

Tracking performance of PID for nonlinear stochastic systems

Cheng Zhao and Shuo Yuan

Abstract

In this paper, we will consider a class of continuous-time stochastic control systems with both unknown nonlinear structure and unknown disturbances, and investigate the capability of the classical proportional-integral-derivative(PID) controller in tracking time-varying reference signals. First, under some suitable conditions on system nonlinear functions, reference signals, and unknown disturbances, we will show that PID controllers can be designed to globally stabilize such systems and ensure the boundedness of the tracking error. Analytic design formulae for PID gain matrices are also provided, which only involve some prior knowledge of the partial derivatives of system structural nonlinear functions. Besides, it will be shown that the steady-state tracking error hinges on three critical factors: i) the change rate of reference signals and external disturbances; ii) the intensity of random noises; iii) the selection of PID gains, and can be made arbitrarily small by choosing PID gains suitably large. Finally, by introducing a desired transient process which is shaped from the reference signal, we will present a new PID tuning rule, which can guarantee both nice steady-state and superior transient control performances.

Keywords: PID control, nonlinear stochastic systems, parameter design, stability, tracking.

1 Introduction

Feedback is a basic concept in automatic control, whose primary objective is to reduce the effects of the plant uncertainty on the desired control performance. The PID controller is by far the most basic and dominating form of feedback in use today, and is believed to be “bread and butter” of control engineering [2]. In fact, more than 90% of all control loops are PID [2]. Of course, one of the main challenging tasks for the implementation of the PID controller is how to design the three controller parameters, which has been investigated extensively in the

Cheng Zhao and Shuo Yuan are with the Key Laboratory of Systems and Control, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China(e-mail: zhaocheng@amss.ac.cn; syuan@amss.ac.cn). Corresponding author: Shuo Yuan.

literature, e.g., for linear time-invariant systems with time delay [11, 1], for affine nonlinear systems with adaptively tuning PID gains [13], and for mechanical systems with special structures [12, 14], just to name a few.

As the most widely adopted control method in industrial processes, the PID controller is favored by various control practitioners because of its simple structure and ease of implementation. However, there are limited theoretical investigations explaining the rationale for why PID is so successful in dealing with various practical nonlinear systems with uncertainties. In recent years, some rigorous mathematical studies on the theory and design of classical PID have been made for uncertain nonlinear systems, see e.g., [19, 18, 17, 6], which have shown explicitly that PID control has the ability to deal with a vast range of system structural uncertainties. For instance, in [20], the authors have shown that the classical PID control has the ability to globally stabilize a class of nonlinear uncertain systems without control channel uncertainty, and make the system output converge to any given constant setpoint, provided that some prior knowledge of the Lipschitz constants of system nonlinear functions are available. Moreover, necessary and sufficient conditions for the selection of the PID parameters have also been provided for a class of single-input-single-output(SISO) affine nonlinear systems in [19]. To the best of our knowledge, the global stability of a class of PID controlled nonaffine MIMO uncertain nonlinear systems was established for the first time in [18]. Then, the authors further extended the deterministic results to stochastic cases in [17].

It is worth mentioning that most of the investigations on the analysis and design of PID control assume that the reference signal is time-invariant(or converges to a constant), and do not account for unknown external uncertainties, see e.g. [9, 3, 19, 20, 18, 17]. For theoretical studies of PID controlled nonlinear stochastic systems, the diffusion term is usually required to vanish at the setpoint(see e.g., [4, 17]), which is also an unrealistic assumption for many practical systems. In order to further reveal the rationale of the linear PID control, it is necessary to take both internal structural uncertainties and unknown external disturbances into consideration. Also, it is of vital importance to investigate the capability of PID in dealing with general time-varying reference signals. These facts motivate us to consider a class of nonlinear stochastic systems subject to both unknown dynamics and external disturbances, where both the reference signal and the external disturbance are not assumed to be slowly time-varying. Besides, the diffusion term is not required to vanish at the reference signal in this paper.

The contributions are summarized as follows:

- First, we will show that the classical PID control can globally stabilize such systems and ensure the boundedness of the tracking error under suitable conditions on system nonlinear functions, disturbances, and reference signals. Also, analytic design formulae for PID gain matrices are provided, which are only based on bounds of partial derivatives of the nonlinear drift and diffusion functions.
- It will be shown that the steady-state error is determined by the change

rate of reference signals and external disturbances, the intensity of the stochastic disturbances, and choices of the PID gain matrices. Moreover, it will be shown that the PID gains can be chosen large enough to achieve practical tracking, even if the reference signal is not slowly varying.

- A new PID tuning rule is also presented, which can guarantee both nice steady-state and superior transient control performance of the closed-loop systems.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the problem formulation, including the notations, the control systems, and the assumptions. Section 3 presents the main results of this paper, with their proofs given in Section 4. Finally, we conclude the paper with some remarks in Section 5.

2 Problem Formulation

2.1 Notations

Denote $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ as the space of $m \times n$ real matrices, $|x|$ as the Euclidean norm of a vector x , A^\top as the transpose of a matrix A . Let $\mathbb{R}^+ = [0, \infty)$. The norm of a matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is defined by $\|P\| = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, |x|=1} |Px|$. For a symmetric matrix S , let $\lambda_{\min}(S)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(S)$ denote the smallest and largest eigenvalues of S , respectively. For two symmetric matrices S_1 and S_2 in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the notation $S_1 \geq S_2$ (or $S_2 \leq S_1$) means that $S_1 - S_2$ is a positive semi-definite matrix. For a function $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_k}, \mathbb{R}^m)$, let $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ denote the $m \times n_i$ Jacobian matrix of f with respect to x_i at the point (x_1, \dots, x_k) . For a random variable X , let $\mathbf{E}(X)$ denote its expectation.

2.2 The control systems

Consider a class of nonlinear stochastic systems with both unknown nonlinear structure and unknown disturbance:

$$\begin{cases} dx_1(t) = x_2(t)dt \\ dx_2(t) = [f(x_1(t), x_2(t), u(t)) + d(t)] dt + g(x_1(t), x_2(t))dB_t, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is the state vector, $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the control input, $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^{3n}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $g \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ are system structural nonlinear functions, $d \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is the unknown external disturbance and $\{B_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion.

Remark 1 *Many physical systems can be described by model (1) via the Newton's second law in mechanics or some fundamental physical laws in electromagnetics. For instance, it can be used to describe the motion of a controlled moving body in \mathbb{R}^n . The well-known Langevin equation can also be described by model (1). Besides, note that unknown dynamics, external disturbances, and random*

noises are simultaneously taken into account in system (1), which makes it applicable to many practical processes including motion control systems and power systems, etc.

The control objective is to globally stabilize the uncertain stochastic system (1) in the mean square sense and to make the controlled variable $x_1(t)$ track a given *time-varying* reference signal $r(t)$.

The classical PID controller is given by

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= K_p e(t) + K_i \int_0^t e(s) ds + K_d \dot{e}(t), \\ e(t) &= r(t) - x_1(t), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $e(t)$ is the tracking error, K_p , K_i and K_d are $n \times n$ PID gain matrices to be designed. In this paper, we aim to investigate the capability of the classical PID (2) in dealing with the nonlinear stochastic system (1), and focus on the tracking performance of the closed-loop system.

2.3 Assumptions

We first introduce some assumptions about the uncertain nonlinear functions, the time-varying reference signal and the external disturbance.

Assumption 1. The nonlinear functions f and g satisfy

$$\left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right\| \leq L_i, \quad \left\| \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} \right\| \leq N_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \text{for all } x_1, x_2, u \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where L_1, L_2, N_1 and N_2 are positive constants. Besides,

$$0 < \underline{b}I_n \leq \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \leq \bar{b}I_n, \quad \text{for all } x_1, x_2, u \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $0 < \underline{b} \leq \bar{b}$ are constants and I_n is the identity matrix.

Remark 2 We remark that the boundedness of the partial derivatives $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}$ ($i = 1, 2$) appears to be necessary in general for global results, since the classical PID is a linear feedback, see [20, 18]. The boundedness of the partial derivatives $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i}$ ($i = 1, 2$) is equivalent to the global Lipschitz condition, which is a standard condition used in stochastic differential equation to ensure the global existence and uniqueness of solutions. In addition, the positive constants $L_1, L_2, N_1, N_2, \underline{b}$ and \bar{b} can be used to measure the system uncertainty quantitatively, which will also play a key role in designing the PID matrices.

Assumption 2. Both $r(t)$ and $d(t)$ are continuously differentiable, and their time derivatives are bounded, i.e.,

$$|\dot{r}|_\infty := \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{r}(t)| < \infty, \quad |\dot{d}|_\infty := \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{d}(t)| < \infty.$$

Assumption 3. The random noise along the reference signal is bounded, i.e.,

$$|g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty := \sup_{t \geq 0} |g(r(t), \dot{r}(t))| < \infty.$$

Remark 3 *Assumption 2 means that both the reference signal and the external disturbance cannot change “too fast”, since their L^∞ norms limit the change rate. It is worth noting that the reference signal and the external disturbance are not required to be generated by some exosystems, which is a quite mild condition compared to those used in the literature for output regulation, see e.g., [8]. Assumption 3 is also rather mild and reasonable, since the norm $|g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty$ characterizes the intensity of random noise along the reference signal. Finally, we point out that the three norms $|\dot{r}|_\infty, |\dot{d}|_\infty$ and $|g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty$ will directly affect the tracking performance of the PID controlled stochastic system, which can be seen from Theorem 1 given in the next section.*

3 The main results

3.1 PID Parameter Design

Stability is a primary requirement of a feedback system. It turns out that much insight into PID control can be obtained by analyzing the *stability region*, which is the set of controller parameters that give stable closed-loop systems [2].

In this subsection, we will provide analytic design formulae for the PID matrices K_p, K_i and K_d .

Stability Region. The PID gain matrices K_p, K_i and K_d are diagonal, positive definite and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(K_i) &> \lambda_{\max}(K_i)/\sqrt{2}, \\ \lambda_{\min}(K_p^2 - 2K_iK_d) &> \bar{k} + N_1^2\|K_d\|/\underline{b}, \\ \lambda_{\min}(K_d^2 - K_p/\underline{b}) &> \bar{k} + N_2^2\|K_d\|/\underline{b}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{k} := (L_1 + L_2)(\|K_p\| + \|K_d\|)/\underline{b}$.

Remark 4 *First, it is worth noting that inequalities (3) for the PID matrices only involves the constants L_1, L_2, N_1, N_2 and \underline{b} , which are only related to properties of the system nonlinear functions f and g . Therefore, the selection of the PID matrices is independent of the reference signal $r(t)$ and the unknown disturbance $d(t)$. Next, we remark that inequalities (3) always have solutions. Indeed, if the PID matrices are given by*

$$K_i = k_i I_n, \quad K_p = k_p I_n, \quad K_d = k_d I_n, \quad (4)$$

where $(k_i, k_p, k_d) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are selected from the following three dimensional unbounded set([17]):

$$\Omega = \left\{ (k_i, k_p, k_d) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \mid \begin{array}{l} k_p^2 - 2k_i k_d > \bar{k}_1 + k_d N_1^2 / \underline{b} \\ k_d^2 - k_p / \underline{b} > \bar{k}_1 + k_d N_2^2 / \underline{b} \end{array} \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\bar{k}_1 := (L_1 + L_2)(k_p + k_d)/\underline{b}$, then (3) will be satisfied.

3.2 Bounded tracking error

Let us consider the PID controlled stochastic system (1)-(2), where Assumptions 1-3 hold. Then we are in position to present the main results of this paper.

Theorem 1 *Suppose the PID matrices satisfy (3), then there exist positive constants c_1 , c_2 and λ , depending at most on $K_i, K_p, K_d, L_1, L_2, N_1, N_2, \underline{b}, \bar{b}$ and n , such that for all initial states $(x_1(0), x_2(0)) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(|e(t)| + |\dot{e}(t)|)^2 &\leq c_1(|e(0)| + |\dot{e}(0)| + |u^*|)^2 e^{-\lambda t} \\ &+ c_2 \left(|\dot{r}|_\infty + |\dot{d}|_\infty + |g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty \right)^2, \text{ for all } t \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $e(t) = r(t) - x_1(t)$ is the tracking error and u^* meets the algebraic equation $f(r(0), \dot{r}(0), u^*) + d(0) = 0$. In addition, if we have $\sup_{t \geq 0} |r(t)| + |d(t)| < \infty$, then the closed-loop system (1)-(2) will be globally stable in the sense that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(|x_1(t)| + |x_2(t)| + |u(t)|)^2 < \infty.$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is supplied in the next section.

We give some explanations of Theorem 1. Firstly, Theorem 1 demonstrates the ability of PID control to handle a vast range of uncertainties, and ensures the *boundedness* of the tracking error. Besides, by (6), it is not difficult to obtain

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}|e(t)| \leq c \left(|\dot{r}|_\infty + |\dot{d}|_\infty + |g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty \right), \quad (7)$$

where the constant $c = \sqrt{c_2}$ relies on the choices of the PID matrices. Inequality (7) indicates that the steady-state tracking error is determined by three critical factors:

- The quantity $|\dot{r}|_\infty + |\dot{d}|_\infty$, which reflects the *change rate* of the reference signal $r(t)$ and the external disturbance $d(t)$;
- The norm $|g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty$, which characterizes the *intensity of random noises* along the reference signal;
- The constant c , which depends on the choices of the PID gain matrices.

In particular, one can see that the steady-state error will be *small* if both $r(t)$, $d(t)$ are slowly time-varying and the random noise is *weak* along the reference signal.

Secondly, we remark that the boundedness of the reference signal and the external disturbance is *not necessary* to obtain bounded tracking error, because we only require that the derivatives $\dot{r}(t)$ and $\dot{d}(t)$ are bounded. Therefore, Theorem 1 has demonstrated the ability of PID to track a class of time-varying reference signals with a linear growth rate, which is a significant difference from most of the existing literature since the boundedness of reference signals is usually required to obtain bounded tracking error, see e.g., [5, 15].

Thirdly, let us apply Theorem 1 to a special class of stochastic system, where the reference signal and the external disturbance are *constants*. The following corollary follows immediately from Theorem 1.

Corollary 1 *Consider the PID controlled system:*

$$\begin{aligned} dx_1 &= x_2 dt, \\ dx_2 &= [f(x_1, x_2, u) + d_0] dt + g(x_1, x_2) dB_t, \quad x_1, u \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u &= K_p e(t) + K_i \int_0^t e(s) ds + K_d \dot{e}(t), \quad e(t) = r^* - x_1(t), \end{aligned}$$

where functions f and g satisfy Assumption 1, $d_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the external disturbance and $r^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the setpoint. Suppose $g(r^*, 0) = 0$ and PID matrices satisfy (3), then there are some positive constants c and λ , such that

$$\mathbf{E} (|e(t)| + |\dot{e}(t)|)^2 \leq c (|e(0)| + |\dot{e}(0)| + |u^*|)^2 e^{-\lambda t}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where u^* is the unique solution of $f(r^*, 0, u) + d = 0$.

Remark 5 *From Corollary 1, one can see that for constant external disturbance and constant reference signal, the tracking error will converge to zero exponentially, provided that the diffusion term vanishes at $(r^*, 0)$ and the PID matrices are chosen suitably. It is worth mentioning that Corollary 1 improves the corresponding results in [17] and [18], in which the PID gains are limited to constants. Besides, Corollary 1 also demonstrates that the PID controllers can deal with coupled non-affine uncertain nonlinear systems, see [16] for related results of affine nonlinear systems without external disturbance.*

3.3 Steady-state control performance

Practical tracking is an important research subject, which aims to drive the tracking error to a prescribed vicinity of zero in finite time and maintain it inside thereafter. From (7), one can see that the steady-state error depends on the choice of the PID matrices and the three L^∞ norms $|\dot{r}|_\infty$, $|d|_\infty$ and $|g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty$. However, it is still unclear whether PID control can be designed to achieve practical tracking, i.e., to make the steady-state error *arbitrarily small*. In this subsection, we will address this basic question and give an affirmative answer to it.

To deal with this issue, we first point out an important geometric property of the set Ω defined by (5), namely,

$$(k_i, k_p, k_d) \in \Omega \Rightarrow \left(\frac{k_i}{\epsilon^3}, \frac{k_p}{\epsilon^2}, \frac{k_d}{\epsilon} \right) \in \Omega, \quad 0 < \epsilon \leq 1. \quad (8)$$

Indeed, let $k_i^\epsilon = k_i/\epsilon^3$, $k_p^\epsilon = k_p/\epsilon^2$, $k_d^\epsilon = k_d/\epsilon$, and $\bar{k}_1^\epsilon = (k_p^\epsilon + k_d^\epsilon)(L_1 + L_2)$. Note that $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, it is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned} (k_p^\epsilon)^2 - 2k_i^\epsilon k_d^\epsilon &= \epsilon^{-4} (k_p^2 - 2k_i k_d) > \epsilon^{-4} (\bar{k}_1 + k_d N_1^2 / \underline{b}) \geq \bar{k}_1^\epsilon + k_d^\epsilon N_1^2 / \underline{b}, \\ (k_d^\epsilon)^2 - k_p^\epsilon / \underline{b} &= \epsilon^{-2} (k_d^2 - k_p / \underline{b}) > \epsilon^{-2} (\bar{k}_1 + k_d N_2^2 / \underline{b}) \geq \bar{k}_1^\epsilon + k_d^\epsilon N_2^2 / \underline{b}, \end{aligned}$$

thus $(k_i^\epsilon, k_p^\epsilon, k_d^\epsilon) \in \Omega$.

We also need an additional assumption of the reference signal.

Assumption 4. The reference signal $r(\cdot) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^n)$, and its second derivative is bounded on \mathbb{R}^+ .

Now, consider the PID controlled stochastic system (1)-(2), where Assumptions 1-4 hold. By virtue of property (8), we have the following result.

Theorem 2 *Let $(k_i, k_p, k_d) \in \Omega$ be any given triple. Suppose the PID gain matrices are taken as follows:*

$$K_i^\epsilon = \frac{k_i I_n}{\epsilon^3}, \quad K_p^\epsilon = \frac{k_p I_n}{\epsilon^2}, \quad K_d^\epsilon = \frac{k_d I_n}{\epsilon}, \quad 0 < \epsilon \leq 1. \quad (9)$$

Then there exists a constant $c > 0$, which depends on $k_i, k_p, k_d, L_1, L_2, N_1, N_2, \underline{b}, \bar{b}, n$ only, such that the following tracking performance will be achieved:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}|e(t)|^2 &\leq c \left[(|\dot{r}|_\infty + |\ddot{r}|_\infty + |\dot{d}|_\infty)^2 \epsilon + |g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty^2 \right] \epsilon^3 \\ \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}|\dot{e}(t)|^2 &\leq c \left[(|\dot{r}|_\infty + |\ddot{r}|_\infty + |\dot{d}|_\infty)^2 \epsilon + |g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty^2 \right] \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

for all $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, where $|\dot{r}|_\infty, |\ddot{r}|_\infty, |\dot{d}|_\infty$ and $|g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty$ are the L^∞ norms of the corresponding functions.

Remark 6 *We remark that the constant c in Eq. (10) is independent of the parameter ϵ and these L^∞ norms. Therefore, practical tracking can be achieved for the nonlinear stochastic model (1), as long as one tunes ϵ small enough. In fact, it follows from Theorem 2 that the steady-state error will be small, provided that one of the following conditions holds:*

- *The norms $|\dot{r}|_\infty, |\ddot{r}|_\infty, |\dot{d}|_\infty, |g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty$ are small;*
- *The PID gains are large enough according to (9).*

3.4 Transient control performance

In practical applications, the quality of control systems is usually evaluated by both the steady-state and transient performance. Theorem 2 indicates that nice steady-state control performance can be guaranteed by choosing sufficiently large PID parameters. Of course, it is natural to ask whether PID controllers can be designed to ensure both nice transient and steady errors during the tracking process.

For this purpose, we introduce the following desired transient process to be tracked by $x_1(t)$, which is shaped from the reference signal $r(t)$ by a stable linear filter([21]):

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{y}^* &= -\omega^2(y^* - r(t)) - 2\omega(\dot{y}^* - \dot{r}(t)) + \ddot{r}(t), \\ y^*(0) &= x_1(0), \quad \dot{y}^*(0) = x_2(0), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\omega > 0$ is a constant for tuning the speed of the transient process, and $x_1(0), x_2(0)$ are the initial states of the stochastic system (1).

Now, suppose the PID control for system (1) is described as follows:

$$\hat{u}(t) = K_p E(t) + K_i \int_0^t E(s) ds + K_d \dot{E}(t), \quad (12)$$

where $E(t) = y^*(t) - x_1(t)$ is the error between the controlled variable $x_1(t)$ and its ideal trajectories $y^*(t)$.

To ensure desired transient performance, the controlled variable $x_1(t)$ should be close to $y^*(t)$ during the tracking process. This inspires us to consider the following bound:

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E} \left[|x_1(t) - y^*(t)|^2 + |x_2(t) - \dot{y}^*(t)|^2 \right]. \quad (13)$$

Next, we will show that one can design PID matrices such that the above upper bound is as small as possible.

Theorem 3 Consider system (1), where Assumptions 1-4 hold and the control \hat{u} is defined by (12). Suppose PID matrices are given by (9) with $(k_i, k_p, k_d) \in \Omega$ be a given triple. Then there is a constant $c > 0$, which is independent of ϵ , such that the following estimates of the tracking errors hold uniformly in $[0, \infty)$, i.e.,

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E} |E(t)|^2 \leq c\epsilon^3, \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E} \left| \dot{E}(t) \right|^2 \leq c\epsilon, \quad 0 < \epsilon \leq 1, \quad (14)$$

where $E(t) = y^*(t) - x_1(t)$.

Remark 7 First, Theorem 3 shows that the controlled variable $x_1(t)$ can be tuned arbitrarily close to its ideal transient process $y^*(t)$, provided that one increases the PID gains suitably according to formula (9). Next, from the proof of Theorem 3, it can be obtained that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E} |u(t)|^2 = O(\epsilon^{-1}), \quad 0 < \epsilon \leq 1,$$

which implies that the amplitude of controller $u(t)$ is of order $1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, large PID gains (i.e., ϵ is chosen sufficiently small) will make the implementation of the controller impossible, since saturation of physical actuators is ubiquitous in practical control systems. Besides, large PID gains may amplify measurement errors due to the inevitability of measurement noises, which may lead to unsatisfactory tracking performance. Therefore, the theoretical analysis on PID controlled nonlinear stochastic systems with measurement noises and input saturation should be an important work in the future.

4 Proofs of the main results

To prove the main results, we need to introduce several lemmas.

First, define a function space $C_b^k([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$, which consists of all functions $h \in C^k([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$ with property

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \dot{h}(t) \right| + \cdots + \left| h^{(k)}(t) \right| < \infty,$$

where $k \geq 1$ is a positive integer.

The first lemma indicates that any function $h \in C_b^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$ can be approximated by some function $p \in C_b^3([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$ in a certain sense. To be specific,

Lemma 1 *For any given $n \geq 1$, there is a constant $c_n > 0$, such that for all $h \in C_b^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists some $p \in C_b^3([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$, which satisfies*

$$|p(t) - h(t)| \vee |\dot{p}(t)| \vee |\ddot{p}(t)| \vee |p^{(3)}(t)| \leq c_n \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)|, \text{ for all } t \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

Lemma 2 *Suppose that the $n \times n$ matrices K_p, K_i and K_d are diagonal, positive definite and satisfy inequalities (3), then the following $3n \times 3n$ matrix*

$$P \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2\underline{b}K_iK_p & 2\underline{b}K_iK_d & K_i \\ 2\underline{b}K_iK_d & 2\underline{b}K_pK_d - K_i & K_p \\ K_i & K_p & K_d \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

is positive definite. Also, let A, B, C, D and θ be $n \times n$ matrices that satisfy

$$\|A\| \leq L_1, \quad \|B\| \leq L_2, \quad \|C\| \leq N_1, \quad \|D\| \leq N_2, \quad \theta \geq \underline{b}I_n.$$

Then, there exists $\gamma > 0$, which depends on $K_p, K_i, K_d, L_1, L_2, N_1, N_2$ and \underline{b} only, such that for all $Y = [y_0^\top, y_1^\top, y_2^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{3n}$,

$$2Y^\top P \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ Ay_1 + By_2 - \theta \bar{y} \end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{2} \|K_d\| |Cy_1 + Dy_2|^2 \leq -\gamma |Y|^2,$$

where $\bar{y} := K_i y_0 + K_p y_1 + K_d y_2$.

The proofs of Lemmas 1-2 are given in the Appendix.

It is noteworthy that the positive constant γ is independent of the five matrices A, B, C, D and θ . This property is crucial in the proofs of the main results.

Lemma 3 [18, Proposition 4.1] *Let $\Phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Suppose that*

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} \geq R, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a constant positive definite matrix, then Φ is a global diffeomorphism on \mathbb{R}^n . As a consequence, Φ is surjective.

We also need some basic concepts and results about the solution of stochastic differential equations(SDE). Consider the following nonlinear SDE:

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) = b(t, x(t))dt + \sigma(t, x(t))dB_t, \\ x(0) = x_0, \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the state, B_t is a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion defined on a complete probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) with $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ being a natural filtration, and $b(t, x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$, $\sigma(t, x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$ are nonlinear functions.

Definition 1 Given a time-invariant function $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R})$ associated with the equation (17). The differential operator \mathcal{L} acting on V is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}V(t, x) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} b(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma(t, x)^\top \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x^2} \sigma(t, x), \quad (18)$$

where $\frac{\partial V}{\partial x} := (\frac{\partial V}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial V}{\partial x_m})$ and $\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x^2} := (\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x_i \partial x_j})_{m \times m}$ are the gradient and Hessian matrix of V respectively.

According to [10, Theorem 3.5 and Remark 3.4] up to a slight modification, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4 If there exist a nonnegative function $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ and positive constants α, β such that $\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) = \infty$ and $\mathcal{L}V(t, x) \leq -\alpha V(x) + \beta$, then SDE (17) has a unique solution $(x(t))_{t \geq 0}$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}V(x(t)) \leq V(x(0))e^{-\alpha t} + \beta/\alpha, \text{ for all } t \geq 0.$$

Proof of Theorem 1. For simplicity, let us denote

$$M := |\dot{r}|_\infty, \quad M_1 := |\dot{d}|_\infty, \quad M_2 := |g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty.$$

Step 1. First, by applying Lemma 1 to $r(t)$, there exists $q(t) \in C_b^3([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\max\{|q(t) - r(t)|, |\dot{q}(t)|, |\ddot{q}(t)|\} \leq c_n M, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (19)$$

where $c_n > 0$ only depends on n . Next, by condition $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \geq \underline{b}I_n$ and Lemma 3, we know that for any given $t \geq 0$, there exists a unique $u_r(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that

$$f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_r(t)) + d(t) = 0. \quad (20)$$

Similarly, for all $t \geq 0$, there exists a unique $u_q(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that

$$f(q(t), \dot{q}(t), u_q(t)) + d(t) = 0. \quad (21)$$

Combine (20) with (21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_r(t)) - f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_q(t)) \\ &= f(q(t), \dot{q}(t), u_q(t)) - f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_q(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Note that $0 < \underline{b}I_n \leq \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \leq \bar{b}I_n$, for any given $t \geq 0$, it can be derived that there exists some $n \times n$ matrix θ_t , such that

$$\begin{aligned} & f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_r(t)) - f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_q(t)) \\ &= \theta_t(u_r(t) - u_q(t)), \quad 0 < \underline{b}I_n \leq \theta_t \leq \bar{b}I_n. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Therefore, it follows from (22), (23) and (19) that

$$\begin{aligned} |u_r(t) - u_q(t)| &= |\theta_t^{-1} [f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_r(t)) - f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_q(t))]| \\ &= |\theta_t^{-1} [f(q(t), \dot{q}(t), u_q(t)) - f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_q(t))]| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\underline{b}} \left[L_1 \sup_{t \geq 0} |q(t) - r(t)| + L_2 \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{q}(t) - \dot{r}(t)| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\underline{b}} \left[L_1 \sup_{t \geq 0} |q(t) - r(t)| + L_2 \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{q}(t)| + |\dot{r}(t)| \right] \\ &\leq [(L_1 c_n + L_2(c_n + 1))/\underline{b}] M, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

On the other hand, by taking the derivative of both sides of (21), it follows that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \dot{q}(t) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \dot{q}} \ddot{q}(t) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial u_q} \dot{u}_q(t) + \dot{d}(t) = 0.$$

Hence, by (19) and Assumption 1, we obtain the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} |\dot{u}_q(t)| &= \left| \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial u_q} \right]^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \dot{q}(t) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \dot{q}} \ddot{q}(t) + \dot{d}(t) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\underline{b}} [c_n(L_1 + L_2)M + M_1] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\underline{b}} [c_n(L_1 + L_2) + 1] (M + M_1). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

From (25), one can see Lemma 1 can be applied to the function u_q . Therefore, there exist some $v_q \in C_b^3([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$|v_q(t) - u_q(t)| \vee |\dot{v}_q(t)| \vee |\ddot{v}_q(t)| \vee |v_q^{(3)}(t)| \leq \eta_0(M + M_1), \quad (26)$$

where $\eta_0 := (c_n^2(L_1 + L_2) + c_n)/\underline{b}$ depends on L_1, L_2, \underline{b} and n only. Combine (24) and (26), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |v_q(t) - u_r(t)| &\leq |v_q(t) - u_q(t)| + |u_q(t) - u_r(t)| \\ &\leq [\eta_0 + (L_1 c_n + L_2(c_n + 1))/\underline{b}] (M + M_1) \\ &=: \eta_1(M + M_1). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The constant η_1 also depends on L_1, L_2, \underline{b} and n only.

Step 2. Based on $q(t)$ and $v_q(t)$ given in Step 1, we introduce some notations

$$y_0(t) := - \int_0^t e(s)ds + K_i^{-1}v_q(t), \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} y_1(t) &:= x_1(t) - q(t) + K_i^{-1}\dot{v}_q(t) \\ &= -e(t) + [r(t) - q(t) + K_i^{-1}\dot{v}_q(t)], \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} y_2(t) &:= x_2(t) - \dot{q}(t) + K_i^{-1}\ddot{v}_q(t) \\ &= -\dot{e}(t) + [\dot{r}(t) - \dot{q}(t) + K_i^{-1}\ddot{v}_q(t)], \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$\bar{y}(t) := K_i y_0(t) + K_p y_1(t) + K_d y_2(t), \quad (31)$$

then the PID control (2) can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= K_p e(t) + K_i \int_0^t e(s)ds + K_d \dot{e}(t) \\ &= -\bar{y}(t) + v_q(t) + K_p [r(t) - q(t) + K_i^{-1}\dot{v}_q(t)] \\ &\quad + K_d [\dot{r}(t) - \dot{q}(t) + K_i^{-1}\ddot{v}_q(t)]. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1(t) &:= v_q(t) - u_r(t) + K_p [r(t) - q(t) + K_i^{-1}\dot{v}_q(t)] \\ &\quad + K_d [\dot{r}(t) - \dot{q}(t) + K_i^{-1}\ddot{v}_q(t)], \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

then $u(t)$ has a simpler expression:

$$u(t) = -\bar{y}(t) + \Delta_1(t) + u_r(t). \quad (33)$$

Now, we proceed to estimate the upper bound of $\Delta_1(t)$. By definition (32) of $\Delta_1(t)$, it is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_1(t)| &\leq |v_q(t) - u_r(t)| + \|K_p\| (|r(t) - q(t)| + |K_i^{-1}\dot{v}_q(t)|) \\ &\quad + \|K_d\| (|\dot{r}(t)| + |\dot{q}(t)| + |K_i^{-1}\ddot{v}_q(t)|). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

From (19), (26) and (27), there exists constant $\eta_2 > 0$, which depends on $L_1, L_2, \underline{b}, K_p, K_i, K_d$ and n only, such that

$$|\Delta_2(t)| \leq \eta_2(M + M_1), \text{ for all } t \geq 0. \quad (35)$$

Step 3. By definitions (28)-(30), we obtain the following SDE:

$$\begin{aligned} dy_0 &= [y_1 + (q(t) - r(t))] dt \\ dy_1 &= y_2 dt \\ dy_2 &= dx_2 + \left(K_i^{-1}v_q^{(3)}(t) - \ddot{q}(t) \right) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Besides, recall $dx_2(t) = [f(x_1(t), x_2(t), u(t)) + d(t)]dt + g(x_1(t), x_2(t))dB_t$, and apply relationship (20) and Assumption 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(x_1(t), x_2(t), u(t)) + d(t) \\ &= f(x_1(t), x_2(t), u(t)) - f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_r(t)) \\ &= A(x_1(t) - r(t)) + B(x_2(t) - \dot{r}(t)) + \theta(u(t) - u_r(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

for some time-varying $n \times n$ matrices A, B, θ satisfying

$$\|A\| \leq L_1, \quad \|B\| \leq L_2, \quad \underline{b}I_n \leq \theta \leq \bar{b}I_n.$$

Similarly, it can be obtained that

$$g(x_1(t), x_2(t)) - g(r(t), \dot{r}(t)) = C(x_1(t) - r(t)) + D(x_2(t) - \dot{r}(t)) \quad (38)$$

for some time-varying $n \times n$ matrices C and D satisfying

$$\|C\| \leq N_1, \quad \|D\| \leq N_2.$$

Next, from (29), (30) and (33), we know

$$x_1(t) - r(t) = y_1(t) + \Delta_2(t), \quad x_2(t) - \dot{r}(t) = y_2(t) + \Delta_3(t), \quad u(t) - u_r(t) = -\bar{y}(t) + \Delta_1(t),$$

where $\Delta_2(t)$ and $\Delta_3(t)$ are time-varying functions defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2(t) &:= q(t) - r(t) - K_i^{-1} \dot{v}_q(t), \\ \Delta_3(t) &:= \dot{q}(t) - \dot{r}(t) - K_i^{-1} \ddot{v}_q(t). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(x_1(t), x_2(t), u(t)) + d(t) \\ &= A(x_1(t) - r(t)) + B(x_2(t) - \dot{r}(t)) + \theta(u(t) - u_r(t)) \\ &= A(y_1(t) + \Delta_2(t)) + B(y_2(t) + \Delta_3(t)) + \theta(-\bar{y}(t) + \Delta_1(t)) \\ & \quad g(x_1(t), x_2(t)) = C(x_1(t) - r(t)) + D(x_2(t) - \dot{r}(t)) + g(r(t), \dot{r}(t)) \\ &= C(y_1(t) + \Delta_2(t)) + D(y_2(t) + \Delta_3(t)) + g(r(t), \dot{r}(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_4(t) &:= A\Delta_2(t) + B\Delta_3(t) + \theta\Delta_1(t) + K_i^{-1}v_q^{(3)}(t) - \ddot{q}(t), \\ \Delta_5(t) &:= C\Delta_2(t) + D\Delta_3(t) + g(r(t), \dot{r}(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

then from (36), (40) and (41), we have

$$\begin{aligned} dy_0(t) &= [y_1(t) + (q(t) - r(t))] dt \\ dy_1(t) &= y_2(t) dt \\ dy_2(t) &= [(Ay_1(t) + By_2(t) - \theta\bar{y}(t)) + \Delta_4(t)] dt + [Cy_1(t) + Dy_2(t) + \Delta_5(t)] dB_t. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, set

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} y_0 \\ y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad b(t, Y) = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ Ay_1 + By_2 - \theta \bar{y} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} q - r \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \Delta_4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma(t, Y) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ Cy_1 + Dy_2 + \Delta_5 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ is the $n \times 1$ vector with zero entries. Then we have

$$dY(t) = [b(t, Y(t)) + \Delta(t)] dt + \sigma(t, Y(t)) dB_t. \quad (42)$$

By definition (41), one can easily see that there exists some constant $\eta_3 > 0$, which only depends on $K_p, K_i, K_d, L_1, L_2, N_1, N_2, \underline{b}, \bar{b}$ and n , such that

$$|\Delta(t)| \leq \eta_3(M + M_1), \quad |\Delta_5(t)| \leq \eta_3(M + M_1) + M_2. \quad (43)$$

Step 4. Inspired by [18], we will consider the Lyapunov function $V(Y) = Y^\top P Y$, where P is a $3n \times 3n$ matrix defined by (16). From Lemma 2, the matrix P is positive definite. Moreover, by Definition 1, the differential operator \mathcal{L} acting on V is given by

$$\mathcal{L}V = \underbrace{\frac{\partial V}{\partial Y} b(t, Y)}_{\text{I}} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial V}{\partial Y} \Delta(t)}_{\text{II}} + \underbrace{\sigma(t, Y)^\top P \sigma(t, Y)}_{\text{III}}.$$

By some simple calculations, it can be deduced that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &= 2Y^\top P b(t, Y), \quad \text{II} = 2Y^\top P \Delta(t), \\ \text{III} &= \frac{1}{2} (Cy_1 + Dy_2 + \Delta_5(t))^\top K_d (Cy_1 + Dy_2 + \Delta_5(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Step 5. We next estimate the upper bound of $\mathcal{L}V$. From (43), the second term in $\mathcal{L}V$ satisfies

$$|\text{II}| \leq 2\|P\| \|Y\| |\Delta| \leq \frac{2\|P\| \eta_3(M + M_1) \sqrt{V}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(P)}}. \quad (44)$$

Besides, recall $|\Delta_5(t)| \leq \eta_3(M + M_1) + M_2$, $\|C\| \leq N_1$, $\|D\| \leq N_2$, thus the third term has the following upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III} &= \frac{1}{2} [(Cy_1 + Dy_2)^\top K_d (Cy_1 + Dy_2) + \Delta_5^\top K_d \Delta_5] + (Cy_1 + Dy_2)^\top K_d \Delta_5 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|K_d\| |Cy_1 + Dy_2|^2 + \|K_d\| (\eta_3^2(M + M_1)^2 + M_2^2) \\ &\quad + (N_1 + N_2) \|K_d\| (\eta_3(M + M_1) + M_2) |Y|. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Combine (44) and (45), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}V &\leq 2Y^\top Pb(t, Y) + \frac{1}{2}\|K_d\| |Cy_1 + Dy_2|^2 \\ &\quad + \eta_4 \left[(M + M_1 + M_2)^2 + (M + M_1 + M_2)\sqrt{V} \right]\end{aligned}$$

for some η_4 depending on $K_i, K_p, K_d, L_i, N_i, \underline{b}, \bar{b}, n$ only. Moreover, by Lemma 2, there exists some positive constant λ which depends on $(K_i, K_p, K_d, L_i, N_i, \underline{b})$ only, such that $2Y^\top Pb(t, Y) + \frac{1}{2}\|K_d\| |Cy_1 + Dy_2|^2 \leq -2\lambda V$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}V &\leq -2\lambda V + \eta_4 \left[\hat{M}^2 + \hat{M}\sqrt{V} \right] \\ &\leq -\lambda V + (\eta_4 + \eta_4^2/(4\lambda)) \hat{M}^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{M} := M + M_1 + M_2$. Therefore, by Lemma 4, we know that SDE (42) has a unique solution $(Y(t))_{t \geq 0}$ such that $\mathbf{E}V(t) \leq V(0)e^{-\lambda t} + (\eta_4 + \eta_4^2/(4\lambda)) \hat{M}^2/\lambda$. As a consequence, we have

$$\mathbf{E} \sum_{i=0}^2 |y_i(t)|^2 \leq \eta_5 \left[\sum_{j=0}^2 |y_j(0)|^2 e^{-\lambda t} + \hat{M}^2 \right],$$

where

$$\eta_5 := \max\{2(\eta_4 + \eta_4^2/\lambda)/\lambda, \lambda_{\max}(P)\}/\lambda_{\min}(P)$$

depends on $(K_i, K_p, K_d, L_i, N_i, \underline{b}, \bar{b}, n)$ only. It follows from (29)-(30) that

$$e(t) = -y_1(t) + (r(t) - q(t) + K_i^{-1}\dot{v}_q(t)), \quad \dot{e}(t) = -y_2(t) + (\dot{r}(t) - \dot{q}(t) + K_i^{-1}\ddot{v}_q(t)),$$

therefore it can be obtained

$$\begin{aligned}|e(t)|^2 &\leq 2|y_1(t)|^2 + \eta_6(M + M_1)^2, \quad |\dot{e}(t)|^2 \leq 2|y_2(t)|^2 + \eta_6(M + M_1)^2, \\ |y_1(0)|^2 &\leq 2|e(0)|^2 + \eta_6(M + M_1)^2, \quad |y_2(0)|^2 \leq 2|\dot{e}(0)|^2 + \eta_6(M + M_1)^2,\end{aligned}$$

for some η_6 depending on $(K_i, K_p, K_d, L_i, N_i, \underline{b}, \bar{b}, n)$ at most. Note also that $y_0(0) = K_i^{-1}v_q(0)$, thus there exists $\eta_7 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}|y_0(0)|^2 &\leq 2 \left[|K_i^{-1}(v_q(0) - u_r(0))|^2 + |K_i^{-1}u_r(0)|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \eta_7((M + M_1)^2 + |u_r(0)|^2).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{E} \left[|e(t)|^2 + |\dot{e}(t)|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbf{E} \left[|y_1(t)|^2 + |y_2(t)|^2 + \eta_6(M + M_1)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \eta_8 \left(\sum_{i=0}^2 |y_i(0)|^2 e^{-\lambda t} + \hat{M}^2 \right) \\ &\leq c_1 (|e(0)|^2 + |\dot{e}(0)|^2 + |u_r(0)|^2) e^{-\lambda t} + c_2 \hat{M}^2, \quad t \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

for some c_1 and c_2 depending on $K_i, K_p, K_d, L_i, N_i, \underline{b}, \bar{b}$ and n only. Note that $u_r(0)$ satisfies the equation $f(r(0), \dot{r}(0), u_r(0)) + d(0) = 0$. Recall $\hat{M} = M + M_1 + M_2$, therefore the first statement of Theorem 1 is proved.

Finally, if in addition we have the condition that r and d are bounded, then from (29), (30) and (33), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |x_1(t)| &\leq |y_1(t)| + \underbrace{|q(t) - r(t)| + |r(t)| + |K_i^{-1}\dot{v}_q(t)|}_{\text{bounded}}, \\ |x_2(t)| &\leq |y_2(t)| + \underbrace{|\dot{q}(t)| + |K_i^{-1}\ddot{v}_q(t)|}_{\text{bounded}}, \\ |u(t)| &\leq |\bar{y}(t)| + \underbrace{|\Delta_1(t)| + |u_r(t)|}_{\text{bounded}}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Thus, property $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(|x_1(t)| + |x_2(t)| + |u(t)|)^2 < \infty$ follows immediately from (46) and the boundedness of $\mathbf{E} \sum_{i=0}^2 |y_i(t)|^2$. \square

Remark 8 *It is worth mentioning that the positive constants $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_8, c_1, c_2$ and λ that appeared in the proof of Theorem 1 are independent of the initial states, the reference signal and the external disturbance, since they depend at most on the constants $L_1, L_2, N_1, N_2, \underline{b}, \bar{b}, n$ and the PID parameters.*

Proof of Theorem 2. Now, suppose K_p, K_i and K_d are determined by formula (9). Let us denote

$$w_0(t) := -\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t e(s) ds + \frac{\epsilon}{k_i} v_q(t), \quad (47)$$

$$w_1(t) := -\frac{1}{\epsilon} e(t) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{k_i} \dot{v}_q(t), \quad (48)$$

$$w_2(t) := -\dot{e}(t) + \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} \ddot{v}_q(t), \quad (49)$$

$$\bar{w}(t) := k_i w_0(t) + k_p w_1(t) + k_d w_2(t), \quad (50)$$

where the function $v_q \in C_b^3([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$ is given in Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 1, then the PID control can be written as follows:

$$u(t) = -\frac{\bar{w}(t)}{\epsilon} + u_r(t) + (v_q(t) - u_r(t)) + \frac{k_p}{k_i} \epsilon \dot{v}_q(t) + \frac{k_d}{k_i} \epsilon^2 \ddot{v}_q(t). \quad (51)$$

Moreover, denote

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1(t) &:= v_q(t) - u_r(t) + \frac{k_p}{k_i} \epsilon \dot{v}_q(t) + \frac{k_d}{k_i} \epsilon^2 \ddot{v}_q(t), \\ \delta_2(t) &:= \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} v_q^{(3)}(t) - \ddot{r}(t), \\ M_0 &= |\dot{r}|_\infty + |\ddot{r}|_\infty, \quad M_1 = |\dot{d}|_\infty, \quad M_2 = |g(r, \dot{r})|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

An explanation. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, the constants $\alpha_i, i = 1, \dots, 8; c_1, c_2$ and λ will appear in the following proofs, which depend at most on the constants $L_1, L_2, N_1, N_2, \underline{b}, \bar{b}, n$ and the triple (k_p, k_i, k_d) . We will not explain this property of them one by one later.

Recall $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, it is easy to see that there exists some constant $\alpha_0 > 0$, which is independent of ϵ , such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} |\delta_1(t)| \vee |\delta_2(t)| \leq \alpha_0(M_0 + M_1). \quad (53)$$

Under notations (47)-(49), the closed-loop control system (1)-(2) turns into

$$\begin{cases} dw_0 = \frac{1}{\epsilon} w_1 dt \\ dw_1 = \frac{1}{\epsilon} w_2 dt \\ dw_2 = dx_2 + \delta_2 dt. \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

From (48)-(49), it can be deduced that

$$x_1(t) - r(t) = \epsilon w_1(t) - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} \dot{v}_q(t), \quad x_2(t) - \dot{r}(t) = w_2(t) - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} \ddot{v}_q(t).$$

Besides, recall $f(r(t), \dot{r}(t), u_r(t)) + d(t) = 0$, it can be obtained that (we omit the time variable t for simplicity in the following derivations)

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1, x_2, u) + d &= f(x_1, x_2, u) - f(r, \dot{r}, u_r) \\ &= A(x_1 - r) + B(x_2 - \dot{r}) + \theta(u - u_r) \\ &= \epsilon A w_1 + B w_2 - \frac{\theta \bar{w}}{\epsilon} + \left(\theta \delta_1 - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} A \dot{v}_q - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} B \ddot{v}_q \right), \end{aligned}$$

where A, B, θ are $n \times n$ time-varying matrices satisfying

$$\|A\| \leq L_1, \quad \|B\| \leq L_2, \quad \underline{b} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\theta) \leq \bar{b}.$$

Similarly, the diffusion term

$$g(x_1, x_2) - g(r, \dot{r}) = \epsilon C w_1 + D w_2 - C \dot{v}_q \epsilon^3 / k_i - D \ddot{v}_q \epsilon^3 / k_i.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$dw_2 = \left(\epsilon A w_1 + B w_2 - \frac{\theta \bar{w}}{\epsilon} + \delta_3 \right) dt + (\epsilon C w_1 + D w_2 + \delta_4) dB_t,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_3 &:= \theta \delta_1 - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} A \dot{v}_q - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} B \ddot{v}_q + \delta_2, \\ \delta_4 &:= g(r, \dot{r}) - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} C \dot{v}_q - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} D \ddot{v}_q. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Denote

$$w = \begin{bmatrix} w_0 \\ w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_n & I_n & 0_n \\ 0_n & 0_n & I_n \\ -k_i\theta & \epsilon^2 A - k_p\theta & \epsilon B - k_d\theta \end{bmatrix},$$

we obtain

$$dw = \frac{\hat{A}w}{\epsilon} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \delta_3 \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \epsilon C w_1 + D w_2 + \delta_4 \end{bmatrix} dB_t. \quad (56)$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we consider the Lyapunov function $V(w) = w^\top P w$, where P is a $3n \times 3n$ matrix defined by

$$P \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2\bar{b}k_i k_p I_n & 2\bar{b}k_i k_d I_n & k_i I_n \\ 2\bar{b}k_i k_d I_n & (2\bar{b}k_p k_d - k_i)I_n & k_p I_n \\ k_i I_n & k_p I_n & k_d I_n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (57)$$

Then, by some simple manipulations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V &= \frac{1}{\epsilon} w^\top \left(\hat{A}^\top P + P \hat{A} \right) w + \bar{w}^\top \delta_3 + \frac{1}{2} k_d |\epsilon C w_1 + D w_2 + \delta_4|^2 \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{\epsilon} w^\top \left(\hat{A}^\top P + P \hat{A} \right) w + \frac{1}{2} k_d |\epsilon C w_1 + D w_2|^2}_{\text{I}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\bar{w}^\top \delta_3 + \frac{1}{2} k_d |\delta_4|^2 + k_d (\epsilon C w_1 + D w_2)^\top \delta_4}_{\text{II}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{w} = k_i w_0 + k_p w_1 + k_d w_2$. From Lemma 2, there exists $\lambda > 0$, which depends on $k_i, k_p, k_d, L_1, L_2, N_1, N_2, \bar{b}$ only, such that

$$w^\top \left(\hat{A}^\top P + P \hat{A} \right) w + \frac{1}{2} k_d |\epsilon C w_1 + D w_2|^2 \leq -2\lambda V.$$

Since $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, it can be obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &= \frac{1}{\epsilon} w^\top \left(\hat{A}^\top P + P \hat{A} \right) w + \frac{1}{2} k_d |\epsilon C w_1 + D w_2|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(w^\top \left(\hat{A}^\top P + P \hat{A} \right) w + \frac{1}{2} k_d |\epsilon C w_1 + D w_2|^2 \right) \\ &\leq -\frac{2\lambda}{\epsilon} V. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

By (53), (55) and (26), and recall $\theta \leq \bar{b}I_n$, we conclude that there exists constant $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that

$$|\delta_3| \leq \alpha_1 (M_0 + M_1), \quad |\delta_4| \leq M_2 + \alpha_1 (M_0 + M_1) \epsilon^3.$$

Consequently, there exists $\alpha_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{w}^\top \delta_3| &\leq \alpha_2 \sqrt{V} (M_0 + M_1), \\ k_d |\delta_4|^2 &\leq \alpha_2 (M_2^2 + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon^6), \\ |k_d (C\epsilon w_1 + Dw_2)^\top \delta_4| &\leq \alpha_2 \sqrt{V} (M_2 + (M_0 + M_1) \epsilon^3). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the second term

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi &\leq \alpha_3 \sqrt{V} \tilde{M} + \alpha_3 [M_2^2 + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon^6] \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda V}{\epsilon} + \frac{\alpha_3^2}{\lambda} \tilde{M}^2 \epsilon + \alpha_3 [M_2^2 + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon^6] \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda V}{\epsilon} + \alpha_4 (M_2^2 + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon), \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

for some α_3 and α_4 , where $\tilde{M} := M_0 + M_1 + M_2$. According to (58)-(59), we have the following estimate of $\mathcal{L}V$:

$$\mathcal{L}V \leq -\frac{\lambda V}{\epsilon} + \alpha_4 [M_2^2 + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon].$$

By Lemma 4, we know that

$$\mathbf{E}V(t) \leq V(0)e^{-\lambda t/\epsilon} + \alpha_5 [M_2^2 \epsilon + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon^2],$$

which in turn gives

$$\mathbf{E} \sum_{i=0}^2 |w_i(t)|^2 \leq \alpha_6 \sum_{i=0}^2 |w_i(0)|^2 e^{-\lambda t/\epsilon} + \alpha_6 [M_2^2 \epsilon + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon^2].$$

Note that $w_0(0) = \frac{\epsilon v_q(0)}{k_i}$ and

$$w_1(0) = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} e(0) + \frac{\epsilon^2 \dot{v}_q(0)}{k_i}, \quad w_2(0) = -\dot{e}(0) + \frac{\epsilon^3 \ddot{v}_q(0)}{k_i},$$

and that $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, it is not difficult to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \sum_{i=0}^2 |w_i(t)|^2 &\leq \alpha_7 \left(\frac{|e(0)|^2}{\epsilon^2} + |\dot{e}(0)|^2 + |u_r(0)|^2 \epsilon^2 \right) e^{-\lambda t/\epsilon} \\ &\quad + \alpha_7 (M_2^2 \epsilon + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant α_7 . Note that $|e(t)|^2 \leq 2\epsilon^2 |w_1(t)|^2 + \alpha_8 \epsilon^6 (M_0 + M_1)^2$, and $|\dot{e}(t)|^2 \leq 2|w_2(t)|^2 + \alpha_8 \epsilon^6 (M_0 + M_1)^2$, it can be obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}|e(t)|^2 &\leq c_1 \left(|e(0)|^2 + |\dot{e}(0)|^2 \epsilon^2 + |u_r(0)|^2 \epsilon^4 \right) e^{-\lambda t/\epsilon} \\ &\quad + c_2 (M_2^2 \epsilon^3 + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon^4), \\ \mathbf{E}|\dot{e}(t)|^2 &\leq c_1 \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} |e(0)|^2 + |\dot{e}(0)|^2 + |u_r(0)|^2 \epsilon^2 \right) e^{-\lambda t/\epsilon} \\ &\quad + c_2 (M_2^2 \epsilon + (M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}|e(t)|^2 &\leq c_2 [(M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon + M_2^2] \epsilon^3 \\ \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}|\dot{e}(t)|^2 &\leq c_2 [(M_0 + M_1)^2 \epsilon + M_2^2] \epsilon.\end{aligned}$$

By definitions of M_0 , M_1 and M_2 , it can be seen that the proof of Theorem 2 is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. We only give the sketch proof, since some details are analogous to proof of Theorem 2.

First, we denote $\xi_1(t) = y^*(t) - r(t)$ and $\xi_2(t) = \dot{y}^*(t) - \dot{r}(t)$, then it follows from (11) that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\xi}_1 &= \xi_2 \\ \dot{\xi}_2 &= -\omega^2 \xi_1 - 2\omega \xi_2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, there exist constants c_ω and λ_ω , which depend on ω only, such that $|\xi_1(t)| + |\xi_2(t)| \leq c_\omega e^{-\lambda_\omega t} (|\xi_1(0)| + |\xi_2(0)|)$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} |\xi_1(t)| + |\xi_2(t)| \leq c_\omega (|\xi_1(0)| + |\xi_2(0)|) := \beta_0,$$

where β_0 depends on the initial states, $r(0)$, $\dot{r}(0)$ and ω . Suppose the PID parameters are determined by formula (9). Let us denote

$$\begin{aligned}z_0(t) &:= -\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t E(s) ds + \frac{\epsilon}{k_i} v_q(t), \\ z_1(t) &:= -\frac{1}{\epsilon} E(t) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{k_i} \dot{v}_q(t), \\ z_2(t) &:= -\dot{E}(t) + \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} \ddot{v}_q(t), \\ \bar{z}(t) &:= k_i z_0(t) + k_p z_1(t) + k_d z_2(t),\end{aligned}\tag{60}$$

where $E(t) = y^*(t) - x_1(t)$ and v_q is defined in Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 1. Then the PID control (12) with parameters given by (9) can be expressed by

$$\hat{u} = -\frac{\bar{z}}{\epsilon} + u_r + (v_q - u_r) + \frac{k_p}{k_i} \epsilon \dot{v}_q + \frac{k_d}{k_i} \epsilon^2 \ddot{v}_q.\tag{61}$$

Moreover, denote

$$\bar{\delta}_2 := \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} v_q^{(3)} - \ddot{y}^*.\tag{62}$$

Under (60), the closed-loop control system turns into

$$\begin{aligned}dz_0 &= \frac{z_1}{\epsilon} dt \\ dz_1 &= \frac{z_2}{\epsilon} dt \\ dz_2 &= dx_2 + \bar{\delta}_2 dt.\end{aligned}\tag{63}$$

From (60), it can also be deduced that

$$x_1 = \epsilon y_1 - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} \dot{v}_q + r + \xi_1, \quad x_2 = y_2 - \frac{\epsilon^3}{k_i} \ddot{v}_q + \dot{r} + \xi_2.$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$dz_2 = \left(A\epsilon z_1 + Bz_2 - \frac{\theta \bar{z}}{\epsilon} + \bar{\delta}_3 \right) dt + (C\epsilon z_1 + Dz_2 + \bar{\delta}_4) dB_t,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\delta}_3 &:= A\xi_1 + B\xi_2 + \theta\delta_1 - \frac{A\epsilon^3\dot{v}_q}{k_i} - \frac{B\epsilon^3\ddot{v}_q}{k_i} + \delta_2, \\ \bar{\delta}_4 &:= g(r, \dot{r}) + C\xi_1 + D\xi_2 - \frac{C\epsilon^3\dot{v}_q}{k_i} - \frac{D\epsilon^3\ddot{v}_q}{k_i}, \end{aligned}$$

and A, B, C, D and θ are $n \times n$ matrices satisfying

$$\|A\| \leq L_1, \|B\| \leq L_2, \|C\| \leq N_1, \|D\| \leq N_2, \underline{b}I_n \leq \theta \leq \bar{b}I_n.$$

Denote

$$z = \begin{bmatrix} z_0 \\ z_1 \\ z_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_n & I_n & 0_n \\ 0_n & 0_n & I_n \\ -k_i\theta & \epsilon^2 A - k_p\theta & \epsilon B - k_d\theta \end{bmatrix},$$

we obtain

$$dz = \frac{\hat{A}z}{\epsilon} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \bar{\delta}_3 \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ C\epsilon y_1 + Dy_2 + \bar{\delta}_4 \end{bmatrix} dB_t. \quad (64)$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 2, we consider the Lyapunov function $V = z^\top Pz$, where P is given in (57). Then, by some simple manipulations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V &= \frac{1}{\epsilon} z^\top (\hat{A}^\top P + P\hat{A})z + \frac{1}{2} k_d |C\epsilon z_1 + Dz_2|^2 \\ &\quad + \bar{z}^\top \bar{\delta}_3 + \frac{1}{2} k_d |\bar{\delta}_4|^2 + k_d (C\epsilon z_1 + Dz_2)^\top \bar{\delta}_4 \\ &\leq -\frac{2\lambda}{\epsilon} V + \beta_1 \sqrt{V} + \beta_1 \\ &\leq -\frac{\lambda}{\epsilon} V + \beta_2 \end{aligned}$$

for some β_1 and β_2 independent of ϵ .

By Lemma 4, we know $\mathbf{E}V(t) \leq V(0)e^{-\lambda t/\epsilon} + \beta_2\epsilon/\lambda$, which in turn gives

$$\mathbf{E} \sum_{i=0}^2 |z_i(t)|^2 \leq \beta_3 \sum_{i=0}^2 |z_i(0)|^2 e^{-\lambda t/\epsilon} + \beta_3\epsilon.$$

Note that $|z_0(0)| + |z_1(0)| + |z_2(0)| = O(\epsilon)$ and that $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, it is not difficult to obtain

$$\mathbf{E} \sum_{i=0}^2 |z_i(t)|^2 \leq \beta_4 \epsilon^2 e^{-\lambda t/\epsilon} + \beta_3 \epsilon. \quad (65)$$

Note that

$$|E(t)|^2 \leq 2\epsilon^2 |z_1(t)|^2 + O(\epsilon^6), \quad \left| \dot{E}(t) \right|^2 \leq 2|z_2(t)|^2 + O(\epsilon^6),$$

it can be obtained that

$$\mathbf{E}|E(t)|^2 \leq c\epsilon^3, \quad \mathbf{E} \left| \dot{E}(t) \right|^2 \leq c\epsilon, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,$$

where the constant c is independent of ϵ (possibly depending on the initial states).

Finally, it can be seen from (60) and (65) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}|u(t)|^2 &= O(\epsilon^{-2}) \mathbf{E} \sum_{i=0}^2 |z_i(t)|^2 + O(1) \\ &= O(\epsilon^{-1}), \quad 0 < \epsilon \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3. □

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we have investigated the global tracking problem of the classical PID controller for a basic class of MIMO non-affine nonlinear uncertain stochastic systems. In contrast to most of the previous researches, the system model studied in this paper is more general since it considers unknown dynamics, external disturbances, and time-varying reference signals simultaneously. Explicit design formulae for the PID parameters are provided to stabilize the system globally, and the steady-state tracking error is shown to be closely related to properties of reference signals, external disturbances, and random noises. Finally, by introducing a desired transient process, we have also presented a new PID tuning rule, which can guarantee both nice steady-state and superior transient control performances. Of course, many important issues are still open and worth investigating. For example, it would be interesting and meaningful to consider the situation with measurement noises and input saturation, and to generalize the results in this paper to more general dynamical systems.

6 Appendix

Proof of Lemma 1. We first prove the case $n = 1$. Let J be a nonnegative function belonging to $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and have the following properties:

- (i) $J(t) = 0$ if $|t| \geq 1$,
- (ii) $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} J(t)dt = 1$.

For example, we may take

$$J(t) = \begin{cases} ke^{-\frac{1}{1-t^2}}, & \text{if } |t| < 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } |t| \geq 1, \end{cases} \quad (66)$$

where $k > 0$ is chosen such that condition (ii) is satisfied. Now, for $h \in C_b^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^1)$, we first extend h to a function defined on \mathbb{R} by $h(t) = 2h(0) - h(-t)$, for $t < 0$. Then, we define $p(t)$ as follows:

$$p(t) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(s)J(t-s)ds = \int_{-1}^1 h(t-s)J(s)ds. \quad (67)$$

By the property of convolution, it is well-known that $p(t) \in C^\infty([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^1)$. Next, it is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned} |h(t) - p(t)| &= \left| \int_{-1}^1 (h(t) - h(t-s))J(s)ds \right| \\ &\leq \int_{-1}^1 |h(t) - h(t-s)|J(s)ds \\ &\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)| \int_{-1}^1 J(s)ds \\ &= \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)|, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, from (67), it can be deduced that

$$\begin{aligned} |\dot{p}(t)| &= \left| \int_{-1}^1 \dot{h}(t-s)J(s)ds \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)| \int_{-1}^1 J(s)ds \\ &= \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)|, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We next estimate the upper bounds of $|\ddot{p}(t)|$ and $|p^{(3)}(t)|$. From the identities

$$\dot{p}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{h}(t-s)J(s)ds = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{h}(s)J(t-s)ds,$$

we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{p}(t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{h}(s)\dot{J}(t-s)ds, \\ p^{(3)}(t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dot{h}(s)\ddot{J}(t-s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\ddot{p}(t)| &\leq \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\dot{J}(s)| ds \right] \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)|, \\ |p^{(3)}(t)| &\leq \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\ddot{J}(s)| ds \right] \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)|. \end{aligned}$$

Let us choose

$$c_1 \triangleq \max \left\{ 1, \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\dot{J}(t)| dt, \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\ddot{J}(t)| dt \right\},$$

then (15) is satisfied for $n = 1$.

Next, we consider the case $n \geq 1$. Suppose $h = [h_1, \dots, h_n] \in C_b^1([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$. For each i , we know that there exists $p_i \in C_b^3([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^1)$, which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &|h_i(t) - p_i(t)| \vee |\dot{p}_i(t)| \vee |\ddot{p}_i(t)| \vee |p_i^{(3)}(t)| \\ &\leq c_1 \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}_i(t)|, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Now, set $p(t) = [p_1(t), \dots, p_n(t)]$, then $p \in C_b^3([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, it follows from (68) that

$$\begin{aligned} |h(t) - p(t)| &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |h_i(t) - p_i(t)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_1^2 \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}_i(t)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_1^2 \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = c_1 \sqrt{n} \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, from (68), it can be obtained that

$$|\dot{p}(t)| \vee |\ddot{p}(t)| \vee |p^{(3)}(t)| \leq c_n \sup_{t \geq 0} |\dot{h}(t)|, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,$$

where the constant c_n can be taken as $c_1 \sqrt{n}$. □

Proof of Lemma 2.

Step 1. We first prove that $P > 0$. Denote $B = [2\underline{b}K_i K_d \quad K_i]$ and

$$D = 2\underline{b}K_i K_p, \quad E = \begin{bmatrix} 2\underline{b}K_p K_d - K_i & K_p \\ K_p & K_d \end{bmatrix},$$

then $P = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} D & B \\ B^\top & E \end{bmatrix}$. Note that $D > 0$, to prove $P > 0$, by applying [7, Theorem 7.7.6], it suffices to show that $E - B^\top D^{-1} B > 0$. Note that K_p , K_i and K_d are diagonal matrices (and thus they are commutative), it can be

calculated that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E - B^\top D^{-1} B \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} 2\underline{b}(K_p^2 - K_i K_d) K_p^{-1} K_d - K_i & (K_p^2 - K_i K_d) K_p^{-1} \\ (K_p^2 - K_i K_d) K_p^{-1} & K_d - K_i K_p^{-1} / (2\underline{b}) \end{bmatrix} \\
&\triangleq \begin{bmatrix} D_1 & B_1 \\ B_1 & E_1 \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

To prove $E - B^\top D^{-1} B > 0$, by applying Theorem 7.7.6 in [7] again, we only need to show $D_1 > 0$, and

$$E_1 - B_1^\top D_1^{-1} B_1 > 0. \quad (69)$$

Firstly, from (3), we know that $K_p^2 > 2K_i K_d$ and $K_d^2 > K_p / \underline{b}$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1 &= 2\underline{b}(K_p^2 - K_i K_d) K_p^{-1} K_d - K_i \\
&> 2\underline{b} K_i K_d^2 K_p^{-1} - K_i = (2\underline{b} K_d^2 - K_p) K_i K_p^{-1} \\
&> \underline{b} K_d^2 K_i K_p^{-1} > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Secondly, note that D_1 , B_1 and E_1 are all $n \times n$ diagonal matrices, thus (69) is equivalent to $E_1 D_1 - B_1^2 > 0$. By some standard calculations,

$$E_1 D_1 - B_1^2 = K_p^{-1} (4K_p^2 K_d^2 \underline{b}^2 + K_i^2 - 2K_p^3 \underline{b} - 4K_i K_d^3 \underline{b}^2) / (2\underline{b}).$$

Write

$$K_p = \text{diag}(k_{p1}, k_{p2}, \dots, k_{pd}), \quad K_i = \text{diag}(k_{i1}, \dots, k_{id}), \quad K_d = \text{diag}(k_{d1}, k_{d2}, \dots, k_{dd}),$$

from $K_p^2 > 2K_i K_d$ and $K_d^2 > K_p / \underline{b}$, we know that $k_{pj}^2 > 2k_{ij} k_{dj}$ and $k_{dj}^2 > k_{pj} / \underline{b}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Therefore, based on the proof of [18, Proposition 4.2], we conclude that the j -th diagonal element of the matrix $4K_p^2 K_d^2 \underline{b}^2 + K_i^2 - 2K_p^3 \underline{b} - 4K_i K_d^3 \underline{b}^2$ is positive. Hence, $E_1 D_1 - B_1^2 > 0$.

Step 2. By some simple calculations, it can be deduced that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I} &:= 2Y^\top P \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ Ay_1 + By_2 - \theta \bar{y} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= 2\underline{b} y_0^\top K_i K_p y_1 + 2\underline{b} y_0^\top K_i K_d y_2 + 2\underline{b} y_1^\top K_i K_d y_1 \\
&\quad + y_1^\top K_i y_2 + y_1^\top (2\underline{b} K_p K_d - K_i) y_2 + y_2^\top K_p y_2 \\
&\quad + \bar{y}^\top (Ay_1 + By_2 - \theta \bar{y}).
\end{aligned}$$

First, note that $\theta \geq \underline{b} I_n$ and $\bar{y} = K_i y_0 + K_p y_1 + K_d y_2$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\bar{y}^\top \theta \bar{y} \leq -\underline{b} |K_i y_0 + K_p y_1 + K_d y_2|^2 \\
&= -\underline{b} (y_0^\top K_i^2 y_0 + y_1^\top K_p^2 y_1 + y_2^\top K_d^2 y_2 \\
&\quad + 2y_0^\top K_i K_p y_1 + 2y_0^\top K_i K_d y_2 + 2y_1^\top K_p K_d y_2). \quad (70)
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} \leq & -\underline{b}y_0^\top K_i^2 y_0 - \underline{b}y_1^\top (K_p^2 - 2K_i K_d)y_1 \\ & - y_2^\top (\underline{b}K_d^2 - K_p)y_2 + \bar{y}^\top (Ay_1 + By_2). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Next, notice $\|A\| \leq L_1$, $\|B\| \leq L_2$, it can be obtained that

$$y_0^\top K_i (Ay_1 + By_2) \leq \frac{\underline{b}\|K_i\|^2}{2}|y_0|^2 + \frac{L_1^2}{\underline{b}}|y_1|^2 + \frac{L_2^2}{\underline{b}}|y_2|^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (y_1^\top K_p + y_2^\top K_d) (Ay_1 + By_2) \\ & \leq (\|K_p\|L_1 + \hat{k}/2)|y_1|^2 + (\|K_d\|L_2 + \hat{k}/2)|y_2|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{k} := \|K_p\|L_2 + \|K_d\|L_1$. From (3), it is not difficult to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_p\|^2 & > \lambda_m(K_p^2 - 2K_i K_d) > \bar{k}, \\ \|K_d\|^2 & > \lambda_m(K_d^2 - K_p/\underline{b}) > \bar{k}, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where $\bar{k} = (\|K_p\| + \|K_d\|)(L_1 + L_2)/\underline{b}$. From (72), one can obtain the following inequalities:

$$\|K_p\| \geq 2(L_1 + L_2)/\underline{b}, \quad \|K_d\| \geq 2(L_1 + L_2)/\underline{b}. \quad (73)$$

By the definitions of \hat{k} and \bar{k} , it follows from (73) that

$$\|K_p\|L_1 + \hat{k}/2 + L_1^2/\underline{b} \leq \bar{k}, \quad \|K_d\|L_2 + \hat{k}/2 + L_2^2/\underline{b} \leq \bar{k}.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\bar{y}^\top (Ay_1 + By_2) \leq \frac{\underline{b}\|K_i\|^2|y_0|^2}{2} + \bar{k}\underline{b}(|y_1|^2 + |y_2|^2). \quad (74)$$

Therefore, the first term satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} \leq & -\underline{b}\left(y_0^\top (K_i^2 - \|K_i\|^2 I_n/2) y_0 + y_1^\top (K_p^2 - 2K_i K_d)y_1 \right. \\ & \left. + y_2^\top (K_d^2 - K_p/\underline{b})y_2\right) + \bar{k}\underline{b}(|y_1|^2 + |y_2|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

On the other hand, since $\|C\| \leq N_1$, $\|D\| \leq N_2$, thus the second term has the following upper bound:

$$\text{II} := \frac{1}{2}\|K_d\|\|Cy_1 + Dy_2\|^2 \leq \|K_d\| \sum_{i=1}^2 N_i^2 |y_i|^2. \quad (76)$$

Combine (75) and (76), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} + \text{II} &\leq -\underline{b}y_0^\top \left(K_i^2 - \frac{\|K_i\|^2 I_n}{2} \right) y_0 \\ &\quad - \underline{b}y_1^\top \left[K_p^2 - 2K_i K_d - (\bar{k} + \|K_d\| N_1^2 / \underline{b}) I_n \right] y_1 \\ &\quad - \underline{b}y_2^\top \left[K_d^2 - K_p / \underline{b} - (\bar{k} + \|K_d\| N_2^2 / \underline{b}) I_n \right] y_2. \end{aligned}$$

By inequalities (3), there exists $\gamma > 0$ which depends on $(K_i, K_p, K_d, L_i, N_i, \underline{b})$ only, such that

$$\text{I} + \text{II} \leq -\gamma |Y|^2, \text{ for all } Y = [y_0^\top, y_1^\top, y_2^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{3n}.$$

Therefore, the proof of Lemma 2 is complete. \square

References

- [1] Appeltans, P., Niculescu, S. I., & Michiels, W. Analysis and design of strongly stabilizing PID controllers for time-delay systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 60 (2022), pp. 124-146.
- [2] Åström, K. J., & Hägglund, T. The future of PID control. *Control Engineering Practice*, 9 (2001), pp. 1163-1175.
- [3] Chang, W. D., Hwang, R. C., Hsieh, J. G. A self-tuning PID control for a class of nonlinear systems based on the Lyapunov approach. *Journal of Process Control*, 12 (2002), pp. 233-242.
- [4] Cong, X., & Zhao, C. PID control of uncertain nonlinear stochastic systems with state observer. *Science China Information Sciences*, 64 (2021), pp. 1-12.
- [5] Guo, B. Z., & Wu, Z. H. Output tracking for a class of nonlinear systems with mismatched uncertainties by active disturbance rejection control. *Systems & Control Letters*, 100 (2017), pp. 21-31.
- [6] Guo, L. Feedback and uncertainty: some basic problems and results, *Annual Reviews in Control*, 49 (2020), pp. 27-36.
- [7] Horn, R. A., & Johnson, C. R. Matrix analysis. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- [8] Huang, J. Nonlinear output regulation: theory and applications. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2004.
- [9] Khalil, H. K. Universal integral controllers for minimum-phase nonlinear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 45 (2000), pp. 490-494.
- [10] Khasminskii, R. Stochastic stability of differential equations, 2nd ed., ser. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Springer, Heidelberg, vol. 66, 2012.

- [11] Ma, D., Chen, J., Liu, A., Chen, J., & Niculescu, S. I. Explicit bounds for guaranteed stabilization by PID control of second-order unstable delay systems. *Automatica*, 100 (2019), pp. 407-411.
- [12] Romero, J. G., Donaire, A., Ortega, R., Borja, P. Global stabilisation of underactuated mechanical systems via PID passivity-based control. *Automatica*, 96 (2018), pp. 178-185.
- [13] Song, Y., Huang, X., Wen, C. Robust adaptive fault-tolerant PID control of MIMO nonlinear systems with unknown control direction. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 64 (2017), pp. 4876-4884.
- [14] Takegaki, M., & Arimoto, S. A new feedback method for dynamic control of manipulators. *Journal of Dynamic Systems Measurement and Control-Transactions of the Asme*, 103 (1981), pp. 119-125.
- [15] Wang, Y., & Liu, Y. An enhanced strategy for adaptive output-feedback control of uncertain nonlinear systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 60 (2022), pp. 1064-1091.
- [16] Yuan, S., Zhao, C., & Guo, L. Uncoupled PID control of coupled multi-agent nonlinear uncertain systems. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 31 (2018), pp. 4-21.
- [17] Zhang, J. K., Zhao, C., & Guo, L. On PID control theory for nonaffine uncertain stochastic systems. *Journal of System Science and Complexity*, (2022), in press.
- [18] Zhao, C., & Guo, L. Towards a theoretical foundation of PID control for uncertain nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 142 (2022), 110360.
- [19] Zhao, C., & Guo, L. PID controller design for second order nonlinear uncertain systems. *Science China Information Sciences*, 60(2017), pp. 1-13.
- [20] Zhao, C., & Guo, L.. On the capability of PID control for nonlinear uncertain systems. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 50(2017b), pp. 1521-1526.
- [21] Zhong, S., Huang, Y., & Guo, L. A parameter formula connecting PID and ADRC. *Science China Information Sciences*, 63(2020), 192203.