



Brief Paper

Dwell-time computation for stability of switched systems with time delays

Sina Yamaç Çalışkan¹, Hitay Özbay², Silviu-Iulian Niculescu³

¹Department of Electrical Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1594, USA

²Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Bilkent University, 06800 Bilkent, Ankara, Turkey

³LSS-SUPELEC, 3, Rue Joliot-Curie 91192, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

E-mail: hitay@bilkent.edu.tr

Abstract: The aim of this study is to find an improved dwell time that guarantees the stability of switched systems with heterogeneous constant time-delays. Piecewise Lyapunov–Krasovkii functionals are used for each candidate system to investigate the stability of the switched time-delayed system. Under the assumption that each candidate system is stable for small delay values, a sufficient condition for dwell-time that guarantees the asymptotic stability is derived. Numerical examples are given to compare the results with the previously obtained dwell-time bounds.

1 Introduction

A stability condition is derived in this paper for switched time-delayed systems. The general form of a switched system can be expressed as

$$\dot{x}(t) = f_{q(t)}(x(t)) \quad t \geq t_0 \quad (1)$$

where $q(t) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is the ‘switching signal’, $\mathcal{F} := \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$ for some positive integer ℓ , $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state and $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a differentiable function for every $i \in \mathcal{F}$. For notational convenience, we say that each f_i represents the dynamical behaviour of a candidate system. There are several works on this topic where the candidate systems are considered as linear [1], linear parameter varying [2], non-linear [3] or both non-linear and uncertain [4]. See the survey [5] for a review of recent results and further references.

The analysis of the switched systems differs from the analysis of the time-varying systems. For the switched systems, analysis is performed for a set of switching signal, whereas for the time-varying systems, analysis is performed for a specific switching signal [6]. Many control problems involving complex systems such as non-linear systems, uncertain systems and parameter-varying systems, can be cast within the framework of switched systems, [2, 6–10]. The main challenge in a switched control system is the stability analysis. Note that by a judicious switching between two or more unstable candidate systems the overall system can be made stable, [11]. Conversely, it is also possible to obtain an unstable response by a particular switching between two stable candidate plants. We refer to [7, 12] for a general review of the switched systems.

There is a vast literature about the stability of delay-free switched systems. In [9], necessary and sufficient conditions for the quadratic stability is obtained using Filippov solutions to discontinuous differential equations and Lyapunov functionals. ‘Dwell time’ [8], is the minimum value of the time intervals between consecutive time instances in which switching occurs. It is shown that a sufficiently large dwell time can guarantee the stability of the system provided that the candidate plants are stable [13]. ‘Average dwell time’ as an alternative to the dwell time is introduced in [1]. Using the average dwell-time concept, [14] develops sufficient conditions for exponential stability and weighted L_2 gain for the switched systems; see also [15, 16]. LaSalle’s invariance principle is covered in the framework of the switched systems in [6]. In [17], results of [1] is applied to linear parameter-varying systems. In [18, 19], Lie algebra is used for finding quadratic CLFs. These CLFs are used in the stability analysis of switched linear and non-linear systems [18]. Existence of the CLF for the switched system implies stability of the switched system. Reverse is shown to be true for both linear [20] and non-linear [21] switched systems. Stability of the switched non-linear systems are covered in [3]. State-feedback control design is explained for continuous uncertain switched systems in [22]. The switched filter design, for dynamic output stabilisation of continuous switched systems using Lyapunov–Metzler inequalities, is covered in [23].

In contrast to the variety in the works on delay-free switched systems, there are relatively few works on time-delayed switched systems [24–29]. Switched systems with time delays on detecting the switching signal are covered in [30]. In the present work, time-delayed linear switched

systems are considered to be in the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = A_{q(t)}x(t) + \bar{A}_{q(t)}x(t - \tau(t)_{q(t)}), \quad t \geq t_0 \quad (2)$$

In (2), the system switches between infinite-dimensional systems. Owing to general difficulty of infinite-dimensional systems, stability analysis of the switched time-delayed systems are relatively more difficult [31]. Time-delayed systems are widely encountered in chemical processes, aerodynamics and communication networks [32–34]. Time delays in these systems are usually uncertain and time varying [35–37]. Robust H_∞ controllers can be designed for time-delayed systems, which guarantees the robustness within uncertainty bounds [33]. The large collection of conditions for stability analysis of time-delayed linear systems can be grouped into two categories: delay-dependent conditions and delay-independent conditions [38]. Lyapunov–Razumikhin and Lyapunov–Krasovskii methods are two main approaches in obtaining delay-dependent and delay-independent stability conditions for the time-delayed linear systems [38–42]. There are various sufficient conditions in terms of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) and Riccati-type inequalities for the stability of time-delayed systems [32, 36, 38, 41, 43, 44]. Many of these sufficient conditions are shown to be equivalent [38, 45]. For the switched time-delayed systems, the stability analysis and controller design issues are also discussed in some recent studies [24–26, 28, 46–50]. Additionally, see [51–54] for the discrete-time versions the related problems associated with switched systems. In particular, the stability conditions of [24, 51] are trajectory-dependent. In this paper, trajectory-independent stability is aimed. For the finite-dimensional linear systems, asymptotic stability of the system implies the exponential stability while for the infinite-dimensional systems, this is not the case [31, 55]. The papers [1, 6, 8, 20, 54] deal with finite-dimensional systems. In [28], piecewise Lyapunov–Razumikhin functions are used to find a dwell time for the stability. The approach we are proposing allows reducing the conservatism in [28] by using piecewise Lyapunov–Krasovskii functionals.

The remaining sections of the paper are organised as follows. The problem definition and preliminary remarks are presented in Section 2. The main result is given in Section 3, where a dwell time is derived for guaranteeing stability. Two examples are presented in Section 4. Concluding remarks are made in Section 5. A brief version of this paper (results given without the proofs) has been presented at the IFAC World Congress 2011 [56].

2 Problem definition

We use \mathbb{R}^+ , \mathbb{R}_0^+ and \mathbb{Z}_0^+ to denote the set of positive real numbers, non-negative real numbers and non-negative integers, respectively. The set of all continuous and bounded functions with domain $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}_0^+$ and range \mathbb{R}^n is denoted by $C([a, b], \mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $\|\cdot\|$ be the Euclidean norm of a vector in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $\|f\|_{|t-\tau, t|}$ be the ∞ norm of $f \in C[a, b]$, defined as

$$\|f\|_{|t-\tau, t|} := \sup_{t-\tau \leq \theta \leq t} \|f(\theta)\|$$

With the notations above, consider the following switched time-delayed system

$$\Sigma_i = \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = A_{q(t)}x(t) + \bar{A}_{q(t)}x(t - \tau_{q(t)}), & t \geq 0 \\ x_0(\theta) = \phi(\theta), & \forall \theta \in [-\tau_{\max}, 0] \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $q(t) : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ the piecewise switching and $\mathcal{F} := \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$. In other words, for all $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$, we have $q(t) = k_j \in \mathcal{F}$, where $j \in \mathbb{Z}_0^+$ is the j th switching time instant and $t_j \in \mathbb{R}^+$. From these definitions, it follows that the trajectory of Σ_i in an arbitrary switching interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$ obeys

$$\Sigma_{k_j} = \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = A_{k_j}x(t) + \bar{A}_{k_j}x(t - \tau_{k_j}), & t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}) \\ x_{t_j}(\theta) = \phi_j(\theta), & \forall \theta \in [-\tau_{k_j}, 0] \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where the initial condition $\phi_j(\theta)$ is defined as

$$\phi_j(\theta) = \begin{cases} x(t_j + \theta), & -\tau_{k_j} \leq \theta < 0 \\ \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} x(t_j + h), & \theta = 0 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Let the triplet $\Sigma_i = (A_i, \bar{A}_i, \tau_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^+$ be the i th candidate system of (3). For every time instant t , $\Sigma_i \in \mathcal{A} = \{\Sigma_i : i \in \mathcal{F}\}$, where \mathcal{A} is the set of all candidate systems. In equation (3), $\tau_{\max} = \max_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \tau_i$ is the maximal time delay of the candidate systems in \mathcal{A} .

The switched time-delayed system Σ_i is stable [6] if there exists a strictly increasing continuous function $\bar{\alpha} : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+$ with $\bar{\alpha}(0) = 0$, such that

$$\|x(t)\| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\|x\|_{|t_0-\tau_{\max}, t_0}), \quad \forall t \geq t_0 \geq 0 \quad (6)$$

along the trajectory of (3). The system is asymptotically stable if Σ_i is stable and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = 0$.

Lemma 2.1 (see [39]): A given candidate system Σ_i can be transformed into the following system denoted by Υ_i

$$\dot{y}(t) = (A_i + \bar{A}_i)y(t) - \int_{-2\tau_i}^{-\tau_i} \bar{A}_i^2 y(t + \theta) d\theta - \int_{-\tau_i}^0 \bar{A}_i A_i y(t + \theta) d\theta \quad (7)$$

with the initial condition

$$\psi_i(\theta) = \begin{cases} \phi(\theta) & -\tau_i \leq \theta < 0 \\ \phi(-\tau_i) & -2\tau_i \leq \theta < -\tau_i \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Note that asymptotic stability of the system Υ_i implies asymptotic stability of the system Σ_i .

Lemma 2.2 (see [39]): Suppose for a given triplet $\Sigma_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $i \in \mathcal{F}$, there exist real symmetric matrices $P_i > 0$, S_{1i} and S_{2i} that solves the LMI

$$\begin{bmatrix} M & -\tau_i P_i \bar{A}_i A_i & -\tau_i P_i \bar{A}_i^2 \\ -\tau_i A_i^T \bar{A}_i^T P_i & -\tau_i S_{1i} & 0 \\ -\tau_i (\bar{A}_i^2)^T P_i & 0 & -\tau_i S_{2i} \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (9)$$

where

$$M = P_i(A_i + \bar{A}_i) + (A_i + \bar{A}_i)^T P_i + \tau_i S_{1i} + \tau_i S_{2i} \quad (10)$$

then Υ_i is asymptotically stable. This guarantees the asymptotic stability of Σ_i for all delays in the interval $[0, \tau_i]$.

It is easy to check that (9) implies $S_{1i} > 0$, $S_{2i} > 0$ and $A_i + \bar{A}_i$ is Hurwitz stable. If all candidate systems of (3), $\Sigma_i \in \mathcal{A}$ are asymptotically stable satisfying (9), then the set

\mathcal{A} is denoted as $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. It is assumed that $\mathcal{A} = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ for the rest of the discussion. In this paper, sufficient condition that guarantees the asymptotic stability of the switched system (3) will be constructed using piecewise Lyapunov–Krasovskii functionals. One method in the stability analysis of switched systems is to find common Lyapunov function (CLF). In [57], CLFs are found for switched time-delay systems assuming that each candidate system has the same time delay τ , each candidate is assumed to be delay-independently stable, A matrix is symmetric and \tilde{A} matrix is in the form δI . Even without these assumptions, method of finding CLFs are very conservative due to the fact that it is usually difficult to find a CLF for all the candidate systems, especially for time-delay systems whose stability criteria are only sufficient in most cases. A recent work found asymptotic stability conditions using piecewise Lyapunov–Razumikhin functions [28]. In our work, by using piecewise Lyapunov–Krasovskii functionals, we will try to reduce the conservatism in [28].

Although there are less conservative conditions than (9) for the stability of time-delayed linear systems (see e.g. [38, 41]), for the purpose of this paper the condition (9) is more useful. Typically, less conservative results are obtained by additional terms in the Krasovskii functional. However, this complicates the analysis in finding an bound such as (20) obtained below. For example, inclusion of the derivative of the state in the Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional as in [41], makes it difficult to bound the Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional by a function that depends ‘only’ on the state. The inequalities (20) and (24) that are obtained from the particular Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional chosen here play crucial roles in our analysis.

3 Main results

For a given $\tau_D > 0$, the switching signal set based on the dwell time τ_D is denoted as $S[\tau_D]$ where for any switching signal $q(t) \in S[\tau_D]$, the distance between any consecutive discontinuities of $q(t)$, that is, $t_{j+1} - t_j$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_0^+$, is greater than τ_D [1, 8, 28]. Dwell-time-based switching is independent of the trajectory of the solutions [6]. Before presenting the main result of the paper, we need to recall some lemmas and prove some propositions, which will be useful in the proof of our main result.

Lemma 3.1 (see [39]): Suppose $u, v, w : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+$ are continuous, non-decreasing functions, $u(0) = v(0) = 0$, $w(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$. If there exists a continuous functional V , such that

$$u(|x(t)|) \leq V(t, x_t) \leq v(|x|_{[t-\tau, t]}), \quad \forall t \geq t_0 \quad (11)$$

$$\dot{V}(t, x_t) \leq -w(|x(t)|), \quad \forall t \geq t_0 \quad (12)$$

then the solution $x = 0$ of the switched time-delay system (3) is uniformly asymptotically stable.

For functions defined in Lemma 3.1, we say that (V, u, v, w) is a stability quadruple for the switched time-delay system (3). Construct the following piecewise Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional for the transformed system Υ_i of the candidate system

$$V_i(t, x_t) = x^T(t)P_i x(t) + \int_{-\tau_i}^t \int_{t+\theta}^t x^T(\xi)S_{1i}x(\xi) d\xi d\theta + \int_{-2\tau_i}^{-\tau_i} \int_{t+\theta}^t x^T(\xi)S_{2i}x(\xi) d\xi d\theta \quad (13)$$

where $P_i > 0$, $S_{1i} > 0$ and $S_{2i} > 0$ are real symmetric matrices and $\theta \in [-2\tau, 0]$. This functional can be bounded by

$$u_i(|x(t)|) \leq V_i(t, x_t) \leq v_i(|x|_{[t-2\tau_i, t]}), \quad \forall t \geq t_0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

where

$$u_i(s) = \sigma_{\min}[P_i]s^2 \quad (14)$$

and

$$v_i(s) = \left(\sigma_{\max}[P_i] + \frac{\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{1i}] + \frac{3\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{2i}] \right) s^2 \quad (15)$$

Here $\sigma_{\min}[\cdot]$ and $\sigma_{\max}[\cdot]$ denote the minimum and maximum singular values, respectively.

Proposition 3.2: For each time-delay system Υ_i with Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional (13), assume that (11) and (12) are satisfied for some $w_i(s)$ with u and v defined as in (14) and (15) respectively, then we have the following result

$$|x|_{[t_m - \tau_i, t_m]} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\max}[P_i] + \frac{\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{1i}] + \frac{3\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{2i}]}{\sigma_{\min}[P_i]}} |x|_{[t_n - 2\tau_i, t_n]}, \quad \forall t_m \geq t_n + \tau_i \quad (16)$$

Proof: Υ_i is stable and V_i is an admissible functional satisfying (11), $V_i(t_m, x_t) \leq V_i(t_n, x_t)$ for all $t_m \geq t_n$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(|x(t_m)|) &\leq V_i(t_m, x_t) \leq V_i(t_n, x_t) \leq v_i(|x|_{[t_n - 2\tau_i, t_n]}) \\ \sigma_{\min}[P_i] |x(t_m)| &\leq u_i(|x(t_m)|) \leq v_i(|x|_{[t_n - 2\tau_i, t_n]}) \\ &\leq \left(\sigma_{\max}[P_i] + \frac{\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{1i}] + \frac{3\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{2i}] \right) \\ &\quad |x|_{[t_n - 2\tau_i, t_n]} \end{aligned}$$

Since $P_i > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} |x(t_m)| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\max}[P_i] + \frac{\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{1i}] + \frac{3\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{2i}]}{\sigma_{\min}[P_i]}} |x|_{[t_n - 2\tau_i, t_n]}, \quad \forall t_m \geq t_n \\ |x(t_m - \tau_i)| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\max}[P_i] + \frac{\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{1i}] + \frac{3\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{2i}]}{\sigma_{\min}[P_i]}} |x|_{[t_n - 2\tau_i, t_n]} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

for all $t_m \geq t_n + \tau_i$. Since $t_m > t_n + \tau_i$ is arbitrary, this equation is also valid for all $t \in [t_m - \tau_i, t_m]$. \square

Assume that Lemma 3.1 is satisfied for system (3) and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u(s) \rightarrow \infty$. Then if $|\phi|_{[t_0 - \tau, t_0]} \leq \delta_1$ and $\delta_1 > 0$, Lemma 3.1. implies that there exists $\delta_2 > \delta_1 > 0$, such that $u(\delta_2) = v(\delta_1)$ and $|x(t)| < \delta_2$ for all $t > t_0$. For such a δ_2 , consider the following:

Proposition 3.3: For system (3) satisfying Lemma 3.1 with $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u(s) \rightarrow \infty$, for an arbitrary η , $0 < \eta < \delta_2$, $|\phi|_{[t_0 - \tau, t_0]} \leq \delta_1 < \delta_2$ implies

$$|x(t)| \leq \eta, \quad \forall t > t_0 + T(\eta) \quad (18)$$

where $T(\eta) = [v(\delta_1)]/\gamma$, v is defined as in the Lemma 3.1 and $\gamma = \inf_{\eta \leq s \leq \delta_2} w(s)$

Proof: Let $T_* > 0$ and let $\|x(t_1)\| > \eta$ for a time instant $t_1 > t_0 + T_*$. Let $\gamma = \inf_{\eta \leq s \leq \delta_2} w(s)$. Since the system is stable and V is a Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional, from Lemma 3.1, we have the following

$$\dot{V}(t, x_t) \leq -w(\|x(t)\|) < -\gamma \quad \forall t \geq t_0$$

This implies $V(t, x_t) \leq V(t_0, \phi) - (t - t_0)\gamma \leq v(\delta_1) - (t - t_0)\gamma$. Let $T_* > [v(\delta_1)]/\gamma$. Then for every $t > t_0 + T_*$, we have $V(t, x_t) \leq 0$. However, we assume that there is a time instant $t_1 > t_0 + T_*$ such that $\|x(t_1)\| > \eta$. This implies that

$$V(t, x_t) \geq u(\|x(t_1)\|) \geq u(\eta) > 0$$

This is a contradiction. Therefore time instant t_1 cannot exist and this implies

$$\|x(t)\| \leq \eta \quad \forall t > t_0 + \frac{v(\delta_1)}{\gamma}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Assumption 3.4: For every transformed candidate system Υ_i defined in Lemma 2.1, the corresponding candidate system Σ_i satisfies the stability condition of Lemma 2.2, that is, $A = \tilde{A}$.

Consider an arbitrary switching interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$ of the switching signal $q(t) \in S[\tau_D]$ with $\tau_D > \tau_{\max}$ where $q(t) = k_j$, $k_j \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$ and $t_j \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup 0$ is the j th switching time instant. The state variable $x_j(t)$ obeys (4) in this interval. Define $x_j(t_{j+1}) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} x(t_{j+1+h}) = x_{j+1}(t_{j+1})$ based on the fact that $x(t)$ is continuous for $t \geq 0$. With this definition $x_j(t)$ is defined on the compact set $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$. The initial condition of Σ_{k_j} is $\phi_j(t) = x(t) = x_{j-1}(t)$ where $t \in [t_j - \tau_{k_j}, t_j]$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Initial condition of the transformed system Υ_i is $\phi_i(t)$ as defined before. Let the Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional be

$$V_{k_j}(t, x_t) = x_j^T(t)P_{k_j}x_j(t) + \int_{-\tau_{k_j}}^0 \int_{t+\theta}^t x_j^T(\xi)S_{1k_j}x_j(\xi) d\xi d\theta + \int_{-2\tau_{k_j}}^{-\tau_{k_j}} \int_{t+\theta}^t x_j^T(\xi)S_{2k_j}x_j(\xi) d\xi d\theta \quad (19)$$

Then for every $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]$, we have

$$\kappa_{k_j} \|x_j(t)\|^2 \leq V_{k_j}(t, x_t) \leq \left(\bar{\kappa}_{k_j} + \frac{\tau_{k_j}^2}{2} \bar{\chi}_{1k_j} + \frac{3\tau_{k_j}^2}{2} \bar{\chi}_{2k_j} \right) \|x_j\|_{[t-2\tau_{k_j}, t]} \quad (20)$$

where $\kappa_i = \sigma_{\min}[P_i]$, $\bar{\kappa}_i = \sigma_{\max}[P_i]$, $\chi_{1i} = \sigma_{\max}[S_{1i}]$ and $\chi_{2i} = \sigma_{\max}[S_{2i}]$.

Proposition 3.5: Let

$$W_{k_j} = -(P_{k_j}(A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j}) + (A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j})^T P_{k_j}) - \tau_{k_j}(R_{1k_j} + R_{2k_j}) \quad (21)$$

where $R_{1k_j} = R_{1k_j}^T$ is the solution of the LMI

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_{1k_j} - R_{1k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}P_{k_j}\bar{A}_{k_j}A_{k_j} \\ -\tau_{k_j}A_{k_j}^T\bar{A}_{k_j}^T P_{k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}S_{1i} \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (22)$$

and $R_{2k_j} = R_{2k_j}^T$ is the solution of the LMI

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_{2k_j} - R_{2k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}P_{k_j}\bar{A}_{k_j}^2 \\ -\tau_{k_j}(\bar{A}_{k_j}^T)^2 P_{k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}S_{2i} \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (23)$$

then the upper bound on the derivative of the Lyapunov Krasovskii functional (19) can be set as

$$\dot{V}_{k_j}(t, x_t) \leq -x_j^T(t)W_{k_j}x_j(t) \quad (24)$$

Proof: Take the derivative of the Lyapunov Krasovskii functional with respect to time along the trajectory.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{k_j}(t, x_t) &= x_j^T(t)D_{1k_j}x_j^T(t) \\ &+ \int_{-\tau_{k_j}}^0 [x_j^T(t) \quad x_j^T(t+\theta)] D_{2k_j} \begin{bmatrix} x_j(t) \\ x_j(t+\theta) \end{bmatrix} d\theta \\ &+ \int_{-2\tau_{k_j}}^{-\tau_{k_j}} [x_j^T(t) \quad x_j^T(t+\theta)] D_{3k_j} \begin{bmatrix} x_j(t) \\ x_j(t+\theta) \end{bmatrix} d\theta \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{1k_j} &= P_{k_j}(A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j}) + (A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j})^T P_{k_j} \\ D_{2k_j} &= \begin{pmatrix} S_{1k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}P_{k_j}\bar{A}_{k_j}A_{k_j} \\ -\tau_{k_j}A_{k_j}^T\bar{A}_{k_j}^T P_{k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}S_{1i} \end{pmatrix} \\ D_{3k_j} &= \begin{pmatrix} S_{2k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}P_{k_j}\bar{A}_{k_j}^2 \\ -\tau_{k_j}(\bar{A}_{k_j}^T)^2 P_{k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}S_{2i} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Add and subtract the term

$$\int_{-\tau_{k_j}}^0 x_j^T(t)R_{1k_j}x_j(t) d\theta + \int_{-2\tau_{k_j}}^{-\tau_{k_j}} x_j^T(t)R_{2k_j}x_j(t) d\theta$$

to the right-hand side of equation (25) where R_{1k_j} and R_{2k_j} are the solutions of the LMIs (22) and (23), respectively. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{k_j}(t, x_t) &= x_j^T(t)\tilde{D}_{1k_j}x_j^T(t) \\ &+ \int_{-\tau_{k_j}}^0 [x_j^T(t) \quad x_j^T(t+\theta)] \tilde{D}_{2k_j} \begin{bmatrix} x_j(t) \\ x_j(t+\theta) \end{bmatrix} d\theta \\ &+ \int_{-2\tau_{k_j}}^{-\tau_{k_j}} [x_j^T(t) \quad x_j^T(t+\theta)] \tilde{D}_{3k_j} \begin{bmatrix} x_j(t) \\ x_j(t+\theta) \end{bmatrix} d\theta \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}_{1k_j} &= P_{k_j}(A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j}) + (A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j})^T P_{k_j} + \tau_{k_j}(R_{1k_j} + R_{2k_j}) \\ \tilde{D}_{2k_j} &= \begin{pmatrix} S_{1k_j} - R_{1k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}P_{k_j}\bar{A}_{k_j}A_{k_j} \\ -\tau_{k_j}A_{k_j}^T\bar{A}_{k_j}^T P_{k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}S_{1i} \end{pmatrix} \\ \tilde{D}_{3k_j} &= \begin{pmatrix} S_{2k_j} - R_{2k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}P_{k_j}\bar{A}_{k_j}^2 \\ -\tau_{k_j}(\bar{A}_{k_j}^T)^2 P_{k_j} & -\tau_{k_j}S_{2i} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Since \tilde{D}_{2k_j} and \tilde{D}_{3k_j} are negative definite

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{k_j}(t, x_t) &= x_j^T(t)\tilde{D}_{1k_j}x_j^T(t) \\ &+ \int_{-\tau_{k_j}}^0 [x_j^T(t) \quad x_j^T(t+\theta)] \tilde{D}_{2k_j} \begin{bmatrix} x_j(t) \\ x_j(t+\theta) \end{bmatrix} d\theta \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \int_{-2\tau_{k_j}}^{-\tau_{k_j}} [x_j^T(t) \quad x_j^T(t + \theta)] \tilde{D}_{3k_j} \begin{bmatrix} x_j(t) \\ x_j(t + \theta) \end{bmatrix} d\theta \\
 & \leq x_j^T(t) \tilde{D}_{1k_j} x_j^T(t) = -x_j^T(t) W_{k_j} x_j(t) \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

The best choice of W_{k_j} is obtained from the following optimisation problem. Maximise I over all $I \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and symmetric matrices $P_{k_j}, R_{1k_j}, R_{2k_j}, S_{1k_j}, S_{2k_j}$ subject to LMIs (22) and (23) and additional constraints

$$\begin{bmatrix} M & -\tau_{k_j} P_{k_j} \bar{A}_{k_j} A_{k_j} & -\tau_{k_j} P_{k_j} \bar{A}_{k_j}^2 \\ -\tau_{k_j} A_{k_j}^T \bar{A}_{k_j}^T P_{k_j} & -\tau_{k_j} S_{1k_j} & 0 \\ -\tau_{k_j} (\bar{A}_{k_j}^T)^2 P_{k_j} & 0 & -\tau_{k_j} S_{2k_j} \end{bmatrix} < 0$$

$$P_{k_j} (A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j}) + (A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j})^T P_{k_j} + \tau_{k_j} (R_{1k_j} + R_{2k_j}) + I \leq 0$$

where \mathbb{R}^+ is the set of positive real numbers, I is the identity matrix of appropriate dimension and $M = P_{k_j} (A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j}) + (A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j})^T P_{k_j} + \tau_{k_j} S_{1k_j} + \tau_{k_j} S_{2k_j}$. The matrices $P_{k_j}, R_{1k_j}, R_{2k_j}, S_{1k_j}$ and S_{2k_j} are obtained from the solution of this optimisation problem. From these matrices, we can determine $\sigma_{\min}[P_i], \sigma_{\max}[P_i], \sigma_{\max}[S_{1i}], \sigma_{\max}[S_{2i}]$ and

$$W_{k_j}^* = -P_{k_j} (A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j}) - (A_{k_j} + \bar{A}_{k_j})^T P_{k_j} - \tau_{k_j} (R_{1k_j} + R_{2k_j})$$

Select $w(s)$ in Lemma 3.1 as $w(s) = \varpi_{k_j} s^2$ where $\varpi_{k_j} = \sigma_{\min}[W_{k_j}^*] > 0$ is the minimum eigenvalue of the $W_{k_j}^*$. With this selection, (12) is satisfied.

Assume $|\phi_j(t)|_{[t_j - \tau_j, t_j]} \leq \delta_j$. For an arbitrary α with $0 < \alpha < 1$, let $\eta = \alpha \delta_j$ in Proposition 3.3. With this selection of η and $\delta_j = \delta_1$, we have $0 < \eta = \alpha \delta_j < \delta_1 < \delta_2$. Using the Proposition 3.3, we have

$$\|x_j(t)\| \leq \alpha \delta_j \quad \forall t \geq t_j + T_j \quad (27)$$

where

$$T_j = \frac{v(\delta_j)}{\gamma} = \frac{\left(\bar{\kappa}_j + \frac{\tau_j^2}{2} \bar{\chi}_{1j} + \frac{3\tau_j^2}{2} \bar{\chi}_{2j}\right)}{\alpha^2 \varpi_j} \quad (28)$$

Equation (27) implies

$$|x|_{[t_j + T_j, t_{j+1}]} \leq \alpha \delta_j \quad (29)$$

Let

$$\lambda = \max_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{\sigma_{\max}[P_i] + \frac{\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{1i}] + \frac{3\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{2i}]}{\sigma_{\min}[P_i]}$$

$$\mu = \max_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{\bar{\kappa}_i}{\varpi_i}, \quad \rho_1 = \max_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{\tau_{\max}^2 \bar{\chi}_{1i}}{2\varpi_i}, \quad \rho_2 = \max_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{3\tau_{\max}^2 \bar{\chi}_{2i}}{2\varpi_i} \quad (30)$$

Define

$$T^* = \frac{\mu + \rho_1 + \rho_2}{\alpha^2}$$

Note that

$$T^* > T_j = \frac{v(\delta_j)}{\gamma} = \frac{\left(\bar{\kappa}_j + \frac{\tau_j^2}{2} \bar{\chi}_{1j} + \frac{3\tau_j^2}{2} \bar{\chi}_{2j}\right)}{\alpha^2 \varpi_j}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Let the dwell time to be $\tau_D = T^* + 2\tau_{\max}$. Recall that $t_{j+1} - t_j > \tau_D$. Thus $t_{j+1} - t_j > T^* + 2\tau_{\max} > T^* + 2\tau_{j+1} >$

$T_j + 2\tau_{j+1}$. Also note that $|\psi_{j+1}(t)| = |x_j(t)|$ where $t \in [t_{j+1} - 2\tau_{j+1}, t_{j+1}]$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\psi_{j+1}|_{[t_{j+1} - 2\tau_{j+1}, t_{j+1}]} & = |x_j|_{[t_{j+1} - 2\tau_{j+1}, t_{j+1}]} \leq |x_j|_{[t_j + T_j, t_{j+1}]} \leq \alpha \delta_j \\
 & := \delta_{j+1} \quad (31)
 \end{aligned}$$

and δ_0 is defined as $\delta_0 := |\psi|_{[-2\tau_{\max}, 0]} = |\phi|_{[-\tau_{\max}, 0]} \geq |\phi|_{[-\tau_{k_0}, 0]}$. Therefore we obtain a convergent sequence δ_i where $\delta_i = \alpha^i \delta_0$ with $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

Proposition 3.2 implies

$$|x|_{[t, t + \tau_i]} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\max}[P_i] + \frac{\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{1i}] + \frac{3\tau_i^2}{2} \sigma_{\max}[S_{2i}]}{\sigma_{\min}[P_i]}} |x|_{[t_n - 2\tau_i, t_n]}, \quad \forall t \geq t_j$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sup_{t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]} \|x_j(t)\| & \leq \sup_{t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]} |x_j(t)|_{[t, t + \tau_{k_j}]} \leq \sqrt{\lambda} |x_j|_{[t_j - 2\tau_{k_j}, t_j]} \\
 & \leq \sqrt{\lambda} \delta_j = \alpha^j \sqrt{\lambda} \delta_0 \quad (32)
 \end{aligned}$$

which implies the asymptotic stability of the transformed switched time-delay system Υ_i with the switching signal $q(t) \in S[\tau_D]$. Asymptotic stability of the transformed switched time-delay system implies the asymptotic stability of the switched time-delay system Σ_i . Thus, we can state our final result as follows.

Theorem 3.6: Under Assumption 3.4, the system Σ_i , defined in (3), is asymptotically stable for any switching rule $q(t) \in S[\tau_D]$, where $\tau_D = T^* + 2\tau_{\max}$ with

$$T^* = \frac{\mu + \rho_1 + \rho_2}{\alpha^2} \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in (0, 1)$$

and μ, ρ_1, ρ_2 are as defined in (30); here α determines the decay rate as shown in (32).

4 Numerical examples

In this section, several illustrative examples are used to demonstrate the results in Section 3 and compare the main result of this paper with [28, 29].

Example 4.1: The system given below is taken from [28] for comparison purposes. Let Σ_1 be

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.9 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{A}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ -0.5 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tau_1 = 0.3 \text{ s} \quad (33)$$

Let Σ_2 be

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0.5 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{A}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0.1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tau_2 = 0.6 \text{ s} \quad (34)$$

In the paper [28], dwell time for this system is found to be $\tau_D = 6.52$ s. Using Theorem 3.6, a dwell time is found as $\tau_D = 1.2 + [2.15/\alpha^2]$ seconds for a fixed α . Note that the system is stable for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. For $\alpha > 0.48$ our dwell-time result is smaller than 6.52 s. Let us take $\alpha = 0.99$. This implies $\tau_D = 3.4$ s. Hence, the bound obtained in [28] can be improved.

Example 4.2: Consider the numerical example in [29]. In this example, two candidate systems are stabilised by a state feedback. The stabilised individual systems have the following A, \bar{A} matrices and time delays

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1.799 & -0.814 \\ 0.2 & -0.714 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{A}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ -0.45 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\tau_1 = 0.155 \text{ s} \quad (35)$$

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1.853 & -0.093 \\ -0.853 & -1.1593 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{A}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0.05 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\tau_2 = 0.2 \text{ s} \quad (36)$$

In [29], a dwell time for the stabilised uncertain switched system is obtained as $\tau_D = 0.83$ s. For the same closed loop system with no uncertainty, our method obtains the dwell time for the switched system as $\tau_D = 0.4 + [0.31/\alpha^2]$ s. Let us take $\alpha = 0.99$. This implies $\tau_D = 0.72$ s.

5 Concluding remarks

We performed the stability analysis for the switched system by using some appropriate model transformations of the candidate systems. Piecewise Lyapunov–Krasovkii functionals are used for the derivation of a dwell time. Thus, the earlier results obtained by using piecewise Lyapunov–Razumikhin functions in [28, 29] are now improved and simplified. Two illustrative examples are given for comparisons with the previous results.

6 Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the French–Turkish PIA Bosphorus (TUBITAK grant no. 109E127 and EGIDE Project No. 22974WJ), and by DPT-HAMIT project.

7 References

- Hespanha, J., Morse, A.S.: ‘Stability of switched systems with average dwell time’. Proc. 38th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control, Phoenix, USA, 1999, vol. 3, pp. 2655–2660
- Bett, C.J., Lemmon, M.D.: ‘Bounded amplitude performance of switched LPV systems with applications to hybrid systems’, *Automatica*, 1999, **35**, (3), pp. 491–503
- Colaneri, P., Geromel, J.C., Astolfi, A.: ‘Stabilization of continuous-time switched nonlinear systems’, *Syst. Control Lett.*, 2008, **57**, (1), pp. 95–103
- Orlov, Y.: ‘Finite time stability and robust control synthesis of uncertain switched systems’, *SIAM J. Control Optim. Archive*, 2004, **43**, (4), pp. 1253–1271
- Lin, H., Antsaklis, P.J.: ‘Stability and stabilizability of switched linear systems: a survey of recent results’, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2009, **54**, (2), pp. 308–322
- Hespanha, J.: ‘Uniform stability of switched linear systems: extensions of LaSalle’s Invariance principle’, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2004, **49**, (4), pp. 470–482
- Hespanha, J., Liberzon, D., Morse, S.: ‘Overcoming the limitations of adaptive control by means of logic-based switching’, *Syst. Control Lett.*, 2003, **49**, (1), pp. 49–65
- Morse, A.S.: ‘Supervisory control of families of linear set-point controllers Part I. Exact matching’, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 1996, **41**, (10), pp. 1413–1431
- Skafidas, E., Evans, R.J., Savkin, A.V., Petersen, I.R.: ‘Stability results for switched controller systems’, *Automatica*, 1999, **35**, (4), pp. 553–564
- Yue, D., Han, Q.-L.: ‘Delay-dependent exponential stability of stochastic systems with time-varying delay, nonlinearity, and Markovian switching’, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2005, **50**, (2), pp. 217–222
- Koutsoukos, X.D., Antsaklis, P.J.: ‘Design of stabilizing switching control laws for discrete- and continuous-time linear systems using piecewise-linear Lyapunov functions’, *Int. J. Control*, 2002, **75**, (12), pp. 932–945
- Sun, Z., Ge, S.S.: ‘Analysis and synthesis of switched linear control systems’, *Automatica*, 2005, **41**, (2), pp. 181–195
- Hespanha, J., Morse, A.S.: ‘Switching between stabilizing controllers’, *Automatica*, 2002, **38**, (11), pp. 1905–1917
- Sun, X.-M., Zhao, J., Hill, D.J.: ‘Stability and L2-gain analysis for switched delay systems: a delay-dependent method’, *Automatica*, 2006, **42**, (10), pp. 1769–1774
- Zhai, G., Hu, B., Yasuda, K., Michel, A.N.: ‘Stability analysis of switched systems with stable and unstable subsystems: an average dwell time approach’. Proc. 2000 Am. Control Conf., 2000 **1**, (6), pp. 200–204
- Zhang, L., Ga, H.: ‘Asynchronously switched control of switched linear systems with average dwell time’, *Automatica*, 2010, **46**, (5), pp. 953–958
- Yan, P., Özbay, H.: ‘On switching \mathcal{H}_∞ controllers for a class of linear parameter varying systems’, *Syst. Control Lett.*, 2007, **56**, pp. 504–511
- Agrachev, A.A., Liberzon, D.: ‘Lie-algebraic stability criteria for switched systems’, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 2001, **40**, (1), pp. 253–269
- Liberzon, D., Hespanha, J., Morse, A.S.: ‘Stability of switched systems: a Lie-algebraic condition’, *Syst. Control Lett.*, 1999, **37**, (3), pp. 117–122
- Liberzon, D., Morse, A.S.: ‘Basic problems in stability and design of switched systems’, *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, 1999, **19**, (5), pp. 59–70
- Mancilla-Aguilar, J.L., Garcia, R.A.: ‘A converse Lyapunov theorem for nonlinear switched systems’, *Syst. Control Lett.*, 2000, **41**, (1), pp. 67–71
- Geromel, J.C., Daecto, G.S.: ‘Switched state feedback control for continuous-time uncertain systems’, *Automatica*, 2009, **45**, (2), pp. 593–597
- Geromel, J.C., Korogui, R.H.: ‘Dynamic output feedback stabilization of continuous-time switched systems’. Proc. Second IFAC Conf. on Analysis and Design of Hybrid Systems, Italy, 7–9 June 2006, pp. 347–352
- Kulkarni, V., Jun, M., Hespanha, J.: ‘Piecewise quadratic Lyapunov functions for piecewise affine time-delay systems’. Proc. 2004 American Control Conf., Boston, USA, 2004, vol. 5, pp. 3885–3880
- Liu, J., Liu, X., Xie, W.-C.: ‘Delay-dependent robust control for uncertain switched systems with time-delay’, *Nonlinear Anal.: Hybrid Syst.*, 2008, **2**, (1), pp. 81–95
- Sun, Y., Michel, A., Zhai, G.: ‘Stability of discontinuous retarded functional differential equations with applications to delay systems’. Proc. 2003 American Control Conf., Denver, USA, 2003, vol. 4, pp. 3387–3392
- Sun, Y., Michel, A., Zhai, G.: ‘Stability of discontinuous retarded functional differential equations with applications’, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2005, **50**, (8), pp. 1090–1105
- Yan, P., Özbay, H.: ‘Stability analysis of switched time delay systems’, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 2008, **47**, (2), pp. 936–949
- Yan, P., Özbay, H., Şansal, M.: ‘A Switching controller approach to stabilization of parameter varying time delay systems’. Proc. Joint 48th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control and 28th Chinese Control Conf., Shanghai, P. R. China, December 16–18 2009, pp. 7222–7226
- Xie, G., Wang, L.: ‘Stabilization of switched linear systems with time-delay in detection of switching signal’, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 2005, **305**, (1), pp. 277–290
- Hale, J., Lunel, S.V.: ‘Introduction to functional differential equations’ (Springer–Verlag, 1993)
- Dugard, L., Verriest, E.I. (Eds.): ‘Stability and control of time-delay systems’ (Springer–Verlag, 1998)
- Foias, C., Özbay, H., Tannenbaum, A.: ‘Robust control of infinite dimensional systems: frequency domain methods’ (*Lecture Notes in Control and Information Science* 209) (Springer–Verlag, 1996)
- Kelly, F.: ‘Mathematical modelling of the internet’, in Engquist, B., Schmid, W. (Eds): ‘Mathematics Unlimited-2001 and Beyond’ (Springer–Verlag, 2001), pp. 685–702
- Quet, P.-F., Ataslar, B., Iftar, A., Özbay, H., Kalyanaraman, S., Kang, T.: ‘Rate-based flow controllers for communication networks in the presence of uncertain time-varying multiple time-delays’, *Automatica*, 2002, **38**, (6), pp. 917–928
- Wu, F., Grigoriadis, K.M.: ‘LPV Systems with parameter-varying time delays: analysis and control’, *Automatica*, 2001, **37**, (2), pp. 221–229.
- Yan, P., Özbay, H.: ‘Robust controller design for AQM and \mathcal{H}_∞ performance analysis’, in Tarbouriech, S., Abdallah, C., Chiasson,

- J. (Eds.): 'Advances in Communication Control Networks' (*Lecture Notes in Control and Information Science* **308**) (Springer-Verlag, 2005), pp. 49–64
- 38 Xu, S., Lam, J.: 'On equivalence and efficiency of certain stability criteria for time-delay systems', *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2007, **52**, (1), pp. 95–101
- 39 Gu, K., Kharitanov, V.L., Chen, J.: 'Stability and robust stability of time delay systems' (Birkhauser, 2003)
- 40 Niculescu, S.-I.: 'Delay effects on stability: a robust control approach' (*Lecture Notes in Control and Information Science*, **269**) (Springer-Verlag, 2001)
- 41 Xu, S., Lam, J.: 'Improved delay-dependent stability criteria for time-delay systems', *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2005, **50**, (3), pp. 384–387
- 42 Gu, K., Niculescu, S.-I.: 'Survey on recent results in the stability and control of time-delay systems', *ASME J. Dyn. Syst., Meas. Control*, 2003, **125**, (2), pp. 158–165
- 43 Kao, C.-Y., Lincoln, B.: 'Simple stability criteria for systems with time-varying delays', *Automatica*, 2004, **40**, (8), pp. 1429–1434
- 44 Kharitanov, V.L.: 'Robust stability analysis of time delay systems: a survey', *Annu. Rev. Control*, 1999, **23**, (1), pp. 185–196
- 45 Xu, S., Lam, J.: 'A survey on linear matrix inequalities in stability analysis of delay systems', *Int. J. Syst. Sci.*, 2008, **39**, (12), pp. 1095–1113
- 46 Xiang, Z.R., Wang, R.H.: 'Robust control for uncertain switched nonlinear systems with time delay under asynchronous switching', *IET Control Theory Appl.*, 2009, **3**, pp. 1041–1050
- 47 Xie, D., Chen, X.: 'Observer-based switched control design for switched linear systems with time delay in detection of switching signal', *IET Control Theory Appl.*, 2008, **2**, pp. 437–445
- 48 Xu, X., Antsaklis, P.J.: 'Stabilization of second-order LTI switched systems'. Proc. 38th Conf. on Decision and Control, Phoenix, USA, December 1999, 2, pp. 1339–1344
- 49 Xu, X., Antsaklis, P.J.: 'Optimal control of switched autonomous systems'. Proc. 41st IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control, Las Vegas, USA, December 2002, 4, pp. 4401–4406
- 50 Xu, X., Antsaklis, P.J.: 'Optimal control of switched systems based on parameterization of the switching instants', *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2004, **49**, (1), pp. 2–16
- 51 Montagner, V.F., Peres, P.L.D., Leite, V.J.S., Tarbouriech, S.: 'Stability and stabilizability of discrete-time switched linear systems with state delay'. Proc. 2005 American Control Conf., 8–10 June 2005, vol. 6, pp. 3806–3811
- 52 Wu, A.-G., Feng, G., Duan, G.-R., Gao, H.: 'Stabilising slow-switching laws for switched discrete-time linear systems', *IET Control Theory Appl.*, 2001, **5**, pp. 1843–1858
- 53 Zhang, L., Shi, P., Boukas, E.-K., Wang, C.: 'Robust H_∞ filtering for switched linear discrete time-delay systems with polytopic uncertainties', *IET Control Theory Appl.*, 2007, **1**, pp. 722–730
- 54 Zhang, W.-A., Yu, L.: 'Stability analysis for discrete-time switched time-delay systems', *Automatica*, 2009, **45**, (10), pp. 2265–2271
- 55 Kharitanov, V.L., Hinrichsen, D.: 'Exponential estimates for time delay systems', *Syst. Control Lett.*, 2004, **53**, (5), pp. 395–405
- 56 Çalışkan, S.Y., Özbay, H., Niculescu, S.-I.: 'Stability analysis of switched systems using Lyapunov-Krasovskii functionals'. Proc. 18th IFAC World Congress, Milano, Italy, August 28–September 2, 2011, pp. 7492–7496
- 57 Zhai, G., Sun, Y., Chen, X., Michel, A.: 'Stability and \mathcal{L}_2 gain analysis for switched symmetric systems with time delay'. Proc. 2003 American Control Conf., Denver, USA, 2003, vol. 3, pp. 2682–2687