

V can be chosen independent \rightarrow

2.6. INVARIANCE THEOREMS

For autonomous systems, if
for some Lyapunov function $V(x)$
we have

$$\dot{V}(x) \leq -W(x) \leq 0$$

it is known from LaSalle's
invariance theorem that the trajectory
of the system approaches the
largest invariant set in $E \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n :
W(x) = 0\}$.

(52)

LASALLE'S THEOREM

Let Ω be a compact set with the property that every solution of $\dot{x} = f(x)$ which starts in Ω remains in Ω for all future time in Ω . Let $v: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable function such that $\dot{v}(x) \leq 0$ in Ω . Let $E \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \dot{v}(x) = 0\}$ and M the largest invariant set in E . Then every solution starting in Ω approaches M as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

EX.

$$\dot{x}_1 = x_2$$

$$\dot{x}_2 = -k_1 \sin(x_1) - k_2 x_2$$

with $k_1, k_2 > 0$.

Consider the Lyapunov function

$$V(x) = \int_0^{x_1} \sin(s) ds + \frac{1}{2} x_2^2$$

$$\text{which } = k_1(1 - \cos(x_1)) + \frac{1}{2} x_2^2$$

which is positive definite on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -\pi < x_1 < \pi\}$

We have

$$\dot{V}(x) = -kx_2^2 \leq 0$$

$$\text{But } E = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \dot{V}(x) = 0 \right\}$$

$$= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_2 = 0 \right\}$$

Then by Lasalle's theorem,
 $x(t, x_0)$ approaches the largest invariant set $E \subset M$: this invariant set is necessarily $x = 0$ \Rightarrow
 $x(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$

For nonautonomous systems

$$\dot{x} = f(t, x)$$

it is not even clear how to define the set E . However, if

$$\dot{V}(t, x) \leq -W(x) \leq 0$$

$$\text{then } E = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : W(x) = 0 \right\}.$$

We expect that $x(t, x_0)$ approaches E .

(54)

We give first the
so called BARBALAT's LEMMA.

Let $\phi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a uniformly continuous function on $[0, \infty)$.

Suppose that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \phi(z) dz$ exists and it is finite. Then

$$\phi(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

Short proof. Assume this is false.

There exists a $k_1 > 0$ such that $\forall T > 0$ we find $T_1 \geq T$ with $|\phi(T_1)| \geq k_1$. Since $\phi(t)$ is uniformly continuous there is k_2 such that

$$|\phi(t+\tau) - \phi(t)| < \frac{k_1}{2}$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \tau \leq k_2$. Hence

$$|\phi(t)| = |\phi(t) - \phi(T_1) + \phi(T_1)| \geq |\phi(T_1)| - |\phi(t) - \phi(T_1)| > k_1 - \frac{1}{2}k_1 = \frac{1}{2}k_1$$

$$\forall t \in [T_1, T_1 + k_2].$$

(55)

Therefore

$$T_1 + k_2$$

$$\left| \int_{T_1}^{T_1 + k_2} \phi(t) dt \right| = \int_{T_1}^{T_1 + k_2} |\phi(t)| dt \\ > \frac{1}{2} k_1 k_2$$

since $\phi(t)$ has the same sign for $T_1 \leq t \leq T_1 + k_2$

Thus $\int^t \phi(x) dx$ cannot converge to a finite limit as $t \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow$ contradiction!

Theorem 2.6.1. Let $D_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|x\| < 2\}$

and suppose $f(t, x)$ is locally Lipschitz in x , uniformly on t , on $[0, \infty) \times D_2$.

Let $V: [0, \infty) \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable function such that

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V(t, x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|)$$

(56)

and

$$\dot{V}(t, x) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} f(t, x) \leq -W(x) \leq 0$$

$\forall t \geq 0, \forall x \in D_2$, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ defined on $[0, 2]$ and $W(x)$ is continuous on D_2 . Then all solutions of $\dot{x} = f(t, x)$ with $\|x_0\| < \alpha_2^{-1}(\alpha_1(2))$ are bounded and satisfy

$$W(x(t)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

Proof For any $\|x_0\| < \alpha_2^{-1}(\alpha_1(2))$ we can choose $p < 2$ such that $\|x_0\| < \alpha_2^{-1}(\alpha_1(p))$. As in the proof of theorem 2.3

$$\|x(t_0)\| < \alpha_2^{-1}(\alpha_1(p)) \Rightarrow$$

$$\|x_0\| \quad x(t) \in R_{t_0, p} \quad \forall t \geq t_0$$

since $\dot{V}(t, x) \leq -W(x) \leq 0$. Hence

$$\|x(t)\| \leq p \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

57

Since $V(t, x(t))$ is monotonically nonincreasing and bounded from below by zero, it converges as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Now

$$\int_{t_0}^t w(x(z)) dz \leq - \int_{t_0}^t \dot{V}(t, x(z)) dz \\ = V(t_0, x(t_0)) - V(t, x(t)) \leq V(t_0, x(t_0))$$

therefore $\int_{t_0}^t w(x(z)) dz$ exists and it is finite. Since $\|x(t)\| < \rho$ and $t \geq t_0$ and $f(t, x)$ is locally Lipschitz in x , uniformly in t , we conclude that $x(t)$ is uniformly continuous in t on $[t_0, \infty)$. (Indeed, $\dot{x}(t)$ is bounded on $[t_0, \infty)$). Hence by Barbalat's lemma

$$w(x(t)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

If all assumptions of theorem 2.6.1 hold globally and $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ then the statement of the theorem is true for $\forall x(t_0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ◀

The limit $W(x(t)) \rightarrow 0$ implies that $x(t)$ approaches

$$E = \{x \in D \mid W(x) = 0\}$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$. In general, E is not an invariant set and $x(t)$ approaches a set contained in E which is not invariant. Only for autonomous systems $x(t)$ approaches an invariant set contained in E . As a generalisation of LaSalle's theorem we have for nonautonomous system the following result.

Theorem 2.6.2 Let $x=0$ be an equilibrium point for $\dot{x}=f(t, x)$. and $D_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|x\| < 2\}$. Let $V: [0, \infty) \times D_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable function such that

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V(t, x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|)$$

$$\dot{V}(t, x) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} f(t, x) \leq 0$$

$$\int_t^{t+\delta} \dot{V}(z, \psi(z, t, x)) dz \leq -\lambda V(t, x)$$

$$\text{for } 0 < \lambda < 1$$

$$\forall t \geq 0, \forall x \in D_2,$$

for some $\delta > 0$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ defined on $[0, \delta]$ and $\psi(z, t, x)$ is the solution of the system that starts from x at time t .

Then $x=0$ is UAS. If all the assumptions hold globally and $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$, then $x=0$ is GUAS.

$$\alpha_i(z) = k_i z^c, k_i > 0, c > 0, i=1,2$$

then $x=0$ is GES



Proof. As in previous results, we can prove

60

$$\|x(t_0)\| \leq \alpha_2^{-1}(\alpha_1(\rho)) \Rightarrow x(t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t_0, \rho} \quad \forall t \geq t_0$$

where $\rho < r$ (since $\dot{V}(t, x) \leq 0$). For $t \geq t_0$

$$V(t + \delta, x(t + \delta)) = V(t, x(t))$$

$$+ \int_t^{t+\delta} \dot{V}(\tau, \psi(\tau, t, x(t))) d\tau \quad (1)$$

$$\leq V(t, x(t)) - \lambda V(t, x(t)) = (1-\lambda) V(t, x(t))$$

Since $\dot{V}(t, x) \leq 0$

$$(2) \quad V(\tau, x(\tau)) \leq V(t, x(t)) \quad \forall \tau \in [t, t + \delta].$$

For any $t \geq t_0$, let N be the smallest positive integer such that $t \leq t_0 + N\delta$. Divide the interval $[t_0, t_0 + (N-1)\delta]$ into $(N-1)$ equal subintervals of length δ each. Hence

(61)

from ②

$$v(t, x(t)) \stackrel{\downarrow}{\leq} v(t_0 + (N-1)\delta, x(t_0 + (N-1)\delta))$$

$$\leq (1-\lambda) v(t_0 + (N-2)\delta, x(t_0 + (N-2)\delta))$$

↑
from ①

↓ :

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq (1-\lambda)^{N-1} v(t_0, x(t_0)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\lambda} (1-\lambda)^{(t-t_0)/\delta} v(t_0, x(t_0)) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\lambda} e^{-b(t-t_0)} v(t_0, x(t_0)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } b \triangleq \frac{1}{\delta} \ln \frac{1}{1-\lambda}$$

$$\text{If } \sigma(r, s) = \frac{r}{1-\lambda} e^{-bs} \Rightarrow$$

$$v(t, x(t)) \leq \sigma(v(t_0, x(t_0)), t-t_0)$$

$$\forall v(t_0, x(t_0)) \in [0, \alpha_1(\rho)]$$

from which we get $\|x(t)\| \leq \beta(\|x(t_0)\|, t-t_0)$

for any $x(t_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{t_0, \rho}$,

(62)

where

$$\beta(z, s) = \alpha_1^{-1}(\alpha(\alpha_2(z), s)) \quad *$$

Example

$$\dot{x} = A(t)x$$

with continuous $A(t)$, $t \geq 0$.

Suppose there is a continuously differentiable symmetric $P(t)$
satisfying

$$0 \leq gI \leq P(t) \leq g_2 I \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

as well as

$$-\dot{P}(t) = P(t)A(t) + A^T(t)P(t) \\ + C^T(t)C(t)$$

with continuous $C(t)$. If

$$V(t, x) = x^T P(t) x$$

we have

$$\dot{V}(t, x) = -x^T C^T(t) C(t) x \leq 0$$

The solution of $\dot{x} = A(t)x$ is

$$\psi(z, t, x) = \phi(z, t)x$$

(63)

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_t^{t+\delta} \dot{V}(\tau, \psi(\tau, t, x)) d\tau = \\
 & -x^T \int_t^{t+\delta} \Psi^T(\tau, t) C^T(\tau) C(\tau) \Psi(\tau, t) d\tau \cdot x \\
 & = -x^T W(t, t+\delta) x
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$W(t, t+\delta) = \int_t^{t+\delta} \Phi^T(\tau, t) C^T(\tau) C(\tau) \Phi(\tau, t) d\tau$$

If for some $k < c_2$:

$$W(t, t+\delta) \geq kI, \quad \forall t \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_t^{t+\delta} \dot{V}(\tau, \psi(\tau, t, x)) d\tau \leq -k \|x\|^2 \\
 & \leq -\frac{k}{c_2} V(t, x)
 \end{aligned}$$

All assumptions of the theorem 2.6.2
theorem are satisfied with

$$x_i(\tau) = c_i \tau^2, \quad i=1, 2, \quad \lambda = \frac{k}{c_2} < 1$$

(64)

and we conclude that $x=0$ is GES.

The matrix $W(t, t+\delta)$ is the observability gramian of the pair $(A(t), C(t))$. Condition ③ comes from the uniform complete observability assumption on $(A(t), C(t))$:

UNIFORM COMPLETE OBSERVABILITY

$$\text{of } \begin{cases} \dot{x} = A(t)x \\ y = C(t)x \end{cases}$$

(UCO)

There exist strictly positive t_1, t_2 and $\delta > 0$ such that $\forall t_0 \geq 0$

$$t_1 I \leq W(t_0, t_0 + \delta) \leq t_2 I \quad | \quad ④$$

The observability is uniform since it holds uniformly on t_0 and complete since it holds $\forall x(t_0)$

65

If the system is observable
on $[t_0, t_0 + \delta]$, i.e. ④ is satisfied
on $[t_0, t_0 + \delta]$, then $x(t_0)$
can be reconstructed from $y(\cdot)$

$$x(t_0) = W(t_0, t_0 + \delta) \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \delta} \Phi^T(\tau, t_0) C^T(\tau) y(\tau) d\tau$$

INVARIANCE OF UCO UNDER OUTPUT INJECTION
UCO of $\begin{cases} \dot{x} = A(t)x \\ y = C(t)x \end{cases}$

is preserved under output injection:

$$\text{i.e. } \begin{cases} \dot{x} = (A(t) + k(t)C(t))x \\ y = C(t)x \end{cases}$$

is UCO if $\forall \delta > 0$ there exists $k > 0$

such that $\forall t_0 \geq 0$

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \delta} \|k(\tau)\|^2 d\tau \leq k.$$

66

In particular, if

$$\beta_1 I \leq W(t_0, t_0 + \delta) \leq \beta_2 I$$

then

$$\beta'_1 I \leq W_k(t_0, t_0 + \delta) \leq \beta'_2 I$$

where W_k is the observability gramian of $(A(t) + k(t)C(t), C(t))$

and

$$\beta'_1 \triangleq \frac{\beta_1}{(1 + \sqrt{k\beta_2})^2}$$

$$\beta'_2 \triangleq \beta_2 e^{k\beta_2}$$