  $\frac{r}{M}$  in the ODEs of the estimation errors. Differentiation of  $V_Q(t)$  gives

$$\dot{V}_Q + 2\delta V_Q = Q\zeta^2(t) - \varepsilon_M Q\zeta^2\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right), \quad \varepsilon_M = e^{-2\delta\frac{r}{M}}. \quad (30)$$

Differentiating  $V_0(t)$  along (26) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_0 + 2\delta V_0 &= (z^{N_0})^T(t) [2\delta P_0 + P_0(A_0 - B_0 K_0) + \\ &(A_0 - B_0 K_0)^T P_0] z^{N_0}(t) + 2(z^{N_0})^T(t) P_0 B_0 \mathcal{K}_e X_e(t) \\ &+ 2\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} (-\lambda_n + q + \delta) z_n^2(t) \\ &+ 2\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} z_n(t) b_n [\mathcal{K}_e X_e(t) - K_0 z^{N_0}(t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Let  $\alpha_1, \alpha > 0$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} &2\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} z_n(t) b_n [\mathcal{K}_e X_e(t) - K_0 z^{N_0}(t)] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha_1}\right) \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \lambda_n z_n^2(t) + \frac{2\alpha}{N\pi^2} |K_0 z^{N_0}(t)|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2\alpha_1}{N\pi^2} |\mathcal{K}_e X_e(t)|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where we used the value of  $b_n$ , given in (6), and the estimate

$$\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n^2}{\lambda_n} \leq \frac{2\alpha}{\pi^2} \int_N^{\infty} \frac{dx}{x^2} = \frac{2\alpha}{N\pi^2}. \quad (33)$$

Differentiation of  $V_e(t)$  and Jensen's inequality lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_e + 2\delta V_e &\leq X_e^T(t) [P_e F_e + F_e^T P_e + 2\delta P_e] X_e(t) \\ &+ 2X_e^T(t) P_e G_e v_e(t) + 2X_e^T(t) P_e \mathcal{L}_e \zeta\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right) \\ &+ 2X_e^T(t) P_e \mathcal{L}_e C_1 e^{-A_1 \frac{r}{M}} e^{N-N_0(t)} + |X_e(t)|_{S_e}^2 - \varepsilon_M \times \\ &\left[ |X_e(t) + v_e(t)|_{S_e}^2 + |v_e(t)|_{R_e}^2 \right] + \left(\frac{r}{M}\right)^2 |\dot{X}_e(t)|_{R_e}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

To compensate  $\zeta^2(t)$  we use monotonicity of  $\lambda_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , (31) and (32) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &2\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \left(-\lambda_n + q + \delta + \left[\frac{1}{2\alpha} + \frac{1}{2\alpha_1}\right] \lambda_n\right) z_n^2(t) \\ &\stackrel{(22)}{\leq} 2\left(-\lambda_{N+1} + q + \delta + \left[\frac{1}{2\alpha} + \frac{1}{2\alpha_1}\right] \lambda_{N+1}\right) \|c\|_N^{-2} \zeta^2(t) \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

provided  $-\lambda_{N+1} + q + \delta + \left[\frac{1}{2\alpha} + \frac{1}{2\alpha_1}\right] \lambda_{N+1} \leq 0$ . Let

$$\eta(t) = \text{col}\{z^{N_0}(t), X_e(t), v_e(t), \zeta\left(t - \frac{r}{M}\right), e^{N-N_0}(t)\}.$$

From (31)-(35) we have

$$\dot{V}(t) + 2\delta V(t) \leq \eta^T(t) \Psi_1 \eta(t) + \frac{2}{\|c\|_N^2} \Psi_2 \zeta^2(t) \leq 0, \quad t \geq 0,$$

provided

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_2 &= -\lambda_{N+1} + q + \delta + \left[\frac{1}{2\alpha} + \frac{1}{2\alpha_1}\right] \lambda_{N+1} + \frac{Q\|c\|_N^2}{2} < 0, \\ \Psi_1 &= \Psi_{\text{full}} + \left(\frac{r}{M}\right)^2 \Lambda^T R_e \Lambda < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\text{full}} &= \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_0 & \Sigma_1 \\ * & \Gamma_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ P_e \mathcal{L}_e C_1 e^{-A_1 \frac{r}{M}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \Gamma_1 &= 2p_e [A_1 + \delta I], \quad \Lambda = [\Lambda_0, \mathcal{L}_e C_1 e^{-A_1 \frac{r}{M}}] \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_0 &= \begin{bmatrix} \psi & P_0 B_0 \mathcal{K}_e & 0 & 0 \\ * & \Phi(P_e, S_e, R_e) & P_e \text{col}\{\mathcal{L}_e, 0\} & \\ * & * & * & -\varepsilon_M Q \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{N\pi^2} \text{diag}\left\{\alpha K_0^T K_0, \alpha_1 [\mathcal{K}_e \ 0]^T [\mathcal{K}_e \ 0], 0\right\}, \\ \psi &= P_0(A_0 - B_0 K_0) + (A_0 - B_0 K_0)^T P_0 + 2\delta P_0, \\ \Phi(P_e, S_e, R_e) &= \begin{bmatrix} P_e F_e + F_e^T P_e + 2\delta P_e + (1 - \varepsilon_M) S & P_e G_e - \varepsilon_M S_e \\ * & -\varepsilon_M (S_e + R_e) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \Lambda_0 &= [0, F_e, G_e, \mathcal{L}_e]. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

By Schur's complement we have that  $\Psi_2 < 0$  iff

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\lambda_{N+1} + q + \delta + \frac{Q\|c\|_N^2}{2} & 1 \\ * & -2\lambda_{N+1} \text{diag}\{\alpha, \alpha_1\} \end{bmatrix} < 0. \quad (38)$$

Finally, that (7) yields  $\Gamma_1 < 0$ . Therefore, applying Schur complement and taking  $p_e \rightarrow \infty$  we find that  $\Psi_1 < 0$  iff

$$\Psi_0 + \left(\frac{r}{M}\right)^2 \Lambda_0^T R_e \Lambda_0 < 0 \quad (39)$$

with  $\Lambda_0$  given in (37). Note that (38) and (39) are reduced-order LMIs whose dimension is independent of  $N$ . Summarizing, we arrive at:

*Theorem 1:* Consider (3), measurement (4) with  $c \in L^2(0, 1)$  satisfying (9) and control law (17). Let  $\delta > 0$  be a desired decay rate. Let  $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  satisfy (7) and  $N \geq N_0 + 1$ . Assume that  $L_0$  and  $K_0$  are obtained using (10) and (11), respectively. Given  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,  $M \geq 1$  and  $r > 0$ , let there exist positive definite matrices  $P_0, P_e, S_e, R_e$  and scalars  $Q, \alpha, \alpha_1 > 0$  such that (38) and (39) hold. Then the solution  $z(x, t)$  to (3) under the control law (17) and the corresponding subpredictor-based observer  $\hat{z}(x, t)$  defined by (15), (14) and (16) satisfy

$$\|z(\cdot, t) - \hat{z}(\cdot, t)\| + \|z(\cdot, t)\| \leq D e^{-\delta t} \|z(\cdot, 0)\| \quad (40)$$

for some constant  $D > 0$ .

We show next that (38) and (39) are feasible for any delay  $r > 0$  provided  $M$  and  $N$  are large enough. For this purpose consider (27) and

$$V_M(t) = \left|e_M^{N_0}(t)\right|_P^2 + V_{S, e_M^{N_0}}(t) + V_{R, e_M^{N_0}}(t)$$

with  $V_{S, e_M^{N_0}}(t), V_{R, e_M^{N_0}}(t)$  as in (29), where  $0 < P, S, R \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0+1}$ . The LMI

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(P, S, R) &= \begin{bmatrix} \phi & -PL_0 C_0 - e^{-2\delta h} S \\ * & -e^{-2\delta h} (S + R) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + h^2 \begin{bmatrix} (A_0 - L_0 C_0)^T \\ -C_0^T L_0^T \end{bmatrix} R \begin{bmatrix} A_0 - L_0 C_0 & -L_0 C_0 \end{bmatrix} < 0, \\ \phi &= P(A_0 - L_0 C_0) + (A_0 - L_0 C_0)^T P + 2\delta P + (1 - e^{-2\delta h}) S. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

with  $h = \frac{r}{M}$  guarantees  $\dot{V}_M(t) + 2\delta V_M(t) \leq 0$  along (27). Given  $\delta > 0$ , (10) implies that (41) is feasible for small enough  $h > 0$  (see e.g. [28]).

*Proposition 1:* Given  $h > 0$ , let  $0 < P, S, R \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0+1}$  such that (41) holds. Then, given  $r > 0$  and  $M > \frac{r}{h}$ , there exists some  $N_*$  such that for all  $N > N_*$ , (38) and (39) are feasible.

*Proof:* We first show that there exist  $0 < P_e, S_e, R_e \in \mathbb{R}^{M(N_0+1) \times M(N_0+1)}$  such that

$$\Phi(P_e, S_e, R_e) + \left(\frac{r}{M}\right)^2 \begin{bmatrix} F_e^T \\ G_e^T \end{bmatrix} R_e \begin{bmatrix} F_e & G_e \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (42)$$

with  $\Phi(P_e, S_e, R_e)$  given in (37). Consider the ODE

$$\dot{X}_e = F_e X_e(t) + G_e v_e(t) \quad (43)$$

obtained from (26) by setting  $\zeta(t) \equiv 0$  and  $e^{N-N_0}(t) \equiv 0$ . For  $V_e(t)$ , given in (28), by standard arguments it can be easily verified that (42) guarantees  $\dot{V}_e(t) + 2\delta V_e(t) \leq 0$ . We will construct  $V_e(t)$  recursively, by using  $P$ ,  $S$  and  $R$ , thereby obtaining  $P_e$ ,  $S_e$  and  $R_e$ . First, consider the ODE (27). Since  $\frac{r}{M} < h$ , (41) holds with  $h$  replaced by  $\frac{r}{M}$ . Next, consider (27) and the ODE of  $e_{M-1}^{N_0}(t)$  in (43):

$$\dot{e}_{M-1}^{N_0}(t) = (A_0 - L_0 C_0) e_{M-1}^{N_0}(t) - L_0 C_0 \left( v_{e, M-1}(t) - e_{M-1}^{N_0}(t) \right) \quad (44)$$

Let  $\mu > 0$  and define

$$V_{M-1}(t) = \left| e_{M-1}^{N_0}(t) \right|_P^2 + V_{S, e_{M-1}^{N_0}}(t) + V_{R, e_{M-1}^{N_0}}(t) + \mu V_M(t)$$

where  $V_M(t)$  is rescaled by  $\mu$ . Using (27) and (44), the following LMI guarantees  $\dot{V}_{M-1}(t) + 2\delta V_{M-1}(t) \leq 0$ :

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c|cc} \mathcal{J}(P, S, R) & PL_0 C_0 + \left(\frac{r}{M}\right)^2 (A_0 - L_0 C_0)^T R L_0 C_0 & 0 \\ & -\left(\frac{r}{M}\right)^2 C_0^T L_0^T R L_0 C_0 & 0 \\ \hline * & \mu \mathcal{J}(P, S, R) + \left(\frac{r}{M}\right)^2 \begin{bmatrix} C_0^T L_0^T R L_0 C_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & 0 \end{array} \right] < 0. \quad (45)$$

Since  $\mathcal{J}(P, S, R) < 0$ , taking  $\mu$  large enough and applying Schur complement it can be seen that (45) holds. Repeating these arguments by backward induction, i.e choosing

$$V_{M-j}(t) = \left| e_{M-j}^{N_0}(t) \right|_P^2 + V_{S, e_{M-j}^{N_0}}(t) + V_{R, e_{M-j}^{N_0}}(t) + \mu V_{M-j+1}(t), \quad 2 \leq j \leq M-1 \quad (46)$$

and increasing  $\mu$  at each step, we obtain that (42) holds with  $W_e = \text{diag} \{ \mu^j W \}_{j=0}^{M-1}$ ,  $W \in \{P, S, R\}$ . Next, recall (38) and (39), with  $\Psi_0$  given in (37). Set  $\alpha = \alpha_1 = 2$  and let  $\beta > 0$ . Rescaling, we replace  $\Phi(P_e, S_e, R_e)$  with  $\Phi(\beta P_e, \beta S_e, \beta R_e) = \beta \Phi(P_e, S_e, R_e)$ . Let  $P_0 = P_c$ , given in (11), resulting in  $\psi < 0$  in (37). Setting  $\beta > 0$  to be large enough, then choosing  $Q = N$  large enough and applying Schur complement twice in (39), we find that (38) and (39) hold. ■

### B. Classical observer-based predictor

For the case of a classical predictor, we consider a  $N+1$  dimensional observer of the form

$$\hat{z}(x, t) = \hat{z}^{N_0}(t) \cdot \text{col} \{ \phi_0(x), \dots, \phi_{N_0}(x) \} + \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) \cdot \text{col} \{ \phi_{N_0+1}(x), \dots, \phi_N(x) \}. \quad (47)$$

Here  $\hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t)$  is defined in (12) and satisfies (15), whereas  $\hat{z}^{N_0}(t)$  satisfies the following ODE

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{z}}^{N_0}(t) &= A_0 \hat{z}^{N_0}(t) + B_0 u(t-r) \\ &\quad - L_0 [C_0 \hat{z}^{N_0}(t) + C_1 \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) - y(t)], \quad t \geq 0, \\ \hat{z}^{N_0}(t) &= 0, \quad t \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Recall  $e^{N-N_0}(t)$  given in (19) and satisfying (24). Define  $e^{N_0}(t) = z^{N_0}(t) - \hat{z}^{N_0}(t)$ , where  $z^{N_0}(t)$  is given in (12). The innovation term in (48) can be presented as

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 \hat{z}^{N_0}(t) + C_1 \hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t) - y(t) \\ = -C_0 e^{N_0}(t) - C_1 e^{N-N_0}(t) - \zeta(t) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\zeta(t)$ , given in (21), subject to (22). Using these notations with (6) and (48), we obtain

$$e^{N_0}(t) = (A_0 - L_0 C_0) e^{N_0}(t) - L_0 C_1 e^{N-N_0}(t) - L_0 \zeta(t). \quad (49)$$

As in [23], we propose the predictor-based control law

$$\bar{z}(t) = e^{A_0 r} \hat{z}^{N_0}(t) + \int_{t-r}^t e^{A_0(t-s)} B_0 u(s) ds, \quad u(t) = -K_0 \bar{z}(t) \quad (50)$$

Note that exponential decay of  $\bar{z}(t)$  implies exponential decay of  $\hat{z}^{N_0}(t)$  with the same decay rate. Differentiating  $\bar{z}(t)$  and using (48) and (50) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{z}}(t) &= (A_0 - B_0 K_0) \bar{z}(t) + e^{A_0 r} L_0 \\ &\quad \times \left[ C_0 e^{N_0}(t) + C_1 e^{N-N_0}(t) + \zeta(t) \right], \quad t \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Then, the reduced-order (decoupled from  $\hat{z}^{N-N_0}(t)$ ) closed-loop system is given by non-delayed ODEs (24), (49), (51) and the tail

$$\dot{z}_n(t) = (-\lambda_n + q) z_n(t) - b_n K_0 \bar{z}(t-r), \quad n > N \quad (52)$$

which depends on the delay. Note also that in the case of state-feedback (see e.g. [21]), the predictor is given by (50) with  $\hat{z}^{N_0}$  changed by  $z^{N_0}$  leading to decoupled from the tail ODE (51) with  $L_0 = 0$ . The latter simplifies the stability analysis of the closed-loop system and makes the proof of LMI feasibility trivial. Next, we consider  $L^2$ -stability analysis of the closed-loop system, which is delay-independent for  $\delta = 0$ . Define the Lyapunov functional

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}(t) &= \bar{V}_0(t) + \left| e^{N_0}(t) \right|_{P_e}^2 + \int_{t-r}^t e^{-2\delta(t-s)} |\bar{z}(s)|_S^2 ds, \\ \bar{V}_0(t) &= |\bar{z}(t)|_{P_0}^2 + \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} z_n^2(t) + p_e \left| e^{N-N_0}(t) \right|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where  $P_0, P_e, S > 0$  are matrices of appropriate dimensions and  $p_e > 0$  is a scalar. By arguments similar to (31)-(39) the following LMIs guarantee  $\dot{\bar{V}} + 2\delta \bar{V} \leq 0$  for  $p_e \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\begin{aligned} -\varepsilon_r S + \frac{2\alpha}{N\pi^2} K_0^T K_0 &< 0, \\ \left[ \begin{array}{c|cc} \psi + S & P_0 e^{A_0 r} L_0 C_0 & P_0 e^{A_0 r} L_0 \\ * & \psi_1 & -P_e L_0 \\ * & * & \psi_2 \end{array} \right] &< 0, \\ \psi_1 &= P_e (A_0 - L_0 C_0) + (A_0 - L_0 C_0)^T P_e + 2\delta P_e, \\ \psi_2 &= \frac{2}{\|c\|_N} \left[ -\lambda_{N+1} + q + \delta + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \lambda_{N+1} \right], \quad \varepsilon_r = e^{-2\delta r}, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where  $\psi$  is given in (37). Fix any  $r > 0$ . Let  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} I$ ,  $P_0$  such that  $\psi = -2I$  and  $P_e$  such that  $\psi_1 = -\beta I$  for  $\beta > 0$ . Choosing first  $\beta > 0$  large enough and then  $N$  large enough and applying Schur complement, it can be verified that (54) holds. Summarizing, we arrive at

*Proposition 2:* Consider (3), measurement (4) with  $c \in L^2(0, 1)$  satisfying (9) and control law (50). Let  $\delta > 0$  be a desired decay rate. Let  $N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  satisfy (7) and  $N \geq N_0 + 1$ . Let  $L_0$  and  $K_0$  be obtained using (10) and (11), respectively. Given  $r > 0$ , let there exist positive definite matrices  $P_0, P_e, S$  and scalar  $\alpha > 0$  such that LMIs (54) hold. Then the solution  $z(x, t)$  to (3) under the control law (50) and the observer  $\hat{z}(x, t)$  defined by (47) satisfy (40) for some constant  $D > 0$ . Furthermore, given any  $r > 0$ , the LMI (54) is feasible provided  $N$  is large enough.

### C. Numerical example

We consider (3) with  $q = 3$ , resulting in an unstable open-loop system. We consider (4) with  $c(x) = \chi_{[0.3,0.6]}$  (an indicator function). We fix  $\delta = 0.1$  which results in  $N_0 = 0$ . The controller and observer gains, given by  $K_0 = 8.8$ ,  $L_0 = 14.66$ , are found using (10) and (11), respectively.

We start with sub-predictors. Given various values of  $r > 0$ , the LMIs of Theorem 1 were verified for  $1 \leq N + M \leq 110$  and  $1 \leq M \leq 20$  by using the standard Matlab LMI toolbox. Table I presents the minimal values of  $N$  and  $M$  found to guarantee the feasibility (i.e. the exponential stability of the closed-loop system with a decay rate 0.1). For classical predictors, the LMIs of Proposition 2 were verified for  $1 \leq N \leq 100$ . Table II presents the minimal values of  $N$  which guarantee feasibility of the LMIs. It is seen from the tables that for the same values of  $r$ , the classical predictor employs a lower-order  $N + 1$ -dimensional observer compared to  $(M - 1)(N_0 + 1) + N + 1$ -dimensional sub-predictors. Moreover, the simple LMIs for a classical predictor can be verified for any  $r$  (with corresponding huge  $N$ ). This is different from sub-predictors, where the LMIs dimension and the number of decision variables grow with  $M$ . This leads to the difficulty of the LMIs verification for large  $M$  in Matlab. However, it is well-known that a classical predictor is less friendly for implementation. The controller uses significant memory as it requires the history of control signals, which turns out to be expensive in implementation. Moreover, one has to carefully discretize the integral term to avoid instabilities. Since a possible instability is related to the finite-dimensional part, we suggest to use the same implementation methods as used for ODEs with the classical predictor (see [25] with e.g. sampled-data implementation).

$r$	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1	1.1	1.2
$N$	4	6	12	22	41	62	90
$M$	1	4	7	10	12	13	18

TABLE I

SUB-PREDICTORS: MINIMAL  $N$  AND  $M$  FOR FEASIBILITY.

$r$	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.3	2.5	2.8
$N$	7	12	19	34	42	58	88

TABLE II

CLASSICAL PREDICTOR: MINIMAL  $N$  FOR FEASIBILITY.

We carry out simulations of the closed-loop systems. We begin with sub-predictors. Recall the closed-loop system (15), (17) and (26). We choose the initial condition

$$z(x, 0) = 30x^2(1 - x^2), \quad x \in [0, 1]. \quad (55)$$

We consider  $r \in \{0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$ ,  $N = 12$  and  $M = 7$ . We truncate the tail ODEs after 48 coefficients and use the approximations  $\|z(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2 \approx \sum_{n=0}^{60} z_n^2(t)$ ,  $\zeta(t) \approx \sum_{n=20}^{60} c_n z_n(t)$ . The simulation results are presented in Figure 1. For  $r = 0.6$ ,  $N = 12$  and  $M = 7$ , obtained from LMIs (see Table I), the simulations of the closed-loop system confirm the theoretical results. Simulation for larger  $r = 0.7$  show ultimate boundedness with slow convergence. Simulation with  $r = 0.8$




Fig. 1. Closed-loop simulations: Sub-Predictors.




Fig. 2. Closed-loop simulations: Classical Predictor.

shows instability, meaning that our LMIs are only slightly conservative.

Next, we consider classical predictor. Recall the closed-loop system (15), (24), (49), (50) and (51). We choose the initial condition (55). Let  $r \in \{1.5, 2.5, 3\}$  and  $N = 19$ . We truncate the tail ODEs after 40 coefficients and use the approximations  $\|z(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2}^2 \approx \sum_{n=0}^{60} z_n^2(t)$ ,  $\zeta(t) \approx \sum_{n=20}^{60} c_n z_n(t)$ . The simulation results are presented in Figure 2. For  $r = 1.5$  and  $N = 19$ , obtained from LMIs (see Table II), the simulation confirms the theoretical results. For larger  $r = 2.5$ , simulation shows ultimate boundedness, whereas for  $r = 3$  the closed-loop system is unstable. For the classical predictor, the lower-order LMIs appeared to be more conservative compared to simulation results. We believe that this is due to the cross-term  $e^{A_0 r} = e^{3r}$  which couples  $\bar{z}(t)$  with  $\zeta(t)$  (see (51)) and becomes huge for larger  $r$ . In the LMIs (54),  $e^{A_0 r}$  appears off-diagonal, leading to difficulty in verifying the feasibility in Matlab.

### III. CONCLUSION

We studied constant input delay compensation by finite-dimensional observer-based controllers for the 1D heat equation. We proved that both sub-predictors and classical predictors theoretically compensate any delay provided the observer dimension is large. Classical predictors are known to be less friendly in application to uncertain systems (see

e.g. Remark 3 in [19]). The suggested predictor methods can be extended in the future to various parabolic PDEs.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. Balas, "Finite-dimensional controllers for linear distributed parameter systems: exponential stability using residual mode filters," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 133, no. 2, pp. 283–296, 1988.
- [2] P. Christofides, *Nonlinear and Robust Control of PDE Systems: Methods and Applications to transport reaction processes*. Springer, 2001.
- [3] R. Curtain, "Finite-dimensional compensator design for parabolic distributed systems with point sensors and boundary input," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 98–104, 1982.
- [4] C. Harkort and J. Deutscher, "Finite-dimensional observer-based control of linear distributed parameter systems using cascaded output observers," *International journal of control*, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 107–122, 2011.
- [5] T. Nambu, *Theory of Stabilization for Linear Boundary Control Systems*. CRC Press, 2017.
- [6] R. Katz and E. Fridman, "Constructive method for finite-dimensional observer-based control of 1-D parabolic PDEs," *Automatica*, vol. 122, 2020.
- [7] —, "Finite-dimensional control of the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation under point measurement and actuation," in *59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2020.
- [8] E. Fridman and A. Blighovsky, "Robust sampled-data control of a class of semilinear parabolic systems," *Automatica*, vol. 48, pp. 826–836, 2012.
- [9] N. Bar Am and E. Fridman, "Network-based  $H_\infty$  filtering of parabolic systems," *Automatica*, vol. 50, pp. 3139–3146, 2014.
- [10] I. Karafyllis and M. Krstic, "Sampled-data boundary feedback control of 1-D parabolic PDEs," *Automatica*, vol. 87, pp. 226–237, 2018.
- [11] A. Selivanov and E. Fridman, "Delayed point control of a reaction–diffusion PDE under discrete-time point measurements," *Automatica*, vol. 96, pp. 224–233, 2018.
- [12] R. Katz, E. Fridman, and A. Selivanov, "Boundary delayed observer-controller design for reaction-diffusion systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2021.
- [13] R. Katz and E. Fridman, "Delayed finite-dimensional observer-based control of 1-D parabolic PDEs," *Automatica*, vol. 123, 2021.
- [14] Z. Artstein, "Linear systems with delayed controls: a reduction," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 869–879, 1982.
- [15] M. Krstic, *Delay Compensation for Nonlinear, Adaptive, and PDE Systems*. Boston: Birkhauser, 2009.
- [16] A. Germani, C. Manes, and P. Pepe, "A new approach to state observation of nonlinear systems with delayed output," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 96–101, 2002.
- [17] T. Ahmed-Ali, E. Cherrier, and F. Lamnabhi-Lagarigue, "Cascade high gain predictors for a class of nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 221–226, 2011.
- [18] M. Najafi, S. Hosseinnia, F. Sheikholeslam, and M. Karimadini, "Closed-loop control of dead time systems via sequential sub-predictors," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 86, no. 4, pp. 599–609, 2013.
- [19] Y. Zhu and E. Fridman, "Sub-predictors for network-based control under uncertain large delays," *Automatica*, vol. 123, p. 109350, 2021.
- [20] H. Sano, "Neumann boundary stabilization of one-dimensional linear parabolic systems with input delay," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 3105–3111, 2018.
- [21] H. Lhachemi, C. Prieur, and R. Shorten, "An LMI condition for the robustness of constant-delay linear predictor feedback with respect to uncertain time-varying input delays," *Automatica*, vol. 109, p. 108551, 2019.
- [22] T. Ahmed-Ali, E. Fridman, F. Giri, M. Kahelras, F. Lamnabhi-Lagarigue, and L. Burlion, "Observer design for a class of parabolic systems with large delays and sampled measurements," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2200–2206, 2019.
- [23] R. Katz, E. Fridman, and I. Basre, "Delayed finite-dimensional observer-based control of 1D parabolic PDEs via reduced-order LMIs," *Automatica*. Submitted.
- [24] S. Mondié and W. Michiels, "Finite spectrum assignment of unstable time-delay systems with a safe implementation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 2207–2212, 2003.
- [25] I. Karafyllis and M. Krstić, *Predictor feedback for delay systems: Implementations and approximations*. Springer, 2017.
- [26] I. Furtat, E. Fridman, and A. Fradkov, "Disturbance compensation with finite spectrum assignment for plants with input delay," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 298–305, 2017.
- [27] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*. Springer New York, 1983, vol. 44.
- [28] E. Fridman, *Introduction to time-delay systems: analysis and control*. Birkhauser, Systems and Control: Foundations and Applications, 2014.