REFERENCES

[1] M. A. Dahleh and I. J. Diaz-Bobillo, *Control of Uncertain Systems: A Linear Programming Approach.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1995.

[2] A. E. Barabanov and O. N. Granichin, "Optimal control of linear plant with bounded disturbance," *Automation Remote Contr.*, no. 5, pp. 39–46, 1984.

[3] M. A. Dahleh and J. B. Pearson, "l_1-optimal feedback controllers for MIMO discrete-time systems," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 33, pp. 314–322, 1987.

[4] D. G. Meyer, "Two properties of l_1-optimal controllers," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 33, pp. 876–878, 1988.

[5] G. Deodhare and M. Vidyasagar, "l_1-optimality of feedback control systems: The discrete-time case," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 35, pp. 1082–1085, 1990.

[6] M. A. Dahleh and J. B. Pearson, "Minimization of a regulated response to a fixed input," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 33, pp. 924–930, 1988.

[7] R. D. Hill and M. E. Halpern, "Minimum overshoot design for SISO discrete-time systems," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 38, pp. 155–158, 1993.

[8] G. Deodhare and M. Vidyasagar, "Control system design via infinite linear programming," *Int. J. Contr.*, vol. 55, pp. 1351–1380, 1992.

[9] K. L. Moore and S. P. Bhattacharya, "A technique for choosing zero locations for minimal overshoot," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 35, pp. 577–580, 1990.

Some Properties of an Upper Bound for μ

Gjerrit Meinsma, Yash Shrivastava, and Minyue Fu

***Abstract*—A convex upper bound of the mixed structured singular value μ is analyzed. The upper bound is based on a multiplier method. It is simple, it can exploit low-rank properties, and it is shown to be less conservative than the well-known (D,G)-scaling. A direct relationship with (D,G)-scaling is given. The upper bound can be modified to one that is continuous with an explicit Lipschitz constant.**

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the engaging problems of robust control is to determine whether or not a system remains stable and retains satisfactory performance qualities under variations and uncertainties of some sort. In an attempt to get a handle on the problem, Doyle [8] introduced in 1982 the *structured singular value*. The definition of the structured singular value, or μ for short, is such that robust stability/robust performance of the control problem is equivalent to μ being less than one. Originally μ was defined for problems where the performance is measured by an $\mathcal{H}_\infty$-norm and the uncertainties come in the form of structured complex matrices, such as those due to neglected dynamics. It was soon realized, however, that the definition of μ could be extended to handle real parametric uncertainties as well. This extension of μ is known as the *mixed*-structured singular value [9].

Unfortunately, in its full generality the test "$\mu < 1$?" is NP-hard [5], [17], and as such any attempt to develop polynomial-time algorithms work for special cases only, or, if they do work for the general case, then they provide only *sufficient* conditions (see Young *et al.* [20] and the survey papers by Packard and Doyle [16] and Barmish and Kang [2]). The role of upper bounds of μ is that they provide such sufficient conditions. Of the computable upper bounds of μ that have been reported, the best at present that can handle the general μ problem are those by Fan *et al.* [9] and Fu and Barabanov [11].

In this paper we examine an upper bound of μ based on what is called the multiplier method. The idea of the multiplier method is that nonsingularity of a family of matrices $\mathcal{T}$ is ensured if for some matrix C we have that $CT + T^*C^* > 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Note that the condition $CT + T^*C^* > 0$ is convex in the variable C. The idea is not really new, although its application for the general μ problem was only recently realized by Fu and Barabanov [11]. The multiplier approach is extremely simple and, as Fu and Barabanov showed, it is readily translated using the S-procedure into linear matrix inequalities (LMI's) and generalized eigenvalue problems (GEVP's). LMI's and GEVP's are nowadays efficient to solve (see Nesterov and Nemirovsky [15] and Boyd *et al.* [4]). The simplicity of the multiplier method may give the impression that the upper bounds of μ derived from it are conservative. Interestingly, however, the best advocated upper bound of μ by Fan *et al.* [9] can be seen as an example of the multiplier method and turns out to be more conservative than—or, at best, equal to—any of the upper bounds derived in [11] from the multiplier method.

We collect in this paper some general properties of the multiplier method and the upper bound of μ it induces. Section II introduces the notation and some well-established results. Section III discusses the multiplier method. First, we show that the upper bound of Fan *et al.* [9] is more conservative than the general multiplier method. This fact was realized already by Fu and Barabanov [11], but here we provide an explicit relationship. In Section IV we show that many variations of the multiplier method are equivalent. This result allows us to exploit low-rank conditions to reduce the computational cost without any conservatism. We briefly comment on the lack of continuity of μ and its upper bounds and how the multiplier method may be modified to recover continuity. Owning to the simplicity of the method, we obtain Lipschitz continuity with an explicit Lipschitz constant.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we summarize material that we need later. The mixed structured singular value is defined, and we briefly review (D,G)-scaling and the GEVP.

The norm $||T||$ of a matrix T is in this paper the spectral norm. T^* is the complex conjugate transpose of T and the *Hermitian part* He T of T is defined as

$$\text{He}\, T = \tfrac{1}{2}(T + T^*).$$

Given a subset $\mathbb{X}$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ we use $\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{X}$ to denote the unit ball in $\mathbb{X}$

$$\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{X} = \{\Delta \in \mathbb{X}: ||\Delta|| \le 1\}.$$

Given $\mathbb{X}$ the *mixed structured singular value* of M, denoted by $\mu_\mathbb{X}(M)$, is defined as the infimal value of $\alpha > 0$ for which all elements of the set $I - (1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{X} M$ are nonsingular. Obviously $\mu_\mathbb{X}(M)$ depends on the "structure" $\mathbb{X}$. Invariably, the structures considered are of the form

$$\mathbb{X} = \text{diag}\,(\mathbb{R}I_{k_1}, \cdots, \mathbb{R}I_{k_{m_r}}, \mathbb{C}I_{l_1}, \cdots, \mathbb{C}I_{l_{m_c}}, \mathbb{C}^{f_1\times f_1}, \cdots, \mathbb{C}^{f_{m_C}\times f_{m_C}}) \quad (1)$$

Manuscript received July 25, 1995.

The authors are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan N.S.W. 2308 Australia (email: meinsma@pascal.newcastle.edu.au).

Publisher Item Identifier S 0018-9286(96)06768-2.

where m_r, m_c, and m_C are the number of repeated real scalar blocks, repeated complex scalar blocks, and full complex blocks, respectively.

A. (D,G)-Scaling, LMI's, and GEVP's

Let $\mathbb{H}^q$ denote the set of $q \times q$ Hermitian matrices and denote its subset of positive definite elements by $\mathbb{P}^q$. Given the structure of $\mathbb{X}$ of (1), the sets $\mathcal{D}_\mathbb{X}$ and $\mathcal{G}_\mathbb{X}$ are defined as

$$\mathcal{D}_\mathbb{X} = \operatorname{diag}(\mathbb{P}^{k_1}, \cdots, \mathbb{P}^{k_{m_r}}, \mathbb{P}^{l_1}, \cdots, \mathbb{P}^{l_{m_c}}, \mathbb{P}I_{f_1}, \cdots, \mathbb{P}I_{f_{m_C}})$$

$$\mathcal{G}_\mathbb{X} = \operatorname{diag}(\mathbb{H}^{k_1}, \cdots, \mathbb{H}^{k_{m_r}}, 0_{l_1\times l_1}, \cdots, 0_{l_{m_c}\times l_{m_c}}, 0_{f_1\times f_1}, \cdots, 0_{f_{m_C}\times f_{m_C}}).$$

Note that for all $\Delta \in \mathbb{X}, D \in \mathcal{D}_\mathbb{X}$, and $G \in \mathcal{G}_\mathbb{X}$ we have that $D\Delta = \Delta D; D^{1/2}\Delta = \Delta D^{1/2}; \Delta G = \Delta^* G = G\Delta$. Given M we define $\Phi_\alpha(D,G)$ as

$$\Phi_\alpha(D,G) = M^*DM + j(GM - M^*G) - \alpha^2 D.$$

This notation is a bit different from that of [9]. Fan *et al.* [9] showed that $\mu_\mathbb{X}(M) < \alpha$ if $\alpha > 0$ and $\Phi_\alpha(D,G) < 0$ for some $D \in \mathcal{D}_\mathbb{X}$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}_\mathbb{X}$. So, in particular the α that solves the constrained minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && \alpha \\ &\text{subject to} && \Phi_\alpha(D,G) < 0, \alpha > 0, D \in \mathcal{D}_\mathbb{X}, G \in \mathcal{G}_\mathbb{X} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

is an upper bound of $\mu_\mathbb{X}(M)$. This minimum α is denoted as $\nu_\mathbb{X}(M)$. Minimization problem (2) is an example of a GEVP. A GEVP is a minimization problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\alpha\in\mathbb{R}, x\in\mathbb{R}^{q\times p}}{\text{minimize}} && \alpha \\ &\text{subject to} && \alpha B(x) - A(x) > 0, B(x) > 0, E(x) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $A(x), B(x)$, and $E(x)$ are square symmetric matrices depending affinely on the variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times p}$. For GEVP's efficient polynomial-time algorithms exist [15], [4], [12]. A *linear matrix inequality* (LMI) in the variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times q}$ is an inequality $E(x) > 0$, where $E(x)$ is a square symmetric matrix affine in x.

III. The Multiplier Method

In this section we examine an upper bound of $\mu_\mathbb{X}$ that relies on the multiplier method as developed by Fu and Barabanov [11]. In particular we provide a connection with (D,G)-scaling. At the basis of the multiplier method lies the trivial observation that

> a square matrix T is nonsingular if there is a square matrix C such that $\operatorname{He} CT > 0$.

This is easy to see: If T is singular with $Tv = 0, v \neq 0$ we get for any C that $v^*(CT + T^*C^*)v = 0$, contradicting that $CT + T^*C^* = 2\operatorname{He} CT > 0$. The matrix C is called *multiplier* because of its links with the Popov multiplier, although it is not quite the same as that of Popov [18]. Popov-style multipliers, in the modern setting, appear in the work of Safonov and others—see [7] and [14]—and they are in a way equivalent to (D,G)-scaling (see [1]). The approach we use here can be traced back to an idea by Brockett and Willems [6] from 1965. The following result is immediate.

Theorem III.1: $\mu_\mathbb{X}(M) < \alpha$ for an $n \times n$ matrix M if there is a single multiplier $C \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ such that

$$\operatorname{He} C\left(I_n - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{X}M\right) > 0. \tag{3}$$

By (3) it is meant that all elements of the set $C(I_n - (1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{X}M)$ have positive definite Hermitian part.

If C satisfies (3) we say that C is a *feasible multiplier* for the set $I_n - (1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{X}M$. The infimal α for which such a feasible multiplier C can be found is thus an upper bound of $\mu_\mathbb{X}(M)$. For later reference we call this upper bound $\hat{\mu}_\mathbb{X}(M)$

$$\hat{\mu}_\mathbb{X}(M) := \inf\left\{\alpha > 0 : \exists C \text{ s.t. } \operatorname{He} C\left(I_n - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{X}M\right) > 0\right\}. \tag{4}$$

Even though (3) is convex in C, computation of $\hat{\mu}_\mathbb{X}$ is generally not possible due to the infinite family $(1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{X}$. There is an exception. If the structure $\mathbb{X}$ has real components only, that is

$$\mathbb{X} = \operatorname{diag}(\mathbb{R}I_{k_1}, \cdots, \mathbb{R}I_{k_{m_r}}) \tag{5}$$

then by convexity (3) holds for multiplier C iff the finitely many LMI's

$$\operatorname{He} C(I_n - \Delta M) > 0 \forall \Delta = \frac{1}{\alpha}\operatorname{diag}(\pm I_{k_1}, \cdots, \pm I_{k_{m_r}}) \tag{6}$$

are satisfied. Minimizing $\alpha > 0$ over all C subject to (6) is a GEVP. Thus it seems that computation of $\hat{\mu}_\mathbb{X}$ is well suited for the real case. This is in contrast with (D,G)-scaling which is primarily useful for the nonreal case. In any case, real or not, the following holds.

Theorem III.2: For every structure $\mathbb{X}$ and matrix M we have

$$\mu_\mathbb{X}(M) \leq \hat{\mu}_\mathbb{X}(M) \leq \nu_\mathbb{X}(M).$$

In particular, if $\Phi_\alpha(D,G) < 0$ with $D \in \mathcal{D}_\mathbb{X}, G \in \mathcal{G}_\mathbb{X}$, then $C = \alpha^2 D + jM^*G$ satisfies (3).

Proof: Let $C = \alpha^2 D + jM^*G$. It is readily verified that for every $\Delta \in \mathbb{X}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &2\operatorname{He} C(I - \Delta M) \\ &\quad = C(I - \Delta M) + (I - \Delta M)^* C^* \\ &\quad = -\Phi_\alpha(D,G) + M^* D^{1/2}(I - \alpha^2 \Delta^* \Delta) D^{1/2} M \\ &\qquad + \alpha^2 (D^{1/2} - \Delta D^{1/2} M)^* (D^{1/2} - \Delta D^{1/2} M). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Therefore $\operatorname{He} C(I - \Delta M) > 0$ for all $\Delta \in (1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_\mathbb{X}$ if $\Phi_\alpha(D,G) < 0$.

In (7) we used the fact that for every $\Delta \in \mathbb{X}$ we have $D^{1/2}\Delta = \Delta D^{1/2}$ and $G\Delta = \Delta^* G$. ∎

So (D,G)-scaling can be interpreted as being a restrictive special case of the multiplier method. On the other hand, while $\nu_\mathbb{X}$ is efficient to compute, computation of $\hat{\mu}_\mathbb{X}$ is generally possible only for real-valued structures (5), and even then care has to be taken since the computational cost grows exponentially with the number of real blocks m_r. In [11] it is explained how to combine the advantages of the multiplier method with the advantages of (D,G)-scaling. Loosely speaking, the idea is to apply the multiplier method on the first, say, five real blocks and to apply (D,G)-scaling on the *remaining* real blocks (and complex blocks). As shown in [11] these combined computable upper bounds of $\mu_\mathbb{X}$ are less conservative than $\nu_\mathbb{X}$. It remains to be seen how these upper bounds compare to (D,G)-scaling in combination with a gridding of the real parameter space which is an alternative method to reduce conservatism of the upper bound $\nu_\mathbb{X}$. We end this section with an example that shows $\hat{\mu}_\mathbb{X}$ is generally strictly less than $\nu_\mathbb{X}$.

Example III.3: We derive in this example the values of $\mu_\mathbb{X}(M), \nu_\mathbb{X}(M)$, and $\hat{\mu}_\mathbb{X}(m)$ for the case that

$$\mathbb{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{R} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{R} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ j & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For all $\Delta = \operatorname{diag}(\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{X}$ the determinant $\det(I_2 - \Delta M)$ equals $1 - j\delta_1\delta_2$. This is nonzero irrespective of the values of $\delta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence $\mu_\mathbb{X}(M) = 0$.

For this example $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{X}}$ is the set of diagonal positive definite matrices, and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{X}}$ is the set of real diagonal matrices. With $D \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{X}}$ written as $D = \operatorname{diag}(d_1, d_2)$ and $G = \operatorname{diag}(g_1, g_2)$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_\alpha(D,G) &= M^*DM + j(GM - M^*G) - \alpha^2 D \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} d_2 - \alpha^2 d_1 & jg_1 - g_2 \\ -jg_1 - g_2 & d_1 - \alpha^2 d_2 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Based on the diagonal elements of (8) it can be seen that $\Phi_\alpha(D,G) < 0$ for some $D \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{X}}$ only if $\alpha^2 > 1$. On the other hand, (8) is negative definite for every $\alpha^2 > 1$ if we choose $d_1 = d_2 = 1$ and $g_1 = g_2 = 0$. Hence $\nu_{\mathbb{X}}(M) = 1$.

For $C = I_2$ and $\Delta = \operatorname{diag}(\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{X}$ we have that

$$\operatorname{He} C(I_2 - \Delta M) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & (j\delta_2 - \delta_1)/2 \\ (-j\delta_2 - \delta_1)/2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This is positive definite for all real δ_i satisfying $|\delta_i| < \sqrt{2}$. Hence $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M) \le 1/\sqrt{2}$. A further technical analysis shows that $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M)$ is in fact equal to $1/\sqrt{2}$. So, for this example none of the bounds are the same: $0 = \mu_{\mathbb{X}}(M) < \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M) = 1/\sqrt{2} < \nu_{\mathbb{X}}(M) = 1$.

IV. Equivalent Multipliers

The multiplier method has many variations. For example, instead of trying to find a multiplier C such that (3) holds, it might be perhaps advantageous to try to find a scalar c for which

$$\operatorname{He} c \det(I - \Delta M) > 0 \quad \text{for all } \Delta \in \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}. \tag{9}$$

If such a c exists then again $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(M) < \alpha$. In this section we discuss a few of these variations. We show that certain variations are equivalent in that they induce the same upper bound of $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}$. The class of equivalent multiplier methods includes one that exploits low-rank properties of M, but it does not include the one in (9).

Numerous robust stability problems require computation of $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(M)$ in which the matrix M has low rank. In fact, M is often constructed from tall matrices P and Q as

$$M = QP^*$$

with P and Q readily given by the problem at hand.

Example IV.1: Let $\{A_0, \cdots, A_m\}$ be a collection of $q \times q$ matrices, and let A be any $q \times q$ matrix of the form

$$A = A_0 + \delta_1 A_1 + \cdots + \delta_m A_m, \quad -1 < \delta_i < 1.$$

It is well known that the uncertain system $\dot{x} = Ax$ is asymptotically stable for all such matrices A iff A_0 has all its eigenvalues in the open left-half plane and for all frequencies $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$I_q - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \delta_i A_i (j\omega I_q - A_0)^{-1} \text{ is nonsingular } \forall |\delta_i| < 1. \tag{10}$$

Condition (10) is a low-rank μ problem. To see this define $\Delta = \operatorname{diag}(\delta_1 I_q, \cdots, \delta_m I_q)$ and define the tall matrices P and Q_ω as

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} I_q \\ \vdots \\ I_q \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_\omega = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ \vdots \\ A_m \end{bmatrix} (j\omega I_q - A_0)^{-1}.$$

This way the matrix $I_q - \Sigma_{i=1}^m \delta_i A_i (j\omega I_q - A_0)^{-1}$ of (10) can be written as $I_q - P^* \Delta Q_\omega$. By the determinant rule $\det(I - AB) = \det(I - BA)$ it now follows that (10) holds for all frequencies iff with respect to structure $\mathbb{X} = \operatorname{diag}(\mathbb{R}I_q, \cdots, \mathbb{R}I_q)$ we have

$$\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(Q_\omega P^*) < 1$$

for all frequencies $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. The matrix $M := Q_\omega P^*$ is $qm \times qm$ but only has rank q.

In general, robust nonsingularity of the $n \times n$ set

$$I_n - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}} QP^*$$

is the same as robust nonsingularity of the "smaller" $q \times q$ set

$$I_q - P^* \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}} Q.$$

The obvious question is whether or not the multiplier method applied to the smaller $I_q - P^*(1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}} Q$ provides a more conservative upper bound of $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(QP^*)$ than $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(QP^*)$. They are equivalent.

Theorem IV.2: Let $M = QP^*$. The following four upper bounds of $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(M)$ are the same:

$$\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M) := \inf \left\{ \alpha > 0 : \exists C \text{ s.t. } \operatorname{He} C\left(I_n - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}} M\right) > 0 \right\}$$

$$\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},2}(P,Q) := \inf \left\{ \alpha > 0 : \exists C_2 \text{ s.t. } \operatorname{He} C_2\left(I_q - P^* \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}} Q\right) > 0 \right\}$$

$$\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},3}(P,Q) := \inf \left\{ \alpha > 0 : \exists C_3 \text{ s.t. } \operatorname{He} \left(I_q - P^* \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}} Q\right) C_3 > 0 \right\}$$

$$\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},4}(M) := \inf \left\{ \alpha > 0 : \exists C_4 \text{ s.t. } \operatorname{He} \left(I_n - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}} M\right) C_4 > 0 \right\}.$$

Proof: We prove in four steps that $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}} \le \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},2} = \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},3} \le \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},4} = \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}$ which shows they are all equal.

($\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}} \le \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},2}$): Suppose $\alpha > \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},2}$ and that C_2 satisfies $\operatorname{He} C_2(I_q - P^*(1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}} Q) > 0$. Consider $C := PC_2P^* + \varepsilon EE^*$ with E and ε yet to be determined. Then

$$\begin{aligned} C(I_n - \Delta M) &= (PC_2P^* + \varepsilon EE^*)(I_n - \Delta QP^*) \\ &= [P \quad E] \begin{bmatrix} C_2(I_q - P^*\Delta Q) & 0 \\ -\varepsilon E^* \Delta Q & \varepsilon I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P^* \\ E^* \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, its Hermitian part equals

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{He} C(I_n - \Delta M) = [P \quad E] &\begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{He} C_2(I_q - P^*\Delta Q) & -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} Q^* \Delta^* E \\ -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} E^* \Delta Q & \varepsilon I \end{bmatrix} \\ &\cdot \begin{bmatrix} P^* \\ E^* \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

For any E for which $[P \quad E]$ has full row rank, there is a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ such that (11) is >0 for all $\Delta \in (1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}$. Hence $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}} < \alpha$. Since this can be done for any $\alpha > \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},2}$ we have that $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}} \ge \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},2}$.

($\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},2} = \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},3}$): Take $C_3 = C_2^{-*}$.

($\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},3} \ge \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},4}$): Suppose $\alpha > \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},4}$ and that C_4 satisfies $\operatorname{He}(I_n - (1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}} M) C_4 > 0$. Consider $C_3 := P^*C_4P + \varepsilon E^*E$ with E and ε yet to be determined. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (I_q - P^*\Delta Q)C_3 &= (I_q - P^*\Delta Q)(P^*C_4P + \varepsilon E^*E) \\ &= [P^* \quad E^*] \begin{bmatrix} (I_n - \Delta M)C_4 & -\varepsilon \Delta Q E^* \\ 0 & \varepsilon I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P \\ E \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, its Hermitian part equals

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{He}(I_q - P^*\Delta Q)C_3 = [P^* \quad E^*] &\begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{He}(I_n - \Delta M)C_4 & -\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\Delta Q E^* \\ -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} E Q^* \Delta & \varepsilon I \end{bmatrix} \\ &\cdot \begin{bmatrix} P \\ E \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

For any E for which $[P^* \quad E^*]$ has full row rank there is a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ such that (12) is >0 for all $\Delta \in (1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}$. Hence $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},3} < \alpha$. Since this can be done for any $\alpha > \mu_{\mathbb{X},4}$ we have that $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},3} \le \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},4}$.

($\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},4} = \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}$): Take $C = C_4^{-*}$. ■

The equivalence of $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},4}$ shows that flipping the multiplier to the other side of the nonsingularity set has no effect on the upper bound it induces. A further variation of the multiplier method which is easily verified is that $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(QR^{-1}P^*)$ equals

$$\inf\left\{\alpha>0:\exists C_5 \text{ such that } \mathrm{He}\, C_5\left(R - P^*\frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}Q\right)>0\right\}.$$

Example IV.3: Consider Example IV.1. For a fixed frequency ω, the upper bound $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(Q_\omega P^*)$—which involves a $qm \times qm$ multiplier—is the same as the infimal $\alpha>0$ for which a $C_5 \in \mathbb{C}^{q\times q}$ exists such that

$$\mathrm{He}\, C_5\left[(j\omega I_q - A_0) - \sum_{i=1}^{m}\delta_i A_i\right] > 0 \text{ for all } \delta_i \in \left[-\frac{1}{\alpha},\frac{1}{\alpha}\right].$$

The equivalence of the various multiplier upper bounds generally breaks down if $I_n - \Delta M$ or $I_q - P^*\Delta Q$ is replaced with one that no longer depends affinely on Δ. For example, we know that $I_n - \Delta M$ is nonsingular iff $\det(I_n - \Delta M)$ is nonzero. However, the existence of a multiplier C for $I_n - \Delta M$ satisfying (3) does not necessarily imply that a scalar c exists such that

$$\mathrm{He}\, c\det\left(I - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}M\right) > 0. \tag{13}$$

As an example, suppose we have

$$\mathbb{X} = \begin{bmatrix}\mathbb{R} & 0\\ 0 & \mathbb{R}\end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M = \begin{bmatrix}2j & 0\\ 0 & 2j\end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(M) = \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M) = 0$ because for any $\alpha>0$ we have $\mathrm{He}\,(I_2 - (1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}M) = \{I_2\} > 0$. However, for say, $\alpha = 1$, we cannot find a c that satisfies (13) because for the four Δ's

$$\Delta = \begin{bmatrix}\pm 1 & 0\\ 0 & \pm 1\end{bmatrix} \in \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}.$$

The determinant $\det(I - \Delta M) = (1\pm 2j)(1\pm 2j)$ takes the values $-3 \pm 4j$ and 5 (twice), and these do not lie in one half-space $\{s:\theta + \pi/2 > \arg s > \theta - \pi/2\}$.

It is an important asset of the multiplier method that it can exploit the low rank properties of M. The reduction in size when going from the $n\times n$ matrix $I_n - \Delta M$ to the equivalent $q\times q$ matrix $I_q - P^*\Delta Q$ is most extreme if $M = QP^*$ has rank one.

Lemma IV.4: $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M) = \mu_{\mathbb{X}}(M)$ if M has rank one.

Proof: Let P and Q be column vectors such that $M = QP^*$. By Theorem IV.2 we have that $\hat{\mu}(M) = \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},2}(P,Q)$. Suppose $\alpha > \mu_{\mathbb{X}}(M)$. Then by definition of $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}$ all members of $1 - P^*((1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}})Q$ are nonzero. Since $1 - P^*((1/\alpha)\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}})Q$ is convex it must, therefore, lie in some half-space $\{s:\theta - \pi/2 < \arg s < \theta + \pi/2\}$. Then

$$\mathrm{He}\, e^{-j\theta}\left(1 - P^*\frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}Q\right) = \mathrm{Re}\, e^{-j\theta}\left(1 - P^*\frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}Q\right) > 0$$

so that $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X},2}(P,Q) < \alpha$. Since this holds for any $\alpha > \mu_{\mathbb{X}}(M)$, the result follows. ■

Young [19] showed that also (D,G)-scaling is exact for rank one matrices M. The multiplier method is also exact if $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ in which case we can simply take the multiplier to be the identity.

V. Continuity

In typical robust stability applications the nonsingularity property that needs to be tested is

$$I - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{X}}H(j\omega) \text{ is nonsingular for all } \omega \in \mathbb{R}\cup\infty? \tag{14}$$

In other words, check at each frequency ω whether or not $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(H(j\omega)) < \alpha$. This is usually impossible, and one has to rely on a finite frequency grid. The problem, however, is that $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}$, $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}$, and $\nu_{\mathbb{X}}$ are discontinuous which greatly impairs the use of gridding.

Example V.1: Suppose $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}$. If x is a real, then $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(x) = |x|$. $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}$ is discontinuous because for every (arbitrarily small) $y \neq 0$ we have that $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(x+jy) = 0$. Since $\mu_{\mathbb{X}} = \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}} = \nu_{\mathbb{X}}$ for this case (See Lemma IV.4), $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and $\nu_{\mathbb{X}}$ also are discontinuous.

Generally $\mu_{\mathbb{X}}(H(j\omega))$ and its upper bounds are discontinuous at some isolated frequencies only. An even more severe discontinuity problem that can occur is that the infimal α for which (14) holds true may be discontinuous as a function of H (measured in, say, the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ norm). This problem was first demonstrated in [10] and subsequently rigorously studied in [3]. The multiplier method upper bound can be adjusted—at the expense of worsening the bound—to one that is continuous.

Lemma V.2: Let η be some (small) positive number <1. If the multiplier C in (4) is restricted to the convex set

$$\|C\| < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{He}\, C > \eta I \tag{15}$$

then C has a condition number less than $1/\eta$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}$ is continuous

$$\|\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M+E) - \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M)\| \le \frac{1}{\eta}\|E\|. \tag{16}$$

The proof is trivial. Note that the condition $\|C\| < 1$ alone has no effect on the upper bound $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M)$ since the multiplier may be scaled to be like that. Second, note that any feasible multiplier C is nonsingular and satisfies $\mathrm{He}\, C > 0$. However, as the bound α approaches its optimal value $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(M)$, its associated feasible multiplier C may become ill-conditioned in the sense that $\mathrm{He}\, C$ approaches a singular matrix. An advantage of the continuity condition (16) over that of Lee and Tits [13] is that (16) is a Lipschitz continuity condition with known Lipschitz constant $1/\eta$.

Example V.3: Suppose the multiplier C is restricted to (15) for some $0<\eta<1$. For $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}$ it may be verified that $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{X}}(x+jy) = \max\{0, |x| - |y|(\sqrt{1-\eta^2}/\eta)\}$ (cf. Example V.1.).

The LMI (15) is easily incorporated in the convex upper bounds of Fan *et al.* [9] and Fu and Barabanov [11], as all of them generate a feasible multiplier C. (Condition (15) is also an LMI in (D,G) if we use $C = \alpha^2 D + jM^*G$.)

References

[1] V. Balakrishnan, Y. Huang, A. Packard, and J. Doyle, "Linear matrix inequalities in analysis with multipliers," in *Proc. Am. Contr. Conf.*, 1994, pp. 1228–1232.

[2] B. R. Barmish and H. I. Kang, "A survey of extreme point results for robustness of control systems," *Automatica*, vol. 29, pp. 13–35, 1993.

[3] B. R. Barmish, P. P. Khargonekar, Z. C. Shi, and R. Tempo, "Robustness margin need not be a continuous function of the problem data," *Syst. Contr. Lett.*, vol. 15, pp. 91–98, 1990.

[4] S. Boyd, L. El Ghaoui, E. Feron, and V. Balakrishnan, *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 1994.

[5] R. D. Braatz, P. M. Young, J. C. Doyle, and M. Morari, "Computational complexity of μ calculation," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1000–1002, 1994.

[6] R. W. Brockett and J. C. Willems, "Frequency domain stability criteria—Part I," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 10, pp. 255–271, 1965.

[7] R. Y. Chiang and M. G. Safonov, *User's Guide, Robust Control Toolbox*. Natick, MA: Mathworks, 1992.

[8] J. C. Doyle, "Analysis of feedback systems with structured uncertainties," *IEE Proc., Part D*, vol. 129, pp. 242–250, 1982.

[9] M. Fan, A. Tits, and J. Doyle, "Robustness in the presence of joint parametric uncertainty and unmodeled dynamics," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 25–38, 1991.

[10] M. Fu, "Polytopes of polynomials with zeros in a prescribed region," in *Robustness in Identification and Control*, M. Milanese, R. Tempo, and A. Vicino, Eds. New York: Plenum, 1988.
[11] M. Fu and N. E. Barabanov, "Improved upper bounds of the mixed structured singular value," Univ. Newcastle, Australia, Tech. Rep. EE9461, 1994; also in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision Contr.*, New Orleans, LA, Dec., 1995, pp. 3115–3120.
[12] P. Gahinet and A Nemirovsky, "LMI Lab—A package for manipulating and solving LMI's," 1993, preprint.
[13] L. Lee and A. Tits, "On continuity/discontinuity in robustness indicators," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 1551–1553, 1993.
[14] J. H. Ly, M. G. Safonov, and R. Y. Chiang, "Real/complex multivariable stability margin computation via generalized Popov multiplier-LMI approach," in *Proc. Amer. Contr. Conf.*, pp. 425–429, 1994.
[15] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovsky, *Interior Point Polynomial Methods in Convex Programming*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 1993.
[16] A. Packard and J. Doyle, "The complex structured singular value," *Automatica*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 71–109, 1993.
[17] S. Poljak and J. Rohn, "Checking robust nonsingularity is np-hard," *Math. Contr., Signals Syst.*, vol. 6, pp. 1–9, 1993.
[18] V. M. Popov, "Absolute stability of nonlinear systems of automatic control," *Automat. Remote Contr.*, vol. 22, pp. 857–875, 1962.
[19] P. M. Young, "The rank one mixed μ problem and 'Kharitonov-type' analysis," *Automatica*, vol. 30, no. 12, pp. 1899–1911, 1994.
[20] P. M. Young, M. P. Newlin, and J. C. Doyle, "Practical computation of the mixed μ problem," in *Proc. Amer. Contr. Conf.*, 1992, pp. 2190–2194.

Design of Transaction Management Protocols

P. Kozák and W. M. Wonham

***Abstract*— The paper shows how transaction management protocols can be designed using discrete-event system control theory. It outlines designs for some well-known protocols: serialization graph testing, two-phase locking, and timestamp ordering. These protocols can be obtained as solutions (centralized, fully decentralized, or maximal decentralized) of standard control problems. The results serve to unify the problems considered and suggest the possibility of computer-aided design.**

I. Introduction

A transaction (database) system has three main components: a set of data items, transactions (users) acting on these data items, and a manager controlling access of the transactions to the data. The manager's function includes maintaining data consistency, maximizing throughput, minimizing waiting time, and failure recovery. Transaction systems are discrete-event systems (DES) [1], so the tools of DES control theory [2]–[5] can be applied [1].

This paper discusses the specialized task of concurrency control [6], [7] dealing with data consistency and shows how the managers can be designed as DES controllers. Section II formulates the problem. Section III presents a centralized solution known as the serialization graph testing protocol. On imposing additional requirements—e.g., decentralization—different solutions can be obtained (Section IV). The locking and timestamp ordering protocols can be found as fully decentralized solutions [5] of a supervisory control problem. Optimistic protocols are discussed in Section V. Section VI draws conclusions.

The problem is formulated within the supervisory control framework of the DES [2], [4] and with reference to the database background in [6], [7], and [1]. For the first time in [1], the concurrency problem was formulated within the dynamic system control framework. The main differences between [1] and the present paper are: the dynamic mode of information is modeled directly by the transaction model,[1] different sets of controllable events are examined, and some protocols are obtained as decentralized controllers in contrast with the centralized controller of [1]. Limited lookahead policies [3] are also considered.

Manuscript received August 27, 1993; revised October 7, 1994. This work was supported in part by Bell Canada under Contract 3-254-188-10 (University of Toronto).

P. Kozák is with the Czech Academy of Sciences, Institute of Information Theory and Automation, 182 08 Prague 8, Czech Republic (e-mail: kozak@utia.cas.cz).

W. M. Wonham is with the Systems Control Group, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1A4 Canada.

Publisher Item Identifier S 0018-9286(96)06771-2.

II. Problem Formulation

Consider a set of data items D and set of transactions $\mathcal{T}$. A transaction $t \in \mathcal{T}$ can execute the following operations: R_t^d (*read data item* $d \in D$), W_t^d (*write into data item* $d \in D$), C_t (*commit*—the transaction has successfully terminated and all changes of data items by the transaction are made permanent), and A_t (*abort*—the transaction has terminated, but all changes it made in data items are now considered incorrect and are canceled. The transaction can restart again.). For each $t \in \mathcal{T}$ let

$$\Sigma_t = \{\mathrm{C}_t, \mathrm{A}_t\} \cup \{\mathrm{R}_t^d | d \in D\} \cup \{\mathrm{W}_t^d | d \in D\}.$$

The transaction t is modeled as the language $L_t = (\Sigma_t \backslash \{\mathrm{C}_t\})^* \mathrm{C}_t$, where $\backslash$ denotes set difference and $(\Sigma_t \backslash \{\mathrm{C}_t\})^*$ the set of finite sequences over $\Sigma_t \backslash \{\mathrm{C}_t\}$. The model reflects the fact[2] that the manager must expect any sequence of operations ending with C_t.

Let $\Sigma = \cup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \Sigma_t$. The transaction system is the language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$, defined as the shuffle product of the L_t ($t \in \mathcal{T}$). The strings of L are called *schedules*. A *serial schedule* is a schedule without the interleaving of operations of distinct transactions. The main assumption is that each transaction maintains data consistency if it acts alone and if the last executed operation of this transaction is "commit."

The consistency criterion for schedules [6] and [7] is formulated using the concept of a serialization graph. Say that two operations of a schedule form a *conflicting pair* if they are executed by distinct transactions which are committed in the schedule, they act on the same data item, and at least one of these operations is "write." The *serialization graph (SG)* of a schedule is a labeled directed graph which has the names of committed transactions as nodes and whose edges are defined by the conflicting pairs of the schedule and labeled by the corresponding data items. For each conflicting pair there is a directed edge between transaction names, starting at whichever transaction of the pair occurred earlier.

A schedule is *serializable*[3] if there are no cycles in its SG. For consistency it is additionally required: "The results of any committed

[1] The performance analysis of different managers of both static and dynamic mode of information presented in [1] uses the static-mode-information transaction model.

[2] This is referred to as the dynamic mode of information. For the static mode of information, L_t is singleton.

[3] This property is sometimes called also "conflict serializable."