



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

European Journal of Control

journal homepage: www.sciencedirect.com/journal/european-journal-of-control

Data-driven event-triggering mechanism for linear systems subject to input saturation

Alexandre Seuret^{a,*}, Sophie Tarbouriech^b

^a Universidad de Sevilla, Avenida de los Descubrimientos s/n, Sevilla, 41092, Spain

^b LAAS-CNRS, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, Toulouse, France

ARTICLE INFO

Recommended by T. Parisini

Keywords:

Data-driven control
Saturated inputs
Event-triggered control
LMI

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on designing an event-triggering mechanism aimed at reducing control updates while maintaining the stability of a saturated closed-loop system. It addresses the regional stabilization of linear systems under input saturation conditions from a data-driven perspective. To do so, we propose a systematic method to convert model-driven conditions into data-driven control design Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI) conditions, enabling the co-design of the event-triggering rule and the state feedback gain. The theoretical contribution is then applied to the control of a spacecraft rendezvous problem.

1. Introduction

Dealing with dynamical systems presents a significant challenge, primarily in the modeling phase, as it requires the ability to develop a sufficiently precise mathematical model for control purposes, enhancing then data-driven control approaches. For a comprehensive overview of these approaches, one can refer to the recent survey in Sanfelici Bazanella, Campestrini, and Eckhard (2023). One notable aspect is the collection of a rich dataset from experiments, which helps mitigate imprecise knowledge of the plant model, as explored in Bazanella, Campestrini, and Eckhard (2011) and Hou and Wang (2013). Alternatively, a robust formulation can be employed to encapsulate the uncertainties affecting the model within a suitable set, as demonstrated in Berberich, Koch, Scherer, and Allgöwer (2020), Berberich, Köhler, Müller, and Allgöwer (2020), and Van Waarde, Eising, Trentelman, and Camlibel (2020). These references provide insights into techniques derived from control theory.

In the context of data-driven control design, significant attention has been devoted to the analysis of stability and the design of control solutions, Sanfelici Bazanella et al. (2023) and Recht (2019). In particular, the case of linear systems has already been carefully treated; see, for example, Breschi, De Persis, Formentin, and Tesi (2021), De Persis and Tesi (2019), Van Waarde, Camlibel, and Mesbahi (2022) and Van Waarde et al. (2020). Still, few works guarantee stability despite control limitations (Piga, Formentin, & Bemporad, 2018). A challenging issue is to account for the presence of input non-linearity such as saturation and, therefore, to revisit some well-known results dealing with regional stability of saturated systems (Hu & Lin, 2001; Tarbouriech, Garcia,

Gomes da Silva, & Queinnec, 2011). Furthermore, another direction of the paper is to address the way to implement control, differently from the classical periodic approach, through an alternative: the event-triggered control approach. This technique allows updating the system input only when a certain condition is verified, aiming to reduce transmission, communication, or energy consumption (Heemels, Johansson, & Tabuada, 2012; Tabuada, 2007). Emulation and co-design are the two main approaches in the event-triggered control framework. In the first, the controller is given and only the event-triggering rule needs to be designed, while in the second, a simultaneous design of the control law and the event-triggering rules is proposed (Åström, 2008; Khashooei, Antunes, & Heemels, 2017; Lehmann & Lunze, 2011). Here, we consider the co-design problem, by proposing a dynamic event-triggering rule inspired by Girard (2015).

Hence, we address the design of a dynamic event-triggering mechanism to reduce control updates while preserving the stability of the closed loop. The regional stabilization of linear systems subject to input saturation is tackled, with results proposed from a data-driven perspective. Leveraging a model-based solution to the problem, we propose a systematic method to transform model-driven conditions into data-driven Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI) conditions, enabling the co-design of the event-triggering rule and the state feedback gain. It is noteworthy that few works have explored the event-triggering technique in the data-driven context. Examples include Banno, Azuma, Ariizumi, and Asai (2021), Digge and Pasumarthi (2022), Matsuda, Kato, Wakasa, and Adachi (2022) or Wang, Sun, Berberich, Wang, Allgöwer, and Chen (2023). The contribution of this paper extends

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: aseuret@us.es (A. Seuret).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejcon.2024.101045>

Received 13 May 2024; Accepted 10 June 2024

Available online 15 June 2024

0947-3580/© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of European Control Association. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

these works, particularly those of [Seuret and Tarbouriech \(2023, 2024\)](#), by considering dynamic event-triggering mechanisms and proposing theoretical conditions based on LMI formulations. These conditions enable the design of the control law and the triggering parameters, as well as the characterization of an inner approximation of the basin of attraction of the origin for the closed-loop system.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, preliminary results are presented as foundational elements for constructing data-driven control solutions. Section 3 introduces the system under consideration, along with assumptions regarding data collection, and summarizes the control objectives. The main contribution is then articulated in Section 4, along with discussions on associated optimization problems. In Section 5, the results are illustrated within the context of a spacecraft rendezvous problem. Finally, concluding remarks and forthcoming issues conclude the paper.

Notation. Throughout the paper, \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ denote the set of natural numbers, the set of real numbers, the n -dimensional Euclidean space and the set of all real $n \times m$ matrices, respectively. In addition we will use notation \mathbb{S}^n (\mathbb{S}_+^n) and \mathbb{D}_+^n for the set of symmetric (positive definite) matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and the set of diagonal positive definite matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. For any integers n and m in \mathbb{N} , matrices I_n and 0 denote the identity matrix of $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and the null matrix of appropriate dimensions, respectively. For any matrix M of $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the notation $M > 0$, ($M < 0$) means that M ($-M$) is in \mathbb{S}_+^n . For any matrices $A = A^T$, $B, C = C^T$ of appropriate dimensions, matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ * & C \end{bmatrix}$ denotes the symmetric matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^T & C \end{bmatrix}$. For any matrix $N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, notation $N_{(i)}$, for any $i = 1, \dots, n$, stands for the i th row of N and $N_{(ij)}$, for any $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$, stands for the (i, j) entry of N . $\|x\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm of x . For any M in \mathbb{S}_+^n , $\lambda_m(M)$ and $\lambda_M(M)$ denote its minimal and maximal eigenvalues respectively. For a matrix $M \in \mathbb{S}^n$, we denote the ellipsoid $\mathcal{E}(M) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, x^T M x \leq 1\}$.

2. Preliminary results

2.1. Matrix-constrained relaxation

In this section, we state an instrumental result (see also [Seuret & Tarbouriech, 2023; Van Waarde et al., 2022, 2020](#)), which provides a way to write in an equivalent form a matrix inequality depending on parameters satisfying a quadratic constraint.

Lemma 1. For given positive integers n_1, n_2, n_3 , consider matrices $(\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \mathcal{M}_3)$ in $\mathbb{S}_+^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2} \times \mathbb{S}_+^{n_3}$ and $(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3)$ in $\mathbb{S}^{n_3} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_3 \times n_2} \times \mathbb{S}_+^{n_3}$, i.e. with $\mathcal{N}_3 > 0$. Then, the following statements are equivalent

(i) Inequality

$$\mathcal{M}(A) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{M}_1 & \mathcal{M}_2 A \\ * & \mathcal{M}_3 \end{bmatrix} > 0, \quad \forall A \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{N}}, \quad (1)$$

holds true where $\Sigma_{\mathcal{N}}$ represents the set of allowable uncertain matrices A characterized by

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{N}} := \left\{ A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_3}, \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_3} \\ A \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{N}_1 & \mathcal{N}_2 \\ * & \mathcal{N}_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_3} \\ A \end{bmatrix} \leq 0 \right\}. \quad (2)$$

(ii) There exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{M}_1 & 0_{n_1, n_3} & \mathcal{M}_2 \\ * & \mathcal{M}_3 + \eta \mathcal{N}_1 & \eta \mathcal{N}_2 \\ * & * & \eta \mathcal{N}_3 \end{bmatrix} > 0. \quad (3)$$

2.2. Preliminaries on generalized sector conditions

In this paper, we consider the classical decentralized vector-valued saturation map $\text{sat}(u)$ from \mathbb{R}^{n_u} to \mathbb{R}^{n_u} , which is defined component-wise as follows:

$$\text{sat}(u_i) = \text{sgn}(u_i) \min(|u_i|, \bar{u}_i), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n_u. \quad (4)$$

In (4), u_i refers to the i th control input and \bar{u}_i is the i th entry of the level of saturation \bar{u} . It is well-known that the presence of saturation requires a particular care of the notion of stability ([Tarbouriech et al., 2011; Zaccarian & Teel, 2011](#)). To handle it, we consider the dead-zone function $\phi(u)$ defined as

$$\phi(u) = \text{sat}(u) - u. \quad (5)$$

Following [Tarbouriech et al. \(2011, Remark 7.3\)](#), we use the following *Generalized sector condition* lemma (see also [Zaccarian & Teel, 2011](#)).

Lemma 2 ([Tarbouriech et al., 2011](#)). Consider a matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_x}$. The following relation holds, for any diagonal matrix $T \in \mathbb{D}_+^{n_u}$

$$\phi(u)^T T [\text{sat}(u) + Gx] \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in S(G), \quad (6)$$

where $S(G) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} : |G_{(i)} x| \leq \bar{u}_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n_u\}$.

3. Problem formulation

3.1. System data and assumptions

The class of systems considered in this paper is that one of discrete-time linear systems subject to an input saturation, described as follows:

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} = \mathcal{A}x_k + B \text{sat}(u_k), & (\mathcal{A}, B) \in \mathcal{Z}, \\ x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where, for given positive integers n_x and n_u , $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is the state vector and $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the control input and x_0 stands for the initial condition of the system. The dynamics of the system is defined by possibly time-varying matrices $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_u}$, which belongs to the uncertainty set \mathcal{Z} , which is subject to the following assumption.

Assumption 1. The uncertainty set \mathcal{Z} is assumed to be unknown but bounded.

3.2. Data collections and assumption

Considering the class of systems described by (7), our objective is to collect experimental data, which have been performed beforehand to compensate for the lack of knowledge of the system matrices. Based on this data collection, the main objective is to derive a data-driven control design result. To conduct this method, it is crucial to properly define the notion of data. We define the following data matrices that collect the available measurements for the control design.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}^+ &:= \begin{bmatrix} X_1^+ & X_2^+ & \dots & X_p^+ \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{X} &:= \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & X_2 & \dots & X_p \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{U} &:= \begin{bmatrix} \text{sat}(U_1) & \text{sat}(U_2) & \dots & \text{sat}(U_p) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In each experiment i , a control input $U_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is applied when the state is located at position X_i , resulting in the system transitioning to state X_i^+ .

We define the data collection \mathcal{D} as follows

$$\mathcal{D} := (\mathcal{X}^+, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{U}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times p} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times p} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times p}. \quad (9)$$

and we suppose that the data collection \mathcal{D} is informative, as defined below.

Definition 1. The data collection \mathcal{D} in (8) is said informative if matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}^+ \\ \mathcal{U} \end{bmatrix}$ is full rank.

According to the system dynamics, these data verify

$$\mathcal{X}^+ = A\mathcal{X} + B\mathcal{U} + \omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times p}, \quad (10)$$

for some matrices (A, B) . The noise samples $\omega = [w(0) \ w(1) \ \dots \ w(p)]$ are unknown. However, the following assumption is made on the “energy” of the noise, following the presentation of [Bisoffi, De Persis, and Tesi \(2022\)](#).

Assumption 2. Assume that there exists a known parameter $\delta \geq 1$ such that the noise samples matrix ω verify

$$\omega \in \Omega := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times p}, v v^\top \leq \delta \Delta_\omega\}, \quad (11)$$

with Δ_ω given by the least square approximation error

$$\Delta_\omega = \mathcal{X}^+ \left(I_p - \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X} \\ \mathcal{V} \end{bmatrix}^\top \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X} \\ \mathcal{V} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X} \\ \mathcal{V} \end{bmatrix}^\top \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X} \\ \mathcal{V} \end{bmatrix} \right) \mathcal{X}^{+\top}.$$

This assumption is related to different interpretations of matrix Δ_ω , provided for example in terms of co-variance of the noise ω as mentioned in Berberich, Köhler, et al. (2020), Bisoffi et al. (2022), Van Waarde et al. (2022), where an alternative representation of Ω are proposed. Here, we emphasized the least-square interpretation.

In this paper, we consider

the following set as in Bisoffi et al. (2022)

$$C := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} I \\ A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}^+ \mathcal{X}^{+\top} - \delta \Delta_\omega & -\mathcal{X}^+ \mathcal{X}^\top & -\mathcal{X}^+ \mathcal{V}^\top \\ * & \mathcal{X} \mathcal{X}^\top & \mathcal{X} \mathcal{V}^\top \\ * & * & \mathcal{V} \mathcal{V}^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix} \leq 0 \right\} \quad (12)$$

We can relate sets \mathcal{Z} and C in the following assumption.

Assumption 3. The uncertainty set \mathcal{Z} is included in C .

3.3. Event-triggered state-feedback control law

The main objective of this paper is to design an event-triggered control described as follows:

$$u_k = \begin{cases} K x_k, & \text{if the control law is updated,} \\ u_{k-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

with $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_x}$ is the control gain to be defined such that the trajectories of the closed-loop system (7) with (13) is (locally) asymptotically stable. To distinguish the triggered data from the current state, we introduce memory variables χ_k in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} and s_k in \mathbb{N} to denote the value of the state that is employed at time k to compute the control input. More precisely, it holds

$$\begin{bmatrix} \chi_k \\ s_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ k \end{bmatrix}, & \text{if the memory is updated,} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \chi_{k-1} \\ s_{k-1} \end{bmatrix}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Hence, the control input is simply given by $u_k = K \chi_k$, for all k . Note that $\chi_0 = x_0$ and $s_0 = 0$. To determine whether the value of χ_k has to be updated or not, we introduce a dynamic discrete-time event-triggering rule, given by

$$s_{k+1} = \min_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \{m \geq s_k + 1 \mid \psi(x_m, \chi_k) \geq \rho \eta_m\}, \quad (15)$$

where the triggering condition is parameterized by:

- A quadratic triggering function, ψ given by

$$\psi(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 & \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_2^\top & \Psi_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix}, \quad \forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_x}, \quad (16)$$

with $\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 & \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_2^\top & \Psi_3 \end{bmatrix}$ being a symmetric matrix satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ I \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 & \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_2^\top & \Psi_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ I \end{bmatrix} = \Psi_1 + \Psi_2 + \Psi_2^\top + \Psi_3 \leq 0. \quad (17)$$

- The triggering variable η_k in \mathbb{R} is driven by the following discrete-time dynamic equation:

$$\eta_{k+1} = (\lambda + \rho) \eta_k - \psi(x_k, \chi_k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \eta_0 \geq 0, \quad (18)$$

where λ and ρ are such that $\rho \geq 0$ and $(\lambda + \rho) \in [0, 1)$.

Constraint (17) ensures $\psi(x, x) \leq 0$ for all x in \mathbb{R}^n , which means that the event-triggered condition is not violated just after a control update. Note also that imposing $\rho = 0$ in (15) makes the dynamic event-triggering rule a static one. Following classical methods of the continuous-time dynamic event-triggering mechanism design (Dolk, Borghers, & Heemels, 2017; Girard, 2015; Tarbouriech & Girard, 2018), one has to guarantee that the variable η_k is non-negative for all k in \mathbb{N} . The following lemma addresses this issue.

Lemma 3. Consider scalar parameters (λ, ρ) such that $\rho \geq 0$ and $(\lambda + \rho) \in [0, 1)$ and assume that $\eta_0 > 0$. Then, the dynamic event-triggering variable is non-negative for any sampling instants t_k , i.e., $\eta_k \geq 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Consider the dynamic of η_k in (18) together with the event-triggering rule (15). Assume that $\rho \geq 0$, $(\lambda + \rho) \in [0, 1)$ and $\eta_0 > 0$. The proof is then made by recursion.

Initialization ($k = 1$): Assume that $\eta_0 > 0$. According to the dynamic Eq. (18) with $k = 0$ and $x_0 = \chi_0$, we have

$$\eta_1 = (\lambda + \rho) \eta_0 - \underbrace{\psi(x_0, \chi_0)}_{\leq 0 \text{ from (17)}} \geq 0.$$

As $(\lambda + \rho) \in [0, 1)$, $\eta_0 > 0$ and $\psi(x_0, \chi_0) \leq 0$, it is clear that $\eta_1 \geq 0$, which concludes the initialization.

Recursion ($k \in \mathbb{N}$): Assume that, at time $k \geq 1$ the variable η_k is positive. Then, the following two situations may occur.

If $\psi(x_k, \chi_k) \geq \rho \eta_k$. Then, the value of the control law as well as χ_k are updated, i.e., $\chi_k = x_k$. In this situation, $\psi(x_k, \chi_k) \leq 0$ still holds since we get the same constraint (17) of the triggering function ψ as in the case $k = 0$ above. Consequently, $\eta_{k+1} \geq 0$.

If $\psi(x_k, \chi_k) \leq \rho \eta_k$, then, according to the discrete-time Eq. (18) and since $\lambda \geq 0$, $\eta_k \geq 0$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{k+1} &= (\lambda + \rho) \eta_k - \psi(x_k, \chi_k) \\ &= \underbrace{\lambda \eta_k}_{\geq 0} + \underbrace{(\rho \eta_k - \psi(x_k, \chi_k))}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\eta_{k+1} \geq 0$ holds, which concludes the recursion.

3.4. Control objectives

The problem addressed in this paper concerns the co-design of the state feedback gain K and the matrix Ψ , defining the event-triggering rule (15) and (16), to minimize control law updates while maintaining stability of the origin for the closed loop. It is well-known (see Hu & Lin, 2001; Tarbouriech et al., 2011, and related literature) that ensuring global asymptotic stability of the origin for saturated systems (7) is feasible only if the open loop is not exponentially unstable. This condition also holds when the matrix dynamics are uncertain. Therefore, as the basin of attraction of the origin generally cannot cover the entire state space, it becomes crucial to determine an approximation of this basin. To tackle this task, we consider an inner approximation of the basin of attraction of the origin achieved by constructing a level set associated with an appropriate Lyapunov function.

The problem to solve can be formulated as follows:

Problem 1. Design the gain K and the event-triggering parameters (Ψ, ρ, λ) such that the regional (local) asymptotic stability is ensured for any initial condition belonging to a level set associated to the considered Lyapunov function.

Let us emphasize that we want to tackle Problem 1 from a data point of view, that is using the data collection \mathcal{D} defined in (8). To do this, we will exploit the preliminary results proposed in Section 2.

4. Main results

4.1. Theoretical conditions

In this section, we exploit the material presented in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 to solve Problem 1, that is to solve the co-design problem consisting in designing the state feedback gain K and the event-triggering parameters.

Theorem 1. For given parameters λ and ρ such that $\lambda \leq \lambda + \rho < 1$, assume that there exists

$$D_V^1 := \{\mu, W, S, Y, Z, \bar{\Psi}_i\} \\ \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{S}_{n_x} \times \mathbb{D}_{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_{i_u}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_{i_u}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_{i_x}}$$

solution to the following inequalities

$$\Phi(D) > 0, \begin{bmatrix} W & Z_{(i)}^\top \\ * & \bar{u}_i^2 \end{bmatrix} > 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, n_u \quad (19)$$

where

$$\Phi(D) = \begin{bmatrix} W + \bar{\Psi}_1 & \bar{\Psi}_2 & 0 & 0 & W & 0 \\ * & \bar{\Psi}_3 & Y^\top + Z^\top & 0 & 0 & Y^\top \\ * & * & 2S & 0 & 0 & S \\ * & * & * & \Phi_4 & -\mu \mathcal{X}^+ \mathcal{X}^\top & -\mu \mathcal{X}^+ \mathcal{U}^\top \\ * & * & * & * & \mu \mathcal{X} \mathcal{X}^\top & \mu \mathcal{X} \mathcal{U}^\top \\ * & * & * & * & * & \mu \mathcal{U} \mathcal{U}^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

with

$$\Phi_4 = W + \mu \mathcal{X}^+ \mathcal{X}^{\top+} - \mu \delta \Delta_{\omega}.$$

Then, the dynamic event-triggered control law (13) with the gain $K = YW^{-1}$ and the event-triggering function (18) characterized by (λ, ρ) and matrices $\Psi_i = \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\lambda}\right) W^{-1} \bar{\Psi}_i W^{-1}$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, ensures that the ellipsoid $\mathcal{E}(W^{-1})$ is an inner-approximation of the basin of attraction of the origin for the closed-loop system (7)–(13).

Proof. Consider the following candidate for the Lyapunov function

$$V(x_k, \eta_k) = x_k^\top P x_k + \eta_k. \quad (20)$$

Recall that Lemma 1 ensures that the dynamic event-triggering variable η_k is strictly positive. Hence, imposing $P > 0$ guarantees that the previous function is positive definite.

Computing now the forward increment of V along the trajectory of the system yields

$$\Delta V(x_k, \eta_k) := V(x_{k+1}, \eta_{k+1}) - V(x_k, \eta_k) \\ = x_{k+1}^\top P x_{k+1} - x_k^\top P x_k + \eta_{k+1} - \eta_k. \quad (21)$$

The objective is to ensure that $\Delta V(x) \leq 0$ for all (x_k, η_k) such that x in $\mathcal{E}(P)$, i.e. $x^\top P x \leq 1$. The satisfaction of the last inequalities in (19) means that the ellipsoid $\mathcal{E}(W, 1)$ is included in the set $S(G)$, for a given matrix G . From Lemma 2, for $x \in \mathcal{E}(W, 1)$, inequality (6) holds and we get:

$$2\phi^\top(K\chi_k)T(\text{sat}(K\chi_k) + G\chi_k) \leq 0. \quad (22)$$

Define now \mathcal{L} by

$$\mathcal{L}(x_k, \chi_k, \eta_k) := \Delta V(x_k, \chi_k, \eta_k) \\ - 2\phi^\top(K\chi_k)T(\text{sat}(K\chi_k) + G\chi_k). \quad (23)$$

Then, the previous discussion ensures that $\Delta V(x_k, \chi_k, \eta_k) \leq \mathcal{L}(x_k, \chi_k, \eta_k)$ for all χ_k in $S(G)$.

Re-injecting the expression of x_{k+1} and η_{k+1} , we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}(x_k, \chi_k, \eta_k) = (\mathcal{A}x_k + B \text{sat}(K\chi_k))^\top P (\mathcal{A}x_k + B \text{sat}(K\chi_k)) \\ - x_k^\top P x_k - 2\phi^\top(K\chi_k)T(\text{sat}(K\chi_k) + G\chi_k) \\ - \psi(x_k, \chi_k) - (1 - \lambda - \rho)\eta_k. \quad (24)$$

Recalling that the event-triggering condition ensures that $\rho\eta_k \leq \psi(x_k, \chi_k)$, then it holds

$$-\psi(x_k, \chi_k) - (1 - \lambda - \rho)\eta_k = \underbrace{\rho\eta_k - \psi(x_k, \chi_k)}_{\leq 0} - (1 - \lambda)\eta_k \\ \leq -(1 - \lambda)\eta_k \leq -\left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho}\right)\psi(x_k, \chi_k).$$

Re-injecting the previous upper bound into the expression of \mathcal{L} , we get

$$\mathcal{L}(x_k, \chi_k, \eta_k) = (\mathcal{A}x_k + B \text{sat}(K\chi_k))^\top P (\mathcal{A}x_k + B \text{sat}(K\chi_k)) \\ - x_k^\top P x_k - 2\phi^\top(K\chi_k)T(\text{sat}(K\chi_k) + G\chi_k) \\ - \left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho}\right) \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ \chi_k \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 & \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_2^\top & \Psi_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ \chi_k \end{bmatrix} \quad (25)$$

Introducing the augmented vector $\xi_k = [x_k^\top \chi_k^\top \phi^\top(K\chi_k)]$, we are able to express \mathcal{L} as follows

$$\mathcal{L}(x_k, \chi_k, \eta_k) = -\xi_k^\top \Theta \xi_k \quad (26)$$

where

$$\Theta := \begin{bmatrix} P + \left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho}\right)\Psi_1 & \left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho}\right)\Psi_2 & 0 \\ * & \left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho}\right)\Psi_3 & (K + G)^\top T \\ * & * & 2T \end{bmatrix} \\ - \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}^\top \\ K^\top B^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top P \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}^\top \\ K^\top B^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

Applying the Schur Complement, condition $\Theta > 0$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} P + \left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho}\right)\Psi_1 & \left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho}\right)\Psi_2 & 0 & \mathcal{A}^\top \\ * & \left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho}\right)\Psi_3 & (K + G)^\top T & K^\top B^\top \\ * & * & 2T & B^\top \\ * & * & * & P^{-1} \end{bmatrix} > 0$$

Matrices P and T being positive definite, their inverse exists and will be denoted as $W = P^{-1}$ and $S = T^{-1}$. Pre- and post-multiplying the previous inequality by $\text{diag}(W, W, S, I_n)$, and defining $\bar{\Psi}_i = \left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{\rho}\right) W \Psi_i W$, for all $i = 1, 2, 3$, $Y = KW$ and $Z = GW$, condition $\Theta < 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} W + \bar{\Psi}_1 & \bar{\Psi}_2 & 0 & W \mathcal{A}^\top \\ * & \bar{\Psi}_3 & Y^\top + Z^\top & Y^\top B^\top \\ * & * & 2S & S B^\top \\ * & * & * & W \end{bmatrix} > 0.$$

We are now in position to apply Lemma 1 with matrices

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} W + \bar{\Psi}_1 & \bar{\Psi}_2 & 0 \\ * & \bar{\Psi}_3 & Y^\top + Z^\top \\ * & * & 2S \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{M}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} W & 0 \\ 0 & Y^\top \\ 0 & S \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{M}_3 = W,$$

and with the uncertainty matrix $\mathcal{A} = [\mathcal{A} \ B]^\top$.

In the situation of emulation, i.e. when the controller gain K is fixed a priori, the previous theorem can be adapted to only deliver the parameter of the event triggering condition. This is formulated in the next corollary.

Corollary 1. Assume that there exists

$$D_V^2 := \{\mu, W, S, Z, \bar{\Psi}_i\} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{S}_{n_x} \times \mathbb{D}_{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_{i_u}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_{i_u}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_{i_x}},$$

solution to the following inequalities (19) with $Y = KW$.

Then, the dynamic event-triggered control law (13) with the given gain K and the event-triggering function (18) characterized by (λ, ρ) and matrices $\Psi_i = W \bar{\Psi}_i W$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, ensures that the ellipsoid $\mathcal{E}(W^{-1})$ is an inner-approximation of the basin of attraction of the origin for the closed-loop system (7)–(13).

Remark 1. Let us mention how the results propose above might be compared with the literature:

- The method proposed includes a more generic formulation of the dynamic event-triggering rule thanks to the quadratic function ψ , defined in (16) and (17). In most of the existing work on event-triggered control design, this matrix is constrained by a particular structure, which is $\begin{bmatrix} \psi_1 & -\psi_1 \\ -\psi_1 & \psi_1 - \psi_3 \end{bmatrix}$, with $\psi_1 > 0$ and $\psi_3 > 0$ as for instance in Wang et al. (2023).
- To deal with saturation our approach follows the same route as Breschi, Zaccarian, and Formentin (2023) and Seuret and Tarbouriech (2023) since uses a quadratic abstraction based on Lemma 2. Note that differently from Breschi et al. (2023), the noise is affecting the dynamics and not the measurement.

4.2. Optimization problem

Let us first note that the matrix inequalities in Theorem 1 or in Corollary 1 are linear in the decision variables, as long as λ and ρ are fixed. One of the objectives behind the proposed theoretical conditions is to maximize the size of the inner-approximation of the basin of attraction (that is the size of the set $\mathcal{E}(W^{-1})$). Hence, in this context the following optimization problem can be considered

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{D_p^1} \quad & \epsilon \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (19), W \succeq \epsilon I_{n_x}, \quad \epsilon > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

In the paper, we focused on the maximization of the size of the inner-approximation of the basin of attraction of the origin for the closed-loop system (7)–(13), but it should be interesting to propose some criterion to reduce the amount of control updates. This will be the topic of forthcoming issue.

5. Numerical applications

To assess the theoretical contribution of this paper, we examine the problem of spacecraft rendezvous, a topic that has been extensively studied with various mathematical models. Specifically, we concentrate on the scenario where a target evolves in a circular Keplerian orbit, and the approaching vehicle (chaser) is in close proximity to the target. This problem can be effectively modeled by the linear Hill–Clohessy–Wiltshire (HCW) equations, as introduced in Clohessy and Wiltshire (1960) and Hill (1878), providing accurate descriptions of the relative position of the spacecraft.

The HCW model, using impulsive control, describes the relative motion of a chaser vehicle close to the target. The reduced model in the (x, y) -plan can be written as follows:

$$\ddot{r}_x - 3n^2 r_x - 2n \dot{r}_y = 0, \quad (28a)$$

$$\ddot{r}_y + 2n \dot{r}_x = 0, \quad (28b)$$

where $(r_x, r_y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ stands for the relative position between the chaser and the target in the target reference frame. We introduce (v_x, v_y) , which stands for the relative velocities between the chaser and the target in the target reference frame. The HCW model assumes that the target vehicle is passive and moving along a circular orbit of radius R . For a typical orbit at, say, an altitude of $R = 500$ km, we would get $n = 0.0011$ rad/s. The control action is here performed through impulses acting only on the velocities. In order words, this can be summarized as

$$v_x^+ = v_x + u_x, \quad v_y^+ = v_y + u_y, \quad (29)$$

where the impulses are of limited amplitude.

Performing a discretization of the model with a period $T = 0.5$ s, such that the sampling instants are $t_k = kT$ leads to the following discrete time dynamics

$$x_{k+1} = e^{A_0 T} (x_k + B_0 u_k), \quad (30)$$

where $x_k = [r_x(t_k) \ v_x(t_k) \ r_y(t_k) \ v_y(t_k)]$ is the state vector $u_k = [u_x(t_k) \ u_y(t_k)]$, and with the following matrices

$$A_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 3n^2 & 0 & 0 & 2n \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -2n & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this context, minimizing the consumption of control action is a crucial concern for ensuring mission safety. Additionally, due to potential variations in the sampling period or deviations from a perfectly circular orbit at 500 km for the target, the model may be subject to disturbances and uncertainties. Taken together, these factors motivate the application of a data-driven control design. To address these uncertainties, we collect $N = 50$ data points represented as in (8). Uncertainties have been incorporated into (30) as follows:

$$X_i^+ = (e^{A_0 T} + \Delta A) X_i + (e^{A_0 T} B_0 + \Delta B) \text{sat}(U_i), \quad (31)$$

where ΔA and ΔB are random matrices such that $|\Delta A_{(ij)}| \leq \delta$, $|\Delta B_{(ij)}| \leq \delta$, with $\delta = 10^{-3}$, for all appropriate integers i, j , and where X_i and U_i have also been selected randomly. In particular, some values of U_i are such that $\text{sat}(U_i) = \pm \tilde{u}_j$. To get a better understanding of the effect of these random matrices and of the saturation, the optimal least squares estimate of \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} , using a set of data are given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{A} & \mathbb{B} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0211 & 0.4694 & -0.0318 & 0.0241 & 1.9107 & 0.2610 \\ 0.0423 & 0.9389 & -0.0636 & 0.0487 & 3.8214 & 0.5239 \\ -0.0147 & 0.0090 & 1.0061 & 0.4658 & 0.0378 & 1.8873 \\ -0.0294 & 0.0176 & 0.0123 & 0.9316 & 0.0737 & 3.7744 \end{bmatrix},$$

which differs notably from the original system

$$\begin{bmatrix} e^{A_0 T} & e^{A_0 T} B_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.5 & 0 & 0.002 & 0.5 & 0.0002 \\ 1.5 \cdot 10^6 & 1 & 0 & 0.001 & 1 & 0.001 \\ 0 & -0.002 & 1 & 0.5 & -0.0002 & 0.5 \\ 0 & -0.001 & 0 & 1 & -0.001 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

While the matrix \mathbb{A} is quite similar to $e^{A_0 T}$, the values of \mathbb{B} present great differences with respect to $e^{A_0 T} B_0$, which is due to the presence of the input saturation. The matrix Δ_ω associated with the set of data is given by

$$\Delta_\omega = \begin{bmatrix} 28.28 & 56.56 & 0.99 & 1.97 \\ 56.56 & 113.11 & 2.03 & 4.00 \\ 0.99 & 2.03 & 32.38 & 64.75 \\ 1.97 & 4.00 & 64.75 & 129.51 \end{bmatrix},$$

and we have selected parameter $\delta = 1.005$. Solving the optimization problem (27), with (19), $\lambda = 0.8$ and $\rho = 0.1$ leads to the following controller gain K and matrix W :

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} -0.1335 & -0.2819 & 0.0626 & 0.0215 \\ 0.0117 & -0.0015 & -0.1327 & -0.2801 \\ 608.56 & -249.62 & -24.40 & 29.84 \\ -249.62 & 249.36 & 63.36 & -19.94 \\ -24.40 & 63.36 & 358.52 & -138.25 \\ 29.84 & -19.94 & -138.25 & 188.32 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} -0.1335 & -0.2819 & 0.0626 & 0.0215 \\ 0.0117 & -0.0015 & -0.1327 & -0.2801 \\ 608.56 & -249.62 & -24.40 & 29.84 \\ -249.62 & 249.36 & 63.36 & -19.94 \\ -24.40 & 63.36 & 358.52 & -138.25 \\ 29.84 & -19.94 & -138.25 & 188.32 \end{bmatrix},$$

so that both $\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{B}K$ and $e^{A_0 T} + e^{A_0 T} B_0 K$ are Schur stable.

The simulation results are illustrated in Fig. 1, depicting the trajectories of the system with disturbances δA and δB , adhering to the same constraints as those during data generation. The initial condition $x_0 = [12.03 \ -20.89 \ 2.63 \ 4.28]^T$ is situated at the boundary of the ellipsoid $\mathcal{E}(W^{-1})$. Fig. 1 demonstrates that despite the saturation of both control inputs, the resulting trajectory converges asymptotically to the origin. Additionally, it shows a reduction in the number of control updates, highlighting the efficiency of the method.




Fig. 1. Graphs showing the trajectories of r_x, r_y , the two saturated control inputs u_x, u_y , the triggering functions $\rho\eta_k$ and $\psi(x_k, \chi_k)$ and the triggering instants.

Note that the matrix W obtained leads to a smaller ellipsoidal set $\mathcal{E}(W^{-1})$ in comparison with that one resulting of the conditions in Seuret and Tarbouriech (2024). It clear illustrates the trade-off due to the event-triggered rule with the respect of the size of the inner-approximation of the basin of attraction of the origin.

6. Conclusions and perspectives

This paper addressed the design of a dynamic triggering mechanism within a data-driven framework, incorporating limitations on input magnitude modeled using a saturation map. The primary objectives were to jointly design the triggering parameters and the state-feedback gain while characterizing an inner approximation of the basin of attraction of the origin for saturated closed-loop systems. Achieving these goals relied on a collection of informative data experiments, with theoretical conditions formulated based on quadratic Lyapunov criteria, leading to convex optimization problems.

The obtained results provide valuable insights for future research. Particularly, the optimization problem introduced in this paper emphasizes maximizing the inner-approximation of the basin of attraction of the origin, leaving the reduction of the number of control updates as a topic for further investigation. Moreover, a promising avenue for future work involves developing a more systematic approach to design the event-triggering mechanism. This could entail exploring decentralized triggering rules, each tailored to specific control channels.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Alexandre Seuret: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Sophie Tarbouriech:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

The work by A. Seuret has been partially funded by the European Union - NextGenerationEU and by the Spanish Agency for Research (AEI) through the ATRAE grant ATR2023-145067. Research by Sophie Tarbouriech is partially funded by ANR via project OLYMPIA, France, number ANR-23-CE48-0006.

References

- Aström, K. J. (2008). Event based control. In *Analysis and design of nonlinear control systems* (pp. 127–147). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Banno, I., Azuma, S.-I., Ariizumi, R., & Asai, T. (2021). Data-driven sparse event-triggered control of unknown systems. In *IEEE American control conf.* (pp. 3392–3397).
- Bazanella, A., Campestri, L., & Eckhard, D. (2011). *Controller design: the h_2 approach*. Haarlem, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Berberich, J., Koch, A., Scherer, C. W., & Allgöwer, F. (2020). Robust data-driven state-feedback design. In *IEEE American control conf.* (pp. 1532–1538). IEEE.
- Berberich, J., Köhler, J., Müller, M. A., & Allgöwer, F. (2020). Data-driven model predictive control with stability and robustness guarantees. *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(4), 1702–1717.
- Bisoffi, A., De Persis, C., & Tesi, P. (2022). Data-driven control via Petersen's lemma. *Automatica*, 145, Article 110537.
- Breschi, V., De Persis, C., Formentin, S., & Tesi, P. (2021). Direct data-driven model-reference control with Lyapunov stability guarantees. In *IEEE conf. on decision and control* (pp. 1456–1461). IEEE.
- Breschi, V., Zaccarian, L., & Formentin, S. (2023). Data-driven stabilization of input-saturated systems. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, (7), 1640–1645.
- Clohesy, W. H., & Wiltshire, R. S. (1960). Terminal guidance systems for satellite rendezvous. *Journal of the Aerospace Sciences*, 27(9), 653–658.
- De Persis, C., & Tesi, P. (2019). Formulas for data-driven control: Stabilization, optimality, and robustness. *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(3), 909–924.
- Digge, V., & Pasumathy, R. (2022). Data-driven event-triggered control for discrete-time LTI systems. In *European control conf.* (pp. 1355–1360).
- Dolk, V. S., Borger, D. P., & Heemels, W. P. M. H. (2017). Output-based and decentralized dynamic event-triggered control with guaranteed \mathcal{L}_p -gain performance and zero-freeness. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(1), 34–49.
- Girard, A. (2015). Dynamic triggering mechanisms for event-triggered control. *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(7), 1992–1996.
- Heemels, W. P. M. H., Johansson, K. H., & Tabuada, P. (2012). An introduction to event-triggered and self-triggered control. In *IEEE conf. on decision and control* (pp. 3270–3285).
- Hill, G. W. (1878). Researches in lunar theory. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 1(3), 245–260, 5–26, 129–147.
- Hou, Z. S., & Wang, Z. (2013). From model-based control to data-driven control: Survey, classification and perspective. *Information Sciences*, 235, 3–35.
- Hu, T., & Lin, Z. (2001). *Control systems with actuator saturation: analysis and design*. Boston: Birkhauser.
- Khashooei, B. A., Antunes, D. J., & Heemels, W. P. M. H. (2017). Output-based event-triggered control with performance guarantees. *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(7), 3646–3652.
- Lehmann, D., & Lunze, J. (2011). Extension and experimental evaluation of an event-based state-feedback approach. *Control Engineering Practice*, 19(2), 101–112.
- Matsuda, Y., Kato, S., Wakasa, Y., & Adachi, R. (2022). State-feedback event-triggered control using data-driven methods. In *61st annual conference of the society of instrument and control engineers of Japan* (pp. 1287–1292).
- Piga, D., Formentin, S., & Bemporad, A. (2018). Direct data-driven control of constrained systems. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 26, 1422–1429.
- Recht, B. (2019). A tour of reinforcement learning: The view from continuous control. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 2, 253–279.
- Sanfelici Bazanella, A., Campestri, L., & Eckhard, D. (2023). The data-driven approach to classical control theory. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 56, Article 100906.
- Seuret, A., & Tarbouriech, S. (2023). A data-driven approach to the l_2 stabilization of linear systems subject to input saturations. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 1646–1651.
- Seuret, A., & Tarbouriech, S. (2024). Robust data-driven control design for linear systems subject to input saturations. *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Transactions on Automatic Control*, accepted.
- Tabuada, P. (2007). Event-triggered real-time scheduling of stabilizing control tasks. *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Transactions on Automatic Control*, 52(9), 1680–1685.
- Tarbouriech, S., Garcia, G., Gomes da Silva, J. M., Jr., & Queinnec, I. (2011). *Stability and stabilization of linear systems with saturating actuators*. Springer.
- Tarbouriech, S., & Girard, A. (2018). LMI-based design of dynamic event-triggering mechanism for linear systems. In *IEEE conf. on decision and control* (pp. 121–126).
- Van Waarde, H. J., Camlibel, M. K., & Mesbahi, M. (2022). From noisy data to feedback controllers: non-conservative design via a matrix S-lemma. *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(1), 162–175.
- Van Waarde, H. J., Eising, J., Trentelman, H. L., & Camlibel, M. K. (2020). Data informativity: a new perspective on data-driven analysis and control. *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(11), 4753–4768.
- Wang, X., Sun, J., Berberich, J., Wang, G., Allgöwer, F., & Chen, J. (2023). Data-driven control of dynamic event-triggered systems with delays. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 33(12), 7071–7093.
- Zaccarian, L., & Teel, A. R. (2011). *Modern anti-windup synthesis*. Princeton University Press.