

# A Unified Approach to Controller Design for Achieving ISS and Related Properties

Shoudong Huang, *Member, IEEE*, Matthew R. James, *Fellow, IEEE*, Dragan Nešić, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Peter M. Dower, *Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—A unified approach to the design of controllers achieving various specified input-to-state stability (ISS) like properties is presented. Both full state and measurement feedback cases are considered. Synthesis procedures based on dynamic programming are given using the recently developed results on controller synthesis to achieve uniform  $l^\infty$  bound. Our results provide a link between the ISS literature and the nonlinear  $H^\infty$  design literature.

**Index Terms**—Controller synthesis, disturbance attenuation, dynamic programming,  $H^\infty$  design, input-to-state stability (ISS),  $l^\infty$  bounded robustness.

## I. INTRODUCTION

ANALYSIS and design of controllers for nonlinear systems with disturbances is one of the central topics in control engineering. Research on this topic has seen several major breakthroughs over the past 15 years including nonlinear  $H^\infty$  control (e.g. [3], [4], [11], and [26]) and the development of input-to-state stability (ISS) concepts (e.g. [2], [21], and [24]). These two lines of research have been developed relatively independently of each other and they differ in stability properties that are considered, tools that are used and questions that are asked. Both approaches have their advantages and disadvantages but they both provide invaluable tools and insight into the problems of analysis and design of nonlinear control systems with disturbances.

Nonlinear  $H^\infty$  control has its roots in the theory of linear  $H^\infty$  control (from which the name is inherited). The main objective of research in nonlinear  $H^\infty$  control has been to develop analysis and design tools to achieve controllers robust against uncertainty. The framework and tools used to solve the nonlinear problem originate from optimal control (including risk-sensitive stochastic optimal control), game theory, and dissipative systems. Dynamic programming is a key technique in all these areas. Willems' theory [27] of dissipative systems is an elegant and powerful technique for stability analysis with strong links to Lyapunov stability theory (storage functions play the role of Lyapunov functions).

Manuscript received March 29, 2004; revised April 8, 2005 and May 31, 2005. Recommended by Associate Editor J. M. Berg. This work was supported by the Australian Research Council.

S. Huang is with the ARC Centre of Excellence for Autonomous Systems, Faculty of Engineering, The University of Technology, Sydney, NSW 2007, Australia (e-mail: sdhuang@eng.uts.edu.au).

M. R. James is with the Department of Engineering, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia (e-mail: Matthew.James@anu.edu.au).

D. Nešić and P. M. Dower are with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia (e-mail: d.nesic@ee.mu.oz.au; p.dower@ee.mu.oz.au).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2005.858691

Research in nonlinear  $H^\infty$  control has proceeded to date to extend linear  $H^\infty$  control results to a nonlinear setting to the extent possible. In this context, it is typical to model the plant and controller as nonlinear operators and to consider  $L^2$  stability with a finite (linear) gain of the closed-loop system, which comes from its linear tradition. Moreover, this literature often aims at designing controllers that achieve minimum (optimal), or near minimum, gains from disturbance inputs to plant outputs and, hence, controller design often requires a solution of an appropriate dynamic programming equation (DPE) or inequality (DPI). An advantage of this approach is that it can be applied to a very broad class of plants and its main drawback is the heavy computation required to solve DPE/DPI [11]. Nevertheless, the methodology is fundamental and provides useful conceptual insights. Note that while much of the existing literature has focused on linear gains, the tools and techniques used apply much more generally, as we will see.

The ISS related literature builds on the tradition of stability of dynamical systems and Lyapunov theory. Research in this area has concentrated on finding appropriate nonlinear generalizations of different finite gain input-output stability properties that are more natural in the nonlinear context and fully compatible with Lyapunov theory. The plant is modeled as a dynamical system with disturbance inputs and the related stability properties usually make use of nonlinear gains. The majority of ISS related research has concentrated on presenting different equivalent characterizations of ISS like properties [2], [10], [23], [24], proving appropriate small gains theorems [13] and applying the ISS like properties to analysis and controller design. For example, in [10], it was stated that ISS and  $H^\infty$  are basically the same property and only differ in the way the perturbation influence is measured, and a relation between  $H^\infty$  storage functions and ISS Lyapunov functions is established. However, the ISS literature is usually not concerned with computing minimum disturbance gains and the main tool for applying these results are Lyapunov like functions that are very difficult to find. Typically, abstract existence results are used, or else explicit constructions for special classes of systems. We are not aware of any results that provide a systematic procedure for controller design for general nonlinear systems that achieves different ISS like stability properties for the plant dynamics.

The purpose of this paper is to exploit optimal control techniques typically used in nonlinear  $H^\infty$  control to address the problem of controller design with the goal of achieving different ISS like properties for the plant dynamics. In particular, we use recent results on uniform  $L^\infty$  bounded (ULIB) robustness [12] that employ nonlinear dissipative systems and  $H^\infty$

techniques in an appropriate  $L^\infty$  stability setting. Our main results show that a range of controller design problems achieving appropriate ISS like properties for the plant dynamics can be solved by solving another ULIB problem for an auxiliary augmented plant. We present our results in a unifying manner to show that controllers achieving any of the following properties can be designed via appropriate ULIB problems: ISS [19], integral input-to-state stability (iISS) [2], integral input to integral state stability (iIiSS) [20], input to output stability (IOS) [25], input output to state stability (IOSS) [16], and incremental input to state stability ( $\delta$ ISS) [1]. It will become apparent that further ISS like properties can be achieved using the same technique. Important features of our approach are: i) We need to fix the desired disturbances gains and transients bounds prior to controller design; ii) admissible controllers we consider are causal operators and our solutions can be interpreted as a dynamical controller with an appropriate initialization; iii) we achieve an ISS like bound only for the plant dynamics and controller dynamics is not considered; iv) we consider both full state and measurement feedback problems; v) our controllers are obtained via solutions of appropriate DPE/DPI and in general they are computationally very demanding.

In the synthesis problems in this paper, we consider only plant states in the input–output bounds. This is because no state space realization for the controller is given a priori. This freedom facilitates dynamic programming solution. We address robustness and design issues related to our procedure. We mention also that our results have been presented for discrete time systems. The continuous time case is more technical and can be considered in future work.

This paper is organized as follows. Preliminaries and notations are given in Section II. In Section III, we present a unified definition for 6 different ISS like properties. In Section IV, we state the state feedback and measurement feedback synthesis problems considered in this paper. The problems are then transferred into ULIB synthesis problems in Section V. In Section VI, the dynamic programming results are presented using the existing ULIB results. A simple illustrative example is given in Section VII. Some further remarks on our method are presented in Section VIII. Section IX concludes this paper.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

Sets of real numbers, nonnegative real numbers, integers and nonnegative integers are denoted respectively as  $\mathbf{R}$ ,  $\mathbf{R}_+$ ,  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_+$ . Moreover, we denote

$$\bar{\mathbf{R}} := \mathbf{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \quad \check{\mathbf{R}} := \mathbf{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}. \quad (1)$$

Given  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\forall k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$ , we use the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} w_{[0,k-1]} &:= \{w_0, \dots, w_{k-1}\} \\ \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]} &:= \{w_{[0,k-1]} : w_i \in \mathbf{W}, 0 \leq i \leq k-1\} \\ \mathcal{W}_{[0,\infty)} &:= \{w_{[0,\infty)} : w_i \in \mathbf{W}, \forall i \geq 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Sometimes we use the notation  $w = w_{[0,\infty)}$ . We use the convention that  $\mathcal{W}_{[0,-1]} = \emptyset$ . In the sequel, we use the notation  $x_{[0,k]}$ ,  $\mathcal{X}_{[0,k]}$ ,  $\mathcal{X}_{[0,\infty)}$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_{[0,\infty)}$ ,  $y_{[0,k-1]}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_{[0,k-1]}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_{[0,\infty)}$ ,

etc, which have meanings analogous to (2). We also use the following notation:

$$\|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty := \max_{0 \leq i \leq k-1} |w_i|$$

where  $|\cdot|$  is the Euclidean norm. To simplify the notation, for any two vectors  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , sometimes we also denote  $(x_1^T \ x_2^T)^T$  as  $(x_1, x_2)$ .

Recall that a function  $\gamma : \mathbf{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$  is of class  $\mathcal{K}$  if it is continuous, strictly increasing and  $\gamma(0) = 0$ ; it is of class  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$  if it is of class  $\mathcal{K}$  and also  $\gamma(s) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . A function  $\beta : \mathbf{R}_+ \times \mathbf{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$  is said to be a function of class  $\mathcal{KL}$  if for each fixed  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\beta(\cdot, t)$  is of class  $\mathcal{K}$  and for each fixed  $s \geq 0$ ,  $\beta(s, \cdot)$  decreases to zero.

Sontag [20] proved the following lemma on  $\mathcal{KL}$  functions that we need.

*Lemma 2.1:* [20] Given arbitrary  $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ , there exist two functions  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  such that

$$\beta(s, t) \leq \beta_1(s, t) = \alpha_1(\alpha_2(s)e^{-t}) \quad \forall s \geq 0, t \geq 0. \quad (3)$$

## III. A UNIFIED DEFINITION FOR ISS LIKE PROPERTIES

One aspect of our contribution is a unified approach to solving a range of control design problems that achieve various ISS-like properties for the plant in the closed-loop system. The first step in this unified approach is to provide a unified definition of a range of ISS-like properties that have been considered recently in the literature. In this section we first state a range of seemingly unrelated ISS like properties in Definition 3.1 and then in Definition 3.4 we restate all in a unified and compact manner that is particularly suited for our approach.

Consider the following system with input sequence  $\{w_k\}$  and output sequence  $\{\bar{z}_k\}$

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= f(x_k, w_k) \\ \bar{z}_k &= H(x_k) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $x_k \in \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $w_k \in \mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\bar{z}_k \in \mathbf{R}^q$ . We denote by  $\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]})$  the solution of the system at time  $k$  that starts from the initial condition  $x_0$  and under the action of the input  $w_{[0,k-1]}$ . Sometimes we simply use  $\phi_k$  or  $x_k$  to denote  $\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]})$ . A range of ISS like properties that have been introduced in the literature [1], [2], [14], [16], [19], [20], [25] are listed here.

*Definition 3.1:* Let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ , the system (4) is the following.

- ISS [14], [19] if there exist  $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$  and  $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{K}$  such that the trajectories of the system satisfy

$$|\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]})| \leq \beta(|x_0|, k) + \gamma_1(\|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty)$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ , and  $k \geq 0$ .

- iISS [2] if there exist  $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$  and  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{K}$  such that

$$|\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]})| \leq \beta(|x_0|, k) + \gamma_1 \left( \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2(|w_i|) \right)$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ , and  $k \geq 0$ .

- iISS [20] if there exist  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$  such that

$$\gamma_1 \left( \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2 (|\phi(i, x_0, w_{[0,i-1]})|) \right) \leq \gamma_3 (|x_0|) + \gamma_4 \left( \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_5 (|w_i|) \right)$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ , and  $k \geq 0$ .

- IOS [25] if there exist  $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$  and  $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{K}$  such that

$$|H(\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]}))| \leq \beta(|x_0|, k) + \gamma_1 (\|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty)$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ , and  $k \geq 0$ .

- IOSS [6] if there exist  $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$  and  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{K}$  such that

$$|\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]})| \leq \beta(|x_0|, k) + \gamma_1 (\|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty) + \gamma_2 (\|\bar{z}_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty)$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ , and  $k \geq 0$ .

- $\delta$ ISS [1] if there exist  $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$  and  $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{K}$  such that

$$\left| \phi(k, x_0^1, w_{[0,k-1]}^1) - \phi(k, x_0^2, w_{[0,k-1]}^2) \right| \leq \beta(|x_0^1 - x_0^2|, k) + \gamma_1 (\|(w^1 - w^2)_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty)$$

for all  $x_0^1, x_0^2 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0,k-1]}^1, w_{[0,k-1]}^2 \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ , and  $k \geq 0$ . ■

*Remark 3.2:* The original ISS-like properties are usually defined globally. That is in Definition 3.1  $B_0 = \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{R}^s$ . However, similar properties can be introduced for more general sets  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ . In this paper, we will consider this general case. Our methods are also applicable to the more general *practical ISS-like properties* (e.g. [13]) but we are not addressing them here. ■

*Remark 3.3:* By Lemma 2.1, any  $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$  has an upper bound of the form  $\beta_1(s, t) = \alpha_1(\alpha_2(s)e^{-t})$ . Notice that  $\beta_1$  itself is also a  $\mathcal{KL}$  function, so the properties in Definition 3.1 are qualitatively equivalent to the properties where the function  $\beta(\cdot, k)$  is replaced by  $\alpha_1(\alpha_2(\cdot)e^{-k})$ . For example, system (4) is ISS if and only if there exist  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  and  $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{K}$  such that the trajectories of (4) satisfy

$$|\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]})| \leq \alpha_1(\alpha_2(|x_0|)e^{-k}) + \gamma_1 (\|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty) \quad (5)$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ , and  $k \geq 0$ . Certainly, the bound  $\alpha_1(\alpha_2(|x_0|)e^{-k})$  may be not as tight as the bound  $\beta(|x_0|, k)$  with  $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ . In this paper, we will only consider the case when  $\mathcal{KL}$  function is of the form  $\alpha_1(\alpha_2(s)e^{-t})$ . ■

We find it useful to restate Definition 3.1 since its new form is more suited for our paper. First, note that the inequality (5) in the ISS definition is

$$|\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]})| - \alpha_1(\alpha_2(|x_0|)e^{-k}) - \gamma_1 (\|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty) \leq 0.$$

Hence, the definition can be restated as follows. There exists mappings  $G^{ISS} : \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,  $\rho^{ISS} : \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{Z}_+ \rightarrow$

$\mathbf{R}_+$  and for every  $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$  there exists a mapping  $\psi_k^{ISS} : \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ , such that

$$G^{ISS}(\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]}), \rho^{ISS}(x_0, k), \psi_k^{ISS}(w_{[0,k-1]})) \leq 0$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ , and  $k \geq 0$ . In fact, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{ISS}(x_0, k) &:= \alpha_2(|x_0|)e^{-k} \\ \psi_k^{ISS}(w_{[0,k-1]}) &:= \|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty \\ G^{ISS}(\phi, \rho, \psi) &:= |\phi| - \alpha_1(\rho) - \gamma_1(\psi) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ . We use the convention that  $\psi_k^{ISS}(\emptyset) = 0$  and note that since  $w_{[0,-1]} = \emptyset$ , we have that  $\psi_0^{ISS}(w_{[0,-1]}) = 0$ .

Using the same arguments as before, we can restate each property in Definition 3.1 in the same manner. The summary of all situations is presented in Table I that is used in conjunction with the following:

*Definition 3.4:* (Unified definition for ISS like properties)

Let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$  be given. System (4) has Property  $\star$ , where  $\star \in \{ISS, iISS, iIiSS, IOS, IOSS, \delta ISS\}$ , if there exist  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  such that with  $\rho^*(\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $\psi_k^*(\cdot)$ ,  $\varphi_k^*(\cdot)$  and  $G^*(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  defined in Table I we have that the solutions of the system (4) satisfy

$$G^*(\phi(k, x_0, w_{[0,k-1]}), \rho^*(x_0, k), \psi_k^*(w_{[0,k-1]}), \varphi_k^*(\phi_{[0,k-1]})) \leq 0 \quad \forall x_0 \in B_0, \forall w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]} \quad \forall k \geq 0 \quad (6)$$

where  $\phi_{[0,k-1]}$  denotes the sequence of solutions  $\phi(i, x_0, w_{[0,i-1]})$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$  of system (4). ■

*Remark 3.5:* Note that the  $\delta$ ISS property for the system

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} = \tilde{f}(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{w}_k) \quad (7)$$

can be investigated via an augmented auxiliary system of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_{k+1}^1 &= \tilde{f}(\tilde{x}_k^1, \tilde{w}_k^1) \\ \tilde{x}_{k+1}^2 &= \tilde{f}(\tilde{x}_k^2, \tilde{w}_k^2) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which consists of two exact copies of the original system that are initialized respectively from the initial conditions  $\tilde{x}_0^1$  and  $\tilde{x}_0^2$  and that are driven with the inputs  $\tilde{w}^1$  and  $\tilde{w}^2$ . We can say that the system (8) has the form (4) if we define

$$x := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}^1 \\ \tilde{x}^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad w := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{w}^1 \\ \tilde{w}^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad f(x, w) := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{f}(\tilde{x}^1, \tilde{w}^1) \\ \tilde{f}(\tilde{x}^2, \tilde{w}^2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

In the sequel, whenever we talk about  $\delta$ ISS of the system (4), we will always assume that the above given transformation has already been carried out and, hence, the system has the form (8) with (9) (we assume that the dimensions  $n$  and  $s$  of  $x$  and  $w$  respectively are even). And we actually mean the  $\delta$ ISS property of system (7) (where  $\tilde{x}$  and  $\tilde{w}$  respectively have a dimension  $n/2$  and  $s/2$ ). ■

*Remark 3.6:* There are two reasons for restating Definition 3.1 as in Definition 3.4. First, the inequality (6) will be shown to be related to an inequality in the uniform  $l^\infty$  boundedness (ULIB) problem that was recently considered and solved in the literature [12]. Moreover, we will show how to transform our problem that involves some of the properties in Definition 3.1

TABLE I  
DATA NEEDED IN THE UNIFYING DEFINITION FOR ISS LIKE PROPERTIES [EQUATION (6)] AND THE DIMENSION  $n^*$  OF THE AUXILIARY SYSTEM (18)

Property $\star$	$\rho^*(x_0, k)$	$\psi_k^*(w_{[0, k-1]})$	$\varphi_k^*(\phi_{[0, k-1]})$	$G^*(\phi, \rho, \psi, \varphi)$	$n^*$
ISS	$\alpha_2( x_0 )e^{-k}$	$\ w_{[0, k-1]}\ _\infty$	0	$ \phi  - \alpha_1(\rho) - \gamma_1(\psi)$	$n + 2$
iISS	$\alpha_2( x_0 )e^{-k}$	$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2( w_i )$	0	$ \phi  - \alpha_1(\rho) - \gamma_1(\psi)$	$n + 2$
iiISS	$\gamma_3( x_0 )$	$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_5( w_i )$	$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2( \phi_i )$	$\gamma_1(\varphi) - \rho - \gamma_4(\psi)$	$n + 3$
IOS	$\alpha_2( x_0 )e^{-k}$	$\ w_{[0, k-1]}\ _\infty$	0	$ H(\phi)  - \alpha_1(\rho) - \gamma_1(\psi)$	$n + 2$
IOSS <sup>1</sup>	$\alpha_2( x_0 )e^{-k}$	$\ w_{[0, k-1]}\ _\infty$	$\ H(\phi)_{[0, k-1]}\ _\infty$	$ \phi  - \alpha_1(\rho) - \gamma_1(\psi) - \gamma_2(\varphi)$	$n + 3$
$\delta$ ISS <sup>2</sup>	$\alpha_2( x_0^1 - x_0^2 )e^{-k}$	$\ (w^1 - w^2)_{[0, k-1]}\ _\infty$	0	$ \phi^1 - \phi^2  - \alpha_1(\rho) - \gamma_1(\psi)$	$n + 2$

<sup>1</sup>We use the notation  $H(\phi)_{[0, k-1]}$  to denote the sequence  $H(\phi(i, x_0, w_{[0, i-1]}))$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ .

<sup>2</sup>The meaning of notation used in this row of the table is explained in Remark 3.5.

into an auxiliary ULIB problem that can be solved using techniques of [12]. The inequality (6) is especially suited for this problem transformation. Second, our results are unifying for all ISS like properties of Definition 3.1 and, hence, Definition 3.4 provides a compact way of presenting our proofs and results. ■

*Remark 3.7:* A range of other stability and detectability properties can be captured by using the same Definition 3.4 and augmenting the Table I in an appropriate manner by specifying  $\rho^*(\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $\psi_k^*(\cdot)$ ,  $\varphi_k^*(\cdot)$ ,  $G^*(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  for the new properties. We have not exhausted all possible candidate properties in Table I, but rather concentrated on the most representative properties that were considered in the literature. ■

#### IV. PROBLEM STATEMENTS

In this section, we pose several controller design problems. First, we state the full state feedback controller design problem with the goal of achieving one of the properties from Table I for the plant state in the closed-loop system. Second, we state the measurement feedback problem that achieves one of the properties from Table I for the plant state in the closed-loop system. We will solve these two problems by transforming them into two *auxiliary* problems (full state feedback and measurement feedback ULIB problems) that were recently considered and solved in the literature (see [12]). In this section, we also provide definitions of the ULIB problems.

For the full state feedback case, consider the nonlinear discrete-time system

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= f(x_k, u_k, w_k), & k \geq 0 \\ \bar{z}_k &= H(x_k), & k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here  $x_k \in \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\bar{z}_k \in \mathbf{R}^q$ ,  $u_k \in \mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  and  $w_k \in \mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$  are the state, output, control input, and disturbance input, respectively.

Before stating the problems of interest, we define the class of admissible controllers that our designs will yield. For system (10), let  $X = \mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  be given, define  $\mathcal{X}_{[0, \infty)}$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{[0, \infty)}$  similarly as in (2). An *admissible* state feedback controller is a causal map  $K : \mathcal{X}_{[0, \infty)} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{[0, \infty)}$ , meaning that for each time  $k \geq 0$  if  $x^1, x^2 \in \mathcal{X}_{[0, \infty)}$  and  $x_l^1 = x_l^2$  for all  $0 \leq l \leq k$  then  $K(x^1)_k = K(x^2)_k$ , i.e. the control at any time  $k$  is independent of the future states. We denote the set of admissible state feedback controllers as

$$\mathcal{C}_{sf} := \{K : \mathcal{X}_{[0, \infty)} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{[0, \infty)}, K \text{ is causal}\}. \quad (11)$$

We sometimes abuse the notation by writing  $u_k = K(x_{[0, k]})$ . Also, the state trajectories of the plant in the closed-loop system consisting of the system (10) and a given admissible controller  $u_k = K(x_{[0, k]})$  are denoted as  $\phi(k, x_0, u, w_{[0, k-1]})$ . Note that the class of admissible controllers is very large and it includes static and dynamic controllers, as well as a number of other configurations.

The first problem that we consider is stated next. This problem is referred to as a *State Feedback  $\star$  Problem* where  $\star$  can be any property listed in Table I.

**State Feedback  $\star$  (SF $\star$ ) Problem:** Consider system (10), let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  and  $\star \in \{\text{ISS, iISS, iiISS, IOS, IOSS, } \delta\text{ISS}\}$  be given and define the functions  $\rho^*(\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $\psi_k^*(\cdot)$ ,  $\varphi_k^*(\cdot)$  and  $G^*(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  as generated by Table I. Find, if possible, an admissible state feedback controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  such that the trajectories of the plant in the closed-loop system satisfy the following:

$$\begin{aligned} G^*(\phi_k, \rho^*(x_0, k), \psi_k^*(w_{[0, k-1]}), \varphi_k^*(\phi_{[0, k-1]})) &\leq 0 \\ \forall x_0 \in B_0, \forall w_{[0, k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0, k-1]}, \forall k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here  $\phi_k = \phi(k, x_0, u, w_{[0, k-1]})$  and we use  $\phi_{[0, k-1]}$  to denote the sequence  $\phi(i, x_0, u, w_{[0, i-1]})$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ . When

there exists such a controller, we say that the SF $\star$  Problem is solvable for (10).

*Remark 4.1:* In fact, the previous definition can be regarded as six definitions. For example, when  $\star = \text{ISS}$ , the problem is SFISS Problem. ■

*Remark 4.2:* Note a crucial difference between Definition 3.4 and the statement of the SF $\star$  Problem. In the definition, we say that the property holds if *there exist* functions  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  such that an appropriate inequality holds. However, in the statement of the SF $\star$  Problem we *fix* all the functions  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  and then attempt to find a controller that satisfies (12). Hence, if the controller does not exist for one set of  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ , it may exist for another set of these functions. Obviously, this poses certain limitations in terms of how one can use our tools. However, our results are very useful in a range of engineering situations in which it makes sense to fix the gains prior to design. Moreover, our results can be used in an iterative manner, as in  $H^\infty$  control, where, if a controller does not exist for a certain set of gains, we then increase the gains and then try to redesign the controller. Finding a design technique that does not require a priori fixing of the gain functions is highly desirable and is left for future research. ■

For the measurement feedback ISS like synthesis problem, consider the nonlinear discrete-time system

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= f(x_k, u_k, w_k), & k \geq 0 \\ \bar{z}_k &= H(x_k), & k \geq 0 \\ y_k &= h(x_k, w_k), & k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Here,  $x_k \in \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\bar{z}_k \in \mathbf{R}^q$ ,  $u_k \in \mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$ ,  $w_k \in \mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $y_k \in \mathbf{R}^p$  are the state, output, control input, disturbance input, and measured output, respectively.

*Remark 4.3:* Note that the measurement output  $y$  in (13) is in general different from the output  $\bar{z} = H(x)$  that is used to define the IOS and IOSS properties in Definition 3.1. ■

For system (13), let  $\mathbf{Y} = \text{range}\{h\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^p$  and  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  be given, define  $\mathcal{Y}_{[0,\infty)}$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{[0,\infty)}$  similarly as in (2). An *admissible* measurement feedback controller is a strictly-causal map  $K : \mathcal{Y}_{[0,\infty)} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{[0,\infty)}$ , meaning that for each time  $k > 0$  if  $y^1, y^2 \in \mathcal{Y}_{[0,\infty)}$  and  $y_l^1 = y_l^2$  for all  $0 \leq l \leq k-1$  then  $K(y^1)_k = K(y^2)_k$ , i.e., the control at time  $k$  is independent of current and future measurements. We denote the set of admissible measurement feedback controllers as

$$\mathcal{C}_{mf} := \{K : \mathcal{Y}_{[0,\infty)} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{[0,\infty)}, K \text{ is strictly causal}\}. \quad (14)$$

We sometimes abuse notation by writing  $u_k = K(y_{[0,k-1]})$ . Also, we still denote the trajectories of the plant in the closed-loop system consisting of the system (13) and a given admissible controller  $u_k = K(y_{[0,k-1]})$  as  $\phi(k, x_0, u, w_{[0,k-1]})$ .

**Measurement Feedback  $\star$  (MF $\star$ ) Problem:** Consider system (13), let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  and  $\star \in \{\text{ISS}, \text{iISS}, \text{iiISS}, \text{IOS}, \text{IOSS}, \text{\delta ISS}\}$  be given and define the functions  $\rho^*(\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $\psi_k^*(\cdot)$ ,  $\varphi_k^*(\cdot)$  and  $G^*(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  as generated by Table I. Find, if possible, an admissible measurement feedback controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{mf}$  such that the trajectories of the plant in the closed-loop system satisfy (12). When there exists such a controller, we say that the MF $\star$  Problem is solvable for system (13).

*Remark 4.4:* The SF $\star$  and MF $\star$  problems require only that a desired bound is achieved on the solutions of the plant whereas no such requirement is imposed on the states of a possibly dynamic controller. There are five reasons for this: i) ISS-like properties for nonlinear systems provide a desired bound for any initial state of the system. However, for a closed-loop system, the initial state of the plant and the initial state of the controller play different roles. The initial state of the plant may be arbitrary. But the initial state of the controller can be chosen by the designer. Hence it may be too strong to require ISS-like bound to be obtained for any initial state of the plant *and any initial state of the controller* in the closed-loop system. ii) We consider possibly dynamic feedback controller design where the dimension of the controller is not given before the design. iii) As we will show in Section VIII-A, the requirement (12) guarantees appropriate robustness to perturbation in the initialization of the controller. iv) As we will show in Section VIII-B, the method proposed in this paper can be generalized to achieve closed-loop ISS-like properties, but it is hard to state clearly in a unified way what the achieved bounds are. v) This requirement is compatible with definitions of nonlinear  $H^\infty$  problems [11] and the ULIB problems that are stated next. ■

We will show that the SF $\star$  Problem for (10) and MF $\star$  Problem for the system (13) can be solved by solving the following controller synthesis problems for certain auxiliary systems. We first state the problems themselves and then introduce the auxiliary systems in the following section.

For the state feedback ULIB synthesis problem, we consider the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= f(x_k, u_k, w_k), & k \geq 0 \\ z_k &= g(x_k), & k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

For the measurement feedback ULIB synthesis problem, we consider the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= f(x_k, u_k, w_k), & k \geq 0 \\ y_k &= h(x_k, w_k), & k \geq 0 \\ z_k &= g(x_k), & k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here,  $x_k \in \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $u_k \in \mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$ ,  $w_k \in \mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$  are the state, control input, and disturbance input, respectively.  $z_k \in \mathbf{R}$  is the performance output quantity. In (16),  $y_k \in \mathbf{R}^p$  is the measured output.

We still use the same notation  $\mathcal{C}_{sf}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_{mf}$  and  $\phi(k, x_0, u, w_{[0,k-1]})$  as those in the SF $\star$  and MF $\star$  problems (though the systems considered here are a bit different).

**State Feedback ULIB (SFULIB) Problem:** Consider system (15) and let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$  be given. Find, if possible, an admissible state feedback controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  such that the trajectories of the closed-loop system consisting of the plant (15) and the controller  $K(\cdot)$  satisfy

$$g(\phi(k, x_0, u, w_{[0,k-1]})) \leq \lambda \quad \forall x_0 \in B_0, \forall w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}, \forall k \geq 0. \quad (17)$$

When there exists such a controller, we say that the SFULIB Problem is solvable for system (15).

**Measurement Feedback ULIB (MFULIB) Problem:** Consider system (16) and let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$  be given. Find, if

TABLE II  
SUMMARY OF THE VARIABLE  $\zeta_k^*$  AND THE FUNCTION  $f_\rho^*$  IN EQUATIONS (18), (19), (45), (46)

Property ★	$\rho^*(x_0, k) = \zeta_k^*$	$\zeta_0^*$	dynamics of $\zeta_k^*$	$f_\rho^*(\zeta^*)$
ISS iISS IOS IOSS	$\alpha_2( x_0 )e^{-k}$	$\alpha_2( x_0 )$	$\zeta_{k+1}^* = e^{-1}\zeta_k^*$	$e^{-1}\zeta^*$
iiISS	$\gamma_3( x_0 )$	$\gamma_3( x_0 )$	$\zeta_{k+1}^* = \zeta_k^*$	$\zeta^*$
$\delta$ ISS	$\alpha_2( x_0^1 - x_0^2 )e^{-k}$	$\alpha_2( x_0^1 - x_0^2 )$	$\zeta_{k+1}^* = e^{-1}\zeta_k^*$	$e^{-1}\zeta^*$

TABLE III  
SUMMARY OF THE VARIABLE  $\hat{\eta}_k^*$  AND FUNCTIONS  $\hat{w}^*$  AND  $\hat{f}_\psi^*$  IN EQUATIONS (18), (19)

Property ★	$\hat{w}^*(x_0, u_0, x_1)$	$\hat{\eta}_0^*$	dynamics of $\hat{\eta}_k^*$	$\hat{f}_\psi^*(\hat{\eta}^*, \hat{w}^*)$
ISS IOS IOSS	$\min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{ w  : f(x_0, u_0, w) = x_1\}$	0	$\hat{\eta}_{k+1}^* = \max\{\hat{\eta}_k^*, \hat{w}^*(x_k, u_k, x_{k+1})\}$	$\max\{\hat{\eta}^*, \hat{w}^*\}$
iISS	$\min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{ w  : f(x_0, u_0, w) = x_1\}$	0	$\hat{\eta}_{k+1}^* = \hat{\eta}_k^* + \gamma_2(\hat{w}^*(x_k, u_k, x_{k+1}))$	$\hat{\eta}^* + \gamma_2(\hat{w}^*)$
iiISS	$\min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{ w  : f(x_0, u_0, w) = x_1\}$	0	$\hat{\eta}_{k+1}^* = \hat{\eta}_k^* + \gamma_5(\hat{w}^*(x_k, u_k, x_{k+1}))$	$\hat{\eta}^* + \gamma_5(\hat{w}^*)$
$\delta$ ISS	$\min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{ w^1 - w^2  : f(x_0, u_0, w) = x_1\}$	0	$\hat{\eta}_{k+1}^* = \max\{\hat{\eta}_k^*, \hat{w}^*(x_k, u_k, x_{k+1})\}$	$\max\{\hat{\eta}^*, \hat{w}^*\}$

possible, an admissible measurement feedback controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{mf}$  such that the trajectories of the closed-loop system consisting of the plant (16) and the controller  $K(\cdot)$  satisfy (17). When there exists such a controller, we say that the MFULIB Problem is solvable for system (16).

*Remark 4.5:* Solutions to the SFULIB Problem and MFULIB Problem were obtained in [12]. Note the similarity between the bounds in (12) and (17) that are respectively used to define the SF★, MF★ and ULIB problems. The main difference is that the bound in (12) depends directly on  $\phi(k, x_0, u, w_{[0, k-1]})$ ,  $\rho^*(x_0, k)$ ,  $\psi_k^*(w_{[0, k-1]})$  and  $\varphi_k^*(\phi_{[0, k-1]})$  whereas the bound in (17) depends only on  $\phi(k, x_0, u, w_{[0, k-1]})$ . However, we will show in the next section that  $\rho^*(x_0, k)$ ,  $\psi_k^*(w_{[0, k-1]})$  and  $\varphi_k^*(\phi_{[0, k-1]})$  for any property given in Table I can be generated as solutions of auxiliary difference equations that are appropriately initialized and, moreover, we can solve the SF★ Problem for the system (10) and the MF★ Problem for the system (13) by solving appropriate ULIB problems for augmented auxiliary systems that is appropriately initialized. This “problem transformation” is discussed in the next section. ■

## V. PROBLEM TRANSFORMATIONS

In this section, we show how the SF★ Problem for the system (10) and the MF★ Problem for the system (13) can be converted into appropriate ULIB problems for auxiliary augmented systems.

### A. State Feedback Case

In this section, we will use Tables I–IV to introduce an auxiliary system that will be useful in solving SF★ Problem. Let  $\star \in \{\text{ISS}, \text{iISS}, \text{iiISS}, \text{IOS}, \text{IOSS}, \delta\text{ISS}\}$  be given. Let  $n^*$  and  $G^* : \mathbf{R}^{n^*} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  come from Table I, where  $n^*$  denotes the dimension of the auxiliary system. Let functions  $f_\rho^* : \mathbf{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ ,  $\hat{w}^* : \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ ,  $\hat{f}_\psi^* : \mathbf{R}_+ \times \mathbf{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ ,  $f_\phi^* : \mathbf{R}_+ \times \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$  and  $\zeta_0^*$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0^*$ ,  $\theta_0^* \in \mathbf{R}$  come from Tables II, III, IV. We define the following auxiliary system:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\zeta}_{k+1}^* &= \hat{f}^* \left( \hat{\zeta}_k^*, u_k, w_k \right), & k \geq 0 \\ z_k &= G^* \left( \hat{\zeta}_k^* \right), & k \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

TABLE IV  
 SUMMARY OF THE VARIABLE  $\theta_k^*$  AND THE FUNCTION  $f_\varphi^*$  IN EQUATIONS (18), (19), (45), (46)

Property $\star$	$\varphi_k^*(\phi_{[0,k-1]}) = \theta_k^*$	$\theta_0^*$	dynamics of $\theta_k^*$	$f_\varphi^*(\theta^*, x)$
ISS, iISS, IOS, $\delta$ ISS	---	---	---	---
iliSS	$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2( x_i )$	0	$\theta_{k+1}^* = \theta_k^* + \gamma_2( x_k )$	$\theta^* + \gamma_2( x )$
IOSS	$\ H(x)_{[0,k-1]}\ _\infty$	0	$\theta_{k+1}^* = \max\{\theta_k^*,  H(x_k) \}$	$\max\{\theta^*,  H(x) \}$

where

$$\hat{\xi}^* := \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \zeta^* \\ \hat{\eta}^* \\ \theta^* \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{f}^*(\hat{\xi}^*, u, w) := \begin{pmatrix} f(x, u, w) \\ f_\rho^*(\zeta^*) \\ \hat{f}_\psi^*(\hat{\eta}^*, \hat{w}^*(x, u, f(x, u, w))) \\ f_\varphi^*(\theta^*, x) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

We also let

$$\hat{B}_0^* := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ \zeta_0^* \\ \hat{\eta}_0^* \\ \theta_0^* \end{pmatrix} : x_0 \in B_0 \right\}, \quad \lambda := 0. \quad (20)$$

*Remark 5.1:* Here, we use  $n^*$  to denote the dimension of the auxiliary system (18), (19). We can see that this dimension depend on the property  $\star$ . For example,  $n^* = n + 3$  when  $\star \in \{\text{iLiSS}, \text{IOSS}\}$  (where  $\hat{\xi}^* = (x, \zeta^*, \hat{\eta}^*, \theta^*)$ );  $n^* = n + 2$  when  $\star \in \{\text{ISS}, \text{iISS}, \text{IOS}, \delta\text{ISS}\}$  (when  $\hat{\xi}^* = (x, \zeta^*, \hat{\eta}^*)$ , the variable  $\theta^*$  is not needed), see Tables I and IV. When considering some different properties other than those listed in Table I, the dimension  $n^*$  may also be different. For example, when  $\star = \text{GAS}$  (global asymptotic stability, which can be obtained from ISS with  $w \equiv 0$ ),  $n^* = n + 1$ . In this paper, we were not concentrating on the GAS property but the tools can be easily used to address it. ■

The main result of this subsection is stated below which shows a relationship of the SF $\star$  Problem for system (10) and the SFULIB Problem for auxiliary system (18), (19) with  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (20). Since the system (18), (19) is higher dimensional than (10), we find it convenient to introduce different notation for sets of admissible state feedback controllers. The sets of admissible state feedback controllers for (18), (19) and (10) are, respectively, denoted as  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^*$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{sf}$ , i.e.,

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^* := \left\{ \bar{K} : \bar{\mathcal{X}}_{[0,\infty)}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{[0,\infty)}, \bar{K} \text{ is causal} \right\} \quad (21)$$

where  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{[0,\infty)}^*$  is defined similarly as in (2) with  $\bar{X}^* = \mathbf{R}^{n^*}$ .

*Theorem 5.2:* Let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$  and  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  be given. Let  $\star \in \{\text{ISS}, \text{iISS}, \text{iliSS}, \text{IOS}, \text{IOSS}, \delta\text{ISS}\}$ ,  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,

$i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  be given and define  $n^*$ ,  $G^*$ ,  $f_\rho^*$ ,  $\hat{w}^*$ ,  $\hat{f}_\psi^*$ ,  $f_\varphi^*$ ,  $\zeta_0^*$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0^*$  and  $\theta_0^*$  as generated by Tables I–IV. Let  $X = \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\bar{X}^* = \mathbf{R}^{n^*}$  and define the sets of admissible controllers  $\mathcal{C}_{sf}$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^*$  by (11) and (21). Then, the following statements are equivalent.

- i) The SF $\star$  Problem is solvable for system (10).
- ii) The SFULIB Problem is solvable for system (18), (19) with  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (20).

Moreover, if controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  of the form

$$u_k = K(x_{[0,k]}) \quad (22)$$

solves the SF $\star$  Problem for system (10), then the controller  $\bar{K} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^*$  defined by

$$u_k = \bar{K}(\hat{\xi}_{[0,k]}^*) = \bar{K}(x_{[0,k]}, \zeta_{[0,k]}^*, \hat{\eta}_{[0,k]}^*, \theta_{[0,k]}^*) := K(x_{[0,k]}) \quad (23)$$

solves the SFULIB Problem for system (18), (19) with  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (20). Conversely, if controller  $\bar{K} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^*$  of the form

$$u_k = \bar{K}(\hat{\xi}_{[0,k]}^*) = \bar{K}(x_{[0,k]}, \zeta_{[0,k]}^*, \hat{\eta}_{[0,k]}^*, \theta_{[0,k]}^*) \quad (24)$$

solves the SFULIB Problem for the system (18), (19) with  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (20), then the following controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$ :

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_{k+1}^* = f_\rho^*(\zeta_k^*) \\ \hat{\eta}_{k+1}^* = \hat{f}_\psi^*(\hat{\eta}_k^*, \hat{w}^*(x_k, u_k, x_{k+1})) \\ \theta_{k+1}^* = f_\varphi^*(\theta_k^*, x_k) \\ u_k = \bar{K}(x_{[0,k]}, \zeta_{[0,k]}^*, \hat{\eta}_{[0,k]}^*, \theta_{[0,k]}^*) \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

with initialization  $\zeta_0^*$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0^*$ ,  $\theta_0^*$ , solves the SF $\star$  Problem for system (10). ■

The structure of the dynamic state feedback controller (25) for the case  $\star = \text{ISS}$  is shown in Fig. 1.

*Proof:* The SF $\star$  Problem for system (10) is to find a controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  such that the trajectory of the closed-loop system consisting of (10) and  $K$  satisfies

$$G^*(x_k, \rho^*(x_0, k), \psi_k^*(w_{[0,k-1]}), \varphi_k^*(x_{[0,k-1]})) \leq 0 \quad (26)$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ ,  $k \geq 0$ .




Fig. 1. Dynamic state feedback controller (25) when  $\star = \text{ISS}$  [see also (44) and (68)], where  $q^{-1}$  denotes the unit step delay.

We first prove that the inequality (26) is equivalent to

$$G^{\star} \left( x_k, \rho^{\star}(x_0, k), \hat{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_0, w_{[0, k-1]}), \varphi_k^{\star}(x_{[0, k-1]}) \right) \leq 0 \quad (27)$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0, k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0, k-1]}$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , where

$$\hat{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_0, w_{[0, k-1]}) := \inf_{\tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]}} \{ \psi_k^{\star}(\tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]}) : \phi(i, x_0, u, \tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]}) = \phi(i, x_0, u, w_{[0, k-1]}), i = 1, \dots, k \} \quad (28)$$

i.e.,  $\hat{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_0, w_{[0, k-1]})$  is the minimal possible  $\psi_k^{\star}(\tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]})$  where the disturbances  $\tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]}$  and  $w_{[0, k-1]}$  (with the same initial state  $x_0$ ) result in the same state trajectory.

In fact, for the  $G^{\star}$  in Table I, since  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_4$  are class  $\mathcal{K}$  functions,  $G^{\star}$  is monotone in  $\psi$ , i.e.,

$$G^{\star}(x, \rho, \psi_2, \varphi) \leq G^{\star}(x, \rho, \psi_1, \varphi) \quad \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^n, \rho \geq 0, \varphi \geq 0, \psi_2 \geq \psi_1 \geq 0.$$

If (27) holds, then from

$$\hat{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_0, w_{[0, k-1]}) \leq \psi_k^{\star}(w_{[0, k-1]})$$

we have (26). On the other hand, if (26) holds (for any  $w_{[0, k-1]}$ ), then

$$\begin{aligned} & G^{\star} \left( x_k, \rho^{\star}(x_0, k), \hat{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_0, w_{[0, k-1]}), \varphi_k^{\star}(x_{[0, k-1]}) \right) \\ &= \sup_{\tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]}} \{ G^{\star}(x_k, \rho^{\star}(x_0, k), \psi_k^{\star}(\tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]}), \varphi_k^{\star}(x_{[0, k-1]})) : \\ & \quad \phi(i, x_0, u, \tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]}) = \phi(i, x_0, u, w_{[0, k-1]}) \\ & \quad 1 \leq i \leq k \} \\ & \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (27) holds and this completes the proof of equivalence of (26) and (27).

Furthermore, notice that we can also write

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_0, w_{[0, k-1]}) \\ &= \bar{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_{[0, k]}) \\ &:= \inf_{\tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]}} \{ \psi_k^{\star}(\tilde{w}_{[0, k-1]}) : \phi(i, x_0, u, \tilde{w}_{[0, i-1]}) = x_i, \\ & \quad i = 1, \dots, k \} \quad (29) \end{aligned}$$

where  $x_i = \phi(i, x_0, u, w_{[0, i-1]})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$  is the state sequence which is available for feedback. Hence, (27) is further equivalent to

$$G^{\star}(x_k, \rho^{\star}(x_0, k), \bar{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_{[0, k]}), \varphi_k^{\star}(x_{[0, k-1]})) \leq 0 \quad (30)$$

for all  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $w_{[0, k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0, k-1]}$ ,  $k \geq 0$ .

Notice that the left hand side of (30) is a function of the state trajectory  $x_{[0, k]}$ . As long as the state sequence  $x_{[0, k]}$  is available for feedback, the four items  $x_k, \rho^{\star}(x_0, k), \bar{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_{[0, k]}), \varphi_k^{\star}(x_{[0, k-1]})$  can all be computed and, thus, are available for feedback. This makes it possible to transfer the SF $\star$  Problem for system (10) into a SFULIB problem for the auxiliary system.

In fact, we can use three difference equations to generate the terms  $\rho^{\star}(x_0, k)$ ,  $\hat{\psi}_k^{\star}(x_0, w_{[0, k-1]})$  and  $\varphi_k^{\star}(x_{[0, k-1]})$  in the inequality (27), respectively. The details are stated next. Some important functions used in this procedure are summarized in Tables II–IV.

For each property  $\star \in \{\text{ISS}, \text{iISS}, \text{iiISS}, \text{IOS}, \text{IOSS}, \delta\text{ISS}\}$ , we define a new variable  $\zeta_k^{\star}$ , the initial value  $\zeta_0^{\star}$  is given in the third column of Table II, the dynamics of  $\zeta_k^{\star}$  is given in the fourth column of Table II. Similarly, define a new variable  $\hat{\eta}_k^{\star}$ , the initial state  $\hat{\eta}_0^{\star}$  is given in the third column of Table III, the dynamics of  $\hat{\eta}_k^{\star}$  is given in the fourth column of Table III where the function  $\hat{w}^{\star}$  is given in the second column of Table III. Define a new variable  $\theta_k^{\star}$ , the initial state  $\theta_0^{\star}$  is given in the third column of Table IV, the dynamics of  $\theta_k^{\star}$  is given in the fourth column of Table IV.

By defining the new variables in this way, we have

$$\zeta_k^* = \rho^*(x_0, k), \hat{\eta}_k^* = \hat{\psi}_k^*(x_0, w_{[0,k-1]}), \theta_k^* = \varphi_k^*(x_{[0,k-1]}).$$

Hence, the requirement (26) [or (27)] is equivalent to

$$G^*(\hat{\xi}_k^*) \leq \lambda \quad \forall \hat{\xi}_k^* \in \hat{B}_0^* \quad \forall w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}, k \geq 0. \quad (31)$$

where  $\hat{\xi}_k^*$  is defined in (19),  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  are given in (20). This is actually the requirement in SFULIB Problem for system (18), (19).

Now, it is not hard to prove the theorem. If controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  of the form (22) solves the SF $\star$  Problem for system (10), then the closed-loop system combining (10) with the control input sequence obtained by (22) satisfies (26). Thus, the closed-loop system combining (18), (19) with the same control input sequence satisfies (31). Notice that this control input sequence can also be obtained by the map  $\bar{K} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^*$  defined by (23). Hence,  $\bar{K}$  solves the SFULIB Problem for system (18), (19) with  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (20).

Conversely, if controller  $\bar{K} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^*$  of the form (24) solves the SFULIB Problem for the system (18), (19) with  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (20), then the closed-loop system combining (18), (19) with the control input sequence obtained by (24) satisfies (31). Hence, the closed-loop system combining (10) with the same control input sequence satisfies (26). Notice that this control input sequence can also be obtained by the map  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  defined by (25) with initialization  $\zeta_0^*, \hat{\eta}_0^*, \theta_0^*$ . Hence  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  solves the SF $\star$  Problem for system (10). ■

To illustrate how Tables I–IV are used in Theorem 5.2, consider the case when  $\star = \text{ISS}$ . For simplicity, we will omit the superscript “ISS” in the expressions, e.g. use  $G$  instead of  $G^{\text{ISS}}$ , etc. Notice that the variable  $\theta$  is not needed in this case (see Table IV).

From Table I, row 1 column 5, we have

$$G(x, \zeta, \eta) = |x| - \alpha_1(\zeta) - \gamma_1(\eta). \quad (32)$$

From Tables II and III, row 1, we have

$$f_\rho(\zeta) = e^{-1}\zeta \quad \hat{f}_\psi(\eta, w) = \max\{\eta, |w|\} \quad (33)$$

$$\zeta_0 = \alpha_2(|x_0|) \quad \hat{\eta}_0 = 0 \quad (34)$$

$$\hat{w}(x_0, u_0, x_1) = \min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{|w| : f(x_0, u_0, w) = x_1\}. \quad (35)$$

Hence, (19) takes the form

$$\hat{\xi} = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \zeta \\ \hat{\eta} \end{pmatrix} \quad \hat{f}(\hat{\xi}, u, w) = \begin{pmatrix} f(x, u, w) \\ e^{-1}\zeta \\ \hat{f}(\hat{\eta}, w) \end{pmatrix} \quad (36)$$

where

$$\check{f}(\hat{\eta}, w) = \max \left\{ \hat{\eta}, \min_{\tilde{w} \in \mathbf{W}} \{|\tilde{w}| : f(x, u, \tilde{w}) = f(x, u, w)\} \right\}. \quad (37)$$

So, the auxiliary system (18) becomes

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k, w_k) \\ \zeta_{k+1} = e^{-1}\zeta_k \\ \hat{\eta}_{k+1} = \max \left\{ \hat{\eta}_k, \min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{|w| : f(x_k, u_k, w) = f(x_k, u_k, w_k)\} \right\} \\ z_k = |x_k| - \alpha_1(\zeta_k) - \gamma_1(\hat{\eta}_k). \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

Also, (20) becomes in this case

$$\hat{B}_0 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ \alpha_2(|x_0|) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} : x_0 \in B_0 \right\}, \quad \lambda = 0. \quad (39)$$

The set of admissible state feedback controllers for the auxiliary system (38) is

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf} := \{ \bar{K} : \bar{\mathcal{X}}_{[0,\infty)} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{[0,\infty)}, \bar{K} \text{ is causal} \} \quad (40)$$

where  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{[0,\infty)}$  is defined similarly as in (2) with  $\bar{X} = \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ .

*Corollary 5.3:* (ISS Case) Let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$ ,  $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{K}$ , and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  be given. Let  $X = \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\bar{X} = \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$  and define the sets of admissible controllers  $\mathcal{C}_{sf}$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}$  by (11), (40). Then, the following statements are equivalent.

- i) The SFISS Problem is solvable for system (10).
- ii) The SFULIB Problem is solvable for system (38) with  $\hat{B}_0$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (39).

Moreover, if controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  of the form

$$u_k = K(x_{[0,k]}) \quad (41)$$

solves the SFISS Problem for system (10), then the controller  $\bar{K} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}$  defined by

$$u_k = \bar{K}(x_{[0,k]}, \zeta_{[0,k]}, \hat{\eta}_{[0,k]}) := K(x_{[0,k]}) \quad (42)$$

solves the SFULIB Problem for system (38) with  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (39). Conversely, if controller  $\bar{K} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}$  of the form

$$u_k = \bar{K}(x_{[0,k]}, \zeta_{[0,k]}, \hat{\eta}_{[0,k]}) \quad (43)$$

solves the SFULIB Problem for the system (38) with  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (39), then the following controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_{k+1} = e^{-1}\zeta_k \\ \hat{\eta}_{k+1} = \max \left\{ \hat{\eta}_k, \min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{|w| : f(x_k, u_k, w) = x_{k+1}\} \right\} \\ u_k = \bar{K}(x_{[0,k]}, \zeta_{[0,k]}, \hat{\eta}_{[0,k]}) \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

with initialization  $\zeta_0 = \alpha_2(|x_0|)$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0 = 0$ , solves the SFISS Problem for system (10). ■

### B. Measurement Feedback Case

In this section, we will use Tables I, II, IV, and V to introduce an auxiliary system that will be useful in solving MF $\star$  Problem. Let  $\star \in \{\text{ISS, iISS, iIiSS, IOS, IOSS, } \delta\text{ISS}\}$  be given. Let  $n^*$

TABLE V  
SUMMARY OF THE VARIABLE  $\eta_k^*$  AND THE FUNCTION  $f_\psi^*$  IN EQUATIONS (45), (46)

Property ★	$\psi_k^*(w_{[0,k-1]}) = \eta_k^*$	$\eta_0^*$	dynamics of $\eta_k^*$	$f_\psi^*(\eta^*, w)$
ISS IOS IOSS	$\ w_{[0,k-1]}\ _\infty$	0	$\eta_{k+1}^* = \max\{\eta_k^*,  w_k \}$	$\max\{\eta^*,  w \}$
iISS	$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_2( w_i )$	0	$\eta_{k+1}^* = \eta_k^* + \gamma_2( w_k )$	$\eta^* + \gamma_2( w )$
iiISS	$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \gamma_5( w_i )$	0	$\eta_{k+1}^* = \eta_k^* + \gamma_5( w_k )$	$\eta^* + \gamma_5( w )$
$\delta$ ISS	$\ (w^1 - w^2)_{[0,k-1]}\ _\infty$	0	$\eta_{k+1}^* = \max\{\eta_k^*,  w_k^1 - w_k^2 \}$	$\max\{\eta^*,  w^1 - w^2 \}$

and  $G^* : \mathbf{R}^{n^*} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  come from Table I, where  $n^*$  denotes the dimension of the auxiliary system. Let functions  $f_\rho^* : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,  $f_\psi^* : \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,  $f_\varphi^* : \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , and  $\zeta_0^*, \theta_0^*, \eta_0^* \in \mathbf{R}$  come from Tables II, IV, V. We define the following auxiliary system:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{k+1}^* &= \tilde{f}^*(\xi_k^*, u_k, w_k), \quad k \geq 0 \\ z_k &= G^*(\xi_k^*), \quad k \geq 0 \\ y_k &= h(x_k, w_k), \quad k \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where

$$\xi^* := \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \zeta^* \\ \eta^* \\ \theta^* \end{pmatrix} \quad \tilde{f}^*(\xi^*, u, w) := \begin{pmatrix} f(x, u, w) \\ f_\rho^*(\zeta^*) \\ f_\psi^*(\eta^*, w) \\ f_\varphi^*(\theta^*, x) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (46)$$

We also let

$$\tilde{B}_0^* := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ \zeta_0^* \\ \eta_0^* \\ \theta_0^* \end{pmatrix} : x_0 \in B_0 \right\}, \quad \lambda := 0. \quad (47)$$

The following theorem shows a relationship of the MF★ Problem for system (13) and the MFULIB Problem for auxiliary system (45), (46) with  $\tilde{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (47).

*Theorem 5.4:* Let  $\mathbf{Y} = \text{range}\{h\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^p$  and  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  be given and define the set of admissible controller  $\mathcal{C}_{mf}$  as in (14). Let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\star \in \{\text{ISS}, \text{iISS}, \text{iiISS}, \text{IOS}, \text{IOSS}, \delta\text{ISS}\}$ ,  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  be given and define  $n^*$ ,  $G^*$ ,  $f_\rho^*$ ,  $f_\psi^*$ ,  $f_\varphi^*$ ,  $\zeta_0^*$ ,  $\theta_0^*$  and  $\eta_0^*$  as generated by Tables I, II, IV, and V. Then, the following statements are equivalent.

- i) The MF★ Problem is solvable for system (13).
- ii) The MFULIB Problem is solvable for system (45), (46) with  $\tilde{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (47).

Moreover, a controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{mf}$  of the form

$$u_k = K(y_{[0,k-1]}) \quad (48)$$

solves the MF★ Problem for system (13) if and only if the same controller<sup>1</sup> solves the MFULIB Problem for the system (45), (46) with  $\tilde{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (47). ■

*Proof:* The MF★ Problem for system (13) is to find a controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{mf}$  such that the trajectory of the closed-loop system consisting of (13) and  $K$  satisfies (26). Now, we only need to introduce three new variables  $\zeta_k^*, \eta_k^*, \theta_k^* \in \mathbf{R}$  to characterize the terms  $\rho^*(x_0, k)$ ,  $\psi_k^*(w_{[0,k-1]})$  and  $\varphi_k^*(x_{[0,k-1]})$  in the inequality (26), respectively. This time we will make use of Tables II, IV, V.

For each property  $\star \in \{\text{ISS}, \text{iISS}, \text{iiISS}, \text{IOS}, \text{IOSS}, \delta\text{ISS}\}$ , we define three new variables  $\zeta_k^* = \rho^*(x_0, k)$ ,  $\theta_k^* = \varphi_k^*(x_{[0,k-1]})$  and  $\eta_k^* = \psi_k^*(w_{[0,k-1]})$ . The initial values and the dynamics of the three variables are given in the third column and fourth column of Tables II, IV and V.

Now, the inequality (26) is equivalent to

$$G^*(\xi_k^*) \leq \lambda \quad \forall \xi_0^* \in \tilde{B}_0^*, \forall w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}, k \geq 0 \quad (49)$$

where  $\xi^*$  is defined in (46),  $\tilde{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  are given in (47). This is the requirement in MFULIB Problem for system (45), (46).

Notice that the system (13) and the system (45), (46) have the same control input  $u$  and the same measured output  $y$ , so the set of the admissible controllers for the MF★ Problem for system (13) and the set of the admissible controllers for the MFULIB Problem for system (45), (46) are both  $\mathcal{C}_{mf}$ . We can assert the theorem from the equivalence of (49) and (26). ■

*Remark 5.5:* The SF problem is not strictly a special case of the MF problem due to the one-step delay in the latter case. Our choice of information patterns was considered to achieve simpler and more transparent results. ■

To illustrate how Tables I, II, IV, and V are used in Theorem 5.4, consider the case when  $\star = \text{ISS}$ . As before, we will omit the superscript “ISS” in the expressions, e.g. use  $G$  instead of  $G^{\text{ISS}}$ , etc.

<sup>1</sup>Notice that the dimensions of the measurement outputs of system (13) and system (45), (46) are the same, the dimensions of the control inputs of system (13) and system (45), (46) are also the same. Here, “the same controller” means the mapping from the measurement output to control input is the same.

From Table I, row 1, we have

$$G(x, \zeta, \eta) = |x| - \alpha_1(\zeta) - \gamma_1(\eta). \quad (50)$$

By Tables II and V, row 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_\rho(\zeta) &= e^{-1}\zeta & f_\psi(\eta, w) &= \max\{\eta, |w|\} \\ \zeta_0 &= \alpha_2(|x_0|), & \eta_0 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Hence, (46) takes the form

$$\xi = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \zeta \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \quad \tilde{f}(\xi, u, w) = \begin{pmatrix} f(x, u, w) \\ e^{-1}\zeta \\ \max\{\eta, |w|\} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (52)$$

So, the auxiliary system (45), (46) becomes

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k, w_k) \\ \zeta_{k+1} = e^{-1}\zeta_k \\ \eta_{k+1} = \max\{\eta_k, |w_k|\} \\ z_k = |x_k| - \alpha_1(\zeta_k) - \gamma_1(\eta_k) \\ y_k = h(x_k, w_k). \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

Also, (47) becomes

$$\tilde{B}_0 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ \alpha_2(|x_0|) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} : x_0 \in B_0 \right\}, \quad \lambda = 0. \quad (54)$$

*Corollary 5.6:* (ISS Case) Let  $\mathbf{Y} = \text{range}\{h\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^p$  and  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  be given and define the set of admissible controller  $\mathcal{C}_{m,f}$  as in (14). Let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  be given. Then, the following statements are equivalent.

- i) The MFISS Problem is solvable for system (13).
- ii) The MFULIB Problem is solvable for system (53) with  $\tilde{B}_0$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (54).

Moreover, a controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{m,f}$  of the form

$$u_k = K(y_{[0,k-1]}) \quad (55)$$

solves the MFISS Problem for system (13) if and only if the same controller  $K$  solves the MFULIB Problem for the system (53) with  $\tilde{B}_0$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (54). ■

## VI. DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING RESULTS

Using Theorems 5.2 and 5.4 and the results of ULIB problems [12], we have the following dynamic programming results for the SF $\star$  and MF $\star$  problems. The results in this section are direct consequences of [12, Ths. 3.3, 3.5, 4.17, 4.19]. The dynamic programming inequalities provide a framework for controller design to achieve various ISS like properties in terms of Lyapunov-like value functions (numerical methods may need to solve for them).

### A. State Feedback Case

*Theorem 6.1:* (Necessity) Let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  be given. Let  $\star \in \{\text{ISS, iISS, iLiSS, IOS, IOSS, \delta ISS}\}$ ,  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  be given and define  $n^\star$ ,  $G^\star$ ,  $f_\rho^\star$ ,  $\hat{w}^\star$ ,  $\hat{f}_\psi^\star$ ,  $f_\varphi^\star$ ,  $\zeta_0^\star$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0^\star$  and  $\theta_0^\star$  as generated by Tables I–IV. Let  $\hat{f}^\star$  come from (19), let  $\hat{B}_0^\star$  and  $\lambda$  come from (20). Let  $X = \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\bar{X}^\star = \mathbf{R}^{n^\star}$  and define the sets of admissible controllers  $\mathcal{C}_{sf}$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^\star$  by (11), (12). If the SF $\star$  Problem for system

(10) is solvable, then the value function  $V_a^\star : \mathbf{R}^{n^\star} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{R}}$  defined by<sup>2</sup>

$$V_a^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star) := \inf_{\bar{K} \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^\star} \sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}} \left\{ G^\star(\hat{\xi}_k^\star) : u_k = \bar{K}(\hat{\xi}_{[0,k]}^\star), \hat{\xi}_0^\star = \hat{\xi}^\star \right\}, \quad \forall \hat{\xi}^\star \in \mathbf{R}^{n^\star} \quad (56)$$

satisfies

- 1)  $\hat{B}_0^\star \subseteq \text{dom} V_a^\star := \{\hat{\xi}^\star \in \mathbf{R}^{n^\star} : V_a^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star) < +\infty\}$ ;
- 2)  $\sup_{\hat{\xi}^\star \in \hat{B}_0^\star} V_a^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star) \leq \lambda$ ;
- 3) the following dynamic programming equation (DPE) holds for all  $\hat{\xi}^\star \in \text{dom} V_a^\star$ :

$$V_a^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star) = \max \left\{ G^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star), \inf_{u \in \mathbf{U}} \sup_{w \in \mathbf{W}} V_a^\star(\hat{f}^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star, u, w)) \right\}. \quad (57)$$

*Proof:* Suppose there exists a  $K_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  solving the SF $\star$  Problem for system (10). Then from Theorem 5.2, there exists a  $\bar{K}_0 \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^\star$  solving the SFULIB Problem for system (18), (19) with  $\hat{B}_0^\star$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (20). By [12, Th. 3.3.], items 1) and 3) in Theorem 6.1 hold. By the definition of  $V_a^\star$

$$V_a^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star) \leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}} \left\{ G^\star(\hat{\xi}_k^\star) : u_k = \bar{K}_0(\hat{\xi}_{[0,k]}^\star), \hat{\xi}_0^\star = \hat{\xi}^\star \right\} \quad \forall \hat{\xi}^\star \in \mathbf{R}^{n^\star}.$$

Because  $\bar{K}_0$  solves the SFULIB Problem for system (18), (19) with  $\hat{B}_0^\star$  and  $\lambda$ , we have  $\forall \hat{\xi}^\star \in \hat{B}_0^\star$

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}} \left\{ G^\star(\hat{\xi}_k^\star) : u_k = \bar{K}_0(\hat{\xi}_{[0,k]}^\star), \hat{\xi}_0^\star = \hat{\xi}^\star \right\} \leq \lambda.$$

Thus, item 2) in Theorem 6.1 holds. ■

*Theorem 6.2:* (Sufficiency) Let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$  and  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  be given. Let  $\star \in \{\text{ISS, iISS, iLiSS, IOS, IOSS, \delta ISS}\}$ ,  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  be given and define  $n^\star$ ,  $G^\star$ ,  $f_\rho^\star$ ,  $\hat{w}^\star$ ,  $\hat{f}_\psi^\star$ ,  $f_\varphi^\star$ ,  $\zeta_0^\star$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0^\star$  and  $\theta_0^\star$  as generated by Tables I–IV. Let  $\hat{f}^\star$  come from (19), let  $\hat{B}_0^\star$  and  $\lambda$  come from (20). Let  $X = \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\bar{X}^\star = \mathbf{R}^{n^\star}$  and define the sets of admissible controllers  $\mathcal{C}_{sf}$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^\star$  by (11), (21). Suppose that there exist  $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n^\star}$ ,  $V^\star : \mathbf{R}^{n^\star} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^\star : S \rightarrow \mathbf{U}$  such that the following conditions hold:

- 1)  $\hat{B}_0^\star \subseteq S$ ;
- 2)  $\sup_{\hat{\xi}^\star \in S} V^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star) \leq \lambda$ ;
- 3) the following dynamic programming inequality (DPI) holds for all  $\hat{\xi}^\star \in S$ :

$$V^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star) \geq \max \left\{ G^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star), \inf_{u \in \mathbf{U}} \sup_{w \in \mathbf{W}} V^\star(\hat{f}^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star, u, w)) \right\}; \quad (58)$$

- 4) for all  $\hat{\xi}^\star \in S$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ G^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star), \sup_{w \in \mathbf{W}} V^\star(\hat{f}^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star, \mathbf{u}^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star), w)) \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ G^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star), \inf_{u \in \mathbf{U}} \sup_{w \in \mathbf{W}} V^\star(\hat{f}^\star(\hat{\xi}^\star, u, w)) \right\}; \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

<sup>2</sup> $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}^\star$  is the set of admissible state feedback controller (21) for system (18), (19),  $\mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$  is defined in (2),  $\hat{\xi}_k^\star$  is the solution of system (18), (19) with  $u_k = \bar{K}(\hat{\xi}_{[0,k]}^\star)$  and  $\hat{\xi}_0^\star = \hat{\xi}^\star$ .

5) the solution  $\hat{\xi}_k^*$  of

$$\hat{\xi}_{k+1}^* = \hat{f}^* \left( \hat{\xi}_k^*, \mathbf{u}^* \left( \hat{\xi}_k^* \right), w_k \right) \quad (60)$$

satisfy

$$\hat{\xi}_k^* \in S \quad (61)$$

for all  $\hat{\xi}_0^* \in S$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , and  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ .

Then, the following controller  $K^* \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  defined by:

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_{k+1}^* = f_\rho^* (\zeta_k^*) \\ \hat{\eta}_{k+1}^* = \hat{f}_\psi^* (\hat{\eta}_k^*, \hat{w}^*(x_k, u_k, x_{k+1})) \\ \theta_{k+1}^* = f_\varphi^* (\theta_k^*, x_k) \\ u_k = \mathbf{u}^* \left( \hat{\xi}_k^* \right) = \mathbf{u}^* (x_k, \zeta_k^*, \hat{\eta}_k^*, \theta_k^*) \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

with initialization  $\zeta_0^*$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0^*$ ,  $\theta_0^*$ , solves the SF $\star$  Problem for system (10). ■

*Proof:* By Conditions 3–5, we have that the pair  $(V^*, S)$  is a “good solution” of the DPI (58) in the sense of Definition 3.4 in [12]. Denote

$$\bar{K} \left( \hat{\xi}_{[0,k]}^* \right) := \mathbf{u}^* \left( \hat{\xi}_k^* \right)$$

then by Conditions 1 and 2 and [12, Th. 3.5],  $\bar{K}$  solves the SFULIB Problem for system (18), (19) with  $\hat{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (20). By Theorem 5.2, controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  defined by (62) with initialization  $\zeta_0^*$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0^*$ ,  $\theta_0^*$ , solves the SF $\star$  Problem for system (10). ■

*Remark 6.3:* The necessity and sufficiency results are considered separately to make clear the conditions under which the DPE (or DPI) has a solution, and the conditions under which a solution to the DPI can be used to construct a controller, respectively. The additional conditions in the sufficiency theorem relate to the optimal controller which is not part of the necessity results. ■

Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.2 can be regarded as 6 different results. For example, when  $\star = \text{ISS}$ , functions  $G$  and  $\hat{f}$  are given in (32) and (36), respectively. Also,  $\hat{B}_0$  and  $\lambda$  are given in (39). So we have the following corollary by Theorem 6.2.

*Corollary 6.4:* (ISS case, State Feedback, Sufficiency) Let  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$ ,  $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  be given. Let  $X = \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\bar{X} = \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$  and define the sets of admissible controllers  $\mathcal{C}_{sf}$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{sf}$  by (11), (40). Suppose that there exist  $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ ,  $V : \mathbf{R}^{n+2} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{u} : S \rightarrow \mathbf{U}$  such that the following conditions hold:

- 1)  $\left\{ \left( \begin{array}{c} x_0 \\ \alpha_2(|x_0|) \\ 0 \end{array} \right) : x_0 \in B_0 \right\} \subseteq S$ ;
- 2)  $\sup_{(x,\zeta,\hat{\eta}) \in S} V(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta}) \leq 0$ ;
- 3) the following DPI holds for all  $(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta}) \in S$ :

$$V(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta}) \geq \max \{ |x| - \alpha_1(\zeta) - \gamma_1(\hat{\eta}), \inf_{u \in \mathbf{U}} \sup_{w \in \mathbf{W}} V(f(x, u, w), e^{-1}\zeta, f_\eta(\hat{\eta}, x, u, w)) \} \quad (63)$$

where

$$f_\eta(\hat{\eta}, x, u, w) = \max \{ \hat{\eta}, \min_{\tilde{w} \in \mathbf{W}} \{ |\tilde{w}| : f(x, u, \tilde{w}) = f(x, u, w) \} \}. \quad (64)$$

4) for all  $(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta}) \in S$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ |x| - \alpha_1(\zeta) - \gamma_1(\hat{\eta}), \sup_{w \in \mathbf{W}} V(f(x, \mathbf{u}(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta}), w), \right. \\ & \quad \left. e^{-1}\zeta, f_\eta(\hat{\eta}, x, \mathbf{u}(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta}), w)) \right\} \\ & = x \{ |x| - \alpha_1(\zeta) - \gamma_1(\hat{\eta}), \\ & \quad \inf_{u \in \mathbf{U}} \sup_{w \in \mathbf{W}} V(f(x, u, w), e^{-1}\zeta, f_\eta(\hat{\eta}, x, u, w)) \} \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where  $f_\eta(\hat{\eta}, x, u, w)$  is given in (64).

5) the solution  $(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k)$  of

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} = f(x_k, \mathbf{u}(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k), w_k) \\ \zeta_{k+1} = e^{-1}\zeta_k \\ \hat{\eta}_{k+1} = \max \left\{ \hat{\eta}_k, \min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{ |w| : f(x_k, \mathbf{u}(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k), w) = x_{k+1} \} \right\} \end{cases} \quad (66)$$

satisfy

$$(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k) \in S \quad (67)$$

for all  $(x_0, \zeta_0, \hat{\eta}_0) \in S$ ,  $k \geq 0$  and  $w_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,k-1]}$ .

Then, the following controller  $K \in \mathcal{C}_{sf}$  defined by:

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_{k+1} = e^{-1}\zeta_k \\ \hat{\eta}_{k+1} = \max \left\{ \hat{\eta}_k, \min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{ |w| : f(x_k, u_k, w) = x_{k+1} \} \right\} \\ u_k = \mathbf{u}(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k) \end{cases} \quad (68)$$

with initialization  $\zeta_0 = \alpha_2(|x_0|)$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0 = 0$ , solves the SFISS Problem for system (10). ■

## B. Measurement Feedback Case

Let  $n^*$  be given. We use  $2^{\mathbf{R}^{n^*}}$  to denote the set of all subsets of  $\mathbf{R}^{n^*}$ . For given functions  $G^* : \mathbf{R}^{n^*} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,  $f_\rho^* : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,  $f_\psi^* : \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ,  $f_\varphi^* : \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , we define  $\hat{G}^* : 2^{\mathbf{R}^{n^*}} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  by

$$\hat{G}^*(X) := \sup_{\xi^* \in X} G^*(\xi^*) \quad \forall X \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n^*} \quad (69)$$

and  $F^* : 2^{\mathbf{R}^{n^*}} \times \mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^p \rightarrow 2^{\mathbf{R}^{n^*}}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} F^*(X, u, y) := & \{ (x, \zeta, \eta, \theta) : \exists w \in \mathbf{W}, \exists (x', \zeta', \eta', \theta') \in X, \\ & \text{such that } h(x', w) = y, f(x', u, w) = x \\ & f_\rho^*(\zeta') = \zeta, f_\psi^*(\eta', w) = \eta, f_\varphi^*(\theta', x') = \theta \}. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

The *set-valued observer* is defined as

$$X_{i+1} = F(X_i, u_i, y_i) \quad X_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n^*}. \quad (71)$$

*Remark 6.5:* The solution of set-valued observer are sets which are estimations of the states of system (45), (46). In fact, for  $X_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n^*}$ ,  $j \geq 1$ ,  $u_{[0,j-1]} \in \mathcal{U}_{[0,j-1]}$ ,  $y_{[0,j-1]} \in \mathcal{Y}_{[0,j-1]}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_j = \{ & (x, \zeta, \eta, \theta) : \exists (x_0, \zeta_0, \eta_0, \theta_0) \in X_0, \\ & \exists w_{[0,j-1]} \in \mathcal{W}_{[0,j-1]}, \text{ such that } x_j = x, \zeta_j = \zeta \\ & \eta_j = \eta, \theta_j = \theta, h(x_i, w_i) = y_i, 0 \leq i \leq j-1 \\ & \text{where } x_{i+1} = f(x_i, u_i, w_i), \zeta_{i+1} = f_\rho^*(\zeta_i) \\ & \eta_{i+1} = f_\psi^*(\eta_i, w_i), \theta_{i+1} = f_\varphi^*(\theta_i, x_i), 0 \leq i \leq j-1 \}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Using [12, Ths. 5.4, 4.17, 4.19], we can obtain the dynamic programming results for the MF $\star$  Problem.

*Theorem 6.6:* (Necessity) Let  $\mathbf{Y} = \text{range}\{h\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^p$  and  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  be given and define the set of admissible controller  $\mathcal{C}_{mf}$  as in (14). Let  $\star \in \{\text{ISS, iISS, iLiSS, IOS, IOSS, } \delta\text{ISS}\}$ ,  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  be given and define  $n^*$ ,  $G^*$ ,  $f_\rho^*$ ,  $f_\psi^*$ ,  $f_\varphi^*$ ,  $\zeta_0^*$ ,  $\theta_0^*$  and  $\eta_0^*$  as generated by Tables I, II, IV, and V. Let  $\tilde{f}^*$  come from (46), let  $\tilde{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  come from (47). Let  $\hat{G}^*$  come from (69) and  $F^*$  come from (70). If the MF $\star$  Problem is solvable for (13), then the value function  $W_a^* : 2^{\mathbf{R}^{n^*}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{R}}$  defined by<sup>3</sup>

$$W_a^*(X) := \inf_{K \in \mathcal{C}_{mf}} \sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{y_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{Y}_{[0,k-1]}} \left\{ \hat{G}^*(X_k) : X_0 = X, u_k = K(y_{[0,k-1]}) \right\} \quad (73)$$

satisfies

- 1)  $\tilde{B}_0^* \in \text{dom } W_a^* := \{X \in 2^{\mathbf{R}^{n^*}} : -\infty < W_a^*(X) < +\infty\}$ ;
- 2)  $W_a^*(\tilde{B}_0^*) \leq \lambda$ ;
- 3) the following dynamic programming equation (DPE) holds for all  $X \in \text{dom } W_a^*$ :

$$W_a^*(X) = \max \left\{ \hat{G}^*(X), \inf_{u \in \mathbf{U}} \sup_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} W_a^*(F^*(X, u, y)) \right\}. \quad (74)$$

*Proof:* Suppose there exists a  $K_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{mf}$  solving the MF $\star$  Problem for system (13). Then, from Theorem 5.4,  $K_0$  solving the MFULIB Problem for system (45), (46) with  $\tilde{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (47). The item 2) in Theorem 6.6 holds by the definition of  $W_a^*$

$$\begin{aligned} W_a^*(\tilde{B}_0^*) & \leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{y_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{Y}_{[0,k-1]}} \left\{ \hat{G}^*(X_k) : X_0 = \tilde{B}_0^*, \right. \\ & \quad \left. u_k = K_0(y_{[0,k-1]}) \right\} \\ & \leq \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

By [12, Th. 4.17], the items 1) and 3) in Theorem 6.6 hold.  $\blacksquare$

<sup>3</sup> $\mathcal{C}_{mf}$  is the set of admissible measurement feedback controller (14) for system (45), (46),  $\mathcal{Y}_{[0,k-1]}$  is defined similarly as in (2),  $X_k$  is the solution of (71) with  $u_k = K(y_{[0,k-1]})$ , and  $X_0 = X$ .

*Theorem 6.7:* (Sufficiency) Let  $\mathbf{Y} = \text{range}\{h\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^p$  and  $B_0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^s$ ,  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^m$  be given and define the set of admissible controller  $\mathcal{C}_{mf}$  as in (14). Let  $\star \in \{\text{ISS, iISS, iLiSS, IOS, IOSS, } \delta\text{ISS}\}$ ,  $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  be given and define  $n^*$ ,  $G^*$ ,  $f_\rho^*$ ,  $f_\psi^*$ ,  $f_\varphi^*$ ,  $\zeta_0^*$ ,  $\theta_0^*$  and  $\eta_0^*$  as generated by Tables I, II, IV, and V. Let  $\tilde{f}^*$  come from (46), let  $\tilde{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  come from (47). Let  $\hat{G}^*$  come from (69) and  $F^*$  come from (70). Suppose there exist  $\hat{S} \subseteq 2^{\mathbf{R}^{n^*}}$ ,  $W^* : 2^{\mathbf{R}^{n^*}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{R}}$ ,  $\mathbf{u}^* : \hat{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{U}$ , and  $X_0 \in \hat{S}$  such that the following conditions hold:

- 1)  $\tilde{B}_0^* \subseteq X_0$ ;
- 2)  $W^*(X_0) \leq \lambda$ ;
- 3) the following DPI holds for all  $X \in \hat{S}$ :

$$W^*(X) \geq \max \left\{ \hat{G}^*(X), \inf_{u \in \mathbf{U}} \sup_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} W^*(F^*(X, u, y)) \right\}; \quad (75)$$

- 4) for all  $X \in \hat{S}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ \hat{G}^*(X), \sup_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} W^*(F^*(X, \mathbf{u}^*(X), y)) \right\} \\ & = \max \left\{ \hat{G}^*(X), \inf_{u \in \mathbf{U}} \sup_{y \in \mathbf{Y}} W^*(F^*(X, u, y)) \right\}; \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

- 5) the solution of

$$X_{k+1} = F(X_k, \mathbf{u}^*(X_k), y_k) \quad (77)$$

with initial condition  $X_0 \in \hat{S}$  satisfies

$$X_k \in \hat{S} \quad (78)$$

for all  $k \geq 0$  and  $y_{[0,k-1]} \in \mathcal{Y}_{[0,k-1]}$ .

Then, the controller defined by

$$u_k = \mathbf{u}^*(X_k) \quad (79)$$

solves the MF $\star$  Problem for system (13).  $\blacksquare$

*Proof:* By Conditions 3–5 we have that the pair  $(W^*, \hat{S})$  is a “good solution” of the DPI (75) in the sense of [12, Def. 4.18]. By Conditions 1 and 2 and [12, Th. 4.19], controller  $K$  defined by (79) solves the MFULIB Problem for system (45), (46) with  $\tilde{B}_0^*$  and  $\lambda$  defined in (47). By Theorem 5.4, the same  $K$  solves the MF $\star$  Problem for system (13).  $\blacksquare$

Similarly, both Theorem 6.6 and Theorem 6.7 can be regarded as 6 different results. For example, when  $\star = \text{ISS}$ , we can obtain the corresponding corollaries for the ISS case. The details are omitted here due to space limitations.

## VII. EXAMPLE

Consider one-dimensional system

$$x_{k+1} = x_k^3 + x_k^2 u_k + \sin(x_k) \cos(u_k) + \frac{2 + \sin(x_k)}{1 + u_k^2} w_k. \quad (80)$$

We consider the SFISS problem with

$$\alpha_1(s) = \alpha_2(s) = \gamma_1(s) = s. \quad (81)$$

We use Corollary 6.4 to find a solution to the problem. For this example, we set

$$\begin{aligned} B_0 &= [-1, 1] \quad \mathbf{U} = [-1, 1] \quad \mathbf{W} = [-1, 1] \\ S &= [-1, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$




Fig. 2. Value function  $V(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta})$  and State feedback controller  $\mathbf{u}(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta})$  when  $\hat{\eta} = 0.5$ . (a)  $V(x, \zeta, 0.5)$ . (b)  $\mathbf{u}(x, \zeta, 0.5)$ .




Fig. 3. Trajectory of the closed-loop system. (a) Disturbance input trajectory ( $\|w_{[0,20]}\|_{\infty} \leq 0.2$ ). (b) State trajectory  $x_k$  ( $x_0 = 0.8$ ).

The Approximating Markov Chain method [15] is applied to solve the DPE obtained by changing the “ $\geq$ ” into “ $=$ ” in the DPI (63). Notice that for this example, the function  $f_{\eta}(\hat{\eta}, x, u, w)$  in (64) is simply

$$f_{\eta}(\hat{\eta}, x, u, w) = \max\{\hat{\eta}, |w|\}. \quad (83)$$

Using the discretized space  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}, S$  with grids of 40, we obtain an approximation for the value function  $V(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta})$  and the optimal controller  $\mathbf{u}(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta})$ . For example,  $V(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta})$  and  $\mathbf{u}(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta})$  for  $\hat{\eta} = 0.5$  are illustrated in Fig. 2.

A simulation of the state  $x_k$  in the closed-loop system is illustrated in Fig. 3 (we choose  $x_0 = 0.8$  and a random disturbance sequence  $w_{[0,20]}$  satisfying  $\|w_{[0,20]}\|_{\infty} \leq 0.2$ ), which demonstrates consistency with the ISS inequality

$$\|x_k\| \leq \|x_0\|e^{-k} + \|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_{\infty}. \quad (84)$$

### VIII. REMARKS CONCERNING DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING AND ROBUSTNESS

A feature of the dynamic programming approach we employ for controller synthesis is that controller states are not explicitly taken into account in the problem specification. In partic-

ular, the generalized ISS-like inequality (12) does not include controller states. This is because no state space realization for the controller is given *a priori*. A controller is considered in input–output terms, and is simply required to be a causal function of the measurement information. However, the dynamic programming method provides a state space realization for the optimal controller, together with requirements for the initialization of the optimal controller. It is natural to ask whether or not the closed-loop system consisting of the plant and optimal controller is robust. We answer this question in the affirmative in Section VIII-A with a simple perturbation calculation which quantifies how the ISS-like inequality is affected. In addition, we show in Section VIII-B how the dynamic programming method can be adapted to achieve an ISS-like inequality for the optimal closed-loop that includes the controller states. We make some remarks concerning computational complexity in Section VIII-C.

#### A. Robustness to the Initialization Error of the Controller

We now show that our design is actually robust to the small disturbances in the controller initialization. We illustrate this for the state feedback ISS case. The other cases can be dealt with similarly.

Suppose the conditions in Corollary 6.4 hold. With the dynamic state feedback controller (68), the overall closed-loop system is given by

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k, w_k) \\ \zeta_{k+1} = e^{-1}\zeta_k \\ \hat{\eta}_{k+1} = \max \left\{ \hat{\eta}_k, \min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{|w| : f(x_k, u_k, w) = x_{k+1}\} \right\} \\ u_k = \mathbf{u}^*(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k) \end{cases} \quad (85)$$

where  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $\zeta_0 = \alpha_2(|x_0|)$ ,  $\hat{\eta}_0 = 0$  and  $x_k \in \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $k \geq 0$  are available.

Suppose there are disturbances on the initial state of the controller, the true initial states of the controller is given by

$$\zeta_0 = \alpha_2(|x_0|) + \delta\zeta \quad \hat{\eta}_0 = 0 + \delta\eta. \quad (86)$$

Since

$$0 \leq \min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{|w| : f(x_k, u_k, w) = x_{k+1}\} \leq |w_k| \quad (87)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\eta}_k| &\leq \max \{|\delta\eta|, |w_0|, \dots, |w_{k-1}|\} \\ &= \max \{|\delta\eta|, \|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty\} \\ |\zeta_k| &= e^{-k}|\zeta_0| \leq (\alpha_2(|x_0|) + |\delta\zeta|)e^{-k}. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Suppose  $(x_0, \zeta_0, \hat{\eta}_0) \in S$ , then by Condition 5 in Corollary 6.4,  $(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k) \in S$ ,  $\forall k \geq 0$ , from Conditions 2 and 3 in Corollary 6.4

$$|x_k| - \alpha_1(\zeta_k) - \gamma_1(\hat{\eta}_k) \leq V(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k) \leq 0.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x_k| &\leq \alpha_1(\zeta_k) + \gamma_1(\hat{\eta}_k) \\ &\leq \alpha_1((\alpha_2(|x_0|) + |\delta\zeta|)e^{-k}) \\ &\quad + \gamma_1(\max \{|\delta\eta|, \|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty\}). \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

Inequalities (88) and (89) show that when  $|\delta\zeta|, |\delta\eta|$  are small, the changes on the upper bounds of  $|\hat{\eta}_k|, |\zeta_k|, |x_k|$  are also small. Thus our design possesses robustness with respect to controller initialization error in this sense.

#### B. Closed-Loop ISS-Like Property That Includes Controller States

In this subsection, we provide a technique that can be used to achieve the ISS-like property for the closed-loop system that explicitly involves the controller states. We illustrate this for the state feedback ISS case. The other cases can be dealt with similarly. The idea is that we design our controller in such a way that the plant state achieves a stronger property similar to the ISS dynamical stability property [9]. We are then able to prove that the closed-loop system is actually ISS in the usual sense.

For the state feedback ISS case, we change the dynamics of  $\zeta$  and  $\hat{\eta}$  in (38) and consider the system

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k, w_k), & k \geq 0 \\ \zeta_1 = e^{-1}(|\zeta_0| + \alpha_2(|x_0|)) \\ \zeta_{k+1} = e^{-1}\zeta_k, & k \geq 1 \\ \hat{\eta}_{k+1} = \max \left\{ a|\hat{\eta}_k|, \min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{|w| : f(x_k, u_k, w) = x_{k+1}\} \right\} \\ k \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (90)$$

where  $0 < a < 1$  and the initial conditions are  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $\zeta_0, \hat{\eta}_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ . If we require

$$G(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k) = |x_k| - \alpha_1(\zeta_k) - \gamma_1(\hat{\eta}_k) \leq 0, \quad k \geq 1 \quad (91)$$

for arbitrary  $x_0 \in B_0$ ,  $\zeta_0, \hat{\eta}_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ , then we can achieve closed-loop ISS property.

To see this, by (87) and (90) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}_k &\leq \max \{a^k|\hat{\eta}_0|, \|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty\} \\ &\leq a^k|\hat{\eta}_0| + \|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty, \quad k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Since we also have

$$\zeta_k \leq e^{-k}(|\zeta_0| + \alpha_2(|x_0|)), \quad k \geq 0 \quad (93)$$

by (91), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |x_k| &\leq \alpha_1(e^{-k}(|\zeta_0| + \alpha_2(|x_0|))) + \gamma_1(a^k|\hat{\eta}_0|) \\ &\quad + \gamma_1(\|w_{[0,k-1]}\|_\infty), \quad k \geq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Together with (92) and (93), we can get the closed-loop ISS inequality ( $a^k \rightarrow 0$  because  $0 < a < 1$ ).

The requirement (91) can be achieved by the following two steps. We choose the first control

$$u_0 = \mathbf{u}(x_0, \alpha_2(|x_0|), 0) \quad (95)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta})$  is obtained by Corollary 6.4. The consequent controls are chosen as

$$u_k = \mathbf{u}^1(x_k, \zeta_k, \hat{\eta}_k), \quad k \geq 1 \quad (96)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}^1(x, \zeta, \hat{\eta})$  can be obtained by solving the SFULIB problem for the auxiliary system

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k, w_k) \\ \zeta_{k+1} = e^{-1}\zeta_k \\ \hat{\eta}_{k+1} = \max \left\{ a|\hat{\eta}_k|, \min_{w \in \mathbf{W}} \{|w| : f(x_k, u_k, w) = x_{k+1}\} \right\} \\ z_k = |x_k| - \alpha_1(\zeta_k) - \gamma_1(\hat{\eta}_k) \end{cases}$$

with

$$\hat{B}_0^1 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ \zeta_0 \\ \hat{\eta}_0 \end{pmatrix} : |x_0| - \alpha_1(\zeta_0) - \gamma_1(\hat{\eta}_0) \leq 0 \right\}, \quad \lambda = 0.$$

Control (95) guarantees that (91) holds for  $k = 1$  while controls (96) guarantee that (91) holds for all  $k \geq 2$ .

Though the closed-loop ISS property can be achieved, it is hard to obtain a clear result on what the achieved transient bound and asymptotic gain [in the ISS property (92), (93), (94)] are as a function of the gains used in the controllers. It is even harder to present the results on SF\* Problem in a unified manner. Consequently, in view of this and the calculations of Section VIII-A, we did not present the all results in this paper in this way.

### C. Computational Complexity

The controller design methods proposed in this paper are expressed in terms of dynamic programming equations (or inequalities). If a given dynamic programming equation (or inequality) has a solution (satisfying some mild technical conditions), then the corresponding synthesis problem is solvable. It is well known that explicit solutions for dynamic programming equations are not generally available and approximate or numerical methods are often required. In the measurement feedback case, numerical methods can only be used when the set-valued observer is finite dimensional. Otherwise, approximate solutions have to be used. One possible way to find approximate solutions for dynamic programming equations (or inequalities) is using the idea of relaxed dynamic programming [17].

In the unified synthesis approach we provided in this paper, additional dimensions for the dynamic programming problem are introduced in order to achieve the desired decay rate and asymptotic gain. This further increases the computation burden. However, the computational complexity is due to the nature of the generality of the problem. For particular problems and applications, it may be possible to reduce the dimension of the problem by introducing dynamics for the value function, like the Lyapunov function for the ISS dynamical stability introduced by Grune [9].

## IX. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we first provided a unified definition of different ISS-like properties, then we considered the quantitative synthesis of ISS-like properties involving plant states where the disturbance gain and the transient bound are prescribed. The synthesis problems are shown to be equivalent to an auxiliary synthesis problem of  $l^\infty$  bounded robustness considered in [12]. Both the state feedback synthesis and measurement feedback synthesis problems are solved using dynamic programming techniques. Further research work may consider, for example, the synthesis problem of achieving optimal/suboptimal gains, continuous time, further development of dynamic programming applied to ISS-like objectives, and the reduction of the computational complexity.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Angeli, "A Lyapunov approach to incremental stability properties," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 410–421, Mar. 2002.
- [2] D. Angeli, E. D. Sontag, and Y. Wang, "A characterization of integral input-to-state stability," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 1082–1097, Jun. 2000.
- [3] A. Isidori and A. Astolfi, "Disturbance attenuation and  $H_\infty$ -control via measurement feedback," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 37, no. 9, pp. 1283–1293, Sep. 1992.
- [4] T. Basar and P. Bernhard,  *$H^\infty$ -Optimal Control and Related Minimax Design Problems: A Dynamic Game Approach*, 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser, 1995.

- [5] M. A. Dahleh and I. J. Diaz-Bobillo, *Control of Uncertain Systems: A Linear Programming Approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1995.
- [6] N. Elia and M. A. Dahleh, "Minimization of the worst case peak-to-peak gain via dynamic programming: State feedback case," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 687–701, Apr. 2000.
- [7] I. J. Fialho and T. T. Georgiou, "Worst case analysis of nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 1180–1196, Jun. 1999.
- [8] M. Green and D. Limebeer, *Linear Robust Control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1995.
- [9] L. Grune, "Input-to-state dynamical stability and its Lyapunov function characterization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 1499–1504, Sep. 2002.
- [10] L. Grune, E. D. Sontag, and F. R. Wirth, "Asymptotic stability equals exponential stability, and ISS equals finite energy gain—if you twist your eyes," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 38, pp. 127–134, 1999.
- [11] J. W. Helton and M. R. James, "Extending  $H^\infty$  control to nonlinear systems: control of systems to achieve performance objectives," in *Advances in Design and Control*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 1999.
- [12] S. Huang and M. R. James, " $l^\infty$ -bounded robustness for nonlinear systems: analysis and synthesis," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 1875–1891, Nov. 2003.
- [13] Z. P. Jiang, A. R. Teel, and L. Praly, "Small-gain theorem for ISS systems and applications," *Math. Control, Signals, Syst.*, vol. 7, pp. 95–120, 1994.
- [14] Z. P. Jiang and Y. Wang, "Input-to-state stability for discrete-time nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 37, pp. 857–869, 2001.
- [15] H. J. Kushner and P. Dupuis, *Numerical Methods for Stochastic Control Problems in Continuous Time*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [16] M. Krichman, E. D. Sontag, and Y. Wang, "Input-output-to-state stability," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1874–1928, 2001.
- [17] B. Lincoln and A. Rantzer, "Suboptimal dynamic programming with error bounds," in *Proc. 41st Conf. Decision and Control*, vol. 2, Dec. 2002, pp. 2354–2359.
- [18] D. Liberzon, E. D. Sontag, and Y. Wang, "Universal construction of feedback laws achieving ISS and integral-ISS disturbance attenuation," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 46, pp. 111–127, 2002.
- [19] E. D. Sontag, "Smooth stabilization implies coprime factorization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 435–443, Apr. 1989.
- [20] —, "Comments on integral variants of ISS," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 34, pp. 93–100, 1998.
- [21] —, "The ISS philosophy as a unifying framework for stability-like behavior," in *Nonlinear Control in the Year 2000 (Volume 2) (Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences)*, A. Isidori, F. Lamnabhi-Lagarrigue, and W. Respondek, Eds. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 2000, pp. 443–468.
- [22] J. S. Shamma and K.-Y. Tu, "Set-valued observers and optimal disturbance rejection," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 253–264, Feb. 1999.
- [23] E. D. Sontag and Y. Wang, "On characterizations of input to state stability property," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 24, pp. 351–359, 1995.
- [24] —, "New characterizations of input to state stability property," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 41, no. 9, pp. 1283–1294, Sep. 1996.
- [25] —, "Notions of input to output stability," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 38, pp. 235–248, 1999.
- [26] A. J. van der Schaft,  *$L_2$ -Gain and Passivity Techniques in Nonlinear Control*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [27] J. C. Willems, "Dissipative dynamical systems—Part I: General theory," *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, vol. 45, pp. 321–351, 1972.



**Shoudong Huang** (M'04) was born on December 8, 1969. He received the B.S. and M.S. degrees in mathematics and the Ph.D. degree in automatic control from Northeastern University, China, in 1987, 1990, and 1998, respectively.

He joined the Department of Mathematics, Northeastern University, in 1990, and was promoted to Associate Professor in 1998. From November 1998 to January 2001, he worked as a Research Associate and a Postdoctoral Research Fellow in the Department of Mechanical Engineering, The University of Hong Kong. From September 2001 to December 2003, he worked as a Research Fellow in the Department of Engineering, The Australian National University. Currently, he works as a Research Fellow at the ARC Centre of Excellence for Autonomous Systems, Faculty of Engineering, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia. His research interests include nonlinear control systems and mobile robots exploration and navigation.



**Matthew R. James** (S'86–M'88–SM'01–F'02) was born in Sydney, Australia, on February 27, 1960. He received the B.Sc. degree in mathematics and the B.E. (Hon. I) in electrical engineering from the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, in 1981 and 1983, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in applied mathematics from the University of Maryland, College Park, in 1988.

From 1978 to 1984, he was employed by the Electricity Commission of New South Wales (now Pacific Power), Sydney, Australia. From 1985 to 1988, he held a Fellowship with the Systems Research Center (now Institute for Systems Research), the University of Maryland. In 1988–1989, he was Visiting Assistant Professor with the Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, RI, and from 1989 to 1991, he was Assistant Professor with the Department of Mathematics, University of Kentucky, Lexington. From 1991 to 1995, he was Research Fellow and Fellow with the Department of Systems Engineering, Research School of Information Science and Engineering, Australian National University, Canberra. In 1995, he joined the Department of Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, Australian National University, Canberra, where he served as Head during 2001 and 2002. His research interests include nonlinear, quantum, and stochastic control systems. He coauthored a book (with J.W. Helton) entitled *Extending  $H_\infty$  Control to Nonlinear Systems: Control of Nonlinear Systems to Achieve Performance Objectives* (Philadelphia, PA: SIAM 1999).

Dr. James is a Fellow of IEAust. Since January 2004, he has held an ARC Professorial Fellowship.



**Dragan Nešić** (M'00–SM'02) received the B.E. degree from The University of Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in 1990, and the Ph.D. degree from Systems Engineering, RSISE, Australian National University, Canberra, in 1997.

He is currently an Associate Professor and Reader in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering (DEEE), The University of Melbourne, Australia. In the period of 1997–1999, he held postdoctoral positions at DEEE, The University of Melbourne, Australia; CESAME, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain la Neuve, Belgium; and ECE, University of California, Santa Barbara. Since February 1999, he has been with The University of Melbourne. His research interests include networked control systems, discrete-time, sampled-data and continuous-time nonlinear control systems, input-to-state stability, extremum seeking control, applications of symbolic computation in control theory, etc.

Dr. Nestic was awarded a Humboldt Research Fellowship funded by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Germany, in 2003. Currently, he is an Australian Professorial Fellow (2004–2009), which is a research position funded by the Australian Research Council. Dr. Nestic is a Fellow of IEAust. He is an Associate Editor for the journals *Automatica*, the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON AUTOMATIC CONTROL, and *Systems and Control Letters*.



**Peter M. Dower** (M'95) received the B.E. degree from the University of Newcastle, Australia, in 1993, and the Ph.D. degree in engineering from the Australian National University, Canberra, in 1998.

After completing a one year postdoctoral fellowship with the Department of Mathematics at the University of California, San Diego, he was employed with the Department of Electronic Engineering at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia. In June 2003, he joined the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering at the University of Melbourne. His research interests include nonlinear systems theory and controller design, numerical methods, and control applications in photonic systems.