

# Nonsmooth Optimization for Multiband Frequency Domain Control Design

Pierre Apkarian<sup>a</sup>, Dominikus Noll<sup>b</sup>,

<sup>a</sup>ONERA-CERT, Centre d'études et de recherche de Toulouse, Control System Department, 2 av. Edouard Belin, 31055 Toulouse, France - and - Université Paul Sabatier, Institut de Mathématiques, Toulouse, France

<sup>b</sup>Université Paul Sabatier, Institut de Mathématiques, 118, route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse, France

---

## Abstract

Multiband frequency domain synthesis consists in the minimization of a finite family of closed-loop transfer functions on prescribed frequency intervals. This is an algorithmically difficult problem due to its inherent nonsmoothness and nonconvexity. We extend our previous work on nonsmooth  $H_\infty$  synthesis to develop a nonsmooth optimization technique to compute local solutions to multiband synthesis problems. The proposed method is shown to perform well on illustrative examples.

*Key words:*  $H_\infty$ -synthesis, multidisk problems, structured controller design, nonsmooth optimization.

---

## 1 Introduction

We present a new algorithmic approach to multi frequency band feedback control synthesis. We consider simultaneous minimization of a finite family of closed-loop performance functions

$$f(\mathcal{K}) = \max_{i=1,\dots,N} \|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{K}$  is the feedback controller,  $T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, \cdot)$  the  $i$ th closed-loop performance channel, and  $\|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i}$  the peak value of the transfer function maximum singular value norm on a prescribed frequency interval  $I_i$ :

$$\|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i} = \sup_{\omega \in I_i} \bar{\sigma}(T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega)).$$

Typically, each  $I_i$  is a closed interval or a finite union of intervals. For a single channel,  $i = 1$  and  $I_1 = [0, \infty)$ , minimizing  $f(\mathcal{K})$  reduces to standard  $H_\infty$  synthesis.

The present approach to multiband synthesis expands on [1–3, 14], where this idea was laid down for standard  $H_\infty$  synthesis. It leads to efficient algorithms, because a

substantial part of the computations is carried out in the frequency domain, where the plant state dimension only mildly affects cputimes. Our method avoids the difficulties of bilinear matrix inequalities, where the presence of Lyapunov variables, whose number grows quadratically with the state-space dimension, quickly leads to large size optimization programs as systems get sizable. We have identified this as the major source of breakdown for most existing codes.

Multiband control design is of great practical interest mainly for two reasons:

- Very often design criteria are expressed as frequency domain constraints on limited frequency bands.
- In the traditional approach, weighting functions are used to specify frequency bands. But the search for suitable weighting functions is often critical and increases the controller order.

Despite its importance, only few methods for multiband synthesis have been published. In [12], the authors develop an extension of the KYP Lemma [18] to handle band restricted frequency domain constraints. The resulting problem is nonconvex even in state-feedback.

There exist classical loop-shaping methods, like QFT [11], which exploit graphical tools and interfaces, but to work satisfactorily require an advanced level of intuition. QFT is no longer suited under additional structural con-

---

\* This paper was not presented at any IFAC meeting. Corresponding author Pierre Apkarian Tel. +33 5.62.25.27.84 - Fax: +33 5.62.25.27.64.

*Email addresses:* `apkarian@cert.fr` (Pierre Apkarian), `noll@mip.ups-tlse.fr` (Dominikus Noll).

straints on the controller.

Similar comments apply to methods based on the Youla parametrization, which lead to high-order controllers [7]. Classical Bode, Nyquist and Nichols plots to design simple controllers such as PID and phase-lag [4, 10] are limited to SISO systems, even though some generalizations to MIMO systems have been tried [13]. Altogether we believe that frequency band synthesis warrants a fresh investigation based on recent progress in optimization.

In contrast with  $H_\infty$ - [2] and multidisk synthesis [3], multi band design leads to an additional difficulty. Closed loop stability with controller  $\mathcal{K}$  has to be built into a mathematical programming constraint. Two possibilities to model this constraint will be discussed, for more details see [2, 3]. In the sequel each  $T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}$  is a smooth operator defined on the open domain  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^{(m_2+k) \times (p_2+k)}$  of  $k$ th order stabilizing controllers

$$\mathcal{K} := \begin{bmatrix} A_K & B_K \\ C_K & D_K \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_K \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$$

with values in the infinite dimensional space  $RH_\infty$ .

## 2 Multiband frequency domain design

We consider a plant  $P$  in state-space form

$$P(s) : \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ u \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

together with  $N$  concurring performance specifications, represented as plants  $P^i(s)$  in state-space form as

$$P^i(s) : \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}^i \\ z^i \\ y^i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A^i & B_1^i & B_2^i \\ C_1^i & D_{11}^i & D_{12}^i \\ C_2^i & D_{21}^i & D_{22}^i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x^i \\ w^i \\ u^i \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3)$$

where  $x^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n^i}$  is the state of  $P^i$ ,  $u^i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$  the control,  $w^i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1^i}$  the vector of exogenous inputs,  $y^i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$  the vector of measurements and  $z^i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1^i}$  the  $i$ th performance vector. Without loss of generality, it is assumed that  $D = 0$  and  $D_{22}^i = 0$  for all  $i$ .

Multiband synthesis requires designing an output feedback controller  $u^i = K(s)y^i$  for the plants (3) with:

- **Internal stability:** The controller  $\mathcal{K}$  stabilizes the original plant  $P$  in closed-loop.
- **Performance:** Among all internally stabilizing controllers,  $\mathcal{K}$  minimizes the worst case performance function  $f(\mathcal{K}) = \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i}$ .

We assume that the controller  $K$  has the form:

$$K(s) = C_K(sI - A_K)^{-1}B_K + D_K, \quad A_K \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}, \quad (4)$$

where the case  $k = 0$  of a static controller is included. The synthesis problem may then be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } f(\mathcal{K}) = \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i} \\ & \text{subject to } \mathcal{K} \text{ stabilizes } (A, B, C), \mathcal{K} \in \mathcal{D} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Note that structural constraints on the controller are easily handled by restricting  $\mathcal{K}$  to suitable subspaces.

**Remark 1** A difficulty in (5) is that  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{K} \text{ stabilizes } (A, B, C)\}$  is not a constraint in the sense of mathematical programming. An element  $\mathcal{K}$  on the boundary  $\partial\mathcal{D}$  is not a valid solution. Since an optimization algorithm for (5) will converge to  $\mathcal{K} \in \partial\mathcal{D}$ , we have to modify this constraint to avoid numerical failure.

## 3 Model I: distance to instability

In this section we present a first systematic way to build a constraint which guarantees closed-loop stability. For simplicity we work with static controllers. The case of dynamic controllers simply follows from standard augmentation of the plant [2].

We start by introducing a stabilizing channel  $s \mapsto T_{\text{stab}}(\mathcal{K}, s) := (sI - (A + B\mathcal{K}C))^{-1}$  for (2). Then  $\mathcal{K}$  stabilizes  $P$  in closed-loop iff  $T_{\text{stab}}(\mathcal{K})$  is stable. The stability domain  $\mathcal{D}$  in (5) is then

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p_2} : \|(sI - (A + B\mathcal{K}C))^{-1}\|_\infty < +\infty\}.$$

We then replace  $\mathcal{D}$  by the smaller closed set

$$\mathcal{D}_b = \{\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p_2} : \|(sI - (A + B\mathcal{K}C))^{-1}\|_\infty \leq b\},$$

where  $b > 0$  is some large constant, and consider the following program:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } f(\mathcal{K}) = \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i} \\ & \text{subject to } g(\mathcal{K}) := \|T_{\text{stab}}(\mathcal{K})\|_\infty \leq b \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The distance to instability of a stable matrix  $A$  is defined as:

$$\beta(A) = \inf\{\|X\|_F : A + X \text{ unstable}\}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\beta(A) \geq \epsilon \Leftrightarrow \|(sI - A)^{-1}\|_\infty \leq 1/\epsilon.$$

That means, our natural choice is  $b = 1/\beta$ .

How do we solve program (6)<sub>b</sub> numerically? We consider the homotopy program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p_2}} \max \left\{ \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i}, \mu \|T_{\text{stab}}(\mathcal{K})\|_{\infty} \right\} \\ = \min_{\mathcal{K}} \max \{f(\mathcal{K}), \mu g(\mathcal{K})\} =: \min_{\mathcal{K}} f_{\mu}(\mathcal{K}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\mu > 0$  is called the homotopy parameter.

**Lemma 2** *Let  $\mathcal{K}_{\mu}$  be a local minimum of (7)<sub>μ</sub> which is non-degenerate in the sense that it is neither a critical point of  $f$  alone, nor a critical point of  $g$  alone. Then  $\mathcal{K}_{\mu}$  is a Karush-Kuhn-Tucker point of program (6)<sub>b(μ)</sub> with  $b(\mu) = g(\mathcal{K}_{\mu}) = f(\mathcal{K}_{\mu})/\mu$ .*

**PROOF.** As  $\mathcal{K}_{\mu}$  is non degenerate, the necessary optimality conditions for (7)<sub>μ</sub> give  $0 < t_{\mu} < 1$  such that

$$0 \in t_{\mu} \partial f(\mathcal{K}_{\mu}) + (1 - t_{\mu}) \mu \partial g(\mathcal{K}_{\mu}) \quad \text{and} \quad f(\mathcal{K}_{\mu}) = \mu g(\mathcal{K}_{\mu}).$$

Let us now write the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions for (6)<sub>b</sub>: There exists a Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda_b$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \in \partial f(\mathcal{K}_b) + \lambda_b \partial g(\mathcal{K}_b), \quad g(\mathcal{K}_b) - b \leq 0, \\ \lambda_b \geq 0, \quad \lambda_b (g(\mathcal{K}_b) - b) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We see that the solution  $\mathcal{K}_{\mu}$  of (7)<sub>μ</sub> solves (6)<sub>b</sub> if

$$b(\mu) = g(\mathcal{K}_{\mu}), \quad \lambda_{b(\mu)} = ((1 - t_{\mu})\mu) / t_{\mu}.$$

This proves the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 3** *Let  $\mathcal{K}_b$  be a local minimum of program (6)<sub>b</sub> which is non degenerate in the sense that it is not a Karush-Kuhn-Tucker point of  $f$  alone. Then  $\mathcal{K}_b$  is a critical point of program (7)<sub>μ(b)</sub> with  $\mu(b) = f(\mathcal{K}_b)/g(\mathcal{K}_b)$ .*

**PROOF.** We compare the necessary optimality conditions. Reading the formulas backwards, we get

$$\mu(b) = f(\mathcal{K}_b)/g(\mathcal{K}_b).$$

Then reading  $\lambda_b = (1 - t_{\mu})\mu/t_{\mu}$  backwards leads to

$$t_{\mu(b)} = \frac{\mu(b)}{\lambda_b + \mu(b)} = \frac{f(\mathcal{K}_b)}{f(\mathcal{K}_b) + \lambda_b g(\mathcal{K}_b)} \in (0, 1). \quad \square$$

**Remark 4** *There is a local one-to-one correspondence between (6)<sub>b</sub> and (7)<sub>μ</sub> in the sense that  $\mathcal{K}_b = \mathcal{K}_{\mu(b)}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_{\mu} = \mathcal{K}_{b(\mu)}$ . To find  $\mathcal{K}_b$  for  $b = \beta^{-1}$  it suffices to find*

$\mu(b) = \mu(\beta^{-1})$  and solve (7)<sub>μ(β<sup>-1</sup>)</sub>. Using (7)<sub>μ</sub> to solve model (6)<sub>b</sub> is basically a homotopy method, because the parameter  $b(\mu)$  is gradually driven toward its final value  $b$  by adjusting  $\mu$ . Notice that the problem may become ill-conditioned when  $b$  is chosen too small.

## 4 Model II: shifting poles

Let us consider a second possibility to fix a closed subset of  $\mathcal{D}$  based on the shifted  $H_{\infty}$  norm, [7, p. 100]:  $\|H(\cdot)\|_{\infty, \alpha} = \|H(\cdot + \alpha)\|_{\infty}$ . For  $\alpha < 0$ , condition  $\|H\|_{\infty, \alpha} < +\infty$  guarantees that the poles of  $H(s)$  lie to the left of  $\Re s = \alpha < 0$ . That means that for every  $\alpha < 0$ , the closure  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha}$  of the open domain

$$\mathcal{D}^{\alpha} = \{\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p_2} : \|(sI - (A + BKC))^{-1}\|_{\infty, \alpha} < +\infty\}$$

is a tractable constraint set, because  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha} \subset \mathcal{D}$ . Indeed, elements  $\mathcal{K} \in \partial \mathcal{D}^{\alpha}$  still have  $\Re \lambda \leq \alpha < 0$  for the poles  $\lambda$  of  $A + BKC$ , hence these  $\mathcal{K}$  are closed-loop stabilizing. This suggests the optimization program

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad f(\mathcal{K}) = \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i} \\ \text{subject to} \quad \mathcal{K} \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Having prepared its rationale, let us discuss an algorithm for (8)<sup>α</sup>. The situation is slightly more complicated than for model I, because  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha}$  is not easily represented as a constraint set in the sense of nonlinear programming. What we have, though, is a barrier function for  $\mathcal{D}^{\alpha}$ . Putting

$$h_{\alpha}(\mathcal{K}) = \|T_{\text{stab}}(\mathcal{K})\|_{\infty, \alpha},$$

where  $T_{\text{stab}}(s) := (sI - (A + BKC))^{-1}$  is the stabilizing channel for plant  $P$ , we see that

$$\mathcal{D}^{\alpha} = \{\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p_2} : h_{\alpha}(\mathcal{K}) < +\infty\}.$$

We may then consider the following family of programs

$$\min_{\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p_2}} \max \{f(\mathcal{K}), \mu h_{\alpha}(\mathcal{K})\} =: \min_{\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p_2}} f_{\mu, \alpha}(\mathcal{K}), \quad (9)$$

where  $f_{\mu, \alpha}(\mathcal{K})$  is the barrier function. We link (8) to (9):

**Lemma 5** *Let  $\mathcal{K}^{\mu, \alpha}$  be a local minimum of (9)<sup>μ, α</sup> which is non degenerate in the sense that it is neither a critical point of  $f$  alone, nor a critical point of  $h_{\alpha}$  alone. Let  $\mathcal{K}^{\alpha}$  be an accumulation point of the sequence  $\mathcal{K}^{\mu, \alpha}$  as  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ . Suppose  $\min_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}_+} \sigma(j\omega I - (AB\mathcal{K}^{\alpha}C - \alpha I))$  is attained on a finite set of frequencies. Then  $\mathcal{K}^{\alpha}$  is a critical point of program (8)<sup>α</sup>.*

**PROOF.** 1) The KKT conditions for (8)<sup>α</sup> at  $\mathcal{K}^{\alpha}$  give a subgradient  $G \in \partial f(\mathcal{K}^{\alpha})$  such that  $-G$  is in the Clarke normal cone  $N_{\overline{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha}}(\mathcal{K}^{\alpha})$  of  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha}$  at  $\mathcal{K}^{\alpha}$ ; cf. [5].

2) The KKT conditions for  $(9)^{\mu,\alpha}$  say that there exists  $0 < t_{\mu,\alpha} < 1$  such that  $f(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}) = \mu h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha})$  and

$$0 \in t_{\mu,\alpha} \partial f(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}) + (1 - t_{\mu,\alpha}) \mu \partial h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}). \quad (10)$$

We introduce the level sets

$$\mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu) = \{\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p_2} : h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}) \leq h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha})\}.$$

There are now two cases. Either  $h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ , or there exists a subsequence for which these values are bounded. In the latter case,  $f(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}) = \mu h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha})$  gives  $f(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}) \rightarrow 0$ , hence  $f(\mathcal{K}^\alpha) = 0$ . This case is excluded, because here  $\mathcal{K}^\alpha$  is a global minimum of  $f$  alone.

3) Now assume that  $h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}) \rightarrow \infty$ , so that the  $\mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu)$  grow as  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ . Then  $\cup_{\mu>0} \mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu) = \mathcal{D}^\alpha$ . By (10) there exists a subgradient  $G_{\mu,\alpha} \in \partial f(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha})$  such that

$$-(1 - t_{\mu,\alpha}) \mu G_{\mu,\alpha} / t_{\mu,\alpha} \in \partial h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}).$$

In other words, the negative subgradient  $-G_{\mu,\alpha}$  of  $f$  at  $\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}$  is a direction in the normal cone  $N_{\mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu)}(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha})$  to the level set  $\mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu)$  at  $\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}$ . Passing to a subsequence, we may assume  $G_{\mu,\alpha} \rightarrow G_\alpha$ . By upper semicontinuity of the Clarke subdifferential [8],  $G_\alpha \in \partial f(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$ . We now show that  $G_\alpha$  is in the normal cone  $N_{\overline{\mathcal{D}^\alpha}}(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$ , because then the necessary optimality condition in step 1) is satisfied.

4) Let us introduce the following function

$$\phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}) = \begin{cases} -h_\alpha(\mathcal{K})^{-2} & \text{if } h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}) < \infty \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Then  $\mathcal{D}^\alpha = \{\mathcal{K} : \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}) < 0\}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu) = \{\mathcal{K} : \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}) \leq -\frac{1}{h_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha})^2}\}$ . Notice, however, that  $\overline{\mathcal{D}^\alpha} \neq \{\mathcal{K} : \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}) \leq 0\}$ . That means, we cannot directly conclude via upper semicontinuity of the Clarke subdifferential of  $\phi_\alpha$ , as we did for  $\partial f$ . This complicates this proof.

We show that  $\phi_\alpha$  is locally Lipschitz. Since  $h_\alpha$  is locally Lipschitz, this is true inside  $\mathcal{D}^\alpha$ . Only points  $\mathcal{K} \in \partial \mathcal{D}^\alpha$  might cause problems. But

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}) &= -h_\alpha(\mathcal{K})^{-2} \\ &= -1 / \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}_+} \bar{\sigma} \left( (j\omega I - A - BKC + \alpha I)^{-1} \right)^2 \\ &= - \min_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}_+} \underline{\sigma} (j\omega I - A - BKC + \alpha I)^2 \end{aligned}$$

and this is locally Lipschitz, because for fixed  $\omega$ , the minimum eigenvalue of an Hermitian matrix is locally Lipschitz. This also shows that  $\phi_\alpha$  has value 0 outside  $\overline{\mathcal{D}^\alpha}$ , which is therefore not the level set of  $\phi_\alpha$  at level 0.

Using upper semi-continuity of the Clarke subdifferential  $\limsup_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \partial \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}) \subset \partial \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$  implies

$$\limsup_{\mu \rightarrow 0} N_{\mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu)}(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}) \subset \Lambda_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha),$$

where  $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathcal{K})$  is the convex cone generated by the compact convex set  $\partial \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K})$ , because the normal cone to  $\mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu)$  is generated by the subdifferential of  $\phi_\alpha$  at  $\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}$ . Recall the difficulty: our proof is not finished because  $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$  is *not* identical with the Clarke normal cone  $N_{\overline{\mathcal{D}^\alpha}}(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$  to  $\overline{\mathcal{D}^\alpha}$  at  $\mathcal{K}^\alpha$ .

Let us show that  $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$  is pointed, that is,  $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha) \cap -\Lambda_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha) = \{0\}$ . This follows as soon as we show that  $\pm G \in \partial \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$  implies  $G = 0$ .

By hypothesis, the minimum singular value at  $\mathcal{K}^\alpha$  is attained on a finite set of frequencies. This implies that  $\phi_\alpha$  is Clarke regular at  $\mathcal{K}^\alpha$ . Hence the Clarke directional derivative coincides with the Dini directional derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha) &= \{G : \forall D \langle G, D \rangle \leq \phi'_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha; D) = \\ &\quad \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^{-1} (\phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha + tD) - \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha))\}. \end{aligned}$$

But  $\phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha) = 0$  so for fixed  $\epsilon > 0$  we can find  $t_\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\langle G, D \rangle \leq t_\epsilon^{-1} \phi_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha + t_\epsilon D) + \epsilon \leq \epsilon$ , the latter since  $\phi_\alpha \leq 0$ . We have shown  $\langle G, D \rangle \leq \epsilon$ , and since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary, we have  $\langle G, D \rangle \leq 0$ . Now we use the fact that  $-G$  is also a subgradient. Repeating the argument gives  $-\langle G, D \rangle \leq 0$ . Altogether,  $\langle G, D \rangle = 0$ , and since  $D$  was arbitrary,  $G = 0$ .

5) Having shown that  $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$  is pointed, it follows that the convex hull of  $\limsup_{\mu \rightarrow 0} N_{\mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu)}(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha})$  is pointed,

because by 4) it is contained in  $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$ . Now we use Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 2.3 in [9] to deduce that  $\limsup_{\mu \rightarrow 0} N_{\mathcal{D}^\alpha(\mu)}(\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}) \subset N_{\overline{\mathcal{D}^\alpha}}(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)$ . In the terminology of that paper, this is referred to as normal convergence. That completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 6** 1) The above reasoning carries over to dynamic controllers via the augmentation [2]. 2)  $f_{\mu,\alpha}$  in (9) and  $f_\mu$  in (7) have almost identical structure, so the algorithms for both models are similar. 3) Normal convergence defined in [9] is a suitable concept to describe approximation of mathematical programs. If the constraint set is represented as the level set of a locally Lipschitz operator, normal convergence is satisfied. However, in our case, the limiting set  $\overline{\mathcal{D}^\alpha}$  is not a level set, which complicates the situation. Academic counterexamples where normal convergence fails can be constructed; see [9]. The method of this section is a barrier method, because  $\alpha$  is fixed from start, while  $\mu$  is driven to 0 to give convergence. So  $\mu$  plays a role similar to the barrier parameter in interior-point methods. As our experiments show, this

requires a final  $\mu \ll -\alpha$ , so ill-conditioning may occur only when  $\alpha$  is chosen too small.

## 5 Algorithms for multiband control design

In this section we develop tools and present algorithms to solve models I via (7) $_{\mu}$  and II via (9) $^{\mu,\alpha}$ .

### 5.1 Subdifferential of the barrier function

Computation of the Clarke subdifferential of  $f_{\mu}$  and  $f_{\mu,\alpha}$  is central for our approach. The foundations for the results here are given in [2] for the  $H_{\infty}$  norm and in [3] for multi-disk synthesis. In order to unify the presentation, we introduce a common terminology for both cases. For  $f_{\mu}$  at fixed  $\mu > 0$ , we introduce a new closed-loop transfer channel:

$$T_{w^{N+1} \rightarrow z^{N+1}}(\mathcal{K}) = \mu T_{\text{stab}}(\mathcal{K}),$$

so that  $f_{\mu}(\mathcal{K}) = \max_{i=1,\dots,N+1} \|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i}$  when we set  $I_{N+1} = [0, \infty]$ . Similarly, for  $f_{\mu,\alpha}$  at fixed  $\mu > 0$ ,  $\alpha < 0$ , we introduce the  $(N+1)$ st channel in the form

$$T_{w^{N+1} \rightarrow z^{N+1}}(\mathcal{K}, s) = \mu T_{\text{stab}}(\mathcal{K}, s + \alpha),$$

so that again  $f_{\mu,\alpha}(\mathcal{K}) = \max_{i=1,\dots,N+1} \|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i}$  with  $I_{N+1} = [0, \infty]$ .

As formulas for the Clarke subdifferential of  $f_{\mu,\alpha}$  are easily inferred from those of  $f_{\mu}$ , we will restrict the discussion to  $f_{\mu}$ . We introduce the simplifying closed-loop notation in state space

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^i(\mathcal{K}) &:= A^i + B_2^i \mathcal{K} C_2^i, \quad \mathcal{B}^i(\mathcal{K}) := B_1^i + B_2^i \mathcal{K} D_{21}^i, \\ \mathcal{C}^i(\mathcal{K}) &:= C_1^i + D_{12}^i \mathcal{K} C_2^i, \quad \mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{K}) := D_{11}^i + D_{12}^i \mathcal{K} D_{21}^i, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and in frequency domain

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, s) & G_{12}^i(\mathcal{K}, s) \\ G_{21}^i(\mathcal{K}, s) & \star \end{bmatrix} &:= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{C}^i(\mathcal{K}) \\ C_2^i \end{bmatrix} (sI - \mathcal{A}^i(\mathcal{K}))^{-1} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}^i(\mathcal{K}) & B_2^i \\ D_{21}^i & \star \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, for  $i = N+1$ , we define the plant

$$P^{N+1}(s) : \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}^{N+1} \\ z^{N+1} \\ y^{N+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & I & B \\ I & 0 & 0 \\ C & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x^{N+1} \\ w^{N+1} \\ u^{N+1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where  $x^{N+1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n$  is the dimension of  $A$ ,  $u^{N+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$ ,  $w^{N+1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $y^{N+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$ , and  $z^{N+1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Let us introduce the notion of active frequencies. For a given controller  $\mathcal{K}$ , active channels or specifications are

obtained through the index set  $I_{\mu}(\mathcal{K})$

$$\{i \in \{1, \dots, N+1\} : \|T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K})\|_{I_i} = f_{\mu}(\mathcal{K})\}, \quad (13)$$

Moreover, for each  $i \in I_{\mu}(\mathcal{K})$ , we consider the set of active frequencies

$$\Omega_{\mu}^i(\mathcal{K}) = \{\omega \in I_i : \bar{\sigma}(T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega)) = f_{\mu}(\mathcal{K})\}.$$

We assume that  $\Omega_{\mu}^i(\mathcal{K})$  is a finite set, indexed as

$$\Omega_{\mu}^i(\mathcal{K}) = \{\omega_{\nu}^i : \nu = 1, \dots, p^i\}, \quad i \in I_{\mu}(\mathcal{K}). \quad (14)$$

The set of all active frequencies is  $\Omega_{\mu}(\mathcal{K})$ . Now:

**Theorem 7** *Assume  $\mathcal{K}$  stabilizes  $P^{N+1}$  in (12), i.e.,  $\mathcal{K} \in \mathcal{D}$ . With (13) and (14), let the columns of  $Q_{\nu}^i$  form an orthonormal basis of the eigenspace of  $T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega_{\nu}^i) T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega_{\nu}^i)^H$  associated with the largest eigenvalue  $\bar{\sigma}(T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega_{\nu}^i))^2$ . Then, the Clarke subdifferential of  $f_{\mu}$  at  $\mathcal{K}$  is the compact and convex set*

$$\partial f_{\mu}(\mathcal{K}) = \{\Phi_Y : Y := (Y_1^1, \dots, Y_{p^1}^1, \dots, Y_1^q, \dots, Y_{p^q}^q) \in \mathbb{B}^P\}$$

where

$$\mathbb{B}^P = \{(Y_i) : Y_i = Y_i^H, Y_i \succeq 0, \sum_i \text{Tr}(Y_i) = 1\},$$

and  $p := \sum_{i \in I_{\mu}(\mathcal{K})} p^i$ ,  $q$  the number of elements in  $I_{\mu}(\mathcal{K})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_Y &= f_{\mu}(\mathcal{K})^{-1} \sum_{i \in I_{\mu}(\mathcal{K})} \sum_{\nu=1, \dots, p^i} \Re \{G_{21}^i(\mathcal{K}, j\omega_{\nu}^i) \times \\ &T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega_{\nu}^i)^H Q_{\nu}^i Y_{\nu}^i (Q_{\nu}^i)^H G_{12}^i(\mathcal{K}, j\omega_{\nu}^i)\}^T. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The formula also applies to  $f_{\mu,\alpha}$  when suitably adapted.

**PROOF.** The proof is based on the representation of the Clarke subdifferential of finite maximum functions [8], and is omitted for brevity. The reader is referred to [2, 3, 14] for related cases.  $\square$

### 5.2 Solving the subproblem

We describe an extension of the nonsmooth technique developed in [1, 2] for  $H_{\infty}$  synthesis, and in [3] for multi-disk problems. The method is convergent and has been tested on a variety of sizable problems.

As before, we consider minimization of  $f_{\mu}$  for fixed  $\mu$ , and minimization of  $f_{\mu,\alpha}$  for fixed  $\mu, \alpha$ . We define

$$f_{\mu}(\mathcal{K}, \omega) := \max_{i=1, \dots, N+1} \{\bar{\sigma}(T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega)) : \omega \in I_i\},$$

so that  $f_\mu(\mathcal{K}) = \max_{\omega \in [0, \infty]} f_\mu(\mathcal{K}, \omega)$ . Minimizing  $f_\mu$  is then a semi-infinite program for the family  $f_\mu(\cdot, \omega)$ . Clearly,  $f_\mu(\mathcal{K}, \omega) \leq f_\mu(\mathcal{K})$  for  $\omega \in [0, \infty]$  and  $f_\mu(\mathcal{K}, \omega) = f_\mu(\mathcal{K})$  for  $\omega \in \Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ , the set of active frequencies. By Theorem 7, the subdifferential of  $f_\mu(\mathcal{K}, \omega)$  is the set of subgradients

$$\Phi_{Y, \omega} := f_\mu(\mathcal{K}, \omega)^{-1} \sum_{i \in I_\omega(\mathcal{K})} \Re \{ G_{21}^i(\mathcal{K}, j\omega) \times T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega)^H Q_\omega^i Y_\omega^i (Q_\omega^i)^H G_{12}^i(\mathcal{K}, j\omega) \}^T,$$

where  $I_\omega(\mathcal{K})$  is the index set of active models at frequency  $\omega$ :

$$\{i \in \{1, \dots, N+1\} : \omega \in I_i, \bar{\sigma}(T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega)) = f_\mu(\mathcal{K}, \omega)\}.$$

Here the columns of the matrix  $Q_\omega^i$  form an orthonormal basis of the eigenspace of  $T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega) T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega)^H$  associated with its largest eigenvalue, and

$$\sum_{i \in I_\omega(\mathcal{K})} \text{Tr} Y_\omega^i = 1, \quad Y_\omega^i = (Y_\omega^i)^H \succeq 0.$$

An important feature of our technique is to allow finite extensions of the set of active frequencies:  $\Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K}) \supseteq \Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ . In section 5.3 we show how  $\Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})$  is constructed. The idea is as follows: At the current  $\mathcal{K}$  only a finite set of  $f_\mu(\cdot, \omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$  is active. Therefore, minimizing  $f_\mu$  in a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{K}$  is reduced to minimizing this finite family. The subgradients of  $f$  at  $\mathcal{K}$  only depend on these active  $f_\mu(\cdot, \omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ . As we move away from the current  $\mathcal{K}$  to a nearby  $\mathcal{K}'$ , other functions  $f_\mu(\mathcal{K}', \omega')$ ,  $\omega' \notin \Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ , will become active, of course. If this happens too early, the descent step proposed by the local model will be poor. By choosing an enlarged set  $\Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})$ , including some frequencies  $\omega'$  outside  $\Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ , we render the step from  $\mathcal{K}$  to the new  $\mathcal{K}'$  more robust.

For any such finite extension  $\Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})$ , and for fixed  $\delta > 0$ , we introduce a corresponding optimality function

$$\theta_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K}) := \inf_{H \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times p_2}} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})} \sup_{\sum_{i \in I_\omega(\mathcal{K})} \text{Tr} Y_\omega^i = 1, Y_\omega^i \succeq 0} -f_\mu(\mathcal{K}) + f_\mu(\mathcal{K}, \omega) + \langle \Phi_{Y, \omega}, H \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \delta \|H\|_F^2. \quad (16)$$

When  $\Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K}) = \Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ , we write  $\theta_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ . Since  $\Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K}) \subset \Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})$ , we have  $\theta_\mu(\mathcal{K}) \leq \theta_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})$  for any extensions.  $\theta_\mu(\mathcal{K})$  and  $\theta_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})$  are called optimality functions because they share the following property:  $\theta_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K}) \leq 0$  for all  $\mathcal{K}$ , and  $\theta_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$  implies that  $\mathcal{K}$  is a critical point of  $f_\mu$  [2]. Similar optimality functions have been used in the work of E. Polak, see [15–17]. They can be used to generate descent steps. In order to do this, we show that optimality function (16) has a tractable dual form.

**Proposition 8** *The dual formula for  $\theta_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})$  is:*

$$\theta_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K}) = \sup_{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})} \tau_\omega = 1, \tau_\omega \geq 0} \sup_{\sum_{i \in I_\omega(\mathcal{K})} \text{Tr} Y_\omega^i = 1, Y_\omega^i \succeq 0} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})} \tau_\omega (f_\mu(\mathcal{K}, \omega) - f_\mu(\mathcal{K})) - \frac{1}{2\delta} \left\| \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})} \tau_\omega \Phi_{Y, \omega} \right\|_F^2 \quad (17)$$

*The associated optimal descent direction in the controller space is given as*

$$H(\mathcal{K}) := -\frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})} \tau_\omega \Phi_{Y, \omega}. \quad (18)$$

**PROOF.** The proof is essentially covered by the results in [3] and is omitted for brevity.  $\square$

**Remark 9** *The appealing feature of the dual program (17) is that it is a small size SDP, or even a convex QP when singular values are simple. It is worth noticing that band restricted norms  $\|\cdot\|_{I_i}$  and peak frequencies  $\omega \in \Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$  are easily computed via an extension of the bisection algorithm in [6].*

Proposition 8 suggests the following descent scheme for the subproblems for given  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mu$  respectively  $\mu, \alpha$ .

#### Nonsmooth descent algorithm for the subproblem

- Fix  $\delta > 0$ ,  $0 < \vartheta < 1$ ,  $0 < \rho < 1$ .
- 1. **Initialization.** Find a controller  $\mathcal{K}$  which stabilizes the plant  $P$  in (2).
- 2. **Generate frequencies.** Given the current  $\mathcal{K}$ , compute  $f_\mu(\mathcal{K})$  and obtain active frequencies  $\Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ . Select a finite enriched set of frequencies  $\Omega_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})$  containing  $\Omega_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ .
- 3. **Descent direction.** Compute  $\theta_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K})$  and the solution  $(\tau, Y)$  of SDP or convex QP (17). If  $\theta_{e, \mu}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$ , stop, because  $0 \in \partial f_\mu(\mathcal{K})$ . Otherwise compute descent direction  $H(\mathcal{K})$  given in (18).
- 4. **Line search.** Find largest  $t = \vartheta^k$  such that  $f_\mu(\mathcal{K} + tH(\mathcal{K})) \leq f_\mu(\mathcal{K}) + t\rho\theta_\mu(\mathcal{K})$  and such that  $\mathcal{K} + tH(\mathcal{K})$  remains stabilizing.
- 5. **Step.** Replace  $\mathcal{K}$  by  $\mathcal{K} + tH(\mathcal{K})$ , increase iteration counter by one, and go back to step 2.

**Remark 10** *Results in [2, 3] can be used to prove convergence to a critical point  $0 \in \partial f_\mu(\mathcal{K}_\mu)$  for fixed  $\mu$ , starting from an arbitrary  $\mathcal{K} \in \mathcal{D}$ . Convergence of the overall scheme follows when we combine this with Lemmas 2, 3 and 5. The subproblems become ill-conditioned when  $\mu$  gets too small, shown by a large number of iterations or even failure to reach criticality. This can be avoided by choosing  $\beta$  (in model I) and  $\alpha$  (in model II) moderately small.*

### 5.3 Enriched sets of frequencies

Choosing an extended set of frequencies  $\Omega_{e,\mu}$  in step 2 is a key ingredient for the success of our technique and is beneficial mainly for two reasons:

- It renders the algorithm less dependent on the accuracy within which peak frequencies in  $\Omega_\mu$  are computed. A consequence is that the computed search direction behaves more smoothly.
- It captures more information on the frequency responses  $\omega \mapsto \bar{\sigma}(T_{w^i \rightarrow z^i}(\mathcal{K}, j\omega))$  on their associated intervals  $I_i$ . This leads to better step lengths.

### 5.4 Combined algorithm

We assemble the elements of the previous sections into an algorithm. Here a difference between models (7) and (9) occurs. In (7)<sub>b</sub> we have to drive  $\mu$  to the specific value  $b(\mu) = \beta^{-1}$ , where  $\beta > 0$  is our prior threshold for the distance to instability (homotopy method). In model (9) <sup>$\alpha$</sup> , we fix threshold  $\alpha < 0$  for the poles  $\lambda$  in closed loop, that is  $\Re\lambda \leq \alpha < 0$ , but drive  $\mu$  to 0 (barrier method). In both cases we start with a moderate size  $\mu$  to solve (7) <sub>$\mu$</sub>  respectively (9) <sup>$\mu,\alpha$</sup> . Then we update  $\mu$  to  $\mu^+$  and use the solution  $\mathcal{K}^{\mu,\alpha}$  as initial for the next subproblem. Different strategies to steer the parameter  $\mu$  are discussed in the experimental section. We also discuss to what precision the early subproblems need to be solved, and how a successive refinement should be organized.

## 6 Numerical experiments

We consider the double integrator  $G(s) = s^{-2}$ , one of the most fundamental plants in control. Multiband design specifications are borrowed from [19] and involve sensitivity  $S := (I + GK)^{-1}$  and complementary sensitivity  $T := GK(I + GK)^{-1}$ . Multiband constraints are

- disturbance rejection and tracking

$$|S(j\omega)| \leq 0.85, \text{ for } \omega \in I_1 := [0, 0.5], \text{ rad./s}$$

- gain-phase margins

$$|S(j\omega)| \leq 1.30, \text{ for } \omega \in I_2 := [0.5, 2], \text{ rad./s}$$

- bandwidth

$$|T(j\omega)| \leq 0.707, \text{ for } \omega \in I_3 := [2, 4], \text{ rad./s}$$

- roll-off

$$|w(j\omega)T(j\omega)| \leq 1.0, \text{ for } \omega \in I_4 := [4, \infty], \text{ rad./s,}$$

where  $w(s)$  is the weighing function

$$w(s) := \frac{0.2634s^2 + 1.659s + 5.333}{0.0001s^2 + 0.014s + 1}.$$

This problem is cast as a multiband  $H_\infty$  synthesis problem in the form (5):

$$\min\{f(\mathcal{K}) : \mathcal{K} \text{ stabilizes } G(s)\}$$

with the definition  $f(\mathcal{K}) :=$

$$\max\left\{\frac{1}{0.85}\|S\|_{I_1}, \frac{1}{1.30}\|S\|_{I_2}, \frac{1}{0.707}\|T\|_{I_3}, \|w(s)T\|_{I_4}\right\}.$$

As explained in section 2, the stability constraint could be represented either as distance to instability constraint, using the homotopy function:

$$\text{minimize } f_\mu(\mathcal{K}) := \max\{f(\mathcal{K}), \mu\|T_{\text{stab}}\|_\infty\}$$

(model I) where  $\mu$  is the homotopy parameter, and where  $T_{\text{stab}}(\mathcal{K}, s) = (sI - (A + B\mathcal{K}C))^{-1}$  is the stabilizing channel for the plant, or as a barrier approach (model II), where

$$\text{minimize } f_{\mu,\alpha}(\mathcal{K}) := \max\{f(\mathcal{K}), \mu\|T_{\text{stab}}\|_{\infty,\alpha}\}$$

for a threshold  $\alpha < 0$ , restricting poles  $\lambda$  of the closed-loop system to  $\Re\lambda \leq \alpha < 0$ , and for the barrier parameter  $\mu > 0$ . In particular, it will be interesting to see the relationship between  $\beta$  and  $-\alpha$ .

#### 6.1 Model I: numerical difficulties with a single solve

To emphasize numerical difficulties with small homotopy parameters we report experiments for various values of  $\beta$ , assuming that the corresponding  $\mu$ -values are known. All experiments are started from the same stabilizing  $\mathcal{K}$  of order  $k = 1$ .

The experiment confirms that it is not a good idea to solve program (7) directly for the "correct" value  $\mu_\beta$  giving  $b(\mu_\beta) = \beta^{-1} = b$ , because numerical difficulties arise.

Column 2 in Table 1 gives those values  $\mu = \mu_\beta$  needed to achieve the distance to instability  $\beta$  in column 1. Column 3 gives the achieved multiband performances. Column 4 gives the number of inner iterations to reach convergence. Underlined values give the final (max) multiband performance showing that adequate performance was not achieved. The conclusion of this first experiment is that a homotopy search in the parameter  $\mu$  is required. Steering  $\mu$  directly or too quickly to the correct value  $\mu_\beta$  causes failure.

Table 1  
Numerical difficulties when solving directly for  $\mu_\beta$ , \* failure to achieve descent

$\beta$	$\mu$	multiband performance				iter
0.68	10	0.09	0.42	1.43	<u>1.44</u>	26
0.35	1	0.17	1.06	1.07	<u>2.84</u>	32*
0.07	0.01	<u>1.44</u>	1.17	0.25	<u>1.44</u>	> 200
1.3e-4	1e-3	0.20	0.51	1.13	<u>7.57</u>	5*

### 6.2 Design with algorithms I and II

The above difficulties can be avoided by decreasing  $\mu$  gradually. In Table 2 we used the update  $\mu \leftarrow \mu/3$ . Our stopping test for the subproblems uses the criticality measure  $\theta_{e,\mu}(\mathcal{K}) \leq 0$  in (17) and is defined as  $\theta_{e,\mu}(\mathcal{K}) > -\epsilon_s$  with the updating rule  $\epsilon_s \leftarrow \max(1e-4, \epsilon_s/2)$  and the initialization  $\epsilon_s = 10$ . In this form, we require less computations in the early iterations, while accuracy is gradually increased as we get closer to a local solution.

*Design with algorithm I.* According to section 3, we have set  $b$  to a large value,  $b = 10^5$ , which corresponds to the distance to instability  $\beta = 10^{-5}$ . The parameter  $\mu$  is decreased as long as  $\|(sI - (A + BK))^{-1}\|_\infty < b$ . Results are given in Table 2.

*Design with algorithm II.* Here the strategy is different as we require a minimum stability degree using the shifted  $H_\infty$  norm in section 4. Based on the idea  $-\alpha \approx \beta$ , we set  $\alpha = -1e-5$ . The barrier parameter  $\mu$  is driven to zero with the same updating rule as long as  $\mu > 1e-8$ . Both algorithms I and II are initialized with the same stabilizing controller, see Table 2. ‘ $(\alpha, \beta)$ ’ gives initial and final closed-loop spectral abscissa and distance to instability. The last column shows the achieved multiband performances. ‘ $\mu$ ’ gives the final values of the homotopy respectively barrier parameter, ‘iter’ the total number of inner iterations to meet our termination criterion. Controllers obtained with algorithms I and II both meet all design requirements since all band restricted performances are below unity. This represents 20 % improvements over the results in [19]. It is also instructive to see both techniques terminate at a nonsmooth local minimum where 3 among the 4 band restricted performances coincide.

Table 2  
Designs with algorithm models I and II. In model I the value  $\beta = 10^{-5}$  is fixed, in model II the value  $\Re\lambda = -\alpha = 10^{-5}$  is imposed.

	$(\alpha, \beta)$	multiband performance			
init	(-0.76, 0.26)	0.091	0.28	2.41	<u>42.37</u>
mod. I	(-6.322e-5, 1e-5)	<u>0.84</u>	<u>0.84</u>	0.31	<u>0.84</u>
mod. II	(-1.02e-5, 7.32e-8)	<u>0.84</u>	<u>0.84</u>	0.31	<u>0.84</u>

## 7 Conclusion

Multiband  $H_\infty$  synthesis is a practically important problem for which convincing approaches are lacking. We have presented a new approach to this difficult problem using methods from nonsmooth optimization.

## References

- [1] P. Apkarian and D. Noll. Controller design via nonsmooth multi-directional search. *SIAM J. on Control and Optimization*, 44(6):1923–1949, 2006.
- [2] P. Apkarian and D. Noll. Nonsmooth  $H_\infty$  synthesis. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Control*, 51(1):71–86, 2006.
- [3] P. Apkarian and D. Noll. Nonsmooth optimization for multidisk  $H_\infty$  synthesis. *to appear in Int. Journal of Control*, 2006.
- [4] H. W. Bode. *Network Analysis and Feedback Amplifier Design*. Van Nostrand, New York, 1945.
- [5] J.F Bonnans and A. Shapiro. *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems*. Springer Series in Operations Research, 2000.
- [6] S. Boyd, V. Balakrishnan, and P. Kabamba. A bisection method for computing the  $H_\infty$  norm of a transfer matrix and related problems. *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, 2(3):207–219, 1989.
- [7] S. Boyd and C. Barratt. *Linear Controller Design: Limits of Performance*. Prentice-Hall, 1991.
- [8] F. H. Clarke. *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*. Canadian Math. Soc. Series. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1983.
- [9] B. Cornet and M.-O. Czarnecky. Smooth normal approximations of epi-Lipschitzian subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . *SIAM J. on Control and Optimization*, 37(3):710 – 730, 1999.
- [10] G. F. Franklin, J. D. Powell, and A. Emami-Naeni. *Feedback Control of Dynamic Systems*. Addison-Wesley, 1986.
- [11] I. Horowitz. Quantitative feedback theory. *IEE Proc.*, 129-D(6):215–226, November 1982.
- [12] T. Iwasaki and S. Hara. Generalized KYP lemma: Unified frequency domain inequalities with design applications. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Control*, 50(1):41–59, 2005.
- [13] A. G. J. MacFarlane and I. Postlethwaite. The generalized Nyquist stability criterion and multivariable root loci. *Int. J. Control*, 25:81–127, 1977.
- [14] D. Noll and P. Apkarian. Spectral bundle methods for nonconvex maximum eigenvalue functions: first-order methods. *Mathematical Programming Series B*, 104(2):701–727, November 2005.
- [15] E. Polak. On the mathematical foundations of nondifferentiable optimization in engineering design. *SIAM Rev.*, 29:21–89, March 1987.
- [16] E. Polak. *Optimization : Algorithms and Consistent Approximations*. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 1997.
- [17] E. Polak and Y. Wardi. A nondifferentiable optimization algorithm for the design of control systems subject to singular value inequalities over a frequency range. *Automatica*, 18(3):267–283, 1982.
- [18] A. Rantzer. On the the Kalman-Yacubovich-Popov Lemma. *Syst. Control Letters*, 28(1):7–10, June 1996.
- [19] V.I.George. Optimum design of robust controller: Frequency domain approach using MATLAB. *Journal IE(I)*, pages 78–82, 2004.