PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Varying control intensity of synchronized chaotic system with time delay

To cite this article: Babatunde O. Onasanya et al 2021 J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 1828 012143

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

You may also like

- <u>Downstream Yangtze River levels</u> <u>impacted by Three Gorges Dam</u> Jida Wang, Yongwei Sheng, Colin J Gleason et al.
- <u>Study on evolution characteristics of a</u> <u>near-dam channel downstream of the</u> <u>Three Gorges Reservoir</u> Hua Ge and Chunyan Deng
- Failure Hazard Assessment of Three Gorges Ship Lift Drive System Based on Combined Weighting and TOPSIS Method Zhuo Chen, Quangen Li, Xuefei Li et al.



This content was downloaded from IP address 159.196.170.189 on 01/02/2024 at 02:56

Varying control intensity of synchronized chaotic system with time delay

Babatunde O. Onasanya^{1,2}, Shiping Wen³, Yuming Feng^{4,*}, Wei Zhang⁵, Ning Tang⁶, and Adeleke T. Ademola⁷

1828 (2021) 012143

¹Key Laboratory of Intelligent Information Processing and Control, Chongqing Three Gorges University, Wanzhou, Chongqing, 404100, China

²Department of Mathematics, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

³Australian AI Institute, University of Technology Sydney, Ultimo, NSW 2007, Australia ⁴School of Computer Science and Engineering, Chongqing Three Gorges University, Wanzhou, Chongqing, 404100, China

⁵Chongqing Engineering Research Center of Internet of Things and Intelligent Control Technology, Chongqing Three Gorges University, Wanzhou, Chongqing, 404100, China ⁶School of Three Gorges Artificial Intelligence, Chongqing Three Gorges University, Wanzhou, Chongqing, 404100, China

⁷Department of Mathematics, Obafemi Awolowo University, Post Code 220005 Ile-Ife, Nigeria

*Email: yumingfeng25928@163.com

Abstract. Hyperchaotic system is a very useful tool in secure and encrypted communications. But situations arise when engineers and scientists seek to synchronize two hyperchaotic systems. This gives another (error) system. The goal is to minimize the error as much as can be in order to make one system look like the other by synchronization. This is a particularly challenging situation. In this paper, two hyperchaotic systems are synchronized by impulsive control. Also, the condition for uniform asymptotic stability of the synchronized error system was given. Finally, the simulation results to justify the reliability of this method is also presented.

1. Introduction

A typical differential equation which is impulsive is of the form

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(t, x), & t \neq t_k \\ \Delta x = x(t_k^+) - x(t_k^-) = I_k(x), & t = t_k, k \in \mathbb{N} \\ x(t_0^+) = \theta. \end{cases}$$
(1)

So many studies on chaotic control have been done and more information can be found in [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6] and [7].

Of particular interest is the work of [8]. It obtained a control matrix. In practice, control should not be continuous, otherwise, it is not impulsive. The intensity of control should reduce with passing time so that the energy of the system is also gradually controlled as control should not suddenly and significantly change the state of the system.

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence. Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI. Published under licence by IOP Publishing Ltd 1

Further to the work of [8], a set of control matrices was obtained to give room for varying and flexible data about interval of impulses and the time at which stabilization is achieved. Also, a completely different sufficient condition for the synchronized error system of Chen to be uniform and asymptotically stable was given.

2. Preliminaries

In what follows, \mathbb{R}_+ represents the nonnegative real numbers and \mathbb{R}^n the Euclidean space. Let $S \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and x_t , a piecewise continuous function.

However, it is important to note that choosing a constant r > 0 as the delay system upper bound and open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, given the functionals $f, I: J \times PC([-r, 0], D) \to \mathbb{R}^n$, the system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = f(x, x_t), & t \neq \tau_k \\ \Delta x(t) = I(t, x_{t^-}), & t = \tau_k \end{cases}$$

$$\tag{2}$$

where $\Delta x(t) = x(t) - x(t^{-})$ with the initial condition

$$x_{t_0} = \theta, \tag{3}$$

where $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\theta \in PC([-r, 0], \mathbb{R}^n)$, has a trivial solution. This is especially when τ_k , the impulse instances, are assumed to satisfy $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots$ and $\lim_{k \to \infty} \tau_k = \infty$.

The solution of (2) which is trivial is stable if for every $\epsilon > 0$ and a non negative real number t_0 , there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that if θ is piecewise continuous on ([-r, 0], D) such that $||\theta||_r \leq \delta$ and any solution of (2) and (3) of the form $x = x(t_0, \theta)$ implies $x(t, t_0, \theta)$ is defined and $||x(t, t_0, \theta)|| \leq \epsilon$, for all $t \geq t_0$. Let δ be independent of t_0 , then that trivial solution has a uniform stability. Its stability is uniform and asymptotical if, in addition, there exists some $\eta > 0$ and for every $\gamma > 0$, there is some $F = F(\eta, \gamma) > 0$ such that if $\theta \in PC([-r, 0], D)$ with $||\theta||_r \leq \eta$, then $||x(t, t_0, \theta)|| \leq \gamma$ for $t \geq t_0 + F$.

Take $V: J \times D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, where J is a clopen interval of the form $[0, \infty)$ in \mathbb{R}_+ . The upper directional derivative of V on the right with respect to system (2) is defined by

$$D^{+}V(t,\phi(0)) = \lim_{h \to 0^{+}} \sup \frac{1}{h} [V(t+h,\phi(0)+hf(t,\phi)) - V(t,\phi(0))],$$
(4)

for $(t, \phi) \in J \times PC([-r, 0], D)$.

Furthermore, take $K_1 = \{g(s)\}$ as a set of continuous functions on \mathbb{R}_+ such that $g(s) \neq 0$ for $0 \neq s \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Also, let $\alpha, \beta, a, g \in K_1$ such that g is nondecreasing in s and

$$V: [-r, \infty) \times W(\rho) \to \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where V is continuous on both $[-r, \tau_0) \times W(\rho)$ and $[\tau_{k-1}, \tau_k) \times W(\rho)$ with the

$$\lim_{(t,y)\to(\tau_k^-,x)}V(t,y)=V(\tau_k^-,x)$$

for each $x \in W(\rho)$ and $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \cdots$. Then, V is said to be locally Lipschitz in x, if when restricted to $\mathbb{R}_+ \times W(\rho)$, and $q \in PC(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$, the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) $\beta(||X||)$ and $\alpha(||X||)$ bound V(t, x) below and above, respectively, for all $(t, x) \in [-r, \infty) \times W(\rho)$;

(ii) $D^+V(t,\phi(0))$ is bounded above by $q(t)a(V(t,\phi(0)))$, for all $t \neq \tau_k$ in \mathbb{R}_+ and $\phi \in PC([-r,0], W(\rho))$ whenever $V(t,\phi(0)) \geq gV(t+s,\phi(s))$ for $s \in [-r,0]$;

(*iii*) $V(\tau_k, \phi(0) + I(\tau_k, \phi)) \le g(V(\tau_k^-, \phi(0))), \forall (\tau_k, \phi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times PC([-r, 0], W(\rho_1))$ for which $\phi(0^-) = \phi(0)$; and

(7)

1828 (2021) 012143 doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1828/1/012143

$$(iv) \ \tau = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \{\tau_k - \tau_{k-1}\} < \infty, \ T_1 = \sup_{t \ge 0} \int_t^{t+r} q(s) ds < \infty, \ and \ T_2 = \inf_{p \ge 0} \int_{g(p)}^p \frac{ds}{a(s)} > T_1.$$

In that case, the solution of (2) which is trivial is uniform and asymptotically stable. More explanations can be found in [5].

Consider the drive system given by

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = M\mathbf{x}(t) + N\mathbf{x}(t-\tau) + \phi(\mathbf{x}(t))$$
(5)

where $\mathbf{x}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix}$. From the (drive) system (5) and the (response) system (6) below

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}'(t) = M\mathbf{x}'(t) + N\mathbf{x}'(t-\tau) + \phi(\mathbf{x}'(t)), & t \neq t_k \\ \Delta \mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}'(t_k^+) - \mathbf{x}'(t_k^-) = J_k(\mathbf{x}'(t_k) - \mathbf{x}(t_k)), & t = t_k \end{cases}$$
(6)

where $\phi(\mathbf{x}'(t)) = \begin{pmatrix} 0\\ -x'z'\\ x'y' \end{pmatrix}$, the error system below can be obtained as $\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{e}}(t) = M\mathbf{e}(t) + N\mathbf{e}(t-\tau) + \phi(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{x}'(t)), & t \neq t_k\\ \Delta \mathbf{e}(t_k) = J_k \mathbf{e}(t_k^-), & t = t_k \end{cases}$

3. Main Result

Theorem 3.1 Given an error system (7), if there exist a constant μ and matrix A such that (i) $||\phi(x)||^2 \leq \mu ||x||^2$

(*ii*) for $||x|| \le 1$

$$\mathcal{V} = \left[\frac{\lambda_x(M^T A + AM) + 2\lambda_x(A^T A)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x(A^T A)||N||^2}{\lambda_x[(I + J_k)^T A(I + J_k)]}\right] > 0$$
$$0 < \delta_k < -\frac{\ln(\lambda_x[(I + J_k)^T A(I + J_k))]/\lambda_n(A)}{\mathcal{V}},$$

and

where A is a symmetric matrix which is positive definite, $\lambda_x(A)$ is the spectral (or maximum eigenvalue) of matrix A, $\lambda_n(A)$ is that eigenvalue of A which is minimum and δ_k is the interval range of impulse. Then, the stability of (7) is uniform and asymptotic.

proof Consider the Lyapunov function

$$V(t, \mathbf{e}(t)) = \mathbf{e}^T A \mathbf{e}$$

such that $\lambda_n(A)||\mathbf{e}||^2 \leq V(t,\mathbf{e}(t)) \leq \lambda_x(A)||\mathbf{e}||^2$. For $t = t_k$

$$V(\mathbf{e}(t)) = \mathbf{e}(t_{k})^{T} A \mathbf{e}(t_{k}) = \mathbf{e}(t_{k}^{-})^{T} [(I + J_{k})^{T} A (I + J_{k})] \mathbf{e}(t_{k}^{-})$$

$$\leq \lambda_{x} [(I + J_{k})^{T} A (I + J_{k})] || \mathbf{e}(t_{k}^{-}) ||^{2}$$

$$\leq \frac{\lambda_{x} [(I + J_{k})^{T} A (I + J_{k})]}{\lambda_{n}(A)} V(t_{k}^{-}, \mathbf{e}(t_{k}^{-}))$$

$$\leq g V(t_{k}^{-}, \mathbf{e}(t_{k}^{-})), \qquad (8)$$

where $g = \frac{\lambda_x [(I+J_k)^T A (I+J_k)]}{\lambda_n(A)}$.

Journal of Physics: Conference Series **1828** (2021) 012143 doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1828/1/012143

$$\begin{split} \text{If } V(t, \mathbf{e}(t)) &\geq gV(t+i, \mathbf{e}(t+i)) \text{ for } -\tau \leq i \leq 0, \text{ then, } V(t, \mathbf{e}(t)) \geq g\lambda_n(A) ||\mathbf{e}(t+i)||^2 \text{ and } \\ ||\mathbf{e}(t+i)||^2 &\leq \frac{V(t+i, \mathbf{e}(t+i))}{\lambda_n(A)} \leq \frac{V(t, \mathbf{e}(t))}{g\lambda_n(A)}. \\ \text{For } t \neq t_k \\ D^+(V(\mathbf{e})) \\ &= 2[M\mathbf{e} + N\mathbf{e}(t-\tau) + \phi(\mathbf{e})]^T A\mathbf{e} \\ &= \mathbf{e}^T(M^TA + AM)\mathbf{e} + 2\mathbf{e}^T AN\mathbf{e}(t-\tau) + 2\mathbf{e}^T A\phi(\mathbf{e}) \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} V(\mathbf{e}) + 2||A\mathbf{e}||^2||N||^2||\mathbf{e}(t-\tau)||^2 + 2||A\mathbf{e}||^2||\phi(\mathbf{e})||^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} V(\mathbf{e}) + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{e}||^2||N||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)} V(\mathbf{e}) + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{e}||^2||\phi(\mathbf{e})||^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} V(\mathbf{e}) + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{e}||^2||N||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)} V(\mathbf{e}) + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{e}||^2 \mu||\mathbf{e}||^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} V(\mathbf{e}) + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{e}||^2||N||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)} V(\mathbf{e}) + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{e}||^2 \mu}{\lambda_n(A)} V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &\leq [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{e}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)} V(\mathbf{e}) + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{e}||^2}{\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &\leq [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &\leq [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &\leq [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &= [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &= [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &= [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &= [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &= [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &= [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &= [\frac{\lambda_x [M^TA + AM]}{\lambda_n(A)} + 2\lambda_x (A^TA)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^TA)||\mathbf{N}||^2}{g\lambda_n(A)}] V(\mathbf{e}) \\ &= [\frac{$$

where $q(t) = \frac{\lambda_x [M^T A + AM] + 2\lambda_x (A^T A)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^T A)||N||^2}{\lambda_x [(I + J_k)^T A(I + J_k)]} = \mathcal{V}.$ Assume a(s) = s, from item (iv) of the hypothesis,

$$T_{2} - T_{1} = \inf_{p>0} \int_{g(p)}^{p} \frac{ds}{a(s)} - \sup_{t\geq 0} \int_{t}^{t+\delta} q(s)ds > 0$$

= $\inf_{p>0} [\ln p - \ln g(p)] - \sup_{t\geq 0} [q(t+\delta) - q(t)] > 0$
= $-\ln g(p) - ((\mathcal{V} + \delta \mathcal{V}) - \mathcal{V}) > 0$
= $-\ln g(p) - \delta \mathcal{V} > 0$
= $-\ln \frac{\lambda_{x} [(I+J_{k})^{T} A(I+J_{k})]}{\lambda_{n}(A)} - \delta_{k} \mathcal{V} > 0$

Hence,

$$0 < \delta_k < -\frac{\ln(\lambda_x[(I+J_k)^T A(I+J_k)]/\lambda_n(A))}{\mathcal{V}}.$$

According to the hypothesis, the error system (7) is uniform and asymptotically stable.

4. Simulation of numerical example

The following is a system of Chen [3]



Figure 1. Chen System's hyperchaotic phenomenon when c = 18.35978



Figure 2. x against t when c = 18.35978

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}} = a(y - x) \\ \dot{\mathbf{y}} = (c - a)x - xz + cy \\ \dot{\mathbf{z}} = xy - bz + K(z - z(t - \tau)) \end{cases}$$
(10)

where $a = 35, b = 3, K = 2.85, \tau = 0.3, x(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 2.27 \\ 2.27 \\ 1.72 \end{pmatrix}$ and z(t) = 0 for $t \in [-0.3, 0)$.

This system exhibits a single-scroll attractor when c = 18.35978 as in [2]. This same system is hyperchaotic as shown in **Figure 1**. The chaos diagrams along x, y and z axes against t axis are respectively shown in **Figure 2**, **Figure 3** and **Figure 4**.

From (10),

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} -35 & 35 & 0\\ -16.64 & 18.35978 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & -0.15 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & -2.85 \end{pmatrix},$$

1828 (2021) 012143 doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1828/1/012143



Figure 3. y against t when c = 18.35978



Figure 4. z against t when c = 18.35978

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -xz \\ xy \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } ||\phi(\mathbf{x}(t))||^2 = x^2(y^2 + z^2) \le x^2(x^2 + y^2 + z^2) \le 5.1529 ||\mathbf{x}||^2, \text{ whence}$$

$$\mu = 5.1529 \text{ This fulfills condition (i) in Theorem 3.1}$$

= 5.1529. This fulfills condition (i) in Theorem 3.1. Furthermore, take $A = I_3$ (the 3 × 3 identity matrix) and the set of Impulse Control Matrices (ICM) $\{J_k\}$ such that

$$J_k = \frac{k+1}{k} \left(\begin{array}{ccc} -0.2 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & -0.8 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & -0.8 \end{array} \right).$$

Note that $\frac{k+1}{k} \to 1$ as $k \to \infty$ so that $J_k \to J_\infty$. Hence,

$$J_{1} = 2.000 \begin{pmatrix} -0.2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -0.8 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$J_{2} = 1.500 \begin{pmatrix} -0.2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -0.8 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$J_{3} = 1.333 \begin{pmatrix} -0.2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -0.8 \end{pmatrix},$$

. . .

$$J_{\infty} = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} -0.2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -0.8 \end{array} \right).$$

1828 (2021) 012143 doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1828/1/012143

From condition (ii) of Theorem 3.1,

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{\lambda_x [M^T A + AM] + 2\lambda_x (A^T A)\mu}{\lambda_n(A)} + \frac{2\lambda_x (A^T A)||N||^2}{\lambda_x [(I + J_k)^T A(I + J_k)]} > 0$$
$$0 < \delta_k < -\frac{\ln(\lambda_x [(I + J_k)^T A(I + J_k)]/\lambda_n(A))}{\mathcal{V}}$$

For k = 1, we have

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{38.9732 + 2(5.1529)}{1} + \frac{2(8.1225)}{0.36} = 94.404 > 0$$
$$0 < \delta_1 < -\frac{\ln(0.36)}{94.404} = 0.010822$$

Choose $\delta_1 = 0.01$.

For k = 2, we have

 $\mathcal{V} = \frac{38.9732 + 2(5.1529)}{1} + \frac{2(8.1225)}{0.49} = 82.43206 > 0$

$$0 < \delta_2 < -\frac{\ln(0.49)}{82.43206} = 0.008654$$

Choose $\delta_2 = 0.008$.

For k = 3, we have

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{38.9732 + 2(5.1529)}{1} + \frac{2(8.1225)}{0.5379} = 79.47978 > 0$$

$$0 < \delta_3 < -\frac{\ln(0.5379)}{79.47978} = 0.007802$$

Choose $\delta_3 = 0.007$.

For $k = \infty$, we have

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{38.9732 + 2(5.1529)}{1} + \frac{2(8.1225)}{0.64} = 74.6618 > 0$$

$$0 < \delta_{\infty} < -\frac{\ln(0.64)}{74.6618} = 0.005977$$

Choose $\delta_{\infty} = 0.005$.

The choice of the impulsive interval δ_k varies from one control instance to the other as shown in **Table 1**. However, it is such that all the properties in Theorem 3.1 are obtained for all k as $k \to \infty$.

5. Simulation with Control

Figure 5, Figure 6, Figure 7 show the control effects in x, y, z against t when c = 18.35978, respectively.

Table 1 summarizes the data of time of synchronization along axes x, y and z and the instantaneous impulsive intervals.





Figure 5. Control in x against t when c = 18.35978



Figure 6. Control in y against t when c = 18.35978



Figure 7. Control in z against t when c = 18.35978

J_k	x	y	z	δ_k
k = 1	2.718	2.457	4.911	0.01
k = 2	1.344	1.482	4.242	0.008
k = 3	1.185	1.224	3.726	0.007
:		:	:	:
$k = \infty$	1.173	1.083	3.192	0.005

 Table 1. Synchronization time along axes.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, a condition which is sufficient to synchronize two hyperchaotic systems via impulsive control is given. The set $\{\delta_k\}$ of the upper bounds of the impulses at different instances which will make the synchronized error system to be uniformly asymptotically stable is also given. This gives infinitely many ways to control the error system.

Finally, the simulations show that this method is effective as the control could be achieved in less time than when it could be achieved in [8]. With the control method proposed in this paper, the control is more efficient, quick and flexible.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by Foundation of Chongqing Municipal Key Laboratory of Institutions of Higher Education ([2017]3), Foundation of Chongqing Development and Reform Commission (2017[1007]), and Foundation of Chongqing Three Gorges University.

References

- Benchohra M, Henderson J and Ntouyas S, 2006, Impulsive Differential Equations and Inclusions, (New York: Hindawi Publishing Corporation).
- [2] Kun T, Peng R H and Celso G, 2019, Existence of chaos in the Chen system with linear time-delay feedback, International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos 29(9) 1950114.
- [3] Ren H P and Li W C, 2010, Heteroclinic orbits in Chen circuits with time delay, Commun Nonlinear Sci Numer Simulat 15 3058-3066.
- [4] Wang X F, Chen G and Yu X, 2000, Anticontrol of chaos in continuous-time systems via time-delay feedback, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 10(4) 771; doi: 10.1063/1.1322358.
- [5] Liu X and Ballinger G, 2001, Uniform Asymptotic Stability of impulsive delay differential equations, Computers and Mathematics with Applications 41 903-915.
- [6] Liu B, Xu B, Zhang G and Tong L, 2019, Review of Some Control Theory Results on Uniform Stability of Impulsive Systems, *Mathematics* 7(12) 1186; doi:10.3390/math7121186.
- [7] Feng Y, Tu D, Li C and Huang T, 2015, Uniformly stability of impulsive delayed linear systems with impulsive time windows, Italian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics 34 213–220.
- [8] Tian K, Ren H and Bai C, 2020, Synchronization of Hyperchaos With Time Delay Using Impulse Control, IEEE Access 8 72570-72576; doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2986786.