Dean&Francis
ISSN 2959-6157

Impact of Linear and Nonlinear Robust Control on Robust Stability

Yiduo Yang

International College, University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing 100876, China
yyd518340@163.com

Abstract:
Linear robust control methods, like H-infinity and μ-synthesis, offer clear ways to design controllers. They help control systems stay stable even with unknown factors and outside shaking. These methods guarantee the system stays stable and performs well under changing conditions. Besides, they are used a lot in industrial systems that are well-modeled. In addition to these, nonlinear robust control techniques, like sliding mode control, adaptive robust control, and robust backstepping, handle nonlinear forces well. And they also adjust easily to unknown factors that change over time. Thus, this paper compares how linear and nonlinear robust control methods differ in staying stable, how hard they are to design, and how well they block outside shaking. By looking at key theories and existing study findings, this work shows how the system type, the kind of unknown factors, and the use case change the selection between linear and nonlinear robust controllers. Moreover, it discusses mixed methods that combine linear and nonlinear ways to achieve improved stability in complex engineering systems.

Keywords: Robust Stability, Linear Robust Control, Nonlinear Robust Control, H-infinity Control, Sliding Mode Control

1. Introduction

Since the 1980s, robust stability has been a main idea in control theory. This stability makes sure control systems stay stable when dealing with unknown factors, such as changing values, modeling mistakes, and outside shaking. And linear methods have been a key way to deal with this. Existing studies have moved from addressing simple uncertainties in linear systems to managing nonlinear dynamics in applications such as industrial automation, aviation, and robotics. Important new work includes data-driven nonlinear control that uses simple linear structures, nonlinear control for robots that learns as it works, and the rise of mixed AI methods for unstable and random unknown factors in computer-physical systems [1,2]. Besides, the rapid growth of industrial automation and market expansion highlights the need for robust control amid disturbances, delays, and

ISSN 2959-6157

nonlinear actuator effects. This paper examines both linear and nonlinear robust control methods, highlighting their differences in stability, disturbance rejection, adaptability, and computational complexity under various uncertainties and system dynamics. It also looks at how unknown factors that are structured, unstructured, and change over time affect which control method engineers choose. It also studies how useful mixed methods are in complex systems. Through literature review, theoretical analysis, method comparisons, and relevant case studies, the paper offers practical guidance for engineering applications, highlights gaps in existing research, and provides insights for future enhancements in robust control techniques.

2. The Theoretical Foundation of System Robust Stability

2.1 Definition and Metrics of Robust Stability

Despite unknown factors, such as changing values, modeling mistakes, or outside shaking, a control system shows robust stability if it can keep working well. This is like a plane staying on its path even with strong winds. For a continuous LTI system, robust stability requires that the closed-loop eigenvalues must be in the left half of the plane (for continuous systems) or inside the unit circle (for digital systems), even with all expected unknown factors. Using Lyapunov theory, robustness can be verified by identifying a positive definite function $V(x)$ such that $\dot{V}(x) < 0$ for x¡Ù0 under all admissible uncertainties, ensuring the system remains stable despite variations and disturbances [3]. For checking how strong a system is (robustness), common ways to measure it include Gain Margin (GM), Phase Margin (PM), and the Structured Singular Value (μ), as seen in Table 1. These measure how well the system handles changes in gain, time delay, and structured shaking, in that order. GM and PM are simple and easy to see, making them good for quick checks on single-input, single-output (SISO) systems. And the μ measure gives a clear worst-case number for multi-input, multi-output (MIMO) systems with structured unknown factors. The $H\infty$ norm, which is related to μ, sets a limit on the system's biggest gain. These numbers help measure how strong the system is and guide how controllers are designed [4].

Table 1: Robust Stability Metrics

Metric	Definition	Significance	Typical Application	Target
GM	Reciprocal of open-loop gain at -180° phase frequency	Measures tolerance to gain variations leading to instability	Voltage regulation under resistor drift in power electronics	> 6 dB
PM	Phase difference to -180° at 0 dB gain	Measures resistance to oscillations caused by delays	Robotic servo systems under friction delays	45°~60°
μ	Maximum singular value under structured perturbations	Quantifies worst-case amplitude of structured disturbances	Aerospace flight control under coupled actuator faults	$\mu < 1$

2.2 System Uncertainty and Disturbance Models

In robust control, system uncertainties and disturbances critically impact stability and performance. They show the difference between the simple model and the real system. This happens because of limited information, changes in the surroundings, or outside forces. If not handled, these differences can make the system unstable. For example, a change in a value can cause shaking in a power grid. By defining the worst-case situation, these factors let the controller make sure the performance stays within limits during shaking, often measured using $H\infty$ norm limits [3]. Parameter uncertainty is usually written down like this:

$$p=p_0+\Delta p,¡¬\Delta p¡¬_{\infty}¡Ü? \quad (1)$$

where p_0 is the nominal parameter and Δp represents the deviation. Based on their structure, uncertainties are structured (known block forms) or unstructured (arbitrary within norm bounds).

To check how a system performs with outside forces, engineers group these forces (disturbances) by their signal type: deterministic, stochastic, and bounded. Deterministic disturbances, like steady, sine-wave, or ramp signals, act right on the system's state through its math. Stochastic disturbances are usually modeled as random Gaussian processes with a mean of zero; this includes noise from the process and measurement. Bounded disturbances satisfy known magnitude limits, thus allowing worst-case analysis of system responses.

To unify the analysis of uncertainties and disturbances, the linear fractional transformation (LFT) method can integrate them into a generalized system P(s), and interconnect it with the Δ block, for example, $M=\begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{21} & P_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, forming the closed-loop transfer function:

$$T=P_{11}+P_{12}K(I0P_{22}K)^{01}P_{21} \tag{2}$$

This approach facilitates stability and performance verification using the small-gain theorem or μ-analysis [5]. In power systems, engineers can model load changes as outside shaking and grid value differences as unknown factors. This lets them check the closed-loop response and the strong performance of the controller they built, even with real shaking and changes in values.

2.3 Robust Control Methods and Stability Margins

To ensure closed-loop stability in the presence of parameter variations, structured perturbations, or unstructured disturbances, robust control methods provide systematic tools tailored to different types of uncertainties. Based on the type of uncertainty, these methods can be broadly classified as interval, unstructured, and structured approaches. The interval parameter method uses Kharitonov's theorem to assess the stability of systems with polynomial coefficients varying within given ranges. The interval polynomial is defined as follows:

$$p(s)=s^n+a_n s^{n01}+¡-+a_0, a_i¡Ê[\underset{-i}{a}, \overset{?}{a_i}] \tag{3}$$

where the a_i vary within the specified intervals, and the entire family of polynomials is Hurwitz stable if and only if four designated boundary polynomials are stable. By avoiding the enumeration of all polynomials, this method is well suited for rapid preliminary analysis [6].

The small-gain theorem is the base for H∞ control, a frequency-domain optimization technique that limits worst-case responses from unstructured disturbances, and ensures closed-loop stability. For a system P (with outside shaking *w*, control signals *u*, desired results *z*, and measured outputs *y*), the goal is to build a controller *K* that keeps the system stable despite this shaking. This method is especially good for simple unknown factors, giving strong performance at a reasonable cost. On the other hand, structured unknown factors are handled using μ-theory and μ-synthesis [4]. μ-theory quantifies the smallest structured perturbation capable of destabilizing the nominal system M, with the robust stability condition expressed as follows.

$$\mu(M)<1, \mu(M)=\frac{1}{\min \sigma?(\Delta) | \det(I0M\Delta)=0, \Delta \text{asspecifiedstructure}} \tag{4}$$

μ-synthesis uses D-K iteration to optimize the controller K and the scaling matrix *D*, minimizing μ across all frequencies to manage complex block-structured uncertainties. This approach achieves high accuracy in MIMO systems but requires significant computational effort. Furthermore, robust stability margins extend classical gain and phase margins to metrics like the singular value $\sigma?(I+L)$, quantifying system stability and performance limits. Each method suits different scenarios: interval methods quickly assess coefficient variations, and μ-synthesis is appropriate for precise design in the presence of complex structured uncertainties.

3. Linear Robust Control and Its Influence on Robust Stability

3.1 The Analysis of Robust Stability in H∞ Control

H∞ control keeps linear systems stable even when facing structured or simple unknown factors. It does this through frequency optimization and weighting design. The analysis for staying stable relies on the Algebraic Riccati Equation (ARE). Engineers find the location of the closed-loop poles by solving these equations:

$$X+A^TX+C_1^TC_10(XB_2+C_1^TD_{12})R^{01}(B_2^TX+D_{12}^TC_1)=0 \tag{5}$$

$$AY+YA^T+B_1B_1^T0(YC_2^T+B_1D_{21}^T)S^{01}(C_2Y+D_{21}B_1^T)=0 \tag{6}$$

where $R=D_{12}^TD_{12}$ and $S=D_{21}D_{21}^T$ are positive matrices, and X and Y are stabilizing solutions [7]. By solving these equations, engineers can directly find out if the closed-loop poles are in the left half of the plane. This makes sure the system stays stable inside and out, even with shaking or unknown factors. This ARE-based analysis lets H∞ control provide a strong, theoretical promise of stability while still being usable in real life.

The linear approach introduces conservatism because it assumes simple unknown factors. This can result in con-

ISSN 2959-6157

trollers with gains that are too high or performance that is more than needed. Nonlinear methods can get better, more exact performance by using feedback that changes with the system's state or learns as it works. However, these methods require very accurate models and take a lot of computing power. In contrast, linear H∞ control makes sure the system stays stable while easily solving Riccati equations or LMIs using ready-made math tools. And this makes it good for systems that need to work in real-time [3]. Nonlinear methods usually take a lot of computing power since they require solving the Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs (HJI) equations or complex nonlinear math problems. This limits how often they can be used in real-time. For blocking outside shaking, linear H∞ control makes the closed-loop response better by using weighting functions to focus on certain frequency ranges. For example, suppressing low-frequency disturbances in power systems for frequency-domain robustness. Nonlinear methods can utilize state feedback and gain adjustment that learns to stop complex shaking as it happens. However, how well they work is limited by how accurate the model is and how much power the computer has.

3.2 μ-Synthesis and Structured Singular Value Methods

To evaluate a system's robustness to structured uncertainties, the structured singular value μ is used. It quantifies the smallest block-diagonal perturbation capable of destabilizing the system, providing precise worst-case bounds for correlated parameter variations in multivariable systems. μ-synthesis is implemented via iterative scaling and H∞ optimization, where the system is first scaled according to uncertainty blocks and the H∞ norm is minimized across the entire frequency range, ensuring robust closed-loop stability. The system maintains stability provided that the nominal system is stable and the structured uncertainties stay within the μ-bound. The μ value is typically computed using power iteration, D-scaling, or balanced truncation methods [8].

In contrast to standard H∞ control, μ-synthesis explicitly accounts for uncertainty structure, thus yielding accurate robustness margins without overly conservative design. This feature is especially critical in highly coupled multivariable systems, since variations in actuator gains, flexible modes, or mass distribution can significantly affect performance. Consequently, μ-synthesis demonstrates clear advantages in aerospace and high-precision robotic applications. In flexible spacecraft control, μ analysis handles structured mass and actuator uncertainties, achieving vibration suppression and attitude regulation. In high-precision mechanical systems, it enables optimization against worst-case coupled disturbances while maintaining high-accuracy tracking. Through structured robustness, μ-synthesis balances performance, robustness, and conservatism, thereby making it an essential tool for analysis and design in complex multivariable control problems.

3.3 Advantages and Disadvantages of Linear Robust Control

Linear robust control, encompassing H∞, and μ-synthesis, helps a lot with keeping systems strong against unknown factors. However, how well these methods work is limited by how accurate the model is, whether the system is linear, and how much computing power is available.

By allowing clear analysis, ensuring stability, and managing multivariable systems, linear robust control performs well in many applications. The easy math of linear robust control lets engineers use ready-made tools like Riccati equations, LMIs, and frequency methods such as Bode plots. This helps them find solutions and compute things quickly. As a result, linear robust control is especially good for designing linear time-invariant (LTI) systems in areas like plane travel, car manufacturing, and factory work. For example, LMIs have been used to check stability in digital systems with time delays, input limits in systems with changing uncertainty, and algebraic methods that turn checking multivariable stability into solving simple polynomial math [9-11].

H∞ and μ-synthesis methods provide formal stability guarantees, thus ensuring robustness under bounded uncertainties. This is shown by H∞ analysis of non-autonomous linear control systems (LADRC) that have unknown values and by finding stochastic strength limits for linear hybrid systems. Also, μ-synthesis can handle complex unknown factors, making linear methods usable for systems with many variables, like multi-axis robots and digital systems with time delays [12].

However, linear robust control has certain limitations. The unstructured uncertainty assumption in H∞ control often leads to overly conservative designs, while μ-synthesis, although more precise, requires heavy computation due to the iterative D-K procedure. To reduce conservatism, uncertainty matrix decompositions have been optimized, for instance by using particle swarm algorithms to improve LADRC guidance and attitude control performance. Linear methods also assume small perturbations around a nominal linear model, restricting their use in strongly nonlinear systems, like chaotic dynamics in power electronics, often requiring approximate or hybrid methods. Moreover, how well linear methods work depends a lot on having accurate simple models and clear limits for unknown factors. In real systems, like biological networks or adaptive structures, these rules can be hard to meet. Even extended models, such as generalized linear hybrid systems with semi-Markov processes, still rely on knowing the values exactly.

4. Nonlinear Robust Control and Its Influence on Robust Stability

4.1 Stability and Characteristics of Nonlinear Robust Control

In nonlinear robust control, outside shaking and unknown changes in values are stopped to keep the system stable. The theory for this comes from nonlinear stability analysis methods, including the Lyapunov method, input-to-state stability (ISS), passivity, and contraction theory. And this allows robust handling of complex behaviors like chaos and limit cycles. These methods promise stability both locally and everywhere, and they form the theory base for designing nonlinear control. ISS shows the effect of outside shaking using conditions that look like this:

$$¡¬x(t)¡¬¡Ü\beta(¡¬x(0)¡¬,t)+\gamma(\sup_{\tau¡Üt}¡¬d(\tau)¡¬)(\beta¡ÊK,L,\gamma¡ÊK) \quad (7)$$

which quantifies the system states' response to input perturbations Passivity expresses energy relations between input and output via $\dot{V}(x)¡Üy^{T}u$, while contraction theory ensures exponential convergence of system trajectories under $\sigma(J)<-\lambda<0$. These tools collectively enable robust prediction and control of nonlinear system behavior.

The design of nonlinear robust controllers relies heavily on stability theory. For example, Sliding Mode Control (SMC) enforces $s(x)=0$ with the control law $u=-k?sgn(s)$ to achieve finite-time robustness against matched uncertainties. Backstepping constructs Lyapunov functions recursively to achieve global tracking in cascaded systems. Adaptive Control uses $\dot{\hat{\theta}}=-\Gamma^{01}?(x)e$ (where e is the tracking error) to make up for unknown changes in values, which makes the math easier and lets it be used in real things like flight control [13]. Complex actions like chaos or limit cycles can be reduced using Lyapunov exponents or scaled Lyapunov functions, as shown in boundary control of the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation.

4.2 Uncertainty Handling in Nonlinear Robust Control

Nonlinear systems are always subject to various unknown factors. These include changing values, unmodeled forces, outside shaking, and simple unknown factors. Handling these factors well is key to staying stable and performing well. Nonlinear robust control achieves this by mixing strategies such as adaptive control, sliding mode control, observer-based control, and data-driven control. By matching the control method to the type of unknown factor, these approaches ensure strength beyond simple linear models.

Parameter uncertainties, such as slowly varying or unknown system parameters, can be mitigated using adaptive control laws. For example, parameter estimates can be updated based on the following equation.

$$\dot{\hat{\theta}}=-\Gamma?^{T}(x)\frac{?V}{?x} \quad (8)$$

which allows the controller to compensate for gradual parameter drift while maintaining stability in switched or cascaded systems. For unmodeled dynamics and internal disturbances, SMC introduces robust terms of the form $u=u_{eq}0k?sgn(s)$ ($k>$bounds). This constrains the system error within a predefined sector, providing finite-time robustness and effectively suppressing oscillations in sampled-data systems [14].

External disturbances are commonly handled using observer-based methods, which estimate and compensate unknown inputs. When integrated with Model Predictive Control (MPC) and sliding mode techniques, these observers enable the system to maintain performance under

ISSN 2959-6157

matched input uncertainties, even in constrained environments. Non-structured uncertainties, which cannot be easily parameterized, are addressed using fuzzy logic, neural networks, or other data-driven approaches, including reinforcement learning. These methods approximate unknown functions through cost minimization and are particularly useful for operator-based tracking problems in complex nonlinear systems [15].

Different strategies present distinct advantages and limitations depending on the application context. Backstepping can achieve cascaded disturbance rejection in robotic systems, offering global stability but with rapidly increasing computational complexity. MPC–SMC combinations are effective in vehicular platoon control, providing performance recovery with relatively low computational effort, although their effectiveness can be sensitive to sampling intervals. Neural network-based adaptive controllers support online tuning in process control, reducing conservatism, but the computational cost of training can be significant. Despite these advances, challenges remain, including adaptive oscillations, multi-loop coordination gaps, and reliance on accurate system modeling [14].

4.3 Performance Evaluation and Applications of Nonlinear Robust Control

Evaluation of nonlinear robust control uses theoretical, practical, and numerical measures to assess real-world robustness. Compared with linear approximations, nonlinear methods often outperform linear ones in transient response and finite-time convergence, especially in complex systems such as robotics, networked control, and energy processes.

Theoretically, H∞-type dissipativity conditions $V+z^{T}z0\gamma^{2}w^{T}w$¡Ü0 ensure bounded system states and outputs under energy-limited disturbances, while finite-time or predefined-time stability can be further assessed via Lyapunov-Krasovskii-inspired functionals, allowing guaranteed convergence within fixed horizons even in multi-delay or switched systems [16].

For evaluation, engineering metrics measure overshoot, steady-state error, and settling time. In real-time implementation, sliding mode controllers use chattering indices and computational load to indicate demands, while sustained oscillation amplitudes reveal operational challenges [12]. Besides, numerical and simulation-based methods complement theoretical and engineering metrics. System performance can be tested with Monte Carlo simulations across uncertainty sets, attraction domains can be estimated with sum-of-squares (SOS) programming, and stability in delayed or switched systems can be checked using piecewise Lyapunov functionals within Takagi-Sugeno (T-S) fuzzy models. These approaches allow rigorous robustness evaluation without redoing the underlying nonlinear control theory.

Through practical applications, the impact of nonlinear robust control is illustrated. In robotics, techniques like Nonlinear Active Disturbance Rejection Control (NADRC) and ARISE controllers improve disturbance rejection and transient response. For networked control systems, nonlinear methods are leveraged to handle input saturation and communication delays, maintaining stability in multi-agent or delayed configurations. In energy and industrial processes, data-driven robust controllers combine models and learning to manage unmodeled dynamics and external disturbances.

5. The Stability Analysis and Comparison of Linear and Nonlinear Robust Control

Linear, nonlinear, and hybrid robust control methods each offer unique strengths in handling system uncertainties. Linear methods use LTI models and rely on LMIs, Riccati equations, H∞/μ bounds, or Kharitonov tests to ensure stability, and they work fast for small changes but are cautious with strong nonlinearities. By directly addressing system nonlinearities via Lyapunov functionals, ISS, and adaptive estimation, nonlinear methods give better robustness and fast convergence, but cost more to compute. Hybrid approaches mix linear and nonlinear methods, balancing performance, robustness, and efficiency in complex systems.

In practice, linear methods suit LTI systems (such as H∞ vibration suppression, μ-synthesis fault-tolerant control), nonlinear methods are preferred for robotics or energy systems with strong nonlinearities, and hybrid methods are ideal for networked or multivariable systems. Performance evaluation can use Bode plots, Lyapunov-based analysis, simulations, and data-driven techniques.

As summarized in Table 2, these methods can be compared across model assumptions, stability tools, robustness, computation, and disturbance rejection.

Table 2: Comparison of Linear, Nonlinear, and Hybrid Robust Control Methods

Aspect	Linear Robust Control	Nonlinear Robust Control	Hybrid Methods
Model	LTI or linearizable	Directly nonlinear	Combination of linear and nonlinear
Stability Analysis	LMIs, Riccati, H∞/μ, Kharitonov	Lyapunov functionals, ISS, adaptive estimation	Linear + nonlinear tools
Robustness	Global asymptotic; conservative	Broader, finite-time convergence	Balanced robustness
Computation	Efficient (LMIs, D-K)	Higher (backstepping, SOS)	Moderate (LPV-nonlinear MPC)
Disturbance Rejection	Frequency-domain (H∞)	Sliding-mode, adaptive observers	Combined frequency + adaptive methods

6. Conclusion

This paper analyzes the influence of linear and nonlinear robust control strategies on robust stability under various system uncertainties and disturbances. The study shows that linear robust control provides clear design guidance and stability guarantees in well-modeled systems, whereas nonlinear robust control offers greater adaptability in highly nonlinear and time-varying conditions. Moreover, hybrid strategies that integrate both approaches demonstrate potential for improved robustness and performance. Future research should explore combining robust stability theory with intelligent algorithms and data-driven modeling to address challenges in large-scale, uncertain, and complex engineering systems.

References

[1] Ping, X., Hu, J., Lin, T., Ding, B., Wang, P., & Li, Z. (2022). A survey of output feedback robust MPC for linear parameter varying systems. IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica, 9(10), 1717-1751.

[2] Mazhar, A., Tanveer, A., Izhan, M., & Khan, M. Z. T. (2023). Robust Control Approaches and Trajectory Planning Strategies for Industrial Robotic Manipulators in the Era of Industry 4.0: A Comprehensive Review. Engineering Proceedings, 56(1), 75.

[3] Sename, O., Borrell, A. M., & Morato, M. M. (2024). On robust and predictive control approaches for linear parameter varying systems: application to vehicle lateral control. Foundations and Trends® in Systems and Control, 11(4), 285-380.

[4] Skogestad, S., & Postlethwaite, I. (2005). Multivariable feedback control: analysis and design. john Wiley & sons.

[5] Xing, W., & Shen, J. (2024). Security control of cyber-physical systems under cyber attacks: A survey. Sensors, 24(12), 3815.

[6] Barmish, B. R., & Jury, E. I. (1994). New tools for robustness of linear systems. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 39(12), 2525-2525.

[7] Zhou, K., & Doyle, J. C. (1998). Essentials of robust control (Vol. 104). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice hall.

[8] Mushtaq, T., Bhattacharjee, D., Seiler, P., & Hemati, M. S. (2024). Structured singular value of a repeated complex full-block uncertainty. International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control, 34(7), 4881-4897.

[9] De Souza, C. E., & Coutinho, D. (2014). Robust stability and control of uncertain linear discrete-time periodic systems with time-delay. Automatica, 50(2), 431-441.

[10] Tarbouriech, S., Garcia, G., & da Silva Jr, J. G. (2002). Robust stability of uncertain polytopic linear time-delay systems with saturating inputs: an LMI approach. Computers & Electrical Engineering, 28(3), 157-169.

[11] Dainson, B. E., & Lewin, D. R. (1998). An algebraic criterion for robust stability of linear control systems. IEEE transactions on automatic control, 43(2), 237-241.

[12] Shao, N., Huang, Y., Hong, D., et al. (2025, May). Design and Performance Evaluation of a μ-Synthesis-Based Robust Impedance Controller for Robotic Joints. In Actuators (Vol. 14, No. 6, p. 266). MDPI.

ISSN 2959-6157

[13] Sakthivel, R., & Ito, H. (2007). Non-linear robust boundary control of the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation. IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information, 24(1), 47-55.
[14] Okuyama, Y., Takemori, F., & Nakamori, K. (2001). Amplitude dependent stability analysis for non-linear sampled-data control systems. In 2001 European control conference (ECC) (pp. 30-35). IEEE.
[15] Bi, S., Deng, M., & Xiao, Y. (2014). Robust stability and tracking for operator-based nonlinear uncertain systems. IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering, 12(3), 1059-1066.
[16] Fang, M. (2025). Artificial Intelligence Technology in Library Scientific Research Support Service. Frontiers in Educational Research, 8(5).