

Design of Saturating State Feedback With Sign-Indefinite Quadratic Forms

Isabelle Queinnec , Sophie Tarbouriech , Giorgio Valmorbida , and Luca Zaccarian , *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—In this article, we propose a novel class of piecewise smooth Lyapunov functions leading to linear-matrix-inequality-based stability/performance analysis and control design for linear systems with saturating inputs. We provide conditions for global properties, and also conditions for local properties and guaranteed estimates of the basin of attraction. The backbone of our result consists in using quadratic forms with constant matrices that are not necessarily sign definite, thereby providing additional degrees of freedom. Using generalized sector conditions involving the dead-zone nonlinearity and its derivative, we formulate convex optimization conditions to verify their positivity in the region of interest. Several numerical examples with connections to existing results illustrate the potential behind our novel construction.

Index Terms—Lyapunov methods, input saturation, generalized sector conditions, linear matrix inequalities, convex optimization.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE operating constraints of any practical control system often include magnitude limits on the actuators that must be taken into account in the control design to avoid potentially catastrophic effects (see, e.g., [1] and [22]). The conservative (so-called low-gain) approach of restricting solutions to never reach the saturation bounds may limit excessively the system operation or induce poor performance. With linear plants, it is known that global asymptotic stability can only be achieved if the plant is not exponentially unstable (these plants are

called asymptotically null controllable with bounded controls—ANCBC) [21]. Moreover, some of these systems require nonlinear stabilizers [7]. When the plant is not ANCBC, it is imperative to characterize the basin of attraction of the origin and to obtain tight estimates, thus providing the user with a large set of operating conditions.

In the past two decades, constructive methods based on convex optimization have led to direct design and antiwindup design strategies to mitigate performance degradation during saturation [11], [23], [31]. Most of these results use quadratic Lyapunov functions and the circle criterion to certify absolute stability. In this scenario, only the sector property of the saturation is considered, and the resulting analysis is generally conservative. For the regional analysis and design, which are necessary with non-ANCBC plants, generalized sector conditions enjoyed by the saturation are used, typically leading to certified estimates of the basin of attraction based on sublevel sets of Lyapunov functions. When using the Popov criterion [14], the nonlinearity is incorporated in the Lyapunov function, and less conservative regional results can be obtained using information on the gradient of the nonlinearity [4], [17]. However, it is only recently that the sector properties of the nonlinearity have been used to also relax the positivity of the Lyapunov functions for optimization-based analysis of Lure systems [6], [16], [26], [27].

In this article, we introduce a new class of nonquadratic Lyapunov functions for stability analysis and control design providing global and nonglobal guarantees. The quadratic forms that we consider were first introduced in [19] and then revisited in [4] and [16]. However, in [4] and [19], a constraint on the positivity of the matrix in the quadratic form was imposed. As in the analysis results of [16], here, we exploit the flexibility of matrices that are not sign definite for the stability analysis and, for the first time, for the control synthesis of nonlinear state feedback laws for saturating systems. Both global and regional cases are studied. In the framework of linear complementarity systems, a similar Lyapunov function was presented in [2]. Moreover, in the discrete-time saturated system context, Gonzaga *et al.* [10] used a special case of the function studied here. Not many results focus on nonpositive quadratic forms when addressing continuous-time saturated systems. In our recent work [27], we show that relaxing the positivity conditions allows improving the nonlinear \mathcal{L}_{2m} gain estimates, when using piecewise polynomial storage functions. Also, Li *et al.* [16] suggested similar positivity relaxations when focusing on max of quadratics for analysis purposes. Additionally, for systems with slope bounds in a known set of state spaces, regional gain and regions of attraction

Manuscript received December 20, 2019; revised December 29, 2019, September 27, 2020, and May 3, 2021; accepted August 10, 2021. Date of publication August 24, 2021; date of current version June 30, 2022. This work was supported in part by the French National Research Agency through HANDY project under Grant ANR-18-CE40-0010. Recommended by Associate Editor L. B. Freidovich. (*Corresponding author: Sophie Tarbouriech.*)

Isabelle Queinnec and Sophie Tarbouriech are with the LAAS-CNRS, University of Toulouse, CNRS, Toulouse, France (e-mail: queinnec@laas.fr; tarbour@laas.fr).

Giorgio Valmorbida is with the Laboratoire des Signaux et Systèmes, CentraleSupélec, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay, 91190 Gif-sur-Yvette, France, and also with Inria Saclay, 91192 Gif-sur-Yvette, France (e-mail: giorgio.valmorbida@l2s.centralesupelec.fr).

Luca Zaccarian is with the LAAS-CNRS, University of Toulouse, CNRS, Toulouse, France, and also with the Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Trento, 38122 Trento, Italy (e-mail: zaccarian@laas.fr).

Color versions of one or more figures in this article are available at <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2021.3106878>.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2021.3106878

were studied in [26]. Finally, for systems with rational Jacobian, one can circumvent the need for a predefined set, in which the slope is bounded [6].

In this article, we propose synthesis conditions exploiting sign-indefinite quadratic forms. For the global case, our conditions are authentic linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) and allow constructing certificates for examples, where quadratic functions are proven to not exist. For the regional case, we obtain suggestive functions, whose positivity is only guaranteed in the estimated region of attraction, and which even become negative outside that certified domain, so that extra degrees of freedom are available for obtaining nonconservative (and nonconvex) contractive sublevel sets. An interesting parallel approach is provided in [15], where generalized quadratic forms are used to address the analysis problems considered in our article. In addition to also providing design conditions (whereas only analysis is addressed in [15]), our conditions directly imply well posedness of the nonlinear algebraic loop, whereas this property is stated as an assumption in [15].

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section II describes the system under consideration and the analysis and design problems, together with some background material. Section III introduces our new sign-indefinite quadratic form and the arising Lyapunov functions, together with some new tools for establishing its positivity in the region of interest. This article is completed by Section IV providing global analysis and design conditions and by Section V providing regional analysis and design conditions. Several examples taken from the literature are presented throughout this article.

Notation: \mathbb{R}^n is the n -dimensional Euclidean space, while \mathbb{C} is the complex plane and $\Re(s)$ is the real part of number $s \in \mathbb{C}$. $\mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^n$ (respectively, $\mathbb{S}_{> 0}^n$) is the set of symmetric positive-semidefinite (respectively, positive-definite) matrices of dimension n . $\mathbb{D}_{\geq 0}^m$ (respectively, $\mathbb{D}_{> 0}^m$) is the set of diagonal positive-semidefinite (respectively, positive-definite) matrices of size m . Given any symmetric matrix A , $\lambda_m(A)$ and $\lambda_M(A)$ are, respectively, its minimum and maximum real eigenvalues. For any matrix A , A^\top denotes its transpose and $\text{He}(A) = A + A^\top$. For any square matrix A , $\text{Tr}(A)$ denotes its trace. For q matrices A_i , $i = 1, \dots, q$, $\text{diag}(A_1, \dots, A_q)$ denotes the block-diagonal matrix constructed from matrices A_i . I_n denotes the identity matrix of dimension n , whereas 0 stands for a matrix of zeros of appropriate dimensions. For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $|y|_\infty$ and $|y|$ stand for its infinity and Euclidean norms, respectively.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

A. Linear State Feedback With Dead-Zone Loop

Consider the following plant:

$$\dot{x} = Ax + B\text{sat}(u) \quad (1)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the state and the input, respectively. A and B are constant matrices of appropriate dimension, and pair (A, B) is supposed to be stabilizable. Function $\text{sat} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ denotes the vector-valued symmetric decentralized unit saturation, whose components are defined for $i = 1, \dots, m$ as $\text{sat}_i(u_i) := \max\{-1, \min\{1, u_i\}\}$, with u_i being the i th

component of vector u . Model (1) well represents situations where the saturation limits are not unitary by simply rescaling the columns of B .

By defining the dead-zone function as $\text{dz}(u) := u - \text{sat}(u)$, system (1) reads

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu - B\text{dz}(u). \quad (2)$$

In this article, we are interested in state-feedback control laws defined by

$$u(x) = K_1x + K_2\text{dz}(u(x)) \quad (3)$$

where $K_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $K_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are either known in the problem of stability analysis or to be designed in the synthesis problem.

The presence of the dead zone at the right-hand side of (3) induces a nonlinear algebraic loop implicitly defining a piecewise affine feedback selection $x \mapsto u(x)$. By setting $K_2 = 0$, one retrieves the classical linear state-feedback case without algebraic loop [23]. If the algebraic loop is well posed, then one can guarantee the existence of a (piecewise affine) solution to (3). Necessary and sufficient well-posedness conditions can be, for example, derived from [12, Claim 2].

The following facts are straightforward consequences of [30, Prop. 1] and [12, Claim 1 and Remark 1], respectively.

Fact 1: If there exists $\Delta \in \mathbb{D}_{> 0}^m$ such that $2\Delta - \Delta K_2 - K_2^\top \Delta > 0$, then the algebraic loop in (3) is well-posed.

Fact 2: If the algebraic loop in (3) is well posed, then its unique solution is a globally Lipschitz piecewise affine function of x over a finite polytopic partition of \mathbb{R}^n .

B. Problem Statement and Sector Conditions Background

The closed-loop system resulting from the interconnection of (2) and (3) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= (A + BK_1)x + B(K_2 - I_m)\text{dz}(u(x)) \\ u(x) &= K_1x + K_2\text{dz}(u(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Due to the presence of the dead zone, the closed-loop dynamics (4) is nonlinear, and asymptotic stability of the origin can be ensured globally (that is for any initial condition $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$) or only locally (that is, only for initial conditions in a neighborhood of the origin). Fundamental limitations of bounded stabilization of linear systems [20] imply that when A has exponentially unstable eigenvalues, the maximal set of initial conditions providing solutions that converge to zero (the so-called *basin of attraction*) is bounded. The exact characterization of the basin of attraction of the origin remains an open problem in general. Hence, a challenging problem consists in computing accurate estimates. Whenever we can provide a guarantee on the size of the basin of attraction (typically through an inner approximation), we talk about *regional* asymptotic stability (as opposed to merely *local* asymptotic stability, where the basin of attraction may be arbitrarily small). Feedback (4) provides an interesting context, where (due to the properties of function dz) local asymptotic stability holds if and only if $A + BK_1$ is Hurwitz, but the characterization of a large estimate (namely an inner




Fig. 1. Regional stability via inclusion of a sublevel set $S(W, 1)$ of function V within set S_h .

approximation) of the basin of attraction requires nontrivial derivations (see, e.g., [11], [23], and [31]).

In this article, we use piecewise quadratic Lyapunov functions stemming from sign-indefinite quadratic forms with the goal in mind of addressing both the global and the regional exponential stability problems in the two cases, where K_1 and K_2 are fixed (analysis) or to be designed (synthesis).

In the global case, we address the following problems.

Problem 1 (Global analysis): Given gains K_1 and K_2 in (4), determine whether the origin is globally exponentially stable.

Problem 2 (Global synthesis): Compute gains K_1 and K_2 in (4) ensuring global exponential stability (GES) of the origin.

We address Problems 1 and 2 by exploiting the following well-known global sector condition (see, e.g., [14]).

Fact 3 (Global sector condition): The inequality

$$dz(u)^\top T(u - dz(u)) \geq 0 \quad (5)$$

holds for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and for any $T \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq 0}^m$.

In the regional case, we address the following problems.

Problem 3 (Regional analysis): Given gains K_1 and K_2 in (4), determine whether the origin is locally exponentially stable and provide an estimate of its basin of attraction.

Problem 4 (Regional synthesis): Compute gains K_1 and K_2 in (4) ensuring local exponential stability of the origin, together with an estimate of the basin of attraction.

To study regional properties, it is useful to generalize the global sector condition of Fact 3 in ways originally characterized in [9] and [11]. As shown in Fig. 1, regional asymptotic stability is assessed by focusing on an open sublevel set $S(W, 1) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : W(x) < 1\}$ of a Lyapunov function W restricted to the set

$$S_h := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |h(x)|_\infty \leq 1\} \quad (6)$$

where function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is typically vanishing at the origin. Most of the existing works [9], [11], [12], [23] use linear selections for h . In this article, we use the following implicit form, where H_1 and H_2 are arbitrary design parameters and function $x \mapsto u(x)$ is implicitly defined in (3) and characterized in Facts 1 and 2:

$$h(x) = H_1 x + H_2 dz(u(x)). \quad (7)$$

With the above selections, the following result is a direct adaptation of [24, Lemma 1] (see also [13]).

Fact 4 (Regional sector condition): The inequality

$$dz(u)^\top T(u - dz(u) - h(x)) \geq 0 \quad (8)$$

holds for all $x \in S_h$, all $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and all $T \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq 0}^m$.

We complete our background material by introducing a few equalities inspired by the bounds initially proposed in [4], exploiting the properties of the directional derivative $x \mapsto \dot{u}(x)$ of function $x \mapsto u(x)$ in (3) and the directional derivative $x \mapsto \dot{dz}(u(x))$ of function $x \mapsto dz(u(x))$ along the solutions of (4).

Fact 5 (Derivative of the dead zone): The identities

$$\dot{dz}(u(x))^\top T(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{dz}(u(x))) \equiv 0 \quad (9)$$

$$dz(u(x))^\top T(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{dz}(u(x))) \equiv 0 \quad (10)$$

hold for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for all $T \in \mathbb{D}^m$.

Proof: We prove the relations for all x such that $|u_i(x)| \neq 1$, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. For those values of x , the proof follows by noting that each component of u satisfies

$$\dot{dz}_i(u_i(x)) = \begin{cases} \dot{u}_i(x), & \text{if } |u_i(x)| > 1 \\ 0, & \text{if } |u_i(x)| < 1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\dot{u}_i(x) - \dot{dz}_i(u_i(x)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } |u_i(x)| > 1 \\ \dot{u}_i(x), & \text{if } |u_i(x)| < 1. \end{cases}$$

Remark 1: The control solution (4) requires the knowledge of the physical saturation output sat_{ph} present in the actuators, which might not be accessible in industrial applications. In this setting, a workaround is the introduction of an artificial (conservative) saturation function sat at the controller output, so that the actuation effort reaching the plant is $\text{sat}_{\text{ph}}(\text{sat}(u)) = \text{sat}(u)$, where the last equality holds as long as the artificial saturation levels of sat are smaller than or equal to the physical saturation levels of sat_{ph} . In this case, the artificial saturation provides an effective way to obtain the closed-loop system (4) even when the output of sat_{ph} is not accessible.

Besides this fact, mismatches between the saturation model sat and the actual saturation nonlinearity sat_{ph} may also emerge. In this case, we emphasize that the Lyapunov-based results presented in this article enjoy intrinsic robustness of asymptotic stability (see, e.g., [8, Ch. 7]), so that a certain level of nonzero mismatch is guaranteed to preserve the asymptotic stability properties in a semiglobal practical sense (see [8, Def. 7.18]). Due to this *robustness-in-the-small* guarantee, we expect some kind of graceful performance degradation when the saturation modeling is imprecise (e.g., the slope of the saturation may be not unitary in certain ranges) and in cases where the physical saturation levels might be smaller than the artificial ones (indeed in those cases $\text{sat}_{\text{ph}}(\text{sat}(u)) \neq \text{sat}(u)$). Similarly, due to the stated *robustness-in-the-small*, it is straightforward to extend our proofs to the case where the state measurement used in our feedback is replaced by an estimated state provided by a sufficiently fast Luenberger observer. Providing quantitative bounds on the tolerated mismatch that does not destroy stability, namely a *robustness-in-the-large* guarantee, is possible by embedding the nonlinearities in suitable inflated sector conditions, but is beyond the scope of this work and provides an interesting direction of future investigation. \star

III. EXTENDED SIGN-INDEFINITE LYAPUNOV FUNCTION

A. Proposed Structure

The four main results of this article, providing solutions to Problems 1–4, rely on a generalization of the piecewise smooth Lyapunov function originally proposed in [4], corresponding to

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &= \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}^\top P \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $dz(u(x))$ is the solution to (3). As in [4], we do not need to explicitly compute the mapping $x \mapsto u(x)$ because the Lyapunov construction follows from the implicit equation (3).

Due the fact that there are points where V in (11) is not differentiable, it is useful to emphasize that the Lipschitz nature of V allows us to ignore those areas when characterizing local exponential stability or GES of the origin. This fact is well formalized in the next lemma, which is a direct consequence of the results in [3] (see also [25]).

Lemma 1: Consider dynamics (4) and assume that there exists a locally Lipschitz Lyapunov function $x \mapsto W(x)$, positive scalars β_1, β_2 , and β_3 , and an open sublevel set $S(W, r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : W(x) < r\}$ of W , for some $r > 0$ satisfying

$$\beta_1 |x|^2 \leq W(x) \leq \beta_2 |x|^2, \quad \forall x \in S(W, r) \quad (12)$$

$$\dot{W}(x) := \langle \nabla W(x), Ax + B \text{sat}(u(x)) \rangle \leq -\beta_3 |x|^2,$$

$$\text{for almost all } x \in S(W, r) \quad (13)$$

then the origin is locally exponentially stable for (4) with basin of attraction containing $S(W, r)$. Moreover, if (12) and (13) hold for any $r > 0$ with the same scalars $\beta_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, then the origin is globally exponentially stable for (4).

The following lemma uses Fact 3 to establish sufficient conditions for positive definiteness and radial unboundedness of V in (11), while not imposing positive definiteness of matrix P .

Lemma 2: Given V in (11) with u defined in (3), if the algebraic loop in (3) is well posed and there exist matrices $P_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n, P_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, P_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$, and $T_0 \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq 0}^m$ such that

$$\Phi_0 = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} - K_1^\top T_0 \\ P_{12}^\top - T_0 K_1 & P_{22} - T_0 K_2 - K_2^\top T_0 + 2T_0 \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad (14)$$

then there exist positive scalars β_1 and β_2 satisfying (12) for any $r > 0$.

Proof: The global sector condition (5) with $T = T_0$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &\geq V(x) - 2dz(u(x))^\top T_0 u(x) - dz(u(x)) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}^\top \Phi_0 \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\geq \lambda_m(\Phi_0) \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 \geq \lambda_m(\Phi_0) |x|^2 \end{aligned}$$

which provides the lower bound in (12) with $\beta_1 = \lambda_{\min}(\Phi_0)$.

To study the upper bound in (12) from well posedness of the algebraic loop (3) and Fact 2, the globally Lipschitz property of u , together with $u(0) = 0$, ensures the existence of $L_u > 0$ such that $|u(x)| \leq L_u |x|$; therefore, using $|dz(u(x))| \leq |u(x)| \leq L_u |x|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &\leq \lambda_M(P_{11}) |x|^2 + 2|P_{12}| |x| |dz(u(x))| + |dz(u(x))|^2 |P_{22}| \\ &\leq (\lambda_M(P_{11}) + 2|P_{12}| L_u + |P_{22}| L_u^2) |x|^2 =: \beta_2 |x|^2 \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

B. Advantages From Using a Sign Indefinite P

A novelty of this article is that we do not insist on the fact that matrix P in (11) be positive definite, which allows representing a broader class of Lyapunov functions as compared to previous works such as [4]. As an example, consider the following two Popov-like functions, the first one focusing on the dead zone and the second one focusing (more classically, as in [14, Ex. 7.4] and [29, Sec. 2.5 and 2.1.6]) on the saturation:

$$V_{\text{Dai}}(x) := x^\top P_0 x + \sum_{i=1}^m 2\lambda_i \int_0^{u_i(x)} dz_i(s) ds \quad (15)$$

$$V_{\text{Khalil}}(x) := x^\top P_0 x + \sum_{i=1}^m 2\lambda_i \int_0^{u_i(x)} \text{sat}_i(s) ds. \quad (16)$$

As observed in [4], using the identity $2 \int_0^{u_i(x)} dz_i(s) ds = dz_i^2(u_i(x))$, the first function V_{Dai} in (15) can be obtained as a particular case of V in (11), by setting $P_{11} = P_0, P_{12} = 0, P_{22} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) = \Lambda$, and $\lambda_i > 0$, which provides a positive definite P .

However, a positive definite P does not provide enough degrees of freedom for representing the second function V_{Khalil} in (16), which can be instead represented by a sign indefinite P , as follows, with the last line inspired by (11):

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{Khalil}}(x) &= x^\top P_0 x + \sum_{i=1}^m 2\lambda_i \int_0^{u_i(x)} s - dz_i(s) ds \\ &= x^\top P_0 x + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i (u_i(x)^2 - dz_i^2(u_i(x))) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Using the expression of $u(x)$ in (3), we obtain the following selection of P in (17):

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} P_0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\Lambda \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} K_1^\top \\ K_2^\top \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \begin{bmatrix} K_1 & K_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

where P_{22} is often nonpositive (e.g., when $K_2 = 0$) but yet satisfies the positivity conditions of Lemma 2 under mild conditions on matrix P_0 (these conditions are satisfied whenever $P_0 > 0$ but also allow for more general cases).

Proposition 1: If matrix $P_0 + K_1^\top \Lambda K_1$ is positive definite, then condition (14) is satisfied for any $T_0 > \frac{\Lambda}{2}$, namely, under

a well-posedness assumption, V_{Khalil} in (16) satisfies (12) for all $1, \dots, m$ and $r > 0$.

Proof: With the structure of V in (11), using the derivations in (17), function V_{Khalil} in (16) corresponds to the selection of P in (18). With this selection of P , matrix Φ_0 in (14) reads

$$\Phi_0 = \begin{bmatrix} P_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2T_0 - \Lambda \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} K_1^\top \\ K_2^\top \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \begin{bmatrix} K_1 & K_2 \end{bmatrix} + \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -I_m \end{bmatrix} T_0 \begin{bmatrix} K_1 & K_2 \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (19)$$

Using the elimination lemma (see, e.g., [18]), defining bases N_1 and N_2 of the null spaces of $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I_m \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} K_1 & K_2 \end{bmatrix}$, respectively, it follows that $\Phi_0 > 0$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} N_1^\top \left(\begin{bmatrix} P_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2T_0 - \Lambda \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} K_1^\top \\ K_2^\top \end{bmatrix} \Lambda \begin{bmatrix} K_1 & K_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) N_1 \\ = P_0 + K_1^\top \Lambda K_1 > 0 \\ N_2^\top \begin{bmatrix} P_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2T_0 - \Lambda \end{bmatrix} N_2 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

which are both satisfied under the stated assumptions. ■

C. Set Inclusion for Regional Results

As depicted in Fig. 1, regional asymptotic stability should rely on a set inclusion property ensuring that the sublevel set

$$S(W, 1) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : W(x) < 1\} \quad (20)$$

of some suitable function W , based on function V in (11), is contained in the set \mathcal{S}_h of (6) [associated with function h in (7)] so that the inequality of Fact 4 holds in $S(W, 1)$. Not insisting on positivity of function V outside \mathcal{S}_h can lead to extra degrees of freedom in the construction proposed in Section V (see, for example, the surface represented in Fig. 4 and the corresponding discussion in Example 3). Therefore, we propose selecting W in (20) as

$$W(x) := \begin{cases} \min\{V(x), 1\}, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{S}_h \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Note that (21) does not lead, in general, to a continuous W , but it guarantees the identity

$$S(W, 1) = S(V, 1) \cap \mathcal{S}_h \quad (22)$$

which is useful for the Lyapunov analysis of Section V.¹ The following lemma establishes sufficient conditions for (Lipschitz) continuity of W and provides a tool, based on Fact 4, to guarantee bounds (12) with $r = 1$.

Lemma 3: If the algebraic loop in (3) is well posed and there exist matrices $P_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $P_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $P_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $H_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $H_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, and $T \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$ such that for all $i =$

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} & 0 \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ + \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & (H_1^\top - K_1^\top)T & H_{1i}^\top \\ 0 & TH_2 - T(K_2 - I_m) & H_{2i}^\top \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) > 0 \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

then defining V and W as in (11) and (21), the following properties hold.

- (i) Function W in (21) is Lipschitz continuous.
- (ii) The set inclusion $S(W, 1) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_h$ holds, with \mathcal{S}_h and $S(W, 1)$ defined in (6) and (20), respectively.
- (iii) Function W satisfies (12) for $r = 1$ and for suitable scalars β_1 and β_2 .

Proof: As a first step of the proof, we apply a Schur complement to (23), ensuring that, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Phi}_1 := P + \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & (H_1^\top - K_1^\top)T \\ 0 & T(H_2 - K_2) + T \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ - \begin{bmatrix} H_{1i}^\top \\ H_{2i}^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H_{1i} & H_{2i} \end{bmatrix} > 0. \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

Then, based on (24), we can prove the following fact:

$$h_i(x)^2 \leq V(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{S}_h. \quad (25)$$

Indeed, for all $x \in \mathcal{S}_h$, we can use the sector condition of Fact 4 ensuring that

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) - h_i(x)^2 &\geq V(x) - h_i(x)^2 - \text{dz}(u)^\top T(u - \text{dz}(u) - h(x)) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \text{dz}(u) \end{bmatrix}^\top \bar{\Phi}_1 \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \text{dz}(u) \end{bmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (25) that at the boundary of \mathcal{S}_h , where $h_i(x) = 1$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, it must hold that $V(x) \geq 1$, which implies that $W(x)$ is continuous at the patching surfaces in (21), which proves item (i).

Item (ii) follows immediately from (22), ensuring that

$$x \in S(W, 1) \Rightarrow x \in \mathcal{S}_h. \quad (27)$$

As for item (iii), to show (12) for all $x \in S(W, 1)$, first notice that from definition (21), we have $W(x) = V(x)$ for all $x \in S(W, 1)$. Then, we may focus on function V , for establishing (12). In particular, for any $x \in S(W, 1)$, we may use Fact 4 to conclude once again from (26) that

$$W(x) = V(x) \geq \lambda_m(\bar{\Phi}_1)|x|^2 \quad \forall x \in S(W, 1).$$

As for the upper bound in (12), we may proceed as in Lemma 2 using well posedness of the algebraic loop (3). ■

IV. GLOBAL RESULTS

A. Global Analysis

Using function V in (11), this section proposes conditions to solve Problem 1, as stated in the next theorem.

¹Condition (22) is especially useful in cases where $V(x)$ becomes smaller than 1 outside \mathcal{S}_h (so that $S(W, 1)$ may possibly be an unbounded disconnected set), as in the example shown in Fig. 4.

Theorem 1: Given K_1 and K_2 , if there exist matrices $P_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $P_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $P_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $T_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\geq 0}^m$ $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $T_2 \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$, and $T_3 \in \mathbb{D}^m$ such that (14) and (28) hold, (28) is shown in the bottom of the page, then the origin of (4) is globally exponentially stable.

Proof: The proof uses Lemma 1 by showing both (12) and (13) for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

To show (12), let us first observe that the (3,3) term of (28) reads $2T_2 - T_2K_2 - K_2^\top T_2 > 0$, where $T_2 > 0$ by assumption. Therefore, Fact 1 implies well posedness of the algebraic loop (3), and from Lemma 2, hypothesis (14) implies (12) globally (for any $r > 0$).

To show (13), first note that

$$\dot{V}(x) = 2 \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{dz}(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (29)$$

Using Facts 3 and 5, we may bound $\dot{V}(x)$ for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(x) &\leq \dot{V}(x) + 2dz(u(x))^\top T_1(u - dz(u(x))) \\ &\quad + 2\dot{dz}(u(x))^\top T_2(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{dz}(u(x))) \\ &\quad + 2dz(u(x))^\top T_3(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{dz}(u(x))) = -\eta^\top \mathcal{G} \eta \quad (30) \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta := \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \\ \dot{dz}(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}$ is an extended state, and matrix \mathcal{G} can be easily evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} = & \text{He} \left(- \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A+BK_1 & B(K_2-I_m) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_m \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ & - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ T_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_1 & K_2 - I_m & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ & - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ T_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_1(A+BK_1) & K_1B(K_2-I_m) & K_2-I_m \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ & - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ T_3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_1(A+BK_1) & K_1B(K_2-I_m) & K_2-I_m \end{bmatrix} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that the above expression corresponds to the matrix in (28), which then implies $\mathcal{G} > 0$ and by (30) also implies (13) for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and completes the proof. ■

For the analysis result of Theorem 1, since K_1 and K_2 are *a priori* given, the inequalities (14) and (28) are linear in P_{11} , P_{12} , P_{22} , and T_i , $i = 0, \dots, 3$; therefore, they can be efficiently solved by an LMI solver (as a feasibility semidefinite program).

Example 1: We illustrate here the reduced conservativeness of the conditions of Theorem 1, as compared to the use of quadratic Lyapunov functions. For global exponential stabilization of the dynamics presented in [31, Example 4.3.1], one may attempt using static antiwindup gains and quadratic Lyapunov certificates. Unfortunately, as discussed in [31], these certificates fail to satisfy the necessary conditions for quadratic stability analysis and synthesis. It turns out that even with the antiwindup gains set to zero (mere stability analysis), the LMI conditions of our Theorem 1 ensure GES of the origin.

More specifically, the dynamics in [31, Example 4.3.1] before antiwindup corresponds to the closed-loop system (4) with selections

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -0.05 & 1 \\ -10 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 9.9 & 0.495 \end{bmatrix}, \quad K_2 = 0.$$

By solving LMIs (14) and (28) as per Theorem 1, one obtains matrices P and T_i , $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$, certifying GES. In particular, for this example, the Lyapunov function V is characterized by matrix $P = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0052 & -0.1815 & 0.0411 \\ -0.1815 & 8.4599 & -0.1985 \\ 0.0411 & -0.1985 & 0.7077 \end{bmatrix}$, with the eigenvalues $\{0.6982 \ 1.0051 \ 8.4694\}$, which reveals that the degree of freedom of not constraining $P_{22} > 0$ is not necessary for establishing GAS of the origin, in this example.

Fig. 2 depicts in red some trajectories of the closed-loop system (4). Note that the level sets of the Lyapunov function (in black) are stretched horizontally in the proximity of the origin and vertically away from the origin. This peculiar shape of the trajectories causes the infeasibility of quadratic Lyapunov conditions, well overcome by Theorem 1. ◻

Remark 2: The conditions of Theorem 1 readily extend to the case where dynamics (4) is generalized to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= A_{cl}x + B_{cl}dz(u(x)) \\ u(x) &= K_1x + K_2dz(u(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Indeed, it suffices to replace all the occurrences of $A + BK_1$ by A_{cl} and those of $B(K_2 - I_m)$ by B_{cl} in conditions (28), and the proof of the theorem remains unchanged.

Expression (31) arises when analyzing the output feedback interconnection of a linear plant with an n_c -order dynamic

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_1 := & \text{He} \left(- \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A+BK_1 & B(K_2-I_m) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_m \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ & - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ T_1K_1 + T_3K_1(A+BK_1) & T_1(K_2-I_m) + T_3K_1B(K_2-I_m) & T_3(K_2-I_m) \\ T_2K_1(A+BK_1) & T_2K_1B(K_2-I_m) & T_2(K_2-I_m) \end{bmatrix} \right) > 0 \quad (28) \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 2. Level sets of the piecewise quadratic Lyapunov function (11) (black solid). Trajectories exponentially converge to the origin (red dotted). The dashed blue lines correspond to the boundary of the set containing the origin where $dz(u(x)) = 0$.

controller possibly involving an antiwindup gain [23, ch. 8]

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_p &= A_p x_p + B_p \text{sat}(y_c), \quad y_p = C_p x_p \\ \dot{x}_c &= A_c x_c + B_c y_p + E_c dz(y_c) \\ y_c &= C_c x_c + D_c y_p + F_c dz(y_c)\end{aligned}$$

which is represented by (31) with

$$\begin{aligned}[A_{cl}|B_{cl}] &= \begin{bmatrix} A_p + B_p D_c C_p & B_p C_p & -B_p(F_c - I_m) \\ B_c C_p & A_c & -E_c \end{bmatrix} \\ [K_1|K_2] &= [D_c C_p \quad C_c | F_c].\end{aligned}$$

★

B. Global Synthesis

Using function V in (11), here, we propose conditions solving Problem 2, that is, designing gains K_1 and K_2 ensuring GES of the origin.

Theorem 2: If there exist matrices $Q_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $Q_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $S \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $Y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $Y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ such that

$$\Phi_2 := \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} - Y_1^\top \\ Q_{12}^\top - Y_1 & Q_{22} - Y_2 - Y_2^\top + 2S \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_2 := \text{He} \left(- \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{12}^\top & Q_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_m \end{bmatrix} \right. \\ \left. - \begin{bmatrix} AM + BY_1 & BY_2 - BS - M & 0 \\ Y_1 & Y_2 - S & Y_1 & Y_2 - S \\ AM + BY_1 & BY_2 - BS - M & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_1 & Y_2 - S \end{bmatrix} \right) > 0 \quad (33)\end{aligned}$$

then M is nonsingular, and the origin of system (4) with

$$K_1 = Y_1 M^{-1}, \quad K_2 = Y_2 S^{-1} \quad (34)$$

is globally exponentially stable.

Proof: First, note that M is nonsingular; indeed, $M + M^\top > 0$ is implied by the (3,3) entry of (33).

The rest of the proof mimics the one of Theorem 1 by using Lemma 1. In particular, to show (12), consider the change of variables $K_1 M = Y_1$ and $K_2 S = Y_2$, and note that inequality (32) coincides with (14) pre- and postmultiplied by $\text{diag}(M^\top, S)$ and $\text{diag}(M, S)$, respectively. Moreover, the (4,4) term in (33) with $Y_2 = K_2 S$ reads $2S - K_2 S - S K_2^\top > 0$, which implies well posedness of (3) from Fact 1. Then, (12) is guaranteed by Lemma 2.

The rest of the article focuses on showing (13) by exploiting Fact 5 in addition to considering an enlarged space (comprising x and \hat{x} as in [5] and [18]) so that the Lyapunov certificate is suitably separated from the dynamics matrices.

More specifically, consider the extended vector $\eta := [x^\top dz(u(x))^\top \hat{x}^\top dz(u(x))^\top]^\top$. From the dynamic equation (4), for any matrix N , we get

$$\eta^\top N (-\dot{x} + (A + BK_1)x + B(K_2 - I_m)dz(u(x))) = 0 \quad (35)$$

which may be evaluated with $N = [M^{-\top} \ 0 \ M^{-\top} \ 0]^\top$, where $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. To establish bound (13), we may write the following bounds originating from Facts 3 and 5 evaluated with $T = S^{-1}$, and from (35):

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}(x) &\leq \dot{V}(x) + 2dz(u(x))^\top S^{-1}(u - dz(u(x))) \\ &\quad + 2\dot{dz}(u(x))^\top S^{-1}(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{dz}(u(x))) \\ &\quad + 2dz(u(x))^\top S^{-1}(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{dz}(u(x))) \\ &\quad + 2\eta^\top N (-\dot{x} + (A + BK_1)x + B(K_2 - I_m)dz(u(x))) \\ &= -\eta^\top \mathcal{G}_d \eta, \quad \text{for almost all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (36)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, exponential stability can be established by proving $\mathcal{G}_d > 0$, which would prove a negative upper bound on $\dot{V}(x)$, quadratic in x (and other variables too). To show that $\mathcal{G}_d > 0$, let us equivalently study the sign of matrix

$$\mathcal{G}_1 := \text{diag}(M^\top, S, M^\top, S) \mathcal{G}_d \text{diag}(M, S, M, S)$$

and consider the change of variables $Q_{11} = M^\top P_{11} M$, $Q_{12} = M^\top P_{12} S$ and $Q_{22} = S P_{22} S$, $K_1 M = Y_1$, and $K_2 S = Y_2$, so that the expression \mathcal{G}_1 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1 &= \text{He} \left(- \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{12}^\top & Q_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_m \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_m \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y_1 & Y_2 - S & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ I_m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & Y_1 & Y_2 - S \end{bmatrix} \right)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_m \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & Y_1 & Y_2 - S \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
& -\text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ 0 \\ I_n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} AM + BY_1 & BY_2 - BS & -M & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

whose five addends clearly sum up to (33). Then, from (33), we have $\mathcal{G}_1 > 0$ and, therefore, $\mathcal{G}_d > 0$, which implies, via (36), that bound (13) holds for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, thus completing the proof. ■

Remark 3: While the analysis and synthesis results of Theorems 1 and 2 both rely on the technical tools introduced in Sections II-B and III, the extra unknowns appearing in the synthesis conditions require additional transformations and an extended space corresponding to $\eta = (x, dz(u(x)), \dot{x}, \dot{dz}(u(x)))$, while \dot{x} does not appear in the representation of the analysis conditions. In addition to this fact, we expect the synthesis conditions to show increased conservativeness because the coordinate transformation in the proof of Theorem 2 requires imposing $T_1 = T_2 = T_3 = S^{-1}$. Due to this reason, after the gains have been selected through the synthesis conditions of Theorem 2, we expect less conservative estimates to emerge from the solution of the analysis conditions of Theorem 1. ★

While the conditions of Theorem 2 ensure GES, the convergence rate of the resulting feedback law could be arbitrarily small. The next proposition provides a means to ensure that the eigenvalues of matrix $A + BK_1$ (namely, the linear dynamics governing the tail of the converging responses) are placed in the half plane $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(s) \leq -\alpha\}$ for some desired convergence rate $\alpha > 0$. We emphasize that the convergence rate $\alpha > 0$, as stated in the next proposition, is a local property (related to $A + BK_1$) and, therefore, is ensured only in a neighborhood of the origin where the saturation is not active.

Proposition 2: Given a desired convergence rate $\alpha > 0$, if there exist matrices $R \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $Q_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $S \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $Y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $Y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satisfying (32), (33), and

$$R = R^\top > 0, \text{He} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha M + AM + BY_1 & -M \\ \alpha M + AM + BY_1 + R & -M \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (37)$$

then matrix M is nonsingular, the origin of system (4) with selections (34) is globally exponentially stable, and the eigenvalues of $A + BK_1$ have real part smaller than $-\alpha$.

Proof: GES has been already proven in Theorem 2. To show that the eigenvalues of $A + BK_1$ have real part smaller than $-\alpha$, it is enough to show that matrix $\bar{A} := A + BK_1 + \alpha I$ is Hurwitz. To this end, condition (37) premultiplied by $\text{diag}(M^{-\top}, M^{-\top})$ and postmultiplied by $\text{diag}(M^{-1}, M^{-1})$ reads

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \bar{R} \\ \bar{R} & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} M^{-\top} \\ M^{-\top} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & -I_n \end{bmatrix} \right) < 0$$

with the Lyapunov certificate $\bar{R} = M^{-\top} R M^{-1} > 0$. Pre- and postmultiplying the above inequality by $[\bar{A} z]^\top$ and its transpose, we obtain

$$2z^\top \bar{R} \bar{A} z = 2z^\top \bar{R} (A + BK_1 + \alpha I) z < 0 \quad \forall z \neq 0$$

which completes the proof. ■

V. REGIONAL STABILITY

In this section, we address Problems 3 and 4 following the idea of the set inclusion in Fig. 1 and exploiting the result in Lemma 3. We first present analysis results and then synthesis results, paralleling the previous section.

A. Regional Analysis

Using Lemma 3, the next theorem proposes conditions ensuring local exponential stability of the origin for system (4), thus providing a solution to Problem 3.

Theorem 3: Given any scalar $\tau > 0$, if there exist matrices $Q_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $Q_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $T_1 = \text{diag}\{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$, $T_2 \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$, $T_3 \in \mathbb{D}^m$, $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ such that

$$T_1 > \tau I_m \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_3 := & \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} & 0 \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tau t_i \end{bmatrix} \\
& + \text{He} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Z_1^\top - K_1^\top T_1 & Z_{1i}^\top \\ 0 & Z_2 - T_1(K_2 - I_m) & Z_{2i}^\top \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, and condition (40) as shown at the bottom of the next page holds, then the origin is locally exponentially stable for the closed-loop system (4) and its basin of attraction contains set $S(W, 1)$ defined in (20), with functions V and W in (11) and (21) characterized by $P = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} \end{bmatrix}$.

Proof: The proof relies on Lemma 1 by showing the two bounds (12) and (13) with $r = 1$.

To show (12), let us first observe that the (3,3) term of (40) reads $2T_2 - T_2 K_2 - K_2^\top T_2 > 0$, where $T_2 > 0$ by assumption, so that Fact 1 implies well posedness of the algebraic loop (3). Moreover, defining $H_1 = T_1^{-1} Z_1$ and $H_2 = T_1^{-1} Z_2$ and combining (38) with (39), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Phi}_3 := & \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} & 0 \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t_i^2 \end{bmatrix} + \text{He} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Z_1^\top - K_1^\top T_1 & Z_{1i}^\top \\ 0 & Z_2 - T_1 K_2 + T_1 & Z_{2i}^\top \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
& > \Phi_3 > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Left and right multiplying $\bar{\Phi}_3 > 0$ by $\text{diag}(I_n, I_m, t_i^{-1})$, we obtain (23) so that all the assumptions of Lemma 3 hold. Therefore, from item (i), function W in (21) is Lipschitz continuous and coincides with V (of (11) in the open set $S(W, 1)$). Moreover, from item (iii), bound (12) holds.

To show (13), first consider item (ii) of Lemma 3 ensuring that for all $x \in S(W, 1)$ we have $x \in \mathcal{S}_h$ and we may use the local condition (8) of Fact 4. Then, proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 1 but using Fact 4 in place of Fact 3 (because we focus on local results), using expressions (29), for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W}(x) &\leq \dot{W}(x) + 2dz(u(x))^\top T_1(u - dz(u(x)) - h(x)) \\ &\quad + 2dz(u(x))^\top T_2(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{dz}(u(x))) \\ &\quad + 2dz(u(x))^\top T_3(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{dz}(u(x))) = -\eta^\top \mathcal{G}_l \eta \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where $\eta := \begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}$ is an extended state, and matrix \mathcal{G}_l can be easily evaluated, using $Z_1 = T_1 H_1$ and $Z_2 = T_1 H_2$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_l &= \text{He} \left(- \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A + BK_1 & B(K_2 - I_m) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_m \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_m \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_1 K_1 - Z_1 & T_1(K_2 - I_m) - Z_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ T_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_1(A + BK_1) & K_1 B(K_2 - I_m) & K_2 - I_m \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ T_3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_1(A + BK_1) & K_1 B(K_2 - I_m) & K_2 - I_m \end{bmatrix} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that the above expression corresponds to the matrix in (40), shown at the bottom of this page, which then implies $\mathcal{G}_l > 0$, and by (41) implies (13) for almost all $x \in S(W, 1)$ thus completing the proof. ■

Since the dz function is zero around the origin, a necessary and sufficient condition for local asymptotic (and exponential) stability of the origin for the closed-loop system (4) is that matrix $A + BK_1$ is Hurwitz. The advantage of using more advanced conditions, such as those of Theorem 3, is that of obtaining nontrivial estimates $S(W, 1)$ of the basin of attraction. The next proposition provides a useful means for maximizing the size of this estimate by guaranteeing the inclusion

$$\mathcal{E}(\hat{P}, 1) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x^\top \hat{P} x < 1\} \subset S(W, 1) \quad (42)$$

so that minimizing \hat{P} in some suitable way ensures enlarged estimates $S(W, 1)$.

Proposition 3: Given any scalar $\tau > 0$, if there exist matrices $\hat{P} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $\hat{T} \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$, $Q_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $Q_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$,

$T_1 = \text{diag}\{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$, $T_2 \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$, $T_3 \in \mathbb{D}^m$, $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satisfying (38), (39), (40), and

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{He} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{P} - P_{11} & -2(P_{12} + K_1^\top \hat{T}) \\ 0 & -P_{22} - (K_2 - I_m)^\top \hat{T} - \hat{T}(K_2 - I_m) \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad (43)$$

then the origin is locally exponentially stable for the closed-loop system (4) and its basin of attraction contains set $S(W, 1)$ defined in (20), which satisfies inclusion (42).

Proof: The proof of local exponential stability with $S(W, 1)$ contained in the basin of attraction has already been given in Theorem 3. We prove below that the additional LMI (43) ensures (42). To this end, it is enough to show that $(x^\top \hat{P} x < 1) \Rightarrow (S(W, 1) < 1)$, which holds if we show that

$$x^\top \hat{P} x > V(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{S}_h.$$

By using the global sector condition in (5) with $T = \hat{T}$, the inequality above is ensured if

$$x^\top \hat{P} x - V(x) - dz(u)^\top \hat{T}(u - dz(u)) > 0$$

which can be checked to be a quadratic form in $\begin{bmatrix} x \\ dz(u(x)) \end{bmatrix}$ involving the positive definite matrix in (44), thus completing the proof. ■

Remark 4: As expressed in Theorem 3 and its proof, the trick used to handle t_i^2 , which appears in $\bar{\Phi}_3$, consists in replacing it by τt_i , where τ is upper bounded by T_1 . Moreover, τ may be either a scalar (as suggested in Theorem 3) or, when the dimension of the input is small, may be set as a vector, thus allowing us to replace (39) by $t_i > \tau_i$, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. The selection of a suitable τ may be performed either with a simple grid search or cast in a nonlinear optimization procedure (such as the `fminsearch` MATLAB function) including a convex optimization problem based on Proposition 3, corresponding to

$$\min_{\substack{\hat{P}, Q_{11}, Q_{12}, Q_{22}, \\ \hat{T}, T_1, T_2, T_3, Z_1, Z_2}} \text{Tr}(\hat{P}), \text{ subject to} \quad (38), (39), (40), (43). \quad (44)$$

The objective function given by the trace of \hat{P} is used as an indication of the size of the estimate of the basin of attraction. Example 2 illustrates the use of this optimization criterion. ★

Example 2: Consider the load balancing example reported in [23, Ex. 1.1] corresponding to the closed-loop system (4) with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -5 \end{bmatrix}, K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2.6 & 1.4 \end{bmatrix}, K_2 = 0.$$

For this example, we first solve the conditions of Theorem 3 and Proposition 3 adopting the optimization strategy proposed

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_3 &:= \text{He} \left(- \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^\top & P_{22} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A + BK_1 & B(K_2 - I_m) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_m \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ T_1 K_1 - Z_1 + T_3 K_1(A + BK_1) & T_1(K_2 - I_m) - Z_2 + T_3 K_1 B(K_2 - I_m) & T_3(K_2 - I_m) \\ T_2 K_1(A + BK_1) & T_2 K_1 B(K_2 - I_m) & T_2(K_2 - I_m) \end{bmatrix} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$




Fig. 3. Example 2: the left figure shows the set $S(W, 1)$ (in black) obtained when solving (44) and the maximized ellipsoid $\mathcal{E}(\hat{P}, 1) \subset S(W, 1)$ (dashed red ellipse). On the right we, see the set $S(W, 1)$ obtained when minimizing the trace of P_{11} .

in Remark 4 and minimizing the trace of matrix \hat{P} as in (44). The resulting level set $S(W, 1)$ is shown in black at the left of Fig. 3 (already reported in Fig. 1). The boundary of the set $\mathcal{E}(\hat{P}, 1)$ is shown in dashed red and is contained in $S(W, 1)$, as proven in Proposition 3. The dashed-dotted magenta ellipse in the same figure corresponds to a quadratic estimate of the basin of attraction obtained with the analysis results in [23, Prop. 3.1], illustrating the increased ability of providing improved estimates of the basin of attraction with sign-indefinite quadratic forms and Theorem 3. The dotted blue lines denote the boundaries of set \mathcal{S}_h in (6), where the local sector condition (8) is valid (and where function W coincides with V). The peculiar shape of these boundaries is obtained thanks to the term $H_2 dz(u(x))$ in (7).

The black level set $S(W, 1)$ shown at the right of Fig. 3 corresponds to replacing problem (44) by a heuristic approach minimizing the trace of P_{11} (the upper left subentry of P associated to vector x , as per (11)) under constraints (38)–(40). While this criterion only indirectly addresses the maximization of the set $S(W, 1)$, the right plot indicates that it leads to a slightly larger set $S(W, 1)$, as compared to the solution proposed in Proposition 3. In both cases, the obtained estimates are significantly larger than the quadratic estimates obtained with [23, Prop. 3.1] (dashed-dotted magenta).

For this example, the optimization of Remark 4 returns a sign-indefinite solution P corresponding to

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0428 & 0.0030 & 0.0833 \\ 0.0030 & 0.0100 & 0.0570 \\ 0.0833 & 0.0570 & -0.0697 \end{bmatrix}$$

where we can see that $P_{22} = -0.0697$ is negative. \circ

Example 3: We present an example showing that the Lyapunov-like function V may become negative outside \mathcal{S}_h , which motivates introducing function W in (21), because $S(V, 1)$ is an unbounded set, while $S(W, 1)$ is bounded and contained in \mathcal{S}_h . Fig. 4 reports the surface of V and shows in black the level set $V(x) = 1$. Function V is obtained for the exponentially unstable plant (4) with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, K_2 = 0.9$$




Fig. 4. Example 3: surface of the Lyapunov-like function $V(x)$ and the sublevel corresponding to $V(x) = 1$ (in black).

by solving (38)–(40) while minimizing the trace of matrix P_{11} , as in the right picture in Fig. 3. Note that $S(V, 1)$ is a disconnected unbounded set (unbounded in directions where x_2 grows unbounded), while $S(W, 1)$ only corresponds to the inner square-shaped connected set. Also in this case, the optimal value of P is not sign definite and corresponds to

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0152 & 0.0264 & -0.4719 \\ 0.0264 & 0.1066 & -5.8609 \\ -0.4719 & -5.8609 & -9.6106 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Based on Remark 1, we may numerically investigate the robustness of stability when the artificial saturation level $u_{\max} = 1$ embedded in the controller is different from the actual physical saturation level $u_{\max, \text{ph}}$ trimming the plant input. Clearly, only the cases where $u_{\max, \text{ph}} \leq u_{\max} = 1$ are interesting because the case $u_{\max, \text{ph}} \geq u_{\max}$ does not pose any problem. We characterize three cases below, by picking an initial condition close to the boundary of $S(W, 1)$ and perturbing the initial condition and the physical saturation level.

Case 1: Consider the initial condition $x_0 = [4 \ -0.82]^\top$ belonging to the guaranteed stability set $S(W, 1)$ (indeed $V(x_0) = 0.9781 < 1$). When shrinking the saturation level up to $u_{\max, \text{ph}} = 0.8205$, the closed-loop trajectories preserve convergence the origin. With $u_{\max, \text{ph}} = 0.8200$, the closed-loop trajectory diverges.

Case 2: Consider the initial condition $x_0 = [4 \ -0.95]^\top$, which does not belong to $S(W, 1)$ (indeed $V(x_0) = 1.431 > 1$). The closed-loop trajectory converges to zero with $u_{\max, \text{ph}} = 1$ but diverges with $u_{\max, \text{ph}} = 0.95$.

Case 3: Consider the initial condition $x_0 = [4 \ -1]^\top$, which does not belong to $S(W, 1)$ (indeed $V(x_0) = 1.435 > 1$). The closed-loop solution already diverges with $u_{\max, \text{ph}} = 1$.

Both Cases 1 and 2 show some level of robustness with uncertain saturation levels, whereas Case 3 shows that the estimate of the basin of attraction is not too conservative. \circ

Remark 5: Similar to the observations in Remark 2 for the global case, the analysis conditions in Theorem 3 and the optimization problem in (44) readily extend to the case where dynamics (4) is replaced by the more general form (31) and may

be used to address output feedback dynamic controllers with antiwindup action. \star

B. Regional Synthesis

The following theorem provides conditions to solve Problem 4 by suitably selecting feedback gains K_1, K_2 .

Theorem 4: If there exist matrices $Q_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $Q_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $S \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$, $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $Y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $Y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ such that

$$\Phi_4 := \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} & 0 \\ Q_{12}^\top & Q_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \text{He} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Z_1^\top - Y_1^\top & Z_{1i}^\top \\ 0 & Z_2 - Y_2 + S & Z_{2i}^\top \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad (45)$$

and condition (46) as shown at the bottom of this page hold then matrix M is nonsingular. Moreover, the origin is locally exponentially stable for the closed-loop system (4) with K_1 and K_2 chosen as in (34), and its basin of attraction contains the set $S(W, 1)$ defined in (20), with functions V and W in (11) and (21) characterized by

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} M^{-\top} & 0 \\ 0 & S^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{12}^\top & Q_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & S^{-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

Proof: We first show that M is nonsingular, which is a direct consequence of $M + M^\top > 0$ implied by the (3,3) entry of Ψ_4 in (46), shown at the bottom of this page. The rest of the proof relies on Lemma 1, by showing the two bounds (12) and (13) with $r = 1$.

To show (12), let us first observe that with $Y_2 = K_2 S$, the (4,4) term of (46) reads $2S - SK_2 - K_2^\top S > 0$, where $S > 0$ by assumption, so that Fact 1 implies well posedness of the algebraic loop (3). Moreover, left and right multiplying $\Phi_4 > 0$ by $\text{diag}(M^\top, S, 1)$ and $\text{diag}(M, S, 1)$, respectively, and also using $Y_1 = K_1 M$ and $Y_2 = K_2 S$ and P as in (47), we obtain $\Phi_1 > 0$, with Φ_1 as in (23). As a consequence, Lemma 3 holds and function W in (21) is Lipschitz continuous [item (i)] and satisfies (12) with $r = 1$ [item (iii)].

To show (13), item (ii) of Lemma 3 ensures $S(W, 1) \subset S_h$, which allows applying the local conditions (8) of Fact 4 to all $x \in S(W, 1)$. In particular, we exploit Facts 4 and 5 evaluated with $T = S^{-1}$ and the change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &= H_1 M, & Z_2 &= H_2 S, \\ Q_{11} &= M^\top P_{11} M, & Q_{12} &= M^\top P_{12} S, & Q_{22} &= S P_{22} S \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

following similar steps to the proof of Theorem 2 on an extended space parameterized by $\eta := [x^\top \text{dz}(u(x))^\top \dot{x}^\top \text{dz}(u(x))^\top]^\top$, which satisfies bound (35). Recalling that $W(x) = V(x)$ for all

x in the open set $S(W, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W}(x) &\leq \dot{W}(x) + 2\text{dz}(u)^\top S^{-1}(u - \text{dz}(u) - h(x)) \\ &\quad + 2\dot{\text{dz}}(u(x))^\top S^{-1}(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{\text{dz}}(u(x))) \\ &\quad + 2\text{dz}(u(x))^\top S^{-1}(\dot{u}(x) - \dot{\text{dz}}(u(x))) \\ &\quad - 2\eta^\top N(-\dot{x} + (A + BK_1)x + B(K_2 - I_m)\text{dz}(u(x))) \\ &= -\eta^\top \bar{\Psi}_4 \eta, \quad \text{for almost all } x \in S(W, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

By selecting $N = [M^{-\top} \ 0 \ M^{-\top} \ 0]^\top$ in (49), and using the change of variables (48), together with $Y_1 = K_1 M$ and $Y_2 = K_2 S$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_4 &= \text{diag}(M^\top, S, M^\top, S) \bar{\Psi}_4 \text{diag}(M, S, M, S) \\ &= \text{He} \left(- \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{12}^\top & Q_{22} \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_m \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_m \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_1 M - Z_1 & K_2 S - Z_2 - S & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ I_m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & K_1 M & K_2 S - S \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_m \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & K_1 M & K_2 S - S \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{He} \left(\begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ 0 \\ I_n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} AM + BK_1 M & BK_2 S - BS & -M & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which coincides with Ψ_4 appearing in (46), and is positive definite by hypothesis. As a consequence, $\bar{\Psi}_4 > 0$, which, by (49), implies (13) with $r = 1$, thus concluding the proof. \blacksquare

Remark 6: From Theorems 3 and 4, one can recover the global conditions of Theorems 1 and 2 by setting $Z_1 = 0$ and $Z_2 = 0$. In particular, the observations in Remark 3 apply also to the regional case, and we expect the main source of conservativeness to come from the fact that the multipliers T_i of the sector-like conditions are set to be the same (and equal to S^{-1}) in the synthesis LMIs, to preserve convexity. \star

Similar to the discussion after Theorems 2 and 3, is it useful to provide guaranteed performance criteria that may be enforced together with the LMI conditions (45) and (46) of Theorem 4.

$$\Psi_4 := \text{He} \left(- \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ Q_{12}^\top & Q_{22} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_m \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} AM + BY_1 & BY_2 - BS & -M & 0 \\ Y_1 - Z_1 & Y_2 - Z_2 - S & Y_1 & Y_2 - S \\ AM + BY_1 & BY_2 - BS & -M & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_1 & Y_2 - S \end{bmatrix} \right) > 0 \quad (46)$$

The next two propositions provide parallel results to those of Propositions 2 and 3 for the regional synthesis results of Theorem 4.

Proposition 4: Given a desired convergence rate $\alpha > 0$, if there exist matrices $R \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $Q_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $S \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$, $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $Y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $Y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satisfying (45), (46), and (37), then matrix M is nonsingular. Moreover, the origin is locally exponentially stable for the closed-loop system (4) with K_1 and K_2 chosen as in (34), and its basin of attraction contains set $S(W, 1)$ defined in (20), with functions V and W in (11) and (21) characterized by (47). Moreover, the eigenvalues of $A + BK_1$ have real part smaller than $-\alpha$.

Proof: The proof is a straightforward combination of the proof of Theorem 4 and Proposition 2. ■

Proposition 5: If there exist matrices $\hat{P} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{11} \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$, $Q_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $Q_{22} \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $S \in \mathbb{D}_{>0}^m$, $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $Y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $Y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satisfying (45), (46), and

$$\begin{bmatrix} M + M^\top - Q_{11} & I_n & -Q_{12} - Y_1^\top \\ I_n & \hat{P} & 0 \\ -Q_{12}^\top - Y_1 & 0 & -Q_{22} + 2S - Y_2 - Y_2^\top \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad (50)$$

then matrix M is nonsingular. Moreover, the origin is locally exponentially stable for the closed-loop system (4) with K_1 and K_2 chosen as in (34). Finally, its basin of attraction contains set $S(W, 1)$ defined in (20) [with V in (11) characterized by (47)], and the set $S(W, 1)$ satisfies inclusion (42).

Proof: The proof of local exponential stability of the origin with basin of attraction containing the set $S(W, 1)$ has been given in Theorem 4. We prove below that inclusion (42) holds. To this end, by Proposition 3, it is enough to show that (50) implies (43), which we do in the rest of the proof.

To prove (43), apply a Schur complement to (50) to obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} M + M^\top - \hat{P}^{-1} - Q_{11} & -Q_{12} - Y_1^\top \\ -Q_{12}^\top - Y_1 & -Q_{22} + 2S - Y_2 - Y_2^\top \end{bmatrix} > 0$$

and then observe that $(\hat{P}^{-1} - M^\top)\hat{P}(\hat{P}^{-1} - M) \geq 0$ implies $M + M^\top - \hat{P}^{-1} \leq M^\top \hat{P} M$, so that

$$\begin{bmatrix} M^\top \hat{P} M - Q_{11} & -Q_{12} - Y_1^\top \\ -Q_{12}^\top - Y_1 & -Q_{22} + 2S - Y_2 - Y_2^\top \end{bmatrix} > 0.$$

Finally, pre- and postmultiplying the previous inequality by $\text{diag}(M^\top, S)$ and $\text{diag}(M, S)$, respectively, and recalling that $Y_1 = K_1 M$ and $Y_2 = K_2 S$, we obtain (43). ■

Remark 7: Combining the results of Propositions 4 and 5, we may optimally choose the gains K_1 and K_2 by first fixing a desired convergence rate α and then solving the optimization

$$\min_{\substack{R, \hat{P}, Q_{11}, Q_{12}, Q_{22}, \\ M, S, Z_1, Z_2, Y_1, Y_2}} \text{Tr}(\hat{P}), \text{ subject to} \quad (45), (46), (37), (50) \quad (51)$$

so that the size of the estimate of the basin of attraction $S(W, 1)$ is maximized by minimizing the trace of \hat{P} , while guaranteeing the local convergence rate α . This type of tradeoff is well explored in Example 4. ★




Fig. 5. Example 4: tradeoff between the local convergence rate α and the optimization criterion $\text{Tr}(\hat{P})$ in the synthesis conditions of Theorem 4 (blue curve) and the analysis conditions of Theorem 3.

Example 4: Consider the longitudinal dynamics of an F8 aircraft from [28], modeled by plant (1) with matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.8 & -0.006 & -12 & 0 & -19 & -3 \\ 0 & -0.014 & -16.64 & -32.2 & -0.66 & -0.5 \\ 1 & -0.0001 & -1.5 & 0 & -0.16 & -0.5 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

To design K_1 and K_2 , we solve optimization (51) for a number of selections of target convergence rates $\alpha \in [1, 4]$. The corresponding optimal costs $(\text{Tr}(\hat{P}))^{-1}$ are represented in logarithmic scale by the blue dots in Fig. 5. The tradeoff blue curve interpolates the evaluated points. We recall that the minimized trace of \hat{P} is only an indication of the size of the basin of attraction \mathcal{B} , due to the property $\mathcal{E}(\hat{P}, 1) \subset S(W, 1) \subset \mathcal{B}$.

To illustrate the reduced conservativeness of the analysis conditions of Theorem 3 and Proposition 3, as discussed in Remarks 3 and 6, the red dots in the same figure report the actual local convergence rate α (easily evaluated as the maximum real part of the eigenvalues of $A + BK_1$) and the performance criterion $\text{Tr}(\hat{P})$ evaluated by solving the optimization in (44) with the corresponding gains. As one may see, both the estimated α (by inequality (37) of Proposition 4) and the estimated trace of \hat{P} (by inequality (50) of Proposition 5) in the synthesis conditions are significantly worse than those of the analysis case.

To illustrate the numerical conditioning of the obtained matrices, we report below the values of the gains obtained for $\alpha = 3.5$, corresponding to

$$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.0716 & 0.1813 & -2.2395 & -0.8175 \\ 3.0745 & -1.2914 & 10.8585 & 12.8640 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8391 & 0.0293 \\ 0.7123 & 0.8391 \end{bmatrix}$$

inducing the following eigenvalues of $A + BK_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 4}$: $-3.5733 \pm 0.5560i$; $-3.7880 \pm 1.6975i$, which confirm the desired convergence rate higher than 3.5. ○

VI. CONCLUSION

In this article, we proposed a new class of sign-indefinite quadratic forms for the stability analysis and control design of nonlinear control laws for linear systems with input saturation. Both local and global stability analysis and synthesis results are presented, in terms of convex optimization problems, using the arising piecewise smooth Lyapunov functions.

Numerical examples testify the substantial improvement over the existing results, showing that nonquadratic Lyapunov functions have the ability to show global stability of some systems for which a quadratic function fails to exist. Moreover, the numerical results highlight that improvements also emerge from relaxing the positivity of the quadratic form. For regional stability, a nonlinear generalized sector condition is introduced, and numerical examples illustrate the improvement of the estimates of the basin of attraction. Indeed, more general shapes than mere ellipsoids are obtained, thanks to the implicit definition of the Lyapunov function.

Future work includes the investigation of efficient schemes for the solution of implicit functions induced by the use of nonlinear control laws. We will also investigate the design of dynamic nonlinear output feedback laws and their application to the design of anti-windup compensators. Furthermore, another interesting direction is to consider other nonlinearities, possibly combined with saturation, as, for example, quantizers, backlash or friction functions, with the aim of improving the characterization of an asymptotically stable attractor.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anonymous, "Why the grippen crashed," *Aerospace America*, Bay City, MI, USA, p. 11, 1994.
- [2] M. Camlibel, J. Pang, and J. Shen, "Lyapunov stability of complementarity and extended systems," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 1056–1101, 2007.
- [3] F. H. Clarke, *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: SIAM, 1990.
- [4] D. Dai, T. Hu, A. R. Teel, and L. Zaccarian, "Piecewise-quadratic Lyapunov functions for systems with deadzones or saturations," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 58, pp. 365–371, 2009.
- [5] M. C. de Oliveira and R. E. Skelton, "Stability tests for constrained linear systems," in *Perspectives in Robust Control*. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2001, pp. 241–257.
- [6] R. Drummond, G. Valmorbida, and S. R. Duncan, "Generalized absolute stability using Lyapunov functions with relaxed positivity conditions," *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 207–212, Apr. 2018.
- [7] A. T. Fuller, "In the large stability of relay and saturated control systems with actuator saturation," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 457–480, 1969.
- [8] R. Goebel, R. G. Sanfelice, and A. R. Teel, *Hybrid Dynamical Systems: Modeling, Stability, and Robustness*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton Univ. Press, 2012.
- [9] J. M. Gomes da Silva Jr. and S. Tarbouriech, "Antiwindup design with guaranteed regions of stability: An LMI-based approach," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 106–111, Jan. 2005.
- [10] C. A. C. Gonzaga, M. Jungers, and J. Daafouz, "Stability analysis of discrete-time Lur'e systems," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 2277–2283, 2012.
- [11] T. Hu and Z. Lin, *Control Systems With Actuator Saturation: Analysis and Design*. Boston, MA, USA: Birkhäuser, 2001.
- [12] T. Hu, A. R. Teel, and L. Zaccarian, "Stability and performance for saturated systems via quadratic and nonquadratic Lyapunov functions," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 51, no. 11, pp. 1770–1786, Nov. 2006.
- [13] T. Hu, A. R. Teel, and L. Zaccarian, "Anti-windup synthesis for linear control systems with input saturation: Achieving regional, nonlinear performance," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 512–519, 2008.
- [14] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, 2002.
- [15] Y. Li and Z. Lin, "A generalized piecewise quadratic Lyapunov function approach to estimating the domain of attraction of a saturated system," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 48, pp. 120–125, 2015.
- [16] Y. Li, Z. Lin, and N. Li, "Stability and performance analysis of saturated systems using an enhanced max quadratic Lyapunov function," in *Proc. IFAC World Congr.*, 2017, pp. 12353–12358.
- [17] K.-Z. Liu and D. Akasaka, "A partial parameterization of nonlinear output feedback controllers for saturated linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 233–239, 2014.
- [18] G. Pipeleers, B. Demeulenaere, J. Swevers, and L. Vandenbergh, "Extended LMI characterizations for stability and performance of linear systems," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 58, pp. 510–518, 2009.
- [19] J. A. Primbs and M. Giannelli, "Kuhn-tucker-based stability conditions for systems with saturation," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 46, no. 10, pp. 1643–1647, Oct. 2001.
- [20] W. E. Schmitendorf and B. R. Barmish, "Null controllability of linear systems with constrained controls," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 327–345, 1980.
- [21] E. D. Sontag, "An algebraic approach to bounded controllability of linear systems," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 181–188, 1984.
- [22] G. Stein, "Respect the unstable," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 12–25, Aug. 2003.
- [23] S. Tarbouriech, G. Garcia, J. M. Gomes da Silva Jr., and I. Queinnec, *Stability and Stabilization of Linear Systems With Saturating Actuators*. London, U.K.: Springer-Verlag, 2011.
- [24] S. Tarbouriech, C. Prieur, and J. M. Gomes da Silva Jr., "Stability analysis and stabilization of systems presenting nested saturations," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 51, no. 8, pp. 1364–1371, Aug. 2006.
- [25] A. R. Teel and L. Praly, "On assigning the derivative of a disturbance attenuation control Lyapunov function," *Math. Control, Signals, Syst.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 95–124, 2000.
- [26] G. Valmorbida, R. Drummond, and S. R. Duncan, "Regional analysis of slope-restricted Lurie systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1201–1208, Mar. 2019.
- [27] G. Valmorbida, A. Garulli, and L. Zaccarian, "Regional \mathcal{L}_{2m} gain analysis for linear saturating systems," *Automatica*, vol. 76, pp. 164–168, 2017.
- [28] F. Wu, K. M. Grigoriadis, and A. Packard, "Anti-windup controller design using linear parameter-varying control methods," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 73, no. 12, pp. 1104–1114, 2000.
- [29] V. A. Yakubovich, G. A. Leonov, and A. K. Gelig, *Stability of Stationary Sets in Control Systems with Discontinuous Nonlinearities (Stability, Vibrations and Control of Systems, Series A)*, vol. 14. Singapore: World Science, 2004.
- [30] L. Zaccarian and A. R. Teel, "A common framework for anti-windup, bumpless transfer and reliable designs," *Automatica*, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 1735–1744, 2002.
- [31] L. Zaccarian and A. R. Teel, *Modern Anti-Windup Synthesis*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton Univ. Press, 2011.



Isabelle Queinnec received the Ph.D. and HDR degrees in automatic control from University Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France, in 1990 and 2000, respectively.

She is currently Researcher with the Laboratory for Analysis and Architecture of Systems, French National Centre for Scientific Research, University of Toulouse, Toulouse. She is a co-author of a book on saturated systems and of more than 50 journal papers, in control theory and process engineering. Her current research

interests include constrained control and robust control of processes with limited information, with particular interest in applications on aeronautical systems, robotic, electronic, biochemical, and environmental processes.

Dr. Queinnec has been serving a member of the International Federation of Automatic Control (IFAC) Technical Committees on "Biosystems and Bioprocesses" and on "Modelling and Control of Environmental Systems," respectively, since 2002 and 2005, and of the IEEE Control Systems Society Conference Editorial Board since 2013. She is currently an Associate Editor for IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON AUTOMATIC CONTROL.



Sophie Tarbouriech received the Ph.D. and HDR degrees in automatic control from University Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France, in 1991 and 1998, respectively. She is full-time researcher (Directeur de Recherche) in LAAS-CNRS, Toulouse. Her main research interests include analysis and control of linear and nonlinear systems with constraints (limited information), hybrid dynamical systems.

Dr. Tarbouriech is currently an Associate Editor for *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* and a Senior Editor for *IEEE CONTROL SYSTEMS LETTERS* AND *AUTOMATICA*. She is a member of International Federation of Automatic Control and IEEE Technical Committees.



Luca Zaccarian (Fellow, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree in computer and control engineering from the University of Roma Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy, in 2000.

He then became an Assistant Professor and then an Associate Professor with the University of Roma Tor Vergata. Since 2011, he has been the Directeur de Recherche with the Laboratory for Analysis and Architecture of Systems, French National Centre for Scientific Research, University of Toulouse, Toulouse, France. Since

2013, he has also been a part-time Professor with the University of Trento, Trento, Italy. His main research interests include analysis and design of nonlinear and hybrid control systems, and modeling and control of mechatronic systems.

Dr. Zaccarian was a recipient of the 2001 O. Hugo Schuck Best Paper Award from the American Automatic Control Council.



Giorgio Valmorbida received the Ph.D. degree in control theory from the Institut National des Sciences Appliquées, Toulouse, France, in 2010, for the research developed with the Laboratory for Analysis and Architecture of Systems, French National Centre for Scientific Research.

He was a Postdoctoral Researcher with the Università di Roma "Tor Vergata," Rome, Italy, from 2010 to 2012 and with the Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford, Oxford, U.K., from 2013 to 2015. He was a

Junior Research Fellow with the Somerville College, University of Oxford, from 2013 to 2015. He is currently an Associate Professor with the Laboratoire des Signaux et Systèmes, CentraleSupélec, University of Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France. His main research interests include analysis and control of nonlinear systems with input constraints, hybrid systems, infinite-dimensional systems, and polynomial optimization.