

Theory and Design of Extended PID Control for Stochastic Systems with Structural Uncertainties

Baoyou Qu¹ and Cheng Zhao^{2*}†

¹Research Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences,
Shandong University, Qingdao, 266237, China.

²State Key Laboratory of Mathematical Sciences, Academy of
Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
Beijing, 100190, China.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): zhaocheng@amss.ac.cn;

Contributing authors: qubaoyou@sdu.edu.cn;

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Since the classical proportional-integral-derivative (PID) controller has continued to be the most widely used feedback methods in engineering systems by far, it is crucial to investigate the working mechanism of PID in dealing with nonlinearity, uncertainty and random noises. Recently, Zhao and Guo (2022) [27] has established the global stability of PID control for a class of uncertain nonlinear control systems with relative degree two without random perturbations. In this paper, we will consider a more general class of nonlinear stochastic systems with an arbitrary relative degree n , and discuss the stability and design of extended PID controller (a natural extension of PID). We demonstrate that, the closed-loop control systems will be globally stable in mean square with bounded tracking errors provided the extended PID parameters are selected from an $(n + 1)$ -dimensional unbounded set, even if both the system nonlinear drift and diffusion terms contain a wide range of structural uncertainties. Moreover, the steady-state tracking error is proved to be proportional to the noise intensity at the setpoint, which can also be made arbitrarily small by choosing the controller parameters suitably large.

Keywords: nonlinear stochastic systems, PID control, analytic design, uncertain structure, global stability, random perturbations

1 Introduction

As the most widespread control method in the industrial automation domain, the PID controller is favored by various control practitioners because of its simple feedback structure, strong robustness and ease of implementation. In fact, PID controller is often viewed as a simplistic computational control algorithm, and is considered to be “bread and butter” of control engineering [1]. A recent survey also shows that the PID controller has much higher impact rating than most advanced control technologies, and will demonstrate its sustained vitality [18]. Ever since the emergence of PID controller in the early 20th century, tremendous efforts have been made in both academia and industry to improve the performance of PID loops, and many interesting tuning methods have emerged (see, e.g., [5, 14, 30]), of which the Ziegler-Nichols rules are perhaps the most eminent. However, the de facto situation is that poorly tuned PID controlled loops are quite common in practice (see, e.g., [3, 7, 16, 22]), and almost all the existing tuning methods are case dependent and heavily rely on experience or experiment or both. As mentioned in [19], tuning the PID algorithm for accurate and stable closed-loop control becomes a NP-Hard Problem. Moreover, there is no doubt that almost all of the practical control systems are subjected to nonlinearity, uncertainties and various disturbances, while the existing theoretical investigation on PID are mainly focused on linear systems [2, 4, 21], or affine nonlinear systems without random disturbances (see, e.g., [8, 10, 11, 17, 20, 23, 25, 26]).

In recent years, some rigorous mathematical investigations on the theory and design of PID have been made for uncertain nonlinear systems (see e.g., [6, 11, 24–27, 29]). For instance, in [25], Zhao and Guo have shown that for a class of affine nonlinear uncertain systems with relative degree two, the three PID parameters can be designed to stabilize and regulate the control systems globally, provided that the nonlinear functions satisfy a Lipschitz condition. Moreover, necessary and sufficient conditions for the selection of PID parameters have also been provided in [25]. To the best of our knowledge, the global stability of a class of PID controlled nonaffine nonlinear systems without random disturbances was established for the first time in [27]. Then, the authors further extended the deterministic results to stochastic cases in [24]. However, it is worth mentioning that only nonlinear systems with relative degree two are considered in the work of [23–25, 27, 29]. In addition, in the existing study of PID controlled stochastic systems, the diffusion term is usually assumed to vanish at the setpoint (see [6, 24]), which may be unrealistic for many practical systems.

It is natural to ask whether this ubiquitous controller can deal with more general nonlinear uncertain control systems. In view of this, we will discuss the global stabilization problem for a class of nonaffine stochastic systems with a general relative degree n , and extend the corresponding deterministic results in [27] and stochastic case in [24] by a refined method. In contrast to most of the existing study of PID controlled stochastic systems, this article does not require the diffusion term to vanish at the setpoint, which has weakened the assumption used in the literature and seems to be more reasonable for practical situations. On the other hand, for nonlinear stochastic control systems, particularly when the relative order n is large, the extended PID parameters possess multiple degrees of freedom. Consequently, providing a simple analytical design formula for these parameters is typically a very challenging task. To the

best of our knowledge, existing design methods typically rely on high-gain qualitative approaches, necessitating sufficiently large parameter values [12, 26].

In this article, by employing a simple (but powerful) algebraic criteria of polynomial stability, we will establish the global stability of the closed-loop control systems and provide analytic design methods for the extended PID parameters. It is worth to mention that the design rules given in this article are quite simple and are not necessarily to be of high gain, which improves the existing qualitative design methods in the literature. Additionally, both the design and analysis of MIMO nonlinear stochastic systems, as studied in this article, pose greater challenges compared to previous studies due to the system's structural uncertainties and the strong coupling between input and output. Indeed, the proofs of the main theorems reveal that constructing Lyapunov functions is far from straightforward, owing to the intricate structure of the corresponding positive definite matrices. Our results also demonstrate that the selection of extended PID parameters has wide flexibility and does not necessarily require high gain, which improves the existing qualitative methods for parameter design in the literature, see e.g., [9, 12]. Moreover, we will show that the steady-state tracking error can be made arbitrarily small by choosing the controller parameters suitably large.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The problem formulation and main assumptions are provided in Section 2. The global stability together with parameter design of the extended PID controlled stochastic systems are discussed in Section 3. The tracking performances of the closed-loop control system are analyzed in Section 4. Section 5 will provide proofs of the main results. Simulations are provided in Section 6, and some concluding remarks will be given at the end of this paper.

2 Mathematical Formulation

2.1 Notations

Denote $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ as the space of $m \times n$ real matrices, $|x|$ as the Euclidean norm of a vector x , and a^\top as the transpose of a vector or a matrix a . The operator norm and the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of a matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ are defined by $\|P\| = \sup_{|x| \leq 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^n} |Px|$ and $\|P\|_{\text{HS}} = [\text{tr}(PP^\top)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ respectively, where $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ represents the trace of a matrix. For two symmetric matrices S_1 and S_2 in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the notation $S_1 > S_2$ or $S_2 < S_1$ implies that $S_1 - S_2$ is a positive definite matrix; $S_1 \geq S_2$ or $S_2 \leq S_1$ implies that $S_1 - S_2$ is a positive semi-definite matrix. For a function $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_k}, \mathbb{R}^m)$, let $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ denote the $m \times n_i$ Jacobian matrix of f with respect to x_i at the point (x_1, \dots, x_k) . For a random variable X , let $\mathbf{E}(X)$ denote its expectation.

2.2 The Control System

In this paper, we are concerned with the following nonaffine stochastic system with relative degree n ($n \geq 1$):

$$\begin{cases} dx_1(t) &= x_2(t)dt, \\ &\vdots \\ dx_{n-1}(t) &= x_n(t)dt, \\ dx_n(t) &= f(x(t); u(t))dt + g(x(t))dB_t, \\ y(t) &= x_1(t), \quad x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where the state variables $x(t) = (x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ are available for control design, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the control input, $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the system output, $f(x; u) : \mathbb{R}^{nd} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $g : \mathbb{R}^{nd} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ are continuous nonlinear functions and $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is an m -dimensional standard Brownian motion.

Our control objective is to *globally stabilize* the system (1) in the sense that $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}[|x(t)|^2 + |u(t)|^2] < \infty$ and, at the same time, to make the output $y(t)$ track a desired setpoint $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$, under the condition that the nonlinear functions $f(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$ contain uncertainty.

This paper is motivated by our recent theoretical investigation on the classical PID control for system (1) with relative degree two, see [24, 27]. In fact, for the case $n = 2$, it was shown in [24] that the classical PID control

$$u(t) = K_P e(t) + K_I \int_0^t e(s)ds + K_D \dot{e}(t), \quad e(t) = y^* - y(t)$$

can globally stabilize system (1) in mean square, provided that the partial derivatives of the system nonlinear functions are bounded and the diffusion term g vanishes at the setpoint. For dynamical systems with a general relative degree n , we will in this paper consider the extended PID controller, which is the natural extension of PID and is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= k_1 e(t) + k_0 \int_0^t e(s)ds + k_2 \dot{e}(t) + \dots + k_n e^{(n-1)}(t) \\ e(t) &= y^* - y(t) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $e(t)$ is the regulation error, $\dot{e}(t), \dots, e^{(n-1)}(t)$ are the derivatives of $e(t)$ up to $(n-1)^{\text{th}}$ order, and k_0, \dots, k_n are called the extended PID parameters to be designed.

It should be noted that if the relative degree of system (1) is two (or one), the extended PID control (2) reduces to the well-known PID (or PI) controller.

2.3 Assumptions

Now, we introduce two basic assumptions for the system nonlinear functions f and g .

Assumption 1 The drift term $f(x; u)$ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to x , uniformly in u , i.e.,

$$|f(x; u) - f(y; u)| \leq L|x - y|, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3)$$

Besides, the diffusion term $g(x)$ satisfies

$$\|g(x) - g(y)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq M|x - y|, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}, \quad (4)$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HS}}$ is defined by $\|P\|_{\text{HS}} = [\text{tr}(PP^\top)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Condition (3) on function $f(x; u)$ is a standard assumption for establishing global results, which is also used extensively in ordinary differential equation to ensure the global existence and uniqueness of solutions. We next give some explanations to condition (4). In most existing studies on PID control for nonlinear stochastic systems, the Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is usually assumed to be one dimensional, and the diffusion term g is a C^1 function with bounded partial derivatives [24, 29]. In this paper, we consider the more general case where the Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ can be high dimensional, and the diffusion term g is no longer assumed to be a C^1 function. Besides, the boundedness of the partial derivatives of g is replaced by the weaker condition (4). It is also worth noting that the diffusion function g is not required to be zero at the point $z^* := (y^*, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, which is a more reasonable condition and can be satisfied by more scenarios.

In order for the control input to have the ability to influence the state of the control system, the control gain matrix $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}$ should not vanish. This inspires us to introduce the following assumption:

Assumption 2 The $d \times d$ Jacobian matrix $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}$ has the following lower bound:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} + \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \right)^\top \right] (x; u) \geq I_d, \quad (x; u) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (5)$$

where I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix.

By Assumption 2 and [27, Proposition 4.1], one can see that for any given $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a unique $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$f(y^*, 0, \dots, 0; u^*) = 0. \quad (6)$$

Remark 1 We remark that if the control system (1) is affine nonlinear and free from random disturbances, the extended PID controller (2) has the ability to stabilize the system globally (or semi-globally), provided that the system nonlinear functions satisfy certain growth conditions, see e.g., [11, 27].

3 Global Mean Square Stability

In this section, we will demonstrate that for the nonaffine stochastic system (1), the extended PID control (2) can still be designed to globally stabilize the system. Before presenting the main results, we first introduce two definitions.

Definition 1 We say the stochastic system (1) controlled by the extended PID (2) is globally stable in the sense of mean square, if for all initial state $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, the solution of the closed-loop system satisfies

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}[|x(t)|^2 + |u(t)|^2] < \infty.$$

Definition 2 For given nonnegative constants L and M , we say that the $(n+1)$ -parameters k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n are admissible for the two-tuples (L, M) if they are all positive, and there exists a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$, such that

$$P[0, \dots, 0, 1]^\top = [k_0, \dots, k_{n-1}, k_n]^\top, \quad (7)$$

$$PA + A^\top P + 2\bar{k}I_{n+1} < 0, \quad (8)$$

where $\bar{k} := \sum_{i=0}^n k_i L + k_n M^2$ and

$$A := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ -k_0 & -k_1 & -k_2 & \cdots & -k_n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

For notational simplicity, let us denote

$$z^* := (y^*, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}, \quad (10)$$

where $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the setpoint, then we have the following theorem.

Proposition 1 Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and the $(n+1)$ -parameters k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n are admissible for the two-tuples (L, M) . Then, the closed-loop system (1)-(2) will be globally stable. Moreover, there exist some positive constants C_1, C_2 and λ depending on (k_0, \dots, k_n, L, M) only, such that for all $t \geq 0$, $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$,

$$\mathbf{E}[|x(t) - z^*|^2] \leq C_1 [|x(0) - z^*|^2 + |u^*|^2] e^{-\lambda t} + C_2 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2, \quad (11)$$

where z^* and u^* are defined in (10) and (6) respectively.

The proof of Proposition 1 is given in Section 5, which employs the Lyapunov method for stochastic dynamical systems. It indicates that the extended PID control (2) can stabilize the nonlinear stochastic system (1) globally, provided that the extended PID parameters are admissible for the two-tuples (L, M) . Therefore, it is crucial to find out a set of admissible control parameters in practical applications. To this end, we next give a general criterion to determine when k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n are admissible.

Proposition 2 Let L and M be two given nonnegative constants. Then, the $(n+1)$ -parameters k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n are admissible for the two-tuples (L, M) , if all of them are positive and the following inequality hold:

$$\min \left\{ k_0^2, k_{i-1}^2 - 2k_{i-2}k_i, 2 \leq i \leq n, k_n^2 - k_{n-1} \right\} > \bar{k}, \quad (12)$$

where $\bar{k} := \sum_{i=0}^n k_i L + k_n M^2$.

Remark 2 First, we remark that for any positive constants L and M , inequality (12) always has solutions. Indeed, let us choose $(n+1)$ -parameters as follows:

$$k_0 = k, \quad k_i = 3^{-i} k_{i-1} = 3^{-\frac{i(i+1)}{2}} k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Since $3^{-n^2} k \leq k_i \leq 3^{-i} k$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$, it is easy to see that

$$\bar{k} = \sum_{i=0}^n k_i L + k M^2 \leq (2L + M^2) k.$$

On the other hand, we know that the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} k_0^2 &= k^2, \quad k_n^2 - k_{n-1} \geq 3^{-2n^2} k^2 - k, \\ k_i^2 - 2k_{i-1}k_{i+1} &= k_{i-1}k_i(3^{-i} - 2 \times 3^{-(i+1)}) \geq 3^{-3n^2} k^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (12) will be satisfied for all large k . Next, we point out that Proposition 2 provides a universal and concise design formula for the $n+1$ -controller parameters, regardless of the relative degree n of the system. This means that the selection of extended PID parameters has wide flexibility, since they can be arbitrarily chosen from an $(n+1)$ -dimensional unbounded parameter set defined by (12). To the best of our knowledge, this appears to be the first such result in the literature, improving the existing related qualitative design methods.

Now, we are in position to present the main result in this paper, which follows immediately from Propositions 1-2.

Theorem 1 Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and k_0, \dots, k_n are all positive and satisfy (12). Then, the closed-loop system (1)-(2) will be globally stable and satisfy

$$\mathbf{E} [|x(t) - z^*|^2] \leq C_1 [|x(0) - z^*|^2 + |u^*|^2] e^{-\lambda t} + C_2 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd},$$

for some C_1, C_2 and λ depending on (k_0, \dots, k_n, L, M) only.

Remark 3 By Theorem 1, one can see that under some reasonable assumptions of f and g , the extended PID control (2) can indeed globally stabilize the nonaffine stochastic uncertain system (1). Moreover, if the diffusion term g vanishes at the point z^* , i.e., $g(z^*) = 0$, then we know that $\mathbf{E}[|x(t) - z^*|^2]$ will converge to zero exponentially fast.

Remark 4 It is not difficult to see that condition (5) on $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}$ can be weakened. To be precise, if (5) is replaced by

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} + \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \right)^\top \right] (x; u) \geq \underline{b} I_d, \quad (x; u) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (13)$$

where $\underline{b} > 0$ is a constant, then the global stability of the closed-loop system (1)-(2) can still be guaranteed as long as the extended PID parameters are all positive and satisfy

$$\min \left\{ k_0^2 \underline{b}, (k_{i-1}^2 - 2k_{i-2}k_i) \underline{b}, 2 \leq i \leq n, k_n^2 \underline{b} - k_{n-1} \right\} > \bar{k},$$

where $\bar{k} := \sum_{i=0}^n k_i L + k_n M^2$.

Remark 5 Theorem 1 is also true for time-varying reference signals, provided that both the reference signal $y^*(t)$ and its time derivatives up to order $n - 1$ are bounded functions over $[0, \infty)$. Besides, it can be shown that the steady-state tracking error has an upper bound proportional to the sum of the *varying rate of the reference signal* and the *noise intensity at the setpoint*, and can be made arbitrarily small in at least two cases: i) the reference signal is slowly time-varying; ii) the PID controller gains are chosen sufficiently large, see [28] for related discussions of a class of stochastic systems with relative degree two.

In the final part of this section, we remark that if one only concerns about the stability of the closed-loop system, then the integral term $k_0 \int_0^t e(s)ds$ is *not necessary* in general. To be specific, the following extended PD control

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= k_1 e(t) + k_2 \dot{e}(t) + \cdots + k_n e^{(n-1)}(t), \\ e(t) &= y^* - y(t) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

can also stabilize the stochastic system (1) globally.

Theorem 2 Consider the stochastic system (1) controlled by extended PD control (14). Suppose there exists a positive definite matrix $P_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, such that

$$P_0[0, \cdots, 0, 1]^\top = [k_1, \cdots, k_n]^\top, \quad (15)$$

$$P_0 A_0 + A_0^\top P_0 + 2\hat{k}I_n < 0, \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are defined by

$$\hat{k} := \sum_{i=1}^n k_i L + k_n M^2, \quad A_0 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ -k_1 & -k_2 & \cdots & -k_n \end{bmatrix},$$

then the closed-loop system will be globally stable and satisfy

$$\mathbf{E} [|x(t) - z^*|^2] \leq C_1 [|x(0) - z^*|^2] e^{-\lambda t} + C_2 [|f(z^*; 0)|^2 + \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2], \quad \forall t \geq 0, x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd},$$

for some C_1, C_2 and λ depending on (k_1, \cdots, k_n, L, M) only.

Remark 6 Firstly, it can be seen from Theorem 2 that the ultimate bound of $\mathbf{E}[|x(t) - z^*|^2]$ depends not only on the value of $g(z^*)$, but also on the value of $f(z^*; 0)$. However, such ultimate bound will not depend on $f(z^*; 0)$, if the extended PID control (2) is applied (see Theorem 1). This indicates that the integral term has the effect of eliminating the steady state offsets. Secondly, similar to Proposition 2, it can be shown that if the n -parameters k_1, \cdots, k_n are positive and satisfy:

$$\min \left\{ k_1^2, k_i^2 - 2k_{i-1}k_{i+1}, 2 \leq i \leq n-1, k_n^2 - k_{n-1} \right\} > \hat{k},$$

where $\hat{k} = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i L + k_n M^2$, then (15) – (16) can be satisfied for some positive definite matrix P_0 .

4 Parameter Design and Performance Analysis

In Section 3, the global stability of the extended PID controlled stochastic system (1)-(2) is addressed. However, some issues regarding the parameter design and tracking performance remain unclear for the case $n \geq 3$. Firstly, note that inequality (12) is a quadratic inequality involving $(n+1)$ -variables k_0, \dots, k_n , therefore it is not easy to find a set of solutions of (12) when the relative degree n is large. Secondly, it is necessary and meaningful to obtain a more accurate upper bound on tracking error than (11), because it may provide reliable design guidance for control practitioners. Thirdly, it is unclear whether the extended PID parameters can be selected to make the steady-state tracking error (i.e., the upper limit of the tracking error) arbitrarily small.

In this section, we will further address these fundamental problems. To this end, we first provide a design formula for the extended PID parameters. For any given $\lambda > 0$, let k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n be given by

$$k_0 = k, \quad k_i = \left(\prod_{j=1}^i \beta_j \right) k, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (17)$$

where β_1, \dots, β_n and k satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \beta_1 &< [n(\lambda + 8M^2)]^{-1} \wedge 1 \\ 0 < \beta_i &< \beta_{i-1}/n, \quad 2 \leq i \leq n \\ k &> \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \beta_j \right)^{-2} (1 + 3L + 2L^2/(\lambda + 8M^2)). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Remark 7 Under (17)-(18), it can be proved that k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n will satisfy (12). In fact, if we denote

$$\hat{\beta}_0 := 1, \quad \hat{\beta}_i := \prod_{j=1}^i \beta_j, \quad 0 \leq i \leq n,$$

then it is not difficult to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{k} &= \sum_{i=0}^n \hat{\beta}_i k L + \hat{\beta}_n k M^2 \leq (3L + \hat{\beta}_n M^2) k, \\ k_i^2 - 2k_{i-1}k_{i+1} &= \hat{\beta}_{i-1}\hat{\beta}_i(\beta_i - 2\beta_{i+1})k^2 \\ &> (n-2)\hat{\beta}_i^2 k^2 / n \\ &> \hat{\beta}_n^2 k^2, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ k_n^2 - k_{n-1} &= \hat{\beta}_n^2 k^2 - \hat{\beta}_{n-1}k. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (12) holds if

$$k > (\hat{\beta}_{n-1} + 3L + \hat{\beta}_n M^2) / \hat{\beta}_n^2. \quad (19)$$

Fortunately, (19) holds since

$$\hat{\beta}_{n-1} + \hat{\beta}_n M^2 \leq \beta_2 + \beta_1 M^2 < 2/n < 1.$$

Under Assumptions 1 and 2, we present the main result in this section.

Theorem 3 Suppose that (k_0, \dots, k_n) are given by formulas (17)-(18), then the closed-loop system (1)-(2) will be globally stable and achieve the following tracking performance: for all $t \geq 0$, $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$,

$$\mathbf{E}[|x(t) - z^*|^2] \leq \frac{4n^3 k_0^2}{k_n^2} \left[|x(0) - z^*|^2 + |u^*|^2 \right] e^{-\lambda t} + \frac{4n}{\lambda} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2. \quad (20)$$

Moreover, if $\left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \right\| \leq R$ for some $R > 0$, then for all $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, we have

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[|x(t) - z^*|^2] \geq C_3 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2, \quad (21)$$

where C_3 can be chosen as

$$C_3 := \lambda \left[4(2 + 2L + M^2)\lambda + 64(n+1)R^2 \sum_{i=0}^n k_i^2 \right]^{-1}.$$

Remark 8 Firstly, we point out that the proof of Theorem 3 hinges on the invertible coordinate transformation given in (54), which makes the transformed system (under the new coordinates (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)) a weakly dissipative system. Secondly, it is worth noting that both the upper bound and lower bound of the tracking error are established in Theorem 3, from which one can see that the tracking error can be made arbitrarily small by choosing the parameter λ suitably large. Moreover, one can see that:

- (i) If $g(\cdot)$ vanishes at $z^* = (y^*, 0, \dots, 0)$, then $\mathbf{E}[|x(t) - z^*|^2]$ will converge to zero exponentially;
- (ii) If $g(z^*) \neq 0$, $\mathbf{E}[|x(t) - z^*|^2]$ will not converge to zero.

Remark 9 Denote

$$\eta(t) := \mathbf{E}[|x(t) - z^*|^2] = \mathbf{E}[|e(t)|^2 + |\dot{e}(t)|^2 + \dots + |e^{(n-1)}(t)|^2],$$

then $\eta(t)$ can be regarded as a quantity which reflects the tracking performance. Combine (20) with (21), one can see

$$C_3 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \eta(t) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \eta(t) \leq C_2 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2,$$

where C_2 and C_3 are positive constants independent of the initial state and the setpoint y^* . Therefore, the norm of $g(z^*)$, which reflects the intensity of the random disturbances at z^* , plays a crucial role in the tracking performance.

Remark 10 It is worth mentioning that by replacing Assumption 2 with (13), where $\underline{b} > 0$ is a constant, the closed-loop system (1)-(2) can still achieve global stability and the tracking performance (20) as long as the last inequality in (18) is replaced by

$$k > \frac{1}{\underline{b}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \beta_j \right)^{-2} (1 + 3L + 2L^2/(\lambda + 8M^2)). \quad (22)$$

To establish the lower bound (21), it is worth noting that boundedness of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}$ in Theorem 3 can be weakened to the polynomial growth case.

Proposition 3 Suppose Assumptions 1-2 hold and the control gain matrix $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}$ satisfies the following growth condition:

$$\left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(x; u) \right\| \leq R(1 + |x|^\gamma + |u|^\gamma), \quad (x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (23)$$

where R and γ are positive constants. If $\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}} \neq 0$ and (k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n) are given by formulas (17)-(18) with $\lambda > 16\gamma M^2$, there exists a constant C_4 depending only on $(k_0, \dots, k_n, L, M, R, \gamma, n)$ such that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[|x(t) - z^*|^2] > \frac{C_4 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2}{1 + |y^*|^{2\gamma} + |u^*|^{2\gamma} + \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2\gamma}}.$$

5 Proof of The Main Results

Proof of Proposition 1. First we denote

$$\begin{aligned} y_0(t) &= \int_0^t (x_1(s) - y^*) ds + u^*/k_0, \\ y_1(t) &= x_1(t) - y^*, \quad y_i(t) = x_i(t), \quad 2 \leq i \leq n, \\ y(t) &= (y_1^\top(t), \dots, y_n^\top(t))^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where u^* is defined in (6). Then system (1)-(2) can be rewritten as (we omit the time variable t for simplicity):

$$\begin{cases} dy_i = y_{i+1} dt, & 0 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ dy_n = f(y + z^*; u) dt + g(y + z^*) dB_t, \\ u = -\sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i + u^*. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Note that

$$f(y + z^*; u) - f(y + z^*; u^*) = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} f(y + z^*; u^* + t(u - u^*)) dt,$$

it can be deduced that

$$f(y + z^*; u) = f(y + z^*; u^*) + \theta(y; u)(u - u^*), \quad (26)$$

where $\theta(y; u)$ is a $d \times d$ matrix defined by

$$\theta(y; u) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(y + z^*; \bar{u}) dt, \quad \bar{u} = u^* + t(u - u^*). \quad (27)$$

By Assumption 2, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\theta(y; u) + \theta^\top(y; u) \right) \geq I_d, \quad y, u \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (28)$$

Note that $u(t) = -\sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i(t) + u^*$, it follows that

$$f(y(t) + z^*; u(t)) = f(y(t) + z^*; u^*) - \theta(y(t); u(t)) \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i(t).$$

Now, suppose that k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n are admissible for the two-tuples (L, M) . By Definition 2, there is a positive definite matrix $P = (p_{ij})_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$, such that (7)-(8) are satisfied. Consider the following Lyapunov function:

$$V(Y) = \frac{1}{2} Y^\top \bar{P} Y = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^n p_{ij} y_i^\top y_j, \quad \bar{P} = P \otimes I_d,$$

where $Y = [y_0^\top, \dots, y_n^\top]^\top$, and \otimes denotes the Kronecker product. Set

$$b(Y) = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \\ f(y + z^*; u) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma(Y) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ g(y + z^*) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{0}_{d \times m}$ denotes the $d \times m$ zero matrix, then the differential operator \mathcal{L} acting on V is given by (see Definition 3 in Appendix)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V(Y) &= \frac{\partial V}{\partial Y} b(Y) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \sigma^\top(Y) \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial Y^2} \sigma(Y) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_i} y_{i+1} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} f(y + z^*; u) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \sigma^\top(Y) \bar{P} \sigma(Y) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

From (7), we know $p_{in} = k_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, n$, and thus $\frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} = \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i^\top$. Recall $u = -\sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i + u^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} f(y + z^*; u) &= \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} f\left(y + z^*; -\sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i + u^*\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i^\top \left[f(y + z^*; u^*) - \theta(y; u) \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i^\top f(y + z^*; u^*) - \left(\sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i^\top \right) \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n k_i L |Y|^2 - \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where the first inequality follows from the equality

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i^\top \right) \theta(y; u) \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i^\top \right) \theta^\top(y; u) \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i^\top \right) (\theta + \theta^\top)(y; u) \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i \end{aligned}$$

and property (28), and the second inequality follows from Lipschitz property of f (see Assumption 1) and the fact $f(z^*; u^*) = 0$.

Besides, the upper bound of $g(y + z^*)$ can be estimated as follows:

$$\|g(y + z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq \|g(y + z^*) - g(z^*) + g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq 2M^2 |y|^2 + 2\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2,$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \sigma(Y)^\top \bar{P} \sigma(Y) \right\} &= \frac{1}{2} k_n \text{tr} \left[g^\top(y + z^*) \right] = \frac{1}{2} k_n \|g(y + z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\ &\leq k_n M^2 |y|^2 + k_n \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

From (29)-(31) and recall $\bar{k} = \sum_{i=0}^n k_i L + k_n M^2$, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{L}V \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_i} y_{i+1} - \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i + \bar{k} |Y|^2 + k_n \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} Y^\top \left[(PA + A^\top P) \otimes I_d \right] Y + \bar{k} |Y|^2 + k_n \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2.$$

From (8) and the positive definiteness of P , it can be seen that

$$\mathcal{L}V(Y) \leq -\eta V(Y) + k_n \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2$$

for some $\eta > 0$. Hence, it follows from Lemma 1 that

$$\mathbf{E}V(Y(t)) \leq V(Y(0))e^{-\eta t} + k_n \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 / \eta, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

Hence, $\mathbf{E}V(Y(t))$ is a bounded function of $t \in [0, \infty)$. Note that

$$|x(t) - z^*| \leq |Y(t)|, \quad u(t) = -\sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i(t) + u^*, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\min}(P)|Y|^2 \leq V(Y) \leq \lambda_{\max}(P)|Y|^2,$$

we know that the closed-loop system is globally stable in the sense that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}[|x(t)|^2 + |u(t)|^2] < \infty.$$

In addition, by applying the fact $|Y(0)|^2 = |x(0) - z^*|^2 + |u^*|^2/k_0^2$, we conclude that (11) holds for some positive constants C_1, C_2 and λ depending on (k_0, \dots, k_n, L, M) only. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. First, we point out that the construction of the matrix P plays a key role in the proof. In fact, the matrix P is constructed so that (7) is satisfied and $PA + A^\top P$ is a *diagonal matrix*. This requirement will uniquely determine the elements in the matrix P .

Now, we prove Proposition 2 by considering four cases, $n = 1, n = 2, n = 3$ and $n > 3$. It should be noted that the first two situations $n \leq 2$ have been considered in [27], and we directly borrow the construction of matrix the construction of the matrix P .

Case 1: When $n = 1$, the extended PID control (2) reduces to the following PI control:

$$u(t) = k_1 e(t) + k_0 \int_0^t e(s) ds, \quad e(t) = y^* - y(t).$$

Besides, matrix A defined in (9) has the form

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -k_0 & -k_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Definition 2, it suffices to construct a 2×2 matrix $P > 0$ such that

$$P[0, 1]^\top = [k_0, k_1]^\top, \quad PA + A^\top P + 2\bar{k}I_2 < 0$$

where I_2 is the 2×2 unit matrix.

To this end, let us choose

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 2k_0 k_1 & k_0 \\ k_0 & k_1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{32}$$

then it is easy to see that

$$PA + A^\top P = \begin{bmatrix} -2k_0^2 & 0 \\ 0 & -2k_1^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By condition (12), we know that $\min\{k_0^2, k_1^2 - k_0\} > \bar{k} > 0$. The positive definiteness of the matrix P defined by (32) can be easily verified, since k_0, k_1 are positive and $k_1^2 - k_0 > 0$. Moreover, from $\min\{k_0^2, k_1^2 - k_0\} > \bar{k}$, it can be deduced that $PA + A^\top P + 2\bar{k}I_2 < 0$.

Case 2: When $n = 2$, the extended PID control (2) reduces to the classical PID control:

$$u(t) = k_1 e(t) + k_0 \int_0^t e(s) ds + k_2 \dot{e}(t), \quad e(t) = y^* - y(t).$$

Besides, matrix A defined in (9) turns into

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -k_0 & -k_1 & -k_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We mention that if a 3×3 symmetric matrix P satisfies $P[0, 0, 1]^\top = [k_0, k_1, k_2]^\top$ and makes $PA + A^\top P$ is a *diagonal matrix*, then P must have the following form:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 2k_0k_1 & 2k_0k_2 & k_0 \\ 2k_0k_2 & 2k_1k_2 - k_0 & k_1 \\ k_0 & k_1 & k_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

In fact, it can be calculated that

$$PA + A^\top P = -2\text{diag}(k_0^2, k_1^2 - 2k_0k_2, k_2^2 - k_1). \quad (34)$$

By (12), we have

$$\min \left\{ k_0^2, k_1^2 - 2k_0k_2, k_2^2 - k_1 \right\} > \bar{k} > 0 \quad (35)$$

where $\bar{k} := (k_0 + k_1 + k_2)L + k_2M^2$. Obviously, it follows from (34) and (35) that $PA + A^\top P + 2\bar{k}I_3 < 0$. Next, we aim to prove the positiveness of P , which can be accomplished by verifying the following three inequalities:

$$2k_0k_1 > 0, \quad \det \begin{bmatrix} 2k_0k_1 & 2k_0k_2 \\ 2k_0k_2 & 2k_1k_2 - k_0 \end{bmatrix} > 0, \quad \det(P) > 0.$$

The first inequality is obvious since k_0, k_1 and k_2 are all positive. Next, note that $k_1^2 > 2k_0k_2$ and $k_2^2 > k_1$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \det \begin{bmatrix} 2k_0k_1 & 2k_0k_2 \\ 2k_0k_2 & 2k_1k_2 - k_0 \end{bmatrix} &= 2k_0k_1(2k_1k_2 - k_0) - (2k_0k_2)^2 \\ &= 4k_0k_2(k_1^2 - k_0k_2) - 2k_0^2k_1 \\ &> 4k_0^2k_2^2 - 2k_0^2k_1 \\ &= 2k_0^2(2k_2^2 - k_1) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by some simple calculations, the determinant the matrix of P (see (33)) is given by

$$\det(P) = k_0 \left(4k_1^2k_2^2 + k_0^2 - 2k_1^3 - 4k_0k_2^3 \right), \quad (36)$$

which is positive since

$$\begin{aligned} 4k_1^2k_2^2 + k_0^2 - 2k_1^3 - 4k_0k_2^3 &= k_1^2(4k_2^2 - 2k_1) - 4k_0k_2^3 + k_0^2 \\ &> k_1^2(4k_2^2 - 2k_2^2) - 4k_0k_2^3 + k_0^2 \\ &= 2k_2^2(k_1^2 - 2k_0k_2) + k_0^3 > k_0^3 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Case 3: When $n = 3$, it suffices to construct a 4×4 matrix $P > 0$ such that (7) and (8) hold. Let us choose

$$P := \begin{bmatrix} 2k_0k_1 & 2k_0k_2 & 2k_0k_3 & k_0 \\ 2k_0k_2 & 2k_1k_2 - 2k_0k_3 & 2k_1k_3 - k_0 & k_1 \\ 2k_0k_3 & 2k_1k_3 - k_0 & 2k_2k_3 - k_1 & k_2 \\ k_0 & k_1 & k_2 & k_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

and $Q := -(PA + A^\top P)$, where

$$A := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -k_0 & -k_1 & -k_2 & -k_3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (37)$$

By some simple calculations, we can obtain

$$Q = 2\text{diag} \left(k_0^2, k_1^2 - 2k_0k_2, k_2^2 - 2k_1k_3 + k_0, k_3^2 - k_2 \right).$$

Now, suppose that (k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3) satisfy (12), i.e.,

$$\min \left\{ k_0^2, k_1^2 - 2k_0k_2, k_2^2 - 2k_1k_3, k_3^2 - k_2 \right\} > \bar{k},$$

where $\bar{k} = \sum_{i=0}^3 k_i L + k_3 M^2$, then we easily obtain $Q > 0$.

Next, we will show that the matrix A defined by (37) is Hurwitz. The characteristic polynomial of A is given by $s^4 + k_3 s^3 + k_2 s^2 + k_1 s + k_0$. By the Routh-Hurwitz criteria, A is Hurwitz if and only if all $k_i > 0$ and

$$k_1 k_2 k_3 - k_1^2 - k_0 k_3^2 > 0. \quad (38)$$

To prove (38), we define a function h as follows:

$$h(x) = k_1 k_2 x - k_1^2 - k_0 x^2, \quad \sqrt{k_2} < x < \frac{k_2^2}{2k_1}, \quad (39)$$

then the derivative of h satisfies

$$h'(x) = k_1 k_2 - 2k_0 x > h' \left(\frac{k_2^2}{2k_1} \right) = \frac{(k_1^2 - k_0 k_2) k_2}{k_1} > 0,$$

which implies

$$h(x) > h(\sqrt{k_2}) = k_1 k_2 \sqrt{k_2} - k_1^2 - k_0 k_2.$$

Note that $k_2^2 > 2k_1 k_3$ and $k_3 > \sqrt{k_2}$, we know $k_2 \sqrt{k_2} > 2k_1$, therefore $h(x) > k_1 k_2 \sqrt{k_2} - k_1^2 - k_0 k_2 > k_1^2 - k_0 k_2 > 0$. Thus, A is Hurwitz. Moreover, note that P satisfies the matrix equation

$$XA + A^\top X = -2\text{diag}(k_0^2, k_1^2 - 2k_0k_2, k_2^2 - 2k_1k_3 + k_0, k_3^2 - k_2). \quad (40)$$

Since A is Hurwitz (and thus A and $-A^\top$ have no common eigenvalues) and the RHS of (40) is a negative definite matrix, the above matrix equation exists a unique solution which is positive definite. Hence, $P > 0$. Therefore, the parameters k_0, k_1, k_2 and k_3 are admissible for the two-tuples (L, M) .

Case 4: $n > 3$. We prove this case in four steps.

Step 1. (Construction of P) We first define a set of numbers $\{p_{0j}, 0 \leq j \leq n\}$ as follows:

$$p_{0j} = 2k_0 k_{j+1}, \quad 0 \leq j \leq n-1; \quad p_{0n} = k_0. \quad (41)$$

With the help of $p_{02}, \dots, p_{0,n}$, we further define

$$p_{1j} = 2k_1 k_{j+1} - p_{0,j+1}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1; \quad p_{1n} = k_1.$$

Similarly, suppose that for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, $p_{i-1,j}$ has been defined for $i-1 \leq j \leq n$, we define

$$p_{ij} = 2k_i k_{j+1} - p_{i-1,j+1}, \quad i \leq j \leq n-1; \quad (42)$$

$$p_{in} = k_i \quad (43)$$

recursively. Combine (41)-(43), one can see that p_{ij} has been well defined for all $0 \leq i \leq j \leq n$. Besides, denote

$$p_{ij} := p_{ji}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq j < i \leq n,$$

and let P be an $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix given by

$$P := (p_{ij})_{0 \leq i, j \leq n},$$

where p_{ij} are the numbers just defined above.

We will show that the above defined matrix P is positive definite and satisfies conditions (7) and (8).

From (43), it is easy to see

$$P[0, \dots, 0, 1]^\top = [p_{0n}, p_{1n}, \dots, p_{nn}]^\top = [k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n]^\top,$$

which implies that (7) holds.

Step 2. The above defined p_{ij} satisfy the following:

$$0 \leq p_{ij} \leq 2k_i k_{j+1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq j \leq n-1. \quad (44)$$

We use induction to prove (44). Indeed, for $i = 0$, from (41), we know

$$0 \leq p_{0j} = 2k_0 k_{j+1}, \quad 0 \leq j \leq n-1,$$

therefore (44) holds for $i = 0$. Now, suppose that (44) holds for some $0 \leq i_0 < n-1$. Then, by the relationship (42), we know that

$$p_{i_0+1, j} = 2k_{i_0+1} k_{j+1} - p_{i_0, j+1}, \quad i_0 + 1 \leq j \leq n-1, \quad (45)$$

which yields that $p_{i_0+1, j} \leq 2k_{i_0+1} k_{j+1}$, for $i_0 + 1 \leq j \leq n-1$. Next, we aim to show that $p_{i_0+1, j} \geq 0$, for $i_0 + 1 \leq j \leq n-1$.

By induction we have

$$p_{i_0, j+1} \leq 2k_{i_0} k_{j+2}, \quad i_0 + 1 \leq j \leq n-2. \quad (46)$$

Moreover, since $k_j^2 - 2k_{j-1} k_{j+1} > 0$, $1 \leq j \leq n-1$, we have

$$\frac{k_i}{k_{i-1}} > 2 \frac{k_{i+1}}{k_i} > \dots > 2^{j-i+1} \frac{k_{j+1}}{k_j}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n-1.$$

Hence

$$k_i k_j > 2^{j-i+1} k_{i-1} k_{j+1} > k_{i-1} k_{j+1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n-1. \quad (47)$$

Combine this with (46) and (45), we have $p_{i_0+1, j} \geq 0$, $i_0 + 1 \leq j \leq n-2$. Finally, for $j = n-1$, it follows from (45) and (43) that

$$p_{i_0+1, n-1} = 2k_{i_0+1} k_n - p_{i_0, n} = 2k_{i_0+1} k_n - k_{i_0}.$$

Since $k_n^2 > k_{n-1}$, by (47) we can obtain

$$k_{i_0+1} k_n = k_{i_0+1} k_{n-1} \frac{k_n}{k_{n-1}} > 2^{n-i_0-1} k_{i_0} \frac{k_n^2}{k_{n-1}} > k_{i_0}. \quad (48)$$

Therefore, $p_{i_0+1, n-1} > 0$. Hence, $p_{i_0+1, j} \geq 0$, for $i_0 + 1 \leq j \leq n-1$ and (44) is proved.

Step 3. In this step, we calculate each element of $Q := -(PA + A^\top P)$, where A is defined in (9).

Denote $Q := (q_{ij})_{0 \leq i, j \leq n}$, then q_{ij} , $i < j$ can be obtained as follows:

$$q_{ij} = \begin{cases} 2k_0 k_j - p_{0, j-1}, & 0 = i < j \leq n, \\ 2k_i k_j - p_{i, j-1} - p_{j, i-1}, & 1 \leq i < j \leq n. \end{cases}$$

For $i = 0$, it can be seen from (41) that

$$q_{0j} = 2k_0 k_j - p_{0, j-1} = 0, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

For $i \geq 1$, note that $p_{j,i-1} = p_{i-1,j}$, we conclude from (42) that $q_{ij} = 0$ for any $i < j$. Therefore, Q is a diagonal matrix. Next, the diagonal element of Q can be calculated as follows:

$$q_{00} = 2k_0^2, \quad q_{ii} = 2(k_i^2 - p_{i-1,i}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad (49)$$

which in turn gives

$$\lambda_{\min}[Q/2] = \min\{k_0^2, k_i^2 - p_{i-1,i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n\}. \quad (50)$$

In addition, from (44), we know that $p_{i-1,i} \leq 2k_{i-1}k_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Combine this with (50), we obtain

$$\lambda_{\min}[Q/2] \geq \min\{k_0^2, k_i^2 - 2k_{i-1}k_{i+1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1, k_n^2 - k_{n-1}\}.$$

Recall k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n satisfy (12), we have $\lambda_{\min}[Q/2] > \bar{k} > 0$, which in turn gives

$$PA + A^\top P + 2\bar{k}I_{n+1} < 0.$$

Therefore, (8) is proved.

Step 4. We show that the matrix P is positive definite. By Lemma 4 in the Appendix, we know that the matrix A is Hurwitz. Note that P satisfies the matrix equation

$$PA + A^\top P = -Q.$$

Since A is Hurwitz and Q is positive definite, we conclude that the above matrix equation exists a unique positive definite solution, which yields the positive definiteness of P . Therefore, the parameters k_0, k_1, k_2 and k_3 are admissible for the two-tuples (L, M) . \square

Proof of Theorem 2. We only provide an outline of the proof. Denote

$$y_1(t) = x_1(t) - y^*, \quad y_i(t) = x_i(t), \quad 2 \leq i \leq n,$$

then the extended PD control $u(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i(t)$ and system (1) with (14) can be rewritten as the following:

$$\begin{aligned} dy_i &= y_{i+1} dt, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ dy_n &= f\left(y + z^*; -\sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i\right) dt + g(y + z^*) dB_t, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where $y = [y_1^\top, \dots, y_n^\top]^\top$. Similar to (26), we can express $f(y + z^*; u)$ as follows:

$$f(y + z^*; u) = f(y + z^*; 0) + \theta(y; u)u, \quad (52)$$

where

$$\theta(y; u) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{u}}(y + z^*; tu) dt$$

is a $d \times d$ matrix satisfying $\theta(y; u) \geq I_d$ for all $y, u \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Now, consider the following Lyapunov function:

$$V(y) = \frac{1}{2} y^\top \hat{P} y, \quad \hat{P} = P_0 \otimes I_d, \quad y = [y_1^\top, \dots, y_n^\top]^\top$$

and set

$$b(Y) = \begin{bmatrix} y_2 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \\ f(y + z^*; u) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma(Y) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ g(y + z^*) \end{bmatrix},$$

then by the definition (89) of \mathcal{L} , we have

$$\mathcal{L}V = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_i} y_{i+1} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} f(y+z^*; u) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \sigma^\top(y) \hat{P} \sigma(y) \right\}. \quad (53)$$

Note that $\frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i^\top$ (which can be obtained from (15)) and $|f(y+z^*; 0)| \leq L|y| + |f(z^*; 0)|$, it can be deduced that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} f(y+z^*; u) &= \sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i^\top \left[f(y+z^*; 0) - \theta(y; u) \sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i^\top f(y+z^*; 0) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i^\top \right) \sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \left(L|y|^2 + |f(z^*; 0)||y| \right) - \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} \sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we know

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \sigma^\top(y) \hat{P} \sigma(y) \right\} \leq k_n M^2 |y|^2 + k_n \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2.$$

From (53) and recall $\hat{k} = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i L + k_n M^2$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_i} y_{i+1} - \frac{\partial V}{\partial y_n} \sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i + \hat{k} |y|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n k_i |y| |f(z^*, 0)| + k_n \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} y^\top \left[(P_0 A_0 + A_0^\top P_0) \otimes I_d \right] y + \hat{k} |y|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n k_i |y| |f(z^*, 0)| + k_n \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\ &\leq -\eta |y|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n k_i |y| |f(z^*, 0)| + k_n \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some $\eta > 0$. Next, note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n k_i |y| |f(z^*, 0)| \leq \eta |y|^2 / 2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n k_i \right)^2 |f(z^*, 0)|^2 / (2\eta),$$

one can get

$$\mathcal{L}V \leq -\eta_0 V + c_0 (|f(z^*, 0)|^2 + \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2),$$

for some positive constants η_0, c_0 which depending only on (k_0, \dots, k_n, L, M) . Hence, it follows from Lemma 1 and the positive definiteness of $P_0 \otimes I_d$ that

$$\mathbf{E}|y(t)|^2 \leq C_1 |y(0)|^2 e^{-\lambda t} + C_2 \left[|f(z^*, 0)|^2 + \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \right].$$

Recall $x(t) - z^* = y(t)$, thus the proof of Theorem 2 is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Under notations (24), we first introduce an invertible coordinate transformation of the state variables. Let us consider the following transformation:

$$z_0(t) = y_0(t), \quad z_i(t) = z_{i-1}(t) + \left(\prod_{j=1}^i \beta_j \right) y_i(t), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad (54)$$

where β_1, \dots, β_n are given as in (18). Then the following system is derived from system (25) (or system (1)) under the new coordinates $z = (z_0, \dots, z_n)$.

$$\begin{cases} dz_i(t) = \sum_{j=0}^i \frac{1}{\beta_{j+1}} (z_{j+1}(t) - z_j(t)) dt, & 0 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ dz_n(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\beta_{j+1}} (z_{j+1}(t) - z_j(t)) dt + f_\beta(z(t); u(t)) dt + g_\beta(z(t)) dB_t, \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

where

$$f_\beta(z; u) = \widehat{\beta}_n f(z^\beta + z^*; u), \quad g_\beta(z) = \widehat{\beta}_n g(z^\beta + z^*),$$

in which $\widehat{\beta}_i := \prod_{j=1}^i \beta_j$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, and

$$z^\beta := \left[\frac{1}{\beta_1} (z_1^\top - z_0^\top), \frac{1}{\beta_2} (z_2^\top - z_1^\top), \dots, \frac{1}{\beta_n} (z_n^\top - z_{n-1}^\top) \right]^\top.$$

Since (k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n) are given as in (17), the extended PID controller can be expressed in the new coordinates (54) as follows:

$$u(t) = -k_0 y_0(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i y_i(t) + u^* = -k z_n(t) + u^*. \quad (56)$$

Now set

$$b(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\beta_1} (z_1 - z_0) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\beta_{j+1}} (z_{j+1} - z_j) \\ \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\beta_{j+1}} (z_{j+1} - z_j) + f_\beta(z; -k z_n + u^*) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\sigma(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ g_\beta(z) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then system (55) with control (56) takes the following more compact form:

$$dz(t) = b(z(t)) dt + \sigma(z(t)) dB_t. \quad (57)$$

From the definition of $b(\cdot)$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} z^\top b(z) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^i \frac{1}{\beta_{j+1}} z_i^\top (z_{j+1} - z_j) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\beta_{j+1}} z_n^\top (z_{j+1} - z_j) + z_n^\top f_\beta(z; -k z_n + u^*) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\beta_1} |z_0|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i} \right) |z_i|^2 + \beta_n^{-1} |z_n|^2 - \frac{1}{\beta_1} \sum_{i=2}^n z_0^\top z_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\beta_i} z_i^\top z_{i+1} \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i} \right) \sum_{j=i+2}^n z_i^\top z_j + z_n^\top f_\beta(z; -k z_n + u^*). \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Note that $\beta_1 > \beta_2 > \dots > \beta_n > 0$. Then we have

$$\left| -\frac{1}{\beta_1} z_0^\top z_i \right| \leq \frac{1}{n\beta_1} |z_0|^2 + \frac{n}{4\beta_1} |z_i|^2, \quad \left| \frac{1}{\beta_i} z_i^\top z_{i+1} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n\beta_i} |z_i|^2 + \frac{n}{4\beta_i} |z_{i+1}|^2$$

and

$$\left| -\left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\right) z_i^\top z_j \right| \leq \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\right) |z_i|^2 + \frac{n}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\right) |z_j|^2,$$

which yields that

$$\left| -\frac{1}{\beta_1} \sum_{i=2}^n z_0^\top z_i \right| \leq \frac{n-1}{n\beta_1} |z_0|^2 + \frac{n}{4\beta_1} \sum_{i=2}^n |z_i|^2,$$

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\beta_i} z_i^\top z_{i+1} \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{n\beta_i} |z_i|^2 + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{n}{4\beta_{i-1}} |z_i|^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\right) \sum_{j=i+2}^n z_i^\top z_j \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{n-(i+1)}{n} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\right) |z_i|^2 + \sum_{j=3}^n \sum_{i=1}^{j-2} \frac{n}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\right) |z_j|^2 \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{n-(i+1)}{n} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\right) |z_i|^2 + \sum_{j=3}^n \frac{n}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{j-1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_1}\right) |z_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{\beta_1} \sum_{i=2}^n z_0^\top z_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\beta_i} z_i^\top z_{i+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\right) \sum_{j=i+2}^n z_i^\top z_j \\ & \leq \frac{n-1}{n\beta_1} |z_0|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{n\beta_i} |z_i|^2 + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{n}{2\beta_{i-1}} |z_i|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{n-(i+1)}{n} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{\beta_i}\right) |z_i|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Then it follows from (58) and (59) that

$$\begin{aligned} z^\top b(z) & \leq -\frac{1}{n\beta_1} |z_0|^2 - \left(\frac{2}{n\beta_2} - \frac{3}{n\beta_1}\right) |z_1|^2 - \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(\frac{i+1}{n\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{i+2}{n\beta_i} - \frac{n}{2\beta_{i-1}}\right) |z_i|^2 \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{\beta_n} + \frac{n}{2\beta_{n-1}}\right) |z_n|^2 + z_n^\top f_\beta(z; -kz_n + u^*). \end{aligned}$$

Since β_1, \dots, β_n are given by formula (18), it is easy to check that

$$\frac{1}{n\beta_1} > \lambda + 8M^2, \quad \frac{2}{n\beta_2} - \frac{3}{n\beta_1} \geq \frac{2}{\beta_1} - \frac{3}{n\beta_1} > \frac{1}{n\beta_1} > \lambda + 8M^2,$$

and for $2 \leq i \leq n-1$,

$$\frac{i+1}{n\beta_{i+1}} - \frac{i+2}{n\beta_i} - \frac{n}{2\beta_{i-1}} > \frac{1}{\beta_i} - \frac{n}{2\beta_{i-1}} > \frac{n}{2\beta_{i-1}} > \frac{1}{n\beta_1} > \lambda + 8M^2.$$

Note also that

$$\frac{1}{\beta_n} + \frac{n}{2\beta_{n-1}} + \lambda + 8M^2 < \frac{1}{\beta_n} + \frac{1}{2\beta_n} + \frac{1}{n\beta_1} < \frac{2}{\beta_n},$$

then we have

$$z^\top b(z) \leq -(\lambda + 8M^2) |z|^2 + \frac{2}{\beta_n} |z_n|^2 + z_n^\top f_\beta(z, -kz_n + u^*).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} z_n^\top f_\beta(z; -kz_n + u^*) &= \widehat{\beta}_n z_n^\top f(z^\beta + z^*; -kz_n + u^*) \\ &= \widehat{\beta}_n (z_n^\top f(z^\beta + z^*; u^*) - kz_n^\top \theta(z^\beta; -kz_n) z_n), \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where $\theta(z^\beta; -kz_n)$ is defined as in (27). Recall Assumptions 1-2, we derive

$$z_n^\top f_\beta(z; -kz_n + u^*) \leq L\widehat{\beta}_n |z_n| |z^\beta| - k\widehat{\beta}_n |z_n|^2.$$

Since $0 < \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n < 1$, it is easy to check that

$$|z^\beta|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\widehat{\beta}_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i - z_{i-1}|^2 \leq \frac{4}{\widehat{\beta}_n^2} |z|^2.$$

Hence

$$z_n^\top f_\beta(z; -kz_n + u^*) \leq 2L|z_n| |z| - k\widehat{\beta}_n |z_n|^2 \leq \frac{\lambda + 8M^2}{2} |z|^2 - \left(k\widehat{\beta}_n - \frac{2L^2}{\lambda + 8M^2}\right) |z_n|^2.$$

Since

$$k\widehat{\beta}_n > \frac{1}{\widehat{\beta}_n} \left(1 + 3L + \frac{2L^2}{\lambda + 8M^2}\right) > \frac{1}{\widehat{\beta}_n} + \frac{2L^2}{\lambda + 8M^2} > \frac{2}{\beta_n} + \frac{2L^2}{\lambda + 8M^2},$$

we obtain that

$$z^\top b(z) \leq -\frac{\lambda + 8M^2}{2} |z|^2. \quad (61)$$

In addition, by the definition of g_β , we know that

$$\|g_\beta(z)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 = \widehat{\beta}_n^2 \|g(z^\beta + z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq 8M^2 |z|^2 + 2\widehat{\beta}_n^2 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2. \quad (62)$$

Now consider the Lyapunov function $V(z) = |z|^2$, (61) and (62) yield

$$\mathcal{L}V(z) = 2z^\top b(z) + \|g_\beta(z)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq -\lambda V(z) + 2\widehat{\beta}_n^2 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2. \quad (63)$$

By Lemma 1, we know that there exists a unique continuous solution $z(t)$ of SDE (57) and

$$\mathbf{E}[|z(t)|^2] \leq |z(0)|^2 e^{-\lambda t} + \frac{2\widehat{\beta}_n^2}{\lambda} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2. \quad (64)$$

Recall transformations (24), (54) and the fact that $k_0 = k \geq 1$, we have

$$|z_0(0)|^2 = |y_0(0)|^2 = \left|\frac{u^*}{k_0}\right|^2 \leq |u^*|^2,$$

and for $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$|z_i(0)|^2 = \left|y_0(0) + \sum_{j=1}^i \widehat{\beta}_j y_j(0)\right|^2 \leq \left(\left|\frac{u^*}{k_0}\right| + \sum_{j=1}^i |y_j(0)|\right)^2 \leq 2|u^*|^2 + 2i|x(0) - z^*|^2.$$

Hence

$$|z(0)|^2 \leq 2n^2(|x(0) - z^*|^2 + |u^*|^2). \quad (65)$$

Then for $1 \leq i \leq n$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[|y_i(t)|^2] &= \frac{1}{\beta_i^2} \mathbf{E}[|z_i(t) - z_{i-1}(t)|^2] \leq \frac{2}{\beta_n^2} \mathbf{E}[|z(t)|^2] \\ &\leq \frac{4n^2}{\beta_n^2} (|x(0) - z^*|^2 + |u^*|^2) e^{-\lambda t} + \frac{4}{\lambda} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Thus (20) follows.

Now let us consider the case that $\|\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}\| \leq R$, i.e.,

$$\left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(x; u)v \right| \leq R|v|, \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}, u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (67)$$

For $\tilde{y} := [\tilde{y}_1^\top, \dots, \tilde{y}_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, set

$$\tilde{b}(t, \tilde{y}) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_n \\ f(\tilde{y} + z^*; u(t)) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{y}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ g(\tilde{y} + z^*) \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$u(t) = - \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i(t) + u^*, \quad (68)$$

and

$$Y(t) := [y_0^\top(t), y_1^\top(t), \dots, y_n^\top(t)]^\top := [y_0^\top(t); y^\top(t)]^\top \quad (69)$$

is the solution of the system (25), which is regarded as a fixed adapted stochastic process in the definition of \tilde{b} . Let us consider the following SDE:

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{y}(t) = \tilde{b}(t, \tilde{y}(t))dt + \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{y}(t))dB_t, \\ \tilde{y}(0) = y(0), \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

where $y(0) := [y_1^\top(0), \dots, y_n^\top(0)]^\top$ is the same as the initial condition of system (25). Then by the uniqueness solution of system (25) and SDE (70), we know that their solutions are the same, i.e. $\tilde{y}(t) = y(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

By the construction of \tilde{b} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tilde{y}^\top \tilde{b}(t, \tilde{y}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} 2\tilde{y}_i^\top \tilde{y}_{i+1} + 2\tilde{y}_n^\top f(\tilde{y} + z^*; u(t)) \\ &\geq - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (|\tilde{y}_i|^2 + |\tilde{y}_{i+1}|^2) + 2\tilde{y}_n^\top f(\tilde{y} + z^*, u^*) + 2\tilde{y}_n^\top \theta(\tilde{y}, u(t))(u(t) - u^*), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where $\theta(\tilde{y}, u(t))$ is defined as in (27). Note that Assumptions 1-2 and (67) yield

$$2\tilde{y}_n^\top f(\tilde{y} + z^*, u^*) \geq -2L|\tilde{y}_n||\tilde{y}| \geq -2L|\tilde{y}|^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &2\tilde{y}_n^\top \theta(\tilde{y}, u(t))(u(t) - u^*) \\ &\geq -2R|\tilde{y}_n| \left| \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i(t) \right| \geq -\frac{16(n+1)R^2|\mathbf{k}|^2}{\lambda} |\tilde{y}_n|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{16(n+1)} |Y(t)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{k} = [k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n]^\top$. Hence

$$2\tilde{y}^\top \tilde{b}(t, \tilde{y}) \geq - \left(2 + 2L + \frac{16(n+1)R^2|\mathbf{k}|^2}{\lambda} \right) |\tilde{y}|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{16(n+1)} |Y(t)|^2. \quad (72)$$

On the other hand, Assumption 1 also implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{y})\|_{\text{HS}}^2 &= \|g(\tilde{y} + z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 = \|g(z^*) + g(\tilde{y} + z^*) - g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\ &\geq (\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}} - \|g(\tilde{y} + z^*) - g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}})^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - \|g(\tilde{y} + z^*) - g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - M^2 |\tilde{y}|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where we have used the following inequality in (73):

$$(a - b)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}a^2 - b^2.$$

Then for the Lyapunov function $V(\tilde{y}) = |\tilde{y}|^2$, (72) and (73) indicate

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_t V(\tilde{y}) = 2\tilde{y}^\top \tilde{b}(t, \tilde{y}) + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{y})\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \geq -w|\tilde{y}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - \frac{\lambda}{16(n+1)}|Y(t)|^2,$$

where

$$w = 2 + 2L + M^2 + \frac{16(n+1)R^2|\mathbf{k}|^2}{\lambda}.$$

According to (64), (65) and transformation (54), it can be obtained that $y_0(t)$ has the same estimate as in (66). Thus we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - \frac{\lambda}{16(n+1)}\mathbf{E}[|Y(t)|^2] \geq \frac{1}{4}\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - \frac{\lambda n^2 k_0^2}{4k_n^2}(|x(0) - z^*|^2 + |u^*|^2)e^{-\lambda t}.$$

Then it follows from Lemma 2 and the fact $y(t) = \tilde{y}(t)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[|y(t)|^2] &\geq |y(0)|^2 e^{-wt} + \frac{1}{4w}(1 - e^{-wt})\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda n^2 k_0^2}{4k_n^2}(|x(0) - z^*|^2 + |u^*|^2)e^{-wt} \int_0^t e^{(w-\lambda)s} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Note that

$$e^{-wt} \int_0^t e^{(w-\lambda)s} ds \leq 1_{\{w \leq \lambda\}} e^{-wt} t + 1_{\{w > \lambda\}} \frac{e^{-\lambda t}}{w - \lambda}, \quad (75)$$

then

$$e^{-wt} \int_0^t e^{(w-\lambda)s} ds \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence (21) follows with $C_3 = \frac{1}{4w}$. \square

Next we give the proof of Proposition 3.

Proof of Proposition 3. For any $p > 1$, we first give the $2p$ -th moment estimate of the solution $(y_0(t), y_1(t), \dots, y_n(t))$ to system (25). Recall transformations (24), (54) and their corresponding systems (25), (55). Let us consider the Lyapunov function $V_p(z) := |z|^{2p} = V^p(x)$, then (63) and the definition (89) of \mathcal{L} imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V_p(z) &= pV^{p-1}(z)\mathcal{L}V(z) + \frac{1}{2}p(p-1)V^{p-2}(z)\left|\sigma^\top(z)\frac{\partial V(z)}{\partial z}\right|^2 \\ &\leq -\lambda pV_p(z) + 2pV^{p-1}(z)\hat{\beta}_n^2\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + 2p(p-1)V^{p-2}(z)|g_\beta^\top(z)z_n|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By (62) and the fact that $0 \leq g_\beta(z)g_\beta^\top(z) \leq \|g_\beta(z)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 I_d$, we have

$$|g_\beta^\top(z)z_n|^2 = z_n^\top g_\beta(z)g_\beta^\top(z)z_n \leq \|g_\beta(z)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 |z|^2 \leq 8M^2|z|^4 + 2\hat{\beta}_n^2\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 |z|^2.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V_p(z) &\leq -p(\lambda - 16(p-1)M^2)V_p(z) + 4p^2\hat{\beta}_n^2\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 V^{p-1}(z) \\ &\leq -\frac{p}{2}(\lambda - 16(p-1)M^2)V_p(z) + 4p^2p^{2p-1}a^{-p}\hat{\beta}_n^{2p}\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2p}, \end{aligned}$$

where $a = \left[\frac{p^2(\lambda - 16(p-1)M^2)}{2(p-1)}\right]^{\frac{p-1}{p}}$ and we have used the following inequality:

$$4p^2\hat{\beta}_n^2\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 V^{p-1}(z) \leq \frac{p-1}{p}a^{\frac{p}{p-1}}V^p(z) + \frac{1}{p}a^{-p}(4p^2\hat{\beta}_n^2\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2)^p.$$

Then Lemma 1 yields

$$\mathbf{E}[|z(t)|^{2p}] \leq |z(0)|^{2p} e^{-\frac{p}{2}(\lambda - 16(p-1)M^2)t} + \frac{2^{2p+1}p^{2p-2}\hat{\beta}_n^{2p}}{a^p(\lambda - 16(p-1)M^2)} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2p}.$$

Therefore, according to the transformation (54) and the fact that

$$1 \leq \frac{k_0}{k_i} = \frac{1}{\beta_i} \leq \frac{1}{\beta_n} = \frac{k_0}{k_n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

we conclude that for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\mathbf{E}[|y_i(t)|^{2p}] \leq \frac{2^p k_0^{2p}}{k_n^{2p}} |z(0)|^{2p} e^{-\frac{p}{2}(\lambda - 16(p-1)M^2)t} + \frac{4^{p+1}p^{2p-2}}{a^p(\lambda - 16(p-1)M^2)} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2p}. \quad (76)$$

Now for $\hat{y} := [\hat{y}_1^\top, \dots, \hat{y}_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, we set

$$\hat{b}(t, \hat{y}) = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{y}_n \\ f(y(t) + z^*; u(t)) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}(\hat{y}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{d \times m} \\ g(\hat{y} + z^*) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $u(t)$ and $Y(t) = [y_0^\top(t), y^\top(t)]^\top$ are defined as in (68)-(69). Similar to the proof of Theorem 3, we consider the following SDE:

$$\begin{cases} d\hat{y}(t) = \hat{b}(t, \hat{y}(t))dt + \hat{\sigma}(\hat{y}(t))dB_t, \\ \hat{y}(0) = y(0). \end{cases} \quad (77)$$

Then SDE (77) has a unique solution $\hat{y}(t)$ which is also the same as $y(t)$.

Note that $\lambda > 16\gamma M^2$. Then (76) and the fact that

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right)^p \leq C(n, p) \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^p, \quad n \geq 2, \quad p > 0, \quad a_i \geq 0, \quad (78)$$

indicate

$$\mathbf{E}[|Y(t)|^{2(\gamma+1)}] \leq C_5 |z(0)|^{2(\gamma+1)} e^{-\delta t} + C_6 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2(\gamma+1)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_5 &= \frac{(n+1)C(n+1, \gamma+1)2^{\gamma+1}k_0^{2(\gamma+1)}}{k_n^{2(\gamma+1)}}, \\ C_6 &= \frac{(n+1)C(n+1, \gamma+1)4^{\gamma+2}(\gamma+1)^{2\gamma}}{a^{\gamma+1}(\lambda - 16\gamma M^2)}, \\ \delta &= \frac{\gamma+1}{2}(\lambda - 16\gamma M^2) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, according to (64) and transformation (54), $Y(t)$ has the following second moment estimate:

$$\mathbf{E}[|Y(t)|^2] \leq C'_1 |z(0)|^2 e^{-\lambda t} + C'_2 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2,$$

where

$$C'_1 = \frac{2(n+1)k_0^2}{k_n^2}, \quad C'_2 = \frac{4(n+1)}{\lambda}.$$

Similar to (71), we have

$$2\hat{y}^\top \hat{b}(t, \hat{y}) \geq -2|\hat{y}|^2 + 2\hat{y}_n^\top f(y(t) + z^*, u^*) - 2\hat{y}_n^\top \theta(y(t), u(t)) \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i(t), \quad (79)$$

where

$$\theta(y(t), u(t)) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{u}}(y(t) + z^*; \bar{u}) dr, \quad \bar{u} = u^* + r(u(t) - u^*). \quad (80)$$

Note that the Lipschitz condition of f and the fact that $f(z^*, u^*) = 0$ yield

$$2\widehat{y}_n^\top f(y(t) + z^*, u^*) \geq -2L|\widehat{y}_n||y(t)| \geq -8C_2' L^2 |\widehat{y}_n|^2 - \frac{1}{8C_2'} |Y(t)|^2. \quad (81)$$

Now let us deal with the third term in the right hand side of (79). Note first that

$$|u(t) - u^*| = \left| \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i(t) \right| \leq |\mathbf{k}| |Y(t)|,$$

where $\mathbf{k} := [k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n]^\top$. Then the polynomial growth condition (23) of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}$ and (80) imply

$$\begin{aligned} 2\widehat{y}_n^\top \theta(y(t), u(t)) \sum_{i=0}^n k_i y_i(t) &\leq 2|\mathbf{k}| R \left(1 + |y(t) + z^*|^\gamma + (|u^*| + |\mathbf{k}| |Y(t)|)^\gamma \right) |\widehat{y}_n| |Y(t)| \\ &\leq 2^{\gamma+1} |\mathbf{k}| R (1 + |y^*|^\gamma + |u^*|^\gamma) |\widehat{y}_n| |Y(t)| \\ &\quad + 2^{\gamma+1} |\mathbf{k}| R (1 + |\mathbf{k}|^\gamma) |\widehat{y}_n| |Y(t)|^{\gamma+1} \\ &\leq 2^{2\gamma+3} C_2' |\mathbf{k}|^2 R^2 (1 + |y^*|^\gamma + |u^*|^\gamma)^2 |\widehat{y}_n|^2 \\ &\quad + 2^{2\gamma+3} C_6 |\mathbf{k}|^2 R^2 (1 + |\mathbf{k}|^\gamma)^2 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2\gamma} |\widehat{y}_n|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8C_2'} |Y(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{8C_6 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2\gamma}} |Y(t)|^{2(\gamma+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

On the other hand, similar to (73), we also have

$$\|\widehat{\sigma}(\widehat{y})\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - M^2 |\widehat{y}|^2. \quad (83)$$

Then it follows from (79), (81), (82) and (83) that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_t V(\widehat{y}) &= 2\widehat{y}^\top \widehat{b}(t, \widehat{y}) + \|\widehat{\sigma}(\widehat{y})\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \\ &\geq -A(1 + |y^*|^{2\gamma} + |u^*|^{2\gamma} + \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2\gamma}) |\widehat{y}|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - \frac{1}{4C_2'} |Y(t)|^2 - \frac{1}{8C_6 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2\gamma}} |Y(t)|^{2(\gamma+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the positive constant A only depend on $(k_0, \dots, k_n, \lambda, L, M, R, \gamma, n)$. Note that $\widehat{y}(t) = y(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - \frac{1}{4C_2'} \mathbf{E}[|Y(t)|^2] - \frac{1}{8C_6 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2\gamma}} \mathbf{E}[|Y(t)|^{2(\gamma+1)}] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{8} \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - \frac{C_1'}{4C_2'} |z(0)|^2 e^{-\lambda t} - \frac{C_5}{8C_6 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2\gamma}} |z(0)|^{2(\gamma+1)} e^{-\delta t}, \end{aligned}$$

then arguing as in (74) and (75), we conclude that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[|y(t)|^2] \geq \frac{1}{8A} \frac{\|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2}{1 + |y^*|^{2\gamma} + |u^*|^{2\gamma} + \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^{2\gamma}}.$$

□

6 Simulations

In this section, we consider a class of third-order nonlinear stochastic systems with parameter uncertainty

$$\begin{cases} dx_1 = x_2 dt \\ dx_2 = x_3 dt \\ dx_3 = f(x_1, x_2, x_3; u) dt + g(x_1, x_2, x_3) dB_t \end{cases} \quad (84)$$

where $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and the unknown functions f and g take the following forms

$$f = a \sin x_1 + bx_2 + cx_3 + d + u + \mu \tanh(u), \quad g = \sigma.$$

Here a, b, c, d, μ and σ are six *unknown* system parameters which satisfy

$$|a| \vee |b| \vee |c| \leq 1/2, \quad d \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \mu \geq 0, \quad \sigma \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (85)$$

From the expressions of f and g and (85), it is easy to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \right| &= |a \cos x_1| \leq 1/2, \quad \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} \right| \leq 1/2, \quad \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_3} \right| \leq 1/2, \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} &= 1 + \mu (1 - \tanh^2(u)) \geq 1, \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_2} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn gives

$$|f(x; u) - f(y; u)| \leq \sqrt{3}|x - y|/2, \quad |g(x) - g(y)| = 0.$$

Hence, Assumptions 1-2 hold with $L = \sqrt{3}/2$ and $M = 0$. Now, suppose the control variable u takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= k_0 \int_0^t e(s) ds + k_1 e(t) + k_2 \dot{e}(t) + k_3 \ddot{e}(t) \\ e(t) &= y^* - x_1(t). \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Then it follows from Theorem 1 that, there exist positive constants C_1, C_2 and λ such that

$$\mathbf{E} [|e(t)|^2] \leq C_1 [|x(0) - z^*|^2 + |u^*|^2] e^{-\lambda t} + C_2 \|g(z^*)\|_{\text{HS}}^2,$$

if the extended PID parameters (k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3) satisfy the following inequalities:

$$\min \left\{ k_0^2, k_1^2 - 2k_0 k_2, k_2^2 - 2k_1 k_3, k_3^2 - k_2 \right\} > \sqrt{3} \bar{k}/2 \quad (87)$$

where $\bar{k} = k_0 + k_1 + k_2 + k_3$. We assume the parameters (k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3) are given by

$$k_0 = k_3 = k, \quad k_1 = k_2 = 2.5k,$$

then (87) reduces to

$$\min \left\{ k^2, 1.25k^2, k^2 - 2.5k \right\} = k^2 - 2.5k > \frac{7\sqrt{3}}{2}k.$$

Therefore, the control system (84) and (86) will be globally stable if

$$k > (5 + 7\sqrt{3})/2 \approx 8.56.$$

In the following simulations, the extended PID parameters are chosen as $(k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3) = (8.6, 21.5, 21.5, 8.6)$. In Fig. 1, we illustrate the tracking performance under *different system parameters* $(a, b, c, d, \mu, \sigma)$. One can see that the given extended PID controller (86) has the ability to stabilize and regulate the control system (84), even if the system parameters $(a, b, c, d, \mu, \sigma)$ vary in a wide range. This demonstrates that the extended PID control has strong robustness with respect to the system uncertainties. In Fig. 2, we want to see how the constant σ (which reflects the noise intensity) will affect the tracking performance. It can be seen that the steady-state tracking error will be *small* if σ is small. In particular, the tracking error will converge to zero if $\sigma = 0$. In Fig. 3, one can also see that large random disturbance may lead to the high-frequency oscillation of the control input, and increase the variance of the controller input.

7 Conclusion

This paper investigates the stabilization problem of the extended PID control for a class of nonaffine stochastic systems with a general relative degree. We have provided a mathematical theory together with explicit design formulae of the extended PID control for a basic class of nonlinear stochastic systems. To be specific, an $(n + 1)$ -dimensional unbounded set is constructed based on the Lipschitz constants of the drift and diffusion terms, from which the stabilizing extended PID parameters can be chosen arbitrarily. Moreover, the steady-state tracking error is proved to be bounded by the noise intensity at the setpoint, which can also be made arbitrarily small if one chooses the extended PID parameters suitably large. These theoretical results and design methods presented in the paper may provide reliable design guidance for control engineers in practical applications. For further investigation, it would be meaningful to consider more practical situations including time-delay and saturation, etc.




Fig. 1 Curves of $\mathbf{E}|e(t)|^2$ under different system parameters. The system initial state $(x_1(0), x_2(0), x_3(0))$ is $(0.5, 0.5, 0.3)$.

Appendix

Consider the following stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) &= b(t, x(t))dt + \sigma(t, x(t))dB(t), \\ x(0) &= x_0, \end{cases} \quad (88)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $B(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is an m -dimensional standard Brownian motion defined on a complete probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) with $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ being a natural filtration, and $b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\sigma \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times m})$ are nonlinear functions.

Definition 3 Given a function $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ associated with the equation (88). The differential operator \mathcal{L}_t acting on V is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_t V(x) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} b(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \sigma(t, x)^\top \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x^2} \sigma(t, x) \right\}. \quad (89)$$

If $b(t, x)$ and $\sigma(t, x)$ are independent of time t , the operator \mathcal{L}_t will be denoted by \mathcal{L} for simplicity.

According to [13, Theorem 3.5 and Remark 3.4] up to a slight modification, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *If there exist a function $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^+)$ and positive constants α, β such that $\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} V(x) = \infty$ and $\mathcal{L}_t V(x) \leq -\alpha V(x) + \beta$, then SDE (88) has a unique solution*




Fig. 2 Curves of $\mathbf{E}|e(t)|^2$ under different σ . The system parameters $(a, b, c, d, \mu) = (0.4, -0.3, 0.5, 6, 5.2)$, and the initial state $(x_1(0), x_2(0), x_3(0))$ is $(0.9, 0, 0.1)$.

$(x(t))_{t \geq 0}$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}V(x(t)) \leq V(x(0))e^{-\alpha t} + \frac{\beta}{\alpha}.$$

Moreover, by a similar argument as in [13, Theorem 3.5], we also have the following prior estimates.

Lemma 2 Suppose SDE (88) has a unique solution $(x(t))_{t \geq 0}$. If there exist a nonnegative function $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$, a constant $\alpha > 0$ and an adapted process $\beta \in L^1_{loc}([0, \infty) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R})$ such that $\mathcal{L}_t V(x) \geq -\alpha V(x) + \beta(t)$, then we have

$$\mathbf{E}V(x(t)) \geq V(x(0))e^{-\alpha t} + \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-s)} \mathbf{E}\beta(s) ds,$$

where $L^1_{loc}([0, \infty) \times \Omega; \mathbb{R})$ is the space of stochastic processes $\beta(\cdot)$ such that $\beta(t) \in L^1(\Omega)$, $t \geq 0$ and

$$\mathbf{E} \int_0^T |\beta(t)| dt < \infty, \quad \text{for all } T > 0.$$

The real polynomial $f(s) = a_0 + a_1 s + \cdots + a_n s^n$ is called stable if every one of its roots has negative part. It is known that the stability of the positive-coefficients polynomial is determined by the $n-2$ determining coefficients α_i , which are defined by

$$\alpha_i := \frac{a_{i-1}a_{i+2}}{a_i a_{i+1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2.$$




Fig. 3 Curves of $\mathbf{E}|u(t)|^2$ and $\text{Var}(u(t))$ under different σ . The system parameters $(a, b, c, d, \mu) = (0.4, -0.3, 0.5, 6, 5.2)$, and the initial state $(x_1(0), x_2(0), x_3(0))$ is $(1.3, 0, 0.1)$.

The following lemma provides a sufficient condition for stability of the polynomial $f(s)$ for the case $n \geq 5$, see Theorem 5 in [15].

Lemma 3 For $n \geq 5$, if every determining coefficients of $f(s)$ is less than $1/2$, and any three successive determining coefficients satisfy the following condition

$$\alpha_i + \alpha_{i-1}\alpha_i\alpha_{i+1} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad i = 2, \dots, n-3$$

then the polynomial $f(s)$ is stable.

By Lemma 3, we can obtain the following result.

Lemma 4 For $n \geq 4$, suppose that the parameters k_0, \dots, k_n are all positive and satisfy (12), then the matrix A defined by (9) is Hurwitz.

Proof First, by definition (9) of the matrix A , the characteristic polynomial of A can be calculated as follows:

$$\det(sI_{n+1} - A) = s^{n+1} + k_n s^n + \dots + k_1 s + k_0,$$

which is a real polynomial with positive-coefficients. Note that $n+1 \geq 5$, we can apply Lemma 3 to analyze the stability of the characteristic polynomial of A .

First, note that the coefficient of s^{n+1} is 1, it is not difficult to see the determining coefficients are

$$\alpha_i = \frac{k_{i-1}k_{i+2}}{k_i k_{i+1}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-2; \quad \alpha_{n-1} = \frac{k_{n-2}}{k_{n-1}k_n}.$$

Next, from $k_i^2 > 2k_{i-1}k_{i+1}$ and $k_{i+1}^2 > 2k_i k_{i+2}$, $i = 1, \dots, n-2$, we obtain $k_i^2 k_{i+1}^2 > 4k_{i-1}k_i k_{i+1} k_{i+2}$, and thus

$$\alpha_i = \frac{k_{i-1}k_{i+2}}{k_i k_{i+1}} < \frac{1}{4}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-2.$$

Besides, combine $k_{n-1}^2 > 2k_{n-2}k_n$ and $k_n^2 > k_{n-1}$, we conclude that

$$\alpha_{n-1} = \frac{k_{n-2}}{k_{n-1}k_n} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, every determining coefficients of $\det(sI_{n+1} - A)$ is less than $1/2$. In addition, any three successive determining coefficients satisfy

$$\alpha_i + \alpha_{i-1}\alpha_i\alpha_{i+1} \leq \frac{1}{4} + \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2} = \frac{9}{32} < \frac{1}{2}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq n-3,$$

which gives the Hurwitz property of A . □

References

- [1] K. J. Astrom and T. Hagglund. The future of PID control. *Control Engineering Practice*, 9(11):1163–1175, November 2001.
- [2] Karl Johan Åström, Tore Hägglund, and Karl J. Astrom. *Advanced PID Control*, volume 461. ISA-The Instrumentation, Systems, and Automation Society Research Triangle Park, 2006.

- [3] Wł Białkowski. Dreams versus reality - a view from both sides of the gap. *Pulp & Paper-Canada*, 94(11):19–27, November 1993.
- [4] Jianqi Chen, Dan Ma, Yong Xu, and Jie Chen. Delay robustness of PID control of second-order systems: Pseudoconcavity, exact delay margin, and performance tradeoff. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(3):1194–1209, March 2022.
- [5] I.-L. Chien. Consider IMC tuning to improve controller performance. *Chem. Eng. Prog.*, 86:33–41, 1990.
- [6] Xinrong Cong and Lei Guo. PID control for a class of nonlinear uncertain stochastic systems. In *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, New York, 2017. IEEE.
- [7] David B. Ender. Process control performance: Not as good as you think. *Control Engineering*, 40(10):180–190, 1993.
- [8] Michel Fliess and Cedric Join. Model-free control. *International Journal of Control*, 86(12):2228–2252, 2013.
- [9] Bao-Zhu Guo and Zhi-Liang Zhao. On convergence of the nonlinear active disturbance rejection control for MIMO systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(2):1727–1757, 2013.
- [10] Lei Guo. Feedback and uncertainty: Some basic problems and results. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 49:27–36, 2020.
- [11] Lei Guo and Cheng Zhao. Control of nonlinear uncertain systems by extended PID with differential trackers. *Communications in Information and Systems*, 21(3):415–440, 2021.
- [12] H. K. Khalil. Universal integral controllers for minimum-phase nonlinear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 45(3):490–494, March 2000.
- [13] Rafail Khasminskii. *Stochastic Stability of Differential Equations*, volume 66 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer, Heidelberg, second edition, 2012.
- [14] N. J. Killingsworth and M. Krstic. PID tuning using extremum seeking - Online, model-free performance optimization. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 26(1):70–79, February 2006.
- [15] Y. Y. Nie and X. K. Xie. New criteria for polynomial stability. *IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information*, 4(1):1–12, 1987.
- [16] Aidan O’Dwyer. PI and PID controller tuning rules: An overview and personal perspective. 2006.

- [17] Jose Guadalupe Romero, Alejandro Donaire, Romeo Ortega, and Pablo Borja. Global stabilisation of underactuated mechanical systems via PID passivity-based control. *Automatica*, 96:178–185, October 2018.
- [18] Tariq Samad. A survey on industry impact and challenges thereof. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 37(1):17–18, February 2017.
- [19] Oluwasegun Ayokunle Somefun, Kayode Akingbade, and Folasade Dahunsi. The dilemma of PID tuning. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 52:65–74, 2021.
- [20] Yongduan Song, Xiucui Huang, and Changyun Wen. Robust adaptive fault-tolerant PID control of MIMO nonlinear systems with unknown control direction. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 64(6):4876–4884, June 2017.
- [21] Honghai Wang, Qing-Long Han, Jianchang Liu, and Dakuo He. Discrete-time filter proportional-integral-derivative controller design for linear time-invariant systems. *Automatica*, 116:108918, June 2020.
- [22] Cheng-Ching Yu. *Autotuning of PID Controllers: A Relay Feedback Approach*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [23] Jinke Zhang and Lei Guo. Theory and design of PID controller for nonlinear uncertain systems. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 3(3):643–648, July 2019.
- [24] Jinke Zhang, Cheng Zhao, and Lei Guo. On PID control theory for non-affine uncertain stochastic systems. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 36(1):165–186, 2023.
- [25] Cheng Zhao and Lei Guo. PID controller design for second order nonlinear uncertain systems. *Science China-Information Sciences*, 60(2):022201, February 2017.
- [26] Cheng Zhao and Lei Guo. Control of nonlinear uncertain systems by extended PID. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(8):3840–3847, August 2021.
- [27] Cheng Zhao and Lei Guo. Towards a theoretical foundation of PID control for uncertain nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 142:110360, 2022.
- [28] Cheng Zhao and Shuo Yuan. Tracking performance of PID for nonlinear stochastic systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10537*, 2023.
- [29] Cheng Zhao and Yanbin Zhang. Understanding the capability of PD control for uncertain stochastic systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pages 1–8, DOI:10.1109/TAC.2023.3266508, 2023.
- [30] Jg Ziegler and Nb Nichols. Optimum settings for automatic controllers. *Journal of Dynamic Systems Measurement and Control-Transactions of the Asme*, 115(2B):220–222, June 1993.