



## Brief Paper

Is set modeling of white noise a good tool for robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  analysis?<sup>☆</sup>Mario Sznaier<sup>a,\*</sup>, Jorge Tierno<sup>b</sup><sup>a</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA<sup>b</sup>Honeywell Technology Center, MN65-2810, 3660 Technology Dr., Minneapolis, MN 55418, USA

Received 23 March 1998; revised 21 December 1998; received in final form 20 April 1999

## Abstract

Recently, a new deterministic characterization of the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm has been proposed, using a new norm ( $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta}$ ), based on (approximate) set membership modeling of white noise. The main result shows that under mild conditions, for a *fixed* system the gap between the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $W_\eta$  norms can be made arbitrarily small. Motivated by these results it has been argued that the  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta}$  norm provides a useful tool for analyzing robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  controllers, specially since in this context LMI-based necessary and sufficient conditions for robust performance are available. Unfortunately, as we show here with an example involving a very simple plant, the worst case  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$  norm can be conservative by at least a factor of  $\sqrt{m}$  (where  $m$  denotes the dimension of the exogenous signal) for the original robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  problem. Moreover, the same example shows that competing state-space based bounds also exhibit a similar degree of conservatism. Thus, at this point the problem of finding non-conservative bounds on the worst  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm under LTI or slowly-varying LTV perturbations still remains open. © 1999 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Robust performance;  $\mathcal{H}_2$

## 1. Introduction

A large number of control problems of practical importance involve designing a controller capable of stabilizing a given linear time invariant system while minimizing the worst case response to some exogenous disturbances. Depending on the choice of models for the input signals and on the criteria used to assess performance, this prototype problem leads to different mathematical formulations. The case where the exogenous disturbances  $w$  belong to the set of signals with spectral density bounded by one and the objective is to minimize the worst-case “size” of the output  $z$  measured using the power seminorm<sup>1</sup> leads to the well-known  $\mathcal{H}_2$  control problem.

$\mathcal{H}_2$  control is appealing since there is a well established connection between the performance index being optimized and performance requirements encountered in practical situations. Moreover, the resulting controllers are easily found by solving two Riccati equations, and in the state-feedback case exhibit good robustness properties (Anderson & Moore, 1990). However, as the classical paper by Doyle (1978) established, these margins vanish in the output feedback case, where infinitesimal model perturbations can destabilize the closed-loop system.

Following this paper, several attempts were made to incorporate robustness into the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  framework, at least for the case of minimum phase (or mildly non-minimum phase) plants (Stein & Athans, 1987; Zhang & Freudenberg, 1990). More recently these efforts led to the mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  problem (Bernstein & Haddad, 1989; Doyle, Zhou, Glover & Bodenheimer, 1994; Zhou, Glover, Bodenheimer & Doyle, 1994; Kaminer, Khargonekar & Rotea, 1993; Sznaier, 1994; Scherer, 1995; Chen & Wen, 1995), where the resulting controller guarantees optimal performance for the *nominal* controller and stability against LTI dynamic uncertainty. While these results represent significant progress towards obtaining robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  controllers, they suffer from the fact that

<sup>☆</sup>This paper was not presented at any IFAC meeting. This paper was recommended for publication in revised form by Associate Editor A.A. Stoorvogel under the direction of Editor R. Tempo.

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: 001-814-865-0196; fax: 001-814-865-7065.

E-mail addresses: msznaier@frodo.ee.psu.edu (M. Sznaier), jtierno@htc.honeywell.com (J. Tierno)

<sup>1</sup> An alternative stochastic interpretation can be given by considering the input signal  $w$  to be white Gaussian noise with unit covariance and having as design objective the minimization of the RMS value of the output,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}[z^T(t)z(t)]$ , where  $\mathcal{E}$  denotes expectation.

performance is only guaranteed for the nominal plant. Moreover, the resulting controllers have potentially high order (in fact, the optimal  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  controller is infinite dimensional (Megretski, 1994)).

Robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance was analyzed by Stoorvogel (1993) who obtained bounds on the worst-case performance. These bounds are related to the auxiliary problem introduced by Kaminer et al. (1993) and lead to tractable synthesis problems. However, they are obtained assuming non-causal, non-linear time varying model uncertainty. Thus, they are potentially conservative for the case of causal, LTI perturbations.

Recently, Feron (1997) proposed an upper bound on the worst case  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm under passive uncertainty. This upper bound is obtained using an impulse response based interpretation of the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm and dynamic (non-causal) stability multipliers. This approach is appealing since it takes into account, to some extent, causality. However, in order to obtain tractable problems, these multipliers must be restricted to the span of some basis, selected a priori. Moreover, the complexity of this basis is limited by the fact that the computational complexity of the resulting LMI problem grows roughly as the 10th power of the state dimension (Paganini & Feron, 1997).

Alternatively, a new research line has emerged (Paganini, 1995) based upon (approximate) set membership modeling of white signals. As shown in (Paganini, 1995, 1995b, 1996, 1999), for a fixed, given plant this alternative formulation can capture the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm with arbitrary precision. Motivated by these results it has been argued (Paganini, 1995b, 1996, 1999) that this approach provides a useful tool for analyzing robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  controllers, specially since in this context LMI-based necessary and sufficient conditions for robust performance are available. Moreover, these conditions are no more complex than comparable  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  conditions for the same problem.

Unfortunately, as we show here with an example, both impulse–response and set modeling-based bounds can be conservative by at least a factor of  $\sqrt{m}$ , where  $m$  denotes the dimensions of the exogenous input, even for very simple plants. Thus, at the present time the problem of robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  analysis for general MIMO systems still remains open.

## 2. Preliminaries

### 2.1. Notation and definitions

$\mathcal{L}_\infty$  denotes the Lebesgue space of complex-valued matrix functions which are essentially bounded on the unit circle, equipped with the norm  $\|G(z)\|_\infty \doteq \text{ess sup}_{|z|=1} \bar{\sigma}(G(z))$ , where  $\bar{\sigma}$  denotes the largest singular value. By  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  we denote the subspace of functions in  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$  with a bounded analytic continuation out-

side the unit disk. The norm on  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  is defined by  $\|G(z)\|_\infty \doteq \text{ess sup}_{|z|>1} \bar{\sigma}(G(z))$ . By  $\mathcal{H}_2$  we denote the space of complex valued matrix functions  $G(z)$  with analytic continuation outside the unit disk and square integrable there, equipped with the usual  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm:

$$\|G\|_2^2 \doteq \sup_{\gamma > 1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{|z|=\gamma} |G(z)|_F^2 \frac{dz}{z},$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  denotes the Frobenius norm.

Given two matrices  $M$  and  $\Delta$  of compatible dimensions we denote by  $\Delta^*M$  the upper LFT  $\mathcal{F}_u(M, \Delta)$ , i.e.:

$$\Delta^*M = M_{22} + M_{21}\Delta(I - M_{11}\Delta)^{-1}M_{12}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}(\ell^2)$  denote the set of linear bounded operators in  $\ell^2$ . In the sequel we will consider the following set of structured bounded operators in  $\mathcal{L}(\ell^2)$ :

$$\mathcal{B}\Delta = \{\Delta \in \mathcal{L}(\ell^2) : \Delta = \text{diag}[\delta_1 I_{r_1}, \dots, \delta_L I_{r_L}, \Delta_{L+1}, \dots, \Delta_{L+F}] : \|\Delta\|_{\ell^2 \rightarrow \ell^2} \leq 1\}.$$

The subsets of  $\mathcal{B}\Delta$  formed by linear time invariant, linear time varying and (arbitrarily) slowly linear time varying operators will be denoted by  $\mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTV}}$  and  $\mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{SLTV}}$ , respectively.<sup>2</sup> Finally, we will also make use of the following set of scaling matrices which commute with the elements in  $\mathcal{B}\Delta$ :

$$\mathbf{X} = \text{diag}[X_1, \dots, X_L, X_{L+1}I_{m_1}, \dots, X_{L+F}I_{m_F}].$$

**Definition 1** (Robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance). Consider the uncertain system shown in Fig. 1, where  $f \in \ell_2^m$  and  $z$  represent an exogenous input and a performance output, respectively, and where  $\Delta = \text{diag}\{\Delta_i\}$  represents structured model uncertainty. The interconnection  $(M, \Delta)$  has robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance against LTI perturbations if it is robustly stable and

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} \|\Delta^*M\|_2 \leq 1. \quad (1)$$

**Definition 2** (Luenberger, 1969). A partition of an interval  $[a, b]$  of the real line is a finite set of points  $t_i \in [a, b]$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$  such that  $a = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n = b$ .

**Definition 3** (Luenberger, 1969). A real function  $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  is said to be of bounded variation if there exists a constant  $K$  such that for any partition of  $[a, b]$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})| \leq K.$$

<sup>2</sup> In rigor  $\mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{SLTV}}$  is not a single family of operators, but a class containing all the LTV operators with variation slower than a given  $v > 0$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{B}\Delta_v^{\text{SLTV}} \doteq \{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTV}} : \|\lambda\Delta - \Delta\lambda\| \leq v\}$ , where  $\lambda$  denotes the unit delay operator. In the sequel, for notational simplicity and with a slight abuse of notation we will drop the subscript  $v$ .




Fig. 1. Setup for robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  analysis.

The total variation of  $f$ , denoted as  $TV(f)$  is defined as

$$TV(f) = \sup \sum_{i=1}^n |f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})|$$

where the supremum is taken over all partitions of  $[a, b]$ .

The approach proposed by Paganini (1995) is based upon approximating white noise by a subset of  $\ell^2$  composed by “approximately” white signals, defined as follows:

**Definition 4** (Paganini, 1995). Given  $\eta > 0$ , the set of “white up to accuracy  $\eta$ ” signals is given by

$$W_\eta^m = \left\{ f \in \ell^2 : \left\| \int_0^s f(\omega) f(\omega)^* \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} - \frac{s}{2\pi} \frac{\|f\|^2}{m} I_m \right\|_\infty < \eta \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where the  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  norm denotes the maximum across the coordinates of the supremum norm.

Thus this set includes all signals in  $\ell^2$  such that their cumulative spectrum only deviates a small amount from the spectrum of a “true” white signal. Given an  $\ell^2$  stable system (not necessarily LTI) one can look then at the worst case value of the output (in the  $\ell^2$  sense) in response to signals in  $W_\eta^m$  and use this to define an induced norm as follows:

**Definition 5** (Paganini, 1995). Given an  $\ell^2$  stable operator  $H$ , its  $W_\eta^m$  norm is defined as

$$\|H\|_{W_\eta^m} := \sup \left\{ \|Hf\| : f \in W_\eta^m, \frac{1}{m} \|f\|_2^2 \leq 1 \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Since the set  $W_\eta^m$  is formed by signal that are close to being white, one can expect that  $\|H\|_{W_\eta^m}$  is close to  $\|H\|_2$  in some sense. The following theorem shows that this is indeed the case as long as  $H$  is a fixed, given system.

**Theorem 1** (Paganini, 1995). For an  $\ell^2$  stable LTI system  $H$  the following inequality holds:

$$\|H\|_2^2 \leq \|H\|_{W_\eta^m}^2 \leq \|H\|_2^2 + \eta W[H(e^{j\omega})],$$

where

$$W(Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{ij} [Y(2\pi)^* Y(2\pi)]_{ij} + TV[Y(\omega)^* Y(\omega)]_{ij}.$$

**Corollary 1.** For a given, fixed system  $H$ ,

$$\|H\|_{W_\eta^m} \xrightarrow{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \|H\|_2.$$

### 2.2. Robust $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$ performance

Consider now the problem of assessing the worst case performance (in the  $W_\eta^m$  sense) of the interconnection of a nominal LTI system  $M$  and bounded structured uncertainty.

**Definition 6** (Robust  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$  performance). The uncertain system  $(M, \Delta)$  with input  $u$  in  $\ell_2^m$  has robust  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$  performance if it is robustly stable, and there exists  $\eta > 0$  such that

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{SLTV}}} \|\Delta^* M\|_{W_\eta^m} \leq 1. \quad (4)$$

The following result shows that this definition leads to a tractable necessary and sufficient condition that can be checked numerically to any desired degree of accuracy.

**Condition 1** (Paganini, 1995). There exists  $\eta > 0$  such that the interconnection  $\Delta^* M$  achieves robust  $W_\eta^m$  performance against  $\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{SLTV}}$  (not necessarily causal) if and only if there exists  $X(\omega) \in \mathbf{X}$ , and a matrix function  $Y(\omega) = Y^*(\omega) \in \mathbf{C}^{m \times m}$ , such that

$$M(e^{j\omega})^* \begin{bmatrix} X(\omega) & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} M(e^{j\omega}) - \begin{bmatrix} X(\omega) & 0 \\ 0 & Y(\omega) \end{bmatrix} < 0, \quad (5)$$

holds for all  $\omega \in [0, 2\pi]$ , and

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \text{trace}(Y(\omega)) \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} < 1. \quad (6)$$

Clearly, from Corollary 1, having robust  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$  performance in the sense of Definition 6 is a *sufficient* condition for achieving robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance in the usual sense. Moreover, motivated by Theorem 1 one may think that this is also necessary. However, as we show in the sequel, in the case of MIMO systems this condition is *only* sufficient and potentially conservative by at least a factor of  $\sqrt{m}$ , where  $m$  is the dimension of the exogenous  $\ell^2$  disturbance. Thus, it follows that robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance

(in the usual sense) and robust  $W_\eta^m$  performance are different problems, and solving the latter does not necessarily solve the former.

### 3. A simple counterexample

Consider the following MISO plant where the exogenous disturbance  $f \in \ell_m^2$  and the performance output  $z$  is a scalar (see Fig. 1):

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} q \\ z \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m \times 1} & I_{m \times m} \\ 1 & 0_{1 \times m} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} p \\ f \end{bmatrix} = M \begin{bmatrix} p \\ f \end{bmatrix}, \\ q &= [q_1 \quad q_2 \quad \dots \quad q_m]^T, \\ f &= [f_1 \quad f_2 \quad \dots \quad f_m]^T, \\ \Delta &= [\Delta_1 \quad \Delta_2 \quad \dots \quad \Delta_m] \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{LTI}, \\ z &= (\Delta^* M) f = \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i f_i. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Clearly for this plant we have

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{LTI}} \|\Delta^* M\|_2 = 1. \tag{8}$$

Moreover, expanding the set of  $\Delta$ 's to include non-causal perturbations does not increase this worst-case norm. On the other hand, consider now the following perturbation  $\Delta^n \doteq [\Delta_1^n \quad \Delta_2^n, \dots, \Delta_m^n]$ :

$$\Delta_i^n(j\omega) \doteq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \omega \in \left[ \frac{(i-1+km)\pi}{mn}, \frac{(i+km)\pi}{mn} \right), \\ & i = 1, \dots, m, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

By construction  $\Delta^n$  is such that  $\|\Delta^n\|_\infty = 1$  for all  $n$ .

Finally, consider the following input:

$$\begin{aligned} f^n &= \begin{bmatrix} f_1^n \\ \vdots \\ f_m^n \end{bmatrix}, \\ f_i^n(j\omega) &\doteq \begin{cases} \sqrt{m} & \text{if } \omega \in \left[ \frac{(i-1+km)\pi}{mn}, \frac{(i+km)\pi}{mn} \right), \\ & i = 1, \dots, m, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

By construction  $f^n$  is an  $\ell^2$  signal with  $\|f^n\|_2^2 = m$ . Moreover, as we show next, given any  $\eta > 0$ ,  $f^n$  is in the set  $W_\eta^m$  of signals “white up to  $\eta$ ” for an appropriate choice of  $n$ . To this effect consider the following quantity:

$$F_\eta(s) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left[ f^n(j\omega)(f^n)^*(j\omega) - \frac{1}{m} I_m \|f^n\|_2^2 \right] d\omega. \tag{11}$$

Using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} &f^n(j\omega)(f^n)^*(j\omega) - \frac{1}{m} I_m \|f^n\|_2^2 \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & m-1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

$$\omega \in \left[ \frac{(i-1+km)\pi}{mn}, \frac{(i+km)\pi}{mn} \right),$$

it can be easily shown that

$$\sup_{s \in [0, 2\pi)} \|F(s)\|_\infty = \frac{m-1}{2mn}. \tag{13}$$

It follows that  $f^n \in W_\eta^m$  for all  $n > (m-1)/2m\eta$ ,  $m \geq 2$ . Finally, the output  $z^n$  corresponding to the uncertainty  $\Delta^n$  and signal  $f^n$  satisfies:

$$\|z^n\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \sum_{i=1}^m (\Delta_i^n f_i^n)^2 d\omega = m. \tag{14}$$

Hence in this case, we have that, for any  $\eta > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{LTI}} \|\Delta^* M\|_2 < \sqrt{m} \\ &\leq \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{LTI}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in W_\eta^m} \|(\Delta^* M) f\|_2 \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{LTI}} \|\Delta^* M\|_{W_\eta^m}. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

This last equation shows that in the case of MISO systems having  $m$  inputs the worst case  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$  norm may be conservative by at least a factor of  $\sqrt{m}$  with respect to the worst case  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm. Thus, Definition 6 does not coincide in general with the standard definition of Robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance.

Note that the perturbation  $\Delta^n$  is not square. An example with square perturbations and having exactly the same gap can be obtained by simply setting:

$$\begin{aligned} M_s &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m \times m} & I_{m \times m} \\ e_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad e_1 = [1 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0], \\ \Delta_s &= \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{11} & \dots & \Delta_{1m} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \Delta_{m1} & \dots & \Delta_{mm} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{LTI}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Clearly,  $\Delta_s^* M_s = [\Delta_{11} \ \dots \ \Delta_{1m}]$  and the example reduces to the previous one.

Further insight into the conservatism of the  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$  can be gained by using condition 1. Since in order to apply this condition  $M$  should be square, we pad  $M_s$  with

rows of zeros, yielding

$$M = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} 0_{m \times m} & I_{m \times m} \\ \hline e_i & 0_{m \times m} \end{array} \right] \quad (17)$$

Obviously, this does not change any of the features discussed previously. Since  $\Delta$  is a full block,

$$X = xI_{m \times m},$$

and Eq. (5) becomes

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c|c} 1 & \\ \hline 0 & \\ & \ddots \\ & 0 \end{array} \right] \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ 0_{m \times m} \end{array} \quad (18)$$

$$- \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} x & \\ \hline x & \\ & \ddots \\ & x \end{array} \right] \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ 0_{m \times m} \end{array} < 0.$$

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c|c} 0_{m \times m} & \\ \hline 0_{m \times m} & Y \end{array} \right]$$

Eq. (18) implies the following inequalities:

$$1 - x < 0,$$

$$x - y_{ii} < 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

from which it follows that  $y_{ii} > 1$  and thus  $\text{trace}(Y) > m$ . Since  $Y$  does not depend on  $\omega$ ,

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \text{trace}(Y(\omega)) \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} > m,$$

and the inequality can be achieved up to arbitrarily small  $\varepsilon$ . In this case the worst case  $W_\eta^m$  norm with respect to slowly time varying  $\Delta$ 's coincides with the worst case  $W_\eta^m$  norm with respect to LTI  $\Delta$ 's and is  $\sqrt{m}$  times bigger than the worst case 2-norm with respect to LTI  $\Delta$ 's. The conservativeness of condition 1 does not come from using slowly time varying perturbations, but from the definition of the worst case  $W_\eta^m$  norm itself.

**Remark 1.** Note that the worst-case model uncertainty  $\Delta^n$  as defined in (9) is non-causal. This shows that, contrary to the conjecture by Paganini and Feron (1997), there is a gap between the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm and Condition 1 even when considering non-causal perturbations.

#### 4. Where the problem lies

From Theorem 1, one can conclude:

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} \|\Delta^* M\|_2^2 \leq \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} \|\Delta^* M\|_{W_\eta^m}^2$$

$$\leq \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} (\|\Delta^* M\|_2^2 + \eta W(\Delta^* M)), \quad (19)$$

and, therefore,

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} \|\Delta^* M\|_2^2 \leq \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} \|\Delta^* M\|_{W_\eta^m}^2$$

$$\leq \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} (\|\Delta^* M\|_2^2 + \eta W(\Delta^* M)). \quad (20)$$

For Definition 6 to be equivalent to the standard definition of Robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance, the following would have to hold:

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} \|\Delta^* M\|_2^2 \leq \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} \|\Delta^* M\|_{W_\eta^m}^2$$

$$\leq \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} (\|\Delta^* M\|_2^2). \quad (21)$$

However, since in general,

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} \eta W(\Delta^* M)$$

$$= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta^{\text{LTI}}} \eta \left\{ \sum_{ij} [(\Delta^* M)(2\pi)^*(\Delta^* M)(2\pi)]_{ij} \right.$$

$$\left. + TV[(\Delta^* M)(\omega)^*(\Delta^* M)(\omega)]_{ij} \right\} \neq 0. \quad (22)$$

Eq. (21) does not necessarily follow from Eq. (20). Indeed, as the example presented earlier in this paper shows, Eq. (21) does not hold in general. By switching the lim and sup operators in Definition 6, the worst case  $W_\eta^m$  penalizes not only the 2-norm of the operator  $\Delta^* W$ , but also its total variation. This fact causes the worst case  $W_\eta^m$  norm to be achieved by  $\Delta$ 's that are not a good abstraction of physical uncertainty, and thus artificially inflates the worst case norm with respect to the worst case  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm.

#### 5. Limitations of state-space-based approaches

In this section we briefly consider the state-space-based approach proposed by Feron (1997) for finding the worst case  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm under LTI uncertainty. As we show in the sequel, this bound exhibits exactly the same degree of conservatism as the  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$  bound when dealing with multivariable noise. The main idea behind the bound is to consider the impulse response based definition of the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm (energy of the impulse response added over the input channels):

$$\|T_{zf}\|_2^2, \text{ imp} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^m \|T_{zf} e_i \delta(k)\|_2^2, \quad (23)$$

where  $\delta(k)$  denotes the unit impulse and  $e_i = [0 \dots 1 \dots 0]$ . Using this definition to compute the worst case  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm requires computing the following quantity:

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta} \|\Delta^* M\|_2^2 = \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta} \sum_{i=1}^m \|(\Delta^* M) e_i \delta(k)\|_2. \quad (24)$$

In order to obtain an upper bound of the right-hand side of (24), the uncertainty block<sup>3</sup> is replaced by  $\ell^2[0, \infty)$  signals  $p_i$  and  $q_i$  subject to the integral quadratic constraint  $\|q_i\|_2^2 \geq \|p_i\|_2^2$  (see Feron, 1997 for details). This leads to the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta} \|\Delta \star M\|_2^2 &\leq J_s \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{p \in \ell^2[0, \infty), \|q_i\|_2^2 \geq \|p_i\|_2^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \|[M_{21} \ M_{22}][e_i^{p_i} \delta(k)]\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

In the special case of system (7) we have that  $q_i = \delta(k)e_i$ , leading to the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{B}\Delta} \|\Delta \star M\|_2^2 &\leq J_s \\ &= \sup_{p \in \ell^2[0, \infty), \|p_i\|_2^2 \leq 1} \|[M_{21} \ M_{22}][e_i^{p_i} \delta(k)]\|_2 \\ &= \sup_{p \in \ell^2[0, \infty), \|p_i\|_2^2 \leq 1} \sum_{i=1}^m \|p_i\|_2^2 = m. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Hence, we get the same (conservative) answer obtained by using set modeling of white noise. In this case this is due to the fact that replacing  $\Delta$  by the signals  $p_i$  and  $q_i$  in (24) amounts to interchanging the operators  $\sum$  and  $\sup_{\Delta}$ . Essentially, this allows for *different*  $\Delta$ 's to act in different channels leading to the conservative answer. With the hindsight provided by this example, it can be easily shown that exactly the same situation arises when using the LMI (5). This gives another view of the source of the conservatism entailed in using this condition in the MIMO case.

## 6. Conclusions

While the  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$  norm provides a useful tool for analyzing the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm of a fixed given system, the simple counterexample presented here indicates that these results cannot be used in general to assess the worst case  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm of uncertain systems, since there exists at least a  $\sqrt{m}$  gap between the worst case  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm and the worst case  $\|\cdot\|_{W_\eta^m}$ . Thus, necessary and sufficient conditions for robust performance in the  $W_\eta^m$  sense are only sufficient for robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance. Surprisingly, the same counterexample shows that competing state-space-based bounds also suffer from exactly the same degree of conservatism. Neither approach can impose the non-correlation of uncertainty and input direction, leading to conservative answers when dealing with multivariable noise. Hence, at the present time the problem of obtaining convex tight bounds on the worst case  $\mathcal{H}_2$

performance in the presence of LTI (or slowly LTV) uncertainty is still open.

## Acknowledgements

The authors are indebted to an anonymous reviewer and to Professors Fernando Paganini and Eric Feron for pointing out that the simple counterexample also applies to the state-space-based bounds. Mario Sznaier was supported in part by NSF under grant ECS-9625920.

## References

- Anderson, B. D. O., & Moore, J. B. (1990). *Optimal control: linear quadratic methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bernstein, D., & Haddad, W. (1989). LQG control with an  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  performance bound: A Riccati equation approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 34(2), 293–305.
- Chen, X., & Wen, J. T. (1995). A linear matrix inequality approach to the general mixed  $\mathcal{H}_\infty/\mathcal{H}_2$  control problem. In *Proceedings of the 1995 American control conference* (pp. 1443–1447).
- Doyle, J. (1978). Guaranteed Margins for LQG Regulators. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 23(4), 756–757.
- Doyle, J., Zhou, K., Glover, K., & Bodenheimer, B. (1994). Mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  performance objectives II: Optimal control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 39(8), 1575–1587.
- Feron, E. (1997). Analysis of robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance using multiplier theory. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 35(1), 160–177.
- Kaminer, I., Khargonekar, P., & Rotea, M. (1993). Mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control for discrete time systems via convex optimization. *Automatica*, 29(1), 57–70.
- Luenberger, D. G. (1969). *Optimization by vector space methods*. New York: Wiley.
- Megretski, A. (1994). Pure mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  optimal controller is not exponentially stable. Preprint.
- Paganini, F. (1995). *Sets and constraints in the analysis of uncertain systems*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Caltech, Pasadena, CA.
- Paganini, F. (1995b). Necessary and sufficient conditions for robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance. *Proceedings 1995 CDC*, New Orleans, LA (pp. 1970–1975).
- Paganini, F. (1999). Frequency domain conditions for robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance. *IEEE Transactions Automatic Control*, 44(1), 38–49.
- Paganini, F. (1996). A set-based approach for white noise modeling. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 41(10), 1453–1465.
- Paganini, F., & Feron, E. (1997). Analysis of robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  performance: Comparisons and examples. *Proceedings of the 36 IEEE CDC*, San Diego, CA (pp. 1000–1005).
- Scherer, C. W. (1995). Multiobjective  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 40(6), 1054–1062.
- Stein, G., Athans, M. (1987). The LQG/LTR procedure for multivariable feedback control design. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 32(2), pp. 102–114.
- Stoorvogel, A. A. (1993). The robust  $\mathcal{H}_2$  problem: A worst-case design. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 38(9), 1358–1370.
- Sznaier, M. (1994). An exact solution to general SISO mixed  $\mathcal{H}_\infty/\mathcal{H}_2$  problems via convex optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 39(12), 2511–2517.
- Zhang, Z., & Freudenberg, J. S. (1990). LTR for nonminimum phase plants. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 35(5), 1990.
- Zhou, K., Glover, K., Bodenheimer, B., & Doyle, J. (1994). Mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  performance objectives I: Robust performance analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 39(8), 1564–1574.

<sup>3</sup> For notational simplicity we consider here unstructured uncertainty, but the same technique applies to the structured case.



**Mario Sznaier** received the Ingeniero Electronico and Ingeniero en Sistemas de Computacion degrees from the Universidad de la Republica, Uruguay in 1983 and 1984, respectively, and the MSEE and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Washington in 1986 and 1989, respectively. He spent the year 1990 as a Research Fellow in Electrical Engineering at the California Institute of Technology. From 1991 to 1993 he was an Assistant Professor of Electrical Engineering at the University

of Central Florida. In 1993 he joined the Department of Electrical Engineering at the Pennsylvania State University, where he is currently an Associate Professor. His research interest include Multiobjective

Robust Control;  $l^1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  Control Theory, Control Oriented Identification and Active Vision.



**Jorge Tierno** was born in 1964 in Montevideo, Uruguay. He received the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in 1991 and 1996 respectively both in Electrical Engineering from the California Institute of Technology. Since 1995 he has been with the Honeywell Technology Center in Minneapolis, Minnesota. His research interests include robust and distributed control for aerospace applications.