MIXED $H_\infty$/PASSIVE PROJECTIVE SYNCHRONIZATION FOR FRACTIONAL-ORDER NEURAL NETWORKS WITH UNCERTAIN PARAMETERS AND DELAYS
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ABSTRACT. This paper considers the design problem of mixed $H_\infty$/passive projective synchronization for fractional-order (FO) neural networks with uncertain parameters and time-delays. Firstly, by use of active control and adaptive control method, efficient hybrid control strategies are designed for the synchronization of time-delayed FO dynamic networks with uncertain parameters. Then, a continuous frequency distributed model of the FO dynamic networks is given, via the application of FO system stability theory and robust control, the projective synchronization conditions are addressed in terms of linear matrix inequality techniques. Based on the conditions, a desired controller which can guarantee the robust stability of the closed-loop system and also ensure a mixed $H_\infty$/passive performance level is designed. Finally, synchronization of two time-delayed FO dynamic networks with uncertain parameters and the application in secure communications as simulation examples are given to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed method.
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1. Introduction. The seeds of fractional derivatives were planted over 300 years ago, and fractional calculus is a field of applied mathematics that deals with derivatives and integrals of arbitrary orders (including complex orders). In recent years, it has played important roles in science, engineering, mathematics, economics, and other fields of pure and applied sciences because it allows modelling of real physical systems more accurately than calculus of integer order does [1,2]. When the model of a system includes at least one fraction derivative or integral term, we call it a fractional order system. One of the important applications of fractional calculus is in the area of fractional-order neural networks systems. The research related to fractional-order neural networks has received considerable attention, and some valuable results have been presented [3,4]. Due to the finite switching speed of amplifiers, time delay inevitably exists in neural networks. It can cause oscillation and instability behavior of systems [5]. Therefore, the study on stability analysis and controller design of fractional-order neural networks with time delays is of both theoretical and practical importance.
Since Pecora and Carroll [6] introduced a method to synchronize two identical chaotic systems with different initial conditions, synchronization has received considerable attention among scientists due to its importance in many applications such as secure communication, chemical systems, biological systems, and human heartbeat regulation. Since then, a variety of synchronization methods have been developed [7,8]. Furthermore, projective synchronization, characterized by a scaling factor that two systems synchronize proportionally, is one of the most interesting problems. Based on projective synchronization, sliding mode control was discussed in [9] for fractional order chaotic systems, and later, a modified projective synchronization for fractional order hyperchaotic systems was proposed in [10]. Function projective synchronization scheme was investigated in [11], and a modified function projective synchronization for a class of partial linear fractional-order chaotic system was studied in [12]. Very recently, some results with respect to projective synchronization of fractional-order neural networks have been proposed in [13,14].

On the other hand, the passivity theory plays an important role in the design and analysis of linear and nonlinear systems, which has attracted significant attention during the last decades. For fractional-order systems, passivity-based control approach was investigated in [15]. It is well realized that the purpose of $H_\infty$ controllers/filters is to guarantee the closed-loop error systems are stable with an $H_\infty$ norm bound limited to disturbance attenuation [16,17]. Recently, state feedback $H_\infty$ control of commensurate fractional-order systems and $H_\infty$ model reduction for positive fractional-order systems were investigated in [18,19], respectively. Noting the importance of $H_\infty$ control theory and passivity theory, the mixed $H_\infty$/passive performance index was first presented in [20]. Then, many authors have investigated the mixed $H_\infty$/passive control or synchronization for different systems, see, e.g., [21,22]. While for fractional-order neural networks, the projective synchronization problem based on the mixed $H_\infty$/passive performance has been seldom studied which is one of our main motivations.

Motivated by the above discussions, our work is mainly to discuss the mixed $H_\infty$/passive projective synchronization of fractional-order neural networks by using the adaptive control approach and in the presence of time-delay and model uncertainties. By combining the active control and adaptive control, a novel hybrid control scheme is designed, which is suitable for the time-delayed fractional-order neural networks with uncertain parameters. Then, by fractional-order Lyapunov theorem, stability analysis results are given in terms of linear matrix inequalities. Finally, numerical examples and the application in secure communications are presented to illustrate the effectiveness and validation of the proposed adaptive projective synchronization scheme.

2. Problem Formulation. To discuss fractional-order systems, we often need to solve fractional-order differential equations. Some commonly used definitions and lemmas about fractional calculus are proposed.

Definition 2.1. [23] The fractional integral of order $\alpha$ for a function $f$ is defined as

$$I^\alpha f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{f(\tau)}{(t-\tau)^{1-\alpha}} d\tau$$

(1)

where $t \geq t_0$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the well-known gamma function.
Definition 2.2. [23] The Caputo fractional derivative of order $\alpha$ of a function $f \in C^n([t_0, +\infty), R)$ is defined as

$$D^\alpha f(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \int_{t_0}^t \frac{f^{(n)}(\tau)}{(t-\tau)^{\alpha+1-n}} d\tau, & n-1 < \alpha < n \\ d^n f(t)/dt^n, & \alpha = n \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where $t \geq t_0$, $n$ is the first integer which is not less than $\alpha$, i.e., $n-1 \leq \alpha < n$. Particularly, when $0 < \alpha < 1$,

$$D^\alpha f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_{t_0}^t \frac{f'(\tau)}{(t-\tau)^\alpha} d\tau \tag{3}$$

Definition 2.3. [23] Let $\Omega = [a, b]$ be an interval on the real axis $R$, let $n = [\alpha] + 1$ for $\alpha \notin N$ or $n = \alpha$ for $\alpha \in N$. If $y \in C^n[a, b]$, then

$$I^\alpha D^\alpha y(t) = y(t) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{y^{(k)}(a)}{k!}(x-a)^k \tag{4}$$

In particular, if $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $y \in C^1[a, b]$, then

$$I^\alpha D^\alpha y(t) = y(t) - y(a) \tag{5}$$

Lemma 2.1. [24] Let $U, V, W$ and $M$ be real matrices of appropriate dimensions with $M = M^T$, then

$$M + UVW + W^TV^TU^T < 0 \tag{6}$$

if and only if there exists a scalar $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$M + \varepsilon^{-1}UU^T + \varepsilon W^TW < 0 \tag{7}$$

In this section, we consider the time-delayed fractional-order neural networks as the drive system, which can be described by the following differential equation:

$$D^\alpha x(t) = -C x(t) + (A + \Delta A)f(x(t)) + (B + \Delta B)f(x(t - \tau_1)) + H_1 \omega(t) \tag{8}$$

$$z(t) = Jx(t) \tag{9}$$

where $x(t) = [x_1(t), x_2(t), \ldots, x_n(t)]^T \in R^n$ is the state vector of the neural network system (8) and (9). $z(t)$ is the output, $C = \text{diag}(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n)$ represents the self-connection weight, where $c_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$) $\in R$, $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$, $B = (b_{kj})_{n \times n}$ are the interconnection weight matrix, $H_1 \in R^{n \times n}$ is a known real constant matrix and $\tau_1$ stands for a time delay, which is a positive constant, and $f(x(t)) = [f_1(x_1(t)), f_2(x_2(t)), \ldots, f_n(x_n(t))]^T \in R^n$ represents the activation function and $\omega(t) = [\omega_1(t), \omega_2(t), \ldots, \omega_n(t)]^T$ denotes the disturbance input that belongs to $L_2[0, \infty)$. The parameter uncertainties $\Delta A_i$, $\Delta B_i$ are time varying matrices with appropriate dimensions, which are defined as follows

$$[\Delta A, \Delta B] = DF(t)[E_1, E_2] \tag{10}$$

where $D$, $E_1$, $E_2$ are known constant matrices of appropriate dimensions and $F(t)$ is a known time varying matrix with Lebesgue measurable elements bounded by

$$F^T(t)F(t) \leq I \tag{11}$$

where $I$ is the identity matrix with appropriate dimension.

The response system is described by

$$D^\alpha y(t) = -C y(t) + (A + \Delta A)f(y(t)) + (B + \Delta B)f(y(t - \tau_2)) + H_2 \omega(t) + u(t) \tag{12}$$

$$\dot{z}(t) = Jy(t) \tag{13}$$
where \( y(t) = [y_1(t), y_2(t), \ldots, y_n(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is the state vector of the response system (12) and (13), \( \dot{z}(t) \) is the output, \( u(t) = [u_1(t), u_2(t), \ldots, u_n(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is a control input vector and \( H_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is a known real constant matrix with appropriate dimensions.

**Assumption 2.1.** [25] The neuron activation function \( f_i \) is bounded and satisfies Lipschitz condition on \( \mathbb{R} \), that is, there exists constant \( l_i > 0 \) such that
\[
|f_i(\phi) - f_i(\varphi)| \leq l_i |\phi - \varphi| \tag{14}
\]
for any \( \phi, \varphi \in \mathbb{R} \). For convenience, we define \( L = \text{diag}(l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_n) \).

**Definition 2.4.** The systems (8) and (12) can achieve projective synchronization if there exists a nonzero constant \( \beta \) and controller \( u_i(t) \) (\( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \)) for any two solutions \( x(t) \) and \( y(t) \) of systems (8) and (12) with different initial values \( x(0) \) and \( y(0) \) such that
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \| y(t) - \beta x(t) \| = 0 \tag{15}
\]

Our objective is to find suitable and effective controller functions \( u_i(t) \) (\( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \)) to ensure the asymptotically stability of the error system and satisfy the mixed \( H_\infty \)/passive performance, which is defined in the following.

**Definition 2.5.** Given a weight scalar \( \sigma \in (0, 1) \), the synchronization error system between systems (8) and (12): 
\( e(t) = y(t) - \beta x(t) \) is said to be asymptotically stable and satisfy a mixed \( H_\infty \)/passive performance \( \delta \), if the following two requirements are satisfied simultaneously:

1. the synchronization error system between systems (8) and (12) is asymptotically stable;
2. under zero initial condition, there exists a scalar \( \delta > 0 \) such that the following condition is satisfied:
\[
\int_0^{T_p} \left[ -\sigma \dot{z}(t) + 2(1 - \sigma)\delta \dot{z}(t) \omega(t) \right] dt \geq -\delta^2 \int_0^{T_p} \omega^T(t)\omega(t) dt \tag{16}
\]
for any \( T_p > 0 \) and any non-zero \( \omega(t) \in L_2[0, \infty) \), where \( \dot{z}(t) = Je(t) \).

**Remark 2.1.** It has been recognized that the time-delays and parameter uncertainties, which are inherent features of many physical processes, are very often the cause for instability and poor performance of systems. As for the fractional-order complex networks with parametric uncertainties, the issue of synchronization has been well investigated in [26]. Also, the synchronization problem for time-delay fractional-order neural networks has been tackled in [27,28], respectively. Unfortunately, the parametric uncertainties and the time delays have not been considered in [26-28] simultaneously for the synchronization problem of fractional-order neural networks. Especially, our proposed synchronization controller not only can guarantee the robust stability of the closed-loop system, but also ensures a mixed \( H_\infty \)/passive performance level.

3. Synchronization Controller Design and Analysis. Firstly, we define synchronization error as follows
\[
e(t) = y(t) - \beta x(t) \tag{17}
\]
Then based on Definition 2.3, the error dynamical system can be obtained as follows
\[
D^\alpha e(t) = -Ce(t) + (A + \Delta A)[f(y(t)) - \beta f(x(t))] + \frac{B + \Delta B}{\rho}[f(y(t - \tau_2)) - \beta f(x(t - \tau_1))] + (H_2 - \beta H_1)\omega(t) + u(t) \tag{18}
\]
where \( e(t) = [e_1(t), e_2(t), \ldots, e_n(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n \) are state vectors of error system (18), \( \beta = \text{diag}[\beta_1(t), \beta_2(t), \beta_3(t)] \) is continuous vector function.
Remark 3.1. If $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 1$ or $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = -1$, the proposed projective synchronization problem will be reduced to the common synchronization or anti-synchronization. If $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$, the projective synchronization problem will be turned to a stabilization problem of fractional-order delayed neural network system.

Remark 3.2. If $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2 \neq \beta_3$ are time-varying parameters, the proposed projective synchronization problem is said to be function projective synchronization of fractional-order dynamic networks.

In what follows, we will design appropriate control scheme to ensure the projective synchronization can be achieved between the drive system (8) and the response system (12).

At first, the control input $u(t)$ is designed as the following:

$$u(t) = v(t) + w(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

where

$$v(t) = (A + \Delta A)[\beta f(x(t)) - f(\beta x(t))] + (B + \Delta B)[\beta f(x(t - \tau_1)) - f(\beta x(t - \tau_2))],$$

$$w(t) = -K(t)e(t),$$

$$K(t) = \text{diag}(k_1(t), k_2(t), \ldots, k_n(t)),$$

and

$$\dot{k}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_j(t) [2\lambda_i P_{1ji} + 2\lambda_i P_{2ji} + \lambda_i P_{3ji}] e_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} D^\alpha e_j(t) P_{3ji} \lambda_i D^\alpha e_i(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

where $\lambda_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$) are positive constants.

Now, by applying the control scheme (19) to the error system (18), the following error dynamic can be obtained

$$D^\alpha e(t) = -Ce(t) + (A + \Delta A)[f(y(t)) - f(\beta x(t))]$$

$$+ (B + \Delta B)[f(y(t - \tau_2)) - f(\beta x(t - \tau_2))]$$

$$+ (H_2 - \beta H_1)\omega(t) - K(t)e(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

Based on Equation (10), the error system (21) can be rewritten as

$$D^\alpha e(t) = -Ce(t) + (A + DF(t)E_1)[f(y(t)) - f(\beta x(t))]$$

$$+ (B + DF(t)E_2)[f(y(t - \tau_2)) - f(\beta x(t - \tau_2))]$$

$$+ (H_2 - \beta H_1)\omega(t) - K(t)e(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

$$\dot{z}(t) = Je(t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

It is obvious that $e(t) = 0$ is a trivial solution of the error system (22).

Based on a continuous frequency distributed model of Caputo derivatives proposed in [29], the error system (22) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial Z(\omega, t)}{\partial t} &= -\omega Z(\omega, t) - Ce(t) + (A + \Delta A)[f(y(t)) - f(\beta x(t))] \\
&\quad + (B + \Delta B)[f(y(t - \tau_2)) - f(\beta x(t - \tau_2))] \\
&\quad + (H_2 - \beta H_1)\omega(t) - K(t)e(t) \\
e(t) &= \int_0^\infty \mu(\omega)Z(\omega, t)d\omega
\end{aligned}$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

where $Z(\omega, t) = [Z_1(\omega, t), Z_2(\omega, t), \ldots, Z_n(\omega, t)]^T$, $\mu(\omega) = \text{diag}[\mu_1(\omega), \mu_2(\omega), \ldots, \mu_n(\omega)]$ and $\mu_i(\omega) = \frac{\sin(\omega t)}{\omega} - p$.

Next, we mainly prove the stability of the error system (22) for the zero solution.
Theorem 3.1. Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied, for given scalars $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\delta$, $\gamma$ and $0 < \sigma < 1$, matrix $J$ and adaptive constant matrix $K$, if there exist positive definite matrices $P_1$, $P_2$, $P_3$, $R$ and $\varepsilon_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6$), such that

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Omega_1 & \Omega_2 & \Omega_3 & \Omega_4 \\
* & -R_1 & 0 & 0 \\
* & * & -R_2 & 0 \\
* & * & * & -R_3 \\
\end{bmatrix} < 0
\]  

(25)

where

\[
\Omega_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\psi_{11} & \psi_{12} & \psi_{13} & \hat{\phi}_{14} \\
* & \psi_{22} & \psi_{23} & \hat{\phi}_{24} \\
* & * & \hat{\phi}_{33} & \hat{\phi}_{34} \\
* & * & * & \hat{\phi}_{44} \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \Omega_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
P_1D & L_1^TE_1^T\varepsilon_1 & P_1D & L_2^TE_2^T\varepsilon_2 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\Omega_3 = \begin{bmatrix}
P_2D & L_1^TE_1^T\varepsilon_3 & P_2D & L_2^TE_2^T\varepsilon_4 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\Omega_4 = \begin{bmatrix}
P_3D & L_1^TE_1^T\varepsilon_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
R_1 = \text{diag}\{\varepsilon_1I, \varepsilon_1I, \varepsilon_2I, \varepsilon_2I\}, \quad R_2 = \text{diag}\{2\varepsilon_3I, \varepsilon_3I, \varepsilon_4I, \varepsilon_4I\}, \quad R_3 = \text{diag}\{2\varepsilon_5I, 2\varepsilon_5I, 2\varepsilon_5I, 2\varepsilon_6I, 2\varepsilon_6I, 2\varepsilon_6I\},
\]

and

\[
\psi_{11} = -P_1C - C^TP_1 + P_1AL_1 + L_1^TA^TP_1 - P_1K - K^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_1BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TB^TP_1 \\
- P_2K - K^TP_2 - P_2C - C^TP_2 + P_2AL_1 + L_1^TA^TP_2 + \sigma J^TJ,
\]

\[
\psi_{12} = P_2BL_2 + L_2^TB^TP_2, \quad \psi_{13} = -P_2 - C^TP_3 + \frac{1}{2}P_3AL_1 + \frac{1}{2}L_1^TA^TP_3,
\]

\[
\hat{\varphi}_{14} = P_1H_2 - \beta P_1H_1 + P_2H_2 - \beta P_2H_2 - (1 - \sigma)\delta J^T,
\]

\[
\psi_{22} = P_1BL_2 + \frac{3}{2}L_2^TB^TP_1, \quad \psi_{23} = P_2BL_2 + \frac{3}{2}L_2^TB^TP_2,
\]

\[
\hat{\varphi}_{24} = 0, \quad \hat{\varphi}_{33} = -2P_3, \quad \hat{\varphi}_{34} = P_3H_2 - \beta P_3H_1, \quad \hat{\varphi}_{44} = R - \delta^2I,
\]

then the synchronization error system between systems (8) and (12) is asymptotically stable with a prescribed mixed $H_\infty$/passive performance level $\delta$.

**Proof:** Considering the following Lyapunov functional for systems (22) and (23)

\[
V(t) = V_1(t) + V_2(t) + V_3(t)
\]

(26)

where

\[
V_1(t) = \int_0^\infty Z^T(\omega, t)\mu(\omega)P_1Z(\omega, t)d\omega,
\]

\[
V_2(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2\lambda_i}(k_i(t) - k_i)^2, \quad V_3(t) = \int_0^t \omega^T(\omega)R\omega(s)ds.
\]
Taking the time fractional-order derivative of $V(t)$ and combining Equations (24), (10) and (20) give the following result:

$$
\dot{V}(t) = \int_0^\infty [-\omega Z(\omega, t) - Ce(t) + (A + DF(t)E_1)\psi(e(t)) + (B + DF(t)E_2)\psi(e(t - \tau_2)) - K(t)e(t) + (H_2 - \beta H_1)\omega(t)]^T \mu(\omega)P_1Z(\omega, t)d\omega \\
+ \int_0^\infty Z^T(\omega, t)\mu(\omega)P_1[-\omega Z(\omega, t) - Ce(t) + (A + DF(t)E_1)\psi(e(t)) + (B + DF(t)E_2)\psi(e(t - \tau_2)) - K(t)e(t) + (H_2 - \beta H_1)\omega(t)]d\omega \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\lambda_i}(k_i(t) - k_i) \left[ 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_j(t)P_{1ji}\lambda_ie_i(t) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_j(t)P_{2ji}\lambda_ie_i(t) \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_j(t)P_{3ji}\lambda_ie_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} D^\alpha e_j(t)P_{3ji}\lambda_iD^\alpha e_i(t) \right] + \omega^T(t)R\omega(t),
$$

where $\psi(e(t)) = f(y(t)) - f(\beta x(t))$, $\psi(e(t - \tau_2)) = f(y(t - \tau_2)) - f(\beta x(t - \tau_2))$.

Now, based on Assumption 2.1, we have

$$
\dot{V}(t) \leq \int_0^\infty [-\omega Z(\omega, t) - Ce(t) + (A + DF(t)E_1)L_1e(t) \\
+ (B + DF(t)E_2)L_2e(t - \tau_2) \\
+ (H_2 - \beta H_1)\omega(t) - K(t)e(t)]^T \mu(\omega)P_1Z(\omega, t)d\omega \\
+ \int_0^\infty Z^T(\omega, t)\mu(\omega)P_1[-\omega Z(\omega, t) - Ce(t) + (A + DF(t)E_1)L_1e(t) \\
+ (B + DF(t)E_2)L_2e(t - \tau_2) + (H_2 - \beta H_1)\omega(t) - K(t)e(t)]d\omega \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\lambda_i}(k_i(t) - k_i) \left[ 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_j(t)P_{1ji}\lambda_ie_i(t) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_j(t)P_{2ji}\lambda_ie_i(t) \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_j(t)P_{3ji}\lambda_ie_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} D^\alpha e_j(t)P_{3ji}\lambda_iD^\alpha e_i(t) \right] + \omega^T(t)R\omega(t)
$$

From Equation (24), (27) can be rewritten as follows:

$$
\dot{V}(t) \leq e^T(t) \left[ -P_1C - C^TP_1 + P_1AL_1 + L_1^TA^TP_1 + P_1DF(t)E_1L_1 + L_1^TE_1^TDF(t)DT^TP_1 \\
- P_1K - K^TP_1 \right] e(t) + 2e^T(t) [P_1BL_2 + P_1DF(t)E_2L_2] e(t - \tau_2) \\
+ 2e^T(t)[P_1H_2 - \beta P_1H]\omega(t) + 2e^T(t)P_2(K(t) - K)e(t) \\
+ (D^\alpha e(t))^T P_3(K(t) - K)D^\alpha e(t) + \omega^T(t)R\omega(t) \\
\leq e^T(t) \left[ -P_1C - C^TP_1 + P_1AL_1 + L_1^TA^TP_1 + P_1DF(t)E_1L_1 + L_1^TE_1^TDF(t)DT^TP_1 \\
- P_1K - K^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_1BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TB^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_1DF(t)E_2L_2 \\
+ \frac{1}{2}L_2^TE_2^TDF(t)DT^TP_1 + 2P_2(K(t) - K) \right] e(t) \\
+ e^T(t - \tau_2) \left[ \frac{1}{2}P_1BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TB^TP + \frac{1}{2}P_1DF(t)E_2L_2 \right] e(t - \tau_2).
$$
\begin{equation}
\dot{V}(t) \leq \eta^T(t) \left[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\varphi_{11} & \varphi_{12} & \varphi_{13} & \varphi_{14} \\
* & \varphi_{22} & \varphi_{23} & \varphi_{24} \\
* & * & \varphi_{33} & \varphi_{34} \\
* & * & * & \varphi_{44}
\end{array} \right] \eta(t)
\end{equation}

where

\begin{align*}
\eta^T(t) &= [e^T(t) \ e^T(t - \tau_2) \ \mathcal{D}^\alpha e(t) \ \omega^T(t)]^T,
\end{align*}

and

\begin{align*}
\varphi_{11} &= -P_1C - C^TP_1 + P_1A_L + L_1^TA^TP_1 + P_1DF(t)E_1L_1 + L_1^TE_1^TF^T(t)DP_1 \\
&\quad - P_1K - K^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_1BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TB^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_1DF(t)E_2L_2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TE_2^TF^T(t)DP_1 + 2P_2(K(t) - K),
\varphi_{12} &= \varphi_{13} = \varphi_{23} = \varphi_{24} = \varphi_{34} = 0, \quad \varphi_{14} = P_1H_2 - \beta P_1H_1,
\varphi_{22} &= \frac{1}{2}P_1BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TB^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_1DF(t)E_2L_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TE_2^TF^T(t)DP_1,
\varphi_{33} &= P_3(K(t) - K), \quad \varphi_{44} = R.
\end{align*}

Then, from Equation (22), it is easy to see that for any appropriately dimensioned matrices $P_2$ and $P_3$, the following equation holds:

\begin{equation}
0 = 2\left[e^T(t)P_2 + \mathcal{D}^\alpha e(t)P_3 \right] \{ -\mathcal{D}^\alpha e(t) - C\mathcal{E}(t) + (A + DF(t)E_1)\varphi(e(t)) \\
+ (B + DF(t)E_2)\varphi(e(t - \tau_2)) + (H_2 - \beta H_1)\omega(t) - K(t)e(t) \}
\end{equation}

Adding the right-hand sides of (29) to $\dot{V}(t)$, we can get from (28)

\begin{align*}
\dot{V}(t) + \sigma \hat{z}^T(t)\hat{z}(t) - 2(1 - \sigma)\delta \hat{z}^T(t)\omega(t) - \delta^2\omega^T(t)\omega(t) \\
&\leq \eta^T(t) \left[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\tilde{\varphi}_{11} & \tilde{\varphi}_{12} & \tilde{\varphi}_{13} & \tilde{\varphi}_{14} \\
* & \tilde{\varphi}_{22} & \tilde{\varphi}_{23} & \tilde{\varphi}_{24} \\
* & * & \tilde{\varphi}_{33} & \tilde{\varphi}_{34} \\
* & * & * & \tilde{\varphi}_{44}
\end{array} \right] \eta(t),
\end{align*}

where

\begin{align*}
\tilde{\varphi}_{11} &= -P_1C - C^TP_1 + P_1A_L + L_1^TA^TP_1 + P_1DF(t)E_1L_1 + L_1^TE_1^TF^T(t)DP_1 \\
&\quad - P_1K - K^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_1BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TB^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_1DF(t)E_2L_2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TE_2^TF^T(t)DP_1 - P_2K - K^TP_2 - P_2C - C^TP_2 + P_2A_L + L_1^TA^TP_2 \\
&\quad + P_2DF(t)E_1L_1 + L_1^TE_1^TF^T(t)DP_2 - \frac{1}{2}P_3K - \frac{1}{2}K^TP_3 + \sigma J^TJ,
\end{align*}
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\varphi}_{12} &= P_2BL_2 + L_2^TBT_2P_2 + P_2DF(t)E_2L_2 + L_2^TE_2^TF(t)D^TP_2, \\
\dot{\varphi}_{13} &= -P_2 - CT_P + \frac{1}{2}P_3AL_1 + \frac{1}{2}L_1^TA^TP_3 + \frac{1}{2}P_3DF(t)E_1L_1 + \frac{1}{2}L_1^TE_1^TF(t)D^TP_3, \\
\dot{\varphi}_{14} &= P_1H_2 - \beta P_1H_1 + P_2H_2 - \beta P_2H_1 - (1 - \sigma)\delta J^T, \\
\dot{\varphi}_{22} &= \frac{1}{2}P_1BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TB^TP + \frac{1}{2}P_1DF(t)E_2L_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TE_2^TF(t)D^TP_1, \\
\dot{\varphi}_{23} &= \frac{1}{2}P_3BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_3^TB^TP + \frac{1}{2}P_3DF(t)E_2L_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_3^TE_3^TF(t)D^TP_3, \\
\dot{\varphi}_{24} &= 0, \quad \dot{\varphi}_{33} = -2P_3 - P_3K, \quad \dot{\varphi}_{34} = P_3H_2 - \beta P_3H_1, \quad \dot{\varphi}_{44} = R - \delta^2I.
\end{align*}
\]

Based on Lemma 2.1, the above inequality can be rewritten as
\[
\dot{V}(t) + \sigma \hat{z}(t)\hat{z}(t) - 2(1 - \sigma)\delta \hat{z}(t)(\omega(t) - \delta^2\omega(t)) \leq \eta^T(t) \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\varphi}_{11} & \dot{\varphi}_{12} & \dot{\varphi}_{13} & \dot{\varphi}_{14} \\
* & \dot{\varphi}_{22} & \dot{\varphi}_{23} & \dot{\varphi}_{24} \\
* & * & \dot{\varphi}_{33} & \dot{\varphi}_{34} \\
* & * & * & \dot{\varphi}_{44} \end{bmatrix} \eta(t),
\]
with
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\varphi}_{11} &= -P_1C - CT_P + P_1AL_1 + L_1^TA^TP_1 + \varepsilon_1^{-1}P_1DD^TP_1 + \varepsilon_1L_1^TE_1^TE_1L_1 \\
&\quad - P_1K - K^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}P_2BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TB^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_2^{-1}P_2DD^TP_1 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_2L_2^TE_2^TE_2L_2 - P_2K - K^TP_2 - P_2C - CT_P + P_2AL_1 + L_1^TA^TP_2 \\
&\quad + \varepsilon_3^{-1}P_2DD^TP_2 + \varepsilon_3L_1^TE_1^TE_1L_1 + \sigma J^TJ, \\
\dot{\varphi}_{12} &= P_2BL_2 + L_2^TB^TP_2 + \varepsilon_4^{-1}P_2DD^TP_2 + \varepsilon_4L_2^TE_2^TE_2L_2, \\
\dot{\varphi}_{13} &= -P_2 - CT_P + \frac{1}{2}P_3AL_1 + \frac{1}{2}L_1^TA^TP_3 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_5^{-1}P_3DD^TP_3 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_5L_1^TE_1^TE_1L_1, \\
\dot{\varphi}_{22} &= \frac{1}{2}P_1BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_2^TB^TP + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_2^{-1}P_1DD^TP_1 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_2L_2^TE_2^TE_2L_2, \\
\dot{\varphi}_{23} &= \frac{1}{2}P_3BL_2 + \frac{1}{2}L_3^TB^TP_3 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_6^{-1}P_3DD^TP_3 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_6L_3^TE_3^TE_3L_3,
\end{align*}
\]
and the other parameters are the same in (25). Then, using Schur complement and pre-multiplying and post-multiplying the obtained inequality by
\[
\text{diag}(I, I, I, I, \varepsilon_1 I, I, \varepsilon_2 I, I, \varepsilon_3 I, I, \varepsilon_4 I, I, \varepsilon_5 I, I, \varepsilon_6 I).
\]
then we can obtain (25). This completes the proof.

4. **Numerical Simulation.** In this section, we give two simulation examples to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed method and controllers for delayed fractional-order neural network system with parameter uncertainties. Firstly, initial values are selected as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha &= 0.995, \quad \tau_1 = 0.001, \quad \tau_2 = 0.005, \quad \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 5, \\
A &= \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1.2 & 0 \\
1.8 & 1.71 & 1.15 \\
-4.75 & 0 & 1.1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} -0.2 & 0.3 & 0 \\
-0.2 & -0.19 & -0.15 \\
0.6 & 0 & -0.2 \end{bmatrix}, \\
C &= \text{diag}(1, 1, 1), \quad L_1 = L_2 = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1), \quad K = \text{diag}(2, 2, 2), \\
E_1 = E_2 = \text{diag}(0.02, 0.02, 0.02), \quad D = \text{diag}(0.01, 0.01, 0.01), \\
F(t) &= 0.1 \sin(t), \quad k_1(0) = 0.05, \quad k_2(0) = 0.06, \quad k_3(0) = 0.08.
\end{align*}
\]
Example 1:

Case 1: $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3$ are selected as constants, e.g., $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 3$, and

\[
x_1(0) = 0.1, \quad x_2(0) = 0.4, \quad x_3(0) = 0.2, \quad y_1(0) = 0.8, \quad y_2(0) = 0.1, \quad y_3(0) = 0.7.
\]

After using an appropriate LMI solver to get the feasible numerical solution based on inequality (25), we can obtain that the positive definite matrices $P_1, P_2, P_3$ and variables $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$ could be

\[
P_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
1.6671 & 0.5568 & 0.6284 \\
0.5568 & 0.7896 & 0.0434 \\
0.6284 & 0.0434 & 0.6562
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
P_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
0.1570 & -0.0482 & -0.0046 \\
-0.0482 & 0.1302 & 0.0520 \\
-0.0046 & 0.0520 & 0.1843
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
P_3 = \begin{bmatrix}
1.8640 & -0.8946 & -0.6145 \\
-0.8946 & 1.8304 & 0.8505 \\
-0.6145 & 0.8505 & 0.8652
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\varepsilon_1 = 42.5351, \quad \varepsilon_2 = 20.4439, \quad \varepsilon_3 = 42.5349,
\]

\[
\varepsilon_4 = 42.5349, \quad \varepsilon_5 = 21.7231, \quad \varepsilon_6 = 19.2881.
\]

The simulation results are shown in Figures 1-4. Figures 1-3 display the uncontrolled state trajectories $\beta_i x_i(t), y_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) between drive system and response system. In Figure 4, the state trajectories of error system asymptotically converge to zero by using the proposed control scheme, which implies that the projective synchronization can be achieved for systems (8) and (12).
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**Figure 1.** The uncontrolled state trajectories $\beta_i x_i(t), y_i(t)$ of the systems (8) and (12)

Case 2: The application of fractional-order neural network system synchronization in secure communication is investigated. The sketch designed for the communication scheme using our proposed synchronization method is similar to Figure 5 in [30].

In the transmitter, the original information signal $S(t)$ is modulated into the chaotic signal by using an invertible function $\Phi$, i.e., $S'(t) = \Phi(x_1, x_2, x_3, S(t))$. Then we add the signal $S'(t)$ to one of the three variables $x_1, x_2, x_3$. For instance, we inject the signal $S'(t)$ into the variable $x_1$ and derive a combined signal $\chi(t) = x_1 + S'(t)$. In the channel, the variables $x_1, x_2, x_3$ and combined signal are transmitted to receiver. When the synchronization of master-slave system was achieved, the state $y_1$ will tend to $\beta x_1$; thus $S'(t)$ can be derived through a simple transformation $S'(t) = \chi(t) - y_1/\beta$. Further, the information signal can be recovered.

Here, we firstly choose an impulse signal, which is shown in Figure 5 as the information signal. The function $\Phi$ is given by $S'(t) = x_1 + S(t)$. We assume that the signal $S'(t)$ is
Figure 2. The uncontrolled state trajectories $\beta_2 x_2(t)$, $y_2(t)$ of the systems (8) and (12).

Figure 3. The uncontrolled state trajectories $\beta_3 x_3(t)$, $y_3(t)$ of the systems (8) and (12).

Figure 4. The controlled state trajectories $e_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) of the error system.
added to the variable $x_2$. Simulation results are presented in Figures 6-8. The transmitted signal is shown in Figure 6; apparently, no effect of the embedded modulating information signal can be depicted. Figure 7 displays the recovered signal $\tilde{S}(t)$, and one can observe that the recovered signal coincides with the original information signal with good accuracy. While the error between the original information signal and the recovered one is shown in Figure 8.

**Example 2:** $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2 \neq \beta_3$ and $x(0), y(0)$ are selected as

- $\beta_1 = 4 + 0.2 \sin(2t)$,  $\beta_2 = 4 + 0.3 \sin(3t)$,  $\beta_3 = 4 + 0.1 \sin(5t)$,
- $x_1(0) = 0.2$,  $x_2(0) = 0.6$,  $x_3(0) = 0.4$,
- $y_1(0) = 0.6$,  $y_2(0) = 0.1$,  $y_3(0) = 0.9$. 

The following result can be obtained

\[
P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2.5477 & 0.4984 & 0.5490 \\ 0.4984 & 1.5865 & 0.0437 \\ 0.5490 & 0.0437 & 0.9872 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8140 & -0.0997 & 0.0634 \\ -0.0997 & 0.5975 & 0.1765 \\ 0.0634 & 0.1765 & 0.3572 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
P_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 4.4223 & -0.7884 & -0.6557 \\ -0.7884 & 3.5620 & 1.0844 \\ -0.6557 & 1.0844 & 1.7510 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \varepsilon_1 = 8.0137, \quad \varepsilon_2 = 4.0025, \quad \varepsilon_3 = 8.0137,
\]

\[
\varepsilon_4 = 8.0137, \quad \varepsilon_5 = 4.0095, \quad \varepsilon_6 = 3.9958.
\]

The state trajectories of error system by using the proposed control scheme is shown in Figure 9, which implies that the mixed $H_\infty$/passive function projective synchronization can be achieved for systems (8) and (12).
Remark 4.1. In the Numerical Simulation part, two examples are given, and they are Example 1: $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3$, and Example 2: $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2 \neq \beta_3$, respectively.

In Example 1, firstly Case 1 is shown, which is a numerical example. The initial values in Case 1 are arbitrarily chosen to obey the rules that the considered drive and response systems under the chosen parameters show chaotic behaviors. Furthermore, under our proposed controller, the considered drive and response systems can be synchronized. From Figures 2-4, we can observe that the uncontrolled drive and response systems are chaotic and they cannot achieve synchronization. Figure 5 shows that the state trajectories of error system asymptotically converge to zero by using the proposed control scheme, which implies that the projective synchronization can be achieved for drive and response systems. Following Case 1 is Case 2, which is an application example in secure communications, and the aim is to show that our proposed method is valid in practical systems.

In Example 2, just $\beta_i, x_i(0), y_i(0) \ (i = 1, 2, 3)$ are different from the ones in Example 1, and the aim is to illustrate that our proposed method is valid for different $\beta_i, x_i(0), y_i(0) \ (i = 1, 2, 3)$.

5. Conclusions. In this paper, the mixed $H_\infty$/passive projective synchronization problem for two time-delayed fractional-order neural networks with uncertain parameters has been studied. In terms of active control and adaptive control theory, a hybrid controller has been proposed to solve such a problem. Meanwhile, based on Lyapunov stability theory, the sufficient conditions are obtained, which can ensure the required mixed $H_\infty$/passive performance level of the considered synchronization error system. Finally, the effectiveness of the proposed control scheme has been illustrated in numerical simulations.

Acknowledgments. This work is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. U1604146, 61203047), Science and Technology Research Project in Henan Province (Nos. 152102210273, 162102410024) and China Scholarship Council (No. 201408410277). The authors would like to sincerely thank Prof. Om P. Agrawal and Prof. R. Koc (Chair), Mechanical Engineering and Energy Processes, Southern Illinois University for hosting her during April 8, 2016 to April 7, 2017.

REFERENCES


