STABILIZABILITY BASED STATE SPACE REDUCTIONS FOR HYBRID SYSTEMS [1]

Elena De Santis, Maria Domenica Di Benedetto, Giordano Pola

Center of Excellence DEWS
Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
University of L'Aquila
Monteluco di Roio, 67040 L'Aquila, Italy
{desantis,dibenede,pola}@ing.univaq.it

Abstract: In this paper, we focus on a particular subclass of hybrid systems, the class of linear switching systems. We propose hybrid state space decompositions, based on hybrid invariant subspaces, which reduce the computational effort required for checking the structural property of asymptotic stabilizability.

Keywords: Switching systems, asymptotic stabilizability, state space reduction, Kalman decomposition.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we focus on a subclass of hybrid systems, the class of linear switching systems [3], where the continuous dynamics and the reset functions are linear and the transitions depend only on an event that acts as a discrete disturbance. The continuous dynamics are given by a linear dynamical control system (whose dynamical matrices depend on the current discrete state) and therefore an input function can be designed for controlling purposes.

Stability issues of hybrid systems have been extensively investigated in the last years (see e.g. in [2], [14], [9], [13] and references therein). However checking stabilizability of switching systems is not an easy task in general (see e.g. [9]) and a complete characterization of stabilizability properties of switching systems is still missing. This is the reason why in this paper we focus on some structural reductions of the hybrid state space, which allow the original problem to be split into simpler subproblems. Moreover connections to the well–known Kalman decomposition of linear dynamical control systems are also established. Dual results on detectability based state space reductions have been recently established in a companion paper [5].

The organization of the paper is as follows. We first recall some definitions of switching systems and stabilizability in Section 2. Then we define in Section 3 invariant hybrid subspaces, thereby extending to the hybrid framework the notions given in [1] for the linear case, and we propose an algorithm for the computation of the minimal invariant hybrid subspace containing a given hybrid subspace. In Section 4, by means of this minimal hybrid subspace, we define a state space transformation of the system, which allows stating conditions for stabilizability. Based on this result and on [7], the given system is decoupled into controlled and autonomous linear switching subsystems. The asymptotic stabilizability of the first ones and the asymptotic stability of the latter ones

[1] This work has been partially supported by the HYCON Network of Excellence, contract number FP6-IST-511368 and by Ministero dell'Istruzione dell'Universita' e della Ricerca under Projects MACSI and SCEF (PRIN05).

imply the asymptotic stabilizability of the given system. Some concluding remarks are offered in Section 6. The results are given without proof for lack of space. A full version of this paper can be found in [8].

2. SWITCHING SYSTEMS

In this section, we formally introduce the class of *linear switching systems* and the structural property of asymptotic stabilizability.

The hybrid state ξ of a linear switching system is composed of two components: the discrete state q_i, belonging to a finite set Q and the continuous state x, belonging to a linear space $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, whose dimension n_i depends on q_i. The evolution of the discrete state is governed by a Finite State Machine (FSM); a transition $e = (q_i, \sigma, q_h)$ may occur at time t from the discrete state q_i to the discrete state q_h, if the discrete disturbance σ occurs at time t. The evolution of the continuous state is described by a set of linear dynamical systems, whose matrices depend on the current discrete state q_i. Whenever a transition e occurs, the continuous state x is instantly reset to a new value $R(e)x$, where $R(e)$ is a matrix depending on the transition e. More formally,

Definition 1. A linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$ is a tuple

$$(\Xi, \Theta, S, E, R),$$

where:

- $\Xi = \bigcup_{q_i \in Q} \{q_i\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is the hybrid state space, where:
  - $Q = \{q_i, i \in J\}$ is the set of discrete states, $J = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$;
  - $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is the continuous state space associated with the discrete state $q_i \in Q$;
- $\Theta = \Sigma \times U$ is the hybrid input space, where:
  - $\Sigma = \{\sigma_h, h \in J_1\}$ is the set of discrete disturbances, $J_1 = \{1, 2, \ldots, N_1\}$;
  - $U = \mathbb{R}^m$ is the continuous input space;
- S is a map associating to any discrete state $q_i \in Q$ the following linear dynamical control system:

  $$\dot{x}(t) = A_i x(t) + B_i u(t),$$

  where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is the continuous state, and u is the continuous input function;
- $E \subset Q \times \Sigma \times Q$ is a collection of transitions;
- R is a function that associates to any $e = (q_i, \sigma, q_h) \in E$ the reset matrix $R(e) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_h \times n_i}$.

A linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$ is said to be *autonomous* if $U = \{0\}$.

We now formally define the semantics of linear switching systems. First of all we assume throughout the paper that *the discrete disturbance is not available for measurements*, thus yielding a non–deterministic system, and that the class of admissible continuous inputs is the set $\mathcal{U}$ of piecewise continuous control functions $u : \mathbb{R} \to U$. As defined in [10], a *hybrid time basis* τ is an infinite or finite sequence of sets $I_j = \{t \in \mathbb{R} : t_j \leq t \leq t'_j\}$, with $t'_j = t_{j+1}$; set $card(\tau) = L + 1$. If $L < \infty$, then t'_L can be finite or infinite. A hybrid time basis τ is said to be *finite*, if $L < \infty$ and $t'_L < \infty$ and *infinite*, otherwise. Given a hybrid time basis τ, any time instant t'_j is called *switching time*. Since linear switching systems are time invariant, we assume without loss of generality that $t_0 = 0$ in any hybrid time basis. Throughout the paper, we assume that there is a minimum time separation between two consecutive switching times:

Assumption 1 (*Minimum dwell time*) There exists a real $\delta_m > 0$, called minimum dwell time [11], such that for any hybrid time basis τ, $t'_j - t_j \geq \delta_m$.

The existence of a minimum dwell time is a widely used assumption in the analysis of switching systems (e.g. [11], [9], [6] and the references therein), and models the inertia of the system to react to an external (discrete) input. Denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the set of all hybrid time bases satisfying Assumption 1. The temporal evolution of a linear switching system can be now defined as follows.

Definition 2. (Switching system execution) An execution χ of a linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$ is a collection $(\xi_0, \tau, \sigma, u, \xi)$ with $\xi_0 \in \Xi$, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \to \Sigma$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $\xi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N} \to \Xi$. The hybrid state evolution ξ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\xi(0,0) = \xi_0, \\
&\xi(t,j) = (q(j), x(t,j)), t \in I_j, j = 0, 1, ..., L, \\
&\xi(t_{j+1}, j+1) = (q(j+1), R(e_j) x(t'_j, j)), \\
&j = 0, 1, ..., L,
\end{aligned}$$

where $q : \mathbb{N} \to Q$, $e_j = (q(j), \sigma(j), q(j+1)) \in E$ and $x(t,j)$ is the solution at time t of the dynamical system $S(q(j))$, with initial time t_j, initial condition $x(t_j, j)$ and continuous input u.

Remark 1. The class of linear switching systems is related to the class of *linear switched systems*, which has been extensively studied in the literature (see e.g. [13] and the references therein). While in a switching system transitions are caused by discrete disturbances, in a switched system they are caused by discrete inputs (i.e. discrete controls). A formal definition of switched systems can be obtained from Definition 1 by assuming that Σ is the set of discrete inputs. The semantics of switched systems is formally specified by Definition 2, where $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \to \Sigma$ is a discrete input function. The notion of switched systems obtained by Definition 1 generalizes the models of [13], where transitions are defined between every pair of discrete states and the reset matrix is the identity.

Given $\mathcal{S}$ and an execution χ, set $\eta(t) = \xi(t, j)$, $t \in [t_j, t'_j)$, $j = 0, 1, ..., L$. We assume that *the hybrid state evolution is available for control synthesis*: the set

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{ \eta|_{[0,t]}, \eta : \mathbb{R} \to \Xi, t \geq 0\}$$

embeds all the information on the hybrid state evolution available for control purposes. A *control strategy* φ is a function $\varphi : \mathcal{Y} \to U$ such that the function defined by $u(t) = \varphi(\eta|_{[0,t]})$, $t \geq 0$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. A switching system $\mathcal{S}$ together with a control strategy φ is called *controlled switching system* and its executions with $u(t) = \varphi(\eta|_{[0,t]})$, $t \geq 0$ are called *controlled executions.*

We can now formally introduce our definition of asymptotic stabilizability. Let be

$$\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{q_i \in Q} \{q_i\} \times \mathcal{B}_i,$$

where $\mathcal{B}_i = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} : \|x\|_{n_i} \leq 1\}$ for any $i \in J$ and set $\varepsilon\mathcal{B} := \bigcup_{q_i \in Q} \{q_i\} \times \varepsilon\mathcal{B}_i$ for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

Definition 3. (*Asymptotic Stabilizability*) A linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$ is asymptotically stabilizable if there exists a control strategy φ such that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ and for all controlled executions of $\mathcal{S}$ with initial hybrid state in $\mathcal{B}$, there exists $\hat{t} > 0$ such that:

$$\xi(t, j) \in \varepsilon\mathcal{B}, \qquad \forall t \in I_j \cap [\hat{t}, \infty),\ \forall j = \hat{\jmath}, ...L,$$

where $\hat{\jmath} = \min\{j : \hat{t} \in I_j\}$. The control strategy φ is called stabilizing. If the condition above holds with $\varepsilon = 0$, then $\mathcal{S}$ is called controllable.

Remark 2. From the definition above, it is easy to see that a linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$ with minimum dwell time $\delta_m > 0$ is controllable if and only if any linear system $S(q)$, $q \in Q$ is controllable.

An asymptotically stabilizable autonomous linear switching system is said to be *asymptotically stable.*

Since our purpose is to reduce the state space while preserving stabilizability (hence an asymptotic property), we consider only executions of infinite duration.

3. INVARIANT HYBRID SUBSPACES

Aim of this section is to introduce an invariant linear hybrid subspace that will be the basis upon which stabilizability analysis for linear switching systems can be performed.

The notion of invariant linear subspace for switching systems can be defined as follows.

Definition 4. A set

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{i \in J'} \{q_i\} \times \Omega_i \subset \Xi$$

is a hybrid linear subspace of Ξ, if $J' = J$ and Ω_i is a linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, for any $i \in J$.

For shortness, a hybrid linear subspace will be simply called subspace.

Definition 5. Given a switching system $\mathcal{S}$, a set

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{i \in J} \{q_i\} \times \Omega_i \subset \Xi,$$

is $\mathcal{S}-$invariant if, for any initial hybrid state $\xi_0 \in \Omega$ and for any execution $\chi = (\xi_0, \tau, \sigma, u, \xi)$ with $u(t) = 0, \forall t \geq 0$,

$$\xi(t, j) \in \Omega,\ \forall t \in I_j,\ \forall j = 0, 1, ..., L.$$

The following result gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a subspace to be $\mathcal{S}-$invariant.

Proposition 1. Given a switching system $\mathcal{S}$, a subspace $\bigcup_{i \in J} \{q_i\} \times \Omega_i$ is $\mathcal{S}-$invariant if and only if for any $i \in J$ the following conditions hold:

- $A_i\Omega_i \subset \Omega_i$;
- $R(e)\Omega_i \subset \Omega_h$, for any $e = (q_i, \sigma, q_h) \in E$.

Since the intersection of any two $\mathcal{S}-$invariant subspaces is an $\mathcal{S}-$invariant subspace, the minimal $\mathcal{S}-$invariant subspace containing a given subspace is well defined.

Let

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{i \in J} \{q_i\} \times \mathcal{G}_i \qquad (1)$$

be the minimal $\mathcal{S}-$invariant subspace containing

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigcup_{i \in J} \{q_i\} \times \mathrm{Im}\,(B_i)\,.$$

For any $i \in J$, let

$$\mathcal{C}_i = (\ B_i\ \ A_iB_i\ \ \ldots\ \ A_i^{n_i-1}B_i\ )$$

be the controllability matrix associated with the linear system $S(q_i)$ and set

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{i \in J} \{q_i\} \times \mathcal{R}_i,$$

where $\mathcal{R}_i = \mathrm{Im}\,(\mathcal{C}_i)$. The following result holds.

Lemma 2. The set $\mathcal{G}$ is the minimal $\mathcal{S}-$invariant subspace that contains the hybrid subspace $\mathcal{R}$.

The following result illustrates a procedure for computing $\mathcal{G}$ in a finite number of steps.

Theorem 3. Given $\mathcal{S}$, define the sequence of subspaces $\Omega_i^k \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, $i \in J$, as

$$\Omega_i^0 = \mathcal{R}_i,$$
$$\Omega_i^k = \sum_{h=0}^{n_i-1} (A_i)^h \, \Phi_i^k$$
$$\Phi_i^k = \sum_{j \in J_i} R((q_j, \sigma, q_i))\Omega_j^{k-1} + \Omega_i^{k-1}$$

where $J_i = \{j \in J : (q_j, \sigma, q_i) \in E\}$. The sequence $\{\Omega_i^k, i \in J\}_{k=0,1,2,\ldots}$ converges in $k^* \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} n_i$ steps and

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{i \in J} \{q_i\} \times \Omega_i^{k^*}.$$

By definition, the discrete evolution of the switching system $\mathcal{S} = (\Xi, \Theta, S, E, R)$ is described by the FSM (Q, Σ, E). We recall that the FSM is said to be *strongly connected* if there exists a path between any pair of discrete states in Q. We conclude this section by giving the following result.

Proposition 4. If $n_i = n$ for any $i \in J$, if $R(e) = I$ for any $e \in E$, and if (Q, Σ, E) is strongly connected, then

$$\mathcal{G} = Q \times \widehat{\mathcal{G}},$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{G}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the minimal linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying for any $i \in J$ the following conditions:

$$A_i \widehat{\mathcal{G}} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{G}}; \;\; \mathrm{Im}\,(B_i) \subset \widehat{\mathcal{G}}.$$

Remark 3. The subspace $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ coincides with the 'multiple controllable subspace', as defined in [13] in the framework of switched linear systems (see also Remark 1).

4. STATE SPACE REDUCTIONS BASED ON STABILIZABILITY

It is well–known that a linear system S is asymptotically stabilizable if and only if a suitable subsystem extracted from S is asymptotically stable. In the context of general switching systems, stabilizability conditions become a bit more involved.

In this section, we show how to extract from a given linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$, a number of subsystems so that the stabilizability of some of them and the asymptotic stability of the remaining ones imply the stabilizability of $\mathcal{S}$. This reduces the computational effort required for checking the property under consideration.

Our procedure is based on the reduction of the state space of the linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$ by means of the invariant hybrid subspace $\mathcal{G}$, as defined in the previous section.

Given the hybrid invariant subspace $\mathcal{G}$ as in (1), let $\mu_i \leq n_i$ be the dimension of $\mathcal{G}_i$ and define a hybrid state space transformation for $\mathcal{S}$, as follows. For each $i \in J$, consider the matrix:

$$T_i = \left(b_1^i \ldots b_{\mu_i}^i \;\; v_1^i \ldots v_{n_i-\mu_i}^i\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i},$$

where the vectors $b_1^i, \ldots, b_{\mu_i}^i$ are a basis for $\mathcal{G}_i$ and the vectors $v_1^i, \ldots, v_{n_i-\mu_i}^i$ are such that T_i is full rank. Then the matrices:

$$\widehat{A}_i = T_i^{-1} A_i T_i,$$
$$\widehat{B}_i = T_i^{-1} B_i, i \in J$$
$$\widehat{R}(e) = T_h^{-1} R(e) T_i, e = (q_i, \sigma, q_h),$$

take the form:

$$\widehat{A}_i = \begin{pmatrix} A_i^{(11)} & A_i^{(12)} \\ 0 & A_i^{(22)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \widehat{B}_i = \begin{pmatrix} B_i^{(1)} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\widehat{R}(e) = \begin{pmatrix} R_e^{(11)} & R_e^{(12)} \\ 0 & R_e^{(22)} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_i^{(11)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mu_i \times \mu_i}$. The switching system obtained after the hybrid state space transformation is algebraically equivalent [12] to the switching system $\mathcal{S}$. Note that, in general, the pair $(A_i^{(11)}, B_i^{(1)})$ is not controllable.

We introduce the following technical assumption that will be removed at the end of this section.

Assumption 2 For any $i \in J$, $0 \leq \mu_i < n_i$.

Under Assumption 2, we can define the following autonomous linear switching system (uncontrollable subsystem of $\mathcal{S}$):

$$\mathcal{S}_{un} = (\Xi_{un}, \Theta, S_{un}, E, R_{un}),$$

where:

- $\Xi_{un} = \bigcup_{i \in J} \{q_i\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_i - \mu_i}$;
- for any $q_i \in Q$, $S_{un}(q_i)$ is described by the equation:
$$\dot{z}(t) = A_i^{(22)} z(t);$$
- for any $e \in E$, $R_{un}(e) = R_e^{(22)}$.

The following result gives a relationship between stabilizability properties of $\mathcal{S}$ and stability properties of $\mathcal{S}_{un}$.

Theorem 5. If Assumption 2 holds, then $\mathcal{S}$ is asymptotically stabilizable only if $\mathcal{S}_{un}$ is asymptotically stable.

A stronger result can be assessed under the following additional assumption that will be removed at the end of this section:

Assumption 3 For any $i \in J$, $0 < \mu_i \leq n_i$.

Note that if $\mu_i = 0$, then $B_i = 0$ and any continuous state in $\mathcal{G}_h$ is reset to the origin after any transition of the form $(q_h, \sigma, q_i) \in E$.

Under Assumption 3, we can define the linear switching system (controlled subsystem of $\mathcal{S}$):

$$\mathcal{S}_c = (\Xi_c, \Theta, S_c, E, R_c),$$

where:

- $\Xi_c = \bigcup_{i \in J} \{q_i\} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mu_i}$;
- for any $q_i \in Q$, $S_c(q_i)$ is described by the equation:

$$\dot{z}(t) = A_i^{(11)} z(t) + B_i^{(1)} u(t);$$

- for any $e \in E$, $R_c(e) = R_e^{(11)}$.

On the basis of the above decomposition, we now show that the asymptotic stabilizability of $\mathcal{S}$ can be reduced to the asymptotic stabilizability of $\mathcal{S}_c$ and the asymptotic stability of $\mathcal{S}_{un}$.

Theorem 6. If Assumptions 2 and 3 hold, then $\mathcal{S}$ is asymptotically stabilizable if and only if $\mathcal{S}_c$ is asymptotically stabilizable and $\mathcal{S}_{un}$ is asymptotically stable.

The result above clearly links to the classical *Kalman decomposition* of linear systems. We now show that the Kalman decomposition–based stabilizability characterization of linear systems can be extended to switching systems. We first need to introduce a particular class of controls. A control strategy φ is said to be a *static hybrid linear state feedback*, if for any discrete state $q_i \in Q$, there exists a matrix $K_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_i}$ such that:

$$\varphi(\eta|_{[0,t]}) = K_i x(t, j),$$
$$\eta(t) = (q_i, x(t, j)).$$

A switching system $\mathcal{S}$ is said to be *asymptotically stabilizable via static hybrid linear state feedback* if it is asymptotically stabilizable and the stabilizing control strategy is a static hybrid linear state feedback.

The following result shows that, under appropriate assumptions, the switching system $\mathcal{S}$ is asymptotically stabilizable if and only if $\mathcal{S}_{un}$ is asymptotically stable.

Proposition 7. If Assumptions 2 and 3 hold and if

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{R}, \qquad (2)$$

then $\mathcal{S}$ is asymptotically stabilizable if and only if $\mathcal{S}_{un}$ is asymptotically stable. Moreover, in this case, $\mathcal{S}$ is asymptotically stabilizable via static hybrid linear state feedback.

Even if condition (2) is not satisfied, some conditions on the switching system are given in [4], under which asymptotic stabilizability of $\mathcal{S}$ is implied by asymptotic stability of $\mathcal{S}_{un}$.

We conclude this section by removing Assumptions 2 and 3. We illustrate our result by means of a procedure that reduces step by step the computational effort required for checking stabilizability of linear switching systems.

In the following, 'controllable location' means a discrete state $q_i \in Q$ whose associated linear system $S(q_i)$ is controllable. A strongly connected component of the linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$ is a linear switching subsystem, whose FSM is a strongly connected component of the FSM associated with $\mathcal{S}$; such a system will be called maximal when its discrete state space is the maximal subset of Q having the property above.

Given a linear switching system $\mathcal{S} = (\Xi, \Theta, S, E, R)$, define the restriction of $\mathcal{S}$ to a subset Q' of Q as a linear switching system:

$$\mathcal{S}' = (\Xi', \Theta, S', E', R'),$$

where:

$$\Xi' = \bigcup_{q_i \in Q'} \{q_i\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_i};$$
$$S'(q) = S(q), \forall q \in Q';$$
$$E' = \{(q_i, \sigma, q_h) \in E : q_i, q_h \in Q'\};$$
$$R'(e) = R(e), \forall e \in E'.$$

Removing locations in $Q'' \subset Q$ from $\mathcal{S}$ means defining the restriction of $\mathcal{S}$ to $Q' = Q \backslash Q''$.

Procedure (Stabilizability-based Reduction)

(1) Given a linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$, let Q_1 be the set of discrete states $q \in Q$ such that $S(q)$ is not controllable.
(2) If $Q_1 = \varnothing$ then **STOP**: **$\mathcal{S}$ is controllable**. Otherwise let $\mathcal{S}_1$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{S}$ to Q_1.
(3) Compute the maximal strongly connected components $\mathcal{F}_i$, $i \in J^1$, of $\mathcal{S}_1$ ($\mathcal{S}_1$ is asymptotically stabilizable if and only if each $\mathcal{F}_i$ is asymptotically stabilizable [7]); let $J_{\mathcal{F}_i}$ be the index set associated with the discrete states of $\mathcal{F}_i$, for any $i \in J^1$.
(4) Compute the invariant subspace $\mathcal{G}^{(i)} = \bigcup_{h \in J_{\mathcal{F}_i}} \{q_h\} \times \mathcal{G}_h^{(i)}$, for each strongly connected component $\mathcal{F}_i$. Let $\mathcal{S}_c^{(i)}$ be the controlled subsystem of $\mathcal{F}'_i$, $i \in J^1$, where $\mathcal{F}'_i$ is obtained by removing the locations q_h with $\mathcal{G}_h^{(i)} = \{0\}$ from $\mathcal{F}_i$.
(5) If $\mathcal{S}_c^{(i)}$ is not asymptotically stabilizable for some $i \in J^1$, then **STOP**: **$\mathcal{S}$ is not asymptotically stabilizable**.
(6) Remove the locations q_h, $h \in J_{\mathcal{F}_i}$, for which $\mathcal{G}_h^{(i)} = \mathbb{R}^{n_h}$ (for any execution with initial discrete state q_h the hybrid state remains in $\mathcal{G}^{(i)}$, for any control action. Since $\mathcal{S}_c^{(i)}$ is asymptotically stabilizable, then q_h can be removed [7]). Let Q_2 be the reduced discrete state space.
(7) If $Q_2 = \varnothing$ then **STOP**: **$\mathcal{S}$ is asymptotically stabilizable**. Otherwise let $\mathcal{S}_2$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{S}_1$ to Q_2.
(8) Compute the maximal strongly connected components $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_i$, $i \in J^2$, of $\mathcal{S}_2$.

(9) Compute the invariant subspace $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^{(i)}$, for each $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_i$. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_{un}^{(i)}$, $i \in J^2$ be the uncontrolled subsystems of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_i$.

(10) **STOP**: Return $\left\{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_{un}^{(i)}, i \in J^2\right\}$.

On the basis of the procedure above we can give the last result that generalizes Theorem 6 to the case where Assumptions 2 and 3 are not satisfied. Since controllability implies stabilizability, and controllability is easy to check (cf. Remark 2), in the following theorem we assume that $\mathcal{S}$ is not controllable.

Theorem 8. A noncontrollable linear switching system $\mathcal{S}$ is asymptotically stabilizable if and only if the linear switching system $\mathcal{S}_c^{(i)}$ is asymptotically stabilizable $\forall i \in J^1$ and the linear switching system $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_{un}^{(i)}$ is asymptotically stable $\forall i \in J^2$.

This last theorem decomposes the problem of checking stabilizability of a given linear switching system into simpler subproblems. In particular, the given system is decoupled into controlled and autonomous linear switching subsystems. The asymptotic stabilizability of the first ones and the asymptotic stability of the latter ones imply the asymptotic stabilizability of the given system.

Remark 4. The decoupling of Theorem 8 into controlled and autonomous subsystems is not possible, in general, in the case of switched systems, since the transitions are controlled. In fact, for the special class of switched systems where the continuous dynamical systems share the same matrix A, i.e. $A(q) = A, \forall q \in Q$, it was shown in [13] that the asymptotic stability of $\mathcal{S}_{un}$ (that in fact reduces to an autonomous linear system) implies the stabilizability of the given switched system.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we considered linear switching systems and proposed some state space decompositions, based on hybrid invariant subspaces, which yield a complexity reduction in checking stabilizability. The given system is decoupled into controlled and autonomous linear switching subsystems. The asymptotic stabilizability of the first ones and the asymptotic stability of the latter ones imply and is implied by the asymptotic stabilizability of the given system.

REFERENCES

[1] Basile G., Marro G., Controlled and conditioned invariant subspaces in linear system theory, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 3(5), 1969.

[2] Branicky M.S., Multiple Lyapunov function and other analysis tools for switched and hybrid systems. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 43:475–482, 1998.

[3] De Santis E., Di Benedetto M.D., Berardi L., Computation of maximal safe sets for switching linear systems, *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 49(2):184–195, 2004.

[4] De Santis E., Di Benedetto M.D., Pola G., Can linear stabilizability analysis be generalized to switching systems?, Proc. of Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems (MTNS 04), Leuven (Belgium), July 5–9, 2004. (also available from www.diel.univaq.it/tr/web/web_search_tr.php).

[5] De Santis E., Di Benedetto M.D., Pola G., Detectability based state space reductions for hybrid systems, 17–th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Network and Systems, Kyoto, Japan, July 24–28, 2006.

[6] De Santis E., Di Benedetto M.D., Pola G., Digital Idle Speed Control of Automotive Engine: A Safety Problem for Hybrid Systems, Nonlinear Analysis, Special Issue Hybrid Systems and Applications, 2006. To Appear.

[7] De Santis E., Di Benedetto M.D., Theory and computation of discrete state space decompositions for a class of hybrid systems, (submitted) (also available from www.diel.univaq.it/tr/web/web_search_tr.php), 2006.

[8] De Santis E., Di Benedetto M.D., Pola G., Stabilizability based state space reduction for hybrid systems, (also available from www.diel.univaq.it/tr/web/web_search_tr.php), 2006.

[9] Liberzon D., Switching in Systems and Control, Birkhauser, Boston, MA, Volume in series Systems and Control: Foundations and Applications. ISBN 0-8176-4297-8, June 2003.

[10] Lygeros J., Tomlin C., Sastry S., Controllers for reachability specifications for hybrid systems, *Automatica*, Special Issue on Hybrid Systems, 35:349–370, 1999.

[11] Morse A.S., Supervisory control of families of linear set–point controllers– part 1: exact matching. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 41(10):1413–1431, 1996.

[12] Pola G., van der Schaft A.J., Di Benedetto M.D., Equivalence of Switching Linear Systems by Bisimulation, *International Journal of Control*, 79(1):74–92, January 2006.

[13] Sun Z., Ge S.S., Switched Linear Systems – Control and Design, Communication and Control Engineering Series, Springer, 2005.

[14] Ye H., Michel A.N., Hou L., Stability theory for hybrid dynamical systems. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 43:461–474, 1998.