

# Stability Property of Solutions of Large-Scale Discrete-Time Systems

T.A. Lukyanova and A.A. Martynyuk  
Stability of Processes Department  
Institute of Mechanics  
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine  
Nesterov str. 3, 03057, Kyiv  
Ukraine

## Abstract

The aim of this paper is to present one approach to solution of stability problem for discrete-time system based on hierarchical Lyapunov function. The example showing the proposed approach efficiency are given.

## 1 Hierarchical decomposition of discrete-time system and stability conditions.

We consider a discrete-time system

$$S : \quad x(\tau + 1) = f(\tau, x(\tau)), \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\tau = \{t_0 + k, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $t_0 \in R$ ,  $x \in R^n$ ,  $f : \mathcal{T}_\tau \times R^n \rightarrow R^n$ , the function  $f$  is a continuous function on  $x$  such that the solution  $x(\tau; \tau_0, x_0)$  of system (1.1) exists and is unique for all  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\tau$  when any  $(\tau_0, x_0) \in \mathcal{T}_\tau \times R^n$ . Furthermore, assume that  $f(\tau, x) = 0$  for all  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\tau$  if and only if  $x = 0$  and the state  $x = 0$  is a unique state of equilibrium of system (1.1).

System (1.1) is decomposed into  $s$  interconnected subsystems [1]

$$\tilde{S}_i : \quad x_i(\tau + 1) = g_i(\tau, x_i(\tau)) + h_i(\tau, x(\tau)), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $x_i \in R^{n_i}$ ,  $x = (x_1^T, x_2^T, \dots, x_s^T)^T$ ,  $R^n = R^{n_1} \times R^{n_2} \times \dots \times R^{n_s}$ ,  $g_i : \mathcal{T}_\tau \times R^{n_i} \rightarrow R^{n_i}$ ,  $h_i : \mathcal{T}_\tau \times R^n \rightarrow R^{n_i}$ .

The equations

$$S_i : \quad x_i(\tau + 1) = g_i(\tau, x_i(\tau)), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s, \quad (1.3)$$

describe the dynamics of independent subsystems of system (1.2), the functions  $h_i$  represent the interactions of  $S_i$  with the rest of the systems (1.1). Equations (1.3) are derived from the equations (1.2) when the connections  $h_i$  are equal to zero. Assume that  $g_i(\tau, 0) = 0$  for all  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\tau$  and the states  $x_i = 0$  are the unique equilibrium states of subsystems (1.3).

Further each of subsystem (1.3) is decomposed into  $m_i$  interconnected components

$$\tilde{C}_{ij} : \quad x_{ij}(\tau + 1) = p_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij}(\tau)) + q_{ij}(\tau, x_i(\tau)), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m_i, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $x_{ij} \in R^{n_{ij}}$ ,  $x_i = (x_{i1}^T, x_{i2}^T, \dots, x_{im_i}^T)^T$ ,  $R^{n_i} = R^{n_{i1}} \times R^{n_{i2}} \times \dots \times R^{n_{im_i}}$ ,  $p_{ij} : \mathcal{T}_\tau \times R^{n_{ij}} \rightarrow R^{n_{ij}}$ ,  $q_{ij} : \mathcal{T}_\tau \times R^{n_i} \rightarrow R^{n_{ij}}$ .

The equations

$$C_{ij} : \quad x_{ij}(\tau + 1) = p_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij}(\tau)) \quad (1.5)$$

describe the dynamics of independent components of subsystems (1.3). Equations (1.5) are derived from the equations (1.4) when the connections  $q_{ij}$  are equal to zero. Assume that  $p_{ij}(\tau, 0) = 0$  for all  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\tau$  and the states  $x_{ij} = 0$  are the unique equilibrium states of the components (1.5).

To study stability of system (1.1) we use two-level construction of the Lyapunov functions [2]. Assume that for components (1.5) there exist the Lyapunov functions  $v_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij})$  which establish the asymptotic stability of the equilibrium states  $x_{ij} = 0$  of the components (1.5). For subsystems (1.3) we construct auxiliary functions

$$v_i(\tau, x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} d_{ij} v_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij}), \quad (1.6)$$

where  $d_{ij}$  are positive constants. Similarly for the whole system (1.1) the function

$$V(\tau, x) = \sum_{i=1}^s d_i v_i(\tau, x_i) \quad (1.7)$$

is constructed, where  $d_i$  are positive constants. Under certain assumptions the function  $V(\tau, x)$  constructed by formulas (1.6)–(1.7) is the vector hierarchical Lyapunov function for the system (1.1).

The first difference  $\Delta V(\tau, x(\tau))|_S$  of the function  $V(\tau, x)$  along solutions  $x(\tau; \tau_0, x_0)$  of system (1.1) is defined by formula

$$\Delta V(\tau, x(\tau))|_S = V(\tau + 1, f(\tau, x(\tau))) - V(\tau, x(\tau)).$$

Below we will need such definitions.

**Definition 1.1.** [1] *An  $n \times n$  matrix  $W = (w_{ij})$  is said to be  $M$ -matrix, if it has nonpositive off-diagonal elements and all leading principal minors of  $W$  are positive, that is,*

$$\begin{vmatrix} w_{11} & w_{12} & \dots & w_{1k} \\ w_{21} & w_{22} & \dots & w_{2k} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ w_{k1} & w_{k2} & \dots & w_{kk} \end{vmatrix} > 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

**Definition 1.2.** [3] *A function  $\psi$ ,  $\psi : R_+ \rightarrow R_+$ , belongs to*

- (i) *the class  $K$ , if and only if it is continuous and strictly increasing and  $\psi(0) = 0$ ;*
- (ii) *the class  $KR$ , if and only if  $\psi \in K$  and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \psi(r) = +\infty$ .*

To formulate sufficient stability conditions we require some assumptions.

**Assumption 1.1.** *There exist:*

- (1) open connected neighborhoods  $\mathcal{N}_{ij} \subset R^{n_{ij}}$  of the states  $x_{ij} = 0$  of components  $C_{ij}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_i$ ;
- (2) functions  $\varphi_{ij}, \phi_{ij}, \psi_{ij} \in K$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_i$ ;
- (3) the functions  $v_{ij} : T \times R^{n_{ij}} \rightarrow R_+$  which are continuous functions on  $x_{ij}$  and satisfy the inequalities:

$$(a) \alpha_{ij}\varphi_{ij}(\|x_{ij}\|) \leq v_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij}) \leq \beta_{ij}\phi_{ij}(\|x_{ij}\|), \quad \forall (\tau, x_{ij}) \in \mathcal{T}_\tau \times \mathcal{N}_{ij},$$

$$(b) \Delta v_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij})|_{C_{ij}} \leq -\pi_{ij}\psi_{ij}(\|x_{ij}\|), \quad \forall (\tau, x_{ij}) \in \mathcal{T}_\tau \times \mathcal{N}_{ij},$$

$$(c) \Delta v_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij}(\tau))|_{\tilde{C}_{ij}} - \Delta v_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij}(\tau))|_{C_{ij}} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} \xi_{jk}^i \psi_{ik}(\|x_{ik}\|), \quad \forall (\tau, x_{ij}) \in \mathcal{T}_\tau \times \mathcal{N}_{ij},$$

where  $\alpha_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\beta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\pi_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\xi_{jk}^i \geq 0$  are real constants,  $\|x\|$  is the norm of vector  $x$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_i$ .

**Assumption 1.2.** *Assume that:*

- (1) there exist open connected neighborhoods  $\mathcal{N}_i \subset R^{n_i}$  of the equilibrium states  $x_i = 0$  of subsystems (1.3),  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ;
- (2) there exist the functions  $\psi_i \in K$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ;
- (3) the functions  $v_i : \mathcal{T}_\tau \times R^{n_i} \rightarrow R_+$ , constructed by formula (1.6) satisfy the inequalities:

$$(a) \Delta v_i(\tau, x_i)|_{S_i} \leq -\pi_i\psi_i(\|x_i\|), \quad \forall (\tau, x_i) \in \mathcal{T}_\tau \times \mathcal{N}_i,$$

$$(b) \Delta v_i(\tau, x_i(\tau))|_{\tilde{S}_i} - \Delta v_i(\tau, x_i(\tau))|_{S_i} \leq \sum_{j=1}^s \xi_{ij}\psi_j(\|x_j\|), \quad \forall (\tau, x_i) \in \mathcal{T}_\tau \times \mathcal{N}_i,$$

where  $\pi_i > 0$ ,  $\xi_{ij} \geq 0$  are real constants,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ .

We define the matrices  $W_i = (w_{jk}^i)$  with the elements

$$w_{jk}^i = \begin{cases} \pi_{ij} - \xi_{jj}^i, & \text{if } j = k, \\ -\xi_{jk}^i, & \text{if } j \neq k \end{cases}$$

and the matrix  $W = (w_{jk})$  with elements

$$w_{jk} = \begin{cases} \pi_j - \xi_{jj}, & \text{if } j = k, \\ -\xi_{jk}, & \text{if } j \neq k. \end{cases}$$

Sufficient stability conditions for system (1.1) is founded in the following result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Assume that the perturbed motion equation (1.1) admit the decomposition (1.2)–(1.5) and conditions of Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 are satisfied. Then, if the matrices  $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_s$  and  $W$  are  $M$ -matrices, the equilibrium state  $x = 0$  of system (1.1) is asymptotically stable.*

*If all conditions of Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 are satisfied for  $\mathcal{N}_{ij} = R^{n_{ij}}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_i = R^{n_i}$  and the functions  $\varphi_{ij} \in KR$ , then asymptotic stability in the whole takes place.*

## 2 Hierarchical connective stability of a large-scale discrete-time system.

Assume that for system (1.1) the decomposition (1.2)–(1.5) takes place. It is known [1] that the interconnection functions  $h_i(\tau, x)$  can be represented

$$h_i(\tau, x) = h_i(\tau, \bar{e}_{i1}x_1, \bar{e}_{i2}x_2, \dots, \bar{e}_{is}x_s), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s,$$

where the matrix  $\bar{E} = (\bar{e}_{ij})$  is the fundamental matrix of connections of system (1.2) with the elements

$$\bar{e}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x_j \text{ is contained in } h_i(\tau, x), \\ 0, & \text{if } x_j \text{ is not contained in } h_i(\tau, x). \end{cases}$$

Let the functions of the discrete argument  $e_{ij} : \mathcal{T}_\tau \rightarrow [0, 1]$  for all  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\tau$  satisfy the inequalities

$$e_{ij}(\tau) \leq \bar{e}_{ij}.$$

The constant  $\bar{e}_{ij}$  determine the degree of connection between the independent subsystems (1.3). The matrix  $E(\tau) = (e_{ij}(\tau))$  describes the structural perturbations of system (1.1).

If  $E(\tau) \equiv 0$ , then the system (1.1) is decomposed into  $s$  independent subsystems (1.3), each of which is a composition of the interconnected components (1.4). The connection functions between the independent components (1.5) can be written as

$$q_{ij}(\tau, x_i) = q_{ij}(\tau, \bar{\ell}_{j1}^i x_{i1}, \bar{\ell}_{j2}^i x_{i2}, \dots, \bar{\ell}_{jm_i}^i x_{im_i}), \\ i = 1, 2, \dots, s, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m_i,$$

where

$$\bar{\ell}_{jk}^i = \begin{cases} 1, & x_{ik} \text{ is contained in } q_{ij}(\tau, x_i), \\ 0, & x_{ik} \text{ is not contained in } q_{ij}(\tau, x_i). \end{cases}$$

Let  $\ell_{jk}^i : \mathcal{T}_\tau \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and for all  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\tau$

$$e_{jk}^i(\tau) \leq \bar{\ell}_{jk}^i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s, \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, m_i.$$

The matrices  $\bar{L}_i = (\bar{\ell}_{jk}^i)$  are the fundamental matrices of the connections for the subsystems (1.3) and describe the initial connections between the independent components (1.5). The matrices  $L_i(\tau) = (\ell_{jk}^i(\tau))$  describe structural perturbations of subsystems (1.3).

The notion of hierarchical connective stability of the discrete-time system (1.1) is defined similarly to the continuous case [2].

**Definition 2.1.** *Discrete-time system (1.1) is called hierarchically connective stable, if:*

- (i) for  $E(\tau) \equiv 0$  the equilibrium states  $x_i = 0$  of subsystems (1.3) are asymptotically stable in the whole for any structural matrices  $L_i(\tau)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ;
- (ii) for  $L_i(\tau) \equiv \bar{L}_i$  the equilibrium states  $x = 0$  of system (1.1) is asymptotically stable in the whole for any structural matrix  $E(\tau)$ .

In order that to formulate sufficient conditions for the hierarchical connective stability of the system (1.1) we introduce some assumptions.

**Assumption 2.1.** *Assume that:*

- (1) conditions (1)–(3)(b) of Assumption 1.1 are satisfied for  $\mathcal{N}_{ij} = R^{n_{ij}}$  and functions  $\varphi_{ij}$  are of class  $KR$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_i$ ;
- (2) the first differences of functions  $v_{ij}$  satisfy the inequalities

$$\Delta v_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij}(\tau))|_{\tilde{C}_{ij}} - \Delta v_{ij}(\tau, x_{ij}(\tau))|_{C_{ij}} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m_i} \ell_{jk}^i(\tau) \xi_{jk}^i \psi_{ik}(\|x_{ik}\|)$$

for all  $(\tau, x_{ij}) \in \mathcal{T}_\tau \times R^{n_{ij}}$ , where  $\xi_{jk}^i \geq 0$  are real constants,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_i$ .

**Assumption 2.2.** *Assume that:*

- (1) conditions (1)–(3)(a) of Assumption 1.2 are satisfied for  $\mathcal{N}_i = R^{n_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ;
- (2) the first differences of functions  $v_i$  satisfy the inequalities

$$\Delta v_i(\tau, x_i(\tau))|_{\tilde{S}_i} - \Delta v_i(\tau, x_i(\tau))|_{S_i} \leq \sum_{j=1}^s e_{ij}(\tau) \xi_{ij} \psi_j(\|x_j\|)$$

for all  $(\tau, x_i) \in \mathcal{T}_\tau \times R^{n_i}$ , where  $\xi_{ij} \geq 0$  are real constants,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ;

In this case the elements of matrices  $W_i(\tau) = (w_{jk}^i(\tau))$  and  $W(\tau) = (w_{ij}(\tau))$  depend on discrete time,

$$w_{jk}^i(\tau) = \begin{cases} \pi_{ij} - \ell_{jj}^i(\tau) \xi_{jj}^i, & \text{if } j = k, \\ -\ell_{jk}^i(\tau) \xi_{jk}^i, & \text{if } j \neq k, \end{cases}$$

$$w_{jk}(\tau) = \begin{cases} \pi_j - e_{jj}(\tau) \xi_{jj}, & \text{if } j = k, \\ -e_{ij}(\tau) \xi_{jk}, & \text{if } j \neq k. \end{cases}$$

Now we designate by  $\bar{W}_1, \bar{W}_2, \dots, \bar{W}_s$  and  $\bar{W}$  the matrices corresponding to the fundamental matrices of connections  $\bar{L}_1, \bar{L}_2, \dots, \bar{L}$  and  $\bar{E}$ . We formulate the following test for connective stability of system (1.1).

**Theorem 2.1.** *Assume that the perturbed motion equation (1.1) admit decomposition (1.2) – (1.5) and all conditions of Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 are satisfied. Then, if the matrices  $\overline{W}_1, \overline{W}_2, \dots, \overline{W}_s$  and  $\overline{W}$  are  $M$ -matrices, then the equilibrium state  $x = 0$  of system (1.1) is hierarchically connective stable.*

### 3 Example

Consider the system

$$S : \quad x(\tau + 1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.99 & 0.001 & 0 \\ 0.002 & 0.5 & 1 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.56 \end{pmatrix} x(\tau), \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\tau$ ,  $x \in R^3$ . Decompose system (3.1) and arrive at two independent subsystems

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 : \quad x_1(\tau + 1) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.99 & 0.001 \\ 0.002 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix} x_1(\tau), \\ S_2 : \quad x_2(\tau + 1) &= 0.56 x_2(\tau), \end{aligned}$$

where  $x_1 \in R^2$ ,  $x_2 \in R$ . We decompose the subsystem  $S_1$  and distinguish two independent components

$$\begin{aligned} C_{11} : \quad x_{11}(\tau + 1) &= 0.99 x_{11}(\tau), \\ C_{12} : \quad x_{12}(\tau + 1) &= 0.5 x_{12}(\tau), \end{aligned}$$

where  $x_{11}, x_{12} \in R$ . Choosing functions  $v_{11} = |x_{11}|$ ,  $v_{12} = |x_{12}|$ ,  $\psi_{11} = |x_{11}|$ ,  $\psi_{12} = |x_{12}|$ , we compute the constants  $\pi_{11} = 0.01$ ,  $\pi_{12} = 0.5$ ,  $\xi_{11}^1 = 0$ ,  $\xi_{12}^1 = 0.001$ ,  $\xi_{21}^1 = 0.002$ ,  $\xi_{22}^1 = 0$  and the matrix

$$W_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.01 & -0.001 \\ -0.002 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix},$$

which is the  $M$ -matrix, because  $\Delta_1 = 0.01 > 0$  and  $\Delta_2 = 0.004998 > 0$ . We take  $d_{11} = 45$  and  $d_{12} = 1$ . Then

$$v_1(x_1) = 45 |x_{11}| + |x_{12}|.$$

Choosing functions  $v_2(x_2) = |x_2|$ ,  $\psi_1 = |x_{11}| + |x_{12}|$ ,  $\psi_2 = |x_2|$ , we calculate the constants  $\pi_1 = 0.455$ ,  $\pi_2 = 0.44$ ,  $\xi_{11} = 0$ ,  $\xi_{12} = 1$ ,  $\xi_{21} = 0.2$ ,  $\xi_{22} = 0$ . The matrix

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 0.455 & -1 \\ -0.2 & 0.44 \end{pmatrix}$$

is the  $M$ -matrix, because  $\Delta_1 = 0.455 > 0$  and  $\Delta_2 = 0.0002 > 0$ . We take  $d_1 = 128$  and  $d_2 = 291$ . The function

$$V(x) = 128(45|x_{11}| + |x_{12}|) + 291|x_2|$$

is the hierarchical Lyapunov function establishing asymptotic stability of system (3.1).

Now we investigate system (3.1) by means of one-level construction of function  $V(x)$  [4]. Decompose system (3.1) and distinguish three independent subsystems

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 : \quad x_1(\tau + 1) &= 0.99 x_1(\tau), \\ S_2 : \quad x_2(\tau + 1) &= 0.5 x_2(\tau), \\ S_3 : \quad x_3(\tau + 1) &= 0.56 x_3(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

We choose the functions  $v_i = |x_i|$ ,  $\psi_i = |x_i|$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and obtain the matrix

$$\widetilde{W} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.01 & -0.001 & 0 \\ -0.002 & 0.5 & -1 \\ -0.2 & -0.2 & 0.44 \end{pmatrix},$$

Which is not the M-matrix, because  $\Delta_1 = 0.01 > 0$ ,  $\Delta_2 = 0.04998 > 0$ ,  $\Delta_3 = -0.00000088 < 0$ .

Using matrix  $\widetilde{W}$  we cannot reach a conclusion on stability of system (3.1); however matrices  $W_1$  and  $W$  allow the conclusion that system (3.1) is asymptotically stable.

## References

- [1] Šiljak, D. D. *Decentralized Control of Complex Systems*. Boston etc.: Academic Press, Inc., 1991.
- [2] Ikeda, M. and Šiljak, D. D. Hierarchical Liapunov functions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **112** No.1 (1985) 110–128.
- [3] Hahn, W. *Theory stability of motion*. Berlin etc. : Springer, 1967.
- [4] Sezer, M.E., Šiljak, D.D. Robust stability of discrete systems. *Int. J. Control* **48** No 5 (1988) 2055–2063.