

Delft University of Technology

Adaptive pulse width modulation design for power converters based on affine switched systems

Baldi, Simone; Papachristodoulou, Antonis; Kosmatopoulos, Elias B.

DOI 10.1016/j.nahs.2018.07.002

Publication date 2018 **Document Version** Accepted author manuscript

Published in Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems

Citation (APA)

Baldi, S., Papachristodoulou, A., & Kosmatopoulos, E. B. (2018). Adaptive pulse width modulation design for power converters based on affine switched systems. Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems, 30, 306-322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nahs.2018.07.002

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable). Please check the document version above.

Copyright Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Adaptive pulse width modulation design for power converters based on affine switched systems

Simone Baldi^{a,*}, Antonis Papachristodoulou^b, Elias B. Kosmatopoulos^c

^a Delft Center for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, Delft 2628CD, The Netherlands

^b Department of Engineering Science, Control Group, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PJ, U.K.

^c Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Democritus University of Thrace, Xanthi 67100, Greece and

Informatics & Telematics Institute, Center for Research and Technology Hellas (ITI-CERTH), Thessaloniki 57001, Greece

8 Abstract

3

Δ

5

6

7

In this work we propose a novel adaptive switching strategy for the design of pulse width modulation signals in power converters. Instead of an uncertain averaged model of the power converter, an uncertain switched model is considered, which can better represent the actual power converter dynamics. Uncertainties in the power converters parameters are handled via an adaptive control approach, and all circuit parameters of the switched model are assumed to be unknown (including the load and parasitic effects). After defining the pulse width modulation in terms of a reverse mode-dependent dwell time, an elementarytime-unit Lyapunov function is used to derive a set of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) based on global uniformly ultimately boundedness of the switched system. The LMIs are solved in an adaptive fashion using an exploitation-exploration mechanism: exploitation is achieved by solving the LMIs based on the estimated switched model, while exploration is achieved by a persistently exciting input voltage source, which guarantees convergence of the estimated parameters to the true system parameters.

9 Keywords: Adaptive Control, Switched Systems, Mode-dependent Dwell Time, Power Converters

10 1. Introduction

Switching-mode devices are crucial in many applications in industrial and power electronics. The use of 11 pulse width modulation (PWM) signals to drive the switching behavior is the key in the conversion between 12 direct current voltages in DC-DC power converters. In such devices, the switching PWM signal has to be 13 generated to regulate an output voltage, despite of changes in the load [1, 2]. Different control designs to 14 generate the PWM consider an averaged model for the converter [3]. This modeling approach averages 15 the switching dynamics over the period of the pulse signal. The main advantage of averaged dynamics is 16 their suitability for existing control designs, e.g. power converters with bilinear averaged dynamics have 17 been analyzed by using Hamiltonian methods [4]. If the PWM signal is of sufficiently high frequency, the 18 behavior of the averaged system will be close to the behavior of the original switching-mode converter. 19 However, in case some of the assumptions for the averaged model do not hold, e.g. if the PWM is not of 20 high frequency, a hybrid (switched) model for the converter is preferred and the development of a control 21 design strategy for this switched model is of utmost importance [5]. 22

^{*}Corresponding author. Tel.: +31 15 2781823

Email addresses: s.baldi@tudelft.nl (Simone Baldi), antonis@eng.ox.ac.uk (Antonis Papachristodoulou), kosmatop@iti.gr (Elias B. Kosmatopoulos)

As an example, let us focus on the boost converter, whose averaged and switched models are described 23 in Appendix A with parameters as in Section VI. To explain the mechanism through which a desired voltage 24 is achieved, we illustrate the behavior arising by switching from one mode to the other and compare it with 25 the averaged model behavior. Figs. 1(a) and 1(b) show the phase plane of the two modes of the boost 26 converter (mode 1 and 0, with closed and open switch respectively). Both modes have a stable equilibrium, 27 with the first mode having two real eigenvalues, and the second mode having a pair of complex conjugate 28 eigenvalues. When the two modes are combined via the duty cycle, the trajectories switch from the first to 29 the second mode and vice versa. The resulting dynamics can be represented by the switched system 30

$$\dot{x}(t) = A_{\sigma(t)}x(t) + E_{\sigma(t)}v_s, \quad \sigma(t) \in \{1, 0\},$$
(1)

where the signal $\sigma(t)$ is a time-dependent signal that determines at every time the switching between closed ($\sigma(t) = 1$) and open switch ($\sigma(t) = 0$); the matrices A_{σ} and E_{σ} contain the parameters of the boost converter operating in mode σ (cf. Appendix A); the state $x = [i_L v_{out}]'$ is a bidimensional vector composed of the inductor current i_L and output voltage v_{out} ; and v_s is the (typically constant) input voltage.

Switching with a certain duty cycle *D* between the two modes makes the trajectories converge to a limit cycle, as shown in Figs. 1(c) and 1(d), which have been obtained for $v_s = 12V$ and D = 0.5. On the other hand, according to the averaged model of the boost converter (see its derivation in (A.3)), instead



Figure 1: Phase plane of the two stand-alone modes, and of the switched model with duty cycle D = 0.5 (the ideal state is indicated with a star, and the equilibrium of the averaged model with a circle)

of converging to a limit cycle, the trajectories will converge to an isolated fixed point, indicated with a 38 circle in Figs. 1(c) and 1(d). Since $v_s = 12V$ and D = 0.5, ideally, one would expect to cycle around 39 $v_{out_{des}} = v_s/(1-D) = 24$ V. However, a first crucial observation is that, due to non-ideal effects like parasitic 40 losses, the limit cycle obtained with the ideal duty cycle can be far from the desired output voltage (indicated 41 with a star in Fig. 1(c)). Figs. 1(c) and 1(d) have been obtained with a switching period of 65μ s. By keeping 42 the same duty cycle and decreasing the period, the oscillations can be made smaller and smaller, and the 43 trajectories of the switched model (1) will converge to that of the averaged model, as depicted in Fig. 2. 44 A second observation follows: for not sufficiently high frequency, the fixed point of the averaged model 45 can be far from the actual limit cycle of the power converter. Therefore, in general, the switched model (1) 46 can describe the evolution of voltage and current in a real converter better than its corresponding averaged 47 model. From here the focus of this work on controlling such switched models. 48



Figure 2: Limit cycle for D = 0.5 and different periods (the equilibrium of the averaged model is indicated with a circle)

49 1.1. Switched dynamics, parametric uncertainty and related work

The last years have witnessed the increasing interest of the scientific community in the study of switched 50 systems [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11], with applications to power converters, see [12, 13, 14, 15] and reference therein. 51 Most approaches for stability and stabilization of switched systems are based on deriving common or multi-52 ple Lyapunov functions, resulting from the solution of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs). When considering 53 power converters however, some peculiar characteristics of such devices should be considered: in [12] a 54 set of attainable equilibrium points that can be reached from any initial condition of the power converter 55 is calculated, and a switched control technique is developed to reach those equilibria. However, in [12] 56 asymptotic stability is considered, whereas Figs. 1(c) and 1(d) reveal that, due to finite switching frequency, 57 no desired state can be reached asymptotically. In fact, as recognized in [13], asymptotic stability requires 58 null intervals between switching times: to ensure a minimum time until switching, [13] uses a delay or a 59 dead zone. The technique in [14] can also ensure a minimum time between switching, since a discrete-time 60 approach is used to characterize the power converter limit cycle: the limit cycle is viewed as an attractor for 61 which stability results are established. The PWM approach in [15] results in a practically stable strategy, 62 where a sliding-mode-like strategy is used till a uniform lower bound on the dwell time is attained. 63

64 While capturing the essence of the power converter switched behavior, the aforementioned works ne-65 glect a crucial point: a relevant aspect of an effective power converter control law is robustness against

parameter uncertainty. Even two 'identical' power converters will be subject to process variance intrinsic 66 to device fabrication. Therefore, parametric uncertainty should be taken into account by the control de-67 sign. Parametric uncertainty can be tackled either via a robust [16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21] or via an adaptive 68 [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] control approach. Using an averaged model, in [16] a robust linear quadratic regula-69 tion (LQR) problem is formulated via LMIs, while in [17, 18, 19] the minimization of the \mathcal{H}_2 or \mathcal{H}_∞ norms 70 is carried out so as to assure a guaranteed region of stability. Using a switched model, constrained stabi-71 lization of buck converters based on controlled contractive sets have been considered in [20], while model 72 predictive control is considered in [21]. In most robust control approaches the uncertainty set is represented 73 by a polytope inside which admissible values of the uncertain parameters are constrained. However, as the 74 uncertainty increases (in terms of number of uncertain parameters or size of the uncertainty), lower per-75 formance level can be assured. For this reason, in robust control techniques, the uncertainty is limited to 76 a couple of parameters, typically the resistance load and the nominal duty cycle. Adaptive control strate-77 gies may deal with larger parametric uncertainties than robust control. In [22] a model reference adaptive 78 controller for the averaged model of a full-bridge buck inverter has been proposed based on minimal con-79 troller synthesis. Bilinear dynamics of averaged power converter models have been handled, e.g. via fuzzy 80 neural network control [23] or in the energy-shaping Hamiltonian framework [24]. Other adaptive control 81 techniques include adaptive backstepping [25], dead-beat self-tuning [26], or a combination of adaptive and 82 stabilizing compensators [27]. The work in [28] sits at the boundary between adaptive and robust control, 83 where a parameter-independent (and thus adaptive by definition) strategy is used for transient control, while 84 a robust Proportional-Integral-Derivative (PID) controller is used after the transient: robustness is implicitly 85 assumed as the PID is in charge of stabilizing the state around several possible working points. 86

While adaptive control has been considered for uncertain but ideal components, an additional source 87 of uncertainty in power converters is given by parasitic effects (e.g. non-ideal switch and diode). The 88 influence of parasitic elements is relevant in terms of final equilibrium value (as shown in Fig. 1(c)). The 89 problem with parasitic effects is that they are in general not known a priori: therefore, model construction 90 via online estimation combined with adaptive control turns out to be a reasonable approach. However, all 91 the aforementioned adaptive approaches use averaging models, and adaptive control using a switched model 92 of the power converter is to the best of the authors' knowledge still an open problem, which motivates this 93 study. In this study we propose an adaptive switching strategy for power converters: the main contribution 94 are: (a) we overcome classical dwell-time ideas in favour of a (reverse) mode-dependent dwell-time strategy 95 that can explicitly define a duty cycle with limited switching frequency; (b) while available sliding-mode 96 or switched limit cycles approaches assume ideal circuit components, in this work we take into account the 97 non-ideal limit cycle behavior of the switched system; (c) while state-of-the-art adaptive approaches handle 98 uncertainties in the averaged model, parametric uncertainty of the switched model (1) is considered here. 99

The approach pursued in this work can be summarized as follows: at first, we illustrate stability criteria for global uniformly ultimately boundedness (GUUB) around the desired state under reverse modedependent dwell time (Section 2), and we cover the parametric estimation of the switched model (Section 3); after formulating the control problem based on an elementary time unit approach (Section 4), a set of LMIs for GUUB is solved online in an adaptive fashion under the assumption verified in practice of a persistently exciting input voltage source, which guarantees convergence of the estimated parameters to the true system parameters (Section 5). Simulations (Section 6) and conclusions (Section 7) are finally presented.

107 2. Notation and preliminary definitions

The purpose of a control strategy in power converters is to decide the time-dependent PWM strategy $\sigma(\cdot)$ switching between the two modes in (1). Therefore, having in mind the mechanism through which convergence to a limit cycle is achieved in power converters, it is important to describe the multiple Lyapunov function tools with which such convergence can be characterized. Most stability results via multiple

112 Lyapunov functions consider regulation to zero of switched systems with stable subsystems, and consider

that switching can be a factor destroying stability: therefore, one should stay enough time on a subsystem

¹¹⁴ before switching to the next one, e.g. according to some dwell-time constraint [7].



Figure 3: Multiple Lyapunov functions for power converters.

However, the peculiarity of power converters is that the desired state is in general not a fixed point of the 115 single subsystems (cf. Figs. 1(a) and 1(b)): as a consequence, the flow of the single subsystems around the 116 desired state is not 'stable'. Despite that, we know that an appropriate switching can stabilize the system (cf. 117 Fig. 1(c)): this implies that switching can be an enabling factor for stability. This is illustrated by Fig. 3: the 118 figure reveals that despite the fact that a Lyapunov function might increase in between switches, the jump 119 effect can compensate for the possible increase, so as to obtain a sequence converging to a neighborhood of 120 the desired state. Fig. 3 illustrates the a reverse dwell time concept (first introduced in [29]), formalizing the 121 fact that switch cannot be 'too slow'. However, classical reverse dwell-time signals are unable to specify a 122 duty cycle [7]: therefore, it is functional to introduce the following extended dwell-time definition: 123

Definition 1. [Reverse mode-dependent dwell time [29, 30]] We say that the switching signal $\sigma(\cdot)$ has a reverse mode-dependent dwell time T_p , $p \in \{1,0\}$, if after the *p*-th subsystem is activated there is a time no larger than T_p before another mode is activated.

Let us consider a fixed switching frequency 1/T for the power converter: since the switching signal can 127 be completely determined by the designer, we assume that subsystems are activated exactly at the maxi-128 mum allowed reverse mode-dependent dwell time T_p . Then, it is straightforward to define the duty cycle 129 in terms of mode-dependent dwell time as follows. Assume the power converter starts in the on-state at 130 time 0 ($\sigma(0) = 1$), and there is a time T_1 before activating the off-state ($\sigma(T_1) = 0$), followed by a time T_0 131 before activating the on-state again ($\sigma(T_1 + T_0) = 1$), and so on periodically: then the period is defined as 132 $T = T_1 + T_0$ and the duty cycle is defined as T_1/T . From now on, we will fix the period T of the PWM 133 strategy, so that determining T_1 will automatically determine T_0 as well. 134

135

The objective of a power converter is to track a certain output voltage: as presented in the introduction, the peculiarity of power converters is that the output voltage is approached with some T-dependent bounded error by switching between the on and off mode. Thus, it makes sense to define the following concept of global uniformly ultimately boundedness:

Definition 2. [Global uniformly ultimately boundedness [31]] The solutions of a system are global uniformly ultimately bounded (GUUB) with respect to a point x_{des} with ultimate bound ε if there exist positive constants ε and δ , independent of $t_0 \ge 0$, and for every $\overline{\varepsilon} \in (0, \delta)$, there is $\overline{t} = \overline{t}(\overline{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon)$, also independent of t_0 such that

$$\|x(t_0) - x_{des}\| \le \overline{\varepsilon} \Rightarrow \|x(t, x_0) - x_{des}\| \le \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \ge t_0 + \overline{t}$$
(2)

and, furthermore, (2) holds for arbitrarily large $\overline{\varepsilon}$.

In the power converter application, the smaller the switching period *T*, the smaller the minimum achievable in (2). With some abuse of the definition, whenever (2) holds, we will say that x_{des} is GUUB. Global uniformly ultimately boundedness under reverse mode-dependent dwell time can be characterized using Lyapunov analysis as stated in the following lemma:

Lemma 1. Consider the switched system (1) and a switching sequence $\{t_0, t_1, ..., t_k, t_{k+1}, ...\}$ generated by $\sigma(\cdot)$ under a PWM strategy. If there exist a pair of continuously differentiable, positive definite, radially unbounded Lyapunov functions $W_p : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$, $p \in \{1,0\}$, functions $\underline{a}, \overline{a} \in \mathscr{K}_{\infty}$, and pairs of positive constants λ_p, μ_p , and $c_p, p \in \{1,0\}$ such that

$$\underline{a}(|x - x_{des}|) \leq W_p(t, x - x_{des}) \leq \overline{a}(|x - x_{des}|), \quad p \in \{1, 0\}
\dot{W}_p(t, x - x_{des}) \leq \lambda_p W_p(t, x - x_{des}) + c_p, \quad p \in \{1, 0\}
W_q(t_k^+, x - x_{des}) \leq \mu_p W_p(t_k^-, x - x_{des}), \quad p \neq q \in \{1, 0\}
\ln \mu_1 + \ln \mu_0 + \lambda_1(t_{k+1} - t_k) + \lambda_0(t_{k+2} - t_{k+1}) < 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_+$$
(3)

where t_k^- and t_k^+ indicate the time instant right before and right after the switching time t_k then, the state x_{des} of the switched system (1) is GUUB.

Proof. See Appendix B for the complete proof. A sketch of the proof is: consider the Lyapunov function 155 $W_{\sigma(t)}(t, x(t) - x_{des})$. The positive λ_p in the second inequality of (3) allows the Lyapunov function to increase 156 in between switching instants, while the third inequality of (3) allows the Lyapunov function to decrease 157 at switching instants (if $0 < \mu_p < 1$) or to bound its increase (if μ_p is slightly larger than 1). The fourth 158 inequality of (3) allows us to select λ_p and μ_p is such a way that increase/decrease mechanism results, 159 overall, in an exponentially decreasing sequence till a bound ε around x_{des} depending on c_p is reached. The 160 level sets of the Lyapunov function can be used to derive the ultimate bound ε guaranteeing $||x - x_{des}|| \le \varepsilon$ 161 (cf. the details in Appendix B for an estimate of ε). 162

Remark 1. Lemma 1 holds for switched models of power converters in the form (1), in view of the existence 163 of limit cycles [1, 2]. In particular, in contrast with linear designs based on average nonlinear (i.e. bilinear) 164 models of power converters which lead to a finite region of attraction [16, 17], Lemma 1 results in global 165 stability and attraction results (valid for the entire state space). With respect to the state of the art, e.g. 166 Theorem 1 in [32], which also uses an increase/decrease mechanism as illustrated in Fig. 3, Lemma 1 167 improves the following points: instead of a reverse dwell time, a reverse mode-dependent dwell time is 168 adopted, so that a duty cycle can be specified; in addition, the last inequality in (3) does not require $\ln \mu_1 +$ 169 $\lambda_1(t_{k+1}-t_k) < 0$ and $\ln \mu_0 + \lambda_0(t_{k+2}-t_{k+1}) < 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ as in in [32]. In other words, the constants μ_p , 170 $p \in \{1, 0\}$ are not required to be both in between 0 and 1. 171

Remark 2. It is clear that according to Lemma 1, it suffices to take c_p large enough to prove GUUB: this would lead to a large bound ε in (2). Therefore, for Lemma 1 to be of practical relevance, one should look for the smallest c_p such that (3) holds, so as to obtain a small bound ε around x_{des} .

In the following we will explain how to deal with parametric uncertainties, a situation faced very often in real applications when all the circuit parameters (inductances, capacitances, resistances) are uncertain or even completely unknown (note that parasitic resistances are extremely difficult to be known).

178 **3.** Parametric model and parameter estimation

In this work we will refer to the boost converter (A.1), (A.2) in Appendix A: however, similar reasoning applies to any converter (e.g. buck and buck-boost) which can be written as a switched system in the form¹

$$\dot{x} = A_{\sigma} x + E_{\sigma} v_s, \tag{4}$$

where $x = [i_L v_{out}]'$ and σ is the time-dependent PWM switching signal to be determined. Note that the models in (A.1), (A.2) contain 8 uncertain parameters (R_{D0} , R_{D1} , R_{S0} , R_{S1} , C, L, R_L , R_{load}). In order to obtain a model which is linear with respect to the parameters, we reparametrize the system by estimating all the nonzero entries of A_1 , B_1 , A_0 , B_0 in (A.1), (A.2). More precisely, considering that the modes share some parameters, we have 9 parameters to be estimated (cf. (A.4) in Appendix A). The parameter estimation task will be performed with standard techniques from parameter estimation. To this purpose we write (4) as

$$\dot{x} = A_m x + (A_\sigma - A_m) x + E_\sigma v_s, \tag{5}$$

with A_m a given Hurwitz matrix. We use the series-parallel parametric model [33, Sect. 4.2.2] to obtain

$$\dot{\hat{x}} = A_m \hat{x} + (\hat{A}_\sigma - A_m) x + \hat{E}_\sigma v_s, \tag{6}$$

where \hat{x} is the state of the parametric model and \hat{A}_p , \hat{E}_p are the matrices to be estimated, for each mode $p \in \{1,0\}$. Define $\Theta_{\sigma}^* = \text{vec}[A_{\sigma} E_{\sigma}]'$, $\hat{\Theta}_{\sigma} = \text{vec}[\hat{A}_{\sigma} \hat{B}_{\sigma}]'$, $\phi = [x' v_s 0; 0 x' v_s]$ and adopt a parameter estimator based on integral cost and gradient update [33, Sect. 4.3.5]

$$\hat{\Theta}_{\sigma} = \mathsf{P}\left(-\gamma \overline{R}_{\sigma} \hat{\Theta}_{\sigma} - \gamma \overline{Q}_{\sigma}\right), \quad \hat{\Theta}_{\sigma}(0) = \Theta_{0}$$
(7a)

(7b)

$$\dot{ar{R}}_{\sigma}=-eta ar{R}_{\sigma}+\phi_f \phi_f', \quad ar{R}_{\sigma}(0)=0$$

192

195

196 197

$$\dot{\overline{Q}}_{\sigma} = -\beta \overline{Q}_{\sigma} - \phi_f(x-g), \quad \overline{Q}_{\sigma}(0) = 0$$

$$\dot{\phi}_f = A_{,\nu} \phi_f + \phi_{,\nu} - \phi_f(0) = 0$$
(7c)
(7d)

$$\psi_f = A_m \psi_f + \psi, \quad \psi_f(0) = 0 \tag{7d}$$
$$\dot{g} = A_m g - A_m x, \quad g(0) = x(0), \tag{7e}$$

where
$$\beta$$
 and γ are positive constants and P denotes a projection operator which has to be designed to keep
the estimates inside a convex set: such convex set is known a priori if some bounds for the parameters (R_{D0} ,
 R_{D1} , R_{S0} , R_{S1} , C , L , R_L , R_{load}) are known. The following convergence result can be stated.

Theorem 1. Consider the switched model (4) of a power converter, driven by a well-posed PWM signal². Provided that the input voltage v_s is bounded, the estimation law (7) satisfies the following properties:

200 i)
$$\lim_{t\to\infty} x(t) - \hat{x}(t) = 0$$

201 ii)
$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \left| \hat{\Theta}_{\sigma}(t) \right| = 0$$

iii) if $\phi(\cdot)$ is persistently exciting and $\sigma(\cdot)$ has nonzero activation time in both modes, then $\hat{\Theta}_{\sigma(t)}(t) \rightarrow \Theta^*_{\sigma(t)}$ exponentially on the respective activation time, and the rate of convergence increases with γ .

Proof. This result can be derived by straightforwardly extending the results in [33, Thm. 4.3.3] on the results activation times of mode 1 and mode 0. Note that, under a well-posed PWM strategy, the switching signal $\sigma(\cdot)$ will 'visit both modes', i.e. both modes will have nonzero activation time.

¹Here and in the following, time dependence of the state, input and switching signals might be omitted when obvious.

²This implies that the desired state is well-defined so that the duty cycle is not always 0 or 1, i.e. $v_{out_{ref}} > v_s$ with $v_{out_{ref}}$ bounded for a boost converter, and $v_{out_{ref}} < v_s$ with $v_{out_{ref}}$ far from 0 for a buck converter.

207 4. Problem formulation

In this section we formulate the power converter control problem as a stabilization problem for switched systems. First, we define the reference to be tracked, i.e. the desired output voltage and inductor current:

$$x_{des} = \left[\begin{array}{c} i_{L_{des}} \\ v_{out_{des}} \end{array} \right]$$

A common approach for the definition of the desired inductor current $i_{L_{des}}$, which will be pursued here, is to calculate it assuming that the power delivered by the source is consumed by the load resistance only (i.e. lossless case) [34]. Note that, since $i_{L_{des}}$ might depend on some unknown circuit parameters, an estimate \hat{x}_{des} must be used. We are now ready to give the problem formulation:

Problem 1. [Adaptive PWM design] Given the switched affine model (1) of a power converter with uncertain matrix entries, design a PWM strategy that combines the online estimator (7) with the reverse modedependent switching of Lemma 1, and such that the solutions of the resulting system are GUUB with respect to x_{des} , for any initial state and regardless of the operating point and uncertainty. Furthermore, for a given switching period *T*, derive (and minimize) the ultimate bound as a function of design parameters.

219 4.1. Elementary time unit approach

To formulate a sufficient condition for GUUB of the switched model of the power converter, we will 220 constructively find a multiple Lyapunov function and a reverse mode-dependent dwell time switching se-221 quence such that Lemma 1 is verified. We make use of stability criteria which are convex with respect to 222 the power converter matrices (convexity is required to prove stability of the adaptive closed-loop): this is 223 possible by using a mode-dependent version of the so-called elementary time unit approach [32, 35]. The 224 elementary time unit approach uses multiple positive definite matrices for each subsystem to construct a 225 time-varying Lyapunov function. For example, with positive definite matrices $P_1^{[l]}$, $P_0^{[l]}$, $l = 1, \dots, L$, the 226 mode-dependent dwell time is partitioned such that $T_1 = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \delta_{T_1}^{[l]}$, $T_0 = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \delta_{T_0}^{[l]}$, and the Lyapunov function $V_p(x(t)) = (x(t) - x_{des})' P_p(t)(x(t) - x_{des})$ for subsystem $p \in \{1, 0\}$ is constructed as 227 228

$$P_{p}(t) = \begin{cases} P_{p}^{[l]} + (P_{p}^{[l+1]} - P_{p}^{[l]}) \frac{t - t_{k} - \sum_{r=0}^{l-1} \delta_{T_{p}}^{[r]}}{\delta_{p}^{[l]}} & t_{k} + \sum_{r=0}^{l-1} \delta_{p}^{[r]} \le t < t_{k} + \sum_{r=0}^{l} \delta_{p}^{[r]} \\ P_{p}^{[L]} & t = t_{k} + T_{p} = t_{k+1} \end{cases}$$

$$(8)$$

where t_k is the time instant when subsystem p becomes active and t_{k+1} is the time instant when the other subsystem becomes active: (8) means that the matrix $P_p(t)$ results from the linear interpolation of $P_p^{[l]}$, $l = 1, \dots, L$ during the mode-dependent dwell time. To simplify the notation, let us define $F_1 = A_1 x_{des} + E_1 v_s$ and $F_0 = A_0 x_{des} + E_0 v_s$. The following global uniformly ultimately boundedness result is shown:

Theorem 2. Assume that for some $0 < T_1 < T$ (and consequently $T_0 = T - T_1 > 0$), there exist positive

definite matrices $P_1^{[l]}$, $P_0^{[l]}$, $l = 1, \dots, L$, and pairs of positive constants λ_1 , λ_0 , μ_1 , μ_0 , and c_1 , c_0 such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{P_1^{[l+1]} - P_1^{[l]}}{\delta_{l_1}^{[l]}} + A_1' P_1^{[l]} + P_1^{[l]} A_1 - \lambda_1 P_1^{[l]} & P_1^{[l]} F_1 \\ F_1' P_1^{[l]} & -c_1 \end{bmatrix} < 0$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{P_1^{[l+1]} - P_1^{[l]}}{\delta_{l_1}^{[l]}} + A_1' P_1^{[l+1]} + P_1^{[l+1]} A_1 - \lambda_1 P_1^{[l+1]} & P_1^{[l+1]} F_1 \\ F_1' P_1^{[l]} & -c_1 \end{bmatrix} < 0, \quad l = 1, \cdots, L-1$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1' P_1^{[L]} + P_1^{[L]} A_1 - \lambda_1 P_1^{[L]} & P_1^{[L]} F_1 \\ F_1' P_1^{[L]} & -c_1 \end{bmatrix} < 0$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{P_0^{[l+1]} - P_0^{[l]}}{\delta_{l_0}^{[l]}} + A_0' P_0^{[l]} + P_0^{[l]} A_0 - \lambda_0 P_0^{[l]} & P_0^{[l]} F_0 \\ F_0' P_0^{[l]} & -c_0 \end{bmatrix} < 0$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{P_0^{[l+1]} - P_0^{[l]}}{\delta_{l_0}^{[l]}} + A_0' P_0^{[l+1]} + P_0^{[l+1]} A_0 - \lambda_0 P_0^{[l+1]} & P_0^{[l+1]} F_0 \\ F_0' P_0^{[l]} & -c_0 \end{bmatrix} < 0, \quad l = 1, \cdots, L-1$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_0' P_0^{[l+1]} + P_0^{[l+1]} A_0 - \lambda_0 P_0^{[l]} & P_0^{[l+1]} F_0 \\ F_0' P_0^{[L]} & -c_0 \end{bmatrix} < 0$$

$$\mu_1 P_1^{[L]} - P_0^{[1]} > 0$$

$$\mu_1 P_1^{[L]} - P_0^{[1]} > 0$$

$$\ln \mu_1 + \ln \mu_0 + \lambda_1 T_1 + \lambda_0 T_0 < 0,$$

(9)

then a switching law with reverse mode-dependent dwell time T_1 , T_0 makes the state x_{des} GUUB.

Proof. The proof amounts to showing that Theorem 2 satisfies all the conditions of Lemma 1. The Lya-236 punov function is of the form $V(t, x(t) - x_{des}) = (x(t) - x_{des})' P_{\sigma(t)}(t)(x(t) - x_{des})$, therefore the conditions 237 $\underline{a}(|x-x_{des}|) \leq V_p(t, x-x_{des}) \leq \overline{a}(|x-x_{des}|)$ are satisfied for some quadratic functions $\underline{a}, \overline{a}$ depending on $\overline{\lambda} =$ 238 $\max_{p} \lambda_{max}(P_p)$ and $\underline{\lambda} = \min_{p} \lambda_{min}(P_p)$ (being $\lambda_{max}(\cdot)$ and $\lambda_{min}(\cdot)$ the maximum and minimum eigenvalues, 239 respectively). In addition, the first six LMIs in (9) are equivalent to $\dot{V}_p(t, x - x_{des}) \le \lambda_p V_p(t, x - x_{des}) + c_p$. 240 Then, the seventh and eighth LMIs in (9) are equivalent to $V_q(t_k^+, x - x_{des}) \le \mu_p V_p(t_k^-, x - x_{des})$. Finally, the 241 last inequality in (9) is the same as the last in Lemma 1. Therefore, the Lyapunov function $V(t, x(t) - x_{des})$ 242 satisfies the conditions of Lemma 1, from which GUUB of the state x_{des} of the switched system (1) is de-243 rived. Finally, an estimate of the ultimate bound is $\varepsilon = \overline{c}\sqrt{\lambda}/\lambda$, where $\overline{c} = c_1 + c_0$. Therefore, similarly to Lemma 1, in order to obtain a small ε , Theorem 2 should be solved for the minimum constants c_1 and c_0 , 244 245 which are linear variables to be optimized in (9). 246

Remark 3. The elementary time unit approach of Theorem 2 leads to a problem which is linear (i.e. convex) with respect to the power converter matrices: on the other hand, the computational complexity of the LMIs in Theorem 2 increases for increasing L. Similarly to standard multiple Lyapunov function stability criteria, in order for (9) to be LMIs, the constants λ_p , μ_p , $p \in \{1,0\}$ should be fixed by the designer or found by some line search strategy.

252 5. Adaptive control strategy

The global uniformly ultimately boundedness theorem developed in the previous section assumes that the system matrices are known. In this section we will shown how it is possible to develop an iterative algorithm where the system matrices are estimated from data and a set of linear matrix inequalities solved online. In words, the proposed control scheme iterates the following phases: *a) Stability step* (GUUB based on the current estimated system); *b) Lyapunov-based switching step* (based on the reverse mode-dependent dwell time); *c) Estimation step* (online). The following paragraphs explain each one of these phases.

a) Stability step: Let us assume that at time *t* the estimates $\hat{\Theta}_1$ and $\hat{\Theta}_0$ are given, which contain the estimated matrices \hat{A}_1 , \hat{E}_1 , \hat{A}_0 and \hat{E}_0 . Given the objective of global uniformly ultimately boundedness around the desired state desired state x_{des} , the choice of the performance objectives passes through the definition of the duty cycle of the power converter T_1/T with $0 < T_1 < T$. After fixing the period *T*, one would like the reverse mode-dependent switching strategy that minimizes the bound ε on the error with respect to the desired state (where ε is as defined in the proof of Theorem 2): this is accomplished by solving the following set of LMIs

$$\min c_{1} + c_{0}$$

$$s.t.$$

$$\left[\frac{p_{1}^{[l+1]} - p_{1}^{[l]}}{\delta_{l_{1}}^{[l]}} + \hat{A}_{1}' p_{1}^{[l]} + P_{1}^{[l]} \hat{A}_{1} - \lambda_{1} P_{1}^{[l]} - P_{1}^{[l]} \hat{F}_{1} \\ \hat{F}_{1}' P_{1}^{[l+1]} - c_{1} \right] < 0$$

$$\left[\frac{p_{1}^{[l+1]} - p_{1}^{[l]}}{\delta_{l_{1}}^{[l]}} + \hat{A}_{1}' P_{1}^{[l+1]} + P_{1}^{[l+1]} \hat{A}_{1} - \lambda_{1} P_{1}^{[l+1]} - P_{1}^{[l+1]} \hat{F}_{1} \\ \hat{F}_{1}' P_{1}^{[l+1]} - c_{1} \right] < 0, \quad l = 1, \cdots, L - 1$$

$$\left[\hat{A}_{1}' P_{1}^{[L]} + P_{1}^{[L]} \hat{A}_{1} - \lambda_{1} P_{1}^{[L]} - P_{1}^{[L]} \hat{F}_{1} \\ \hat{F}_{1}' P_{1}^{[L]} - c_{1} \right] < 0$$

$$\left[\frac{p_{0}^{[l+1]} - p_{0}^{[l]}}{\delta_{l_{0}}^{[l]}} + \hat{A}_{0}' P_{0}^{[l]} + P_{0}^{[l]} \hat{A}_{0} - \lambda_{0} P_{0}^{[l]} - P_{0}^{[l]} \hat{F}_{0} \\ \hat{F}_{0}' P_{0}^{[l]} - c_{0} \right] < 0$$

$$\left[\frac{p_{0}^{[l+1]} - p_{0}^{[l]}}{\delta_{l_{0}}^{[l]}} + \hat{A}_{0}' P_{0}^{[l+1]} + P_{0}^{[l+1]} \hat{A}_{0} - \lambda_{0} P_{0}^{[l+1]} - P_{0}^{[l+1]} \hat{F}_{0} \\ \hat{F}_{0}' P_{0}^{[l+1]} - c_{0} \right] < 0, \quad l = 1, \cdots, L - 1$$

$$\left[\hat{A}_{0}' P_{0}^{[L]} + P_{0}^{[L]} \hat{A}_{0} - \lambda_{0} P_{0}^{[L]} - P_{0}^{[L]} \hat{F}_{0} \\ \hat{F}_{0}' P_{0}^{[L]} - c_{0} \right] < 0$$

$$\left[\hat{A}_{0}' P_{0}^{[L]} + P_{0}^{[L]} \hat{A}_{0} - \lambda_{0} P_{0}^{[L]} - P_{0}^{[L]} \hat{F}_{0} \\ \hat{F}_{0}' P_{0}^{[L]} - c_{0} \right] < 0$$

$$\mu_{1} P_{1}^{[L]} - P_{0}^{[1]} > 0$$

$$\ln\mu_{1} + \ln\mu_{0} + \lambda_{1} T_{1} + \lambda_{0} T_{0} < 0$$

$$(10)$$

where $\hat{F}_1 = \hat{A}_1 \hat{x}_{des} + \hat{E}_1 v_s$ and $\hat{F}_0 = \hat{A}_0 \hat{x}_{des} + \hat{E}_0 v_s$. Upon fixing *T*, a bisection algorithm is required to find T_1 and thus the duty cycle T_1/T . The criterion driving the bisection algorithm is defined by checking whether a smaller ε than the previous iteration can be attained. The LMIs (10) guarantee that for the estimated system a switching law with mode-dependent dwell time T_1 , T_0 makes the desired state \hat{x}_{des} GUUB. *Lyapunov-based switching step:* The switching step consists of two parts: first, the duty cycle $T_1/(T_1 + T_0)$ defined by the mode-dependent dwell time is implemented; second, a small dither \tilde{v}_s is added to the input voltage is such a way that persistency of excitation is guaranteed:

$$v_{s}^{o}(t) = v_{s} + \arg\min_{v_{s}\in\Xi} \left\{ \frac{\partial V_{\sigma(t)}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial V_{\sigma(t)}}{\partial x} \left[\hat{A}_{\sigma(t)} x + \hat{E}_{\sigma(t)} (v_{s} + \tilde{v}_{s}) \right] - \lambda_{\sigma(t)} V_{\sigma(t)} - c_{\sigma(t)} \right\}$$
(11)

where $V_{\sigma(t)}(t, x(t)) = (x - x_{des})' P_{\sigma(t)}(t)(x - x_{des})$ comes from the solution of (10), and

$$\Xi = \{ \tilde{\nu} | \tilde{\nu} \in [-2\alpha, -\alpha] \cup [\alpha, 2\alpha] \}$$
(12)

being α a user-defined constant that determines the size of the dither. Note that the term inside parentheses in (11) evaluates the Lyapunov-based stability of the system in between switches.

Remark 4. Provided that the estimates $\hat{\Theta}_1$ and $\hat{\Theta}_0$ are updated online at the same switching frequency of the converter, the solution to the LMIs (10) can be done at lower frequency or in an aperiodic way: when the estimates do not change, or when the trajectory evaluated via (11) is within desired bounds, one can keep the same duty cycle without solving a new set of LMIs.

c) Estimation step: The system is estimated online using (7): the following remark follows.

Remark 5. The dither in (11), (12) guarantees that ϕ is persistently exciting: furthermore, since $0 < T_1 < T$, both modes of the power converter are visited with persistency of excitation, and the exponential convergence result in bullet iii) of Theorem 1 holds. Realizing the dither would require a small extra voltage source in series with the inductance. However, in power conversion practice, v_s is never perfectly constant and is usually exhibits an uncontrollable ripple which provides already enough persistence of excitation: in such a case, the addition of the dither might be unnecessary.

287 5.1. Main result

Algorithm 1 presents the online procedure for power converter control: the corresponding stability result is given.

Theorem 3. Consider the switched system (1) controlled by Algorithm 1. Then, there exist finite positive constants β_1 , β_2 , $\underline{\gamma}$ and a positive number $\overline{t} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}\right)$ such that the following holds: if α in (12) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} 0 < \alpha \le \beta_2 & \text{if } t \le \bar{t} \text{ or } \left| \frac{dV(t)}{dx} \hat{E}_{\sigma(t)} \right| \le \eta \\ \alpha \ge \beta_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(13)

where V(t) is the multiple Lyapunov function available at time t from the solution of (10), η is a positive design constant and the adaptive gain γ of the estimator satisfies $\gamma \ge \gamma$. Then, the proposed adaptive control scheme guarantees bounded closed-loop solutions and, moreover,

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}\|x(t)-x_{des}\|\leq\varepsilon_3,$$

for a tunable bound ε_3 , which is affected by the choice of β_1 , β_2 and η .

296 *Proof.* See Appendix C.

Algorithm 1 Online	power	converter	control
--------------------	-------	-----------	---------

1: Initialize: 2: $h \leftarrow 0$ 3: Stability step: 4: Solve (10), and find T_1^h, T_0^h 5: Lyapunov-based switching step: 6: Apply dither (11), (12) 7: Switch from mode 1 to mode 0 according to T_1^h, T_0^h 8: Estimation step: 9: Estimate according to (7) 10: $h \leftarrow h+1$, **goto** Stability step

Remark 6. The following comments apply to the design parameters. The time instant \overline{t} is the time required 297 for the estimates to converge close to their actual values (under persistency of excitation). This time can 298 be made smaller and smaller by increasing γ . The parameter η gives an estimate of the region where the 299 Lyapunov sequence decreases exponentially toward the limit cycle: far from the desired state high excita-300 tion does not compromise stability, i.e. $\alpha \geq \beta_1$; close to the desired state convergence is not exponential 301 anymore, and the excitation should be small enough, i.e. $\alpha \leq \beta_2$. In the presence of an uncontrollable 302 ripple in v_s , Theorem 3 has a practical meaning: there is no benefit in selecting the switching frequency to 303 be too high (equivalently, T too small), since the ultimate bound will be determined also by the ripple in v_s . 304

Remark 7. Due to the estimation scheme of Theorem 1, Theorem 3 is valid for the entire parametric uncertainty set. This is contrast with linear control designs for nonlinear (i.e. bilinear) average models, which will in general can be proven to be stable for a finite parametric uncertainty set. Obviously, in Theorem 3, the learning transient will be influenced by the initial condition for the parameter estimates.

309 6. Numerical example

A boost converter is used for validation, with $v_s = 12V$, fixed switching period $T = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$ s, and with circuit parameters taken in line with [16]:

$$L = 100 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{H} \qquad R_L = 0.5\Omega \qquad \text{(actual parameters)} \\ R_{D_1} = 0.5\Omega \qquad R_{D_0} = 1 \cdot 10^9 \Omega \\ R_{S_1} = 0.5\Omega \qquad R_{S_0} = 1 \cdot 10^9 \Omega \\ C = 200 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{F} \qquad R_{load} = 25\Omega \qquad (14)$$

As compared to [16], we have included parasitic effects (non-ideal inductor, switch and diode), whose values have been mutuated from [21]. Since we assume that the parameters in (14) are uncertain, a priori knowledge resides in the fact that the proposed adaptive strategy uses the following initial estimates of the

315 parameters

which are significantly far from the actual parameters. Being $T = 5 \cdot 10^{-6}$ s, the switching frequency of 316 the power converter is 200 kHz. With respect to the proposed adaptive approach, the following design 317 parameters have been chosen: $\beta = 1 \cdot 10^{-4}$, $\gamma = 1 \cdot 10^{3}$, $A_m = -100I_2$, $\bar{t} = 0.005$, $\beta_1 = 0.05$, $\beta_2 = 0.075$, 318 $\eta = 0.02$, and for the LMIs we have selected $\lambda_1 = \lambda_0 = 0.1$ and $\mu_1 = \mu_0 = 0.98$. As a means of comparison, 319 the robust LQR design in [16], based on the averaged bilinear model of the boost converter is considered. 320 The design leads to a non-adaptive state-feedback gain $K_{LMI-LOR} = [-0.86 - 1.39 \ 3159.54]$ (the third 32 extra state comes from extending the averaged model with an integrator of the tracking error to attain 322 zero offset, c.f. the design in [16]). The gain $K_{LMI-LOR}$ has been designed on the actual parameters (14), 323 which require more a priori knowledge than an adaptive controller. In some simulations, we consider 324 initial conditions based on the common practice of power converter control: boost converters are often 325 precharged before control takes over and regulates the output voltage. Precharge can be realized (among 326 other methods) by bypassing the inductor with a precharge diode: this implies that the output voltage 327 is approximately equal to the input voltage when regulation starts [36]. Therefore, for a desired state 328 $v_{out_{des}} = 24$ V, $i_{L_{des}} = 1.92$ A and the nominal duty cycle D = 0.5, the precharging initial conditions can be 329 approximately taken as $v_{out_{des}}(0) = 12V$, $i_{L_{des}}(0) = 3.84A$. 330

331 6.1. Robustness to converter components parametric uncertainty



Figure 4: Boost converter with $K_{LMI-LQR}$ with precharging initial conditions: Output voltage, inductor current and duty cycle for the ideal (non-lossy) converter (solid line) and for the non-ideal (lossy) converter (dash-dotted line). The desired voltage is the dotted line.

Fig. 4 shows that, when the converter components are ideal i.e. without parasitic elements, the controller $K_{LMI-LQR}$ is capable of starting up the converter from precharging initial conditions (the interested reader can verify that $K_{LMI-LQR}$ is also capable of starting up the converter from zero initial conditions, indicating that the local region of stability of $K_{LMI-LQR}$ is quite large). However, despite being designed exactly for the actual parameters (14), the presence of parasitic elements (cf. the model of Appendix A) apparently shrinks the local region of stability: in fact, Fig. 4 indicates that it is impossible for the $K_{LMI-LQR}$ to reach the desired state when starting from precharging initial conditions and when parasitic elements are introduced³.

³In [16] it is clearly shown how $K_{LMI-LQR}$ can cope with some components parametric uncertainty and is therefore robust. However, stability of the linear controller is necessarily local, and the region of stability might even shrink if uncertainty is large.



Figure 5: Non-ideal (lossy) boost converter with zero initial conditions: Output voltage, inductor current and duty cycle for $K_{LMI-LQR}$ (dash-dotted line), and the proposed adaptive strategy (dashed line). The desired voltage is the dotted line.

³³⁹ In other words, that any linear non-adaptive controller has limited robustness to parametric uncertainty, and

has a finite region of stability (which may not include the zero or precharging initial conditions). On the

other hand, as expected by the global stability result of Theorem 3, Fig. 5 shows that the proposed adaptive

³⁴² controller, even when starting with the initial estimates (15), handles the parametric uncertainty (including

³⁴³ parasitic elements), and is capable of starting up the converter even from zero initial conditions⁴.



Figure 6: Non-ideal (lossy) boost converter: Online evolution of the parameter estimates for each mode. Estimates (solid line), actual parameters (dash-dotted line).

The key feature of the proposed adaptive approach is the capability of estimating the uncertain parameters: in particular, Fig. 6 shows that the estimator can converge to the actual parameters in less than 1 ms (cf. Fig. 6). Table 1 elaborates on the number of decision variables and semidefinite inequality constraints

⁴Even though precharging initial conditions are more representative of common practice, zero initial conditions have been used in this simulation to demonstrate global stability properties.

necessary to solve the LMI problem. The computational complexity of the elementary time unit approach of 347 Theorem 2 would increase for increasing L. As a trade-off between conservative results and computational 348 complexity, we apply the elementary time unit approach of Theorem 2 with two positive definite matrices 349 for each subsystem (L = 2): this has been verified to work for the system at hand. It has to be noted that the 350 on-line computational cost of LMIs might be hard for embedded systems: despite some recent advances in 35 SDP solvers for embedded systems [37] it is not yet possible to solve the LMIs periodically at the frequency 352 of hundreds of kHz. Therefore, in the simulations we have assumed the LMIs to be solved at the frequency 353 of 200 Hz (while the switching frequency of the power converter is kept at 200 kHz): this leads to a desired 354 settling time (the time at which the converter output has entered and remained within a 5% error band) of 355 around 10ms, which is respected by our adaptive approach. 356

	No. decision var.	No. constraints
Theorem 2, $L = 2$	30	14
Theorem 2, $L = 4$	62	26

Table 1: Computational cost of LMI solution

357 6.2. Robustness to variations of duty cycle

Fig. 7 shows that, when we start from initial conditions close to the desired state, namely $v_{out} = 23.4$ V 358 and $i_L = 0$ A (we have verified that selecting $v_{out} = 23.3$ V or below would lead to instability of $K_{LMI-LQR}$), 359 the linear controller can reach the desired state even in the presence of parasitic elements. In this situation 360 the linear controller, with a settling time of around 2ms, is faster than the proposed adaptive approach. But a 36 final question arises: to which extent can the linear and the adaptive designs tolerate a change in the working 362 point (duty cycle)? Robustness to variations of duty cycle was studied, e.g. in [16]: by changing the load, 363 one necessarily requires to settle to a different duty cycle, which introduces uncertainty in the (averaged) 364 model of the boost converter and might lead to instability. Fig. 7 shows that the linear controller can tolerate 365 a 50% load variation, applied at time 0.02s. But, from Fig. 8, we see that the linear controller cannot handle 366 a 80% load variation: on the other hand, the adaptive controller can recover in both cases. 367

Therefore, we verified that, while the non-adaptive design needs an accurate model and its region of stability shrinks in the presence of duty cycle uncertainty, the adaptive design will estimate the actual load variation and compensate for the (possibly large) change of duty cycle. This is done, of course, at the expense of some learning transient, highlighted in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8. Therefore, the advantage of adaptive control is not in terms of performance (we have seen that the linear controller $K_{LMI-LQR}$ might have a better settling time), but rather in providing improved stability in the presence of large uncertainty (may it be parametric uncertainty or changes of working point).

375 7. Conclusions

In this work we proposed an adaptive switching strategy for the design of pulse width modulation signals in power converters. We illustrated that a switched (i.e. hybrid) model better represents the power converter dynamics especially under lower frequency pulse width modulation. The uncertainties in the power converters parameters have been handled via an adaptive control approach. After defining the pulse width modulation in terms of a reverse mode-dependent dwell time, a desired level of performance was guaranteed by solving online a set of linear matrix inequalities. The LMIs are based on global uniformly ultimately boundedness of switched system under mode-dependent dwell time, and since the parameters of



Figure 7: Non-ideal (lossy) boost converter with initial condition $v_{out} = 23.4$ V and $i_L = 0$ A, and with 50% load variation at time 0.02s: Output voltage, inductor current and duty cycle for the linear controller (dash-dotted line), and the proposed adaptive strategy (dashed line). The desired voltage is indicated with a dotted line.

the power converter are uncertain, they are coupled with a parameter estimator and solved online in an adaptive fashion using an exploitation-exploration mechanism. The effectiveness of the proposed approach has been verified via simulations on boost converter: comparisons with a state-space design based on averaged model have been provided.

387 Appendix A. Switched model of a boost converter

Here we will show how to derive the switched affine model of a boost power converter. A DC-DC boost converter generates at steady state an average output voltage that is larger than its input voltage (Fig. A.9). By applying the Kirchhoff's circuit laws one obtains, for each mode, the following models: for the closed switch ($\sigma(t) = 1$)

$$A_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} -\left(\frac{R_{S1}}{\frac{R_{S1}}{R_{D0}}+1} + R_{L}\right)\frac{1}{L} & \left(\frac{1}{\frac{R_{S1}}{R_{D0}}+1} - 1\right)\frac{1}{L} \\ \left(\frac{1}{\frac{R_{D0}}{R_{S1}}+1}\right)\frac{1}{L} & -\left(\frac{1}{R_{S1}+R_{D0}} + \frac{1}{R_{load}}\right)\frac{1}{L} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$E_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{L} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(A.1)

³⁹² For the open switch ($\sigma(t) = 0$)

$$A_{0} = \begin{bmatrix} -\left(\frac{R_{D1}}{\frac{R_{S0}}{R_{D1}}+1} + R_{L}\right)\frac{1}{L} & \left(\frac{1}{\frac{R_{S0}}{R_{D1}}+1} - 1\right)\frac{1}{L} \\ \left(\frac{1}{\frac{R_{D1}}{R_{S0}}+1}\right)\frac{1}{C} & -\left(\frac{1}{R_{S0}+R_{D1}} + \frac{1}{R_{load}}\right)\frac{1}{C} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$E_{0} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{L} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(A.2)



Figure 8: Non-ideal (lossy) boost converter with initial condition $v_{out} = 23.4V$ and $i_L = 0A$, and with 80% load variation at time 0.02s: Output voltage, inductor current and duty cycle for the linear controller (dash-dotted line), and the proposed adaptive strategy (dashed line). The desired voltage is indicated with a dotted line.



Figure A.9: Boost converter

The switch, inductance and diode can be modeled as nonideal lossy elements: in (A.1)-(A.2) R_{S0} and R_{S1} represent the losses of the switch, *C* is the capacitance, *L* is the inductance (R_L representing losses), *D* is the diode (R_{D0} and R_{D1} representing losses). Modeling the parasitic elements as open circuit resistance of the switches and inductance/diode resistances has been mutuated from [21]: there are alternative ways to model losses, and in particular switching losses, which have not been considered in this work.

Applying a similar approach to the other DC-DC converter configurations [1, 2], analogous switched affine models can be obtained for buck or buck-boost converters. For completeness, we also give the averaged model of a power converter, not adopted in this work for control design but used in Figs. 1(c), 1(d) and 2. The model is derived from averaging theory using the following equation [16]

$$\tilde{\tilde{x}}(t) = (A_0 + (A_1 - A_0)D)\tilde{x}(t) + (A_1 - A_0)\tilde{x}(t)\tilde{u}(t)
+ ((A_1 - A_0)X + (E_1 - E_0))\tilde{u}(t).$$
(A.3)

The vectors $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}$ represent the incremental state and input respectively, while *X* and *D* are the equilibrium state and input (duty cycle) defining the nominal operating point.

In order to obtain a linear-in-the-parameters model, the switched model of the power converter is reparametrized. Due to the presence of matrix entries common to both modes, a convenient reparametrization for the boost converter (A.1)-(A.2) is

1

$$A_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} -a_{1} & -a_{2} \\ a_{3} & -a_{4} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad A_{0} = \begin{bmatrix} -a_{5} & -a_{6} \\ a_{7} & -a_{8} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$E_{1} = E_{0} = \begin{bmatrix} e_{1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(A.4)

⁴⁰⁷ with 9 positive parameters to be estimated.

408 Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 1

The proof follows the lines of [32], with the peculiarity that a mode-dependent switching and global uniformly ultimately boundedness are considered. Denote the switching instants with t_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and by convention in switched systems, we assume all functions to be continuous from right, i.e. $V(t_k^+) =$ $V(t_k)$. From the second inequality in (3) it can be seen that for all $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$ the time derivative of the Lyapunov function $V(t, x(t) - x_{des}) = W_{\sigma(t)}(t, x(t) - x_{des})$ along a trajectory of the switched system satisfies, $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$

$$V(t) \le e^{-\lambda_{\sigma(t_k)}(t-t_k)}V(t_k) + c$$

Then, supposing system (1) had switched from mode p to mode q at time t_k , and switches from mode q to mode p at switching instant t_{k+1} (known switching sequence as in [38]), we have

$$V(t_{k+1}) \le \mu_{\sigma(t_k)} \mu_{\sigma(t_{k-1})} e^{-\lambda_{\sigma(t_k)}(t_{k+1}-t_k) - \lambda_{\sigma(t_{k-1})}(t_k-t_{k-1})} V(t_{k-1}) + c$$

⁴¹⁷ Using the condition $\ln \mu_1 + \ln \mu_0 + \lambda_1 T_1 + \lambda_0 T_0 < 0$, we have $\mu_{\sigma(t_k)} \mu_{\sigma(t_{k-1})} e^{-\lambda_{\sigma(t_k)}(t_{k+1}-t_k)-\lambda_{\sigma(t_{k-1})}(t_k-t_{k-1})} < 1$. ⁴¹⁸ We conclude that there exists a ball $\mathscr{B}(r)$ around the desired state, for some positive constant *r* depending ⁴¹⁹ on c_p , and $\mu \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$V(x(t_k)) \le \mu^k V(x_0), \quad \forall x \notin \mathscr{B}(r), \tag{B.1}$$

which together with the fact that $V(x_{des}) = 0$ implies that x_{des} is GUUB. Using Lyapunov arguments [39, Thm. 4.18], the ball inside which the trajectory will remain can be calculated as follows. In between two consecutive switches the Lyapunov function decays at an exponential rate outside the following ball

$$\|x - x_{des}\| \ge b_c \tag{B.2}$$

423 where b_c is such that

$$\{x : \|x - x_{des}\| \le b_c\} \subseteq \{x : V(x - x_{des}) \le c\} := \Omega_c$$
(B.3)

424 To calculate the ultimate bound we see that

$$x \in \Omega_c \Rightarrow ||x - x_{des}|| \le \underline{a}^{-1}(\overline{a}(b_c)) := \varepsilon$$
(B.4)

425 Appendix C. Proof of Theorem 3

We start by observing that according to Lemma 1 in [40], Lemma 1 in this manuscript implies that, for a switching sequence $\{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_k, t_{k+1}, \dots\}$ satisfying the reverse mode-dependent dwell time condition, there exists a family of continuously differentiable, positive definite, radially unbounded Lyapunov functions $\overline{W}_{\sigma}: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$, positive constants $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3, \lambda$ and $0 < \kappa < 1$ which satisfy

$$\left| \frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\sigma(t)}}{\partial x} E_{\sigma(t)} \right| \leq \varepsilon_{1} \text{ and } \|x - x_{des}\| \geq \varepsilon_{3} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\sigma(t)}}{\partial x} \left(A_{\sigma(t)} x(t) + E_{\sigma(t)} v_{s} \right) - \lambda \overline{W}_{\sigma(t)} < -\varepsilon_{2}$$

$$\text{and } \overline{W}_{\sigma(t_{k+1})}(x(t_{k+1})) \leq \kappa \overline{W}_{\sigma(t_{k})}(x(t_{k}))$$

$$(C.1)$$

Now, let us assume that (C.1) is verified for the multiple Lyapunov function arising from the solution of (9),
with the actual system matrices of the power converter. Let us define the following region

$$\mathscr{U} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n | \|x - x_{des}\| \ge \varepsilon_3 \text{ and } \left| \frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\sigma(t)}}{\partial x} E_{\sigma(t)} \right| \le \varepsilon_1 \right\}$$
(C.2)

which is the region where, without any external excitation, the trajectories are converging towards x_{des} (according to (C.1)).

Let us consider, for $||x - x_{des}|| > \varepsilon_3$ and in between switches $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$, the following cases:

435 C1) $x(t) \notin \mathscr{U}$ and $\left| \frac{\partial V_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \hat{E}_{\sigma(t_k)} \right| \ge \eta$ 436 Let

$$\dot{\overline{W}}_{(\pm j)}(t) = \min_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\}} \frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \left[A_{\sigma(t_k)} x(t) + E_{\sigma(t_k)} (v_s \pm v_s^{(j)}) \right] - \lambda \overline{W}_{\sigma(t)}$$

437 where $\pm v_s^{(j)}$ contains the perturbed input voltage as defined in (12). In the following we will omit the 438 time index for simplicity. Since $\left|\frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x}\hat{E}_{\sigma(t_k)}\right| \ge \eta$, we can verify that

$$\min_{j \in \{1,...,m\}} \frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} E_{\sigma(t_k)} \left[v_s \pm v_s^{(j)} \right] < -c\varepsilon_1 \alpha \tag{C.3}$$

for some positive constant *c* independent of ε_1 , and

$$\min_{j \in \{1,\dots,m\}} \dot{\overline{W}}_{(\pm j)} = \frac{\partial W_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \Theta^*_{\sigma(t_k)} \overline{x}(t) - c\varepsilon_1 \alpha, \tag{C.4}$$

440 Now denote with $V_{\sigma(t_k)}$ the multiple Lyapunov function arising from (10) with the estimated matrices. 441 By making the difference between the derivative of $\overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k)}$ along the trajectories of the real system 442 and the derivative of $V_{\sigma(t_k)}$ along the trajectories of the estimated one, we obtain

$$\begin{split} \dot{\overline{W}}_{(\pm j)} - \dot{V}_{(\pm j)} &= \frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \left[\Theta^*_{\sigma(t_k)} \overline{x}(t) + E_{\sigma(t_k)}(\pm v_s^{(j)}) \right] - \lambda \overline{W}_{\sigma(t)} \\ &- \frac{\partial V_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \left[\hat{\Theta}^*_{\sigma(t_k)} \overline{x}(t) + \hat{E}_{\sigma(t_k)}(\pm v_s^{(j)}) \right] - \lambda V_{\sigma(t)} \\ &= \mathscr{O}(\|\tilde{\Theta}\|) + \mathscr{O}(\|\tilde{\Theta}\|)(\pm v_s^{(j)}) \end{split}$$
(C.5)

where $\bar{x} = [x' v'_s]'$ and $\tilde{\Theta}_{\sigma(t_k)} = \Theta^*_{\sigma(t_k)} - \hat{\Theta}_{\sigma(t_k)}$. The persistency of excitation condition on the input voltage implies

$$\tilde{\Theta}_{\sigma(t_k)} = \mathscr{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma}), \tag{C.6}$$

where 1/k arises from the the total time when subsystem $\sigma(t_k)$ has been active (which is proportional to *k*). Using (C.5) and (C.6) we then obtain

$$\overline{W}_{(\pm j)} - V_{(\pm j)} = \mathscr{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma}) + \mathscr{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma})\alpha.$$
(C.7)

447 Combining (C.7) and (C.4) we then obtain that, if

$$\varepsilon_1 > \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma}),$$
 (C.8)

448 then

$$\arg\min_{j\in\{1,...,m\}} \overline{W}_{(\pm j)} = \arg\min_{j\in\{1,...,m\}} \dot{V}_{(\pm j)}$$
(C.9)

and $\exists \beta_1 > 0 : \alpha_k > \beta_1$ we have $\overline{W}(t) < -\lambda \overline{W}_{\sigma(t)} - \overline{\alpha}$, where $\overline{\alpha}$ is a positive constant.

451 C2) $x(t) \in \mathscr{U}$ and $\left| \frac{\partial V_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \hat{E}_{\sigma(t_k)} \right| < \eta$ 452 Using (C.1) we obtain

$$\overline{W}(t) < -\lambda \overline{W}_{\sigma(t)} - \varepsilon_2 + \sqrt{m}\varepsilon_1 \alpha \tag{C.10}$$

453 which results in $\overline{W}(t) < -\lambda \overline{W}_{\sigma(t)} - \overline{\alpha}$ provided that $\alpha < (-\overline{\alpha} + \varepsilon_2)/\sqrt{m}\varepsilon_1 = \beta_2$.

454 C3) $x(t) \notin \mathscr{U}$ and $\left| \frac{\partial V_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \hat{E}_{\sigma(t_k)} \right| < \eta$ 455 In this case we obtain

$$\left|\frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} E_{\sigma(t_k)} - \frac{\partial V_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \hat{E}_{\sigma(t_k)}\right| \le \mathscr{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma})$$
(C.11)

which implies that if $\mathscr{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma}) \leq \varepsilon_1$ this case is never verified.

457 C4) $x(t) \notin \mathscr{U}$ and $\left| \frac{\partial V_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \hat{E}_{\sigma(t_k)} \right| \ge \eta$ 458 In this case we obtain that if $\mathscr{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma}) \le \varepsilon_1$ and

 $\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_1 \le \eta \le \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_1 \tag{C.12}$

459 then

$$\left|\frac{\partial \overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k)}}{\partial x} \hat{E}_{\sigma(t_k)}\right| \ge \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_1 \tag{C.13}$$

which we can use to repeat the same reasoning after (C.3), provided that c is replaced with c/4.

We have obtained that, in between switches, for $||x - x_{des}|| > \varepsilon_3$ and for $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma}) < \varepsilon_1$, the derivative of the Lyapunov function \overline{W} might increase with bounded rate.

463 At consecutive switching times, (C.1) and the fact that due to convexity of the LMIs we have $\overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k)} - V_{\sigma(t_k)} = \mathcal{O}(\|\tilde{\Theta}\|)$ give us

$$\overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k^+)}(x(t_k)) \leq \kappa \overline{W}_{\sigma(t_k)}(x(t_k)) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{1}{k\gamma}})$$

which implies that there is a ball outside which the bounded increase in between switches are compensated by the decrease at jumps. Furthermore, this ball converges to $||x - x_{des}|| > \varepsilon_3$ exponentially fast. By looking at the overall behavior of the Lyapunov function \overline{W} we have that $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma}) \ge \varepsilon_1$ in an interval that can be made as small as desired by increasing γ . After that, we have $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k\gamma}) < \varepsilon_1$ and in view of C1)-C4) destabilizing effect for $||x - x_{des}|| \ge \varepsilon_3$. Therefore, using invariant set theory, it is then possible to show closed-loop signal boundedness and convergence of x(t) to the subset $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : ||x - x_{des}|| < \varepsilon_3\}$.

A final comment concerns the relation between the optimal ε which can be achieve if the system matrices where perfectly known, and the actual bound ε_3 . It is clear that $\varepsilon_3 = \varepsilon$ only if $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1^*$ and $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_2^*$ where ε_1^* and ε_2^* represent the true bounds assuming the system matrices are known: obviously such bounds are in general unknown a priori, therefore the choice of η , which should satisfy (C.12) and the choice of β_1 , β_2 which affect $\overline{\alpha}$ together with ε_2 , require some fine tuning. This is often the case in adaptive control designs, where closed-loop stability is guaranteed provided that the control design constants satisfy certain bounds that in general are difficult to be calculated a priori [40, 41].

478 **References**

479 **References**

- [1] S. Sangwine. Electronic Components and Technology, Third Edition. CRC Press, 2007.
- [2] R. W. Erickson and D. Maksimovic. Fundamentals of Power Electronics, Third Edition. Springer US, 2001.
- [3] R. D. Middlebrook and S. Cuk. A general unified approach to modelling switching-converter power stages. In *1976 IEEE Power Electronics Specialists Conference*, pages 18–34, 1976.
- [4] G. Escobar, A. J. van der Schaft, and R. Ortega. A Hamiltonian viewpoint in the modelling of switching power converters.
 Automatica, 35:445–452, 1999.
- [5] L. Iannelli, K. H. Johansson, U. T. Jonsson, and F. Vasca. Subtleties in the averaging of a class of hybrid systems with
 applications to power converters. *Control Engineering Practice*, 16:961–975, 2008.
- [6] J. C. Geromel and P. Colaneri. Stability and stabilization of continuous-time switched linear systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 45:1915–1930, 2006.
- 490 [7] D. Liberzon. Switching in Systems and Control. Birkhauser, Boston, MA, 2003.
- [8] L. I. Allerhand and U. Shaked. Robust stability and stabilization of linear switched systems with dwell time. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(2):381–386, 2011.
- [9] W. Xiang. On equivalence of two stability criteria for continuous-time switched systems with dwell time constraint. *Automatica*, 54:36–40, 2015.
- [10] S. Yuan, B. De Schutter, and S. Baldi. Adaptive asymptotic tracking control of uncertain time-driven switched linear systems.
 IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 62(11):5802–5807, 2017.
- [11] S. Yuan, L. Zhang, B. De Schutter, and S. Baldi. A novel lyapunov function for a non-weighted l2 gain of asynchronously
 switched linear systems. *Automatica*, 87:310 317, 2018.
- [12] G. S. Deaecto, J. C. Geromel, F. S. Garcia, and J. A. Pomilio. Switched affine systems control design with application to
 DC-DC converters. *IET Control Theory Applications*, 4(7):1201–1210, 2010.
- [13] J. Buisson, P.-Y. Richard, and H. Cormerais. *On the Stabilisation of Switching Electrical Power Converters*, pages 184–197.
 Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005.
- [14] M. Rubensson and B. Lennartson. Global convergence analysis for piecewise linear systems applied to limit cycles in a
 DC/DC converter. In *Proceedings of the 2002 American Control Conference*, volume 2, pages 1272–1277, 2002.

- [15] C. Albea, G. Garcia, and L. Zaccarian. Hybrid dynamic modeling and control of switched affine systems: Application to
 DC-DC converters. In 2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 2264–2269, 2015.
- [16] C. Olalla, R. Leyva, A. El Aroudi, and I. Queinnec. Robust LQR control for PWM converters: An LMI approach. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 56:2548–2558, 2009.
- [17] F. Amato, C. Cosentino, A. S. Fiorillo, and A. Merola. Stabilization of bilinear systems via linear state-feedback control.
 IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs, 56(1):76–80, 2009.
- [18] C. Olalla, R. Leyva, A. El Aroudi, P. Garces, and I. Queinnec. LMI robust control design for boost PWM converters. *IET Power Electronics*, 3:75–85, 2010.
- [19] C. Olalla, I. Queinnec, R. Leyva, and A. El Aroudi. Optimal state-feedback control of bilinear DC-DC converters with
 guaranteed regions of stability. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 59:3868–3880, 2012.
- [20] N. Athanasopoulos, A. I. Doban, and M. Lazar. Constrained stabilization of discrete-time linear systems. 21st Mediterranean
 Conference on Control & Automation (MED), 25-28 June, pages 830–839, 2013.
- F. M. Oettmeier, J. Neely, S. Pekarek, R. DeCarlo, and K. Uthaichana. MPC of switching in a boost converter using a hybrid
 state model with a sliding mode observer. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 56:3453–3466, 2009.
- [22] A. Salvi, S. Santini, D. Biel, J. M. Olm, and M. di Bernardo. Model reference adaptive control of a full-bridge buck inverter
 with minimal controller synthesis. *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control December 10-13, Florence, Italy*, pages
 3469–3474, 2013.
- R.-J. Wai, M.-W. Chen, and Y.-K. Liu. Design of adaptive control and fuzzy neural network control for single-stage boost
 inverter. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 62:5434–5445, 2015.
- [24] C. Albea, F. Gordillo, and C. Canudas-de Wit. Adaptive control design for a boost inverter. *Control Engineering Practice*, 19:32–44, 2011.
- [25] H. El-Fadil and F. Giri. Robust nonlinear adaptive control of multiphase synchronous buck power converters. *Control Engineering Practice*, 17:1245–1254, 2009.
- Y. Abdel-Rady, I. Mohamed, and E. F. El-Saadany. An improved deadbeat current control scheme with a novel adaptive selftuning load model for a three-phase PWM voltage-source inverter. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 54:747–759, 2007.
- [27] T. D. Do, V. Q. Leu, Y.-S. Choi, H. H. Choi, and J.-W. Jung. An adaptive voltage control strategy of three-phase inverter for
 stand-alone distributed generation systems. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 60:5660–5672, 2013.
- [28] L. Corradini, A. Costabeber, P. Mattavelli, and S. Saggini. Parameter-independent time-optimal digital control for point-of load converters. *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, 24(10):2235–2248, 2009.
- [29] J. P. Hespanha, D. Liberzon, and A. R. Teel. On input-to-state stability of impulsive systems. In *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 3992–3997, 2005.
- [30] X. Zhao, L. Zhang, P. Shi, and M. Liu. Stability and stabilization of switched linear systems with mode-dependent average
 dwell time. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57:1809–1815, 2012.
- 539 [31] E. Lavretsky and K. Wise. Robust and Adaptive Control: With Aerospace Applications. Springer, 2013.
- [32] W. Xiang and J. Xiao. Stabilization of switched continuous-time systems with all modes unstable via dwell time switching.
 Automatica, 50(3):940 945, 2014.
- 542 [33] P. A. Ioannou and J. Sun. Robust Adaptive Control. Dover Publications, 2012.
- [34] R. De Keyser, J. Bonilla, and I. Ionescu. A comparative study of several control techniques applied to a boost converter.
 Proceeding IEEE 10th International Conference on Optimization of Electrical and Electronic Equipment (OPTIM), Brasov, Romania, pages 71–78, 2006.
- [35] L. Zhang and W. Xiang. Mode-identifying time estimation and switching-delay tolerant control for switched systems: An
 elementary time unit approach. *Automatica*, 64:174–181, 2016.
- [36] Y. Zhang, H. Wang, B. Li, D. Xu, and F. Blaabjerg. Precharge strategies for isolated modular DC-DC converters under two
 different start-up conditions. In 2017 IEEE 26th International Symposium on Industrial Electronics (ISIE), pages 1011–1016,
 2017.
- [37] A. Domahidi, E. Chu, and S. Boyd. ECOS: An SOCP solver for embedded systems. In 2013 European Control Conference
 (ECC), pages 3071–3076, 2013.
- [38] S. Yuan, B. De Schutter, and S. Baldi. Robust adaptive tracking control of uncertain slowly switched linear systems. *Nonlin- ear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, 27:1 12, 2018.
- 555 [39] H. K. Khalil. Nonlinear Systems. New York: Macmillan, 1992.
- E. B. Kosmatopoulos and P. A. Ioannou. Robust switching adaptive control of multi-input nonlinear systems. *IEEE Transac- tions on Automatic Control*, 47(4):610–624, 2002.
- E. B. Kosmatopoulos. An adaptive optimization scheme with satisfactory transient performance. *Automatica*, 45(3):716 723, 2009.