

REFERENCES

- [1] D. C. Tarraf, A. Megretski, and M. A. Dahleh, "A framework for robust stability of systems over finite alphabets," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 1133–1146, Jun. 2008.
- [2] G. Goodwin and D. Quevedo, "Finite alphabet control and estimation," *Int. J. Control, Autom., and Syst.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 412–430, Dec. 2003.
- [3] B. Picasso and A. Bicchi, "On the stabilization of linear systems under assigned I/O quantization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 1994–2000, Oct. 2007.
- [4] C. Müller, D. E. Quevedo, and G. C. Goodwin, "How good is quantized model predictive control with horizon one?," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 56, no. 11, pp. 2623–2638, Nov. 2011.
- [5] D. E. Quevedo, J. Østergaard, and D. Nešić, "Packetized predictive control of stochastic systems over bit-rate limited channels with packet loss," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 2854–2868, Dec. 2011.
- [6] A. Gersho and R. M. Gray, *Vector Quantization and Signal Compression*, ser. Engineering and Computer Science. Norwell, MA: Kluwer, 1992.
- [7] D. Delchamps, "Stabilizing a linear system with quantized state feedback," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 916–924, Aug. 1990.
- [8] T. Kameneva and D. Nešić, "On l2 stabilization of linear systems with quantized control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 399–405, Feb. 2008.
- [9] D. Coutinho, M. Fu, and C. de Souza, "Input and output quantized feedback linear systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 761–766, Mar. 2010.
- [10] G. C. Goodwin, D. Q. Mayne, K. Chen, C. Coates, G. Mirzaeva, and D. E. Quevedo, "An introduction to the control of switching electronic systems," *Annu. Rev. in Control*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 209–220, Dec. 2010.
- [11] J.-S. Hu and K.-Y. Chen, "Analysis and design of the receding horizon constrained optimization for class-D amplifier driving signals," *Dig. Signal Process.*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 1511–1525, Dec. 2010.
- [12] J. Rawlings and D. Mayne, *Model Predictive Control: Theory and Design*. Madison, WI: Nob Hill, 2009.
- [13] B. Picasso, S. Pancanti, A. Bemporad, and A. Bicchi, "Receding-horizon control of LTI systems with quantized inputs," in *Proc. IFAC Conf. Anal. and Design of Hybrid Syst.*, 2003, pp. 259–264.
- [14] D. E. Quevedo, G. C. Goodwin, and J. A. De Doná, "Finite constraint set receding horizon quadratic control," *Int. J. Robust and Nonlin. Control*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 355–377, Jan. 2004.
- [15] R. P. Aguilera and D. E. Quevedo, "On the stability of MPC with a finite input alphabet," in *Proc. 18th IFAC World Congr.*, Milano, Italy, Aug. 2011, pp. 7975–7980.
- [16] D. Liberzon, "Quantization, time delays, and nonlinear stabilization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 1190–1195, Jul. 2006.
- [17] D. Q. Mayne, M. Serón, and S. V. Raković, "Robust model predictive control of constrained linear systems with bounded disturbances," *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 219–224, 2005.
- [18] D. Limón, T. Álamo, F. Salas, and E. F. Camacho, "Input to state stability of min-max MPC controllers for nonlinear systems with bounded uncertainties," *Automatica*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 797–803, May 2006.
- [19] H. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 2001.
- [20] Z.-P. Jiang and Y. Wang, "Input-to-state stability for discrete-time nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 857–869, Jun. 2001.
- [21] D. M. Raimondo, D. Limón, M. Lazar, L. Magni, and E. F. Camacho, "Min-max model predictive control of nonlinear systems: A unifying overview on stability," *Eur. J. Control*, vol. 15, pp. 1–17, 2009.
- [22] D. Limón, T. Álamo, D. Raimondo, D. de la Peña, J. Bravo, A. Ferramosca, and E. Camacho, "Input-to-state stability: a unifying framework for robust model predictive control," in *Nonlinear Model Predictive Control*, L. Magni, D. Raimondo, and F. Allgöwer, Eds. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer, 2009, pp. 1–26.
- [23] L. Magni, D. M. Raimondo, and R. Scattolini, "Regional input-to-state stability for nonlinear model predictive control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 1548–1553, Sep. 2006.
- [24] M. Lazar, W. P. M. H. Heemels, and A. Teel, "Lyapunov functions, stability and input-to-state stability subtleties for discrete-time discontinuous systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 2421–2425, Oct. 2009.
- [25] B. Picasso and D. Limón, "On the stability in discrete-time discontinuous systems," in *Proc. 18th IFAC World Congr.*, 2011, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 6431–6436.
- [26] B. Picasso, D. Desiderio, and R. Scattolini, "Robust stability analysis of nonlinear discrete-time systems with application to MPC," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 185–191, Jan. 2012.
- [27] B. D. O. Anderson and J. B. Moore, *Linear Optimal Control*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- [28] B. Picasso and P. Colaneri, "Stabilization of discrete-time quantized linear systems: An H_∞/ℓ_1 approach," in *Proc. 47th IEEE Conf. Decision and Control*, 2008, pp. 2868–2873.

Group and Total Dissipativity and Stability of Multi-Equilibria Hybrid Automata

Eva M. Navarro-López, *Member, IEEE*, and
Dina S. Laila, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Complex systems, which consist of different interdependent and interlocking subsystems, typically have multiple equilibrium points associated with different set points of each operation mode. These systems are usually interpreted as hybrid systems. This paper studies the conditions for dissipativity and some stability properties of a class of hybrid systems with multiple co-existing equilibrium points, modelled as nonlinear hybrid automata. A classification of equilibria for hybrid automata is proposed. The objective is to identify dissipative components as groups of discrete locations within the hybrid automaton, formed according to existing equilibria. An example is provided.

Index Terms—Computational methods, control systems, dissipativity theory, energy control, hybrid automata.

I. MOTIVATION

Many questions still remain unanswered in the modelling and analysis of switched and hybrid systems with myriad interdependent and interlocking subsystems. These subsystems are entire systems in themselves, not only different operation modes from the whole system. In this scenario, the hybrid system has many different equilibria and some subsystems probably have no equilibrium point. Ignoring these details may lead to oversimplification. The real potential of hybrid automata lies in the capability to capture the dynamics of these kinds of systems:

Manuscript received March 01, 2012; revised October 31, 2012; accepted April 25, 2013. Date of publication May 01, 2013; date of current version November 18, 2013. This work was supported by the EPSRC-funded project DYVERSE: A New Kind of Control for Hybrid Systems under Grant EP/I001689/1 and the RCUK under Grant EP/E50048/1. Recommended by Associate Editor L. Zaccarian.

E. M. Navarro-López is with the School of Computer Science, The University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, U.K. (e-mail: eva.navarro@cs.man.ac.uk).

D. S. Laila is with the Faculty of Engineering and the Environment, The University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ, U.K. (e-mail: d.laila@soton.ac.uk).

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this paper are available online at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2013.2261185

this is the motivation behind this work. More general than switched systems, hybrid automata explicitly consider the influence of the transition from one subsystem to another through guards, as well as impulses in the states represented by reset functions. We here define a framework to deal with multiple isolated equilibria in nonlinear hybrid automata and characterise some stability and dissipativity properties. The conditions proposed in this paper for stability and dissipativity can be automatically checked using recent formal verification techniques for hybrid systems [1].

Dissipativity in switched systems has been studied by means of common storage functions [2] and, with less restriction, multiple storage functions [3]. The expanded results of these are given in [4]–[6], and within the framework of differential inclusions [7]. There are also studies of feedback passivity of continuous and discrete-time switched systems [8], [9]. Dissipativity in hybrid automata has not attracted as much attention. Within hybrid systems, dissipativity has been successfully applied to study the asymptotic stability of compact sets in a general class of jump systems (see [10], [11] and references therein), the control of interconnected impulsive systems [12], or the control of impact mechanical systems [13]. The analysis of switched and hybrid systems with multiple equilibria is less common [14]–[16]. Our approach differs because we provide an alternative framework for hybrid automata, with reference to complex large-scale systems with different types of discontinuities, multiple isolated equilibria, and non-identical subsystem dynamic structures – which allows having different continuous state space for every subsystem. In this work, we do not consider Zeno equilibria as in [15].

In brief, the contribution of this paper is three-fold. First, we establish a framework within nonlinear hybrid automata to define different types of co-existing equilibrium points. Second, pre-existing stability conditions are adapted to illuminate the co-existence of different types of equilibria by combining common and multiple Lyapunov-like functions. Finally, we identify dissipative parts within a hybrid automaton and give the definition of *group dissipativity* for groups of locations of the hybrid automaton, and *total dissipativity* for the whole hybrid automaton. Dissipativity of the groups of discrete locations will not imply the dissipativity of the whole hybrid automaton. Additional cross-group-coupling conditions are established, and common and multiple storage-like functions are used.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Following [17], a hybrid automaton with inputs and outputs

$$H = (Q, E, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}, Dom, \mathcal{F}, Init, G, R, h)$$

is a model for a hybrid system with:

- **Discrete locations:** $Q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{N_q}\}$.
- **Continuous state, input and output spaces:** $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$.
- **Continuous inputs:** for each $q_i \in Q$, there is one input space $\mathcal{U}_{q_i} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, and $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{q_i \in Q} \mathcal{U}_{q_i}$.
- **Transitions:** $E \subseteq Q \times Q$, with E a finite set of edges.
- **Location domains:** for each $q_i \in Q$, there is one continuous state space $\mathcal{X}_{q_i} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, with $\bigcup_{q_i \in Q} \mathcal{X}_{q_i} = \mathcal{X}$, and $Dom : Q \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{X}_{q_i}}$. $Dom(q_i) \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{q_i}$.
- **Continuous dynamics:** $\mathcal{F} = \{f_{q_i}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) : q_i \in Q\}$ is a collection of vector fields such that $f_{q_i} : \mathcal{X}_{q_i} \times \mathcal{U}_{q_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{q_i}$. Each $f_{q_i}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{X}_{q_i} in order to ensure that in each q_i the solution exists and is unique.
- **Set of initial states:** $Init \subseteq \bigcup_{q_i \in Q} q_i \times \mathcal{X}_{q_i} \subseteq Q \times \mathcal{X}$.
- **Guard maps:** $G : E \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{X}}$.
- **Reset maps:** $R : E \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{X}}$. For each $e = (q_i, q_j) \in E$, $\mathbf{x} \in G(e)$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{q_i}$, $R(e, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \subset \mathcal{X}_{q_j}$.

- **Continuous outputs:** $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{h}(q_i, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$, $h : Q \times \mathcal{X}_{q_i} \times \mathcal{U}_{q_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{q_i}$. For each $q_i \in Q$, there is one output space $\mathcal{Y}_{q_i} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$, and $\mathcal{Y} = \bigcup_{q_i \in Q} \mathcal{Y}_{q_i}$.

Consider the execution of H , $\phi = (\tau, q, \mathbf{x})$, with hybrid time trajectory $\tau = \{[t_i, t'_i]\}_{i=0}^N \in \mathcal{T}$, and \mathcal{T} the set of all hybrid time trajectories [18]. We highlight that for all $0 \leq i < N$, $t_i \leq t'_i = t_{i+1}$.

Definition 1: An **input sequence of H** is a collection $\phi_u = (\tau, \mathbf{u})$ with hybrid time trajectory $\tau = \{[t_i, t'_i]\}_{i=0}^N \in \mathcal{T}$, and the mapping $\mathbf{u} : \tau \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, satisfying

- 1) **Initial condition.** $\mathbf{u}(t_0) \in \mathcal{U}_{q(t_0)}$ with $(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0)) \in Init$ and $\mathbf{x}(t_0) \in Dom(q(t_0))$.
- 2) **Continuous evolution.** For all i : $\forall t \in [t_i, t'_i]$, $q(t)$ is constant and $\forall t \in [t_i, t'_i]$, $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathcal{U}_{q(t)}$ is continuous.
- 3) **Discrete transitions.** For all $(q(t'_i), q(t_{i+1})) \in E$, $0 \leq i \leq N-1$: $\mathbf{u}(t'_i) \in \mathcal{U}_{q(t'_i)}$ and $\exists \mathbf{u}(t_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{U}_{q(t_{i+1})}$. ■

Definition 2: An **output sequence of H** is a collection $\phi_y = (\tau, \mathbf{y})$ with hybrid time trajectory $\tau = \{[t_i, t'_i]\}_{i=0}^N \in \mathcal{T}$, and the mapping $\mathbf{y} : \tau \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, satisfying

- 1) **Initial condition.** $\mathbf{y}(t_0) \in \mathcal{Y}_{q(t_0)}$ with $\mathbf{y}(t_0) = \mathbf{h}(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0), \mathbf{u}(t_0))$, and $(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0)) \in Init$, $\mathbf{x}(t_0) \in Dom(q(t_0))$, $\mathbf{u}(t_0) \in \mathcal{U}_{q(t_0)}$.
- 2) **Continuous evolution.** For all i : $\forall t \in [t_i, t'_i]$, $q(t)$ is constant, and $\forall t \in [t_i, t'_i]$ we have that $\mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{h}(q(t), \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t))$, \mathbf{h} is smooth, $\mathbf{y}(t) \in \mathcal{Y}_{q(t)}$, $\mathbf{x}(t) \in Dom(q(t))$, and $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathcal{U}_{q(t)}$.
- 3) **Discrete transitions.** For all $e = (q(t'_i), q(t_{i+1})) \in E$, $0 \leq i \leq N-1$: $\mathbf{y}(t'_i) = \mathbf{h}(q(t'_i), \mathbf{x}(t'_i), \mathbf{u}(t'_i))$ with $\mathbf{y}(t'_i) \in \mathcal{Y}_{q(t'_i)}$, $\mathbf{x}(t'_i) = G(e)$ and $\mathbf{u}(t'_i) \in \mathcal{U}_{q(t'_i)}$, and $\exists \mathbf{y}(t_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{Y}_{q(t_{i+1})}$ obtained by using $\mathbf{x}(t_{i+1}) \in R(e, \mathbf{x}(t'_i), \mathbf{u}(t'_i))$. ■

An execution ϕ , an input sequence ϕ_u or an output sequence ϕ_y is *finite* if τ is a finite sequence ending with a closed interval, that is $N < \infty$, $I_N = [t'_N, t_N]$ with $t'_N < \infty$, and is *infinite* if τ is (i) a finite sequence ending with an infinite interval ($N < \infty$, $I_N = [t'_N, t_N]$, $t'_N = \infty$) or (ii) an infinite sequence ($N = \infty$). The set of executions with initial condition $(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))$ is $\mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}$. It is $\mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}^F$ for finite executions and $\mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}^\infty$ for infinite executions.

For any $q_i \in Q$, we consider $T|_{q_i} = \{t_{q_{i1}}, t_{q_{i2}}, \dots, t_{q_{iN_{q_i}}}, \dots, t_{q_{iM_{q_i}}}\}$; $q(t_{q_{ik}}) = q_i, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, as the sequence of times when the location q_i becomes ACTIVE, and $T'|_{q_i} = \{t'_{q_{i1}}, t'_{q_{i2}}, \dots, t'_{q_{iM_{q_i}}}, \dots, t'_{q_{iM_{q_i}}}\}$; $q(t_{q_{ik}}) = q_i, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, as the sequence of times when the location q_i becomes INACTIVE, with N_{q_i} and M_{q_i} the number of entrances to and exits from q_i , respectively. For instance, if $t \in [t_{q_{ik}}, t'_{q_{ik}}] \in \tau$, q_i is active, for the k th time. We also use $T''|_{q_i}$ to denote the sequence of times when q_i becomes inactive to change to another location q_j . We define $\mathcal{I}(T|_{q_i})$ as the set of time intervals during which location q_i is active: that is, $\mathcal{I}(T|_{q_i}) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{N_{q_i}} [t_{q_{ik}}, t'_{q_{ik}}]$.

Consider the following systems:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)), \quad \mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{x}(k+1) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}(k), \mathbf{u}(k)), \quad \mathbf{y}(k) = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}(k), \mathbf{u}(k)), \quad (2)$$

with $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{H}$ are smooth mappings and maps. The system (1) is dissipative w.r.t. the supply rate function $s(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u})$, with $\int_0^t |s(\mathbf{y}(\sigma), \mathbf{u}(\sigma))| d\sigma < \infty, \forall t \geq 0$, if there exists a positive definite storage function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that for any t_0 and any $t_f > t_0$, the following relation is satisfied for all $\mathbf{x}(t_0)$ [19]:

$$V(\mathbf{x}(t_f)) - V(\mathbf{x}(t_0)) \leq \int_{t_0}^{t_f} s(\mathbf{y}(\sigma), \mathbf{u}(\sigma)) d\sigma, \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}). \quad (3)$$

For $V \in \mathcal{C}^1$, inequality (3) is equivalent to [19],

$$\frac{\partial V(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \leq s(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m. \quad (4)$$




Fig. 1. 15-location hybrid automaton of the closed-loop drillstring.

System (2) is dissipative w.r.t. the supply rate function s if there exists a positive definite storage function V , such that $\forall x(0)$, $\forall k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ [20]:

$$V(\mathbf{x}(k+1)) - V(\mathbf{x}(k)) \leq s(\mathbf{y}(k), \mathbf{u}(k)), \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}(k), \mathbf{u}(k)). \quad (5)$$

III. MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

To illustrate the results in this paper, we consider a simplified model of the torsional behaviour of a conventional vertical oilwell drillstring that has multiple equilibria and is given in [17]. The system may exhibit self-excited stick-slip oscillations depending on the values of the control input to the system, u , and the weight on the bit, W_{ob} , which is a varying parameter. The drillstring with u a constant can be modelled as a 5-location hybrid automaton [17].

As also shown in [17], the oscillations in the system can be eliminated using a switching controller that drives the angular velocity of the top-rotary system to a desired value $x_{3r} > 0$. The switching control mechanism is driven by the changing sign of a function $s^r(\mathbf{x}, t)$, which is an integral function of the angular velocities. Based on this model, the closed-loop system, given in [17], can be represented by the 15-location hybrid automaton of Fig. 1, with:

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 &= \{slip_b^+, slip_r^+\}, q_2 = \{slip_b^+, slip_r^-\}, \\ q_3 &= \{slip_b^-, slip_r^+\}, \\ q_4 &= \{slip_b^-, slip_r^-\}, q_5 = \{slip_b^+, stick_r\}, \\ q_6 &= \{stick_b, stick_r\}, \\ q_7 &= \{slip_b^-, stick_r\}, q_8 = \{stick_b, slip_r^+\}, \\ q_9 &= \{stick_b, slip_r^-\}, \\ q_{10} &= \{tr^+, slip_r^+\}, q_{11} = \{tr^+, stick_r\}, q_{12} = \{tr^+, slip_r^-\}, \\ q_{13} &= \{tr^-, slip_r^+\}, q_{14} = \{tr^-, stick_r\}, q_{15} = \{tr^-, slip_r^-\}. \end{aligned}$$

$stick_r$ stands for $S_0^s \equiv \{|s^r| \leq \delta\}$, $stick_b$ for $G_0^s \equiv \{|x_3| \leq \delta, |u_{eq}(\mathbf{x})| \leq T_{sb}\}$, $slip_r^+$ for $S_+^r \equiv \{s^r > \delta\}$, $slip_b^+$ for $G_+ \equiv \{x_3 > \delta, slip_r^-\}$ for $S_-^r \equiv \{s^r < -\delta\}$, and $slip_b^-$ for $\{x_3 < -\delta\}$; tr^+ denotes $G_+^s \equiv \{|x_3| \leq \delta, u_{eq}(\mathbf{x}) > T_{sb}\}$, and tr^- denotes $G_-^s \equiv \{|x_3| \leq \delta, u_{eq}(\mathbf{x}) < -T_{sb}\}$.

Note that in the specification of the domains, to avoid numerical problems with zero detection in the simulation, we define a neighbourhood around zero with a small $\delta > 0$.

The letters on the edges represent the 12 guards of H : $\mathbf{a} \Leftrightarrow G_0^s \cap S_0^r$, $\mathbf{b} \Leftrightarrow G_+^s \cap S_0^r$, $\mathbf{c} \Leftrightarrow G_+^s \cap S_0^s$, $\mathbf{d} \Leftrightarrow G_0^s \cap S_+^r$, $\mathbf{e} \Leftrightarrow G_+^s \cap S_+^r$, $\mathbf{f} \Leftrightarrow G_+^s \cap S_+^s$, $\mathbf{g} \Leftrightarrow G_0^s \cap S_-^r$, $\mathbf{h} \Leftrightarrow G_-^s \cap S_-^r$, $\mathbf{i} \Leftrightarrow G_+^s \cap S_-^r$,




Fig. 2. Example of the division of the state space \mathcal{X} of a hybrid automaton with 5 discrete locations, 3 groups of locations and 3 group equilibria. $\mathcal{X}_{g_1} = \mathcal{X}_{q_1}$, $\mathcal{X}_{g_2} = \mathcal{X}_{q_2}$, $\mathcal{X}_{g_3} = \mathcal{X}_{q_3} \cup \mathcal{X}_{q_4} \cup \mathcal{X}_{q_5}$. The unique equilibrium point within group g_3 belongs to q_3 and q_4 . Moreover, $\mathcal{X}_{q_3} \cap \mathcal{X}_{q_4} \neq \emptyset$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j} &\Leftrightarrow \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x_3| > \delta\} \cap S_0^r, \mathbf{k} \Leftrightarrow \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x_3| > \delta\} \cap S_-^r, \\ \mathbf{l} &\Leftrightarrow \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x_3| > \delta\} \cap S_+^r. \end{aligned}$$

IV. CLASSIFICATION OF EQUILIBRIA

Inspired by [21], we propose several types of equilibria, and split the discrete locations of H into groups, depending on these equilibria (see Fig. 2).

Definition 3: $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a **non-virtual equilibrium** of a discrete location $q_i \in Q$ if: **(i)** $\exists \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{q_i} \in \mathcal{U}_{q_i}$ such that $\mathbf{f}_{q_i}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{q_i}) = 0$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i} \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{X}_{q_i})$; **(ii)** $\forall e \in (q_i \times Q) \cap E$ with $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i} \in G(e)$, $R(e, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{q_i}) = \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i}\}$. $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i}$ is **isolated** if it has a neighbourhood in \mathcal{X}_{q_i} which contains no other equilibria. The **equilibrium output** for q_i is $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{q_i} = \mathbf{h}(q_i, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{q_i})$. ■

Definition 4: $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a **virtual equilibrium** of location $q_i \in Q$ if $\exists \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{q_i} \in \mathcal{U}_{q_i}$ such that $\mathbf{f}_{q_i}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{q_i}) = 0$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i} \notin \text{cl}(\mathcal{X}_{q_i})$, but $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{q_i} \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{X}_{q_j})$ for some $q_j \in Q$, $q_j \neq q_i$. ■

Definition 5: Let N_q be the number of discrete locations of the hybrid automaton H . Consider a partition $P \subset Q$, with $P = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{N_g}\}$ and $N_g \leq N_q$, such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_g} g_i = Q$ and $\bigcap_{i=1}^{N_g} g_i = \emptyset$. Let N_{g_i} be the number of locations within each group g_i , with $1 \leq N_{g_i} \leq N_q$ for all i . We associate with each group g_i a subset of the state space \mathcal{X}_{g_i} such that $\bigcup_{q_j \in g_i} \mathcal{X}_{q_j} = \mathcal{X}_{g_i}$, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_g} \mathcal{X}_{g_i} = \mathcal{X}$ and $\bigcap_{i=1}^{N_g} \mathcal{X}_{g_i} = \emptyset$. Then, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_i} \in \mathcal{X}_{g_i}$ is a **group equilibrium** for H if:

- There exists at least one $q_i \in g_i$ for which $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_i}$ is an isolated non-virtual equilibrium for q_i ;
- $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_i}$ is the unique non-virtual equilibrium point for the discrete locations of the group g_i ;
- $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_i}$ is not a non-virtual equilibrium for any discrete location outside group g_i ;
- for $e \in (g_i \times g_i) \cap E$ with $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_i} \in G(e)$, $R(e, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_i}, \cdot) = \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_i}\}$;
- for all $e \in (g_i \times (Q \setminus g_i)) \cap E$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_i} \notin G(e)$. ■

Remark 1: Condition (i) of Definition 5 allows a shared non-virtual equilibrium for several discrete locations $q_i \in g_i$. This also allows locations with no equilibrium within the same group. Note that $\bigcap_{q_j \in g_i} \mathcal{X}_{q_j}$ can be a non-empty set, allowing the situation shown in Fig. 2.

For instance, for the 15-location hybrid automaton shown in Fig. 1, we have:

- Virtual equilibrium** for q_1 and q_3 (for any value of x_{3r} , η and λ), and for q_8, q_{10}, q_{13} (only if $x_{3r} = \eta/\lambda$):

$$\bar{\mathbf{v}}_1 = \left(x_{3r} - \frac{\eta}{\lambda}, \frac{c_b(x_{3r} - \frac{\eta}{\lambda})}{k_t} + \frac{T_{fb}(x_{3r} - \frac{\eta}{\lambda})}{k_t}, x_{3r} - \frac{\eta}{\lambda} \right)^T.$$

- Virtual equilibrium** for q_2 :

$$\bar{\mathbf{v}}_2 = \left(x_{3r} - \frac{\eta}{\lambda}, \frac{c_b(x_{3r} + \frac{\eta}{\lambda})}{k_t} + \frac{T_{fb}(x_{3r} + \frac{\eta}{\lambda})}{k_t}, x_{3r} + \frac{\eta}{\lambda} \right)^T.$$

- Group equilibrium** within location q_5 : $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_1} = (x_{3r}, (c_b x_{3r} + T_{fb}^+(x_{3r}, W_{ob}))/k_t, x_{3r})^T$.

Locations $q_6, q_7, q_{11}, q_{14}, q_4, q_9, q_{12}$ and q_{15} have no equilibrium point. All the discrete locations of the 15-location hybrid automaton are grouped together in g_1 .

V. TOTAL STABILITY OF GROUP EQUILIBRIA IN HYBRID AUTOMATA

The stability conditions presented in this section are adapted from [14], [22]–[24] for nonlinear hybrid automata. Whilst in these works, a different Lyapunov function is considered for each subsystem, we have a different common Lyapunov function for each group of locations. We define a ball of radius $r > 0$ around a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as $B(r, p) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\mathbf{x} - p\| < r\}$, with $\|\cdot\|$ the Euclidean 2-norm.

Definition 6: Given $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$ a group equilibrium of H . $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j} \in \mathcal{X}_{q_i}$, for some $q_i \in g_j \subseteq Q$, is: **(i) stable** iff for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that $\forall \phi = (\tau, q, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}$,

$$\mathbf{x}(t_0) \in B(\delta, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}) \cap \mathcal{X}_{q(t_0)} \Rightarrow \mathbf{x}(t) \in B(\epsilon, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}), \forall t \in \tau.$$

(ii) attractive iff there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that $\forall \phi = (\tau, q, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}$, $t_\infty = \sum_i (t'_i - t_i)$,

$$\mathbf{x}(t_0) \in B(\delta_1, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}) \cap \mathcal{X}_{q(t_0)} \Rightarrow \lim_{t \rightarrow t_\infty} \mathbf{x}(t) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}.$$

(iii) asymptotically stable if it is stable and attractive. ■

Stability is defined for any executions, whether finite or infinite, but attractivity is defined for infinite executions only since it is a property of convergence to a certain value.

Definition 7: Consider any group of locations g_j within H , and its associated group equilibrium $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j} \in \mathcal{X}_{g_j}$, with $\mathcal{X}_{g_j} = \bigcup_{q_i \in g_j} \mathcal{X}_{q_i}$. A function $V_{g_j} : \mathcal{X}_{g_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that: (i) V_{g_j} is continuously differentiable within every $q_i \in g_j$; (ii) $V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}) > 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{g_j} \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}\}$; (iii) $V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{x} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$, is referred to as **group candidate Lyapunov function** for the group g_j of H . ■

Assumption 1: H switches from one location to another a finite number of times S_H on any finite time interval. For any finite time T , with $t_0 < T \leq t_N$, and $T \in I_i$ for some time interval $I_i \in \tau$, there exists $K_T \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, such that during the time interval $[t_0, T]$, $S_H \leq K_T$.

Let define $Q_i := \{q_i \in g_j : \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j} \text{ is a group equilibrium and non-virtual equilibrium of } q_i\}$, $T|Q_i = \{t_{Q_{i1}}, t_{Q_{i2}}, \dots, t_{Q_{ik}}, \dots\}$ as the sequence of times when any location within Q_i becomes active and $|T|Q_i| = N_{in, Q_i}$. Consider Ω_{g_j} as the set within \mathcal{X}_{g_j} where V_{g_j} is a Lyapunov function:

$$\Omega_{q_i} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{q_i} : q_i \in Q_i, \frac{\partial V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{q_i}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot) \leq 0 \right\},$$

$$\Omega_{g_j} = \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}\} \bigcup_{q_i \in Q_i} \Omega_{q_i}. \quad (6)$$

Now, we state a result on total stability of a group equilibrium against all co-existing equilibria in H for a particular case of hybrid automata, in which executions start at a location whose domain does not contain the domain of attraction of other group equilibrium different from $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$.

Definition 8: Consider a hybrid automaton H . Assume there is a group equilibrium of H , $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$, associated with the group g_j , with $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$ a non-virtual equilibrium of q_i , for at least one $q_i \in g_j$. Then, H is an **Init-constrained hybrid automaton** if

$$(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0)) \in \left((Q_i \times \Omega_{g_j}) \cap \text{Init} \right), \mathbf{u}(t_0) \in \bigcup_{q_i \in Q_i} \mathcal{U}_{q_i}$$

for all executions $\phi = (\tau, q, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}$, and all input sequences $\phi_u = (\tau, \mathbf{u})$. ■

Theorem 1: (Total stability of a group equilibrium of H) Consider an Init-constrained hybrid automaton H . Let N_g be the number of groups of locations in H . Consider $\mathcal{I}(T|q_i)$ as the set of time

intervals during which location q_i is active. Let define $T|g_j = \{t_{g_{j1}}, t_{g_{j2}}, \dots, t_{g_{jk}}, \dots\}$ as the sequence of times when any location of group g_j becomes active, and $T|g_s = \{t_{g_{s1}}, t_{g_{s2}}, \dots, t_{g_{sk}}, \dots\}$ as the sequence of times when any location q_s , that does not belong to group g_j becomes active, with $q_s \in g_s, g_s \subseteq Q \setminus g_j$. Let Assumption 1 hold. $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$ is **totally stable** if there exist N_g group candidate Lyapunov functions $\{V_{g_1}, \dots, V_{g_{N_g}}\}$ such that $\forall \phi = (\tau, q, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}$ and $\forall \phi_u = (\tau, \mathbf{u})$, the following conditions hold:

(i) **Condition related to locations within g_j for which $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$ is a non-virtual equilibrium.** $\forall t \in \bigcup_{q_i \in Q_i} \mathcal{I}(T|q_i), \forall q_i \in Q_i$, and for $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \text{Dom}(q_i), \mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathcal{U}_{q_i}$:

$$\frac{\partial V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t))}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{q_i}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \leq 0. \quad (7)$$

(ii) **Condition related to the entrances to any q_i for which $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$ is a non-virtual equilibrium.** $\forall k \in \{1, \dots, N_{in, Q_i} - 1\}$:

$$V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{Q_{ik+1}})) - V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{Q_{ik}})) \leq 0, \text{ with } t_{Q_{ik}}, t_{Q_{ik+1}} \in T|Q_i. \quad (8)$$

(iii) **Conditions related to locations of H for which $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$ is not a non-virtual equilibrium.** For every $q_r \in Q \setminus Q_i$:

a. There exists $\lambda > 0$ such that for every time q_r is active:

$$V_{g_r}(\mathbf{x}(t)) \leq \lambda V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{Q_{ik}}^*)), \text{ for } t \in [t_{q_r k}, t_{q_r k}^*], \quad (9)$$

with $q_r \in g_r$, and $t_{Q_{ik}}^* = \max_k \{t_{Q_{ik}} \in T|Q_i : t_{Q_{ik}} \leq t_{q_r k}\}$ the last switch-on time before entering q_r of any location $q_i \in Q_i$, with $t_0 \leq t_{Q_{ik}}^* \leq t_{q_r k}$. Note that if $q_r \in g_j \setminus Q_i$, we substitute V_{g_r} by V_{g_j} in (9);

b. $\forall t \in \mathcal{I}(T|q_r), \mathbf{x}(t)$ does not exhibit finite escape times, i.e., $\ddagger t, \|\mathbf{x}(t)\| \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow t_e < \infty$.

(iv) **Cross-group-coupling conditions when entering g_j from any other group.**

a. For every group $g_s \subseteq Q \setminus g_j$, if $\exists t_{g_{sk}},$ with $t_{g_{sk}} \in T|g_s$:

$$V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{g_{jk}})) \leq V_{g_s}(\mathbf{x}(t_{g_{sk}}^*)), \quad (10)$$

$\forall t_{g_{jk}} \in T|g_j$ for which any location of g_j becomes active coming from any location of group g_s , with $t_{g_{sk}}^* = \max_k \{t_{g_{sk}} \in T|g_s : t_{g_{sk}} \leq t_{g_{jk}}\}$ the last time when a location within g_s became active before entering any location of g_j .

b. **Condition on resets.** For every $(q_s, q_j) \in E$, with $q_s \in g_s \subseteq Q \setminus g_j$ and $q_j \in g_j$:

$$V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}^+) - V_{g_s}(\mathbf{x}(t_{q_{sk}}^*)) \leq 0, \quad (11)$$

for all $t_{q_{sk}}^* \in T|q_s^{q_j}$ such that $\mathbf{x}(t_{q_{sk}}^*) \in G(q_s, q_j), \mathbf{x}^+ = R(q_s, q_j, \mathbf{x}(t_{q_{sk}}^*), \mathbf{u}(t_{q_{sk}}^*)), \mathbf{u}(t_{q_{sk}}^*) \in \mathcal{U}_{q_s}$, with $t_{q_{sk}}^*$ the time when q_s becomes inactive to change to any $q_j \in g_j$. ■

The total stability conditions can be strengthened to total asymptotic stability as stated next.

Theorem 2: (Total asymptotic stability of a group equilibrium of H) In addition to conditions of Theorem 1, if (7) is a strict inequality and one of the following conditions is satisfied for all $\phi = (\tau, q, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}$ and their associated infinite input sequences: **(i)** condition (8) is substituted by the fact that for all $q_i \in Q_i$ the sequence $\{V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{Q_{ik}}))\}$ converges to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$; or **(ii)** for some $q_i \in Q_i$, the set $T|q_i$ is finite and $q(t) = q_i$ for all $t \in [t_{q_i N_{q_i}}, \infty)$, with $t_{q_i N_{q_i}} \in T|q_i$ the last switch-on time for q_i , then $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$ is a **totally asymptotically stable equilibrium** of H in the sense of Lyapunov. ■

Remark 2: The case of having the same non-virtual equilibrium point for all the locations of H is a special case of our grouping of locations.

VI. DISSIPATIVE GROUPS WITHIN A HYBRID AUTOMATON AND TOTAL DISSIPATIVITY

We introduce the notion of *group dissipativity* for each group of locations of H and *total dissipativity* for the whole hybrid automaton. Two key differences from previous works are: 1) multiple isolated equilibria are present in the system, and some locations might have no equilibrium, 2) due to the nature of hybrid automata, jumps between locations at switching times are considered. We use multiple storage functions, different for each group, whilst a group of locations will share a common storage function.

To study the dissipativity in hybrid automata, we can exploit the dissipativity of groups of locations to state the dissipativity of the whole hybrid automaton. This is done by establishing appropriate input and output relationships between the groups of locations.

Definition 9: Let $T|g_j$ be the sequence of times when any location of group g_j becomes active and N_{in,g_j} the number of these entrances to any location $q_j \in g_j$. Under Assumption 1, a group of locations g_j of H is **group dissipative** w.r.t. the supply functions $s_{q_j}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u})$ defined for each $q_j \in g_j$, if there exists a group storage-like function $V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x})$ satisfying the conditions of a group candidate Lyapunov function, such that for all executions $\phi = (\tau, q, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}$, and all input and output sequences $\phi_u = (\tau, \mathbf{u})$, $\phi_y = (\tau, \mathbf{y})$:

- (i) **Condition on discrete locations.** $\forall q_j \in g_j$, and $\forall t \in \tau$ for which $q(t) = q_j$:

$$\frac{\partial V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t))}{\partial \mathbf{x}} f_{q_j}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \leq s_{q_j}(\mathbf{y}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)), \quad (12)$$

with $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \text{Dom}(q_j)$, $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathcal{U}_{q_j}$, $\mathbf{y}(t) \in \mathcal{Y}_{q_j}$.

- (ii) **Condition related to the entrances to locations within g_j .** $\forall k \in \{1, \dots, N_{in,g_j} - 1\}$:

$$V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{g_{jk+1}})) - V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{g_{jk}})) \leq s(\mathbf{y}(t_{g_{jk}}), \mathbf{u}(t_{g_{jk}})), \quad (13)$$

with $t_{g_{jk}}, t_{g_{jk+1}} \in T|g_j$, and $s = s_{q_j}(\mathbf{y}(t_{g_{jk}}), \mathbf{u}(t_{g_{jk}}))$ if $q_j \in g_j$ became active at $t_{g_{jk}}$. ■

Condition (12) is equivalent to the dissipation inequality (4), and must be verified for all time intervals that every discrete location in g_j is active. Furthermore, condition (13) generalises for dissipative systems the passivity conditions given in [3]. This is an extra condition which guarantees that the switching sequence only adds a bounded amount of energy into the system. Since sequences of values of the group storage functions are considered in discrete time, it is more appropriate to use the dissipation inequality for discrete-time systems (5). The time gap between consecutive entrances to any q_j in g_j includes the time when q_j is active and inactive. Thus, (13) considers the energy stored by the location while inactive, and is bounded by the supplied energy calculated at the most recent entrance to q_j .

Inspired by the results of [4] and [5], condition (12) can be relaxed as follows.

Definition 10: Let N_{q_j} and M_{q_j} be the number of entrances to and exits from q_j , respectively; and consider the set-up of Definition 9. A group of locations g_j of H is **weakly group dissipative** w.r.t. the supply functions $s_{q_j}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u})$ of all $q_j \in g_j$, if:

- (i) **Condition on discrete locations.** $\forall q_j \in g_j$, and $\forall t \in \tau$ for which $q(t) = q_j$, instead of (12):
- If $N_{q_j} = M_{q_j}$:

$$\sum_{\forall q_j \in g_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{q_j}} \left[V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t'_{q_{jk}})) - V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{q_{jk}})) - \int_{t_{q_{jk}}}^{t'_{q_{jk}}} s_{q_j}(\mathbf{y}(\tau), \mathbf{u}(\tau)) d\tau \right] \leq 0. \quad (14)$$

- If $N_{q_j} > M_{q_j}$, then the execution has entered q_j and remains there until terminal time t'_N , with $t'_N \geq t_{q_{jN_{q_j}}}$, $t_{q_{jN_{q_j}}} \in T|g_j$ is the last switch-on instant time of q_j , and:

$$\sum_{\forall q_j \in g_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{q_j}} \left[V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t'_{q_{jk}})) - V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{q_{jk}})) - \int_{t_{q_{jk}}}^{t'_{q_{jk}}} s_{q_j}(\mathbf{y}(\tau), \mathbf{u}(\tau)) d\tau \right] + \sum_{\forall q_j \in g_j} \mathcal{B}_{q_j} \leq 0, \quad (15)$$

with

$$\mathcal{B}_{q_j} = V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t'_N)) - V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{q_{jN_{q_j}}})) - \int_{t_{q_{jN_{q_j}}}^{t'_N} s_{q_j}(\mathbf{y}(\tau), \mathbf{u}(\tau)) d\tau.$$

- (ii) **Condition related to the entrances to any $q_j \in g_j$.** Condition (13) is satisfied. ■

With conditions (14) and (15), during the time intervals any q_j is active, the balance of stored and supplied energy for g_j is allowed to grow for all $q_j \in g_j$, and the dissipativity of each group is obtained as the total balance of stored and supplied energy when each $q_j \in g_j$ is active.

To expand group dissipativity to the whole hybrid automaton, we define total dissipativity.

Definition 11: Let $T|g_s = \{t_{g_{s1}}, t_{g_{s2}}, \dots, t_{g_{sk}}, \dots\}$ be the sequence of times when any location of group g_s becomes active. Under Assumption 1, the hybrid automaton H is **totally dissipative** w.r.t. a set of supply functions $\{s_{q_1}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}), \dots, s_{q_{N_q}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u})\}$, if there exists a set of group storage-like functions $\{V_{g_1}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, V_{g_{N_g}}(\mathbf{x})\}$ satisfying the conditions of a group candidate Lyapunov function, such that for all $\phi = (\tau, q, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{E}_{(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0))}$, and all $\phi_u = (\tau, \mathbf{u})$, $\phi_y = (\tau, \mathbf{y})$:

- (i) **Condition on groups of locations.** All g_j are group dissipative, with $1 \leq j \leq N_g$.
- (ii) **Cross-group coupling when changing from one group g_s to another g_j .** $\forall g_j$ and $\forall g_s \subset Q \setminus g_j$, if $\exists t_{g_{sk}}$, with $t_{g_{sk}} \in T|g_s$, such that:

- $\forall t_{g_{jk}} \in T|g_j$ for which any location of g_j becomes active coming from any location of group g_s , with $t_{g_{sk}}^* = \max_k \{t_{g_{sk}} \in T|g_s : t_{g_{sk}} \leq t_{g_{jk}}\}$ the last time when a location q_s within any group g_s was active before entering any location of g_j :

$$V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{g_{jk}})) - V_{g_s}(\mathbf{x}(t_{g_{sk}}^*)) \leq s_{q_s}(\mathbf{y}(t_{g_{sk}}^*), \mathbf{u}(t_{g_{sk}}^*)). \quad (16)$$

- Condition on resets. For every $q_j \in g_j$ and every $q_s \in g_s$ such that $(q_s, q_j) \in E$:

$$V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}^+) - V_{g_s}(\mathbf{x}(t'_{q_{sk}})) \leq s_{q_s}(\mathbf{y}(t'_{q_{sk}}), \mathbf{u}(t'_{q_{sk}})), \quad (17)$$

for all $t'_{q_{sk}} \in T|q_s$ such that $\mathbf{x}(t'_{q_{sk}}) \in G(q_s, q_j)$, $\mathbf{x}^+ = R(q_s, q_j, \mathbf{x}(t'_{q_{sk}}), \mathbf{u}(t'_{q_{sk}}))$, $\mathbf{y}(t'_{q_{sk}}) \in \mathcal{Y}_{q_s}$, $\mathbf{u}(t'_{q_{sk}}) \in \mathcal{U}_{q_s}$, with $t'_{q_{sk}}$ the time when q_s becomes inactive to change to any $q_j \in g_j$. ■

Note that conditions (16) and (17) are required to take into account the impact of the stored and supplied energy at one group in the past, on

the stored energy in the most recently active group of locations. These conditions are only checked when we change group.

Definition 12: The hybrid automaton H is **weakly totally dissipative** under all the assumptions considered in Definition 11 if one of the following conditions holds:

- (i) At least one group location is weakly group dissipative, and the others are group dissipative.
- (ii) All the group locations are group dissipative, and instead of (16) and/or (17) we have:
 - $\forall g_j, \forall g_s \neq g_j$, with $t_{gs_k}^*$ as in Definition 11, the following holds instead of (16):

$$\sum_{\forall t_{g_j k}^*: g_j \text{ becomes active after } g_s} [V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t_{g_j k}^*)) - V_{g_s}(\mathbf{x}(t_{g_s k}^*)) - s_{q_s}(\mathbf{y}(t_{g_s k}^*), \mathbf{u}(t_{g_s k}^*))] \leq 0; \quad (18)$$

- $\forall q_j \in g_j, \forall g_j, \forall g_s \neq g_j, \forall q_s \in g_s$ such that $(q_s, q_j) \in E$, the following holds instead of (17):

$$\sum_{(\forall q_s: (q_s, q_j) \in E)} \sum_{k=1}^{M_{q_s}^{q_j}} [V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}^+) - V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x}(t'_{q_s k})) - s_{q_s}(\mathbf{y}(t'_{q_s k}), \mathbf{u}(t'_{q_s k}))] \leq 0, \quad (19)$$

$\forall t'_{q_s k} \in T'_{q_s}^{q_j}$ such that $\mathbf{x}(t'_{q_s k}) \in G(q_s, q_j)$, $\mathbf{x}^+ = R(q_s, q_j, \mathbf{x}(t'_{q_s k}), \mathbf{u}(t'_{q_s k}))$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{q_s}$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{q_s}$, with $M_{q_s}^{q_j}$ the number of exits from q_s to q_j , and $t'_{q_s k}$ the time when q_s changes to $q_j \in g_j$. ■

Definition 13: A group of locations g_j of H is **group passive** if it is group dissipative w.r.t. the supply functions $s_{q_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{u}$, $\forall q_i \in g_j$. The hybrid automaton H is **totally passive** if it is totally dissipative with $s_{q_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{u}$, $\forall q_i \in Q$. ■

From the classical theory of dissipative systems [20], it is well known that dissipative systems exhibit some stability properties for some specific inputs, outputs and supply functions. Similarly, from our dissipativity definitions, we can conclude some of the stability properties given in Section V for particular classes of hybrid automata. For example, if a hybrid automaton H which is Init-constrained to some group g_j is totally dissipative with respect to supply functions $\{s_{q_1}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}), \dots, s_{q_N q}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u})\}$ which are zero for zero inputs (i.e., $\forall q_i, s_{q_i}(\mathbf{h}(q_i, \mathbf{x}, 0), 0) = 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{q_i}$) then for some $q_i \in g_j$, the equilibrium point of the zero-input dynamics $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = f_{q_i}(\mathbf{x}, 0)$ coincides with the group equilibrium point $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$, and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_j}$ is totally stable.

VII. DISSIPATIVITY PROPERTIES IN THE EXAMPLE

We will check if the 15-location hybrid automaton is totally passive w.r.t. $s_{q_i} = y_{q_i} u$, with $y_{q_i} = x_1 - x_3$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7\}$, and $y_{q_i} = x_1$ for all other locations. x_1 and x_3 are the angular velocities of the top-rotary system and the bit, respectively, and x_2 is the difference between the two angular displacements. For all the locations, $u = W_{ob} R_b [\mu_{cb} + (\mu_{sb} - \mu_{cb}) \exp(-\gamma_b/v_f)x_3]$, with $R_b > 0$ the bit radius, $\mu_{sb}, \mu_{cb} \in (0, 1)$ the static and Coulomb friction coefficients associated with the bit, $0 < \gamma_b < 1$ and $v_f > 0$. Note that there is only one group of locations, and we choose the following group storage-like function: $V_{g_1} = (1/2)[(x_1 - \bar{x}_{g_1,1})^2 + (x_2 - \bar{x}_{g_1,2})^2 + (x_3 - \bar{x}_{g_1,3})^2]$, with $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_1}$ as given at the end of Section IV. The parameters used are: $J_r = 2122 \text{ kg m}^2$, $J_b = 471.9698 \text{ kg m}^2$, $R_b = 0.155 \text{ m}$, $k_t = 861.5336 \text{ N m/rad}$, $c_t = 172.3067 \text{ N m s/rad}$,




Fig. 3. 15-location hybrid automaton is weakly totally passive for: $\lambda = 0.9$, $W_{ob} = 20 \text{ kN}$ and $x_{3r} = 12 \text{ rad/s}$.




Fig. 4. 15-location hybrid automaton is: 1) weakly totally passive with $\lambda = 0.9$, $W_{ob} = 20 \text{ kN}$ and $x_{3r} = 12 \text{ rad/s}$, in grey thick lines; 2) non-totally passive, but with trajectories converging to $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{g_1}$ with $\lambda = 0.9$, $W_{ob} = 65 \text{ kN}$ and $x_{3r} = 12 \text{ rad/s}$; 3) non-totally passive with stick-slip oscillations with $\lambda = 0.9$, $W_{ob} = 20 \text{ kN}$ and $x_{3r} = 1 \text{ rad/s}$.




Fig. 5. Stick-slip situation for the 15-location hybrid automaton: H is not totally passive for small x_{3r} 's.

$c_r = 425 \text{ N m s/rad}$, $c_b = 50 \text{ N m s/rad}$, $\mu_{cb} = 0.5$, $\mu_{sb} = 0.8$, $\delta = 10^{-6}$, $\gamma_b = 0.9$, $v_f = 1$. We will show how x_{3r} , λ and W_{ob} affect the passivity of H .

Fig. 3 shows the case where H is not totally passive but only weakly totally passive. In Fig. 4, we show the case in which the trajectories of H converge to the group equilibrium point in q_5 , although it is non-totally passive. For the non-passive locations, condition (12) does not hold; and for q_2 condition (14) of weak passivity also fails. Finally, for the stick-slip situation shown in Fig. 5, H is not totally passive because conditions (12) and (16) do not hold for q_5 .

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We propose a new classification of equilibria in hybrid automata and based on this, a partition of the continuous state space is given. Some stability properties of co-existing isolated equilibria for a type of hybrid automata are given, leading to what is called total stability. Finally, group and total dissipativity properties of hybrid automata are proposed. The example illustrates how the use of hybrid automata can be useful in the analysis of complex hybrid systems.

APPENDIX

Proof of Theorem 1: If the conditions for total stability for \bar{x}_{g_j} hold, the stability of \bar{x}_{g_j} , as given in Definition 6, is guaranteed. We divide the sketch of the proof into four cases.

Case 1: The executions only visit one location for which \bar{x}_{g_j} is a non-virtual equilibrium. From condition (7), the proof corresponds to the well-known proof of stability for smooth systems.

Case 2: The executions travel along locations (all or some locations) within g_j for which \bar{x}_{g_j} is a non-virtual equilibrium. With conditions (7) and (8), the proof follows the same arguments as Branicky's proof of Theorem 2.3 in [22] considering the common candidate Lyapunov function $V_{g_j}(\mathbf{x})$ for all the locations within g_j . In addition, (7) and (8) ensure that after a reset in every change of location, V_{g_j} is decreased/maintained – just as in [24]. Then, if \mathbf{x} starts in $B(\delta, \bar{x}_{g_j})$ just before the reset, then \mathbf{x}^+ starts in $B(\delta, \bar{x}_{g_j})$, and hence, \mathbf{x}^+ stays in $B(\epsilon, \bar{x}_{g_j})$ at the time of the reset, with $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$. In brief, V_{g_j} decreases or is maintained as time progresses.

Case 3: The executions switch between locations, within the same group, that do not contain \bar{x}_{g_j} and the locations for which \bar{x}_{g_j} is a non-virtual equilibrium. Since $(q(t_0), \mathbf{x}(t_0)) \in ((Q_i \times \Omega_{g_j}) \cap \text{Init})$, we will always start at Ω_{g_j} , a discrete location whose domain satisfies condition (7). Bearing in mind conditions of **Case 2** and conditions (iii).a and (iii).b of our Theorem 1, the proof follows the same arguments as given in Theorem 1 of [23] for the case of having a common Lyapunov function and switchings with resets.

Case 4: The executions travel along locations from different groups with different group equilibria. In addition to conditions of the three cases above, the cross-group-coupling conditions (10) and (11), one for each different group g_s visited, are considered. Notice that in this case, condition (9) is applied to any location in any group of H for which \bar{x}_{g_j} is not a non-virtual equilibrium. Following similar arguments as those given in the proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 of [14], we can prove that \mathbf{x} does not move away from the union of the closed level sets for all the group candidate Lyapunov functions of H . In addition, from conditions of Theorem 1, it is ensured that $\exists t^* > 0$, such that $\forall t \geq t^*$, $\mathbf{x}(t)$ remains close to \bar{x}_g , if $\mathbf{x}(t)$ starts close to \bar{x}_g .

Proof of Theorem 2: It follows similar steps to the proof of Theorem 1.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Akbarpour and L. Paulson, "Applications of MetiTarski in the verification of control and hybrid systems," in *Proc. HSCC*, 2009.
- [2] A. Pogromsky, M. Jirstrand, and P. Spøangéus, "On stability and passivity of a class of hybrid systems," in *Proc. 37th IEEE CDC*, 1998, pp. 3705–10.
- [3] M. Žefran, F. Bullo, and M. Stein, "A notion of passivity for hybrid systems," in *Proc. 40th IEEE CDC*, 2001, pp. 768–773.
- [4] J. Zhao and D. Hill, "Passivity and stability of switched systems: A multiple storage function method," *Syst. Cont. Lett.*, vol. 57, pp. 158–164, 2008.
- [5] J. Zhao and D. Hill, "Dissipativity theory for switched systems," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 941–953, 2008.
- [6] M. J. McCourt and P. Antsaklis, "Control design for switched systems using passivity indices," in *Proc. ACC*, 2010, pp. 2499–2504.
- [7] W. M. Haddad and Q. Hui, "Dissipativity theory for discontinuous dynamical systems: Basic input, state, and output properties, and finite-time stability of feedback interconnections," *Nonl. Anal.: Hybrid Syst.*, vol. 3, pp. 551–564, 2009.
- [8] W. Chen and M. Saif, "Passivity and passivity-based controller design of a class of switched control systems," in *Proc. 16th IFAC World Congr.*, 2005.
- [9] A. Bemporad, G. Bianchini, and F. Brogi, "Passivity analysis and passification of discrete-time hybrid systems," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 1004–1009, 2008.
- [10] A. Teel, "Asymptotic stability for hybrid systems via decomposition, dissipativity, and detectability," in *Proc. 49th IEEE CDC*, 2010, pp. 7419–7424.
- [11] R. Goebel and A. Teel, "Solutions to hybrid inclusions via set and graphical convergence with stability theory applications," *Autom.*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 573–587, 2006.
- [12] W. Haddad, Q. Hui, V. Chellaboina, and S. G. Nersesov, "Hybrid decentralized maximum entropy control for large-scale dynamical systems," *Nonlinear Anal.: Hybrid Syst.*, vol. 1, pp. 244–263, 2007.
- [13] M. Spong, J. Holm, and L. Dongjun, "Passivity-based control of bipedal locomotion," *IEEE Robot. Aut. Mag.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 30–40, 2007.
- [14] T. Alpcan and T. Basar, "A stability result for switched systems with multiple equilibria," *Dyn. Cont., Discr. and Imp. Syst. Ser. A: Math. Anal.*, vol. 17, pp. 949–958, 2010.
- [15] A. Lamperski and A. Ames, "Lyapunov theory for Zeno stability," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 100–112, 2012.
- [16] S. Mastellone, D. Stipanović, and M. Spong, "Stability and convergence for systems with switching equilibria," in *Proc. 46th IEEE CDC*, 2007, pp. 4013–4020.
- [17] E. Navarro-López and R. Carter, "Hybrid automata: An insight into the discrete abstraction of discontinuous systems," *Int. J. Syst. Sci.*, vol. 42, no. 11, pp. 1883–98, 2011.
- [18] K. Johansson, M. Egerstedt, J. Lygeros, and S. Sastry, "On the regularization of Zeno hybrid automata," *Syst. Contr. Lett.*, vol. 38, pp. 141–150, 1999.
- [19] J. C. Willems, "Dissipative dynamical systems Part I: General theory," *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 321–351, 1972.
- [20] E. Navarro-López, "Dissipativity and Passivity-related Prop. in Non-linear Discrete-time Systems," Ph.D. dissertation, UPC, 2002.
- [21] J. Lygeros, K. Johansson, S. Simic, J. Zhang, and S. Sastry, "Dynamical properties of hybrid automata," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 2–17, 2003.
- [22] M. Branicky, "Multiple Lyapunov functions and other analysis tools for switched and hybrid systems," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 475–482, 1998.
- [23] J. Lu and J. Brown, "A multiple Lyapunov functions approach for stability of switched systems," in *Proc. ACC*, 2010, pp. 3253–3256.
- [24] T. Pavlidis, "Stability of systems described by differential equations containing impulses," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. AC-12, no. 1, pp. 43–45, 1967.