



# A Stackelberg Game Approach to Mixed $H_2/H_\infty$ Control

Marc Jungers, Emmanuel Trélat, Hisham Abou-Kandil

## ► To cite this version:

| Marc Jungers, Emmanuel Trélat, Hisham Abou-Kandil. A Stackelberg Game Approach to Mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$  Control. 2006. hal-00086395

**HAL Id: hal-00086395**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00086395>**

Preprint submitted on 18 Jul 2006

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# A Stackelberg Game Approach to Mixed $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$ Control

Marc Jungers, Emmanuel Trélat, and Hisham Abou-Kandil

## Abstract

The  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  robust control problem is formulated as a Stackelberg differential game where the leader minimizes an  $\mathcal{H}_2$  criterion while the follower deals with the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  constraint. For a closed loop information structure in the game, the necessary conditions to solve such a constrained optimization problem are derived for the finite time horizon case. It is shown that such an approach leads to a singular control and the Stackelberg strategy degenerates due to the omnipotence of the leader. Using conjugate times theory, we prove that the derived necessary conditions are also sufficient.

## Index Terms

Mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control, game theory, Stackelberg strategy, Riccati equation, robust control.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Robust  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control problem has been treated extensively in recent years to achieve a compromise between  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  norm specifications [1]–[3]. In fact, a predefined level for the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm cannot be guaranteed by a pure  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -control. Several approaches have been proposed to solve the mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control problem. This includes non-standard Riccati equations [1], Youla parametrization [4], convex optimization [5], entropy interpretation [6]. . . The state feedback case was treated in [7] while a compromise between  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -regulators is proposed in [8].

In this note, the mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  robust control problem is formulated as a Stackelberg differential game [9]–[14]. A gametheoretic approach has been already proposed to solve the  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$

M. Jungers and H. Abou-Kandil are with ENS Cachan, Laboratoire SATIE, UMR CNRS 8029, 61 Av. Président Wilson, 94235 Cachan Cedex, France.

E. Trélat is with Université Paris-Sud, Laboratoire de Mathématique, UMR 8628, Bât. 425, 91405 Orsay cedex, France

control problem [15]–[17] via a Nash strategy. However, due to the symmetry between players in a Nash strategy, one player is minimizing the  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm and the second one is associated with the worst case disturbance seen in terms of  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  norm.

For the Stackelberg strategy, the hierarchy between the leader and the follower leads to minimizing the  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -norm by the leader subject to the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -constraint dealt with by the follower. The information bias in such a game is quite suitable to solve such a constraint optimization problem. The model used here was introduced in [2], [3].

The paper is organized as follows. The problem is formulated in Section II. The main contribution is given in Section III where the Stackelberg strategy and the associated necessary conditions are derived under closed loop information structure condition. It is shown in Section IV that the necessary conditions become sufficient using conjugate times theory. Concluding remarks make up Section V.

## II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider the plant described by (Fig. 1)

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + B_\infty w_\infty(t) + B_2 w_2(t) + Bu(t) = f(x, w_\infty, w_2, u), \\ z_\infty(t) &= C_\infty x(t) + D_\infty w_\infty(t) + D_{\infty u} u(t), \\ z_2(t) &= C_2 x(t) + D_{2u} u(t), \\ z(t) &= x(t), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with  $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $w_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_2}$ ,  $w_\infty(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_\infty}$ ,  $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ ,  $z_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$ , and  $z_\infty(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_\infty}$ . The matrices  $A$ ,  $B_\infty$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $B$ ,  $C_\infty$ ,  $C_2$ ,  $D_\infty$ ,  $D_{\infty u}$  and  $D_{2u}$  are constant matrices with appropriate dimensions.  $B_\infty$  is assumed of full rank.




Fig. 1. System structure.

The finite horizon  $[t_0, t_f]$  case is studied here (initial time  $t_0$  and final time  $t_f > t_0$ ). The  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -norm of a signal, denoted  $\|\cdot\|_{2,[t_0,t_f]}$ , allows to define the induced norms  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  of the

system. The input  $w_2$  (respectively  $w_\infty$ ) and the output  $z_2$  (resp.  $z_\infty$ ) define the channel for  $\mathcal{H}_2$  norm  $\|z_2\|_{2,[t_0,t_f]}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  norm  $\sup_w \frac{\|z_\infty\|_{2,[t_0,t_f]}}{\|w_\infty\|_{2,[t_0,t_f]}}$ ). For simplicity, the feedback output  $z$  is assumed to be equal to the state  $x$ .

The problem of mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -control design is to find a feedback control  $u(t)$  stabilizing the system (1) and minimizing the  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -norm under the constraint that the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm is less than a fixed level  $\gamma$ , i.e.

$$u(t) = -K(t)x(t) \quad \text{such that} \quad \begin{cases} \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \|z_2\|_{2,[t_0,t_f]} \\ \text{subject to } \sup_{w_\infty \in \mathcal{W}_\infty} \frac{\|z_\infty\|_{2,[t_0,t_f]}}{\|w_\infty\|_{2,[t_0,t_f]}} < \gamma. \end{cases}$$

The system (1) being linear, the admissible set for the inputs  $u$ ,  $w_2$  and  $w_\infty$  are respectively  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{L}^\infty([t_0, t_f] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^r)$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_2 = \mathcal{L}^\infty([t_0, t_f], \mathbb{R}^{r_2})$ , and  $\mathcal{W}_\infty = \mathcal{L}^\infty([t_0, t_f] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{r_\infty})$ .

### III. STACKELBERG STRATEGY

#### A. Definition

Let

$$J_2(w_\infty, w_2) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_f} [z_2^T(t)z_2(t) + \alpha^2 w_\infty^T(t)R_\gamma w_\infty(t)] dt = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} L_2(x, u, w_\infty, w_2) dt, \quad (2)$$

with

$$L_2 = \frac{1}{2} (x^T(t)C_2^T C_2 x(t) + 2x^T(t)C_2^T D_{2u} u(t) + u^T(t)D_{2u}^T D_{2u} u(t) + \alpha^2 w_\infty^T(t)R_\gamma w_\infty(t)), \quad (3)$$

$R_\gamma = \gamma^2 I - D_\infty^T D_\infty > 0$ , for  $\gamma > \bar{\sigma}(D_\infty)$ , the largest singular value of  $D_\infty$ ,

and

$$J_\infty(u, w_\infty) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0}^{t_f} [-z_\infty^T(t)z_\infty(t) + \gamma^2 w_\infty^T(t)w_\infty(t)] dt = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} L_\infty(x, u, w_\infty) dt, \quad (4)$$

with

$$L_\infty = \frac{1}{2} (-x^T C_\infty^T C_\infty x + w_\infty^T (\gamma^2 I - D_\infty^T D_\infty) w_\infty - u^T D_{\infty u}^T D_{\infty u} u - x^T C_\infty^T D_{\infty u} w_\infty - x^T C_\infty^T D_{\infty u} u - w_\infty^T D_{\infty u}^T D_{\infty u} u), \quad (5)$$

where  $x(\cdot)$ ,  $z_\infty(\cdot)$  and  $z_2(\cdot)$  are solutions of (1).

The criterion  $J_2$  defined by (2) is associated with the  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -norm of system (1). For  $\alpha \neq 0$ ,  $J_2$  is convex with respect to  $w_\infty$ . The criterion  $J_\infty$  defined by (4) is associated with the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm of system (1). Note that, if  $J_\infty > 0$ , for any input  $w_\infty \in \mathcal{W}_\infty$ , then  $\sup_{w_\infty \in \mathcal{W}_\infty} \frac{\|z_\infty\|_{2,[t_0,t_f]}}{\|w_\infty\|_{2,[t_0,t_f]}} < \gamma$ .

The infimum of  $J_\infty$  over  $w_\infty \in \mathcal{W}_\infty$  is either finite (and attained) or equal to  $-\infty$ , depending on the values of  $\gamma$  and of the final time  $t_f$ .

In fact, denoting  $t_c$  the first conjugate time of the system (see Section IV), then  $\inf J_\infty \geq 0$  whenever  $t_f < t_c$ , and  $\inf J_\infty = -\infty$  whenever  $t_f > t_c$ .

The optimal control  $u = u^*$  minimizes the  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -norm when  $w_\infty = w_\infty^*$ , the worst case input according to the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm, is applied.

Stackelberg strategy is well adapted to deal with this kind of constrained minimization problem. The leader acts by choosing the control  $u$  and the follower by choosing the input  $w_\infty$ .

For a control  $\tilde{u}$  of the leader, the rational reaction set  $\mathcal{R}_\infty(\tilde{u})$  of the follower is defined by the set of the admissible input  $w_\infty$  which leads to the infimum of  $J_\infty(\tilde{u}, w_\infty)$ .

A Stackelberg equilibrium  $(u^*, w_\infty^*)$  is defined by

$$\begin{cases} w_\infty^* \in \mathcal{R}_\infty(u^*), \\ \max_{w_\infty \in \mathcal{R}_\infty(u^*)} J_2(u^*, w_\infty) \leq \max_{w_\infty \in \mathcal{R}_\infty(u)} J_2(u, w_\infty), \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{L}^\infty([t_0, t_f], \mathbb{R}^r), \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

(see [13], [14]).

There are three inputs in the system  $u$ ,  $w_2$  and  $w_\infty$ .  $u$  and  $w_\infty$  are considered as the two players of this non-zero sum game. The input  $w_2$  is not a player and is considered as a disturbance. The framework corresponds to a closed-loop information structure,  $u^* = u^*(x, t) \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $w_\infty^* = w_\infty^*(x, t) \in \mathcal{W}_\infty$  are implicit functions of the time  $t$  and the state  $x$  (see [18]).

### B. Necessary conditions for the follower

Solving the problem from the point of view of the follower corresponds to determine its rational reaction set  $\mathcal{R}_\infty(\cdot)$ . This is a standard optimization problem that could be solved by applying Pontryagin's Minimum Principle. We define the Hamiltonian (see [19])  $H_\infty = \psi_\infty^\circ L_\infty + \psi_\infty f$ , where the line vector  $\psi_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the costate vector associated with the dynamic constraint (1) and the scalar  $\psi_\infty^\circ \geq 0$  with  $L_\infty$ . The necessary conditions to be satisfied by the follower could be written along the solution as

$$\frac{\partial H_\infty}{\partial w_\infty}(t) = \psi_\infty^\circ \frac{\partial L_\infty}{\partial w_\infty}(t) + \psi_\infty(t) \frac{\partial f}{\partial w_\infty}(t) = 0, \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{\psi}_\infty(t) = -\psi_\infty^\circ \left( \frac{\partial L_\infty}{\partial x}(t) + \frac{\partial L_\infty}{\partial u}(t) \frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x}(t) \right) - \psi_\infty(t) \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(t) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(t) \frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x}(t) \right). \quad (8)$$

$$(9)$$

In addition, since the final state is free, the transversality condition leads to  $\psi_\infty(t_f) = 0$ .

This implies that  $\psi_\infty^\circ \neq 0$ . Without loss of generality and for the sake of normalization we assume that  $\psi_\infty^\circ = 1$ .

It follows from (7) and from  $\gamma > \bar{\sigma}(D_\infty)$ , that  $R_\gamma$  is invertible and that the optimal input  $w_\infty^*$  (the worst input in sense of  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm for an input  $u$ ) is given by

$$w_\infty^*(t) = -R_\gamma^{-1} [-D_\infty^T C_\infty x(t) - D_\infty^T D_{\infty u} u(t) + B_\infty^T \psi_\infty^T(t)] = S(x, u, \psi_\infty). \quad (10)$$

We introduce the following notations

$$\begin{aligned} W_\gamma &= I + D_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} D_\infty^T, & U &= D_{2u}^T D_{2u} + \alpha^2 D_{\infty u}^T D_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} D_\infty^T D_{\infty u}, \\ N &= R_\gamma + \alpha^2 D_\infty^T D_{\infty u} U^{-1} D_{\infty u}^T D_\infty, & \bar{B} &= B + B_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} D_\infty^T D_{\infty u}, \\ \tilde{B} &= B_\infty + \alpha^2 \bar{B} U^{-1} D_{\infty u}^T D_\infty, & \bar{C}_u &= D_{2u}^T C_2 + \alpha^2 D_{\infty u}^T D_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} D_\infty^T C_\infty, \\ \bar{C}_\infty &= (D_\infty^T D_{\infty u} U^{-1} \bar{C}_u - D_\infty^T C_\infty), \\ \hat{S}_\lambda &= \bar{B} U^{-1} \bar{B}^T, & \hat{S}_\infty &= S_\infty + \alpha^2 \bar{B} U^{-1} D_{\infty u}^T D_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} B_\infty^T, \\ S_\infty &= B_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} B_\infty^T, & \bar{S}_\infty &= S_\infty + \alpha^2 B_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} D_\infty^T D_{\infty u} U^{-1} D_{\infty u}^T D_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} B_\infty^T, \\ \tilde{S} &= \hat{S}_\lambda + \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \tilde{B} N^{-1} \tilde{B}^T, & Q &= C_2^T C_2 + \alpha^2 C_\infty^T D_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} D_\infty^T C_\infty - \bar{C}_u^T U^{-1} \bar{C}_u, \\ \tilde{Q} &= Q - \alpha^2 \bar{C}_\infty^T N^{-1} \bar{C}_\infty, & \bar{A} &= A + B_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} D_\infty^T C_\infty, \\ \hat{A} &= \bar{A} - \bar{B} U^{-1} \bar{C}_u, & \tilde{A} &= \hat{A} - \hat{S}_\infty \bar{S}_\infty^{-1} B_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} \bar{C}_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F_\infty^1(x, u, \psi_\infty) &= x^T C_\infty^T W_\gamma C_\infty + u^T D_{\infty u}^T W_\gamma C_\infty - \psi_\infty \bar{A}, \\ F_\infty^2(x, u, \psi_\infty) &= x^T C_\infty^T W_\gamma D_{\infty u} + u^T D_{\infty u}^T W_\gamma D_{\infty u} - \psi_\infty \bar{B}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= \tilde{f}(x(t), u(t), \psi_\infty(t), w_2(t)) \\ &= \bar{A}x(t) + \bar{B}u(t) - S_\infty \psi_\infty^T(t) + B_2 w_2(t), \quad x(t_0) = x_0, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\dot{\psi}_\infty^T = \left( F_\infty^1(x, u, \psi_\infty) + F_\infty^2(x, u, \psi_\infty) \frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x} \right)^T, \quad \psi_\infty(t_f) = 0, \quad (12)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_\infty(x, u, \psi_\infty) &= -\frac{1}{2} (C_\infty x + D_{\infty u} u)^T W_\gamma (C_\infty x + D_{\infty u} u) + \frac{1}{2} \psi_\infty S_\infty \psi_\infty^T, \\ \tilde{L}_2(x, u, \psi_\infty, w_2) &= L_2(x, u, S(x, u, \psi_\infty), w_2). \end{aligned}$$

### C. Pontryagin Minimum Principle for a particular case

The minimization of  $J_2$  subject to (11) and (12) is not a standard optimization problem. For the sake of clarity, we denote in the sequel  $\frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x}$ , the Jacobian of  $u(t, y)$  w.r.t. the second variable, by  $u_y$ . To solve this problem from the point of view of the leader, the extended state  $X$  is introduced.  $X$  includes the state  $x$ , the costate vector  $\psi_\infty^T$ , and the instantaneous cost  $x^\circ$  (verifying  $\dot{x}^\circ = \tilde{L}_2$ )

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \psi_\infty^T \\ x^\circ \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n+1}, \quad \dot{X} = F(t, X, u, u_y^T) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{f} \\ F_\infty^{1T} + u_y^T F_\infty^{2T} \\ \tilde{L}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

with boundary conditions

$$x(0) = x_0, \quad \psi_\infty(t_f) = 0, \quad x^\circ(0) = 0, \quad (14)$$

where  $u = u(t, h(X)) = u(t, x)$ , with  $h(X) = h \begin{pmatrix} x^T & \psi_\infty & x^{\circ T} \end{pmatrix}^T = x$ .

It is shown below that every optimal control  $u^*$  for the optimization problem of the leader (minimizing  $J_2$  subject to the constraints (11) and (12)) is a singular control for the system (13). This crucial fact permits to derive a Pontryagin Minimum Principle adapted to this type of problem (13).

A similar approach is provided for the LQ case in [18]. However the used arguments are not complete, even though the final result is correct.

We next recall the definition of the end-point mapping and of a singular control (see [20]–[22]).

*Definition 1:* The end-point mapping at time  $t_f$  of system (13) with initial state  $X_0$  is the mapping

$$\begin{aligned} E_{X_0, t_f} : \mathcal{U} = L^\infty([0, t_f] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^r) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n+1} \\ u &\longmapsto X_u(t_f), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where  $X_u(\cdot)$  denotes the trajectory solution of (13) associated with the control  $u$  such that  $X_u(t_0) = X_0$ .

If the function  $F$  in (13) is of class  $\mathcal{C}^p$ ,  $p \geq 1$ , then the end-point mapping  $E_{X_0, t_f}$  is also of class  $\mathcal{C}^p$ .

To determine the Fréchet derivative of  $E_{X_0, t_f}$ , consider a control  $\delta u$  such that  $u + \delta u \in \mathcal{U}$  and let  $X$  be the trajectory associated with  $u$  and  $X + \delta X$  with  $u + \delta u$ . By definition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d(X + \delta X)}{dt} &= F(t, X + \delta X, u(t, h(X + \delta X)) + \delta u(t, h(X + \delta X)), \\ &\quad u_y(t, h(X + \delta X))^T + \delta u_y(t, h(X + \delta X))^T). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

A Taylor series expansion leads to

$$\frac{d(\delta X)}{dt} = \tilde{A}\delta X + \tilde{B}\delta u + \tilde{C}\delta u_y^T, \quad (17)$$

where  $\tilde{A} = (F_X + F_u u_y h_X + F_{u_y} u_{yy} h_X)$ ,  $\tilde{B} = F_u$  and  $\tilde{C} = F_{u_y}$ .

Let  $M(t)$  be the transition matrix associated with  $\tilde{A}(t)$ , i.e. the solution of the Cauchy problem

$$\dot{M}(t) = \tilde{A}(t)M(t), \quad M(0) = I. \quad (18)$$

Then,

$$\delta X(t_f) = M(t_f) \int_0^{t_f} M^{-1}(s) \left( \tilde{B}(s)\delta u(s) + \tilde{C}(s)\delta u_y^T(s) \right) ds, \quad (19)$$

and the next result follows.

*Lemma 1:* The Fréchet derivative of  $E_{X_0, t_f}$  at a point  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  is given by

$$dE_{X_0, t_f}(u) \cdot \delta u = M(t_f) \int_0^{t_f} M^{-1}(s) \left( \tilde{B}(s)\delta u(s) + \tilde{C}(s)\delta u_y^T(s) \right) ds. \quad (20)$$

*Definition 2:* Let  $u$  be in  $\mathcal{U}$ , the control  $u$  is said to be singular on  $[0, t_f]$  if the Fréchet derivative  $dE_{X_0, t_f}(u)$  is not surjective.

If the control  $u$  is singular, then there exists a line vector  $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{2n+1}/\{0\}$  such that

$$\varphi \cdot dE_{X_0, t_f}(u) = 0. \quad (21)$$

The line vector  $p(t) = \varphi M(t_f)M^{-1}(t)$  verifies

$$\dot{p}(t) = -p(t)\tilde{A}(t), \quad p(t_f) = \varphi. \quad (22)$$

It follows from (20), (21) and (22) that

$$\int_0^{t_f} p(t) \left( \tilde{B}(t)\delta u(t, h(X)) + \tilde{C}(t)\delta u_y^T(t, h(X)) \right) dt = 0, \quad (23)$$

for every  $\delta u(t, h(X))$ . In particular, considering first controls  $\delta u(t)$ , (23) yields

$$p(t)\tilde{B}(t) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad p(t)\tilde{C}(t) = 0, \text{ a.e. on } [t_0, t_f].$$



Define the Hamiltonian  $H_2(t, X, u, u_y, p) = pF(t, X, u, u_y)$ . Then a singular control  $u(t, h(X))$  is characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X} &= \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial p}, & \dot{p} &= -p\tilde{A} = -\frac{dH_2}{dX}, \\ \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial u} &= p(t)\tilde{B}(t) = 0, & \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial u_y} &= p(t)\tilde{C}(t) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

This Hamiltonian characterization is next used to derive necessary conditions for the leader.

#### D. Necessary conditions for the leader

*Lemma 2:* If the control  $u^*$  is optimal for the problem defined by (11) - (12) and (2), then it is singular on  $[0, t_f]$  for the extended system (13).

*Proof of Lemma 2:* Let  $X$  be the trajectory solution of the system (13), associated with a control  $u$  issued from  $X_0 = (x_0^T, \psi_{\infty,0}^T, 0)^T$ . If  $u$  is optimal for  $J_2$ , the final state  $X(t_f)$  lies at the boundary of  $E_{X_0,t_f}(\mathcal{U})$ . Hence the end-point mapping  $E_{X_0,t_f}$  is not open at  $u$ , and it follows from the Implicit Functions Theorem that the control  $u$  is singular for system (13) on  $[0, t_f]$ .

The Hamiltonian  $H_2$  associated with  $J_2$  subject to the constraint (13) can be rewritten as

$$H_2 = \lambda_1 \tilde{f} + \lambda_2 (F_\infty^1 + F_\infty^2 u_x)^T + \lambda^\circ \tilde{L}_2, \quad (25)$$

by setting  $p(t) = (\lambda_1(t), \lambda_2(t), \lambda^\circ(t))$ , with  $\lambda_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\lambda_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  (line vectors) and  $\lambda^\circ(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The Hamiltonian characterization of a singular control leads to

$$\frac{\partial H_2}{\partial u} = \lambda_1 \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial u} + \lambda_2 \left( \frac{\partial F_\infty^1}{\partial u} + \frac{\partial F_\infty^2}{\partial u} u_y \right)^T + \lambda^\circ \frac{\partial \tilde{L}_2}{\partial u} = 0, \quad (26)$$

$$\frac{\partial H_2}{\partial u_y} = \lambda_2^T F_\infty^2 = 0, \quad (27)$$

$$\dot{\lambda}_1 = -\lambda_1 \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial x} - \lambda_2 \left( \frac{\partial F_\infty^1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial F_\infty^2}{\partial x} u_y \right)^T - \lambda^\circ \frac{\partial \tilde{L}_2}{\partial x}, \quad (28)$$

$$\dot{\lambda}_2 = -\lambda_1 \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \psi_\infty} - \lambda_2 \left( \frac{\partial F_\infty^1}{\partial \psi_\infty} + \frac{\partial F_\infty^2}{\partial \psi_\infty} u_y \right)^T - \lambda^\circ \frac{\partial \tilde{L}_2}{\partial \psi_\infty}, \quad (29)$$

$$\dot{\lambda}^\circ = 0. \quad (30)$$

From (30),  $\lambda^\circ(t) = \lambda^\circ$  is constant. According to the Pontryagin Minimum Principle, we assume that  $\lambda^\circ \geq 0$ .

### E. Transversality conditions

Since the initial state  $x(0) = x_0$  and the final costate line vector  $\psi_\infty(t_f) = 0$  are fixed, the extended costate line vector  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda^\circ)$  must verify the transversality conditions

$$\lambda_2(0) = 0, \quad \lambda_1(t_f) = 0. \quad (31)$$

(see for example [21, page 104] for more details)

### F. Degenerate Stackelberg strategy

From (27), we infer that  $\lambda_2 \equiv 0$  or  $F_\infty^2 \equiv 0$  (or both).

*Proposition 1:* If the matrix

$$\frac{\partial F_\infty^2}{\partial u} = D_{\infty u}^T (I + D_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} D_\infty^T) D_{\infty u} = D_{\infty u}^T W_\gamma D_{\infty u} \quad (32)$$

is invertible, then  $\lambda_2 \equiv 0$ . In this case, the Stackelberg strategy degenerates, due to the omnipotence of the leader.

*Proof of Proposition 1:* By contradiction, assume that  $\lambda_2 \neq 0$ . Then,  $F_\infty^2 \equiv 0$ . Since  $\frac{\partial F_\infty^2}{\partial u}$  invertible, it follows from the Implicit Functions Theorem that, locally around the trajectory  $u = u(t, x, \psi_\infty)$ .

Hence, system (11) - (12) writes

$$\dot{x} = \tilde{f}(x, \psi_\infty, u(t, x, \psi_\infty)), \quad \dot{\psi}_\infty = F_\infty^1(x, \psi_\infty, u(t, x, \psi_\infty)). \quad (33)$$

The dynamics and the criterion  $J_2$  are both independent of  $u_y$ . Hence, every control  $u_y$  is optimal, which contradicts (26).

The fact that  $\lambda_2 \equiv 0$  means that the leader does not take into account the rational response of the follower represented by the evolution of the costate vector  $\psi_\infty$  to minimize his own criterion  $J_2$ . The Stackelberg strategy with a closed-loop information structure seems to lose globally its hierarchical structure. In fact the condition (32) indicates that, if the criterion of the follower depends on  $u$ , then the leader is able to impose to the follower a desired control. Even though the hierarchy seems to disappear, the leader is omnipotent with respect to the follower. To a certain extent, this could justify using Nash strategy in [15] for a mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  problems.

### G. Computation of the optimal control

Since the costate vector  $(\lambda_1(t_f), \lambda_2(t_f), \lambda^\circ) = (0, 0, \lambda^\circ)$  must be nontrivial, up to normalizing, we next assume  $\lambda^\circ = 1$ .

From (26), we deduce the expression of the optimal control

$$u^* = -U^{-1}\overline{C}_u x - U^{-1}\overline{B}^T \lambda_1^T + \alpha^2 U^{-1} D_{\infty u}^T D_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} B_\infty^T \psi_\infty^T. \quad (34)$$

Plugging this expression into the dynamics (11) yields

$$\tilde{f} = \hat{A}x - \hat{S}_\lambda \lambda_1^T - \hat{S}_\infty \psi_\infty^T + B_2 w_2. \quad (35)$$

According to (28), we obtain

$$\dot{\lambda}_1^T = -\hat{A}^T \lambda_1^T - Qx - \alpha^2 \overline{C}_\infty^T R_\gamma^{-1} B_\infty^T \psi_\infty^T = g^T(x, \lambda_1, \psi_\infty). \quad (36)$$

The evolution of  $\psi_\infty$  (12) reads now

$$\dot{\psi}_\infty = \tilde{F}_\infty^1(x, \lambda_1, \psi_\infty) + \tilde{F}_\infty^2(x, \lambda_1, \psi_\infty) u_y, \quad (37)$$

with  $\tilde{F}_\infty^1(x, \lambda_1, \psi_\infty) = F_\infty^1(x, u^*(x, \lambda_1, \psi_\infty), \psi_\infty)$ , and  $\tilde{F}_\infty^2(x, \lambda_1, \psi_\infty) = F_\infty^2(x, u^*(x, \lambda_1, \psi_\infty), \psi_\infty)$ .

Since  $\lambda_2 = 0$ , the relation (29) yields the constraint

$$\hat{S}_\infty^T \lambda_1^T - \alpha^2 \overline{S}_\infty \psi_\infty^T - \alpha^2 B_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} \overline{C}_\infty x = 0. \quad (38)$$

*Remark 1:* If  $\alpha = 0$ , then the necessary condition (38) becomes  $\lambda_1 \hat{S}_\infty = 0$ . In particular, taking into account the transversality condition (31), the first and second derivatives of this relation at  $t = t_f$  yield

$$x^T(t_f) Q \hat{S}_\infty = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad x^T(t_f) (Q \hat{A} - \hat{A} Q \hat{S}_\infty) = w_2^T(t_f) B_2 Q \hat{S}_\infty. \quad (39)$$

These conditions are additional constraints.

The relation (39) is a relation at time  $t_f$  between the exogeneous input  $w_2$  and the state  $x$ . This necessary condition is not generally verified all the more so since  $w_2$  is in general considered as a disturbance. In conclusion, the case  $\alpha = 0$  does not lead to a relevant solution for the mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  problem. This result justifies the additional term  $\alpha^2 w_\infty^T R_\gamma w_\infty$  in the criterion  $J_2$  associated with the  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -norm, which yields convexity with respect to the control  $u$  whenever  $\alpha \neq 0$ . In the sequel, we assume that  $\alpha \neq 0$ .

Differentiating (38) with respect to  $t$ , it is clear that (38) is equivalent to the following relations

$$x^T(t_f)\overline{C}_\infty = 0, \quad (40)$$

$$\tilde{F}_\infty^2 \frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x} B_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} N R_\gamma^{-1} B_\infty^T = v = \left( \frac{1}{\alpha^2} g \hat{S}_\infty - \tilde{F}_\infty^1 - \tilde{f}^T \overline{C}_\infty^T \right). \quad (41)$$

The relation (40) implies that every  $x_0$  is not necessarily the starting point of an optimal trajectory. The initial state  $x_0$  of an optimal trajectory must belong to a  $r_\infty$ -codim subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $r_\infty = \text{rank } \overline{C}_\infty$ . The constraint (41) leads to

$$\tilde{F}_\infty^2 \frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x} B_\infty = v B_\infty (B_\infty^T B_\infty)^{-1} R_\gamma N^{-1} R_\gamma, \quad (42)$$

and hence

$$\tilde{F}_\infty^2 \frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x} \in v B_\infty (B_\infty^T B_\infty)^{-1} R_\gamma N^{-1} R_\gamma (B_\infty^T B_\infty)^{-1} B_\infty^T + (\text{Ker } B_\infty^T)^T. \quad (43)$$

Even though the optimal trajectory is unique, the expression for  $\frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x}$  is not unique.

*Remark 2:*  $w_2$  is not the action of one player, but a disturbance. Contrary to  $\frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x}$  and  $\tilde{f}$ , the control  $u^*(t, x)$  does not depend on this input  $w_2$ .

*Remark 3:* To facilitate the research of the optimal control, a restricted class of  $u^*(t, y)$  can be imposed. By choosing an affine representation (see [18]) of  $u^*(t, y)$

$$u^*(t, y) = u_y (y - x(t)) + u(t), \quad (44)$$

it is possible to avoid the exact computation of  $\frac{\partial u^*}{\partial x}$  on the optimal trajectory  $x(t)$ .

#### H. Solving by Riccati equation

From (38), and by assuming that  $B_\infty$  is of full rank,

$$\psi_\infty = \left( \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \lambda_1 \tilde{B} - x^T \overline{C}_\infty^T \right) N^{-1} R_\gamma (B_\infty^T B_\infty)^{-1} B_\infty^T. \quad (45)$$

Plugging this relation into (35) and (36), we obtain

$$\dot{x}(t) = \tilde{A}(t)x(t) - \tilde{S}(t)\lambda_1^T(t) + B_2 w_2(t), \quad \dot{\lambda}_1^T(t) = -\tilde{Q}(t)x(t) - \tilde{A}^T(t)\lambda_1^T(t). \quad (46)$$

Similarly to LQ problems, it is possible to express  $\lambda_1(t)$  in the form

$$\lambda_1^T(t) = K_1(t)x(t) + h_1(t). \quad (47)$$

Indeed, it is clear that if the matrix  $K_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and the column vector  $h_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  verify

$$\dot{K}_1(t) = -K_1(t)\tilde{A}(t) - \tilde{A}(t)^T K_1(t) - \tilde{Q}(t) + K_1(t)\tilde{S}(t)K_1(t), \quad (48)$$

$$\dot{h}_1(t) = -K_1(t)\tilde{S}(t)h_1(t) + \tilde{A}^T(t)h_1(t) + K_1(t)B_2w_2(t), \quad (49)$$

with boundary conditions

$$K_1(t_f) = 0, \quad h_1(t_f) = 0, \quad (50)$$

then  $\lambda_1(t)$  defined by (47) solves the differential equation (46) and the boundary condition (31).

Equation (48) is a standard Riccati equation, which can be linearized using Radon's Lemma (see [23]). For a given input  $w_2$ , both equations (48) and (49) can be solved by backward integrating from final conditions (50).

#### IV. SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS

In order to obtain sufficient conditions for this problem, some well known facts of conjugate times theory are next recalled (see for example [24, chapter 9] for more details).

*Definition 3:* The variational system

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \delta x \\ \delta \lambda_1^T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A} & -\tilde{S} \\ -\tilde{Q} & -\tilde{A}^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \delta x \\ \delta \lambda_1^T \end{pmatrix} \quad (51)$$

is called Jacobi's equation. The Jacobi's field  $J(t) = (\delta x^T(t), \delta \lambda_1^T(t))$  is a nontrivial solution of (51).

The transition matrix associated with (51) is denoted  $\phi(t)$ , and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta x(t) \\ \delta \lambda_1^T(t) \end{pmatrix} = \phi(t) \begin{pmatrix} \delta x(0) \\ \delta \lambda_1^T(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1(t) & \phi_2(t) \\ \phi_3(t) & \phi_4(t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \delta x(0) \\ \delta \lambda_1^T(0) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (52)$$

*Definition 4:* The first conjugate time  $t_c$  is the first positive time for which there exists a Jacobi field such that  $\delta x(0) = \delta x(t_c) = 0$ .

This is equivalent to  $\text{rank } \phi_2(t_c) < n$ .

The following results are standard in LQ theory (see [24, chapter 9]).

*Proposition 2:* The first conjugate time  $t_c$  corresponds to the first finite escape time of the Riccati equation (48).

*Proof of Proposition 2:* The solution of the Riccati equation (48) is given by

$$K_1(t) = \phi_4(t)\phi_2^{-1}(t). \quad (53)$$

The first conjugate time  $t_c$  is the first time at which  $\phi_2(t_c)$  is not invertible, that is,  $\|K_1(t)\| \rightarrow +\infty$ , when  $t \rightarrow t_c$ .

*Proposition 3:* The solutions of Pontryagin Minimum Principle are optimal before their first conjugate time. The control (34) with  $\lambda_1(t)$  given by the Riccati equation (48) is optimal if and only if this equation admits a well defined solution on  $[0, t_f]$ .

Thanks to these results the necessary conditions are also sufficient. Before the first conjugate time, the optimal control -if it exists- is unique.

Actually, if  $\tilde{Q}$  is nonnegative, then the following additional properties hold.

*Proposition 4:* If  $\tilde{Q} \geq 0$ , then the solution  $K_1(t)$  of (48) is symmetric and nonnegative.

*Proof of Proposition 4:* See [23, Theorem 4.1.6], observing that  $K_1(t_f) = 0$ ,  $\tilde{S} \geq 0$  and  $\tilde{Q} \geq 0$ .

*Proposition 5:* If  $\tilde{Q} \geq 0$ , then  $t_c = +\infty$ .

*Proof of Proposition 5:* It is sufficient to apply [23, Corollary 3.6.7, Example 3.6.8], observing  $K_1(t_f) = 0$ ,  $\tilde{Q} \geq 0$  and  $\tilde{S} \geq 0$ .

*Proposition 6:* If  $\tilde{Q} \geq 0$ , and if  $K_1(t)$  converges to a limit  $K_1^\infty$  when  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , then  $(\tilde{A} - \tilde{S}K_1^\infty)$  is stable.

*Proof of Proposition 6:* Taking the limit in (48) leads to the Lyapunov equation

$$K_1^\infty(\tilde{A} - \tilde{S}K_1^\infty) + (\tilde{A} - \tilde{S}K_1^\infty)^T K_1^\infty = -\tilde{Q} - K_1^\infty \tilde{S} K_1^\infty < 0. \quad (54)$$

The result follows because  $K_1^\infty$  is symmetric and nonnegative.

In general, we do not know whether  $\tilde{Q}$  is nonnegative or not. In the scalar case however we are able to prove the following result.

*Proposition 7:* In the scalar case,  $r = n = 1$ ,  $m_\infty = m_2 = 1$  and  $r_\infty = r_2 = 1$ ,  $\tilde{Q}$  is nonnegative.

*Proof of Proposition 7:* Let  $\beta = D_{\infty u}^T D_\infty$  and  $\eta = D_{2u}$ , the matrix  $\tilde{Q}$  writes

$$\tilde{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} C_2^T & C_\infty^T D_\infty R_\gamma^{-1} \end{bmatrix} M \begin{bmatrix} C_2 \\ R_\gamma^{-1} D_\infty^T C_\infty \end{bmatrix}, \quad (55)$$

$$\text{where } M = \frac{2\alpha^4\beta^2}{\left(\eta^2 + \frac{\alpha^2\beta^2}{R_\gamma}\right)\left(\eta^2 + 2\frac{\alpha^2\beta^2}{R_\gamma}\right)} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\beta}{R_\gamma} \\ -\eta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\beta}{R_\gamma} & -\eta \end{bmatrix}.$$

## V. CONCLUSION

This paper analyzes the mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control for a multi-channel system. The framework used is the Stackelberg strategy with a closed loop information structure. This strategy is well adapted to manage several criteria with different hierarchical roles. Necessary conditions are provided and lead to a differential Riccati equation. It is emphasized that the Stackelberg strategy globally degenerates, due to the omnipotence of the leader. Using conjugate times theory, sufficient conditions are given in terms of finite escape time for the solution of the Riccati equation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. S. Bernstein and W. M. Haddad, "LQG control with an  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  performance bound: A Riccati equation approach," *IEEE Transactions On Automatic Control*, vol. AC-34, no. 3, pp. 293–305, March 1989.
- [2] K. Zhou, K. Glover, B. Bodenheimer, and J. Doyle, "Mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  performance objectives I: robust performance analysis," *IEEE Transactions On Automatic Control*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 1564–1574, 1994.
- [3] J. Doyle, K. Zhou, K. Glover, and B. Bodenheimer, "Mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  performance objectives II: optimal control," *IEEE Transactions On Automatic Control*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 1575–1587, 1994.
- [4] C. Scherer, "Multiobjective  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control," *IEEE Transactions On Automatic Control*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1054–1063, 1995.
- [5] P. Khargonekar and M. Rotea, "Mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control: a convex optimization approach," *IEEE Transactions On Automatic Control*, vol. 36, no. 7, pp. 823–837, 1991.
- [6] D. Mustafa, K. Glover, and D. Limebeer, " $\mathcal{H}_2$ -optimal control with an  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -constraint: the state feedback case," *Automatica*, vol. vol 27, no. 2, pp. 307–316, 1991.
- [7] M. A. Rotea and P. P. Khargonekar, " $\mathcal{H}_2$ -optimal control with an  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -constraint: the state feedback case," *Automatica*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 307–316, 1991.
- [8] B. Halder, B. Hassibi, and T. Kailath, "Linealy combined suboptimal mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  controllers," vol. Proc. of the 37th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, San Diego CA, December 1997, pp. 434–439.
- [9] T. Başar and G. J. Olsder, *Dynamic Noncooperative Game Theory*. SIAM, 1995.
- [10] A. W. Starr and Y. C. Ho, "Nonzero-sum differential games," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 184–206, 1969.
- [11] —, "Further properties of nonzero-sum differential games," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 207–219, 1969.
- [12] Y. C. Ho, "Survey paper: Differential games, dynamic optimization and generalized control theory," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 179–209, 1970.
- [13] M. Simaan and J. B. Cruz, "On the Stackelberg strategy in nonzero-sum games," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 533–555, 1973.
- [14] —, "Additional aspects of the Stackelberg strategy in nonzero-sum games," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 613–626, 1973.

- [15] D. Limebeer, B. Anderson, and H. Hendel, “A Nash game approach to mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control,” *IEEE Transactions On Automatic Control*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 69–82, January 1994.
- [16] H. O. Florentino and R. M. Sales, “Nash game and mixed  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control.” Proceedings of the American Control Conference, Albuquerque, NM, USA, 1997, pp. 3521–3525.
- [17] X. Chen and K. Zhou, “Multiobjective  $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control design,” *SIAM Journal Control Optimization*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 628–660, 2001.
- [18] G. P. Papavasilopoulos and J. B. Cruz, “Nonclassical control problems and stackelberg games,” *IEEE Transactions On Automatic Control*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 155–166, April 1979.
- [19] L. Pontryagin, V. Boltyanski, R. Gamkrelidze, and E. Michtchenko, *The Mathematical Theory of Optimal Processes*. New York, Wiley Interscience, 1962.
- [20] E. Lee and L. Markus, *Foundations of Optimal Control Theory*. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- [21] E. Trélat, *Contrôle optimal: théorie et applications*. Vuibert, 2005.
- [22] B. Bonnard and M. Chyba, *The role of singular trajectories in control theory*. Math. & Appl. 40 Springer Verlag, 2003.
- [23] H. Abou-Kandil, G. Freiling, V. Ionescu, and G. Jank, *Matrix Riccati Equations in Control and Systems Theory*. Birkhäuser, 2003.
- [24] B. Bonnard, L. Faubourg, and E. Trélat, *Mécanique céleste et contrôle de systèmes spatiaux*. Math. & Appl. 51 Springer Verlag, 2006.