

Parameter Estimation of Sigmoid Superpositions

Ivan Tyukin, Cees van Leeuwen, Danil Prokhorov ^{\$}

RIKEN Brain Science Institute
2-1, Hirosawa-Wako, Saitama, 351-0198 , Japan

^{\$}Ford Research Laboratory,
Dearborn, MI 48121, U.S.A., dprokhor@ford.com

April 5, 2019

Abstract

Superposition of sigmoid function over a finite time interval is shown to be equivalent to the linear combination of the solutions of a linearly parameterized system of logistic differential equations. Due to the linearity with respect to the parameters of the system, it is possible to design an effective procedure for parameter adjustment. Stability properties of this procedure are analyzed. Strategies shown in earlier studies to facilitate learning such as randomization of a learning sequence and adding specially designed disturbances during the learning phase are requirements for guaranteeing convergence in the learning scheme proposed.

Keywords: Neural Networks, Control Theory, Adaptive Control, Learning Algorithms

1 Introduction

Static base functions are used in a variety of universal function-approximation schemes. Their general form runs as follows: Let a given continuous function $g(t)$ be defined over a compact time interval $[0, T]$. There will be a function $y(t)$, represented as

$$y(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f(a_i t + b_i), \quad (1)$$

in which $f(\cdot) : R \rightarrow R$ is a continuous function and for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there are values of n, a_i, b_i , and c_i , such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$|g(t) - y(t)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Amongst the functions $f(\cdot)$ for which approximation of $g(t)$ can be proven, the gaussian and the sigmoid are the most well-known. Approximation by sigmoid is often favored, among others, for its very good rate of convergence with respect to the number n of additive terms in (1) [5]. Recent results [10] have shown that

$$\int_0^t (g(\tau) - y(\tau))^2 d\tau = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right).$$

Another advantage of this scheme is that the rate of approximation is not affected by the dimension of the input [5]. Finally convergence is also possible in Sobolev space, implying existence of an optimal approximator for derivatives of the function $g(t)$ [17], [16].

In spite of significant progress in the fields of nonlinear optimization and neural networks (a comprehensive review of a variety of the learning algorithms is given, for instance, in [14]) an exact estimation of unknown values of parameters a_i, b_i, c_i in (1) is an unsolved problem. Simple local optimization strategies, involving gradient descent, fail to converge because of nonconvexity of the function with respect to the parameters; global search algorithms [18], [13] are forbiddingly expensive computationally [34], and second order search algorithms rely on assumptions relating to the error surface that are not always met, for instance uniqueness of the extremum [36]. To address this complicated and important problem simplifying assumptions have been made [6]. This approach allows the values of functions $f(a_i t + b_i)$ in (1) to be measured directly. Under this assumption convergence to a global minimum could be proven. Also, their method was shown to have very fast speed of convergence. The method, however, has a restricted domain of application, due to the requirement that the values of each additive term in (1) over $[0, T]$ be known. In addition, in the recent years several new methods have been proposed which are capable of avoiding local minima by modifying the learning criterion (see, for instance [20]). Still, these methods cannot guarantee exact estimation of unknown values of the parameters a_i, b_i, c_i . In our view the underlying problem with these conventional methods is that, whereas they use error minimization for approximating a solution, they lack an explicit model of error dynamics. We will propose a novel approach to estimate the values of the parameters in (1) utilizing elements of classical control theory, notably adaptive control with reference model (MRAC).

In this approach the values of function $g(t)$ are interpreted as *reference signals*, the outputs of a dynamical system called *reference system*. The reference signal is used in the explicit definition of an error function as, for instance, the difference with a *tracking signal*. This signal, in turn, is considered the output $y(\theta, t) : \Omega_\theta \times R \rightarrow R$, $\theta \in \Omega_\theta$, $\Omega_\theta \times R \rightarrow R$, $\theta \in \Omega_\theta$ of a dynamical system called *tracking system* with parameter vector $\theta = (\mathbf{a}^T : \mathbf{b}^T : \mathbf{c}^T)$ $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in R^n$ to be determined. Thus the problem of function approximation is transformed into one of finding a suitable parameterization for a given tracking system.

A similar strategy was used in [33], [2] for different purposes. In particular, to investigate stability and convergence of the *existing* learning algorithms. In addition, the resulting equations remained nonlinear in their parameters. The presently proposed transformation will enable us to represent the problem in terms of a nonlinear system that is linear in its parameters. The linearity allows us to apply the conventional methods of adaptive control theory for stabilizing the error dynamics and thus facilitate finding the optimal solution. For this purpose, the learning problem is formulated as one of adaptive tracking (or equivalently, synchronization between reference and tracking system). To this problem we can apply the method of Lyapunov functions, extending parameter space Ω_θ to $\{\alpha, \beta, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{x}(t) | \alpha, \beta, \mathbf{C} \in R^n, \mathbf{x}(t) : R \rightarrow R^n\}$, and use a simple rule for parameter adjustment in the enhanced system dynamics. This provides us with a method potentially more powerful than, for instance, gradient descent, which operates entirely in the original parameter space by relying on the contraction theorem. It is necessary to note, in addition, that output equivalence between two superpositions of the sigmoid functions implies their identity with respect to the parameters [1]. Therefore, the solution of the adaptive tracking problem automatically results in the desired estimates of the parameters.

It should be mentioned, however, that the problem of parameter value identification has not completely been solved even for our case of linearly parameterized, nonlinear systems. The solutions available in the literature are formulated either for linear systems [19], [21], [26] or for some

special cases of nonlinear plants, assuming full state measurements [9] or the possibility to transform the system into an output injection form [22], [23]. In our case we exploit the possibility to extend both the reference and tracking signals to be repeated periodically starting from the same initial conditions. By doing so we significantly simplify the problem of searching for the optimal values of the unknown parameters. A similar strategy is often used in iterative learning control [3], [4], [24], [27] mostly for determining a feed-forward control term which is defined as a function of time. This time-variability of the solution severely reduces the significance of these methods for our problem. Nevertheless, there are several approaches to search for the unknown parameters within an iterative learning control framework [25], [15], [31]. These approaches, however, according to our knowledge, are either designed for linear dynamical systems or when dealing with nonlinear systems cannot guarantee to stop at the non-local solution. This motivates us to show, not only the possibility to transform the entire problem of static nonlinear optimization into our preferred dynamics one but also provide an algorithm to estimate the unknown parameters of the resulting linearly parameterized system of the nonlinear differential equations.

The first step in our approach will be the selection of a “base function” for the reference and tracking systems, suitable for representing a broad class of functions. We have chosen the logistic differential equation [32]. We will provide an existence proof for approximation in this system. The next step will be the specification of an algorithm for parameter adjustment that effectively finds the optimal solution in an interesting domain of functions. We consider this problem for systems with unperturbed conditions as well as with time-varying parameters. The former constitutes a method for representing scalar functions in one variable, for instance time; the latter provides a method for representing functions with multiple inputs. Finally, the viability of the approach is demonstrated in examples, among others comparing it to gradient descent.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we formulate the problem and introduce the class of the systems to be analyzed. In Section 3 we investigate the dynamic abilities of the system and prove the approximation properties of the system. In Section 4 we introduce several schemes to adjust the unknown parameters of the system. We start with a restricted version of the algorithm in Section 4.1, then we relax its applicability restrictions in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 allowing the uncertainties to be in the output function parameters. In Section 4.4 we consider a case when the smooth disturbances are added to the reference system, thus allowing to deal with a larger class of the functions to be approximated. In Section 5 we discuss multi-dimensional approximation problems and show the possibility to utilize the same technique for approximation of a system of nonlinear differential equations with arbitrary smooth right-hand sides. Section 6 contains simulation results for illustrative examples. Section 7 concludes the paper.

2 Problem Formulation

Although the sigmoidal function approximation scheme has several attractive features, the most important obstacle on the way to its implementation remains the absence of an algorithm that guarantees convergence to an optimal solution. We suggest a strategy to turn the problem of searching for the parameters of the static nonlinear parameterized map $f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, t)$, $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in R^n$ into one of searching for linear parameter values of a system of nonlinear differential equations:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = (\alpha, \beta)^T \xi(\mathbf{x}), \quad y(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in R^n$, $\alpha, \beta \in R^n$, $\mathbf{C} \in R^{n1}$. Therefore, the first problem to be addressed is the existence of such a transformation. The proposed solution uses the differential logistic map to realize system (2). This allows as to replace a function $g(t)$ with a weighted sum $y(\mathbf{x}(t))$ of sigmoid, for which we shall deal with the issue of identifying its parameter values. To this purpose, in control-theoretic terms, system (2) is considered the reference system, whereas the tracking system will have the following description:

$$\dot{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})^T \xi(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \eta(y(\mathbf{x}), y(\hat{\mathbf{x}})), \quad y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \hat{\mathbf{C}}\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in R^n$, $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta} \in R^n$, $\hat{\mathbf{C}} \in R^n$. Note the similarity in structure between tracking and reference system, except for an error function $\eta : R^2 \rightarrow R^n$, added to the tracking system. As both the reference and tracking systems are described in the same manner, it is natural to consider the combined system, which couples the reference to the tracking system via its output function $y(\mathbf{x}(t))$ in the error function $\eta(y(\mathbf{x}), y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}))$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}} &= (\alpha, \beta)^T \xi(\mathbf{x}), \quad y(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}, \\ \dot{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} &= (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})^T \xi(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \eta(y(\mathbf{x}), y(\hat{\mathbf{x}})), \quad y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \hat{\mathbf{C}}\hat{\mathbf{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is possible then to estimate the unknown parameters $\alpha, \beta, \mathbf{C}$ of the reference system. We start out by assuming that the only uncertainties are in the vectors α and β , while vector $\mathbf{C}$ is supposed to be known². We will propose an algorithm for parameter adjustment that is capable of finding the solution. Our learning algorithm will belong to the following class of functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{\alpha}} &= \mathcal{A}(y(\mathbf{x}), y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \mathbf{x}); \\ \dot{\hat{\beta}} &= \mathcal{B}(y(\mathbf{x}), y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where operators $\mathcal{A}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ are to be determined on the basis of the speed-gradient algorithm [11]. If this strategy works, the next step would be, to remove this restriction and analyze the case of unknown parameters $\mathbf{C}$ in the output function as well. Another extension would be to consider the system with unmodeled dynamics and analyze its stability.

In sum, the questions to be addressed are: is it possible (at least in theory) to transform a problem of nonlinear static optimization into a problem of a searching for linearly parameterized nonlinear differential equations? If so, then how to estimate the parameters of these nonlinear dynamic system in order to obtain qualitative approximation? The next sections will provide us with the answers.

3 Approximation with Logistic Differential Equations

Let the following system be given:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= \alpha_1 x_1 (1 - \beta_1 x_1); \\ \dot{x}_2 &= \alpha_2 x_2 (1 - \beta_2 x_2); \\ \dots &= \dots \end{aligned}$$

¹We would like to note that dimensions of the vectors α and β are not necessarily equal to n . Although we do not discuss any other parameterization, a variety of alternative descriptions with different parameterizations is possible.

²For the feedforward sigmoidal neural network this requirement is equivalent to the values of the output coefficients being given, the hidden parameter values being unknown. Thus our proposed solution and its extensions will also pertain to the problem of convergence in feedforward neural networks.

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_n &= \alpha_n x_n (1 - \beta_n x_n); \\ y(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{x} = \sum_i C_i x_i, \quad x_i(0) = \Delta_i,\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^T \in R^n$ is a state vector, $\alpha_i \in R$, $\beta_i \in R$ are parameters of system (5), y is an output function, $\mathbf{C} = (c_1, \dots, c_n)^T \in R^n$ is a vector of parameters associated with output y , $x_i(0) \in R$ are initial conditions.

We begin our investigation by asking the question, what dynamics the autonomous system (5) can produce as a function of t . The answer will be that the system can realize as output $y(\mathbf{x}(t))$ *almost any continuous function* over a compact interval $[0, T]$.

Theorem 1 *Let function $g(t) : R \rightarrow R$, $g(t) \in C_{[0,T]}^1$ be given. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $0 < T < \infty$ and $t \in [0, T]$ there are such numbers n , α_i , β_i , c_i and initial conditions $x_i(0) = \Delta_i$ that the following inequality holds:*

$$|y(\mathbf{x}(t)) - g(t)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Theorem 1 proof. We prove the theorem in 3 steps. First, we transform the original system (5) into a system with its right-hand side depending on one set of parameters ($\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)^T$ only instead of the two sets α and β). Second, for each x_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we show that the solution $x_i(t)$ belongs to the interval $[0, 1]$ for any $x_i(0) \in (0, 1)$; $x(t)$ is a monotonic and sigmoidal function with parameters depending on α and initial conditions. Therefore, to conclude the proof it is sufficient to apply a widely-known result³ from approximation theory [8],[12].

Let us start with:

Lemma 1 *Let system (5) be given and $\beta_i \neq 0$. Then there is a linear transformation $\hat{x}_i = \beta_i x_i$ of system (5) coordinates that the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{x}}_1 &= \alpha_1 \hat{x}_1 (1 - \hat{x}_1); \\ \dot{\hat{x}}_2 &= \alpha_2 \hat{x}_2 (1 - \hat{x}_2); \\ \dots &= \dots \\ \dot{\hat{x}}_n &= \alpha_n \hat{x}_n (1 - \hat{x}_n); \\ y(\mathbf{x}) &= \hat{\mathbf{C}}^T \mathbf{x} = \sum_i \frac{C_i}{\beta_i} \hat{x}_i, \quad \hat{x}_i(0) = \beta_i \Delta_i,\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

Lemma 1 proof. The proof is a routine procedure. Let us calculate $\dot{\hat{x}}_i = \beta_i \dot{x}_i$:

$$\dot{\hat{x}}_i = \beta_i \dot{x}_i = \alpha_i \beta_i x_i (1 - \beta_i x_i) = \alpha_i \hat{x}_i (1 - \hat{x}_i).$$

The rest of the lemma proof is quite obvious and we skipped it. *The lemma is proved.*

It is desirable to note that the linear transformation $\hat{x}_i = \beta_i x_i$ is one-to-one, and for any system (6) we can derive its transformed version in the form of system (5) by the inverse transformation $x_i = 1/\beta_i \hat{x}_i$. Therefore in the rest of the proof we will deal with system (6). In addition we would like to note that it is always possible to make such a transformation that the resulting α_i will be positive.

Let us consider the properties of each i -th equation of system (6). We formulate the next lemma:

³Let f be any continuous sigmoidal function. Then finite sums of the form: $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i f(a_i \mathbf{x} + b_i)$, $a_i \in R^n$, $\mathbf{x} \in R^n$, $b_i \in R$ are dense in $C(I_n)$.

Lemma 2 *Let the following differential equation be given:*

$$\dot{x} = kx(1 - x), \quad k \neq 0, \quad (7)$$

and $x(t)$ is a solution of system (7) for initial condition $x(0) = x_0$, $x_0 \in (0, 1)$. Then the next statements hold for equation (7):

- 1) $x(t)$ is a monotonic function with respect to $t > 0$;
- 2) $x(t) \rightarrow 1$ at $t \rightarrow \infty$ for $k > 0$ and $x_0 \in (0, 1)$; $x(t) \rightarrow 0$ at $t \rightarrow \infty$ for $k < 0$ and $x_0 \in (0, 1)$
- 3) $x(t)$ is unique for any $t > 0$ and initial condition $x_0 \in (0, 1)$.

Lemma 2 proof. Statement 1) of the lemma proof is obvious and therefore has been skipped here (see, for example [32]). Let us prove statement 2) of the lemma. To prove the first part, we consider the following function:

$$V(x) = 0.5(x - 1)^2. \quad (8)$$

It is clear that function $V(x)$ is well-defined and positive definite for any $x > 0$. Moreover, $V(x) \rightarrow \infty$ at $x \rightarrow \infty$ and $V(x) = 0$ at $x = 1$. These facts allow us to consider function V as Lyapunov's candidate for system (7). Let us calculate $\dot{V}$:

$$\dot{V} = (x - 1)\dot{x} = -kx(1 - x)^2 \leq 0.$$

We observe that $V > 0$ and $\dot{V} = -kx(1 - x)^2 < 0$ for $x > 0$, $x \neq 1$. For any $x \in (0, 1)$, $V(x(0)) - V(x(t)) > 0$ and therefore $x(t) > x(0)$. Hence the next inequality holds:

$$\dot{V} = (x - 1)\dot{x} \leq -kx(0)(1 - x)^2.$$

This can be written as follows:

$$\dot{V} \leq -kx(0)2V(x).$$

Hence $V \rightarrow 0$ asymptotically, and $x(t) \rightarrow 1$ at $t \rightarrow \infty$ for any $x \in (0, 1)$. To prove the second part of statement 2, where $k < 0$, it is sufficient to consider the following Lyapunov's candidate $V(x) = 0.5x^2$. Its derivative satisfies the following equation: $\dot{V}(x) = kx^2(1 - x)$ and is obviously negative definite over $x \in [0, 1)$.

Uniqueness of $x(t)$ follows directly from the continuity of equation (7) right part [28]. *Lemma 2 is proven.*

On account of lemma 2 we observe, in particular, that system (6) solutions for $\alpha_i > 0$ are completely defined by the choice of initial conditions $\hat{x}_i(0)$. This means that if $\hat{x}_i(t + \tau)$ and $\check{x}_i(t)$ are solutions of system (6) and $\hat{x}_i(t + \tau) = \check{x}_i(t)$ for any $t \geq 0$, then

$$\hat{x}_i(t + \tau) = \check{x}_i(t) \Leftrightarrow \hat{x}_i(\tau) = \check{x}_i(0).$$

In other words, for each solution $\hat{x}_i(t)$ time-shift is equivalent to choice of initial conditions. Moreover, it is easy to see that for any $\tau \in (-\infty, \infty)$ and $\hat{x}_i(0) \in (0, 1)$ there is an initial condition $\check{x}_i(0)$ such that $\hat{x}_i(t + \tau) = \check{x}_i(t)$.

All we have to prove now is that $\hat{x}_i(t)$ is a sigmoidal function. Let us consider $\dot{\hat{x}}_i$. As it follows from system (6) equations, $\hat{x}_i(t)$ time-derivative is:

$$\frac{\partial \hat{x}_i(t)}{\partial t} = \alpha_i \hat{x}_i(t)(1 - \hat{x}_i(t)),$$

then

$$\hat{x}_i(t) = \int \alpha_i \hat{x}_i(t)(1 - \hat{x}_i(t))dt = f(\alpha_i t + b_i) + D, \quad (9)$$

where

$$f(\alpha_i t + b_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\alpha_i t + b_i)}}, \quad D = 0.$$

As initial conditions of system (6) completely define time-shifts of the solutions $\hat{x}_i(t)$, coefficients b_i in (9) depend on initial conditions $\hat{x}_i(0)$ only.

We just proved that i -th solution of system (6) can be written in the following manner:

$$\hat{x}_i(t) = f(\alpha_i t + b_i),$$

where $b_i \in (-\infty, \infty)$, $b_i = f^{-1}(\hat{x}_i(0))$ depends on $\hat{x}_i(0) \in (0, 1)$ explicitly and $f(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid function. Let us consider output $y(\mathbf{x})$ of system (6):

$$y(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{C_i}{\beta_i} f(\alpha_i t + b_i) \right).$$

We denote $\hat{c}_i = C_i/\beta_i$, so $y(\mathbf{x})$ can be written in the form:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{c}_i f(\alpha_i t + b_i)).$$

Therefore, due to [8], for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $g(t) \in C_{[0,T]}^1$ there are such n , $\hat{c}_i$ and b_i that the following inequality holds:

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{c}_i f(\alpha_i t + b_i)) - g(t) \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

for $t \in [0, T]$. To conclude the proof, it is sufficient to notice that parameters α_i , β_i and initial conditions Δ_i can be restored from b_i and $\hat{c}_i$. *The theorem is proven.*

Remark 1 It follows from Theorem 1 proof that it is possible to transform the problem of nonlinear function approximation by static sigmoidal functions into a problem of a choice of initial conditions, parameters α_i and $\hat{c}_i$ of *dynamical* system (6), where parameters α_i are linearly included into the system right-hand side. This result will allow us to turn the problem of determining the nonlinear parameters of the static function into a problem of determining the linear parameters α_i of system (6). The restrictions are that vector $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ and initial conditions $\hat{x}_i(0)$ will have to be known.

Remark 2 Theorem 1 proves that there is a one-to-one transformation of a function approximation problem in terms of static sigmoidal functions to one in terms of differential logistic equations. The latter, therefore, shares all the advantages of the former, including the very good convergence rate [10], its being unaffected by input dimension [5], and its application in Sobolev space [16].

Theorem 1 merely states the existence of parameters α_i and $\hat{c}_i$ of system (6) that ensure arbitrary small error between the system output and reference function $g(t)$. It does not answer the question how to derive the parameters. However, the linearity of the parameters has brought the problem closer to a solution. We will show in the Discussion that in the multidimensional case the resulting system will be linearly parameterized as well. To the issue of how to find the values of the parameters α_i that minimize error we will turn in the next section.

4 Parameter Adjustment Algorithm

For designing the approximation algorithm the following strategy has been used: first, it is assumed that the only uncertainties are in the linear parameters α . We formulated this in Assumption 1. For this limited case an algorithm will be presented in Section 4.1. Second, after this algorithm is realized in Section 4.2, we will present a "schedule" to alternate adjustment for the α parameters and the parameters c_i of the output function. Third, in Section 4.3 we will modify the system in order to allow for simultaneous adjustment of both α_i and c_i parameters.

Another consequence of Assumption 1 is that the reference system represents the function $g(t)$ completely, i.e. without unmodeled dynamics. This problem will be handled separately in Section 4.4. It will be possible to invoke Theorem 1 and show that any function that merely is approached by reference system dynamics can still effectively be modelled by the tracking system, albeit within a margin of tolerance.

4.1 Restricted version

The question is whether it is possible to determine the unknown parameter values α_i in such a way that $g(t) - y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = 0$ for $t \in [0, T]$, utilizing the linear parameterization of system (6). In order to proceed with the analysis we would like to introduce the following assumption:

Assumption 1 *Let continuous function $g(t)$, number of equations n and initial conditions $\hat{x}_i(0)$ be given. Then there exist such parameter values $\alpha_i = \alpha_i^*$ that for any $t \in [0, T]$ the following equality holds for system (6) solutions:*

$$g(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(t) = 0.$$

Assumption 1 states that the only uncertainty in system (6) is the vector $\hat{\alpha}$. Therefore, the reference signal $g(t)$ can be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1^* &= \alpha_1^* x_1^* (1 - x_1^*); \\ \dot{x}_2^* &= \alpha_2^* x_2^* (1 - x_2^*); \\ \dots &= \dots \\ \dot{x}_n^* &= \alpha_n^* x_n^* (1 - x_n^*); \\ y(\mathbf{x}(t)) &= g(t) = \hat{\mathbf{C}}^T \mathbf{x}^*(t), \quad x_i^*(0) = \hat{x}_i(0) = x_i(0). \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Before we propose an adjustment rule for $\hat{\alpha}$ we would like to introduce a notational assumption regarding tracking (6) and reference (10) systems. Let us redefine the system equations, denoting the right-hand side of the i -th equation in (6) by a symbol $\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i)$, and the right-hand side of the i -th equation in (10) by $\alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*)$. Notice further that on account of Assumption 1 we have chosen to omit for the moment error term $\eta(\cdot)$. An aggregated system which contains both the reference system for signal $g(t)$ and tracking system (6) can be written in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &= \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i); \\ \dot{x}_i^* &= \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*), \quad i = \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

As has been mentioned in the beginning of the section, we would like to obtain an estimation of the parameters $\hat{\alpha}_i$, such that $g(t) - y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = 0$ over time-interval $[0, T]$. But the tuning procedure

may take much more time than the length of $[0, T]$. Hence, it is necessary to redesign the reference and tracking systems. One solution is to let the reference signal $g(t)$ be repeated periodically. In order to satisfy this requirement we introduce the next assumption:

Assumption 2 *There are such positive constants $k_1 > 0$, $k_2 > 0$ and a periodic function $\lambda(t)$:*

$$\lambda(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in [(j-1)(\Delta T_1 + \Delta T_2), j\Delta T_1 + (j-1)\Delta T_2) \\ 1, & t \in [j\Delta T_1 + (j-1)\Delta T_2, j(\Delta T_1 + \Delta T_2)) \end{cases}, \quad j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\},$$

that the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i^* &= \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda(t)(k_1(x_i^* - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*)), \quad i = \{1, \dots, n\}; \\ y(\mathbf{x}^*(t)) &= \tilde{g}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is a signum function:

$$\sigma(s) = \begin{cases} 1, & s > 0; \\ 0, & s = 0; \\ -1 & s < 0, \end{cases}$$

$k_2 > 1/\Delta T_2$, $\tilde{g}(t_1)$, $t_1 \in [0, \infty)$ is a periodic extension of $g(t)$, $t \in [0, T]$, $\tilde{g}(t) = \tilde{g}(t + T)$ and $\Delta T_1 + \Delta T_2 = T$.

Assumption 2 requires an inclusion of several extra parameters and functions into the generating system right-hand side. Additional restrictions are to be introduced just to make sure that for each $t = jT$, the following holds:

$$x_i^*(t) = x_i^*(jT) = x_i(0), \quad j = \{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Taking into account Assumption 2 we can write the combined reference and tracking systems as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &= \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \lambda(t)(k_1(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i)); \\ \dot{x}_i^* &= \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda(t)(k_1(x_i^* - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*)), \quad i = \{1, \dots, n\}; \\ \hat{y}(t) &= y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = \hat{\mathbf{C}}^T \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t); \\ y^*(t) &= y(\mathbf{x}^*(t)) = \hat{\mathbf{C}}^T \mathbf{x}^*(t). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Let us introduce the adjustment rule for parameter $\hat{\alpha}_i$ tuning:

$$\dot{\hat{\alpha}}_i = -\gamma e(t) \hat{c}_i (f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \lambda(t) f_i(\hat{x}_i)), \tag{13}$$

where $e(t) = \hat{y}(t) - y^*(t)$ is the tracking error, $\gamma > 0$ is a positive constant. The stability properties of system (12) with algorithm (13) are formulated in:

Theorem 2 *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold for the given continuous function $g(t)$. Then for any positive $\gamma > 0$ all the trajectories of system (12) are bounded and $e(jT - \Delta T_2) \rightarrow 0$ at $j \rightarrow \infty$, $j \in \mathcal{N}$.*

Theorem 2 proof. The theorem proof will consist of three stages. First, we will show that all the trajectories are bounded. Second, we will show that an integral of a function that depends on error $e(t)$ exists over the semi-infinite time interval $[0, \infty)$. Third, it will be shown that $e(t)$ tends to zero at each point $t \in \{T(j-1) + \Delta T_2 j\}$, $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us rewrite system (12) in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e} = & \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i(\dot{\hat{x}}_i - \dot{x}_i^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i(\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda(t)(\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) + \\ & k_2(\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - \sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)))) - k_1 \lambda(t) e. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

First of all we would like to note that equation (14) for $\hat{\alpha}_i = \alpha_i^*$ can be written as follows:

$$\dot{e} = \mu(t) - k_1 \lambda(t) e, \quad (15)$$

where $\mu(t)$ is a bounded function, which satisfies inequality:

$$\int_t^\infty \mu(\tau) e(\tau) d\tau < \infty. \quad (16)$$

Let us explain this. Assume that $\hat{\alpha}_i \equiv \alpha_i^*$ for any $t > t_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e} = & \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i(\dot{\hat{x}}_i - \dot{x}_i^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i(\alpha_i^*(f_i(\hat{x}_i) - f_i(x_i^*)) - \lambda(t)(\alpha_i^*(f_i(\hat{x}_i) - f_i(x_i^*)) + \\ & k_2(\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - \sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)))) - k_1 \lambda(t) e. \end{aligned}$$

Terms $\alpha_i^*(f_i(\hat{x}_i) - f_i(x_i^*)) - \lambda(t)(\alpha_i^*(f_i(\hat{x}_i) - f_i(x_i^*) + 2k_2\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i^*))$ will vanish in the equation above for any $t > t_0 + T$ due to the properties of system (12); initial conditions will be the same and, hence, the system trajectories at $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha^*$ will be identical. Therefore equalities (15) and (16) hold. In addition, it is desirable to observe that

$$\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}} - \dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\alpha^*} = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i(\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i^*)(f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \lambda(t)f_i(\hat{x}_i)). \quad (17)$$

Let us consider the following Lyapunov's candidate:

$$V(e, \alpha, t) = \frac{1}{2} e^2(t) + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*\|_{\gamma^{-1}}^2 + \int_t^\infty \mu(\tau) e(\tau) d\tau.$$

Function $V(e, \alpha)$ time-derivative can be obtained as follows:

$$\dot{V} = e\dot{e} + \gamma^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i^*) \dot{\hat{\alpha}}_i - \mu(t) e(t) = e\dot{e} - \sum_{i=1}^n e(\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i^*) \hat{c}_i(f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \lambda(t)f_i(\hat{x}_i)) - \mu(t) e(t).$$

Due to equality (17) we can easily derive that

$$\dot{V} = e\dot{e} - e(\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}} - \dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\alpha^*}) - \mu(t) e(t) = e\dot{e} - e\dot{e} + e\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\alpha^*} - \mu(t) e(t) = e\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\alpha^*} - \mu(t) e(t).$$

Then, taking into account equation (15), we can conclude that the following equation holds:

$$\dot{V} = e(\mu(t) - k_1 \lambda(t) e) - \mu(t) e = -k_1 \lambda(t) e^2 \leq 0.$$

Function V has a lower bound and does not grow with respect to t . Therefore $e(t)$ is bounded and $\hat{\alpha}$ is bounded as well. Furthermore, the difference

$$V(e(0), \hat{\alpha}(0), 0) - V(e(t_2), \hat{\alpha}(t_2), t_2) = \int_0^{t_2} k_1 \lambda(t) e^2(t) dt$$

is bounded for any $t_2 > t_1$. Hence the following integral exists:

$$\int_0^\infty k_1 \lambda(t) e^2(t) dt < \infty. \quad (18)$$

Due to the boundedness of $\dot{e}$ and finite length of interval ΔT_2 , where $\lambda(t)$ is equal to 1, we can conclude that $e(t) \rightarrow 0$ for any $t \in [j\Delta T_1 + (j-1)\Delta T_2, j(\Delta T_1 + \Delta T_2))$, $j \in \mathcal{N}$, $j \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, $e(jT - \Delta T_2) \rightarrow 0$ at $j \rightarrow \infty$. *The theorem is proven.*

Theorem 2 states that the learning procedure introduced above ensures that the following limiting relation holds: $e(jT - \Delta T_2) \rightarrow 0$. This means that the difference between $g(t)$ and $y(t)$ at point $t = T - \Delta T_2$ can reach an arbitrary small level in finite time. Another consequence of the theorem is formulated in:

Corollary 1 *Let continuous function $g(t)$ be given and assumptions of Theorem 2 hold. In addition, let function $\lambda(t)$ in (12) satisfy the following equation:*

$$\lambda(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & t \in [(j-1)(\Delta T_1(j) + \Delta T_2(j)), j\Delta T_1(j) + (j-1)\Delta T_2(j)); \\ 1, & t \in [j\Delta T_1(j) + (j-1)\Delta T_2(j), j(\Delta T_1(j) + \Delta T_2(j))), \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $\Delta T_1(j), \Delta T_2(j) : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow (0, T)$ are periodic functions such that $\Delta T_1(j) + \Delta T_2(j) = T$, $\Delta T_1(j) \neq 0$, $\Delta T_2(j) \neq 0$. Then for any $\gamma > 0$ all the trajectories of system (2) will be bounded and $e(jT - \Delta T_2(j)) \rightarrow 0$ at $j \rightarrow \infty$, $j \in \mathcal{N}$.

Corollary 1 proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2 and is omitted. Function $\lambda(t)$ may be viewed as an external input to both tracking and reference system provoking the onset of their dynamics. This function, therefore, may be viewed as akin to and devoted to the same goal as *persistent excitation* usually applied to linear systems [30].

In terms of neural network theory we may regard $\lambda(t)$ as a learning schedule. As follows from the corollary there is a possibility to organize the parameter adjustment in such a way that for any given reference point $g(T - \Delta T_2(j))$ system (12) output $y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(jT - \Delta T_2(j)))$ will tend to $g(T - \Delta T_2(j))$. Therefore, Corollary 1 indicates how to organize the learning procedure in order to approximate $g(t)$ by a linear combination of tracking system solutions $y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t))$. We can choose values of ΔT_2 randomly across the whole interval or set up a pre-specified schedule for varying this value systematically (for which knowledge of inherent properties of $g(t)$ could be used to improve the approximation).

An important restriction to the above schedule is that convergence is obtained only for a set of (randomly or pre-) selected points. The question arises whether it is possible to design the tracking system in such a way that convergence occurs for the whole interval $[0, T]$. In other words is it possible to prove $\hat{y}(t) \rightarrow y(t)$ at $t \rightarrow \infty$ without any additional assumptions on the reference signal except that $g(t)$ be periodically extended with respect to t ? The answer is positive. Let us consider a combination of the tracking and reference systems in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &= \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \frac{K_i(t)}{\hat{c}_i} e - \lambda(t)(k_1(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) + \frac{K_i(t)}{\hat{c}_i} e); \\ \dot{x}_i^* &= \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda(t)(k_1(x_i^* - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*)), \quad i = \{1, \dots, n\}; \\ \hat{y}(t) &= y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = \hat{\mathbf{C}}^T \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t); \\ y^*(t) &= y(\mathbf{x}^*(t)) = \hat{\mathbf{C}}^T \mathbf{x}^*(t), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\hat{c}_i \neq 0$, $K_i(t)$ are bounded functions of time t . The modification of system (12) into system (20), adding a new term $K_i(t)e/\hat{c}_i$ is done in order to eliminate the point-marker $\lambda(t)$ in the

integral (18) of the error function and replace it with a function that assumes nonzero values across the semi-infinite interval in which convergence is taking place. This property is formulated in the following theorem:

Theorem 3 *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold for the given continuous function $g(t)$, the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t)$ be positive. Moreover, we assume that the system solutions exist for any $t \in [0, \infty)$. Then for any positive $\gamma > 0$ all trajectories of system (20) with adaptation algorithm (13) are bounded and $e(t) \rightarrow 0$ at $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Theorem 3 proof. Sum $\sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t)$ is positive. This means that there exists such positive constant $\delta > 0$ that $\sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t) > \delta$ for any $t \in R_+$. This fact will play a key role in the proof. In addition it is desirable to note that the structure of the proof will be similar to that of Theorem 2 and will consist of 3 parts.

Let us consider error dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e} = & \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i(\dot{\hat{x}}_i - \dot{x}_i^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i(\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda(t)(\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) + \\ & k_2(\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - \sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)))) - k_1 \lambda(t) e - \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t) e (1 - \lambda(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

It is straight-forward to see that error dynamics at $\hat{\alpha}_i = \alpha_i^*$, $i = \{1, \dots, n\}$ satisfies the following differential equation:

$$\dot{e} = \mu(t) - k_1 \lambda(t) e - \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t) (1 - \lambda(t)) e. \quad (22)$$

As a Lyapunov's candidate we choose a function which is of the same form as the one considered in Theorem 2 proof:

$$V(e, \alpha, t) = \frac{1}{2} e^2(t) + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*\|_{\gamma^{-1}}^2 + \int_t^\infty \mu(\tau) e(\tau) d\tau.$$

Function $V(e, \alpha)$ derivative is calculated to be:

$$\dot{V} = e\dot{e} + \gamma^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i^*) \dot{\hat{\alpha}}_i - \mu(t) e(t) = e\dot{e} - \sum_{i=1}^n e(\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i^*) \hat{c}_i(f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \lambda(t) f_i(x_i^*)) - \mu(t) e(t).$$

Taking into account equation (21) we can write:

$$\dot{V} = e\dot{e} - e(\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}} - \dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\alpha^*}) - \mu(t) e(t) = e\dot{e} - e\dot{e} + e\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\alpha^*} - \mu(t) e(t) = e\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\alpha^*} - \mu(t) e(t).$$

Hence, due to equation (22) we can deduce that the next inequality holds:

$$\dot{V} = e(\mu(t) - k_1 \lambda(t) e - \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t) (1 - \lambda(t)) e) - \mu(t) e = -k_1 \lambda(t) e^2 - \delta (1 - \lambda(t)) e^2 \leq 0.$$

Let $\delta_1 = \min\{\delta, k_1\}$, then we can estimate function V time-derivative as:

$$\dot{V} \leq -\delta_1 e^2.$$

Therefore the following integral exists:

$$\int_0^\infty \delta_1 e^2(t) dt < \infty \quad (23)$$

and similar to the proof of Theorem 2 we can derive that $e(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. *The theorem is proven.*

Remark 3 Theorem 3 allows us to replace a schedule based on selected points by one that takes the whole interval into account. The additional terms $K_i(t)e/\hat{c}_i$, introduced into the tracking system model, act as external disturbances imposed onto the system dynamics. We have to pay special attention to this issue, because Theorem 2 conditions required existence of the system solutions for all t . Whereas under Theorem 2 all the solutions of the tracking system were bounded for any $\hat{\alpha}_i$, the disturbances are able to move the system state outside a hypercube $[0, 1]^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. In that case the system state might reach infinity in finite time. Let us consider the i -th equation of the tracking system:

$$\dot{\hat{x}}_i = \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \frac{K_i(t)}{\hat{c}_i} e - \lambda(t)(k_1(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) + \frac{K_i(t)}{\hat{c}_i} e)$$

and assume that $\lambda(t) = 0$. Then derivative $\dot{\hat{x}}_i$ will have the following form:

$$\dot{\hat{x}}_i = \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \frac{K_i(t)}{\hat{c}_i} e,$$

where $f_i(\hat{x}_i) = \hat{x}_i(1 - \hat{x}_i)$. Let $K_i(t)e/\hat{c}_i < -1$ for an interval of t , long enough for the variable $\hat{x}_i$ to reach negative values in finite time. Then solution of the i -th equation will be unstable if $\hat{\alpha} < 0$. It can be shown that if $\hat{\alpha}$ will be negative for a sufficiently large interval of t , $\hat{x}_i(t)$ reaches infinity in finite time as well. This situation forces us to make $K_i(t)$ small enough to ensure existence of tracking system solutions while k_2 are to be large enough to guarantee that the tracking system returns to the point $\mathbf{x}(0)$ within the interval ΔT_2 when $\lambda(t) = 1$.

A theoretical solution to this problem consists in “repairing” the global boundedness of each state variable in (20). For instance, instead of the equation $\dot{x}_i = \hat{\alpha}_i x_i(1 - x_i)$ consider:

$$\dot{x}_i = \hat{\alpha}_i x_i(1 - x_i) - dx_i^3,$$

where $d > 0$ is arbitrary small positive constant. It is clear then that $x_i(t)$ is bounded for any initial conditions. A practical solution would be to ignore the problem and instead introduce on-line monitoring and, if necessary, modifying the value of $K_i(t)$.

4.2 Extending the Algorithm: Output Parameter Adjustment

Assumption 1 stated that the only uncertainties are in vector $\hat{\alpha}$. This restriction allowed us to prove the stability of the error dynamics with gradient learning rules. Let us extend the results of Theorems 2, 3 allowing parameters $\hat{c}_i$ to be unknown as well. Before we proceed with the analysis let us introduce the following lemma:

Lemma 3 *Let system (21) be given, each solution $\hat{x}_i(t)$, $x_i^*(t)$ of the tracking and generating systems are bounded over $[0, T]$ for any $\sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t) > 0$, $K_i(t) = \text{const}$ and $y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(0)) = y(\mathbf{x}^*(0)) = y(\mathbf{x}(0))$. Then for any α^* , $\hat{\alpha}$ and finite $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ there exist such positive constant k^* , arbitrary small $\delta_3 > 0$ and $t_1 > t_0$ that for any choice of K_i , $\sum_{i=1}^n K_i > k^*$ and $t > t_1$ the following inequality holds:*

$$|e(t)|(1 - \lambda(t)) \leq \delta_3.$$

Lemma 3 proof. The lemma proof is based on the boundedness of the solutions of the tracking and reference systems over $[0, T]$. Due to the periodicity of the signals $\mathbf{x}^*(t)$, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ we observe that each solution $\hat{x}_i(t)$ and x_i^* still remains bounded for any $t > 0$. Therefore, the difference:

$$\hat{c}_i(\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda(t)(\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*)))$$

is bounded as functions $f_i(\cdot)$ are continuous. Let

$$\left| d_1(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i (\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda(t) (\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*))) \right| \leq D_1, \quad (24)$$

where $D_1 \in R_+$. Then the error dynamics (21) may be written in the following manner:

$$\dot{e} = \left(d_1(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n K_i e(t) \right) (1 - \lambda(t)) + k_2 (\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - \sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0))) \lambda(t) - k_1 \lambda(t) e(t). \quad (25)$$

We denote $t_{j-1} = (j-1)(\Delta T_1 + \Delta T_2)$. Let us consider the system solution over the time intervals $t \in [t_{j-1}, t_{j-1} + \Delta T_1)$, $j \in \mathcal{N}$, where $\lambda(t) = 0$. Then it is clear that $e(t_{j-1}) = 0$ and $(1 - \lambda(t)) = 1$. Therefore, system (25) dynamics satisfies the following:

$$\dot{e} = d_1(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n K_i e(t).$$

Hence, taking into account (24) we derive:

$$\begin{aligned} |e(t)| &= \left| e^{-(\sum_{i=1}^n K_i)t} e(t_{j-1}) + e^{-(\sum_{i=1}^n K_i)t} \int_{t_{j-1}}^t d_1(\tau) e^{(\sum_{i=1}^n K_i)\tau} d\tau \right| \\ &= \left| e^{-(\sum_{i=1}^n K_i)t} \int_{t_{j-1}}^t d_1(\tau) e^{(\sum_{i=1}^n K_i)\tau} d\tau \right| \leq \left| e^{-(\sum_{i=1}^n K_i)t} \int_{t_{j-1}}^t D_1 e^{(\sum_{i=1}^n K_i)\tau} d\tau \right| \\ &= \frac{D_1}{\sum_{i=1}^n K_i} \left(1 - e^{-\sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t-t_{j-1})} \right) \leq \frac{D_1}{\sum_{i=1}^n K_i} \leq \frac{D_1}{k^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The result is that for any $t \in [t_{j-1}, t_{j-1} + \Delta T_1)$, error $e(t)$ satisfies inequality $|e(t)| \leq D_1/k^*$. Therefore, for any arbitrary small s there exists such positive constant k^* that $|e(t)|(1 - \lambda(t)) < s$. *The lemma is proven.*

Lemma 3 states that we can make $e(t)$ arbitrary small by choosing the values of coefficients K_i . The main requirement of the lemma consists in the assumption of boundedness of the solutions over $[0, T]$. The reasons to pay special attention to the boundedness of the solutions are similar to the ones discussed in remark 3. The same strategy can also be applied to solve problems if they arise here.

The introduction of parameter k^* with unknown value may be considered a central dilemma of the present approach. Without it (k^* is zero) convergence cannot be guaranteed, and too large k^* may destroy boundedness. The introduction of k^* will prove to be instrumental in providing us with a single control parameter for setting up a schedule for $K_i(t)$. We shall formulate a set of assumptions, broader than Assumption 1, for which the schedule guarantees convergence.

Let the following system be given:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &= \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \frac{k}{\hat{c}_i} e - \lambda(t) (k_1(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2 \sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) + \frac{k}{\hat{c}_i} e); \\ \dot{x}_i^* &= \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda(t) ((k_1(x_i^* - x_i(0)) + k_2 \sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0))) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*)); \\ \hat{y}(t) &= y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^T \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t); \\ y^*(t) &= y(\mathbf{x}^*(t)) = \mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{x}^*(t); \\ \dot{\hat{\alpha}}_i &= -\delta_s(e) \gamma e(t) \hat{c}_i (f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \lambda(t) f_i(\hat{x}_i)); \quad i = \{1, \dots, n\}; \\ \dot{k} &= \delta_s(e) \gamma e^2(t) (1 - \lambda(t)), \quad \delta_s = \begin{cases} 1, & |e| > s; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

For this system we introduce the following assumption:

Assumption 3 *There exist such parameter values $\hat{\alpha}_i = \hat{\alpha}_i^*$ that:*

$$\alpha_i^* = \arg \min_{\hat{\alpha}_i} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n c_i x_i^*(t) - \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(t) \right\|, \quad x_i^*(0) = \hat{x}_i(0), t > 0.$$

along system (27) solutions over time-interval $[0, \Delta T_1]$ for $\gamma = 0$.

Assumption 3 is a weakened form of Assumption 1. The assumption just requires the existence of a "best" vector $\hat{\alpha}^*$ in the sense of a minimum value of the distance between solutions of the tracking and reference systems. Let us define:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(t, t_1) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{c}_i \hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - c_i \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*)) (1 - \lambda(t)) \\ &+ k_2 \hat{c}_i (\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - c_i \sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0))) \quad \hat{x}_i(t_1) = x_i^*(t_1); \quad \hat{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha}^* \\ \mu(t, t_1) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i (\hat{\alpha}^* f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \hat{\alpha}^* f_i(\hat{x}_i^*)) (1 - \lambda(t)); \quad \hat{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha}^*, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{x}_i^*$ is a solution of the i -the differential equation with initial conditions $\hat{x}_i(t_1) = x_i^*(t_1)$. It is clear that functions $\mu(t, t_1)$, $\nu(t, t_1)$ are bounded and function $\mu(t, t_1)$, $t_1 \leq t$ is nonzero only over compact set $[0, T]$ due to the periodicity of the reference and tracking signals. Therefore, the following integral exists:

$$\int_0^\infty |\mu(\tau, 0) e(\tau)| d\tau.$$

Now we are ready to formulate the following:

Theorem 4 *Let Assumptions 2 and 3 hold for the given reference and tracking systems. Moreover, we assume that system (27) solutions exist for any $t \in [0, \infty)$ and $y(\mathbf{x}^*(0)) = y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(0))$. Then for any positive $\gamma > 0$ all the trajectories of system (27) are bounded and there exists time $t_1 > 0$ such that for any $t > t_1$, arbitrary small $s > 0$, $\delta_2 > 0$ the following inequality holds:*

$$|e(t)|(1 - \lambda(t)) < s + \delta_2.$$

Theorem 4 proof. Let us consider the system error dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e} &= \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{c}_i \dot{\hat{x}}_i(t) - c_i \dot{x}_i^*(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i (\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) (1 - \lambda(t)) - \lambda(t) (k_1 (\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2 \sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0))) - \\ &- c_i (\alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) (1 - \lambda(t)) - \lambda(t) (k_1 (x_i^* - x_i(0)) + k_2 \sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)))) - k e(t). \end{aligned}$$

Then the error dynamics at $\hat{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha}^*$ will satisfy the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e} &= \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{c}_i \dot{\hat{x}}_i(t) - c_i \dot{x}_i^*(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i (\hat{\alpha}_i^* f_i(\hat{x}_i) (1 - \lambda(t)) - \lambda(t) (k_1 (\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2 \sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0))) - \\ &- c_i (\alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) (1 - \lambda(t)) - \lambda(t) (k_1 (x_i^* - x_i(0)) + k_2 \sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)))) - k e(t), \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\dot{e} - \dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\hat{\alpha}^*} = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i (\hat{\alpha}_i - \hat{\alpha}_i^*) f_i(\hat{x}_i) (1 - \lambda(t)) + \mu(t, 0).$$

Let us consider $\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\hat{\alpha}^*}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\hat{\alpha}^*} &= \nu(t, 0) - ke(t)(1 - \lambda(t)) - \lambda(t) \sum_{i=1}^n k_1(\hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i - c_i x_i^*). \\ &= \nu(t, 0) - ke(t)(1 - \lambda(t)) - k_1 \lambda(t) e(t).\end{aligned}$$

It is necessary to note that term

$$k_1 \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i x_i(0) - c_i x_i(0)$$

vanishes due to assumption that $y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(0)) = y(\mathbf{x}^*(0))$.

We would like to note that function $\nu(t, 0)$ is bounded and therefore, according to lemma 3 for any arbitrary small $s > 0$ there exists such $k = k^*$ that $|e(t)| < s$ over $[0, \Delta T_1]$ (in particular, $k^* > \sup |\nu(t, 0)|/s$). On the other hand we are free to choose coefficient k_1 arbitrary large and therefore $|e(t)| < s$ over $[0, T]$ for $k_1 = k^* = k$. Let us consider the following Lyapunov's candidate:

$$V(t) = \int_0^{e(t)} \delta_s(\xi) e(\xi) d\xi + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*\|_{\gamma^{-1}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|k - k^*\|_{\gamma^{-1}}^2 + \int_t^\infty |\mu(\tau) e(\tau) \delta_s(e(\tau))| d\tau.$$

Let $|e(t)| > s$ then function $V(t)$ derivative will have the following form:

$$\dot{V}(t) = e\dot{e} + (\hat{\alpha} - \hat{\alpha}^*)^T \dot{\hat{\alpha}} + (k - k^*) \dot{k} - |e(t) \mu(t, 0)|.$$

It is quite straight-forward to see that

$$(\hat{\alpha} - \hat{\alpha}^*)^T \dot{\hat{\alpha}} + (k - k^*) \dot{k} = -e(\dot{e} - \dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\hat{\alpha}^*, k=k^*} - \mu(t, 0)),$$

where

$$\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\hat{\alpha}^*, k=k^*} = \nu(t, 0) - k^* e(t)(1 - \lambda(t)) - k^* \lambda(t) e(t).$$

Then, the function $V(t)$ derivative satisfies the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}(t) &= e\dot{e} - e(\dot{e} - \dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\hat{\alpha}^*, k=k^*} - \mu(t, 0)) - |\mu(t, 0) e(t)| \leq e\dot{e}|_{\hat{\alpha}=\hat{\alpha}^*, k=k^*} \\ &= e(\nu(t, 0) - k^* e(t)) < 0.\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

Inequality $k^* > \sup |\nu(t, 0)|/s$ implies existence of such positive $\delta_4 > 0$ that $k^* > \sup |\nu(t, 0)|/s + \delta_4$ as well. It means that for any $|e(t)| > s$ the following inequality holds:

$$\dot{V}(t) \leq -\delta_4 e^2(t).$$

Let us introduce intervals $[t^i, t^{i+1}]$ where $|e(t)| > s$. It is clear that function $V(t)$ has a lower bound and is nonincreasing as $\dot{V}(t) = 0$ for any $t : |e(t)| < s$. Therefore the following sum exists:

$$J = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{t^i}^{t^{i+1}} \delta_4 e^2(\tau) d\tau.$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that J satisfies the following inequality:

$$\infty > J > \delta_4 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (t^{i+1} - t^i) s^2.$$

By consequence $t^{i+1} - t^i \rightarrow 0$ at $i \rightarrow \infty$ and due to the local boundedness of $\dot{e}$ with respect to $\mathbf{x}^*$, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ we can claim that $e(t)$ approaches an arbitrary small ball $|e(t)| < s$. In order to accomplish the proof, it is sufficient to note that there exists such t_1 that $|e(t)| < s + \delta_2$ for any $t > t_1$. *The theorem is proven.*

Remark 4 Theorem 4 formulates sufficient conditions for stability of system (27), but does not guarantee that the optimal (with respect to the values of $\hat{\alpha}$) solution will actually be found. All we have so far is a "regularized" solution of the problem depending on the unknown value of the parameter k^* . We can, however, obtain a measure of the quality of the solution as a function of k^* . We will obtain useful information about the system by analysis of the difference $V(0) - V(t_1)$, where $V(t)$ is the Lyapunov's candidate used in the proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
V(0) - V(t_1) &= \int_0^{e(0)} \delta_s(\xi) e(\xi) d\xi + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\alpha}(0) - \hat{\alpha}^*\|_{\gamma^{-1}}^2 + \int_0^\infty |\mu(\tau, 0) e(\tau) \delta_s(e(\tau))| d\tau \\
&\quad - \int_0^{e(t_1)} \delta_s(\xi) e(\xi) d\xi + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\alpha}(t_1) - \hat{\alpha}^*\|_{\gamma^{-1}}^2 + \int_{t_1}^\infty |\mu(\tau, 0) e(\tau) \delta_s(e(\tau))| d\tau \\
&\geq \delta_4 \int_0^{t_1} \delta_s(e(\tau)) e^2(\tau) d\tau - \frac{1}{2} \|k(0) - k^*\|_{\gamma^{-1}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|k(t_1) - k^*\|_{\gamma^{-1}}^2 \\
&= \delta_4 \int_0^{t_1} \delta_s(e(\tau)) e^2(\tau) d\tau - \frac{1}{2\gamma} (k(0)^2 - 2k^*(k(0) - k(t_1)) - k(t_1)^2). \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $k(0) = 0$ and $e(0) = e(t_1)$. Therefore, taking into account (29) we can write the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\alpha}(0) - \hat{\alpha}^*\|^2 - \|\hat{\alpha}(t_1) - \hat{\alpha}^*\|^2 &\geq \gamma 2\delta_4 \int_0^{t_1} \delta_s(e(\tau)) e^2(\tau) d\tau + k(t_1)^2 - 2k^*k(t_1) - \\
2\gamma \int_0^{t_1} |\mu(\tau, 0) e(\tau) \delta_s(e(\tau))| d\tau. \tag{30}
\end{aligned}$$

If we ignore the last term in (30), convergence in the parameter space depends on the values of δ_4 and $k(t_1), k^*$ only. Values k^* and δ_4 cannot be determined directly, therefore the only criterion in our case is the value of $k(t_1)$. The smaller value of $k(t_1)$ implies the higher probability of the convergence to $\hat{\alpha}^*$. The last observation has clear physical meaning if it is assumed that value of $k(t_1)$ reflects the total amount of external power injected into the system in order to force it to follow a given level of performance ($|e(t)| \rightarrow \min$). Low values of $k(t_1)$ imply that the system manages to realize this performance on its own (via adjustment of $\hat{\alpha}$).

Remark 4 indicates how to design the learning procedures allowing adjustment of the linear parameters $\hat{c}_i$ in the system. There is a variety of methods to perform linear regression, but for the sake of simplicity we will use a recurrent least squares algorithm [30]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{P}(t) &= -P(t)\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)\hat{\mathbf{x}}^T(t)P(t); \quad P(0) = I; \\
\dot{\hat{\mathbf{C}}} &= -P(t)\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)e(t), \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

where I is the identity matrix. Let us denote the process of searching for the parameters $\hat{c}_i$ with initial conditions $\hat{c}_i(t_0)$ and algorithm (31) as $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{c}}(t_0)$, the problem of searching for $\hat{\alpha}^*$ by $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\alpha}}(t_0)$ and the problem of searching for $\hat{\alpha}^*, k^*$ using algorithms (27) by $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\alpha}, k}(t_0)$. A straightforward way to organize the searching procedure for α^* and c_i (avoiding the non-convexity obstacles by a separation of the processes of searching for α^* and c_i in time) is the following:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\hat{c}}(t_0) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\alpha}}(t_1) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{\hat{c}}(t_2) \mapsto \dots \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{\hat{c}}(t_{n-1}) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\alpha}}(t_n) \mapsto \dots \tag{32}$$

Convergence of sequence (32) implies convergence of the searching process for c_i and α^* . But this procedure cannot be realized explicitly as we have no methods $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\alpha}}(t_i)$ that guarantee convergence to $\hat{\alpha}^*$ starting at time t_i . However, according to Theorem 4 we have procedure $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\alpha}, k}(t_i)$ that ensures

at least stability of the whole system. In addition, there is at least the possibility of convergence to $\hat{\alpha}^*$ if the values of $k(t_{i+1})$ are sufficiently small (see remark 4). Therefore, we can replace the unrealizable sequence (32) by the realizable one:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\hat{c}}(t_0) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t_1) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{\hat{c}}(t_2) \mapsto \dots \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{\hat{c}}(t_{n-1}) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t_n) \mapsto \dots \quad (33)$$

Furthermore, if $k(t_i) \rightarrow 0$ at $i \rightarrow \infty$ then sequence (33) will approximate sequence (32) and will have the same asymptotic properties. Hence the criteria that reflect successful (in a sense of the approximation of unreachable (32)) searching process may have the following formalization:

Condition 1 *For any initial condition $\hat{c}_i(0)$, $\hat{\alpha}(0)$ the following limiting relation holds*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} k(t_i) = 0.$$

The weaker form of this criterion may be written as follows:

Condition 2 *There exists such $j > 0$ that for any $i > j$ the following estimate holds*

$$k(t_i) > k(t_{i+l}), \quad l > 0.$$

One of the reasons for using the modified learning procedure (33) is that Assumption 1 may fail to hold for the target function $g(t)$. Therefore in many cases we do need to adjust the parameters $\hat{c}_i$ if we want to avoid overparameterization. A complementary approach, i.e. to introduce tolerance for approximation error by means of a dead-zone is introduced in Section 4.4.

Our current method implies the separation in time between, respectively, α^* and $\mathbf{C}^*$ parameter adjustment, applying two different algorithms to search for their values. In the next section we discuss the possibility to adjust these parameters simultaneously.

4.3 Simultaneous Adjustment of $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$

Let us introduce the following lemma:

Lemma 4 *Let system (6) be given and $\hat{c}_i \neq 0$. Then there is a linear transformation $\bar{x}_i = \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i$ that the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{x}}_1 &= \alpha_1 \bar{x}_1 (1 - \beta_1 \bar{x}_1); \\ \dot{\bar{x}}_2 &= \alpha_2 \bar{x}_2 (1 - \beta_2 \bar{x}_2); \\ \dots &= \dots \\ \dot{\bar{x}}_n &= \alpha_n \bar{x}_n (1 - \beta_n \bar{x}_n); \\ y(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_i \bar{x}_i, \quad \beta_i = \frac{1}{\hat{c}_i}, \quad \bar{x}_i(0) = \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(0). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Lemma 4 proof. The Lemma proof is straightforward and similar to that of Lemma 1. Let us derive $\bar{x}_i = \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i$ and calculate its time-derivative taking into account (6):

$$\dot{\bar{x}}_i = \hat{c}_i \dot{\hat{x}}_i = \alpha_i \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i (1 - \frac{1}{\hat{c}_i} \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i) = \alpha_i \bar{x}_i (1 - \beta_i \bar{x}_i).$$

The lemma is proven.

Despite its simplicity, Lemma 4 has a corollary which is relevant for the next part of our analysis. Let us consider the following system:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\bar{x}}_1 &= \bar{\alpha}_1 \bar{x}_1 - \bar{\beta}_1 \bar{x}_1^2; \\
\dot{\bar{x}}_2 &= \bar{\alpha}_2 \bar{x}_2 - \bar{\beta}_2 \bar{x}_2^2; \\
&\dots = \dots \\
\dot{\bar{x}}_n &= \bar{\alpha}_n \bar{x}_n - \bar{\beta}_n \bar{x}_n^2; \\
y(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_i \bar{x}_i, \quad \bar{x}_i(0) = \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(0),
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where $\bar{\alpha}_i = \alpha_i$, $\bar{\beta}_i = \alpha_i \beta_i$. It is clear that system (35) is linear with respect to the parameters $\bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i$ which have one-to-one correspondence with that of (6) if the parameters $\hat{c}_i$ in (6) are separated from zero.

Let us introduce, in addition, the following assumption:

Assumption 4 *Let function $g(t)$ be given. Then here exist such parameters $\bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*$ that the following equality holds:*

$$g(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{x}_i(t), \quad \bar{\alpha}_i = \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \quad \bar{\beta}_i = \bar{\beta}_i^*.$$

Assumption 4 is nothing more than a requirement of existence of $\bar{\alpha}_i^*$ and $\bar{\beta}_i^*$ ensuring exact matching between the sum of the solutions $\bar{x}_i(t)$ and the reference function $g(t)$ as in Assumption 1⁴. It is desirable to note that the corresponding condition for system (6) will just require existence of $\hat{\alpha}_i^*$ and $\hat{\beta}_i^*$.

Let us denote $f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i) = \bar{\alpha}_i \bar{x}_i - \bar{\beta}_i \bar{x}_i^2 = (\bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i)^T (\bar{x}_i, -\bar{x}_i^2)$. Then we design both the tracking and reference systems in the same way as in Section 4:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\bar{x}}_i &= f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i) - \lambda(t)(k_1(\bar{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(\bar{x}_i - x_i(0)) - f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i)); \\
\dot{x}_i^* &= f_i(x_i^*, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*) - \lambda(t)(k_1(x_i^* - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)) - f_i(x_i^*, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*)); \\
\bar{y}(t) &= y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{x}_i(t); \\
y(t) &= y(\mathbf{x}^*(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^*(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where function $\lambda(t)$ is to satisfy Assumption 2. Stability conditions for the system with learning rule:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\bar{\alpha}}_i &= -\gamma e(t) \bar{x}_i(t) (1 - \lambda(t)); \\
\dot{\bar{\beta}}_i &= \gamma e(t) \bar{x}_i^2(t) (1 - \lambda(t));
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

are formulated in the following:

Theorem 5 *Let Assumptions 2, 4 hold for the given continuous function $g(t)$. In addition let the solutions of system (36) with algorithm (37) exist over $[0, \infty)$ and bounded. Then for any positive $\gamma > 0$ the following limiting relation holds: $e(jT - \Delta T_2) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, $j \in \mathcal{N}$.*

⁴Generally speaking, this assumption may not hold for the function $g(t)$ because of a requirement of strict equality in $g(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{x}_i(t) = 0$. However, if this is the case, then it is still possible to apply a modified algorithm with dead-zone and guarantee stability and convergence of the learning procedure. We refer the reader to the next section for the details.

Theorem 5 proof is similar to that of Theorem 2 and therefore we would like to provide just a sketch of it. Consider $\dot{e}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{e} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{\bar{x}}_i - \dot{x}_i^* = \sum_{i=1}^n (f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i) - f_i(\bar{x}_i^*, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*)) (1 - \lambda(t)) - \lambda(t) k_1 e(t) + \\ &\quad \sum_{i=1}^n k_2 (\sigma(\bar{x}_i - x(0)) - \sigma(x_i^* - x(0))) \lambda(t).\end{aligned}$$

Let us denote

$$\nu(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), t) = \sum_{i=1}^n (f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*) - f_i(\bar{x}_i^*, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*)) (1 - \lambda(t)) + k_2 (\sigma(\bar{x}_i - x(0)) - \sigma(x_i^* - x(0))) \lambda(t).$$

Therefore, $\dot{e}|_{\bar{\alpha}_i=\bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i=\bar{\beta}_i^*}$ may be written as follows:

$$\dot{e}|_{\bar{\alpha}_i=\bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i=\bar{\beta}_i^*} = \nu(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), t) - \lambda(t) k_1 e(t).$$

It is necessary to note that $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ is assumed to be bounded and, therefore, $\nu(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), t)$ is bounded. Furthermore, $\nu(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), t) \equiv 0$ for any $t_1 > t + T$. Let us designate $\mu(t) = \max_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \{|\nu(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), t)|\}$ (this maximum exists as $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ is bounded). Then we can easily derive that $|e(t)\mu(t)|$ is bounded as well, $|e(t_1)\mu(t_1)| \equiv 0$ for any $t_1 > t + T$, and that $|e(t_1)\mu(t_1)|$ is integrable.

Consider the following Lyapunov's candidate:

$$V = 0.5e(t)^2 + 0.5\|\bar{\alpha} - \bar{\alpha}^*\|_{\gamma-1}^2 + 0.5\|\bar{\beta} - \bar{\beta}^*\|_{\gamma-1}^2 + \int_t^\infty |e(\tau)\mu(\tau)| d\tau.$$

Its time-derivative is:

$$\dot{V} = e\dot{e} - e\left(\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i) - f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*)\right) - |e(t)\mu(t)|,$$

where

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i) - f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*) = \dot{e}(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) - \dot{e}(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\alpha}^*, \bar{\beta}^*).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= e\dot{e} - e(\dot{e} - \dot{e}^*) - |e(t)\mu(t)| = e\dot{e}^* - |e(t)\mu(t)| = -\lambda(t)k_1e^2(t) + e(t)\mu(t) - |e(t)\mu(t)| \\ &\leq -\lambda(t)k_1e^2(t) \leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

The last proves the theorem (for details, see the proof of Theorem 2).

Remark 5 Theorem 5 requires boundedness of the trajectories of system (36). This restriction is motivated by the necessity to ensure the same initial conditions for both the tracking and reference systems at points jT , $j \in \mathcal{N}$ via time-invariant parameters k_1 , k_2 . This is a sufficient condition for function $\mu(t) = \max_{\mathbf{x}} \{|e(t)\nu(\mathbf{x}(t), t)|\}$ to be integrable.

System solutions may not always exist, the system reaching infinity in finite time. It is possible to avoid this obstacle by modifying the tracking and reference systems as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\bar{x}}_i &= f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i) - \lambda(t)(k_1(\bar{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(\bar{x}_i - x_i(0)) - f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i)) - D\bar{x}_i^3; \\ \dot{x}_i^* &= f_i(x_i^*, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*) - \lambda(t)(k_1(x_i^* - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)) - f_i(x_i^*, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*)) - Dx_i^{*3}; \\ \bar{y}(t) &= y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{x}_i(t); \\ y(t) &= y(\mathbf{x}^*(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^*(t),\end{aligned}\tag{38}$$

where $D > 0$ is arbitrary small positive constant. It is clear that solutions of system (38) exist and are bounded for any bounded $\bar{\alpha}_i$ and $\bar{\beta}_i$. Therefore, as long as we keep parameters $\bar{\alpha}_i$ and $\bar{\beta}_i$ in the bounded domain (for instance by using a projection algorithm) then both existence and boundedness requirements will be satisfied.

Remark 6 It is possible to formulate the same results as in Theorem 3 for this case. Let us modify the tracking system adding the term $K_i(t)e$ to the right-hand side of the equations. Then equation (36) will be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\bar{x}}_i &= f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i) - \lambda(t)(k_1(\bar{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(\bar{x}_i - x_i(0)) - f_i(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\alpha}_i, \bar{\beta}_i)) - (1 - \lambda(t))K_i(t)e; \\ \dot{x}_i^* &= f_i(x_i^*, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*) - \lambda(t)(k_1(x_i^* - x_i(0)) + k_2\sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)) - f_i(x_i^*, \bar{\alpha}_i^*, \bar{\beta}_i^*)); \\ \bar{y}(t) &= y(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{x}_i(t); \\ y(t) &= y(\mathbf{x}^*(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^*(t).\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

Theorem 6 *Let Assumptions 2, 4 hold for the given continuous function $g(t)$, sum $\sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t) > 0$. In addition let the solutions of system (39) with algorithm (37) exist over $[0, \infty)$ and bounded. Then $e(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

The proof of the theorem follows straightforwardly from that of Theorems 5 and 3.

4.4 Extending the Algorithm: Allowing Approximation Error

It is desirable to note that Theorems 2 and 3 both require the validity of Assumption 1. Assumption 1 allowed us to model the function $g(t)$ by reference system of the same structure as the tracking one, which has been exploited in the proofs of the theorems and played an important role in order to guarantee convergence of the errors to zero. This assumption may be too restrictive as it requires strict equivalence between reference and tracking signals for $\alpha = \alpha^*$. We are now ready to abandon this assumption by again invoking Theorem 1.

If Assumption 1 does not hold this leads to nonzero error $\varepsilon(t)$ between the reference and tracking signals at $\alpha = \alpha^*$:

$$\varepsilon(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i^* - g(t).$$

Let us assume that $g(t)$ is differentiable, then $\varepsilon(t)$ is differentiable as well. We denote its first derivative by $d\varepsilon(t)$. Taking into account system (10) we can write the following:

$$\frac{d}{dt}(y(\mathbf{x}^*(t)) - g(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \dot{\hat{x}}_i^* - \dot{g}(t) = d\varepsilon(t).\tag{40}$$

Due to compactness of the interval $[0, T]$ we can conclude that derivative $d\varepsilon(t)$ is bounded:

$$|d\varepsilon(t)| < s.$$

Despite the nonzero error $\varepsilon(t)$, we can still think of the reference signal as a signal generated by system (10) with bounded unmodeled dynamics $d\varepsilon_i(t)$ subtracted from each i -th differential

equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_1^* &= \alpha_1^* x_1^* (1 - x_1^*) - d\varepsilon_1(t); \\
\dot{x}_2^* &= \alpha_2^* x_2^* (1 - x_2^*) - d\varepsilon_2(t); \\
&\dots = \dots \\
\dot{x}_n^* &= \alpha_n^* x_n^* (1 - x_n^*) - d\varepsilon_n(t); \\
y_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(t)) &= \hat{\mathbf{C}}^T \mathbf{x}^*(t), \quad x_i^*(0) = \hat{x}_i(0).
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Let us derive the error dynamics taking into account formula (21), assuming that the reference signal is generated by system (41) instead of system (10):

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{e} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i (\dot{\hat{x}}_i - \dot{x}_i^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i (\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) - \lambda(t)(\hat{\alpha}_i f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \alpha_i^* f_i(x_i^*) + \\
&\quad k_2(\sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) - \sigma(x_i^* - x_i(0)))) - k_1 \lambda(t) e - \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(t) e (1 - \lambda(t)) + d\varepsilon(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

The only difference between equation (21) and (42) is in the term $d\varepsilon(t)$ which represents the unmodeled dynamics of $g(t)$.

There are several ways to deal with such uncertainties. One of them is to include a dead-zone into the parameter adjustment scheme [29]. The algorithms with a dead-zone will have the following form:

$$\dot{\hat{\alpha}}_i = -\delta_s(e) \gamma e(t) \hat{c}_i (f_i(\hat{x}_i) - \lambda(t) f_i(x_i^*)), \quad \delta_s(e) = \begin{cases} 1, & |e| > s; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{43}$$

where s is a width of the dead-zone. Theoretical analysis of the stability of the whole system with learning rule (43) is a routine operation and follows from an analysis of the following Lyapunov's candidate:

$$V(t) = \int_0^{e(t)} \delta_s(\xi) e(\xi) d\xi + \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*\|_{\gamma^{-1}}^2 + \int_t^\infty \mu(\tau) e(\tau) \delta_s(e(\tau)) d\tau.$$

Including the dead-zone into the algorithm structure will impede asymptotic convergence of error $e(t)$ to zero. However, it is possible to show that error $e(t)$ will approach some neighborhood of zero, in particular, $|e|(1 - \lambda(t)) < s + \delta_2$, $\delta_2 > 0$ and stay within this domain after a certain amount of time.

It is clear that the tolerance of the resulting learning process will depend on the dead-zone width s , which is exactly the upper bound of $d\varepsilon(t)$. Therefore, in general, applicability of the proposed learning rules strongly depends on a smoothness of $\varepsilon(t)$ (in the sense of the maximum absolute value of its first derivative). We may deal with this issue by referring to the properties of this approximation scheme in Sobolev space [16],[17]. It has been shown that for any arbitrary small $s > 0$ there exists a network that is capable to approximate a given reference function $g(t)$ such that derivative $d\varepsilon(t)$ satisfies the following estimation $|d\varepsilon(t)| < s$. Hence, learning algorithm (43) will still be applicable even in the presence of nonzero differentiable error $\varepsilon(t)$ between the reference signal and outputs of the tracking system at $\hat{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha}^*$. What value of s is admissible will depend on the dimension of the system.

5 Discussion

We will deal with multi-dimensional extensions and consider neural-network applications of our approach. Theorem 1 states that any continuous function of t can be approximated over time

interval $[0, T]$ by a linear combination of the solutions of system (6). It is desirable to note that we can choose function $g(t)$ in such a way that the following equality holds:

$$g(t) = \tilde{g}(\xi(t)), \quad (44)$$

where $g \in C^1$, $\xi(t)$ is a smooth function of t . Let us suppose that system (6) realizes function $\tilde{g}(\xi)$. It means that

$$\tilde{g}(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(\xi),$$

where $\dot{\hat{x}}_i = \alpha_i \hat{x}_i(1 - \hat{x}_i)$. Then we consider function $\tilde{g}(\xi)$ as a function of time t which satisfies equation (44). Therefore due to formula (44) we can write:

$$\tilde{g}(\xi(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(\xi(t)).$$

Moreover

$$\dot{g}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{g}(\xi(t)) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \tilde{g}(\xi) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \xi(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(1 - \hat{x}_i) \dot{\xi}(t).$$

Hence under the following assumptions: $\dot{g}(t) = \dot{\tilde{g}}(t)$ at $t = 0$ and $g(0) = \tilde{g}(\xi(0))$ we can see that linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(t)$ of the solutions of system

$$\dot{\hat{x}}_i = \alpha_i \hat{x}_i(1 - \hat{x}_i) \dot{\xi}(t)$$

realizes function $g(t)$ and vice-versa. This simple observation suggests how to extend the result to the multi-dimensional case. It is possible to consider a reference function $g(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m)$ with m inputs as a function of time t : $g(\xi_1(t), \dots, \xi_m(t))$. Then a system which realizes function $g(\xi_1(t), \dots, \xi_m(t))$ can be represented in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{i,j} \dot{\xi}_j(t) \right) \hat{x}_i(1 - \hat{x}_i); \\ y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(t). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

If we return to the approximation problem we may observe on account of Theorem 1 that system (45) is able to approximate a given function $g(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m)$ over a given compact domain in such a way that for a particular trajectory $(\xi_1(t), \dots, \xi_m(t))$ and any given constant $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist parameters $\alpha_{i,j}$, $\hat{c}_i$, initial conditions and number n satisfying the following:

$$|g(\xi_1(t), \dots, \xi_m(t)) - y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t))| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Curve $\xi(t)$ should be designed in such a way that good approximation along the curve $\xi(t)$ implies good approximation along the whole surface. Intuitively, this depends on the degree to which the curve "covers" the space. In other words, the more complex curve $(\xi_1(t), \dots, \xi_m(t))$ is, the better the approximation that can be achieved over the given compact interval. This is an interesting problem that, however, is outside the scope of the present paper and is therefore set aside for later investigations.

An important consequence of this description is that a system of *coupled* logistic differential equations (45) may realize an approximation of a nonlinear time-invariant system of the following type:

$$\dot{\mathbf{y}} = \chi(\mathbf{y}), \quad (46)$$

where $\chi(\cdot) : R^n \rightarrow R^n$ is an arbitrary smooth function. Let us explain this. Denote:

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f(a_i t + b_i).$$

Consider system (45) for $m = 1$ and replace $\dot{\xi}(t)$ by $\xi(t)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &= \alpha_i \xi(t) \hat{x}_i (1 - \hat{x}_i); \\ y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i(t) = \mathcal{F}(\alpha, \mathbf{x}_0, \hat{\mathbf{C}}, \int_0^t \xi(\tau) d\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

One may substitute function $y(t)$ in (47) instead of $\xi(t)$. This leads immediately to the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &= \alpha_i y(t) \hat{x}_i (1 - \hat{x}_i); \\ y(t) &= \mathcal{F}(\alpha, \mathbf{x}_0, \hat{\mathbf{C}}, \int_0^t y(\tau) d\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Denoting $z(t) = \int_0^t y(\tau) d\tau$ and taking into account that $y = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i$ we can rewrite system (48) in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_i &= \alpha_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \hat{c}_j \hat{x}_j \right) \hat{x}_i (1 - \hat{x}_i); \\ \dot{z} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i \hat{x}_i, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where the new output function $z(t)$ satisfies the following differential equation:

$$\dot{z} = \mathcal{F}(\alpha, \mathbf{x}_0, \hat{\mathbf{C}}, z).$$

$\mathcal{F}(\alpha, \mathbf{x}_0, \hat{\mathbf{C}}, z)$ may realize function $\chi(z)$ with given tolerance subject to the choice of the parameters $\alpha, \mathbf{x}_0, \hat{\mathbf{C}}$ and the number of equations in (49). In the same fashion one can derive the results for $m > 1$ and obtain the corresponding systems for differential equations:

$$\dot{z}_i = \mathcal{F}_i(\alpha, \mathbf{x}_0, \hat{\mathbf{C}}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_i, \dots, z_n),$$

thus approximating (46).

There are two important observations to be made regarding system (49). First, one may notice that system (49) is a specific instance of the Cohen-Grossberg model [7]. Therefore, it is possible to claim that Cohen-Grossberg models of several differential equations, each of which has relatively simple description (for instance, described by coupled logistic differential equation), in principle, are capable of approximating every nonlinear dynamical system with smooth right-hand sides (subject to appropriate choice of the number of differential equations, initial conditions and parameters). Furthermore, the learning algorithms, introduced in the paper can be applied to

these models as well and their stability may be proven in the same fashion. Second, it is desirable to notice that this approach allows us to introduce an alternative learning technique to that of backpropagation through time [35], albeit for continuous-time systems. A detailed discussion of these topics is beyond the scope of the present paper.

In this paper we analytically showed that (randomly or pre-) selected marking points in the learning sequence $(\Delta T_2(j), j \in \mathcal{N})$ significantly increase the overall effectiveness of pattern-by-pattern learning algorithms. One could also increase the number of sigmoid functions in (1) in order to make the contribution of the unmodeled dynamics to the signal as small as possible. This, however, may raise additional questions regarding the exact desired value of the dead-zone in the algorithm (43). In practice one might start out by choosing a certain target value for the dead-zone and then increase the number of sigmoid functions in (1) till the desired level of tolerance is reached. We have not settled on a solution for this important issue yet.

6 Examples

In this section we illustrate the theoretical results with three examples. The first deals with an application of Theorem 2, the second shows an implementation of Theorem 3, and the third example illustrates Theorem 6.

6.1 Example 1

Let a reference signal be given as a linear combination of the solutions of the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= \alpha_1^* x_1(1 - x_1) - \lambda(t)(k_1(x_1 - 0.1) + k_2\sigma(x_1 - 0.1) + \alpha_1^* x_1(1 - x_1)); \\ \dot{x}_2 &= \alpha_2^* x_2(1 - x_2) - \lambda(t)(k_1(x_2 - 0.02) + k_2\sigma(x_2 - 0.02) + \alpha_2^* x_2(1 - x_2)); \\ \tilde{g}(t) &= y(\mathbf{x}(t)) = x_1(t) - x_2(t), \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where $\alpha_1^* = 1$, $\alpha_2^* = 2$, $k_1 = k_2 = 2$, parameters α_1^* and α_2^* are assumed to be unknown and function $\lambda(t)$ satisfies equation (19) with $\Delta T_2(j) = \{1.5, 4\}$ seconds $T = 20$ seconds. According to Theorem 2 and its corollary, we expect to observe convergence of the tracking system output to that of the reference system at the points $jT - \Delta T_2(j)$. As a benefit, in addition, we might get an asymptotic tacking property. This, however is not guaranteed by the theorem. A curve of the reference signal $\tilde{g}(t)$ is presented in figure 1.

Tracking system has a form that is similar to reference system (50):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{x}}_1 &= \hat{\alpha}_1 \hat{x}_1(1 - \hat{x}_1) - \lambda(t)(k_1(\hat{x}_1 - 0.1) + k_2\sigma(\hat{x}_1 - 0.1) + \hat{\alpha}_1 \hat{x}_1(1 - \hat{x}_1)); \\ \dot{\hat{x}}_2 &= \hat{\alpha}_2 \hat{x}_2(1 - \hat{x}_2) - \lambda(t)(k_1(\hat{x}_2 - 0.02) + k_2\sigma(\hat{x}_2 - 0.02) + \hat{\alpha}_2 \hat{x}_2(1 - \hat{x}_2)); \\ y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) &= \hat{x}_1(t) - \hat{x}_2(t). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

According to the formulas (12), (13), we can write an algorithm for the parameters $\hat{\alpha}_1$, $\hat{\alpha}_2$ adjustment:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{\alpha}}_1 &= -(y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \tilde{g}(t))\hat{x}_1(1 - \hat{x}_1)(1 - \lambda(t)) \\ \dot{\hat{\alpha}}_2 &= (y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \tilde{g}(t))\hat{x}_2(1 - \hat{x}_2)(1 - \lambda(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Simulation results for system (50)-(52) with initial conditions $\hat{\alpha}_1(0) = 2$, $\hat{\alpha}_2(0) = 5$, $\hat{x}_1(0) = 0.1$, $\hat{x}_2(0) = 0.02$ are shown in figure 2, where 2.a is a curve of the error $e(t) = y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \tilde{g}(t)$ dynamics, 2.b and 2.c are the curves of the parameters $\hat{\alpha}_1(t)$ and $\hat{\alpha}_2(t)$ evolution.

6.2 Example 2

Let us illustrate an application of Theorem 3. We consider the following reference and tracking systems:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\hat{x}}_i &= \hat{\alpha}_i \hat{x}_i(1 - \hat{x}_i) - K_i e - \lambda(t)(k_1(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) + k_2 \sigma(\hat{x}_i - x_i(0)) + \hat{\alpha}_i \hat{x}_i(1 - \hat{x}_i) + K_i e); \\
\dot{x}_i &= \alpha_i^* x_i(1 - x_i) - K_i e - \lambda(t)(k_1(x_i - x_i(0)) + k_2 \sigma(x_i - x_i(0)) + \alpha_i^* x_i(1 - x_i) + K_i e); \\
y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) &= 100(\hat{x}_1(t) - \hat{x}_2(t) + x_3(t) - x_4(t)); \\
y(\mathbf{x}(t)) &= 100(x_1(t) - x_2(t) + x_3(t) - x_4(t)),
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where $\alpha_1^* = 1.2$, $\alpha_2^* = 0.7$, $\alpha_3^* = 0.2$, $\alpha_4^* = 0.4$, $k_1 = k_2 = 20$, $K_1 = 0.1$, $K_2 = -0.15$, $K_3 = 0.1$, $K_4 = 0.1$, parameters α_i^* are assumed to be unknown. According to formula (13) we can specify the adjustment rules for all parameters $\hat{\alpha}_i$ in model (53):

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\hat{\alpha}}_1 &= -0.1(y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \tilde{g}(t))\hat{x}_1(1 - \hat{x}_1)(1 - \lambda(t)) \\
\dot{\hat{\alpha}}_2 &= 0.1(y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \tilde{g}(t))\hat{x}_2(1 - \hat{x}_2)(1 - \lambda(t)) \\
\dot{\hat{\alpha}}_3 &= -0.1(y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \tilde{g}(t))\hat{x}_3(1 - \hat{x}_3)(1 - \lambda(t)) \\
\dot{\hat{\alpha}}_4 &= 0.1(y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \tilde{g}(t))\hat{x}_4(1 - \hat{x}_4)(1 - \lambda(t)).
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Simulation results for system (53),(54) which describe the system behavior with the following initial conditions $\hat{\alpha}_1(0) = 5$, $\hat{\alpha}_2(0) = 5$, $\hat{\alpha}_3(0) = 0$, $\hat{\alpha}_4(0) = 5$, $\hat{x}_1(0) = 0.1$, $\hat{x}_2(0) = 0.2$, $\hat{x}_3(0) = 0.3$, $\hat{x}_4(0) = 0.4$ are shown in figure 3 (3.a is a curve of the error dynamics, 3.b (1-4) contains the curves of the parameters $\hat{\alpha}_i(t)$ evolution correspondingly).

6.3 Example 3

In this example we illustrate the possibility to adjust the parameters $\hat{\alpha}_i$ and $\hat{c}_i$ simultaneously. As it has been suggested in Section 5, instead of the parameters $\hat{\alpha}_i$ and $\hat{c}_i$ we will deal with $\bar{\alpha}_i = \hat{\alpha}_i$ and $\bar{\beta}_i = \hat{\alpha}_i/\hat{c}_i$. Reference function $g(t)$ has been chosen to satisfy:

$$g(t, \alpha^*, c^*) = \frac{c^*}{1 + e^{-\alpha^* t + 2.944}},$$

where $c^* = 2$, $\alpha^* = 2/3$. We design the reference and tracking systems as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}^* &= (\bar{\alpha}^* x^* - \bar{\beta} x^{*2})(1 - \lambda(t)) - \lambda(t)(k_1(x^* - x(0)) + k_2 \sigma(x^* - x(0))) \\
\dot{\bar{x}} &= (\bar{\alpha} \bar{x} - \bar{\beta} \bar{x}^2)(1 - \lambda(t)) - \lambda(t)(k_1(\bar{x} - x(0)) + k_2 \sigma(\bar{x} - x(0))) - K(t)e,
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where $\bar{\alpha}^* = 2/3$, $\bar{\beta}^* = 1/3$, $k_1 = 20$, $k_2 = 1$, $x(0) = 0.1$, $K(t) = 0.2$, $e = \bar{x} - x^*$. Function $\lambda(t)$ was chosen to be a periodic function with period $T = 10$ sec, impulse width is 1 sec and unit amplitude (one may easily check that this set of the parameters ensure exact matching between function $g(t)$ and $x^*(t)$ over time interval $[0, 9]$).

Adaptation rules to adjust the parameters $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\beta}$ may be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\bar{\alpha}} &= -0.2e(t)\bar{x}_i(t)(1 - \lambda(t)); \\
\dot{\bar{\beta}} &= 0.2e(t)\bar{x}_i^2(t)(1 - \lambda(t)).
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

In order to make the example more illustrative we would like to compare the performance of algorithm (56) with conventional pattern-by pattern gradient scheme:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{\alpha}} &= -0.2e(t)\frac{\partial g(t, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{c})}{\partial \hat{\alpha}} \\ \dot{\hat{c}} &= -0.2e(t)\frac{\partial g(t, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{c})}{\partial \hat{c}}\end{aligned}\tag{57}$$

and batch rule:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\hat{\alpha}} &= -0.2\frac{\partial J(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{c})}{\partial \hat{\alpha}} \\ \dot{\hat{c}} &= -0.2\frac{\partial J(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{c})}{\partial \hat{c}},\end{aligned}\tag{58}$$

where

$$J(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{c}) = \int_0^9 (g(\tau, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{c}) - g(\tau, \alpha^*, c^*))^2 d\tau$$

Results of such a comparison are shown in Fig. 4-7. In Figure 4 there are two trajectories of the parameters $\hat{\alpha}(t)$ and $\hat{c}(t)$ in two-dimensional space. The first curve is obtained from the trajectories of $\hat{\alpha}(t) = \bar{\alpha}(t)$, $\hat{c}(t) = \bar{\alpha}(t)/\bar{\beta}(t)$ and results from algorithm (56) with initial conditions $\bar{\alpha}(0) = -3$, $\bar{\beta}(0) = 1$. Curve 2 is a solution of (57) starting from initial conditions $\hat{\alpha}(0) = -3$, $\hat{c}(0) = -3$. It can be seen that algorithm (56) reaches the global minimum. Conventional gradient descent fails to do so. It appears unstable and goes through a neighborhood of the global minimum along a valley. This process is shown in Fig. 4. In additions, algorithm (56) is much faster than (57) (see Fig. 5 for details).

Figure 6 reflects another interesting feature of algorithm (56). Whereas conventional gradient algorithm starting from $\hat{\alpha}(0) = 3, \hat{c}(0) = -3$ goes towards the goal along the isolines (Curve 2), algorithm (56) does not stick to isolines. Instead, it goes through infinity in the coordinates $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{c}$. This is not because of any singularities with respect to the coordinates $\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}$ but is due simply to the transformation $\hat{c} = \bar{\alpha}/\bar{\beta}$, when $\bar{\beta}$ goes through zero.

Figure 7 contains the trajectories of the solutions obtained with algorithm (58). Curve 1 shows the trajectory corresponding to initial conditions $\hat{\alpha}(0) = -3, \hat{c}(0) = -3$, Curve 2 is related to initial conditions $\hat{\alpha}(0) = 3, \hat{c}(0) = -3$. It is easy to see that this algorithm gets stuck in local minima.

The performance of algorithm (56) is not surprising because it uses information about the system properties in more intelligent way than gradient descent methods. In addition some coordinate transformation has been used and the process of searching for the minimum is organized in a different coordinate system. All the results relating to stability, however, remain true for the functions which may be represented by a superposition of sigmoid function only.

7 Conclusion

In this work the problem of estimating the parameters for a function represented by sigmoid superposition has been analyzed. The key to our proposal is the transformation of this static nonlinearity into a linear combination of the solutions of a system of the differential equations. These equations are linear in parameters but nonlinear with respect to the state variables. We considered the dynamics of an unperturbed system of differential logistic equations. It was found

that a linear combination of the system solutions may realize any continuous function over interval $[0, T]$ with given tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$. In addition, there is a system of logistic equations with time-varying parameters which can realize a function with multiple inputs. The results enabled us to consider a system with coupled equations via output function $y(\mathbf{\hat{x}})$ as a generator of almost any dynamical system – as long as it is smooth in its state and output variables.

The linearity of the resulting system with respect to its unknown parameters allowed us to apply conventional methods and ideas of adaptive control in order to estimate their values for a given reference function. Extension of both the reference and tracking signals to be repeatable (periodic) over semi-infinite time interval played a crucial role in our analysis. This makes it possible to use known matching conditions (or certainty equivalence) to design the adaptation algorithms. Stability analysis has been performed for the learning schemes introduced. The analysis of the learning schemes provided us with rigorous explanations about the advantages of pattern-by-pattern learning with randomized learning sequences.

It should be mentioned, however, that the problem of finding a flawless algorithm is all but solved by our proposal. The most difficult hurdles to knock down were shown to be the boundedness of solutions (in our case, for the algorithms dealing with the adjustment of both $\hat{\alpha}_i$ and $\hat{c}_i$ parameters) and the problem of determining the maximum amplitude of unmodeled dynamics (when the reference signal is not exactly a superposition of sigmoid function). Though we offered possible solution to these issues in the present paper, there may exist more effective solutions. Finding those may be a topic for future research.

References

- [1] F. Albertini and E. D. Sontag. Uniqueness of weights for neural network. In *Proceedings of Systems and Networks: Mathematical Theory and Applications, MTNS*, volume 2, pages 599–602. 1993.
- [2] N Ampazis, S. J. Perntonis, and J. G Taylor. A dynamical model for the analysis and acceleration of learning in feedforward networks. *Neural Networks*, 14:1075–1088, 2001.
- [3] S. Arimoto, S. Kawamura, and F. Miyazaki. Bettering operation of robots by learning. *J. Robotic Syst.*, 1(2):123–124, 1984.
- [4] S. Arimoto, S. Kawamura, and F. Miyazaki. Realization of robot motion based on a learning method. *IEEE Trans. Man. Cybern.*, 18(1):126–134, 1988.
- [5] A. R. Barron. Universal approximation bounds for superposition of a sigmoidal function. *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, 39(3):930–945, 1993.
- [6] E. Castillo, Oscar Fontenla-Romero, Bertha Guijarro-Berdinas, and Amparo Alonso-Betanzos. A global optimum approach for one-layer neural networks. *Neural Computation*, 14:1429–1449, 2002.
- [7] M. Cohen and S. Grossberg. Absolute stability of global formation and parallel memory storage by competitive neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 13:815–826, 1983.
- [8] G. Cybenko. Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function. *Math. of Control, Signals and Systems*, 2:303–314, 1989.

- [9] G. Didinsky, Z. Pan, and T. Basar. Parameter identification for uncertain plants using h^∞ methods. *Automatica*, 31:1227–1250, 1995.
- [10] A. T. Dingankar. The unreasonable effectiveness of neural network approximation. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 44(11):2043–2044, 1999.
- [11] A. L. Fradkov. Speed-gradient scheme and its applications in adaptive control. *Automation and Remote Control*, 40(9):1333–1342, 1979.
- [12] Ken-Ichi Funahashi. On the approximate realizations of continuous mapping by neural networks. *Neural Networks*, (2):183–192, 1989.
- [13] E. Hansen. *Global Optimization Using Interval Analysis*. Marcel Dekker, 1992.
- [14] S. Haykin. *Neural Networks: A Comprehensive Foundation*. Prentice Hall, 1999.
- [15] H. Hjalmarsson, M. Gevers, M. Gunnarsson, and Oliver Lequin. Iterative feedback tuning: Theory and applications. *IEEE Control Systems*, (August):26–41, 1998.
- [16] K. Hornik. Degree of approximation results for feedforward networks approximating unknown mappings and their derivatives. *Neural Computation*, (6):1262–1275, 1994.
- [17] K. Hornik, K. Stinchcombe, and H. White. Universal approximation of an unknown function and its derivatives using multilayer neural networks. *Neural Networks*, (3):551–560, 1990.
- [18] S. Kirkpatrick, C. Gelatt, and M. P. Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *Science*, 220:671–680, 1983.
- [19] G. Kreisselmeier. Adaptive observers with exponential rate of convergence. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, AC-22:2–8, 1977.
- [20] J. T. Lo. Minimization through convexitization in training neural networks. In *Proceedings of International Joint Conference on Neural Networks IJCNN'2002*. 2002.
- [21] Jean-Francois Magni. On continuous-time parameter identification by using observers. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, 40(10):1789–1792, 1995.
- [22] R. Marino and P. Tomei. Global adaptive output-feedback control of nonlinear systems, part i: Linear parameterization. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, 38(1):17–32, 1993.
- [23] R. Marino and P. Tomei. Adaptive observers with arbitrary exponential rate of convergence for nonlinear systems. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, 40(7):1300–1304, 1995.
- [24] William Messner, Roberto Horowitz, Wei-Wen Kao, and Michal Bolas. A new adaptive learning rule. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 36(2):188–197, 1991.
- [25] A. Ollerro, J. Gonzales-Jimenes, J. M. Vincente, and A. Corral. A parametric learning control method with application for robot manipulators. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on System Engineering*, pages 164–167. 1990.
- [26] Ziang Pan and Tamer Basar. Parameter identification for uncertain linear systems with partial state measurements under an h^∞ criterion. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 41(9):1295–1311, 1996.

- [27] M. Q. Phan and J. A. Frueh. Iterative learning control: Analysis, design, integration, and applications. In *System Identification and Learning Control, Chapter 15*, pages 285–306, 1998.
- [28] L. S. Pontryagin. *Ordinary Differential Equations*. Nauka, 1965.
- [29] A. S. Poznyak, Wen Yu, Edgar N. Sanchez, and Jose P. Perez. Nonlinear adaptive trajectory tracking using dynamic neural networks. identification via dynamic neural control. *IEEE Trans. on Neural Networks*, 10(6):1402–1411, 1999.
- [30] S. Sastry and M. Bodson. *Adaptive Control: Stability, Convergence, and Robustness*. Prentice Hall, 1989.
- [31] W. Seo and J. S. Lee. Model reference parametric learning control of uncertain lti systems. In *Proceedings of Iterative Learning Control Workshop and Roundtable*, pages 164–167. 1998.
- [32] S. Strogatz. *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: With applications to Physics, Biology, Chemistry and Engineering*. Perseus Publishing, 2000.
- [33] V. A. Terekhov and I. Yu. Tyukin. Investigation of the neural networks training processes stability. Part I. *Automation and Remote Control*, 60(10):1477–1483, 1999.
- [34] E. Walter and L. Prozanto. *Identification of Parametric Models*. Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- [35] P. J. Werbos. Backpropagation through time: What it does and how to do it. In *Proceedings of IEEE*, volume 78, pages 1550–1560. 1990.
- [36] W. Zangwill. *Nonlinear Programming. A Unified Approach*. Prentice Hall, 1969.

Figure 1: Curve of the reference signal $\tilde{g}(t)$ generated by system (50).

Figure 2: Curves of the signals $e(t)$, $\hat{\alpha}_1(t)$ $\hat{\alpha}_2(t)$ in system (50)-(52).

Figure 3: Curves of the signals $e(t)$, $\hat{\alpha}_i(t)$ in system (53)-(54).

Figure 4: Trajectories $\hat{\alpha}(t), \hat{c}(t)$ in system (55) with algorithm (56) (Curve 1) and algorithm (57) (Curve 2) starting from point $(-3, -3)$. Global minimum is marked by circle

Figure 5: Trajectories $\hat{\alpha}(t), \hat{c}(t)$ in system (55) with algorithm (56) (Curve 1) and algorithm (57) (Curve 2) starting from point $(-3, -3)$. The trajectories have been shown for time interval $[0, 900]$ sec.

Figure 6: Trajectories $\hat{\alpha}(t), \hat{c}(t)$ in system (55) with algorithm (56) (Curve 1) and algorithm (57) (Curve 2) starting from point $(3, -3)$. Algorithm (56) ensures the estimates to reach a neighborhood of the global minimum in very short time and then to approach it with oscillations in the parameter space (blob-like part of the trajectory).

Figure 7: Trajectories $\hat{\alpha}(t), \hat{c}(t)$ in system (55) with batch gradient algorithm (58) starting from point $(-3, -3)$ (Curve 1) and $(3, -3)$ (Curve 2). None reaches the global minimum (marked by circle)

This figure "4neurons.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/math/0207075v1>

This figure "g.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/math/0207075v1>

This figure "learning.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/math/0207075v1>

This figure "surf2_23_batch2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/math/0207075v1>

This figure "surf2_23_init-3-3long2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/math/0207075v1>

This figure "surf2_23_init-3-32.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/math/0207075v1>

This figure "surf2_23_init3-32.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/math/0207075v1>