



# LUND UNIVERSITY

## Min-Mix Control in Discrete Time by Completion of Squares

Bernhardsson, Bo; Hagander, Per

1993

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Bernhardsson, B., & Hagander, P. (1993). *Min-Mix Control in Discrete Time by Completion of Squares*. Paper presented at European Control Conference, 1993, Groningen, Netherlands.

*Total number of authors:*

2

### General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117  
221 00 Lund  
+46 46-222 00 00

# Min-Mix Control in Discrete Time by Completion of Squares<sup>†</sup>

Per Hagander

Department of Automatic Control  
Lund Institute of Technology  
P.O.Box 118, S-221 00 Lund, Sweden  
Phone: +46 46 108786

Bo Bernhardsson

IMA, Univ. of Minnesota,  
514 Vincent Hall, 206 Church Street S.E.,  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
E-mail: bob@control.lth.se

**Abstract:** This paper discusses the so called min-mix problem for discrete time systems. The min-mix problem is one of the mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$ -control problems that capture the idea that disturbances may be both deterministic and stochastic. The deterministic behavior models worst case situations and stochastic disturbances model average properties. The problem is very rich and has connections both to recent results in  $H_\infty$  and also to classical results in stochastic control and differential games. Using the methods of [Bernhardsson, 1992] it is possible to show that the discrete time case also follows directly by *completion of squares*. The continuous time and discrete time cases are therefore unified. The solution is given by three coupled Riccati equations. The time-varying, finite time horizon, output feedback version of the problem is treated, and an explicit formula for the value of the game is also obtain. A simple example demonstrates how this information is useful for the infinite time horizon case.

**Keywords:** Mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$  Control; Stochastic Differential Games; Stochastic Optimal Control;  $H_\infty$ -optimization; Linear-quadratic-Gaussian Control; Riccati Equations; Discrete-time Systems; Linear Systems.

## 1. Introduction

Standard  $H_\infty$ -control can be applied to disturbance attenuation design, but it has then fundamental practical limitations. A description of the process disturbance as a worst case bounded signal has to include the effect of measurement noise. In  $H_\infty$ -control the system is

$$\begin{cases} qx = Ax + B_1d + B_2u \\ y = Cx + De \end{cases}$$

Here  $d$  and  $e$  denote process and measurement disturbances,  $u$  control signals,  $y$  measurements and  $q$  the forward shift operator, i.e.  $qx(k) := x(k+1)$ . The  $H_\infty$ -control problem optimizes system performance against

worst disturbances  $d$  and  $e$ :

$$\min_K \max_{d,e} \|z\|_2^2, \quad \text{when } \|d\|_2^2 + \|e\|_2^2 \leq 1$$

where  $z$  is a vector of signals to be minimized. The constraint means that process disturbances and measurement noise can not both be large. It is unnatural to couple process disturbance and measurement noise in this way. An alternative is to assume that e.g. the measurement noise is stochastic. Several other motivations exist for considering a mixture of  $H_2$  and  $H_\infty$  problems. It is important to separate between the many different so called "mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$ -problems", although some relations exist between the different setups, see e.g. [Doyle *et al.*, 1989], [Mustafa, 1989], [Rotea and Khargonekar, 1990], [Khargonekar and Rotea, 1991], [Limebeer *et al.*, 1991], [Peters and Stoorvogel, 1992], [Haddad *et al.*, 1991], [Kaminer *et al.*, 1992], [Zhou *et al.*, 1990], [Zhou *et al.*, 1992].

Much research is now concentrated on finding tools that make optimal controller design in the case of a combination of stochastic and deterministic disturbances possible. There have been many slightly different attempts. The most promising result seems to be the three coupled Riccati equations developed by [Doyle *et al.*, 1992]. See also [Nikoukhah and Delebecque, 1992]. In [Bernhardsson, 1992], [Bernhardsson and Hagander, 1993] a classical stochastic games approach is used to determine the finite time horizon, continuous time, version of these equations. The operations of minimizing, maximizing and taking expected values appear in the problem. The name min-mix is coined to emphasize the game theory background, see e.g. [Ho, 1970, Rhodes and Luenberger, 1969].

The cornerstone for the solution method presented here is a (conjectured) generalization of a recent dynamic programming separation principle [Bernhard, 1992]. The approach makes it possible to obtain the solution by completion of squares, to unify several results and to gain insight. An explicit formula for the value of the game is also determined. A simple example is used to investigate feasible stationary solutions to the three coupled Riccati equations.

---

<sup>†</sup> This work was partly supported by the Swedish Research Council for Engineering Sciences under contract 91-721

## 2. Discrete Time Min-Mix Controllers

The calculations in discrete time are analogous to continuous time, although there are some differences. The algebra is more complicated in discrete time. The calculations have hopefully been reduced to a near minimum in what follows. Let the, possibly time-varying, system be given by

$$\begin{cases} qx = Ax + B_0 w_0 + B_1 w_1 + B_2 u \\ x(0) = x_0 \\ y = C_2 x + D_{20} w_0 + D_{21} w_1 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Here  $w_0$  denotes a stochastic disturbance modeled as Gaussian unit-variance white noise. Let the criterion be to find saddle equilibria for

$$\begin{aligned} E_{w_0} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{t_f-1} x^T(k) Q x(k) + u^T(k) u(k) - \gamma^2 w_1^T(k) w_1(k) \right\} \\ + E_{w_0} x^T(t_f) Q_f x(t_f) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $w_1$  is a worst-case disturbance. The controller is assumed to be of the form  $u(k) = f(y^{k-1})$ , i. e. to contain a computational delay of one step. The disturbance  $w_1(k)$  is allowed to be a function of  $x^k, y^{k-1}$  but not of future information.

The idea is now to use dynamic programming in the spirit of Isaacs' equation, see [Isaacs, 1965], applying a generalization of a recent separation principle, see [Bernhard, 1992], [Bernhardsson, 1992]. Inspired by the continuous time case, see also [Bernhardsson and Hagander, 1993], we define  $\tilde{x}$  by

$$\begin{cases} q\tilde{x} = A\tilde{x} + B_2 u + B_1 \hat{F}_1 \tilde{x} - L(y - C_2 \tilde{x} - D_{21} \hat{F}_1 \tilde{x}) \\ \tilde{x}(0) = x_0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $L$  and  $\hat{F}_1$  will be determined later. The interpretation of  $\tilde{x}$  will also be clarified later; Consider it for the moment just to be a suitably defined signal. Similarly we investigate the following quadratic expression as a possible candidate for the future loss from time  $k$  and onwards:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{V}(k, x, \tilde{x}) = x^T X(k) x + \tilde{x}^T Y(k) \tilde{x} + \nu(k) \\ \nu(k) = \sum_{j=k+1}^{t_f} \text{Tr} (B_0^T X(j) B_0 + B_{0L}^T Y(j) B_{0L}) \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Recursions for  $X$  and  $Y$  will be determined later. Here we introduce the notation  $\tilde{x} = x - \tilde{x}$ ,  $B_{0L} = B_0 + LD_{20}$  and  $B_{1L} = B_1 + LD_{21}$ . We have also

$$\begin{aligned} q \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} &= \bar{A} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} + \bar{B}_0 w_0 + \bar{B} \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix} \\ \bar{A} &= \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ -B_{1L} \hat{F}_1 & A + LC_2 + B_{1L} \hat{F}_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \bar{B}_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} B_0 \\ B_{0L} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{B} = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \\ B_{1L} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

The loss per step in (2) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} x^T Q x + u^T u - \gamma^2 w_1^T w_1 &= x^T Q x + \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix}^T J \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix} \\ \text{with } J &= \begin{pmatrix} -\gamma^2 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}. \text{ For the dynamic programming} \\ \text{we introduce} & \\ \bar{X} &= \begin{pmatrix} X(k+1) & 0 \\ 0 & Y(k+1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \text{and study the future loss plus the loss at step } k & \\ f &= E_{w_0} \begin{pmatrix} qx \\ q\tilde{x} \end{pmatrix}^T \bar{X} \begin{pmatrix} qx \\ q\tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} + \\ &+ E_{w_0} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix}^T \bar{Q} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix}^T J \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix} \right\} \\ &= \text{Tr} \bar{B}_0^T \bar{X} \bar{B}_0 + \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix}^T \left\{ \bar{A}^T \bar{X} \bar{A} + \bar{Q} \right\} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} + \\ &+ 2 \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix}^T \bar{A}^T \bar{X} \bar{B} \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix} + \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix}^T \left\{ \bar{B}^T \bar{X} \bar{B} + J \right\} \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

To complete the squares we determine  $F$  from

$$\begin{cases} S = \begin{pmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} \\ S_{12}^T & S_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \bar{B}^T \bar{X} \bar{B} + J \\ SF = -\bar{B}^T \bar{X} \bar{A} \\ F = \begin{pmatrix} F_1 & F_{12} \\ F_2 & F_{22} \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

giving

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \text{Tr} \bar{B}_0^T \bar{X} \bar{B}_0 \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix}^T \left\{ \bar{A}^T \bar{X} \bar{A} + \bar{Q} - F^T S F \right\} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \left[ \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix} - F \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} \right]^T S \left[ \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ u \end{pmatrix} - F \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We first evaluate the off-diagonal block of the second term in (6)

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \left\{ \bar{A}^T \bar{X} \bar{A} + \bar{Q} - F^T S F \right\} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} &= \\ \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \left\{ \bar{A}^T + F^T \bar{B}^T \right\} \bar{X} \bar{A} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} &= \\ = - \left( \hat{F}_1^T - F_1^T \right) B_{1L}^T Y \left( A + LC_2 + B_{1L} \hat{F}_1 \right) & \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

and choose to make it zero by  $\hat{F}_1 = F_1$ . Then rewrite the feedback-gain equation

$$\begin{aligned} S \begin{pmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \end{pmatrix} &= -\bar{B}^T \bar{X} \bar{A} \begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \{ [B_1 B_2]^T X [B_1 B_2] + [B_{1L} 0]^T Y [B_{1L} 0] + J \} \begin{pmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \end{pmatrix} &= \\ = -[B_1 B_2]^T X A + [B_{1L} 0]^T Y B_{1L} F_1 & \end{aligned}$$

which simplifies to

$$\begin{pmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \end{pmatrix} = -J^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \end{pmatrix}^T V A \quad (8)$$

$$V^{-1} = X^{-1} + \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \end{pmatrix} J^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \end{pmatrix}^T \quad (9)$$

This we recognize from standard discrete time  $H_\infty$ -theory, see e.g. [Başar and Bernhard, 1991]. The following convexity-concavity conditions on the S-blocks in (5) are now required for the min-max problem

$$S_{11} = -\gamma^2 I + B_1^T X B_1 + B_{1L}^T Y B_{1L} < 0 \quad (10)$$

$$S_{12} = B_1^T X B_2 \quad (11)$$

$$S_{22} = I + B_2^T X B_2 > 0 \quad (12)$$

Using the completion of squares (6) and a lot of similar matrix algebra, we obtain that  $f$  has a maximum with respect to  $w_1$  in case  $u = u^* = F_2 \tilde{x}$ ,

$$\max_{w_1} f = x^T X_k x + \tilde{x}^T Y_k \tilde{x} + \text{Tr} (B_0^T X_j B_0 + B_{0L}^T Y_j B_{0L})$$

for  $w_1 = w_1^*$  given by

$$w_1^* = F_1 \tilde{x} + N \tilde{x} \quad (13)$$

$$-S_{11} N = B_1^T X A + B_{1L}^T Y (A + L C_2) \quad (14)$$

with  $S_{11}$  from (10), and  $X(k)$  and  $Y(k)$  given by the Riccati recursions

$$q^{-1} X = Q + A^T V A \quad (15)$$

$$q^{-1} Y = A^T X A - A^T V A + (A + L C_2)^T Y (A + L C_2) - N^T S_{11} N \quad (16)$$

where  $V$  is obtained by (9), and where  $X(t_f) = Q_f$  and  $Y(t_f) = 0$ . To discuss the minimization with respect to  $u$  we rewrite the system using  $u^*$  and  $w_1^*$ :

$$\begin{cases} q x = A_c x + [B_1(N - F_1) - B_2 F_2] \tilde{x} + B_0 w_0 + \\ \quad + B_1(w_1 - w_1^*) + B_2(u - u^*) \\ q \tilde{x} = A_e \tilde{x} + B_{0L} w_0 + B_{1L}(w_1 - w_1^*) \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

$$\begin{cases} A_c = A + B_1 F_1 + B_2 F_2 \\ A_e = A + L C_2 + B_{1L} N \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

If we now assume  $w_1 = w_1^*$ , we thus have that the covariance matrix  $P = E[\tilde{x} \tilde{x}^T | y^{k-1}]$ , is given by

$$\begin{cases} q P = A_e P A_e^T + B_{0L} B_{0L}^T \\ P(0) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

and the system equations could be written as

$$q x = (A + B_1 F_1) x + B_2 u + B_0 w_0 + B_1 (N - F_1) \tilde{x}$$

$$y = (C_2 + D_{21} F_1) x + D_{20} w_0 + D_{21} (N - F_1) \tilde{x}$$

Now define

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_a & V_{ab} \\ V_{ab}^T & V_b \end{pmatrix} = \text{Cov} \begin{pmatrix} q x - (A + B_1 F_1) \tilde{x} - B_2 u \\ y - (C_2 + D_{21} F_1) \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \text{Cov} \begin{pmatrix} (A + B_1 N) \tilde{x} + B_0 w_0 \\ (C_2 + D_{21} N) \tilde{x} + D_{20} w_0 \end{pmatrix} = \text{Cov} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$

so that

$$V_a = (A + B_1 N) P (A + B_1 N)^T + B_0 B_0^T$$

$$V_{ab} = (A + B_1 N) P (C_2 + D_{21} N)^T + B_0 D_{20}^T$$

$$V_b = (C_2 + D_{21} N) P (C_2 + D_{21} N)^T + D_{20} D_{20}^T$$

Standard estimation theory now says that if  $L$  satisfies  $LV_b + V_{ab} = 0$  simplifying to

$$-L D_{20} D_{20}^T = A_e P (C_2 + D_{21} N)^T + B_0 D_{20}^T \quad (20)$$

then  $\tilde{x}(k+1) \perp \mathcal{Y}_k$  where  $\mathcal{Y}_k$  denotes all past information, since we in (3) made the choice

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}(k+1) - (A + B_1 F_1(k)) \tilde{x}(k) - B_2 u(k) = \\ = -L(k) [y(k) - C_2 \tilde{x}(k) - D_{21} F_1(k) \tilde{x}(k)] \end{aligned}$$

i.e.  $a = -Lb$ . This is the classical orthogonality principle. In summary the discrete time min-max problem boils down to the following:

#### THEOREM 1

Let the problem be given by (1)-(2). The discrete time optimal min-mix controllers satisfy

$$\begin{cases} q \tilde{x} = A \tilde{x} + B_2 u + B_1 F_1 \tilde{x} - L(y - C_2 \tilde{x} - D_{21} F_1 \tilde{x}) \\ u = u^* = F_2 \tilde{x}, \quad w_1 = w_1^* = F_1 x + (N - F_1) \tilde{x} \\ q^{-1} X = Q + A^T V A \\ q^{-1} Y = A^T X A - A^T V A + \\ \quad + (A + L C_2)^T Y (A + L C_2) - N^T S_{11} N \\ q P = A_e P A_e^T + B_{0L} B_{0L}^T \\ -L D_{20} D_{20}^T = A_e P (C_2 + D_{21} N)^T + B_0 D_{20}^T \end{cases}$$

where  $\{F_1, F_2\}$ ,  $V$ , and  $N$  are given by (8), (9), and (14), and where  $A_c$  and  $A_e$  are defined in (18). The concavity-convexity conditions are given by (10), and (12).

*Proof:* The proof follows from the previous discussion in the following way: Complete the squares as in (6), and use the dynamic programming principle described in [Bernhard, 1992]. First prove that given  $u = u^*$  the maximization over  $w_1$  leads recursively to the value of the game given in (4). Here the Riccati equations for  $X$  and  $Y$  are used. Then put  $w_1 = w_1^*$  instead and prove, using the orthogonality described above, that the minimization

$$\min_u E [f | y^{k-1}]$$

using (6) gives  $u = u^*$  and thus also recursively the same value of the game in (4). The convexity-concavity conditions apply at each time step.  $\square$

*Conjecture:* The stationary controller now follows, if in addition  $A_c$  and  $A_e$ , in (18), are stable.

### 3. A Simple Example

Consider the following first order SISO system

$$\begin{aligned} q x &= a x + u + w_1, & x(0) &= 0 \\ y &= x + w_0 \end{aligned}$$

Let the criteria function be given by

$$\sum (Q x^2 + u^2 - g^{-1} w_1^2)$$

where we have introduced  $g := \gamma^{-2}$  for convenience. The stationary equations for the controller are the following

$$\begin{aligned} X &= Q + a^2V, & V &= 1/(1/X + 1 - g) \\ A_c &= a - aV(1 - g), & A_e &= a + L + N \\ Y &= a^2X - a^2V + (a + L)^2Y - N^2(X + Y - 1/g) \\ N &= (aX + (a + L)Y)/(1/g - X - Y) \\ P &= A_e^2P + L^2\sigma^2 \\ L\sigma^2 &= -A_eP \end{aligned}$$

These equations have two sets of solutions, the open loop solution with  $L = 0, P = 0, A_e = a + N$ , and the solution  $L = A_e - 1/A_e, P/\sigma^2 = 1/A_e^2 - 1$  and  $A_e = 1/(a + N)$ . An interesting observation is now that different solutions should be chosen for different levels of  $\gamma$ . The open loop solution with  $L = 0$  is for a stable system optimal if  $\gamma^2 > \gamma_o^2 = Q/(1 - a)^2$ . For smaller  $\gamma$  there is a region where the other solution should be chosen. For  $\gamma < \gamma_{mix}$  there are no solutions to the equations satisfying both the stability and convexity-concavity conditions. There are several open questions for future research here.

#### 4. Conclusions

The paper has presented a solution of the min-mix problem for the discrete time, output feedback, finite horizon case. The solution was obtained by completion of squares. It is rewarding for the understanding to study how LQG and  $H_\infty$  follows as special cases from the min-mix formulas above. From a practical point of view the main drawback is that the obtained three Riccati equations are coupled and constitute a two point boundary value problem in the finite horizon case. It is nontrivial to find numerical solutions. There might be a possibility to triangularize these equations by clever change of variables.

The discrete time parallels the continuous time, e.g. in the use of a dynamic programming separation principle. The main difference is that the algebra is more complicated. There are also some other differences. The stochastic theory needed is simpler in discrete time since Ito-calculus does not have to be used. The conjugate-point theory connected to the Riccati equations is also simpler. It is replaced by the concavity-convexity conditions (10) and (12).

We have in this paper restricted ourselves to the case with a time delay of one step in the controller. The case with a direct term in the controller involves even more tedious algebra. We have also presented a simple example illustrating the equations and the solutions. More work has to be done to judge the practical merits of this controller design method.

The problem is quite rich and we have found many possibilities for future work. One goal could be to tie the results closer to the elegant operator factorization approach for the risk-sensitive problem treated by Whit-

tle, see eg. [Whittle, 1990]. It might then be possible to describe the solution using operator factorizations, see [Hagander, 1973] for the LQG case.

#### 5. References

- BAŞAR, T. and P. BERNHARD (1991): *H<sub>∞</sub>-Optimal Control and Related Minimax Design Problems - A Dynamic Game Approach*. Birkhäuser, Basel, Berlin.
- BERNHARD, P. (1992): "Information and strategies in dynamic games." *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, **30**:1, pp. 212-228.
- BERNHARDSSON, B. (1992): *Theory for Digital and Robust Control of Linear Systems*. PhD thesis, Lund Institute of Technology.
- BERNHARDSSON, B. and P. HAGANDER. (1993): "A stochastic differential games approach to mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$  control." Submitted to American Control Conference.
- DOYLE, J., K. ZHOU, and B. BODENHEIMER (1989): "Optimal control with mixed  $H_2$  and  $H_\infty$  performance objectives." In *American Control Conference*, pp. 2065-2070.
- DOYLE, J., K. ZHOU, K. GLOVER, and B. BODENHEIMER. (1992): "Mixed  $H_2$  and  $H_\infty$  performance objectives, ii: Optimal control." Submitted.
- HADDAD, W., D. BERNSTEIN, and D. MUSTAFA (1991): "Mixed norm  $H_2/H_\infty$  regulation and estimation: The discrete-time case." In *American Control Conference*, pp. 1159-1164.
- HAGANDER, P. (1973): "The use of operator factorization for linear control and estimation." *Automatica*, **9**, pp. 623-631.
- HO, Y. C. (1970): "Differential games, dynamic optimization and generalized control theory." *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, **6**:3, pp. 179-209.
- ISAACS, R. (1965): *Differential Games*. Wiley.
- KAMINER, I., P. P. KHARGONEKAR, and M. ROTEA (1992): "Mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$  control for discrete-time systems via convex optimization." In *American Control Conference*, pp. 1363-1367.
- KHARGONEKAR, P. and M. ROTEA (1991): "Mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$  control: A convex optimization approach." *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, **36**:7, pp. 824-837.
- LIMEBEER, D., B. D. O. ANDERSON, and B. HENDEL. (1991): "Mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$  filtering by the theory of Nash games." Submitted to Tokyo workshop on Robust Control.
- MUSTAFA, D. (1989): "Relations between maximum-entropy  $H_\infty$  control and combined  $H_\infty$ /LQG control." *Systems & Control Letters*, **12**:3, pp. 193-203.
- NIKOUKHAH, R. and F. DELEBECQUE (1992): "On a stochastic differential game and its relationship with mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$ -control." In *American Control Conference*, pp. 1380-1384.
- PETERS, M. A. and A. A. STOOVVOGEL (1992): "Mixed  $H_2/H_\infty$  control in a stochastic framework." In *IFAC Workshop on System Structure and Control*, Prague.
- RHODES, I. B. and D. G. LUENBERGER (1969): "Differential games with imperfect state information." *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, **AC-14**:1, pp. 29-38.
- ROTEA, M. and P. KHARGONEKAR (1990): "Simultaneous  $H_2/H_\infty$  optimal control with state feedback." In *American Control Conference*, volume 3, pp. 2380-2384, California.
- WHITTLE, P. (1990): *Risk Sensitive Optimal Control*. John Wiley & Sons.
- ZHOU, K., J. DOYLE, K. GLOVER, and B. BODENHEIMER (1990): "Mixed  $H_2$  and  $H_\infty$  control." In *American Control Conference*, pp. 2502-2507.
- ZHOU, K., K. GLOVER, B. BODENHEIMER, and J. DOYLE. (1992): "Mixed  $H_2$  and  $H_\infty$  performance objectives, i: Robust performance analysis." Submitted.