

Phase Robustness Analysis for Structured Perturbations in MIMO LTI Systems

Luke Woolcock and Robert Schmid

Abstract

The stability of interconnected linear time-invariant systems using singular values and the small gain theorem has been studied for many decades. The methods of μ -analysis and synthesis has been extensively developed to provide robustness guarantees for a plant subject to structured perturbations, with components in the structured perturbation satisfying a bound on their largest singular value. Recent results on phase-based stability measures have led to a counterpart of the small gain theorem, known as the small phase theorem. To date these phase-based methods have only been used to provide stability robustness measures for unstructured perturbations.

In this paper, we define a phase robustness metric for multivariable linear time-invariant systems in the presence of a structured perturbation. We demonstrate its relationship to a certain class of multiplier functions for integral quadratic constraints, and show that an upper bound can be calculated via a linear matrix inequality problem. When combined with robustness measures from the small gain theorem, the new methods are able to provide less conservative robustness metrics than can be obtained via conventional μ -analysis methods.

Index Terms

Linear Time Invariant Systems, Robust control, Matrix Phase

I. INTRODUCTION

WE consider the robust stability of the stable multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) linear time-invariant (LTI) plant $G \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times n}$ with respect to a stable LTI perturbation $\Delta \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times n}$, as shown in Figure 1. The signals u_1, u_2 represent exogenous inputs to the system and e_1, e_2 represent internal signals. The *feedback interconnection* so defined is denoted by (G, Δ) .

The problem at hand is to quantify the robustness of the stability of the perturbed system in terms of a metric defining the “size” of the set of Δ that is guaranteed to result in a stable interconnection. This defines a stability margin for G , generalizing the classical notion of gain and phase margin for single-input single-output (SISO) systems.

The most famous result for the robust stability analysis of feedback interconnections is the small gain theorem [1], which defines the set of admissible perturbations in terms of their \mathcal{L}_2 -gain. In the case of LTI systems, the \mathcal{L}_2 gain is linked to the frequency response by means of the singular values of their transfer matrices, forming the basis of \mathcal{H}_∞ theory. Therefore, for LTI G and Δ , the small gain criterion may be stated as a frequency domain inequality on the singular values of the two subsystems.




Fig. 1: Block diagram of feedback interconnection (G, Δ) .

In practice, much more is known about the perturbation than only its gain, leading to a high level of conservatism when applying the small gain theorem naively. In the case of MIMO systems, we can often assume the perturbation satisfies a certain block diagonal *structure* $\Delta \subset \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times n}$. Doyle [2] addressed the structured robust stability problem by introducing the *structured singular value* μ , a real-valued function on complex matrices that quantifies the minimum destabilizing \mathcal{L}_2 -gain of the perturbation under the assumption of structure. This gave rise to a broad range of analysis and synthesis techniques with wide applications. In the field of power systems, μ -synthesis techniques have been applied to grid connected inverters with multiparameter distributions [3], \mathcal{H}_∞ -robust current control for wind turbine generators [4] and the region-wise small-signal stability of power systems under perturbations [5].

When considering the robustness of SISO systems, both the gain and phase margin are considered in conjunction. The small gain theorem straightforwardly provides a notion of gain for MIMO systems. However, an appropriate notion of phase for MIMO systems is much less straightforward to develop. The \mathcal{L}_2 -gain of a system is invariant under isometries of the input or output – i.e. it generalizes the property that the gain of a SISO system is invariant when multiplied by a complex number of unit magnitude. It would be desirable to obtain a notion of phase for MIMO systems which has the dual property—that this “phase” would be invariant under some type of scaling of the input and output signals by a positive operator. Additionally, in the context of the robustness of the feedback interconnection system depicted in Figure 1, this notion of phase should lead to a method for the calculation of phase bounds for a set of perturbations that is invariant under such a positive scaling. However, such a notion has proven difficult to formulate. In the following we first review some historical attempts to formalize phase and phase-based robustness for MIMO LTI systems, and then introduce the phase concepts that will be employed in our results.

The well-known passivity theorem [1] generalizes, in an imprecise sense, the notion of phase to MIMO and nonlinear systems. In the LTI case, the notion of positive realness links the properties of a system’s transfer function to its passivity. The input and output passivity indices provide a robustness criterion [6]. The property of passivity is invariant under scaling, as desired, but the passivity *indices* do not generalize this property of SISO phase margins.

An early attempt at defining the phases of a transfer matrix was made by [7] using the eigenvalues of the unitary part of the polar decomposition. This leads to a frequency-wise stability criterion – a so-called “small phase theorem.” Recently [8] made use of this definition of phase response to develop an optimal controller synthesis under mixed gain and phase constraints. While this approach defines scaling-invariant phases for an arbitrary complex matrix, the resulting small phase theorem depends upon a gain-dependent “phase modifier” factor. In the context of robustness analysis, this means that the phase-bounded set of perturbations Δ is not invariant under scaling, except by a positive scalar.

Another early contribution to notions of phase for MIMO LTI systems appeared in [9], employing the singular vectors associated with the singular values of the transfer matrix. This approach provided a MIMO generalisation of the Bode gain-phase relationship for SISO systems, a concept that was further developed in [10]. However, these works did not present a criterion for the robustness of a plant to a phase-bounded uncertainty, and this definition of phase is not invariant under positive scaling.

[11] applied the concept of phase given by [7] to define the phase margin of a MIMO system in terms of the range of phases of the eigenvalues of a unitary perturbation (as in Δ in Figure 1). This approach can be thought of as “lumping” the positive semidefinite portion of the perturbation’s polar decomposition into the plant. [12] treats a structured version of this problem, calculating the phase margin of an LTI system with respect to unitary diagonal perturbations. [13] extends this concept to perturbations with general block diagonal structures, while [14] links the phase margin concept with the David-Wielandt shell to produce optimization problems guaranteed to converge to the exact multivariable gain and phase margin of a system.

The principal limitation of the approaches taken in [7]-[14] is that the classes of perturbations under consideration depend not only on their phase properties but also their gain properties. From a theoretical point of view, these attempts either do not define a scaling-invariant phase of a system, or fail to determine a scaling-invariant set of admissible perturbations. From a practical point of view, this dependency on gain limits the set of perturbations that may be considered, and increases the conservatism of the results obtained.

Some efforts have been made to develop a notion of system phase based on the *numerical range* of the transfer matrix. The numerical range of a matrix is a convex subset of the complex plane whose angular extent is invariant under congruence transformations, which may be thought of as a symmetric scaling of the system’s inputs and outputs. The positive realness of a system’s transfer function is equivalent to the requirement that the numerical range of its frequency response lies in the open right half plane, for all frequencies. Numerical ranges were used by [15] to define the phase-sensitive structured singular value (PS-SSV). This was shown to improve the conservatism of the structured singular value under the assumption that the numerical range of the perturbation is restricted to an angle bounded sector of the complex plane. [9] mentions the relationship between the range of phases contained in the numerical range and the angle and phase difference between the input and output vectors, but does not develop the connection further.

Recently, a definition of the phases of a matrix utilising its numerical range was given by [16], based on the so-called sectorial decomposition. These phases are invariant under congruence, in the same way that the singular values of a matrix are invariant under unitary transformations, and hence satisfies the desired scaling invariance property. A corresponding definition of system phase and a small phase theorem for MIMO LTI systems was introduced in [17]. These definitions of phase are indeed invariant under scaling in the sense of congruence, and unlike previous “small phase” conditions, the resulting robustness set is defined only by its phases, and so is invariant under congruence.

These new notions of system phase employing matrix numerical range have led to a range of novel results in robust stability analysis. Mixed gain- and phase-based stability criteria were introduced in [18] and [19]. Some comparisons of stability analysis methods for assessing the small-signal stability of a wind farm connected to a series-compensated grid were investigated in [20]; the gain/phase based approach was shown to determine stability with less conservatism than an alternative Nyquist-based method. In [21] phase-based methods were applied to multi-agent systems to study the synchronization problem of highly heterogeneous diverse agents. A summary of recent work in the use of phase-based stability studies appeared in [22].

In this paper, we further investigate system stability using the notions of system phase introduced in [17]. We aim to extend

the robust stability result of [17] by considering the structured stability problem. Given a block diagonal structure, we define a *structured phase index* function ψ on complex matrices analogous to the structured singular value μ . We show that an upper bound for this function may be obtained by solving LMI optimization problems, and that a lower bound is given by the solution of a non-convex optimization problem. The main result of this paper shows that for a set of perturbations whose phases are bounded by this phase index function, the stability of the perturbed system is guaranteed, and that this phase-based criterion may be combined on a per-frequency basis with the structured singular value. This result enriches the robustness analysis of feedback interconnections by augmenting the existing μ -based analysis with phase information on the perturbation, and augmenting the existing phase-based analysis of [17] with structural information on the perturbation.

The paper is organised as follows: In Section II, we formulate the structured robust stability problem for LTI systems; our task is to quantify the perturbations that yield a stable feedback connection in terms of the matrix phase of their frequency response. Section III provides a brief introduction to the matrix phase concepts used in the paper. Section IV defines a “structured phase” analogue to the structured singular value of a complex matrix, and provides an LMI-based method for calculating an upper bound of this quantity, as well as a non-convex optimization problem for computing a lower bound. Section V applies the results of Section IV to derive the main result of the paper on phase- and gain-bounded perturbations. Section VI presents an example taken from [2] to show that the criterion may be less conservative than purely gain-based robust stability criteria.

Notation: We denote by \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{C} the sets of real and complex numbers. For a complex number $z \in \mathbb{C}$, its phase is denoted by $\angle z$, and taken to be in the interval $(-\pi, \pi]$. $\mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ denotes the set of $n \times m$ complex matrices. \mathbb{C}^n denotes the set of n dimensional complex column vectors. The $n \times n$ identity matrix is denoted I_n . For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$, we denote its conjugate transpose by A^* , and its induced 2-norm (i.e. maximum singular value) by $\|A\|$. If A is square, we denote the inverse of its conjugate transpose by A^{-*} , its spectrum by $\sigma(A)$ and its determinant by $|A|$. A has a decomposition given by:

$$A = \text{Re}(A) + j \text{Im}(A), \quad (1)$$

where $\text{Re}(A) = (A + A^*)/2$ and $\text{Im}(A) = (A - A^*)/2j$ are Hermitian matrices. If A is Hermitian, $A > 0$ ($A \geq 0$) means that A is positive (semi-)definite, and $A < 0$ ($A \leq 0$) means that A is negative (semi-) definite. The notation $A > B$ ($A \geq B$) means that $A - B$ is positive (semi-)definite.

The 2-norm of a function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by:

$$\|f\| := \int_0^\infty f(t)^T f(t) dt. \quad (2)$$

We then denote the space of finite-energy functions as:

$$\mathbf{L}_2^n := \{f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n : \|f\| < \infty\}. \quad (3)$$

\mathbf{L}_{2e}^n denotes the extended function space:

$$\mathbf{L}_{2e}^n := \{f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n : \|P_T f\| < \infty, \forall T \geq 0\}. \quad (4)$$

where P_T denotes the truncation operator for any $T \geq 0$.

\mathcal{RL}_∞ denotes the space of rational functions with no poles on the imaginary axis. \mathcal{RH}_∞ denotes the subspace with no poles in the RHP. $\mathcal{RL}_\infty^{n \times m}$ and $\mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times m}$ denote the spaces of $n \times m$ matrices of functions in \mathcal{RL}_∞ and \mathcal{RH}_∞ respectively. The Fourier transform of a function $f \in \mathbf{L}_2^n$ is denoted \hat{f} .

A *sector* of the complex plane is denoted:

$$\text{sec}(\alpha, \beta) := \{\rho e^{j\theta} : \rho \geq 0, \theta \in [\alpha, \beta]\}. \quad (5)$$

for some bounding angles $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. The convex hull of a set $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is denoted $\text{Co}(X)$.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We now formally define the robust structured stability problem depicted in Figure 1. Recall that $G, \Delta \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times n}$ are stable, causal LTI systems. They define the following system of equations:

$$e_1 = -\Delta e_2 + u_1, \quad (6)$$

$$e_2 = G e_1 + u_2, \quad (7)$$

where $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbf{L}_2^n$ and $e_1, e_2 \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}^n$. The feedback interconnection of (G, Δ) is *well-posed* if, for each pair of inputs $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbf{L}_2^n$, there are unique solutions $e_1, e_2 \in \mathbf{L}_{2e}^n$. The interconnection is *stable* if $e_1, e_2 \in \mathbf{L}_2^n$ for each $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbf{L}_2^n$. The interconnection is *stable* if and only if the transfer function $(I + G\Delta)^{-1} \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times n}$. Given a plant G , a perturbation Δ is *admissible* with respect to G if (G, Δ) is a well-posed and stable interconnection.

We will now introduce the notation needed to define a block-diagonal structured set of perturbations, closely following [23]. We denote a pair of tuples of positive integers of length s and b respectively, where $s, b \geq 0$ and $s + b > 0$:

$$\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s), \quad (8)$$

$$\mathbf{m} = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_b). \quad (9)$$

We refer to \mathbf{n} and \mathbf{m} as *block dimension tuples compatible with G* if $\sum \mathbf{n} + \sum \mathbf{m} = n$. For the sake of compactness, we will denote such a choice of compatible block dimensions as $\chi = (\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m})$. A choice of χ then defines a set of *structured matrices* as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_\chi := \{ & \text{blkdiag}(b_1 I_{n_1}, b_2 I_{n_2}, \dots, b_s I_{n_s}, \\ & B_1, B_2, \dots, B_b) : b_k \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } B_k \in \mathbb{C}^{m_k \times m_k} \\ & \text{for } k = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } i = 1, \dots, b\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The first s blocks of the form $b_i I_{n_i}$ are called *scalar blocks*, while the remaining b blocks are called *full blocks*. We then define the set of *structured perturbations* whose frequency response belongs to \mathbf{B}_χ .

Definition 1: For a given choice of block dimensions χ compatible with G , we define a *set of structured perturbations*:

$$\Delta_\chi := \{\Delta \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times n} : \Delta(j\omega) \in \mathbf{B}_\chi \forall \omega \in [0, \infty]\}. \quad (11)$$

The *structured robust stability problem* involves finding the largest set of admissible perturbations contained in this structured set according to some metric. The structured singular value introduced by [2] identifies such a set according to a frequency-dependent gain bound. Our Theorem 1 addresses the analogous phase-bounded problem:

Problem 1: Given a plant G and a set of structured perturbations, introduce a frequency-dependent phase bound to identify the admissible perturbations.

A special case of Problem 1 is the case of unstructured perturbations, for which $\Delta = \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times n}$. This was addressed in the small phase theorem of [17]. Thus the first result of this paper can be thought of as extending the small phase theorem to the general case of structured perturbations.

Our Theorem 3 will provide less conservative solutions for the structured robust stability problem by addressing the combined gain and phase bounded problem:

Problem 2: Given a plant G and a set of structured perturbations, provide mixed gain and phase criteria to identify the admissible perturbations.

III. MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

In this section we introduce the results on matrix phase that will be needed for our robustness analysis. The sources are [16], [17] and [24].

Definition 2: The *numerical range* of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is:

$$W(A) := \{x^* A x \mid x \in \mathbb{C}^n, \|x\| = 1\}. \quad (12)$$

Some key properties of the numerical range are:

- (W1) $W(A)$ is a convex and compact set in \mathbb{C} .
- (W2) $\sigma(A) \subseteq W(A)$.
- (W3) $W(cA) = cW(A)$ for $c \in \mathbb{C}$.
- (W4) $W(\text{Re}(A)) = \text{Re}(W(A))$.
- (W5) $W(\text{Im}(A)) = \text{Im}(W(A))$.
- (W6) $W(\text{blkdiag}(A_1, A_2)) = \text{Co}(W(A_1) \cup W(A_2))$.

If we consider the vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$ the input and Av the output of A , the range of phases contained within $W(A)$ can be thought of as encoding the range of possible phases of the inner product of the input and output, which will provide the basis of the definition of the phases of A . This is analogous to the relationship between the singular values of a matrix and the ratio of the 2-norm of its input and output.

Definition 3: The *angular numerical range* of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is:

$$W'(A) := \{x^* A x \mid x \in \mathbb{C}^n, \|x\| \neq 0\}. \quad (13)$$

It can be seen that $W'(A)$ is a convex cone, i.e. $\alpha x + \beta y \in W'(A)$ for any $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ and $x, y \in W'(A)$. Specifically, it is the smallest convex cone that contains $W(A)$.

Definition 4: The *field angle* of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is denoted $\Theta(A)$. If 0 is contained in the interior of $W(A)$, $\Theta(A)$ is defined to be 2π . Otherwise, $\Theta(A)$ is the minimum angle between a pair of rays from the origin that subtend $W(A)$.

Clearly, if $0 \notin W(A)$, $\Theta(A) < \pi$ by the convexity of $W(A)$. Such a matrix is known as a *sectorial* matrix. More generally, we categorise matrices by their field angle as follows:

- 1) If $\Theta(A) < \pi$, then A is *quasi-sectorial*. All sectorial matrices are quasi-sectorial, but quasi-sectorial matrices may contain 0 in their numerical range at a sharp point on its boundary. This case is illustrated by A_2 in Figure 2.




Fig. 2: A_1 is sectorial, A_2 is quasi-sectorial but not sectorial, A_3 is semi-sectorial but not quasi-sectorial, and A_4 is non-semi-sectorial.




Fig. 3: Relationship between $\underline{\phi}(A)$, $\overline{\phi}(A)$ and $W(A)$.

- 2) If $\Theta(A) \leq \pi$, then A is *semi-sectorial*. Semi-sectorial matrices may contain 0 in the boundary of their numerical range, not necessarily at a sharp point. This case is illustrated by A_3 in Figure 2.
- 3) If $\Theta(A) = 2\pi$, then A is *non-semi-sectorial*. A matrix is non-semi-sectorial if and only if 0 is in the interior of its numerical range. This case is illustrated by A_4 in Figure 2.

Remark 1: The geometric interpretation of $\Theta(A)$ is that $W(A) \subseteq \text{sec}(\alpha, \beta)$ with $\beta - \alpha = \Theta(A)$. This means that a semi-sectorial matrix has a numerical range lying in a convex sector of the complex plane.

A sectorial matrix has a *sectorial decomposition* as follows:

$$A = T^*DT, \quad (14)$$

where $D, T \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are invertible and $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ with $|d_i| = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. From Definition 3, we obtain

$$W'(A) = \{k_1d_1 + \dots + k_nd_n : k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 0\} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (15)$$

Therefore, the phases of the diagonal elements determine the angular extent of $W'(A)$ and $W(A)$.

Definition 5 (Matrix phase[17]): The *matrix phases* of a sectorial matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are the n real numbers denoted:

$$\overline{\phi}(A) = \phi_1(A) \geq \phi_2(A) \geq \dots \phi_n(A) = \underline{\phi}(A), \quad (16)$$

chosen modulo 2π so that the *phase center* $\gamma(A) = (\overline{\phi}(A) + \underline{\phi}(A))/2$ satisfies $\gamma(A) \in (-\pi, \pi]$, and:

$$A = T^* \text{diag}(e^{j\phi_1(A)}, e^{j\phi_2(A)}, \dots, e^{j\phi_n(A)})T \quad (17)$$

is a sectorial decomposition of A for some invertible $T \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$.

This definition may be extended to quasi-sectorial matrices by noting that if 0 is an eigenvalue of a quasi-sectorial matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, it must be a normal eigenvalue [24]. A quasi-sectorial matrix A permits a decomposition of the form [17]:

$$A = U^* \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{A} \end{bmatrix} U, \quad (18)$$

where $\hat{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ is a sectorial matrix with $m \leq n$ and $U \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is unitary. Then A is defined to have m phases, which are the phases of \hat{A} . The sectorial decomposition can be further generalised to semi-sectorial matrices, with the details given in [17].

The phases $\overline{\phi}(A)$ and $\underline{\phi}(A)$ may be interpreted geometrically as the angles of the most anticlockwise and clockwise rays from the origin subtending $W(A)$, while $\gamma(A)$ is the angle of the ray bisecting the sector $W'(A)$, as depicted in Figure 3. We also have $\Theta(A) = \overline{\phi}(A) - \underline{\phi}(A)$. This definition of matrix phase can be used to bound the phases of the eigenvalues of a product of two matrices, which translates directly into the phase-based stability results given in [17].

Lemma 1: Suppose $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are semi-sectorial matrices. If $\lambda \in \sigma(AB)$, then:

$$\underline{\phi}(A) + \underline{\phi}(B) \leq \angle \lambda \leq \overline{\phi}(A) + \overline{\phi}(B), \quad (19)$$

up to a multiple of 2π .




Fig. 4: A sectorial matrix A_1 with phase index α .

A direct corollary is that if:

$$\bar{\phi}(A) + \bar{\phi}(B) < \pi, \quad (20)$$

$$\underline{\phi}(A) + \underline{\phi}(B) > -\pi, \quad (21)$$

we may guarantee:

$$|I + AB| \neq 0. \quad (22)$$

We collect a number of simple properties of matrix phases here.

(P1) $\phi_i(zA) = \angle z + \phi_i(A)$ for any nonzero $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\angle z \in (-\pi - \gamma(A), \pi - \gamma(A)]$.

(P2) $\Theta(zA) = \Theta(A)$ for any nonzero $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

(P3) A (quasi-)sectorial matrix is positive (semi-)definite if and only if all its phases are zero.

(P4) If A is semi-sectorial and invertible, $\bar{\phi}(A^{-1}) = -\underline{\phi}(A)$ and $\underline{\phi}(A^{-1}) = -\bar{\phi}(A)$.

(P5) If X_1, \dots, X_k are semi-sectorial matrices with phases lying in $[\alpha, \beta]$, where $\beta - \alpha \leq \pi$, then $X = \text{blkdiag}(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ is a semi-sectorial matrix with $\underline{\phi}(X) \geq \alpha$ and $\bar{\phi}(X) \leq \beta$.

IV. STRUCTURED PHASE INDEX

Motivated by the problem of defining a frequency-dependent phase bound on the set of admissible perturbations, we consider sets of structured matrices \mathbf{B}_χ as defined in (10). We recall the definition of the structured singular value.

Definition 6 (Structured singular value [23]): The structured singular value of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ with respect to a set of structured matrices \mathbf{B}_χ as defined in (10) is defined as:

$$\mu_\chi(A) := \frac{1}{\min\{\|B\| : |I + AB| = 0, B \in \mathbf{B}_\chi\}} \quad (23)$$

An upper bound for μ may be calculated by the use of so-called *D-scaling* matrices belonging to the following set:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_\chi := \{ & \text{blkdiag}(D_1, D_2, \dots, D_s, \\ & d_1 I_{m_1}, d_2 I_{m_2}, \dots, d_b I_{m_b}) : D_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n_k \times n_k} \text{ and } d_k \in \mathbb{C} \\ & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } k = 1, \dots, b\}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

For each scalar block of $B \in \mathbf{B}_\chi$, the matrix $D \in \mathbf{D}_\chi$ has a full block in the corresponding position, and vice versa, and so $DB = BD$. Then, the following is an upper bound for $\mu[2]$:

$$\mu_\chi(A) \leq \bar{\mu}_\chi(A) := \inf_{D \in \mathbf{D}_\chi, |D| \neq 0} \|DAD^{-1}\|. \quad (25)$$

An optimal *D-scaling* matrix may be found via LMI (and other methods,) as implemented in MATLAB's `musv` routine.

Our aim in this section will be to develop an analogous “structured phase” measure on complex matrices. We then provide upper and lower bounds on this quantity, the former of which can be computed using LMI methods. This definition will be used in Section V to obtain our main results on the robust stability of feedback interconnections.

We begin by introducing the notion of a *phase index*, intended as a phase analogue to the largest singular value of a matrix.

Definition 7: The *phase index* of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is defined as follows:

$$\phi(A) := \sup_{z \in W(A)} |\angle z|. \quad (26)$$

A matrix with phase index $\alpha \in [0, \pi]$ has numerical range $W(A)$ that lies within $\text{sec}(-\alpha, \alpha)$, as depicted in Figure 4. It follows that if the negative real line is contained in $W(A)$, $\bar{\phi}(A) = \pi$. This is the case when A is non-semi-sectorial, but is also the case when A is semi-sectorial and π or $-\pi \in [\underline{\phi}(A), \bar{\phi}(A)]$. More precisely, if A is semi-sectorial, then:

$$\phi(A) = \min(\pi, \max(|\underline{\phi}(A)|, |\bar{\phi}(A)|)). \quad (27)$$

It then follows from Lemma 1 that if:

$$\phi(A) + \phi(B) < \pi, \quad (28)$$

for some $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, we have $|I + AB| \neq 0$. We also have the following lemma:

Lemma 2: Suppose $B \in \mathbf{B}_\chi$ and $D \in \mathbf{D}_\chi$ satisfy $\Theta(B) + \Theta(D) \leq \pi/2$. Then:

$$\phi(BD) \leq \phi(B) + \phi(D). \quad (29)$$

Proof: If B has block diagonal structure as notated in (10) and D as in (24), then we can write:

$$BD = \text{blkdiag}(\delta_1 D_1, \dots, \delta_s D_s, d_1 \Delta_1, d_b \Delta_b). \quad (30)$$

By (P5) and (P1), each block's phases lie in the interval $[\phi(B) + \phi(D), \bar{\phi}(B) + \bar{\phi}(D)]$. Then, (P5) implies that BD is a semi-sectorial matrix with phases in that interval, from which the result follows. ■

We now define the *structured phase index*, in analogy to the structured singular value.

Definition 8: Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, its *structured phase index* with respect to a compatible block dimension χ is:

$$\psi_\chi(A) := \pi - \inf\{\phi(B) : |I + AB| = 0, B \in \mathbf{B}_\chi\} \quad (31)$$

There is no straightforward way to calculate ψ . Clearly, it follows from (28) that

$$\psi_\chi(A) \leq \phi(A). \quad (32)$$

However, this offers no more information than the small phase theorem itself, and can be an arbitrarily conservative estimate of the true value of ψ . We can address this by using D -scaling matrices as multipliers.

Lemma 3: For any $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbf{B}_\chi$ and invertible $D \in \mathbf{D}_\chi$, if:

$$\phi(B) < \pi - \phi(AD) - \phi(D), \quad (33)$$

$$\Theta(B) \leq \pi - \Theta(D), \quad (34)$$

are satisfied, we have $|I + AB| \neq 0$.

Proof: Because (34) is satisfied, we may invoke Lemma 2 and (P4) to state $\phi(D^{-1}B) \leq \phi(D) + \phi(B)$. From (33) we also have $\phi(AD) < \pi - \phi(B) - \phi(D)$. By applying Lemma 1 to AD and $D^{-1}B$, the conclusion follows. ■

A corollary of this result is that if Lemma 3 is satisfied by some particular choice of D , it is also satisfied by $\tilde{D} = e^{-j\gamma(D)}D$, for which:

$$\phi(\tilde{D}) = \Theta(\tilde{D})/2. \quad (35)$$

It follows that when searching for D -scaling matrices satisfying Lemma 3, we need only search over D -scaling matrices satisfying $\phi(D) < \pi/2$, i.e. $\text{Re}(D) > 0$.

In order to prove $\psi_\chi(A) < \alpha$, we need to prove that $|I + AB| \neq 0$ for any $B \in \mathbf{B}_\chi$ satisfying only $\phi(B) \leq \pi - \alpha$. A consequence of this is that if we wish to prove this for $\alpha \leq \pi/2$, we require $\Theta(D) = 0$. The previous corollary implies that we need only search for a positive definite D in this case that satisfies the requirement:

$$\phi(AD) < \alpha. \quad (36)$$

Therefore, if we search for a positive definite D satisfying Lemma 3, and fail to find one, it follows that we cannot use D multipliers to prove that $\alpha \leq \pi/2$. More generally, we require $\Theta(D) \leq \max(0, 2\alpha - \pi)$, and we need only search over D satisfying:

$$\phi(D) \leq \max(0, \alpha - \pi/2), \quad (37)$$

$$\phi(AD) + \phi(D) < \alpha. \quad (38)$$

This leads to the definition of an upper bound on ψ as follows.

Definition 9:

$$\bar{\psi}_\chi(A) := \inf\{\alpha \in [0, \pi) : \exists D \in \mathbf{D}_\chi \text{ with } |D| \neq 0 \text{ satisfying (37)-(38) for } \alpha\}. \quad (39)$$

It is clear from Lemma 3 that this is indeed an upper bound for ψ , i.e. that:

$$\bar{\psi}(A) + \phi(B) < \pi, \quad (40)$$

implies $|I + AB| \neq 0$. In the following, we will show that it may be calculated efficiently using LMI optimization problems. We will use the following technical lemma.

Lemma 4: A matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is quasi-sectorial with:

$$\phi(A) \leq \arctan \kappa, \quad (41)$$

for some $\kappa \geq 0$ if and only if the following matrix inequalities are satisfied:

$$\kappa \operatorname{Re}(A) \geq \operatorname{Im}(A), \quad (42)$$

$$\kappa \operatorname{Re}(A) \geq -\operatorname{Im}(A). \quad (43)$$

Proof: (Sufficiency:) The matrix inequalities taken together imply $\operatorname{Re}(A) \geq 0$, which by (W4) implies that $W(A)$ lies in the closed RHP, and is therefore semi-sectorial. The inequality (42) may be rearranged to show:

$$\operatorname{Re}((\kappa - j)A) \geq 0. \quad (44)$$

By (P1), this implies that $\underline{\phi}(A) \geq -\arctan \kappa$. Similarly, (43) may be rearranged to show $\overline{\phi}(A) \leq \arctan \kappa$, showing $\phi(A) \leq \arctan \kappa$ as needed.

(Necessity:) The preceding steps may be reversed to show that the phase constraint (41) imply the LMIs (42)-(43). ■

The following LMI problem allows the first term of the minimum in (55) to be determined in the case that it is no greater than $\pi/2$.

Lemma 5: Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$,

$$\overline{\psi}_\chi(A) \leq \arctan \kappa \quad (45)$$

for some $\kappa > 0$ if and only if:

$$D > 0 \quad (46)$$

$$\kappa \operatorname{Re}(AD) \geq \operatorname{Im}(AD) \quad (47)$$

$$\kappa \operatorname{Re}(AD) \geq -\operatorname{Im}(AD) \quad (48)$$

for some $D^* = D \in \mathbf{D}_\chi$.

Proof: We will proceed by showing that these LMI conditions are equivalent to (37)-(38) for all $\alpha > \arctan \kappa$, placing an upper bound on the infimum in (39). Firstly, $D > 0$ if and only if $\phi(D) = 0$ and D is invertible, so the invertibility requirement and (37) are equivalent to (46) for any α . Lemma 4 then implies that (47)-(48) are equivalent to the condition $\phi(AD) \leq \arctan \kappa$, and so (38) is satisfied for all $\alpha > \arctan \kappa$, as required. ■

Remark 2: The problem of finding the smallest κ for which Lemma 5 is feasible is a type of LMI optimization problem called the *generalized eigenvalue problem*. Such problems are quasi-convex, and solvers exist that are guaranteed to converge on the infimum for κ in polynomial time. In the case where A is nonsingular, MATLAB's `gevp` provides an efficient solution to the problem. If A is singular, numerical issues arise because (47)-(48) cannot be strictly satisfied. In this case, an approach using the `feasp` solver with a bisection method to estimate the minimum κ is required.

Lemma 6: Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$,

$$\overline{\psi}_\chi(A) \leq \pi/2 + \arctan \kappa \quad (49)$$

for some $\kappa > 0$ if and only if:

$$\operatorname{Re}(D) > 0 \quad (50)$$

$$\operatorname{Re}(AD) \geq 0 \quad (51)$$

$$\kappa \operatorname{Re}(D) \geq \operatorname{Im}(D) \quad (52)$$

$$\kappa \operatorname{Re}(D) \geq -\operatorname{Im}(D) \quad (53)$$

for some $D \in \mathbf{D}_\chi$.

Proof: (52)-(53) are by Lemma 4 equivalent to $\phi(D) \leq \arctan \kappa$, and so are equivalent to (37) for $\alpha \geq \pi/2 + \arctan \kappa$. Given these phase constraints, (50) is then equivalent to the invertibility of D . (53) then implies $\phi(AD) \leq \pi/2$, which is sufficient to prove (38) for $\alpha > \pi/2 + \arctan \kappa$. ■

Algorithm 1 summarizes the two-step procedure for calculating $\overline{\psi}_\chi(A)$.

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for calculating $\overline{\psi}_\chi$

Require: $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, χ .

if Lemma 5 is feasible **then** $\overline{\psi}_\chi \leftarrow \arctan \kappa$

else if Lemma 6 is feasible **then** $\overline{\psi}_\chi \leftarrow \pi/2 + \arctan \kappa$

else $\overline{\psi}_\chi \leftarrow \pi$

end if

To complement the upper bound $\overline{\psi}_\chi$, we desire a lower bound. This does not provide a sufficient condition for stability, but does allow a bound to be placed on the conservatism of $\overline{\psi}_\chi$. If we consider $B = \frac{1}{\lambda}I_n$, where $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$, the largest absolute phase of A 's eigenvalues gives a lower bound:

$$\psi_\chi(A) \geq \max_{\lambda \in \sigma(A)} |\angle \lambda| \quad (54)$$

This lower bound can generally be arbitrarily optimistic. To address this, we introduce the following:

$$\underline{\psi}_\chi(A) := \max_{X \in \mathbf{B}_\chi} \{|\angle \lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(XAX^*)\}. \quad (55)$$

To see that this is indeed a lower bound, take $B = \lambda^{-1}X^*X$, which satisfies $\phi(B) \leq \underline{\psi}_\chi(A)$.

The optimization problem contained in (55) is non-convex, and can have multiple local maxima. A detailed study of the properties of this optimization problem is outside of the scope of this paper. We will present an objective function and gradient that can be used with numerical optimization routines to obtain a potentially non-optimal lower bound. We parameterize the scaling matrix and the scaled version of A as:

$$X(x) := x_1X_1 + \dots x_kX_k, \quad (56)$$

$$\tilde{A}(x) := X(x)AX(x), \quad (57)$$

where $x = [x_1 \ \dots \ x_k]^T \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and X_1, \dots, X_k form a basis for all Hermitian matrices in \mathbf{B}_χ . We first define:

$$\lambda_\star(x) := \operatorname{argmax}_{\lambda \in \sigma(\tilde{A}(x))} |\angle \lambda|. \quad (58)$$

The objective function to maximize is then:

$$f(x) := \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^k} |\angle \lambda_\star(x)|. \quad (59)$$

We will now find an expression for the gradient of f in the case that $\lambda_\star(x)$ is unique and a simple eigenvalue of $\tilde{A}(x)$. In this case, we may apply Theorem 4 to obtain the partial derivative of λ_\star with respect to each element of x :

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_\star}{\partial x_i} = \frac{v(x)^* \tilde{A}(x)(X(x)X_i + X_iX(x))u(x)}{v(x)^*u(x)}, \quad (60)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$, where $u(x), v(x) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ are the right and left eigenvectors of $\tilde{A}(x)$ associated with $\lambda_\star(x)$. We may write down the following from the partial derivatives of $\arctan 2$:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \operatorname{Re} \lambda_\star} = -\operatorname{sgn}(|\angle \lambda_\star|) \frac{\operatorname{Im}(\lambda_\star)}{|\lambda_\star|^2}, \quad (61)$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \operatorname{Im} \lambda_\star} = +\operatorname{sgn}(|\angle \lambda_\star|) \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\lambda_\star)}{|\lambda_\star|^2}. \quad (62)$$

Then, each component of the gradient may be written:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \operatorname{Re} \lambda_\star} \operatorname{Re} \frac{\partial \lambda_\star}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \operatorname{Im} \lambda_\star} \operatorname{Im} \frac{\partial \lambda_\star}{\partial x_i}, \quad (63)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

MATLAB's `fminunc` may be used to obtain the estimates of $\underline{\psi}$, with the objective function f and its gradient in (60), and using $X_c = I_n$ as the starting point and `trust-region` as the algorithm.

V. MAIN RESULTS

We are now able to present our the main results of on the stability of LTI feedback interconnected systems subject to structured perturbations. Our main result shows that if the frequency response of the plant and perturbation respect the phase bound at all frequencies, an IQC can be formulated that guarantees the stability of the interconnection, and hence the admissibility of the perturbation.

Our first result provides our solution to Problem 1:

Theorem 1: Consider a well-posed feedback system (G, Δ) , where $G, \Delta \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times n}$. Let $\chi = (\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m})$ be a pair of block dimension tuples compatible with G . If $\Delta \in \mathbf{\Delta}_\chi$ and:

$$\phi(\Delta(j\omega)) < \pi - \overline{\psi}(G(j\omega)), \quad (64)$$

for all $\omega \in [0, \infty]$, then the interconnection (G, Δ) is stable.

Proof: Define the function $D : [0, \infty] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, where $D(\omega)$ is equal to some matrix in \mathbf{D}_χ satisfying the condition of the supremum in (39) with $A = G(j\omega)$ and $\alpha = \alpha(\omega)$ satisfying:

$$\phi(\Delta(j\omega)) \leq \alpha(\omega) < \pi - \bar{\psi}(G(j\omega)). \quad (65)$$

It follows from (37)-(38) that:

$$\phi(G(j\omega)D(\omega)) + \phi(D(\omega)) < \pi - \phi(\Delta(j\omega)), \quad (66)$$

and then by Lemma 2 that:

$$\phi(G(j\omega)D(\omega)) + \phi(D(\omega)^{-1}\Delta(j\omega)) < \pi. \quad (67)$$

It then follows from (P1) that there exists $\beta(\omega) \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ so that:

$$\phi(e^{j\beta(\omega)}G(j\omega)D(\omega)) < \pi/2, \quad (68)$$

$$\phi(e^{-j\beta(\omega)}D(\omega)^{-1}\Delta(j\omega)) \leq \pi/2. \quad (69)$$

Then define the multiplier function:

$$\Pi(j\omega) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -e^{-j\beta(\omega)}D(\omega)^{-1} \\ -e^{j\beta(\omega)}D(\omega)^{-*} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (70)$$

Δ satisfies the IQC defined by Π if and only if the frequency domain inequality (FDI) is satisfied:

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ -\Delta(j\omega) \end{bmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{bmatrix} I \\ -\Delta(j\omega) \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (71)$$

$$\iff \operatorname{Re}(e^{-j\beta(\omega)}D(\omega)^{-1}\Delta(j\omega)) \geq 0 \quad (72)$$

which is indeed guaranteed by (69). The corresponding FDI for G is:

$$\begin{bmatrix} G(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{bmatrix} G(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix} \leq -\epsilon G(j\omega)^*G(j\omega), \quad (73)$$

$$\operatorname{Re}(e^{j\beta(\omega)}G(j\omega)D(\omega)) \geq -\epsilon D(\omega)^*G(j\omega)^*G(j\omega)D(\omega). \quad (74)$$

Note that by (68), $G(j\omega)D(\omega)$ is quasi-sectorial. By taking a decomposition of the form (18) into orthogonal sectorial and zero parts, we can see that the inequality is satisfied for some $\epsilon > 0$ due to the phase restriction implied by (68) on the sectorial part. Further, because the phase condition is satisfied on a closed set, we may choose a single $\epsilon > 0$ that satisfies the inequality for all $\omega \in [0, \infty]$. Therefore, the requirements of Theorem 5 are satisfied, and (G, Δ) is a stable interconnection. ■

We recall the robust stability condition provided by the structured singular value μ .

Theorem 2: [23] Any interconnection (G, Δ) with $\Delta \in \mathbf{\Delta}_\chi$ for a compatible block dimension χ satisfying:

$$\mu_\chi(G(j\omega)) \cdot \|\Delta(j\omega)\| < 1 \quad \forall \omega \in [0, \infty], \quad (75)$$

is well-posed and stable.

Our second main result combines Theorems 1 and 2 to provide a mixed gain and phase stability criterion, providing a solution to Problem 2.

Theorem 3: Consider a well-posed feedback system (G, Δ) , where $G, \Delta \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{n \times n}$. Let $\chi = (\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m})$ be a pair of block dimension tuples compatible with G , and let $\mathbf{\Delta}_\chi$ be a set of structured perturbations, with $\Delta \in \mathbf{\Delta}_\chi$. If there exist closed sets $\Omega_\psi, \Omega_\mu \subseteq [0, \infty]$ so that $\Omega_\psi \cup \Omega_\mu = [0, \infty]$ and

$$\phi(\Delta(j\omega)) + \bar{\psi}_\chi(G(j\omega)) < \pi \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\psi, \quad (76)$$

$$\|\Delta(j\omega)\| \cdot \bar{\mu}_\chi(G(j\omega)) < 1 \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\mu, \quad (77)$$

then the interconnection (G, Δ) is stable.

Proof: We define a piecewise multiplier function $\Pi(j\omega) : j\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n}$. For frequencies $\omega \in \Omega_\psi$, we define $D_\psi(\omega)$ and $\beta(\omega)$ in the same way as in Theorem 1, and:

$$\Pi(j\omega) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -e^{-j\beta(\omega)}D_\psi(\omega)^{-1} \\ -e^{j\beta(\omega)}D_\psi(\omega)^{-*} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (78)$$

Clearly, the FDI on Δ and G is satisfied at these frequencies. For frequencies $\omega \notin \Omega_\psi$, (77) is satisfied. At these frequencies, we define $D_\mu(\omega)$ to be a D -scaling matrix satisfying:

$$\|D_\mu(\omega)G(j\omega)D_\mu(\omega)^{-1}\| \leq \Delta(j\omega)^{-1} < \bar{\mu}(G(j\omega)). \quad (79)$$




Fig. 5: Block diagram of perturbed rotating body system.

At these frequencies, we then define:

$$\Pi(j\omega) := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}(G(j\omega))^{-2}D(\omega)^*D(\omega) & 0 \\ 0 & -D(\omega)^*D(\omega) \end{bmatrix} \quad (80)$$

From Theorem 1, it is clear that Δ and G satisfy the required FDIs for $\omega \in \Omega_\psi$. At other frequencies, the FDI for Δ may be written:

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ -\Delta(j\omega) \end{bmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{bmatrix} I \\ -\Delta(j\omega) \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \quad (81)$$

$$I_n - \bar{\mu}(G(j\omega))^2 \Delta(j\omega)^* \Delta(j\omega) \geq 0 \quad (82)$$

which is guaranteed by the condition on the singular values of $\Delta(j\omega)$. Similarly, the FDI on G at these frequencies is:

$$\begin{bmatrix} G(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{bmatrix} G(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix} \leq -\epsilon G(j\omega)^* G(j\omega) \quad (83)$$

$$I_n - \frac{D(\omega)^{-*} G(j\omega)^* D(\omega)^* D(\omega) G(j\omega) D(\omega)^{-1}}{\bar{\mu}(G(j\omega))^2} \geq \epsilon G(j\omega)^* G(j\omega) \quad (84)$$

which is guaranteed for all $\omega \in \Omega_\mu$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ because (79) is satisfied over a closed set. Therefore, the FDI on both G and Δ is satisfied at all frequencies, and the stability of (G, Δ) is proved. ■

VI. EXAMPLE

We present the application of the combined structured singular value (μ) and structured phase radius (ψ) criteria to a simple system. We will additionally analyse the system with an approach combining the structured singular value with the relative passivity index (R , detailed in the Appendix), and show that the combination of μ and ψ can identify a set of admissible perturbations that cannot be identified by a combination of μ and R . We examine the example of a rotating 3 dimensional body given in Chapter 8.6 of [25]. The dynamics of the system are written in terms of the variables $y_1(t), y_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ with inputs $u_1(t), u_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}$. The dynamic equations of the nominal system are given by:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{y}_1 \\ \dot{y}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & a \\ -a & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (85)$$

where $a = (1 - I_3/I_1)\Omega$. I_3 and I_1 are the moments of inertia in the x and z axes. The system may be represented in transfer function form as follows:

$$Y_0(s) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{s^2 + a^2} \begin{bmatrix} s - a^2 & a(s+1) \\ -a(s+1) & s - a^2 \end{bmatrix}}_{P_0(s)} U(s) \quad (86)$$

where $Y_0(s)$ and $U(s)$ are the Laplace transforms of $[y_1 \ y_2]^T$ and $[u_1 \ u_2]^T$ respectively, and $P_0(s)$ represents the nominal plant dynamics. The system is perturbed by a multiplicative perturbation $\Delta(s) \in \mathcal{RH}_\infty^{2 \times 2}$ as follows:

$$Y_\Delta(s) = (I + \Delta(s))P(s)U(s) = Y_0(s) + \Delta(s)P(s)U(s). \quad (87)$$

The system, equipped with the (stabilizing) control law $U(s) = -Y_\Delta(s) + R(s)$, is illustrated in Figure 5. The complementary sensitivity transfer function $T(s)$ defined by $Y_0(s) = T(s)W(s)$ is given by:

$$T(s) = \frac{1}{s+1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & a \\ -a & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (88)$$

The stability of the perturbed closed loop can be analysed by a feedback loop containing T and Δ (i.e. we identify G of Figure 1 with T .) We consider diagonal perturbations of the form:

$$\Delta(s) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{0.25}{s/b+1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (89)$$




Fig. 6: Root locus of perturbed system as b varies from 0 to ∞ .




Fig. 7: Structured singular value plot for T and singular value plots for Δ .

where $b > 0$ is a parameter. This perturbation belongs to Δ_χ with $\chi = ((), (1, 1))$.

Because the perturbation Δ is parameterised by a single parameter b , we are able to plot the root locus of the system in Figure 6. The root locus plot shows that the system is unstable for values of $b \in [0.45, 2.9]$. The class of perturbations (11) that we address cannot generally be analysed with a root locus plot—this example allows us to compare the performance of different stability analysis methods by comparing the size of the range of perturbations proven admissible by each method.

Figure 7 plots the reciprocal of $\bar{\mu}_\chi$ of $T(j\omega)$ (using MATLAB's `mussv`) and the largest singular value of $\Delta(j\omega)$ in accordance with (77). Inspection of $\Delta(s)$ shows that $\|\Delta(j\omega)\| = 0.5$ for all $\omega \geq 0$, and therefore independent of b . The singular value plots given in Figure 7 show that the gain criterion (77) is satisfied for all frequencies above 5.6 rad/s.

The reciprocal of the R -value of $T(j\omega)$ and the R -value of $\Delta(j\omega)$ are plotted in Figure 8 for several values of b in accordance with (105). By inspection, we can see that the criterion is satisfied for ω no greater than 2.9 rad/s regardless of the value of b chosen, due to the asymptotic behaviour of the R -value of $T(j\omega)$ in the low frequency limit. Therefore, regardless of the value of b , neither the structured singular value criterion nor the R -value criterion are satisfied for $\omega \in (2.9, 5.6)$, and stability cannot be concluded for any perturbation of the form (89) on the basis of the combination of these two criteria.

The upper bound of the structured phase radius $\bar{\psi}_\chi$ of $T(j\omega)$ was calculated using the LMI methods detailed in Algorithm 1 and plotted alongside the phase radii of $\Delta(j\omega)$. The lower bound $\underline{\psi}_\chi$ was also calculated as described in Section IV, but was found to be equal to $\bar{\psi}_\chi$ to within 0.1%, and as such was not plotted. Figure 9 shows that for $b \geq 22$, the phase criterion (76) is satisfied for $\omega < 5.6$ rad/s. Therefore, for $b \geq 22$, either the phase or gain criterion is satisfied for all frequencies, guaranteeing the stability of the system.

The root locus plot indicates that the system is stable for perturbations with values of $b > 2.9$. The combination of structured singular value analysis and relative passivity analysis could not identify any part of this region of stability, while combining structured singular value analysis with structured phase analysis correctly identifies the portion of the stable region where $b > 22$. This demonstrates that there exist admissible perturbations that can be identified by a combination of gain and phase analysis methods that could not have been identified by combining gain and passivity methods.




Fig. 8: Structured relative passivity index plot for T and relative passivity plot for Δ .




Fig. 9: Structured phase radius plot for T and phase radius plots for Δ .

VII. CONCLUSION

We investigated the potential for some newly developed notions of matrix phase to provide novel phase-based robust stability criteria for stable LTI plants that are subject to structured perturbations. The approach resembles the well-known μ -analysis methods that use matrix singular values. When combined with conventional singular value stability criteria, the mixed gain and phase-based methods can provide enhanced criteria for determining robust stability margins. An example demonstrated that the novel criteria were able to determine robust stability criteria for a class of perturbations whose stability could not be determined via either a conventional μ -analysis, nor passivity-based methods. Future work could consider the associated synthesis problem, for example optimising structured phase robustness at low frequencies and gain robustness at high frequencies.

VIII. APPENDIX

A. Derivative of an Eigenvalue

Theorem 4 (Theorem 2, [26]): Suppose that $A_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ has a simple eigenvalue $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ with an associated eigenvalue $u_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$, so that:

$$A_0 u_0 = \lambda_0 u_0. \quad (90)$$

Then there exist functions λ and u defined and continuous on a neighbourhood of A_0 satisfying:

$$\lambda(A_0) = \lambda_0, \quad (91)$$

$$u(A_0) = u_0, \quad (92)$$

$$u_0^* u(A) = 1, \quad (93)$$

$$A u(A) = \lambda(A) u(A). \quad (94)$$

Furthermore, the functions λ and u are differentiable on this neighbourhood, and their differentials are:

$$d\lambda = \frac{v_0^*(dA)u_0}{v_0^*u_0}, \quad (95)$$

$$du = (\lambda_0 I_n - A_0)^+ \left(I - \frac{u_0 v_0^*}{v_0^* u_0} \right) (dZ)u_0, \quad (96)$$

where v_0 is a right eigenvector of A_0 corresponding to λ_0 , i.e:

$$v_0^* A_0 = \lambda_0 v_0^*, \quad (97)$$

B. Integral Quadratic Constraints

Definition 10: Given a bounded self-adjoint operator $\Pi \in \mathcal{RL}_\infty^{2n \times 2n}$, we say that $\Delta : \mathbb{L}_{2e}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_{2e}^n$ satisfies the IQC (integral quadratic constraint) defined by Π if:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\widehat{\frac{\hat{v}(j\omega)}{\Delta(v)(j\omega)}} \right]^* \Pi(j\omega) \left[\widehat{\frac{\hat{v}(j\omega)}{\Delta(v)(j\omega)}} \right] d\omega \geq 0 \quad (98)$$

Theorem 5: (IQC Stability [27]) Consider the interconnection of (G, Δ) given in Figure 1. Assume:

- (I) For every $\tau \in [0, 1]$, the interconnection of G and $-\tau\Delta$ is well-posed.
- (II) For every $\tau \in [0, 1]$, the IQC defined by Π (98) is satisfied by $-\tau\Delta$.
- (III) There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that:

$$\begin{bmatrix} G(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{bmatrix} G(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix} \leq -\epsilon I, \quad \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (99)$$

Then the feedback interconnection of (G, Δ) is stable.

The negative sign applied to Δ accounts for the negative feedback connection in Figure 1.

Remark 3: Suppose that the multiplier Π is partitioned into $n \times n$ blocks:

$$\Pi = \begin{bmatrix} \Pi_{11} & \Pi_{12} \\ \Pi_{12}^* & \Pi_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (100)$$

Then, if $\Pi_{11} \geq 0$ and $\Pi_{22} \leq 0$, the IQC defined by Π is satisfied by $\tau\Delta$ for $\tau \in [0, 1]$ if and only if it is satisfied by Δ [27]. This simplifies condition (II) of Theorem 5.

Remark 4: The frequency domain inequality (III) may be replaced with the following [28]:

$$\begin{bmatrix} G(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{bmatrix} G(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix} \leq -\epsilon G(j\omega)^* G(j\omega), \quad \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (101)$$

C. Relative Passivity Analysis

Consider the feedback loop interconnection of Figure 1. A well-known loop transformation allows the plant and perturbation to be replaced with their ‘‘scattering matrix’’ equivalents, defined as follows:

$$S_G = (I - G)(I + G)^{-1}, \quad (102)$$

$$S_\Delta = (I - \Delta)(I + \Delta)^{-1}. \quad (103)$$

The \mathcal{L}_∞ gain of such a ‘‘scattering’’ system is no greater than 1 if and only if S_G is passive [1]. For linear systems and perturbations, this permits a frequency domain stability criterion based on the largest singular value of the frequency response of the plant and perturbation. If Δ comes from the structured set $\mathbf{\Delta}_\chi$, we may use the structured singular value of S_G , which we will denote:

$$R(G(j\omega)) = \mu_\chi(S_G(j\omega)). \quad (104)$$

This leads to a combined structured gain/passivity stability criterion, namely, that if the frequency response of G and Δ satisfy either one of:

$$\mu_\chi(G(j\omega)) \cdot \|\Delta(j\omega)\| < 1 \text{ or}, \quad (105)$$

$$R(G(j\omega)) \cdot \|S_\Delta(j\omega)\| < 1, \quad (106)$$

for all $\omega \geq 0$, the interconnection (G, Δ) is stable.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Desoer and M. Vidyasagar. *Feedback Systems: Input-Output Properties*. Academic, 1975.
- [2] J. Doyle. “Analysis of feedback systems with structured uncertainties”. In: *IEE Proceedings D (Control Theory and Applications)* 129 (6 Nov. 1982), 242–250(8).
- [3] Y. Chen et al. “Robust Stability Assessment of Single-Phase Inverter With Multiparameter Distributions”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics* 37 (5 2022), pp. 6062–6073.
- [4] Y. Wang et al. “ H^∞ Robust Current Control for DFIG-Based Wind Turbine Subject to Grid Voltage Distortions”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy* 8 (2 2017), pp. 816–825.
- [5] Y. Pan et al. “Towards the Robust Small-Signal Stability Region of Power Systems Under Perturbations Such as Uncertain and Volatile Wind Generation”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 33 (2 2018), pp. 1790–1799.
- [6] J. Bao and P.L. Lee. *Process Control: The Passive Systems Approach*. Springer, 2007.
- [7] I. Postlethwaite, J. Edmunds, and A. MacFarlane. “Principal gains and principal phases in the analysis of linear multivariable feedback systems”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 26 (1 1981), pp. 32–46.
- [8] J.M. Pak and S.H. Hong. “Gain-phase information based robust control theory”. In: *International Journal of Robust Nonlinear Control* (2020).
- [9] J.S. Freudenberg and D.P. Looze. *Frequency Domain Properties of Scalar and Multivariable Systems*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1988.
- [10] J. Chen. “Multivariable Gain-Phase and Sensitivity Integral Relations and Design Tradeoffs”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* (1998).
- [11] J.R. Bar-on and E.A. Jonckheere. “Phase margins for multivariable control systems”. In: *International Journal of Control* (1990).
- [12] Q.G. Wang et al. “On loop phase margins of multivariable control systems”. In: *Journal of Process Control* (2008).
- [13] V. Chellaboina, W. M. Haddad, and A. Kamath. “The structured phase margin for robust stability analysis of linear systems with phase and time delay uncertainties”. In: *International Journal of Control* (2008).
- [14] R. Srazhidinov, D. Zhang, and L. Qiu. “Computation of the phase and gain margins of MIMO control systems”. In: *Automatica* (2023).
- [15] A. L. Tits, V. Balakrishnan, and L. Lee. “Robustness Under Bounded Uncertainty with Phase Information”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 44.1 (Jan. 1999), pp. 50–65.
- [16] D. Wang et al. “On the phases of a complex matrix”. In: *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 593 (2020), pp. 152–179.
- [17] W. Chen et al. “A Phase Theory of Multi-Input Multi-Output Linear Time-Invariant Systems”. In: *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 62.2 (2024), pp. 1235–1260.
- [18] L. Woolcock and R. Schmid. “Mixed gain/phase robustness criterion for structured perturbations with an application to power system stability”. In: *IEEE Control Systems Letters* (2023).
- [19] J. Liang, D. Zhao, and L. Qiu. “Feedback Stability Under Mixed Gain and Phase Uncertainty”. In: *ArXiv* (2024).
- [20] L. Woolcock and R. Schmid. “Performance Comparison of MIMO Gain/Phase Analysis Methods for Sub-Synchronous Instability”. In: *12th IFAC Symposium on Control of Power and Energy Systems* (2024), pp. 515–520.
- [21] D. Wang, W. Chen, and L. Qiu. “Synchronization of diverse agents via phase analysis”. In: *Automatica* 159 (2024), p. 111325.
- [22] W. Chen, D. Wang, and L. Qiu. “The First Five Years of a Phase Theory for Complex Systems and Networks”. In: *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica* 11.JAS-2024-0220 (2024), pp. 1728–1743.
- [23] K. Zhou, J. Doyle, and K. Glover. *Robust and Optimal Control*. Ed. by Tom Robbins. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, 1996.
- [24] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson. *Topics in Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [25] K. Zhou. *Essentials of Robust Control*. Ed. by Tom Robbins. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, 1999.
- [26] Jan R. Magnus. “On Differentiating Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors”. In: *Econometric Theory* 1.2 (Aug. 1985), pp. 179–191.
- [27] J. Veenman, C.W. Scherer, and H. Koroglu. “Robust stability and performance analysis based on integral quadratic constraints”. In: *European Journal of Control* (2016), pp. 1–32.
- [28] A. Megretski and A. Rantzer. “System Analysis via Integral Quadratic Constraints”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* (1997).