Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/engappai

Brief paper

Controller design for time-delay systems using genetic algorithms

Haiping Du *, Nong Zhang

Mechatronics and Intelligent Systems, Faculty of Engineering, University of Technology, Sydney, P.O. Box 123, Broadway, NSW 2007, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a new approach to design controllers for time-delay systems by using genetic algorithms (GAs) together with the solvability of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs). Both of the state-feedback controller and the static output feedback controller can be designed with this approach. It is confirmed by numerical examples that this approach achieves less conservative results than previously existing methods on the given examples.

© 2008 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Recently, much efforts have been done on the problem of controller design for time-delay systems and various approaches have been proposed to reduce the conservatism of delay-dependent conditions by using new bounding for cross terms or choosing new Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional. In particular, a new inequality was introduced for bounding cross terms and a new delay-dependent stabilisation condition using a memoryless controller for state-delayed systems were presented in Moon et al. (2001). It was shown that the proposed stabilisation method can be less conservative than previously existing results. In addition, a less conservative delay-dependent H_∞ control was proposed in Lee et al. (2004) for linear systems with a state-delay based on a new Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional. It was also shown that the proposed method is much less conservative than previously existing results presented in Fridman and Shaked (2002a). Further improving conditions for the delay-dependent stabilisation problem and the solvability of the delay-dependent H_∞ control are given in Zhang et al. (2005), Palhares et al. (2005) and Xu et al. (2006), etc., where the newly less conservative results are shown.

However, in above-mentioned research works, controller synthesis conditions are always presented in terms of nonlinear matrix inequalities in order to reduce the conservatism. Although an iterative algorithm has been developed to solve the nonlinear matrix inequalities due to the nonconvex feasibility problem, the conservativeness still exists since the iterative algorithm can only find the suboptimal solution. On the other hand, for neutral systems with time-delays, genetic algorithm (GA) has been used to find the feasible solutions for controller design (Chen, 2004, 2006, 2007; Lien, 2007). But, the potential of GA in finding solutions to time-delay systems has not been emphasised in these works. In addition, the above-mentioned works only focused on the memoryless state-feedback control. Less efforts have been made in designing the static output feedback controllers for time-delay systems in spite of its importance in real-world applications.

This paper develops an algorithm to design both of the state-feedback and the static output feedback controllers for time-delay systems. The GA is used to search for the possible solutions due to its high potentialities in global optimisation, and hence, the nonlinear matrix inequalities problem is avoided, where convex optimisation algorithm can be used. Numerical examples show that the presented approach obtains less conservative results than the previously existing results on the given examples.

2. Problem formulation

Consider the following state-delayed systems:

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + B_w w(t) + A_1 x(t-\tau) + Bu(t),$$

$$z(t) = \begin{bmatrix} C_0 x(t) + D_w w(t) \\ C_1 x(t-\tau) \\ Du(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

$$y(t) = Cx(t),$$

$$x(t) = \phi(t), \quad t \in [-\tau, 0], \tag{1}$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input, $w(t)$ is the disturbance input that belongs to $L_2[0, \infty)$, $z(t)$ is the controller

* Corresponding author.
  E-mail addresses: hdu@eng.uts.edu.au (H. Du),
nong.zhang@uts.edu.au (N. Zhang).

output, $\tau > 0$ is the delay of the system state, $\phi(t)$ is the initial condition, $A, A_1, B, B_w, C_0, C_1, D, D_w$ and C are known real constant matrices with appropriate dimensions. In this paper, we are considering the following two problems:

Problem 1 (*Stabilisation of state-delayed system*). Assume $B = 0$, $C_0 = 0$, $D_w = 0$, $C_1 = 0$, $D = 0$ in (1), we are interested in designing a memoryless controller

$$u(t) = Ky(t) = KCx(t), \tag{2}$$

where $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is a constant gain matrix to be designed, such that the closed-loop system is stable for any time-delay τ satisfying $0 \leqslant \tau \leqslant \bar{\tau}$, where $\bar{\tau}$ is the designed upper bound of the delay.

Theorem 1. *If there exist $P > 0$, $Q > 0$, $Z > 0$, X, and Y such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} (A+BKC)^T P + P(A+BKC) + \bar{\tau}X + Y + Y^T + Q & -Y + PA_1 & \bar{\tau}(A+BKC)^T Z \\ * & -Q & \bar{\tau}A_1^T Z \\ * & * & -\bar{\tau}Z \end{bmatrix} < 0, \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & Y \\ * & Z \end{bmatrix} \geqslant 0, \tag{4}$$

then Problem 1 *is satisfied.*

The proof of this theorem, which can be directly derived from Moon et al. (2001), is omitted here for brevity.

Problem 2 (H_∞ *control of linear system with state delay*). For system (1), we are interested in designing controller (2) such that the closed-loop system is stable, while the closed-loop system guarantees, under zero initial condition, $\|z(t)\|_2 < \gamma \|w(t)\|_2$, $\gamma > 0$ is a prescribed constant, for all $w(t) \in L_2[0, \infty)$ and any time-delay τ satisfying $0 \leqslant \tau \leqslant \bar{\tau}$.

Theorem 2. *If there exist $P_1 > 0$, $Q > 0$, $Z > 0$, P_2, P_3, X_{11}, X_{12}, X_{22}, Y_1, and Y_2 such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{11} & P^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ A_1 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \end{bmatrix} & P^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ B_w \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} C_0^T D \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ * & -Q + C_1^T C_1 & 0 \\ * & * & -\gamma^2 I + D_w^T D_w \end{bmatrix} < 0, \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_{11} & X_{12} & Y_1 \\ * & X_{22} & Y_2 \\ * & * & Z \end{bmatrix} \geqslant 0, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\Psi_{11} = \begin{bmatrix} (A+BKC)^T P_2 + P_2^T(A+BKC) + \bar{\tau}X_{11} & (A+BKC)^T P_3 - P_2^T \\ +Q + C_0^T C_0 + (DKC)^T DKC + Y_1 + Y_1^T & +P_1^T + \bar{\tau}X_{12} + Y_2^T \\ P_3^T(A+BKC) + P_1 - P_2 + \bar{\tau}X_{12}^T + Y_2 & -P_3 - P_3^T + \bar{\tau}X_{22} + \bar{\tau}Z \end{bmatrix},$$

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & 0 \\ P_2 & P_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

then Problem 2 *is satisfied.*

The proof of this theorem, which can be directly derived from Lee et al. (2004), is omitted here for brevity.

3. Algorithm

GA is a probabilistic search procedure based on the mechanism of natural selection and natural genetics. In the following, an algorithm which combines the random search of GA and the feasible solution of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) will be proposed to find a desirable controller gain matrix K by solving the maximisation problem of

$$\max_{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \bar{\tau} \quad \text{subject to LMIs (3) and (4) or (5) and (6),} \tag{7}$$

where n is the number of state variables used for control, m is the number of input. In this problem, GA is used to randomly generate a matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ initially which changes thereafter within the evolution procedure according to objective (7). If (7) is feasible for an evolved K, which has the maximum $\bar{\tau}$, then this K satisfies the specifications and thus constitutes a solution to the design problem. Note that the matrix inequalities (3)–(6) are LMIs once the control gain matrix K is known, and these LMIs can be solved efficiently by using Matlab LMI toolbox.

Since the standard GAs can be found in most related textbooks, an outline of our algorithm is given as:

Step 1: Use the binary string to encode the feedback gain matrix K.

Step 2: Randomly generate an initial population of N_p chromosomes.

Step 3: Evaluate the objective and assign fitness. Decode the initial population produced in Step 2 into real values for every controller gain matrix K_j, $j = 1, 2, \dots, N_p$. For every K_j, use the bisection method to search for the maximum delay τ_j such that with such a delay τ_j and K_j, LMIs (3) and (4) or (5) and (6) are feasible. Take every delay τ_j as the objective value corresponding to K_j and associate every K_j with a suitable fitness value according to rank-based fitness assignment approach, and then go to Step 4. If for a K_j, there is no feasible delay can be found such that LMIs (3) and (4) or (5) and (6) are feasible, the objective value corresponding to K_j will be assigned a large value in order to reduce its opportunity to be survived in the next generation.

Step 4: Use tournament selection approach to choose the offspring.

Step 5: Perform uniform crossover with probability p_c to produce new offspring.

Step 6: Do bit mutation in the population of chromosomes with a small mutation probability p_m.

Step 7: Retain the best chromosomes in the population using elitist reinsertion method.

Steps 3–7 correspond to one generation. The evolution process will repeat for N_g generations or will end when the search process converges with a given accuracy. The best chromosome is decoded into real values to produce again the control gain matrix.

Remark 1. In this paper, two problems for time-delay systems are considered and one computational algorithm is presented. For the considered problems, the systems are assumed as certain systems, that means, the systems have no parameter uncertainties. Since system uncertainties cannot be ignored in practice, robust controllers should be designed to tolerate both the time-delays and the system uncertainties. Generally, for stabilisation and control of uncertain systems with time-delays, the related matrix inequalities are firstly derived based on the use of Lyapunov–Krasovskii functional or other techniques. Then, an iterative algorithm is used to find the possible suboptimal solutions. And, the parameter uncertainties dealt with are assumed as norm-bounded or polytopic type (Moon et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2004; Xu et al., 2006; Palhares et al., 2005). In fact, for these problems, the presented algorithm can be certainly used to replace the iterative algorithm for finding solutions based on the derived matrix inequalities. For brevity, these problems will not be discussed in this paper.