

Sampled-Data Controller Synthesis using Dissipative Linear Periodic Jump-Flow Systems with Design Applications

L.M. Spin M.C.F. Donkers

Dept. Electrical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands

Abstract

In this paper, we will propose linear-matrix-inequality-based techniques for the design of sampled-data controllers that render the closed-loop system dissipative with respect to **quadratic supply functions**, which includes passivity and an upper-bound on the system's \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm as a special case. To arrive at these results, we model the sampled-data control system as a linear periodic jump-flow system, study dissipativity in terms of differential linear matrix inequalities (DLMI) and then convert these DLMI into a single linear matrix inequality. We will present three applications of these synthesis techniques: 1) passivity-based controller synthesis, as found in teleoperations, 2) input-output-response matching of a continuous-time filter with a discrete-time filter (by minimizing the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of a generalized plant) and 3) a sampled-data controller redesign problem, where the objective is to find the best sampled-data controller, in the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm sense, for a given continuous-time controller. We will show that synthesising sampled-data controllers leads to better closed-loop system behaviour than using a Tustin discretization of a continuous-time controller.

1 Introduction

The vast majority of controller implementations have shifted from analogue to digital controllers over the last century. This paradigm shift has led to research on systems that have mixed continuous/discrete behaviour because the processor in-the-loop experiences discrete-time while the dynamics of the to-be-controlled process experiences continuous-time (Rosenwasser & Lampe 2000, Åström & Wittenmark 2011). This research is motivated by performance loss, and possibly instability, when discretizing continuous-time controllers for implementation on micro-controllers. When the hybrid nature of such systems is taken into account explicitly, performance and stability can be quantified and guaranteed, respectively, see e.g., (Chen & Francis 2012, Bamieh et al. 1991, Mirkin & Palmor 1997, Khargonekar & Sivashankar 1991).

Control systems, in which the controller is implemented digitally and is explicitly incorporated in the design process, are called sampled-data control systems (SDCS). SDCSs are comprised of a continuous-time plant and sampler, a discrete-time controller and a hold device in closed-loop. This allows for direct design of a discrete-time controller for a continuous-time plant (Chen &

Francis 2012). In the 90s, SDCS design was very successful due to a technique called ‘lifting’, see, e.g., (Bamieh et al. 1991, Khargonekar & Sivashankar 1991). While lifting transforms a SDCS into an equivalent infinite-dimensional discrete-time system, it is not directly applicable for systems that have discrete-time inputs and outputs (Mirkin & Palmor 1997), thereby limiting its applicability. Alternatively, the SDCS can be modelled as a system with delayed measurements, where the (time-varying) delay is reset to zero at every sampling instant, see, e.g., (Fridman 2014), though some conservatism is introduced in the analysis as the integral terms in the Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional are typically approximated, see (Hetel et al. 2017). Finally, SDCSs can be modelled as linear periodic jump-flow systems (LPJF), which form a distinct class of hybrid dynamical systems (Goebel et al. 2012), which does not suffer from the aforementioned limitations.

In recent years, a lot of attention has been given to LPJF systems and advancements in this area have enabled designing controllers for LPJF systems using Riccati differential and difference equations, see, e.g., (Ichikawa et al. 2001, Sivashankar & Khargonekar 1994), which are not trivial to solve. In (Possieri & Sassano 2018, Possieri et al. 2020), these Riccati differential and difference equations appear directly in the solution to the optimal state-feedback control problems and a tractable solution for problem is obtained using the so-called Monodromy Riccati equation. Alternatively, the Riccati differen-

Email addresses: `l.m.spin@tue.nl` (L.M. Spin),
`m.c.f.donkers@tue.nl` (M.C.F. Donkers).

tial/difference equations can be relaxed into differential linear matrix inequalities (DLMI), see (Geromel 2023, Holicki & Scherer 2019). A DLMI can be turned into numerically tractable linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) by approximating the unknown variable as piecewise linear or using a Taylor/Fourier series (Geromel 2023) or using splines or a matrix sum-of-square (SOS) approach (Holicki & Scherer 2019). For the particular case of SDCSs, it is shown that these DLMI can be turned into one LMI, which reduces the computational complexity, see (Dreef & Donkers 2021, Heemels et al. 2012).

In this paper, we aim to generalize the DLMI-based results for SDCSs presented in (Dreef & Donkers 2021, Geromel 2023, Holicki & Scherer 2019) towards dissipativity, which has been introduced for linear time-invariant systems in (Willems 1972) and for jump-flow systems in (Teel 2010). We will present controller synthesis results that render the SDCS dissipative with respect to a quadratic storage function in terms of solving one LMI. We will also indicate how this result can be used for synthesis for passivity-based control and to minimize the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of the closed-loop system. Compared to (Dreef & Donkers 2021), the \mathcal{H}_∞ SDCS synthesis results will allow for more general generalized plant formulations. Finally, we will present applications of the presented synthesis results to three classes of control design problems. The first application is the synthesis of passive controllers for teleoperations, the second application is a sampled-data filter-matching problem, where the objective is to match the response of a continuous-time filter with a discrete-time filter by minimizing the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of the difference between the sampled-data and the continuous-time filter, and the third application is a sampled-data controller redesign problem. In this latter problem, the objective is to find the best sampled-data controller, in the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm sense, for a given continuous-time controller. For all three problems, we obtain better closed-loop system behaviour than using a Tustin discretization of a continuous-time controller.

Nomenclature The sets \mathbb{R} , $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ and \mathbb{N} denotes the real numbers, non-negative real numbers, positive real numbers and non-negative integers, respectively. The transpose of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, is denoted by $A^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. The notation $A \succ \mathbf{0}$, $A \succeq \mathbf{0}$, $A \prec \mathbf{0}$, and $A \preceq \mathbf{0}$ denotes that $A = A^\top$ is positive definite, non-negative definite, negative definite and nonpositive definite, respectively. We write matrices of the form $\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^\top & C \end{bmatrix}$ as $\begin{bmatrix} A & * \\ B^\top & C \end{bmatrix}$ and the zero matrix and identity matrix are denoted by $\mathbf{0}$ and I , respectively. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $\|x\| := \sqrt{x^\top x}$ its 2-norm. For a signal $x : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $\|x\|_{\ell_2} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|x[k]\|^2}$ its ℓ_2 -norm, and for a signal $x : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote




Fig. 1. The sampled-data control system schematic.

by $\|x\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \sqrt{\int_0^\infty \|x(t)\|^2 dt}$ its \mathcal{L}_2 -norm, provided that these quantities are finite. Finally, a signal $x(t)$ evaluated at $t = t_k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is denoted as $x[k] = x(t_k)$ and its left-limit in the time interval $(t_k, t_{k+1}]$ is denoted as $x(t_k^+) = \lim_{t \downarrow t_k} x(t)$.

2 Generalized Plant Formulation

In this paper, we will develop controller synthesis techniques for linear sampled-data control systems (SDCSs) with periodic sampling that render the SDCS dissipative with respect to a quadratic storage function. To do so, we model the SDCS as a so-called linear periodic jump-flow (LPJF) system, where the jump instances t_k are periodic in time and are spaced by fixed $h \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, i.e., $t_k = hk$, with jump index $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The SDCS is schematically shown in Fig. 1 and consists of a LPJF plant $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ connected with a hold device \mathcal{H}_h that constrains the continuous-time (CT) input and the discrete-time (DT) input, leading to $\mathcal{P} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{H}_h \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}$, which is interconnected with a to-be-designed controller \mathcal{K} . It should be noted that \hat{u} enters the plant $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ twice. Namely, it enters through the hold-device to act upon the physical system to-be-controlled, while it can also act directly on the weighting filters in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ that are used to describe performance requirements.

To develop a complete description of the sampled-data control problem, we assume the plant is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = A_c x(t) + B_c w_c(t) + B_{cu} u(t) \\ x(t_k^+) = A_d x(t_k) + B_d w_d[k] + B_{du} \hat{u}[k] \\ z_c(t) = C_c x(t) + D_{cc} w_c(t) + D_{cu} u(t) \\ z_d[k] = C_d x(t_k) + D_{dd} w_d[k] + D_{du} \hat{u}[k] \\ y[k] = C_y x(t_k) + D_{yd} w_d[k] + D_{yu} \hat{u}[k] \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

for time $t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}]$, where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}}}$, $w_c(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{w_c}}$, $w_d[k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{w_d}}$, $z_c(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{z_c}}$, $z_d[k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{z_d}}$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$,

$\hat{u}[k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, and $y[k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$ denote the state of the plant, the CT disturbance, the DT disturbance, the CT performance channels, the DT performance channel, the CT controller output, the DT controller output, the DT controller input, respectively. The CT input $u(t)$ and the DT input $\hat{u}[k]$ are constrained by a generalized hold device given by

$$\mathcal{H}_h : \begin{cases} \dot{x}^h(t) = A_c^h x^h(t) \\ x^h(t_k^+) = A_d^h x^h(t_k) + B^h \hat{u}[k] \\ u(t) = C^h x^h(t). \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

with $x^h(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_h}$ denotes the state of the hold device. Choosing $A_c^h = A_d^h = \mathbf{0}$, $B^h = C^h = I$ corresponds to a traditional zero-order hold, although different and higher-order hold functions can be considered as well by possibly increasing the state dimension of the hold device n_h . The plant and the hold device will be interconnected with a controller that has the following state-space realization:

$$\mathcal{K}_d : \begin{cases} \dot{x}^c(t) = \mathbf{0} \\ x^c(t_k^+) = A^c x^c(t_k) + B^c y[k] \\ \hat{u}[k] = C^c x^c(t_k) + D^c y[k], \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

with controller state $x^c(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$. The plant, hold device and controller are said to be in flow during the interval $t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}]$ and a jump occurs at $t = t_k = kh$.

It should be noted that, besides considering more general hold devices in (2), the plant description (1) is more general than the one used in (Dreef & Donkers 2021), where it was assumed that $B_{du} = \mathbf{0}$ and $D_{cu} = \mathbf{0}$. Though this might seem a trivial extension, it will be shown in Section 4 that this extension is needed in order to apply the synthesis results that we will develop to the considered design problems. Furthermore, as was also argued in (Dreef & Donkers 2021) and will be shown in Section 4, it is important to consider jump dynamics in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ to allow for DT weighing filters that express performance requirements. The only restriction that we place on $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is that $D_{yu} = 0$, which may be done without loss of generality (Zhou et al. 1996).

To arrive at a closed-loop description for the SDCS, we first combine the plant (1) with generalized hold device (2) to arrive at

$$\mathcal{P} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}^p(t) = A_c^p x^p(t) + B_c^p w_c(t) \\ x^p(t_k^+) = A_d^p x^p(t_k) + B_d^p w_d[k] + B_J^p u_J[k] \\ z_c(t) = C_c^p x^p(t) + D_{cc}^p w_c(t) \\ z_d[k] = C_d^p x^p(t_k) + D_{dd}^p w_d[k] + D_{dJ}^p u_J[k] \\ y[k] = C_J^p x^p(t_k) + D_{Jd}^p w_d[k], \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $x^p(t) = [x(t)^\top x^h(t)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$, with matrices

$$A_c^p = \begin{bmatrix} A_c & B_{cu} C^h \\ \mathbf{0} & A_c^h \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_c^p = \begin{bmatrix} B_{cu} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5a)$$

$$A_d^p = \begin{bmatrix} A_d & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & A_d^h \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_d^p = \begin{bmatrix} B_d \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_J^p = \begin{bmatrix} B_{du} \\ B^h \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5b)$$

$$C_c^p = [C_c \ D_{cu} C^h], \quad D_{cc}^p = D_{cc}, \quad (5c)$$

$$C_d^p = [C_d \ \mathbf{0}], \quad D_{dd}^p = D_{dd}, \quad D_{dJ}^p = D_{du} \quad (5d)$$

$$C_J^p = [C_y \ \mathbf{0}], \quad D_{Jd}^p = D_{yd}, \quad (5e)$$

Subsequently, we combine (4) with (3), with state $\xi(t) = [x^p(t)^\top x^c(t)^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p+n_c}$ to arrive at the LPJF system that is given by

$$\mathcal{T} : \begin{cases} \dot{\xi}(t) = \mathcal{A}_c \xi(t) + \mathcal{B}_c w_c(t) \\ \xi(t_k^+) = \mathcal{A}_d \xi(t_k) + \mathcal{B}_d w_d[k] \\ z_c(t) = \mathcal{C}_c \xi(t) + \mathcal{D}_c w_c(t) \\ z_d[k] = \mathcal{C}_d \xi(t_k) + \mathcal{D}_d w_d[k], \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

with flow matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_c & \mathcal{B}_c \\ \mathcal{C}_c & \mathcal{D}_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_c^p & \mathbf{0} & B_c^p \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ C_c^p & \mathbf{0} & D_{cc}^p \end{bmatrix} \quad (7a)$$

and the jump matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_d & \mathcal{B}_d \\ \mathcal{C}_d & \mathcal{D}_d \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_d^p & \mathbf{0} & B_d^p \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ C_d^p & \mathbf{0} & D_{dd}^p \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & B_J^p \\ I & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & D_{du}^p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A^c & B^c \\ C^c & D^c \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & I & \mathbf{0} \\ C_y^p & \mathbf{0} & D_{yd}^p \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7b)$$

For this description of the SDCS, analysis and controller synthesis results that will be developed to warrant dissipativity and stability of the closed-loop system.

3 Stability & Dissipativity of SDCSs

In this section, we will present general and tractable results to analyse stability and dissipativity of SDCSs. We will first define dissipativity for the LPJF system (6), which has been defined for linear time-invariant systems in (Willems 1972) and for jump-flow systems in (Teel 2010). We will then focus on quadratic storage and supply functions and show that using techniques from (Goebel et al. 2012, Heemels et al. 2012), analysis conditions can be formulated in the form of differential linear matrix inequalities (DLMI). These DLMI can then be turned into tractable conditions in terms of a single Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI), which can be used to develop controller synthesis results for sampled-data plant (1) with generalized hold (2). Finally, we will show how to use these results to synthesize controllers that warrant

that the SDCS is passive or has a certain upper bound on the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm. We start by defining dissipativity of the LPJF system.

Definition 3.1 *The LPJF system (6) is said to be dissipative with respect to the flow supply function $s_c : \mathbb{R}^{n_{w_c}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{z_c}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and jump supply function $s_d : \mathbb{R}^{n_{w_d}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{z_d}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if there exists a storage function $S : \mathbb{R}^{n_p+n_k} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$S(\xi(t_1), t_1) \leq S(\xi(t_0), t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t_1} s_c(w_c(t), z_c(t)) dt + \sum_{k=N_0}^{N_1} s_d(w_d[k], z_d[k]), \quad (8)$$

hold for all $t_1 \geq t_0$ and all $\xi(t_1)$ and $\xi(t_0)$ and all (essentially) bounded signals w_c , w_d , z_c and z_d . Here, $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the smallest possible upper bound of $N_0 \geq t_0/h$ and $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the largest strict lower bound of $N_1 < t_1/h$. The system is said to be conservative with respect to s_c and s_d if there exists a storage function S such that equation (8) holds with equality.

Whenever the storage function $S(\xi, t)$ is at least once differentiable over the interval $(t_k, t_{k+1}]$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\xi}$, the inequality (8) is equivalent to

$$\frac{d}{dt} S(\xi(t), t) \leq s_c(w_c(t), z_c(t)), \quad \text{for } t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}] \quad (9a)$$

$$S(\xi(t_k^+), t_k^+) - S(\xi(t_k), t_k) \leq s_d(w_d[k], z_d[k]), \quad (9b)$$

where (9a) will be referred to as the flow dissipation inequality and (9b) will be referred to as the jump dissipation inequality.

3.1 Quadratic Storage and Supply Functions

We will now focus on quadratic storage and supply functions. As in (Dreef & Donkers 2021, Goebel et al. 2012, Heemels et al. 2012), we will consider a periodic storage function of the form

$$V(\xi, t) = \xi^\top(t) P(\tau(t)) \xi(t). \quad (10)$$

with timer function $\tau(t)$, as in (Dreef & Donkers 2021), being a left-continuous function that satisfies:

$$\tau(t) = \begin{cases} h & \text{for } t = 0, \\ t - t_k & \text{for } t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}]. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

meaning that $\tau(t_k) = h$ and $\tau(t_k^+) = 0^+$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We will also consider quadratic supply functions of the form

$$s_c(w_c, z_c) = \begin{bmatrix} w_c \\ z_c \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} Q_c & S_c \\ S_c^\top & R_c \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_c \\ z_c \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12a)$$

$$s_d(w_d, z_d) = \begin{bmatrix} w_d \\ z_d \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} Q_d & S_d \\ S_d^\top & R_d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_d \\ z_d \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12b)$$

The supply functions are inspired by a combination of (Goebel et al. 2012) and (Agarwal et al. 2016). The difference being that here both the flow and jump supply functions are quadratic and of similar structure.

We will apply the considered quadratic storage and supply functions to obtain conditions for dissipativity and global exponential stability (GES) of the LPJF system (6). By GES, we mean that all solutions satisfy $\|\xi(t)\| \leq ce^{-\alpha t} \|\xi(0)\|$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and all $\xi(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p+n_k}$ and for some $c > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$. In the lemma that we will present below, we will also use

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_1 & M_3 \\ M_3^\top & M_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_c^\top R_c C_c & C_c^\top S_c^\top + C_c^\top R_c D_c \\ \star & Q_c + S_c D_c + D_c^\top S_c^\top + D_c^\top R_c D_c \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

The results of the lemma are DLMI and can be seen as an extension of the results of (Dreef & Donkers 2021, Geromel 2023) towards dissipativity.

Lemma 3.1 *Consider the LPJF system (6) and supply functions (12) that satisfy $R_c \preceq 0$ and $R_d \preceq 0$. Assume there exists a bounded matrix function $P(\tau) \succ 0$ that is differentiable on the domain $\tau \in (0, h]$ that satisfies*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{P}(\tau) + \mathcal{A}_c^\top P(\tau) + P(\tau) \mathcal{A}_c & P(\tau) \mathcal{B}_c \\ \mathcal{B}_c^\top P(\tau) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \preceq \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & M_3 \\ M_3^\top & M_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14a)$$

for all $\tau \in (0, h]$ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_d^\top P(0^+) \mathcal{A}_d - P(h) & \mathcal{A}_d^\top P(0^+) \mathcal{B}_d \\ \mathcal{B}_d^\top P(0^+) \mathcal{A}_d & \mathcal{B}_d^\top P(0^+) \mathcal{B}_d \end{bmatrix} \preceq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & I \\ C_d & D_d \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} Q_d S_d \\ S_d^\top R_d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & I \\ C_d & D_d \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14b)$$

where one of the inequalities holds strictly. Then, the LPJF system (6) is dissipative with respect to supply functions (12) and its origin is GES.

PROOF. Dissipativity follows directly from pre- and postmultiplying the conditions (14) with $[\xi^\top \ w_c^\top]^\top$ and $[\xi^\top \ w_d^\top]^\top$, respectively, leading to (9) with $S(\xi, t) = V(\xi, t)$ with (10) and s_c and s_d as in (12).

The strictness of one of the flow and jump dissipation inequalities (14) together with $R_c \preceq 0$, $R_d \preceq 0$ and the assumption that $P(\tau) \succ 0$ yields that (10) becomes a **Lyapunov function for the LPJF system (6)**. Namely, in this case, we have that

$$V(\xi(t), t) \leq e^{-\alpha_d} e^{-\alpha_c(t-t_k)} V(\xi(t_k), t_k) \quad \text{for } t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}] \quad (15)$$

with $\alpha_c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where at least one of these inequalities holds strictly, meaning that $V(\xi(t), t) \leq e^{-\alpha_d(k+1)} e^{-\alpha_c t} V(\xi(0), 0)$ for $t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}]$.

Now since $k+1 \leq t/h$, we have that $\alpha = \alpha_d t/h + \alpha_c t > 0$, if either $\alpha_c > 0$ or $\alpha_d > 0$. Now together with the fact that $P(\tau)$ is bounded for all $\tau \in (0, h]$, we have that V is an exponentially decreasing Lyapunov function for the system, which concludes the proof. \square

To arrive at tractable conditions for dissipativity and GES of the LPJF system (6), we can directly rely on numerical methods to solve DLMI. Instead, we follow the approach from (Heemels et al. 2012, Goebel et al. 2012) in this paper, which is based on explicitly solving (14a) with equality. This approach employs the Hamiltonian matrix

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_c - \mathcal{B}_c M_2^{-1} M_3^\top & \mathcal{B}_c M_2^{-1} \mathcal{B}_c^\top \\ M_1 - M_3 M_2^{-1} M_3^\top & -(\mathcal{A}_c - \mathcal{B}_c M_2^{-1} M_3^\top)^\top \end{bmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

and its matrix exponential, in which we use the same partitioning as was used for H , given by

$$F(\tau) = e^{-H\tau} = \begin{bmatrix} F_{11}(\tau) & F_{12}(\tau) \\ F_{21}(\tau) & F_{22}(\tau) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

It should be noted that this Hamiltonian also appears in the computation of the Monodromy Riccati equation in (Possieri & Sassano 2018, Possieri et al. 2020), showing the similarities between the approaches. Furthermore, M_2 is required to be invertible, which is a slight relaxation compared to (14a). Finally, we define $\hat{A} = F_{11}^{-1}(h)$ and \hat{B} and \hat{C} satisfying

$$\hat{B}\hat{B}^\top = -F_{11}^{-1}(h)F_{12}(h), \quad \hat{C}^\top\hat{C} = F_{21}(h)F_{11}^{-1}(h). \quad (18)$$

to establish a close relation to results derived using lifting, see (Heemels et al. 2015). **Furthermore, we decompose**

$$R_d = -E_d^\top \Pi_d^{-1} E_d \preceq 0, \quad (19)$$

conformly with the decomposition introduced in (Veenman 2015) for quadratic performance. Here E_d is the zero matrix or a constant full row rank matrix. Using this notation, we can obtain the following theorem that provides one LMI which guarantees dissipativity and GES.

Theorem 3.1 *Consider the LPJF system (6), assume that $F_{11}(t)$ is invertible for all $t \in [0, h]$, and that the quadratic supply functions are given by (12), such that*

$\Pi_d \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $M_2 \succ \mathbf{0}$. If there exists a matrix P_h satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_h & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star \\ S_d \mathcal{C}_d & Q_d + S_d \mathcal{D}_d + \mathcal{D}_d^\top S_d^\top & \star & \star & \star & \star \\ E_d \mathcal{C}_d & E_d \mathcal{D}_d & \Pi_d & \star & \star & \star \\ \hat{C} \mathcal{A}_d & \hat{C} \mathcal{B}_d & \mathbf{0} & I & \star & \star \\ P_h \hat{A} \mathcal{A}_d & P_h \hat{A} \mathcal{B}_d & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & P_h & \star \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \hat{B}^\top P_h & I \end{bmatrix} \succ \mathbf{0} \quad (20)$$

then the LPJF system (6) is dissipative with respect to the quadratic supply functions (12) and its origin is GES.

PROOF. We start the proof by applying a Schur complement on the bottom four rows and columns of (20), leading to (14b), where the inequality is strict and with $P_h \succ \mathbf{0}$, and in which

$$P(h - \tau) = (F_{21}(\tau) + F_{22}(\tau)P_h)(F_{11}(\tau) + F_{12}(\tau)P_h)^{-1}. \quad (21)$$

with $P_h = P(h)$ for $\tau = 0^+ = 0$, due to continuity of the matrix exponential.

To complete the proof, it remains to show that satisfaction of (21) at $\tau = 0$ is equivalent to satisfaction (14a) for all $\tau \in (0, h]$ and that $P(\tau) \succ \mathbf{0}$. First, observe that, using a Schur complement, (14a) is implied by

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} P(\tau) \preceq -\mathcal{A}_c^\top P(\tau) - P(\tau)\mathcal{A}_c + M_1 - (P(\tau)\mathcal{B}_c - M_3)M_2^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_c^\top P(\tau) - M_3^\top), \quad (22)$$

for all $\tau \in (0, h]$ and where we have to relax $M_2 \succ \mathbf{0}$ to $M_2 \succ \mathbf{0}$. Now, using the arguments in (Heemels et al. 2012), we can obtain that (21) is a well-defined solution to (22) with equality, if $F_{11}(\tau)$ is invertible for all $\tau \in (0, h]$ and if

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_h^{-1} & \hat{B} \\ \hat{B}^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \succ \mathbf{0}. \quad (23)$$

holds, which follows directly from the hypothesis of the theorem. \square

3.2 Controller Synthesis

Let us now use the results of Theorem 3.1 to develop controller synthesis results that render the SDCS (6) with matrices (7) GES and dissipative with respect to supply functions (12). This requires generalizing the results of (Dreef & Donkers 2021).

The synthesis result is based on the observation that the matrices \hat{A} , \hat{B} and \hat{C} that appear in Theorem 3.1, which

result from (17), have the following structure:

$$\hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{B} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{C} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

with $\bar{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times n_p}$ and I is an identity matrix of size n_k . From now on, it will be assumed that the state dimension of the controller is equal to the state dimension of the plant, i.e, $n_p = n_k$, which allows introducing the following partitioning of P_h as well as a new matrix T :

$$P_h = \begin{bmatrix} Y & V \\ V^\top & \hat{Y} \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_h^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} X & U \\ U^\top & \hat{X} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} Y & I \\ V^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

with $\hat{Y} = V^\top(Y - X^{-1})V$ and $\hat{X} = V^{-1}(YXY - Y)V^{-\top}$ for nonsingular matrices U and V satisfying $UV^\top = I - XY$. Furthermore, note that

$P_h^{-1}T = \begin{bmatrix} I & X \\ \mathbf{0} & U^\top \end{bmatrix}$. These matrices allow applying the

linearizing transformation of (Scherer et al. 1997) on the results of Theorem 3.1 to obtain synthesis LMIs that render the SDCS dissipative and GES, as is done in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2 Consider the sampled-data plant (1) with generalized hold (2), assume that $F_{11}(t)$ invertible for all $t \in [0, h]$ and $M_2 \succ \mathbf{0}$ holds and that the quadratic supply functions are given by (12), such that $\Pi_d \succ \mathbf{0}$. Assume there exist matrices $\Gamma, \Theta, \Upsilon, \Omega, Y, X$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} Y & \star \\ I & X & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star \\ S_d \Omega_c & S_d K_2 & Z & \star & \star & \star & \star & \star \\ E_d \Omega_c & E_d K_2 & E_d \Omega_d & \Pi_d & \star & \star & \star & \star \\ \bar{C} \Omega_a & \bar{C} K_1 & \bar{C} \Omega_b & \mathbf{0} & I & \star & \star & \star \\ L_1 & \Gamma & Y L_2 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & Y & \star & \star \\ \bar{A} \Omega_a & \bar{A} K_1 & \bar{A} \Omega_b & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & I & X & \star \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \bar{B}^\top Y & \bar{B}^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \succ \mathbf{0} \quad (26)$$

in which

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Omega_a & \Omega_b \\ \Omega_c & \Omega_d \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_d^p & B_d^p \\ C_d^p & D_{dd}^p \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_u^p \\ D_{du}^p \end{bmatrix} \Omega \begin{bmatrix} C_y^p & D_{yd}^p \end{bmatrix} \quad (27a)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_1 \\ K_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_d^p & B_u^p \\ C_d^p & D_{du}^p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X \\ \Upsilon \end{bmatrix} \quad (27b)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} L_1 & L_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Y & \Theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} A_d^p & \bar{A} B_d^p \\ C_y^p & D_{yd}^p \end{bmatrix} \quad (27c)$$

$$Z = Q_d + S_d \Omega_d + \Omega_d^\top S_d^\top. \quad (27d)$$

Then, the controller (3) with

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^c & B^c \\ C^c & D^c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} V & Y \bar{A} B_u^p \\ \mathbf{0} & I \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma - Y \bar{A} A_d^p X & \Theta \\ \Upsilon & \Omega \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U^\top & \mathbf{0} \\ C_y^p X & I \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \quad (28)$$

where U and V are nonsingular and chosen to satisfy $UV^\top = I - XY$, renders the SDCS (1), (2) and (3) dissipative with respect to supply functions (12) and its origin GES.

PROOF. It can be verified that by applying a congruence transformation with $\text{diag}(P_h^{-1}T, I, I, P_h^{-1}T, I)$ to the LMI (20) it is transformed into (26), where the partitioning of the matrices (7b), (24) and (25) is used. The transformation (28) then yields a controller synthesis LMI. \square

3.3 Special Cases: Passivity and the \mathcal{H}_∞ Norm

The results of Theorem 3.2 can be directly used for two specific cases of dissipativity, which are passivity and the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm. The concept of passivity is popular in electronic circuits as well as teleoperations and haptics (Hannaford 1989). Passivity for CT and DT linear time-invariant systems states that $w_c^\top(t)z_c(t) \leq 0$ and $w_d^\top[k]z_d[k] \leq 0$, respectively, which requires that $n_{w_c} = n_{z_c}$ and $n_{w_d} = n_{z_d}$. Passivity represents a sign-preserving property of a system, and this can be analysed for LPJF systems, by considering the supply functions (12) with $S_c = I, S_d = I, Q_c = \mathbf{0}, Q_d = \mathbf{0}, R_c = \mathbf{0}, E_d = \mathbf{0}$, and $\Pi_d = I$.

Besides passivity, the dissipativity can also be used to minimize (an upper bound on) the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of the SDCS (6), which is an induced norm and has been defined in (Toivonen & Saffors 1997, Sivashankar & Khar-gonekar 1994, Dreef & Donkers 2021).

Definition 3.2 For a stable LPJF system (6) with $\xi_0 = 0$, the \mathcal{H}_∞ norm is the $\mathcal{L}_2 \times \ell_2$ -induced norm:

$$\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = \sup_{0 \neq (w_c, w_d) \in \mathcal{L}_2 \times \ell_2} \frac{(\|z_c\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 + \|z_d\|_{\ell_2}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(\|w_c\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 + \|w_d\|_{\ell_2}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad (29)$$

From this definition, we can observe that for any upper bound γ on the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} (\|z_c\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 + \|z_d\|_{\ell_2}^2) \leq \gamma (\|w_c\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 + \|w_d\|_{\ell_2}^2) \quad (30)$$

for all $w_c(t)$ and all $w_d[k]$, which can be rewritten as (8) with a positive storage function and supply functions (12) with $Q_c = \gamma I, Q_d = \gamma I, R_c = -\frac{1}{\gamma} I, R_d = -\frac{1}{\gamma} I,$

$S_c = 0$, and $S_d = 0$, meaning that the condition in Theorem 3.1 and 3.2 that $M_2 \succ \mathbf{0}$ becomes $\gamma^2 I - \mathcal{D}_c^\top \mathcal{D}_c \succ \mathbf{0}$. As γ enters the matrices (16) and, hence, the matrices \hat{A} , \hat{B} and \hat{C} in a complex (non-convex) way, the lowest upper-bound on the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm is computed by minimizing γ using a line search/bisection, while checking the conditions of Theorem 3.1 or Theorem 3.2, respectively.

4 Applications to Control Design

In this section, we will apply the SDCS synthesis results to three different design problems. We aim to emphasize the formulation of the control problem in the form of the sampled-data plant (1), where we will highlight how a CT system-to-be-controlled is augmented with possibly DT components, such as weighing filters. We will first employ the passivity-based synthesis result for an application in teleoperations and will then continue with two examples that can be formulated as an \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm minimization problem. The first of these examples is a filter-matching problem, where the objective is to match the frequency response of the CT filter with a DT filter, and the second is a *closed-loop* controller-matching problem, where the objective is to approximate the *closed-loop* response of an a priori designed CT controller interconnected with a CT plant by a DT controller interconnected to the same CT plant. Both matching examples will be shown to outperform traditional discretization methods. All the examples have been implemented using the *PeriodicJumpFlowSystemsToolbox*¹, although solutions using DLMIs of Lemma 3.2 can be obtained as well, albeit at a larger computational complexity as the differential terms in the DMLIs need to be approximated, see (Geromel 2023).

4.1 Application to teleoperations

In teleoperations, the objective is to let a human operator control a master device and that behaviour is replicated (as closely as possible) by a slave device that interacts with an unknown environment which is assumed to be passive (Hogan 1989). To let the human operator ‘feel’ the unknown environment, the slave device has to feed the perceived force back to the master device. To achieve this, a controller interconnects the master and slave device. Since the human operator and the environment are uncertain, it is typically assumed that these are passive systems. An important property of passive systems is that interconnections of passive systems are passive (Van der Schaft 2000). Therefore, if the master/slave system is passive, their interconnection with the human operator and the environment remains passive, and passivity can be used as a design tool in designing controller for teleoperation master/slave systems. In




Fig. 2. Passivity-based control of teleoperations scheme

this example, we design a DT controller that controls the force of the CT master and CT slave system based on their position, see Fig. 2.

In the teleoperation system shown in Fig. 2, the master and slave devices are modelled using Newton’s law with a certain mass m_i and a viscous friction coefficient b_i , where $i \in \{m, s\}$ where m and s refer to the master and slave device, respectively. The controller that interconnects the physically disconnected systems measures the master and slave position and calculates a force, while both the operator and the environment also apply a force. This can be expressed using (1), with

$$A_c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{k_m}{m_m} & -\frac{b_m}{m_m} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{k_s}{m_s} & -\frac{b_s}{m_s} \end{bmatrix}, B_c = -B_{cu} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{m_m} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{m_s} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (31a)$$

$$C_y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{yd} = \mathbf{0}, \quad D_{yu} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (31b)$$

Indeed, these matrices express the two physically-disconnected master and slave device, where the operator and the environment apply a force, modelled through a vector $w_c(t)$. Since the system only evolves in CT, the DT dynamics of the plant are simply $A_d = I$, $B_d = \mathbf{0}$ and $B_{du} = \mathbf{0}$. To express the requirement on passivity, it should be noted that the product between input w_c and output z_c should represent a power, meaning that if the inputs are forces, the outputs have to be velocities. This is expressed by

$$C_c = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha k_m & \alpha b_m & -k_s & -b_s \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, D_{cc} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & -1 \\ -\varepsilon & \varepsilon \end{bmatrix}, D_{cu} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (31c)$$

and $C_d = \emptyset$, $D_{dd} = \emptyset$ and $D_{du} = \emptyset$, where ε is small in order to satisfy the constraint $M_2 \succ \mathbf{0}$ and α is sufficiently large in order to guarantee that the force feedback to the operator is small. In this example, we take parameters

¹ This toolbox can be downloaded from github.com/LuukSpin/PeriodicJumpFlowSystemsToolbox

$m_m = 1$ [kg], $m_s = 10$ [kg], $b_m = 10^{-3}$ [Ns/m], $b_s = 10^{-2}$ [Ns/m], $k_m = 10$ [N/m], $k_s = 10^3$ [N/m], $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ and $\alpha = 50$.

To arrive at a complete LPJF system representation of the SDCS given by (4) with matrices (7), we consider a zero-order hold (ZOH) and a first-order hold (FOH), which can be described by (2) with $A_c^h = A_d^h = \mathbf{0}$, $B^h = C^h = I$ for the ZOH and

$$A_c^h = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \frac{1}{h}I & \mathbf{0} & -\frac{1}{h}I \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, A_d^h = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ I & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, B^h = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, C^h = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & I & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (32)$$

for the FOH. This SDCS description allows us to synthesize controller using the results of Theorem 3.2.

Using the passivity synthesis technique given in Theorem 3.2 with $S_c = I$, $S_d = I$, $Q_c = \mathbf{0}$, $Q_d = \mathbf{0}$, $R_c = \mathbf{0}$, $E_d = \mathbf{0}$, and $\Pi_d = I$, a DT controller is designed that renders the closed-loop GES and passive for both ZOH and FOH reconstructors irrespective of the sampling time. For example, for $h = 10^{-3}$, a controller (3), after making a balanced realization, is obtained with

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^c & B^c \\ C^c & D^c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.979 & -0.12 & 1.15 \cdot 10^{-4} & 6.65 \cdot 10^{-4} & -1.34 & -6.95 \\ 0.12 & 0.16 & 0.068 & -0.032 & -0.3 & 20.65 \\ -1.74 \cdot 10^{-3} & 0.023 & 0.995 & 4.9 \cdot 10^{-3} & 1.22 & -0.74 \\ 1.9 \cdot 10^{-4} & -0.019 & -2.04 \cdot 10^{-3} & 0.02 & 0.56 & 0.073 \\ 0.146 & 0.41 & -7.56 \cdot 10^{-3} & 0.018 & -1.13 & 59.9 \\ 7.1 & 20.65 & -0.47 & 0.11 & -50.66 & 2936 \end{bmatrix} \quad (33)$$

Alternatively, a controller can be synthesized in continuous time using the positive-real lemma, see (Scherer & Weiland 2019), leading to

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}^c(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -2.89 & 0.983 & -16.4 & 3.45 \cdot 10^{-3} \\ 4.12 \cdot 10^4 & -401 & -8.25 \cdot 10^4 & 61.4 \\ 2.18 & -8.55 \cdot 10^{-3} & -42.8 & 1 \\ 2.06 \cdot 10^5 & -2 \cdot 10^3 & -4.09 \cdot 10^5 & 307 \end{bmatrix} x^c(t) + \begin{bmatrix} -5.16 & -11.8 \\ -310 & 600 \\ 2.01 & -42.4 \\ -1925 & 5962 \end{bmatrix} y(t) \\ u(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 4.12 \cdot 10^4 & -402 & -8.30 \cdot 10^4 & 61.4 \\ 2.06 \cdot 10^6 & -2.01 \cdot 10^4 & -4.15 \cdot 10^6 & 3071 \end{bmatrix} x^c(t) + \begin{bmatrix} -352 & 213 \\ -1.76 \cdot 10^4 & 1.06 \cdot 10^4 \end{bmatrix} y(t) \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

However, if this controller is subsequently discretized using various discretization schemes (e.g., ZOH, FOH or Tustin), and then analyzed for passivity using the results of Theorem 3.1, the controller does not even render the SDCS stable. In other words, the SDCS design approach results in a passive closed-loop system whereas the traditional design approach does not.

4.2 Application to Filter Matching

The second application of the synthesis results presented in this paper is the problem of matching the response of a (stable) CT reference filter W_r^c with a DT filter W_r^d . The block diagram of this problem is given in Fig. 3. Here, matching is interpreted as minimizing the \mathcal{H}_∞ norm of the (weighted) difference between the two filters, i.e., the difference from the DT input $w_d[k]$ to the (weighted) CT

output $z_c(t)$. We apply the inverse of the CT reference filter W_r^c to give every frequency equal emphasis in the synthesis problem.

To obtain a sampled-data plant description of the form (1), we regard W_r^d as the to-be-designed controller, where the DT disturbance is directly fed to the output of the plant, i.e. $y[k] = w_d[k]$. Furthermore, the CT filter is assumed to have a state-space realization given by

$$W_r^c : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Br(t) \\ x(t_k^+) = Ix(t_k) \\ z_r(t) = Cx(t) + Dr(t) \end{cases} \quad (35a)$$

and to have a stable and causal inverse given by

$$(W_r^c)^{-1} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = (A - BD^{-1}C)x(t) + BD^{-1}z_r(t) \\ x(t_k^+) = Ix(t_k) \\ r(t) = -D^{-1}Cx(t) + D^{-1}z_r(t). \end{cases} \quad (35b)$$

It can be verified that the operator $(W_r^c)^{-1}W_r^c = I$. In case W_r^c does not have a stable and causal inverse, an approximate inverse $(W_r^c)^\dagger$ needs to be found such that $(W_r^c)^\dagger W_r^c \approx I$. Now the CT performance channel z_c consists of the difference between $(W_r^c)^{-1}W_r^c \mathcal{H}_h$ and the control input $u(t)$ that is filtered by $(W_r^c)^{-1}$, i.e., $z_c(t) = \mathcal{H}_h w_d[k] - (W_r^c)^{-1}u(t)$. The hold function here is taken as

$$\mathcal{H}_h : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = \mathbf{0} \\ x(t_k^+) = w_d[k] \\ r(t) = x(t). \end{cases} \quad (35c)$$

Combining (35b) and (35c) with the fact that $y[k] = w_d[k]$ and $z_c(t) = \mathcal{H}_h w_d[k] - (W_r^c)^{-1}u(t)$, leads to a plant description of the form (1) with

$$A_c = [A - BD^{-1}C \ \mathbf{0}], B_c = \mathbf{0}, B_{uc} = [BD^{-1}], \quad (36a)$$

$$A_d = [I \ \mathbf{0}], B_d = [I], B_{ud} = \mathbf{0} \quad (36b)$$

$$C_c = [D^{-1}C \ I], D_{cc} = \mathbf{0}, D_{cu} = -D^{-1} \quad (36c)$$

$$C_d = \emptyset, D_{dd} = \emptyset, D_{du} = \emptyset \quad (36d)$$

$$C_y = \mathbf{0}, D_{yd} = I, D_{yu} = \mathbf{0} \quad (36e)$$

This plant description can be used to synthesize a controller, which in this case is the DT filter W_r^d , using Theorem 3.2 and the procedure indicated in Section 3.3. It should be noted that the plant description above requires $D_{cu} \neq \mathbf{0}$, meaning that the above problem could not have been solved using the plant description of (Dreef & Donkers 2021).

To illustrate the filter-matching problem, let us consider a double notch filter described by the transfer function

$$W_r^c(s) = \frac{s^4 + 0.00289s^3 + 43.03s^2 + 0.1s + 140.3}{s^4 + 3.454s^3 + 44.8s^2 + 113.9s + 140.3} \quad (37)$$




Fig. 3. Block diagram of the filter-matching problem.

and a sampling time of $h = 0.2$ seconds. To assess the results, we compare the original CT filter with the result (after a balanced realization) of the above filter-matching problem, given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^c & B^c \\ C^c & D^c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.236 & -0.307 & 0.474 & -0.177 & -0.567 \\ 0.307 & 0.924 & 0.120 & -0.0403 & -0.138 \\ -0.474 & 0.120 & 0.343 & -0.773 & 0.0913 \\ -0.177 & 0.0403 & 0.773 & 0.536 & 0.160 \\ 0.567 & -0.138 & 0.0913 & -0.160 & 0.727 \end{bmatrix} \quad (38)$$

and several traditional discretization methods of (37), in terms of their Bode magnitude plot. The results are given in Fig. 4, where we have plotted the frequency responses of both CT and DT filters in a single figure and the error is computed pointwise-in-frequency. It can be seen from the top plot that the Bode magnitude of the original filter (37) and the matched filter are very similar, while the ZOH and Tustin discretization of filter perform much worse. The bottom plot compares the matched filter with a FOH and a ‘Tustin with prewarp’ discretization, but this time in terms of error between the DT filter and the CT reference filter, as the differences are small. Still, it can be concluded that, for this example, the SD-filter-matching approach presented here gives better approximations than traditional discretization methods.

4.3 Application to Controller Matching

Let us now consider the problem of designing a DT controller that matches the behaviour of a given CT controller. Here, it is assumed that the CT controller is designed using any design procedure (e.g., classical frequency response methods, or \mathcal{H}_∞ -based mixed sensitivity designs) such that desired closed-loop performance requirements are satisfied. Besides matching the input-output behaviour of the CT controller, the DT controller is also required to render the closed-loop SDCS stable, which is not guaranteed by directly discretizing the CT controller, using, e.g., a Tustin discretization.

The controller redesign problem is schematically shown in Fig. 5. In this figure, the system-to-be-controlled is assumed to be strictly proper and given by

$$\mathcal{G} : \begin{cases} \dot{x}^g(t) = A^g x^g(t) + B_w^g w_c(t) + B_u^g u(t) \\ y_g(t) = C^g x(t) \end{cases} \quad (39a)$$




Fig. 4. Comparison of discretization techniques.

and the CT controller is given by

$$\mathcal{K}_c : \begin{cases} \dot{x}^c(t) = A^c x^c(t) + B^c e(t) \\ u(t) = C^c x^c(t) + D^c e(t). \end{cases} \quad (39b)$$

which is designed to ensure that (39) with $e(t) = r(t) - y_g(t)$ for a given CT reference $r(t)$ has desired closed-loop behaviour. In the redesign problem, a sampled-data controller \mathcal{K}_d is interconnected with \mathcal{G} through a sampler and a ZOH, where the sampled-data controller takes $e[k] = w_d[k] - \mathcal{H}_h y_g(t)$ as an input, where $w_d[k]$ is the DT reference. The objective is to minimize (in an \mathcal{H}_∞ -sense) the difference between output of \mathcal{K}_c and the ZOH-output of \mathcal{K}_d for (any) disturbance w_c acting on the to-be-controlled system \mathcal{G} and (any) reference w_d . This can be expressed in terms of operators

$$z_c(t) = \mathcal{K}_c \left(\mathcal{H}_h w_d[k] - \mathcal{G} \begin{bmatrix} w_c(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} \right) - u(t) \quad (40a)$$

with plant output

$$y[k] = w_d[k] - \mathcal{S}_h \mathcal{G} \begin{bmatrix} w_c(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (40b)$$

where \mathcal{S}_h denotes a sampler, that samples the CT plant output at time instances t_k . To allow the synthesis problem to be solved, we define $x^p = [(x^g)^\top (x^h)^\top (x^c)^\top]^\top$




Fig. 5. Filter-matching technique for redesign of CT filters for SDCS synthesis.

as state, allowing (40) to be written as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}^p(t) = \begin{bmatrix} A^g & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B^c & 0 \\ -B^c C^g & B^c & A^c \end{bmatrix} x^p(t) + \begin{bmatrix} B_w^g \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} w_c(t) + \begin{bmatrix} B_u^g \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u(t) \\ x^p(t_k^+) = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} x^p(t_k) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} w_d[k] + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \hat{u}(t) \\ z_c(t) = [-D^c C^g \quad D^c \quad C^c] x(t) - u(t) \\ y[k] = [-C^g \quad 0 \quad 0] x(t_k) + w_d[k] \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

which has the form of (1) which can be used to formulate (4) whose matrices have the form (7), which can be used in the results of Theorem 3.2 and the procedure outlined in Section 3.3.

To illustrate the controller redesign problem outlined above, let us consider a plant \mathcal{G} and an a priori CT controller \mathcal{K}_c , whose transfer functions satisfy

$$G(s) = \frac{0.1}{s - 0.1}, \quad K_c(s) = \frac{1.747 \cdot 10^5}{s + 268.5} \quad (42)$$

respectively. Note that in this example the CT disturbance w_c is empty. We consider a sampling time of $h = 0.03$ [s] in this example and synthesize a DT controller using Theorem 3.2 and the procedure indicated in Section 3.3, leading to

$$K_d(z) = \frac{431z - 37.33}{z - 0.09988}. \quad (43)$$

We compare this controller by a FOH and a Tustin discretization of $K_c(s)$ with the same sampling time. In Fig. 6, we compare the step response of the closed-loop system given by \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{K}_c with the closed-loop formed by \mathcal{G} and the tustin discretization of \mathcal{K}_c , and the closed-loop systems formed by \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{K}_d , which results from the above redesign procedure. From this figure, we conclude that albeit some performance degradation is observed from the sampled-data controller the Tustin discretization fails to render the closed-loop systems stable, as




Fig. 6. Controller-matching compared with discretization.

the sampling time is chosen too large for the Tustin discretization to keep the closed-loop system stable. This demonstrates the need for having SD-controller-design methods, such as the ones presented in this paper.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have developed linear-matrix-inequality-based techniques for the design of sampled-data controllers that render the closed-loop system dissipative with respect to quadratic supply functions, which includes passivity and an upper-bound on the system's \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm as a special case. The results are applied to controller design for teleoperations that require passivity of the closed-loop system. It has been shown that using the sampled-data-synthesis techniques, a controller can be designed which renders the closed-loop system passive while sequential controller design and discretization does not render the closed-loop passive. Secondly, a filter-matching technique has been formulated, which minimizes the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm and has been shown to produce a better approximation than traditional discretization techniques. Finally, the developed techniques have been shown to be applicable to the redesign of a given continuous-time controller as a sampled-data controller. The controller obtained through controller-matching is guaranteed to be stabilizing and has been shown to have better performance than the direct discretized version of the given continuous-time controller.

References

- Agarwal, E., McCourt, M. J. & Antsaklis, P. J. (2016), Dissipativity of hybrid systems: Feedback interconnections and networks, *in* 'Proc American Control Conference'.
- Åström, K. J. & Wittenmark, B. (2011), *Computer-controlled systems: theory and design*, Courier Corporation.
- Bamieh, B., Pearson, J. B., Francis, B. A. & Tannenbaum, A. (1991), 'A lifting technique for linear periodic systems with applications to sampled-data control', *Systems & Control Letters*.

- Chen, T. & Francis, B. A. (2012), *Optimal Sampled-Data Control Systems*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Dreef, H. J. & Donkers, M. C. F. (2021), ' H_∞ and H_2 Optimal Sampled-Data Controller Synthesis: A Hybrid Systems Approach with Mixed Discrete/Continuous Specifications', *Automatica* .
- Fridman, E. (2014), Introduction to time-delay and sampled-data systems, in 'European Control Conf.'
- Geromel, J. C. (2023), *Differential Linear Matrix Inequalities: In Sampled-Data Systems Filtering and Control*, Springer Nature.
- Goebel, R., Sanfelice, R. G. & Teel, A. R. (2012), 'Hybrid dynamical systems: modeling stability, and robustness'.
- Hannaford, B. (1989), Stability and performance trade-offs in bi-lateral telemanipulation., in 'ICRA', Cite-seer, pp. 1764–1767.
- Heemels, W., Donkers, M. & Teel, A. R. (2012), 'Periodic event-triggered control for linear systems', *IEEE Trans Automatic Control* .
- Heemels, W. P. M. H., Dullerud, G. E. & Teel, A. R. (2015), ' \mathcal{L}_2 -Gain Analysis for a Class of Hybrid Systems with Applications to Reset and Event-Triggered Control: A Lifting Approach', *IEEE Trans Automatic Control* .
- Hetel, L., Fiter, C., Omran, H., Seuret, A., Fridman, E., Richard, J.-P. & Niculescu, S. (2017), 'Recent developments on the stability of systems with aperiodic sampling: An overview', *Automatica* .
- Hogan, N. (1989), Controlling impedance at the man/machine interface, in 'IEEE Int Conf on Robotics and automation'.
- Holicki, T. & Scherer, C. W. (2019), 'Stability analysis and output-feedback synthesis of hybrid systems affected by piecewise constant parameters via dynamic resetting scalings', *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems* .
- Ichikawa, A., Katayama, H. et al. (2001), *Linear Time Varying Systems and Sampled-Data Systems*, Vol. 265, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Khargonekar, P. & Sivasankar, N. (1991), ' \mathcal{H}_2 Optimal Control for Sampled-Data Systems', *Systems & Control Letters* .
- Mirkin, L. & Palmor, Z. J. (1997), 'Mixed Discrete/Continuous Specifications in Sampled-Data H_2 -Optimal Control', *Automatica* .
- Possieri, C. & Sassano, M. (2018), ' \mathcal{L}_2 -gain for hybrid linear systems with periodic jumps: A game theoretic approach for analysis and design', *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* .
- Possieri, C., Sassano, M., Galeani, S. & Teel, A. R. (2020), 'The linear quadratic regulator for periodic hybrid systems', *Automatica* .
- Rosenwasser, E. N. & Lampe, B. (2000), *Computer controlled systems: analysis and design with process-orientated models*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Scherer, C., Gahinet, P. & Chilali, M. (1997), 'Multiobjective output-feedback control via lmi optimization', *IEEE Trans Automatic Control* .
- Scherer, C. & Weiland, S. (2019), 'Linear matrix inequalities in control', *Dutch Institute for Systems and Control* .
- Sivashankar, N. & Khargonekar, P. P. (1994), 'Characterization of the \mathcal{L}_2 -induced norm for linear systems with jumps with applications to sampled-data systems', *SIAM Journal Control & Optimization* .
- Teel, A. R. (2010), Asymptotic stability for hybrid systems via decomposition, dissipativity, and detectability, in '49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)'.
- Toivonen, H. & Sagfors, M. (1997), 'The sampled-data \mathcal{H}_∞ problem: A unified framework for discretization-based methods and riccati equation solution', *Int Journal of Control* .
- Van der Schaft, A. (2000), *\mathcal{L}_2 -Gain and Passivity Techniques in Nonlinear Control*, Vol. 2, Springer.
- Veenman, J. (2015), *A general framework for robust analysis and control: an integral quadratic constraint based approach*, Logos Verlag Berlin.
- Willems, J. C. (1972), 'Dissipative Dynamical Systems part I: General Theory', *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* .
- Zhou, K., Doyle, J. C., Glover, K. et al. (1996), *Robust and optimal control*, Vol. 40, Prentice hall New Jersey.