

Research Article

Complete Controllability of Impulsive Fractional Linear Time-Invariant Systems with Delay

Xian-Feng Zhou, Song Liu, and Wei Jiang

School of Mathematical Sciences, Anhui University, Hefei 230039, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Xian-Feng Zhou; zhouxf@mail.ustc.edu.cn

Received 27 February 2013; Accepted 23 June 2013

Academic Editor: G. M. N'Guérékata

Copyright © 2013 Xian-Feng Zhou et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Some flaws on impulsive fractional differential equations (systems) have been found. This paper is concerned with the complete controllability of impulsive fractional linear time-invariant dynamical systems with delay. The criteria on the controllability of the system, which is sufficient and necessary, are established by constructing suitable control inputs. Two examples are provided to illustrate the obtained results.

1. Introduction

Recently, a variety of problems such as the existence, uniqueness of mild solution for the initial value problem, periodic boundary value problems, antiperiodic boundary value problems, and Ulam stability for impulsive fractional differential equations have been considered due to their important role in modeling natural phenomena such as medicine, biology, and optimal control; see the paper [1–16].

The concept of controllability plays an important role in the analysis and design of control systems. With the developments of theories of impulsive fractional differential equations, there have been a few papers devoted to the controllability of impulsive fractional differential systems; see [17–20]. In [17], the author discussed the controllability of impulsive fractional linear time-invariant systems through constructing a suitable control input in time domain. By fixed point theorem, the controllability of integrodifferential systems was investigated in [18–20]. It should be mentioned that the controllability for linear fractional dynamical systems has been investigated by several scholars [21–26] while the theory of controllability for impulsive fractional linear time-invariant systems is still in the initial stage [17].

The impulsive fractional differential equations (systems) which had been investigated earlier often have the form

$$\begin{aligned} {}^c D_{0,t}^\alpha x(t) &= f(t, x(t)), \quad t \in J' := J \setminus \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}, \\ J &:= [0, T], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$\Delta x(t_k) = x(t_k^+) - x(t_k^-) = I_k(x(t_k)), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m, \quad (2)$$

$$x(0) = x_0 \quad (3)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} {}^c D_{0,t}^\alpha x(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), \quad t \in J' := J \setminus \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}, \\ J &:= [0, T], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\Delta x(t_k) = x(t_k^+) - x(t_k^-) = I_k(x(t_k)), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m, \quad (5)$$

$$y(t) = Cx(t) + Du(t), \quad (6)$$

$$x(0) = x_0 \quad (7)$$

and so forth, where ${}^c D_{0,t}^\alpha$ is the Caputo fractional derivative of order $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ with lower limit zero, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, f is jointly continuous, $I_k : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, t_k satisfies $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m < t_{m+1} = T$, $x(t_k^+) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} x(t_k + \epsilon)$, and $x(t_k^-) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^-} x(t_k + \epsilon)$ represent, respectively, the right and the left limits of $x(t)$ at $t = t_k$, A, B, C, D are the known constant matrices, $x(t), y(t), u(t)$ are vectors with appropriate dimensions.

However, the function $x(t)$ defined on $[0, T]$ is continuous everywhere except for finite number of points $t_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, at which the limits $x(t_k^+)$ and $x(t_k^-)$ exist with

$x(t_k) = x(t_k^-)$. If there exists some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ such that $t_k \in (0, t)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, and $x(t_k^+) - x(t_k^-) \neq 0$, then ${}^c D_{0,t}^\alpha x(t)$ does not exist since $\dot{x}(t)$ is meaningless at the impulsive moment t_k . That is to say $\dot{x}(t_k)$ is meaningless. As a result, investigating (1)–(6) is meaningless.

Motivated by this fact, this paper is concerned with the complete controllability of the impulsive fractional linear time-invariant system with delay

$${}^c D_{t_i,t}^\alpha x(t) = Ax(t) + Bx(t - \tau) + Gu(t), \tag{8}$$

$$t \in (t_i, t_{i+1}), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k,$$

$$\Delta x(t_i) = x(t_i^+) - x(t_i^-) = I_i(x(t_i^-)), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k, \tag{9}$$

$$x(0^+) = \omega, \tag{10}$$

$$y(t) = Ex(t) + Fu(t), \tag{11}$$

$$x(t) = \phi(t), \quad -\tau \leq t \leq 0 \tag{12}$$

in n -dimensional Euclidean space, where $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < \dots < t_k < t_{k+1} = T < \infty$, $J = [0, T]$, ${}^c D_{t_i,t}^\alpha$ denotes the Caputo's derivative of order α with the lower limit t_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$, A, B, G, E, F are known constant matrices with appropriate dimensions, the state variable $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the initial function $\phi(t) \in \mathbb{D} = \{\psi : [-\tau, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \mid \psi \text{ is continuous on } [-\tau, 0]\}$, the delay $0 < \tau < \infty$, $\|\phi\|_{\mathbb{D}} = \sup\{\|\phi(t)\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}, t \in [-\tau, 0]\}$, the control input $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, the output $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $I_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

In this paper, the methods used is to construct a suitable control input function in time domain. The results obtained is sufficient and necessary, which are convenient for computation.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we begin with some notations, definitions, and lemmas. Throughout this paper, ${}^c D_{a,t}^\alpha f(t)$ or ${}^c D_a^\alpha f(t)$ denotes the Caputo's derivative of order α with the lower limit a for the function f , $I_a^\alpha f(t)$ or $I_{a,t}^\alpha f(t)$ denotes integral of order α with lower limit a for the function f , $\bar{f}(s) = L[f(t); s] = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} f(t) dt$ denotes the Laplace transform of the function $f(t)$, and “ $|M|$ ” denotes the norm of the matrix “ M ,” “ M^* ” denotes the transpose of the matrix “ M .” Let $C(J, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be the Banach space of all continuous functions from J into \mathbb{R}^n with the norm $\|u\|_{C(J, \mathbb{R}^n)} = \sup\{\|u(t)\|, t \in J\}$. Let the Banach space $PC(J, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be

$$PC(J, \mathbb{R}^n) = \{u : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \mid u \in C((t_i, t_{i+1}], \mathbb{R}^n), i = 0, 1, \dots, k, u(t_i^-), u(t_i^+) \text{ exist, } u(t_i^-) = u(t_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \tag{13}$$

and the norm $\|u\|_{PC(J, \mathbb{R}^n)} = \sup\{\|u(t)\| : t \in J\}$.

Definition 1 (see [27]). The fractional integral of order α with the lower limit $a \in \mathbb{R}$ for a function f is defined as

$$I_{a,t}^\alpha f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_a^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} f(s) ds, \quad t > a, \alpha > 0 \tag{14}$$

Provided that the right-hand side is pointwise defined on $[a, +\infty)$, where Γ is the Gamma function.

Definition 2 (see [27]). The Caputo's derivative of order α with the lower limit $a \in \mathbb{R}$ for a function $f : [a, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be written as

$${}^c D_{a,t}^\alpha f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \int_a^t (t-s)^{n-\alpha-1} f^{(n)}(s) ds = I_{a,t}^{n-\alpha}(f^{(n)}(t)), \tag{15}$$

$$t > a, \quad 0 < n-1 < \alpha \leq n.$$

Particularly, when $0 < \alpha < 1$, it holds

$${}^c D_{a,t}^\alpha f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_a^t (t-s)^{-\alpha} f'(s) ds = I_{a,t}^{1-\alpha} f'(t), \quad t > a. \tag{16}$$

The Laplace transform of ${}^c D_{0,t}^\alpha f(t)$ is

$$L[{}^c D_{0,t}^\alpha f(t); s] = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-st} ({}^c D_{0,t}^\alpha f(t)) dt = s^\alpha \bar{f}(s) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} s^{\alpha-k-1} f^{(k)}(0), \quad n-1 < \alpha \leq n, \tag{17}$$

where $\bar{f}(s)$ is the Laplace transform of $f(t)$.

In particular, for $0 < \alpha < 1$, it holds

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-st} ({}^c D_{0,t}^\alpha f(t)) dt = s^\alpha \bar{f}(s) - s^{\alpha-1} f(0). \tag{18}$$

Definition 3 (see [27]). The two-parameter Mittag-Leffler function is defined as

$$E_{\alpha,\beta}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{\Gamma(\alpha k + \beta)}, \quad \alpha > 0, \beta > 0, z \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{19}$$

The Laplace transform of Mittag-Leffler function is

$$L[t^{\alpha k + \beta - 1} E_{\alpha,\beta}^{(k)}(\pm at^\alpha); s] = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} t^{\alpha k + \beta - 1} E_{\alpha,\beta}^{(k)}(\pm at^\alpha) dt = \frac{k! s^{\alpha-\beta}}{(s^\alpha \mp a)^{k+1}}, \quad \text{Re}(s) > |a|^{1/\alpha}, \tag{20}$$

where $\text{Re}(s)$ denotes the real parts of s .

In addition, the Laplace transform of $t^{\alpha-1}$ is

$$L[t^{\alpha-1}; s] = \Gamma(\alpha) s^{-\alpha}, \quad \text{Re}(s) > 0. \quad (21)$$

Lemma 4 (see [28]). *Let $0 < \text{Re}(\alpha) \leq 1$. If $x(t) \in C[a, b]$, then*

$$I_{a,t}^{\alpha} ({}^c D_{a,t}^{\alpha} x(t)) = x(t) - x(a), \quad (22)$$

where $C[a, b]$ denotes the set of continuous functions on $[a, b]$.

3. Main Results

Definition 5 (complete controllability). The system (8)–(12) is said to be completely controllable on the interval $J = [0, T]$ if, for any $t_* > 0$ ($t_* \in (0, T]$), $\phi(t) \in \mathbb{D}$, and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists an admissible control input $u(t)$ such that the state variable $x(t)$ of the system (8)–(12) satisfies $x(t_*) = Z$.

Using the Laplace transform method, we can easily obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *The movement orbit of the state variable $x(t)$ of the system (8)–(12) can be written as*

$$x(t) = \begin{cases} \omega E_{\alpha,1}(At^{\alpha}) \\ + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t-s)^{\alpha}) \\ \times (Bx(s-\tau) + Gu(s)) ds, \quad t \in (0, t_1]; \\ (x(t_1) + I_1(x(t_1))) E_{\alpha,1}(At^{\alpha}) \\ + \int_{t_1}^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t-s)^{\alpha}) \\ \times (Bx(s-\tau) + Gu(s)) ds, \quad t \in (t_1, t_2]; \\ \vdots \\ (x(t_i) + I_i(x(t_i))) E_{\alpha,1}(At^{\alpha}) \\ + \int_{t_i}^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t-s)^{\alpha}) \\ \times (Bx(s-\tau) + Gu(s)) ds, \quad t \in (t_i, t_{i+1}], \\ i = 2, 3, \dots, k. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Theorem 7. *The system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[0, T]$ if and only if the controllability matrices*

$$W_c [t_i, t_{i+1}] = \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (t_{i+1}-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_{i+1}-s)^{\alpha}) \times GG^* E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A^*(t_{i+1}-s)^{\alpha}) ds \quad (24)$$

are nonsingular, $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Proof. Sufficiency. Suppose that $W_c [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ is nonsingular; then $W_c^{-1} [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ is well defined, $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$.

For $t \in (0, t_1]$, it follows from the formula (23) that

$$x(t) = \omega E_{\alpha,1}(at^{\alpha}) + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t-s)^{\alpha}) \times (Bx(s-\tau) + Gu(s)) ds, \quad t \in (0, t_1]. \quad (25)$$

For all $Z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, choosing

$$u(t) = G^* E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A^*(t_1-t)^{\alpha}) W_c^{-1} [0, t_1] \cdot \left[Z_0 - \omega E_{\alpha,1}(At_1^{\alpha}) - \int_0^{t_1} (t_1-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_1-s)^{\alpha}) Bx(s-\tau) ds \right] \quad (26)$$

and inserting (26) into (25) yields $x(t_1) = Z_0$. Thus, the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[0, t_1]$.

Similarly, for $t \in (t_1, t_2]$, it follows from the formula (23) that

$$x(t) = (x(t_1) + I_1(x(t_1))) E_{\alpha,1}(At^{\alpha}) + \int_{t_1}^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t-s)^{\alpha}) \times (Bx(s-\tau) + Gu(s)) ds, \quad t \in (t_1, t_2]. \quad (27)$$

Since the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[0, t_1]$, there exists a control input $u_1(t)$ such that $x(t_1) = 0$. By (27), it follows that

$$x(t) = I_1(0) E_{\alpha,1}(At^{\alpha}) + \int_{t_1}^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t-s)^{\alpha}) \times (Bx(s-\tau) + Gu(s)) ds, \quad t \in (t_1, t_2]. \quad (28)$$

For all $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, choosing

$$u(t) = G^* E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A^*(t_2-t)^{\alpha}) W_c^{-1} [t_1, t_2] \cdot \left[Z_1 - I_1(0) E_{\alpha,1}(At_2^{\alpha}) - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (t_2-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_2-t)^{\alpha}) Bx(s-\tau) ds \right], \quad (29)$$

together with (28) yields $x(t_2) = Z_1$. Thus, the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[t_1, t_2]$.

By similar arguments, we can prove that the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $i = 2, \dots, k$.

Consequently, the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $J = [0, T]$.

Necessity. Suppose that the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $J = [0, T]$.

If $W_c [t_0, t_1]$ is singular, then there exists a nonzero vector Z_0 such that

$$Z_0^* W_c [0, t_1] Z_0 = 0. \quad (30)$$

That is

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} Z_0^* (t_1-s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_1-s)^{\alpha}) GG^* E_{\alpha,\alpha} \times (A^*(t_1-s)^{\alpha}) Z_0 ds = 0. \quad (31)$$

Then we have

$$Z_0^* E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) G = 0 \quad (32)$$

on $s \in [0, t_1]$. By the assumption that the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on J , the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$. There exist control inputs $u_0(t)$ and $\hat{u}_0(t)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} x(t_1) &= \omega E_{\alpha,1} (At_1^\alpha) \\ &+ \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) Bx(s - \tau) ds \\ &+ \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) Gu_0(s) ds = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} x(t_1) &= \omega E_{\alpha,1} (At_1^\alpha) \\ &+ \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) Bx(s - \tau) ds \\ &+ \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) G\hat{u}_0(s) ds = Z_0. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

By (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega E_{\alpha,1} (At_1^\alpha) &+ \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) Bx(s - \tau) ds \\ &= Z_0 - \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) G\hat{u}_0(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Inserting (35) into (33) yields

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0 &+ \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) \\ &\times G(u_0(s) - \hat{u}_0(s)) ds = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Multiplying Z_0^* on both side of (36) yields

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0^* Z_0 &+ \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} Z_0^* E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) \\ &\times G(u_0(s) - \hat{u}_0(s)) ds = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

By (32) and (37), we have $Z_0^* Z_0 = 0$. Thus, $Z_0 = 0$. This is a contradiction.

If $W_c[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ is singular for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, then there exists a nonzero vector Z_i such that

$$Z_i^* W_c[t_i, t_{i+1}] Z_i = 0. \quad (38)$$

That is

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} Z_i^* (t_{i+1} - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_{i+1} - s)^\alpha) \\ \times GG^* E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A^*(t_{i+1} - s)^\alpha) Z_i ds = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Then, it follows that

$$Z_i^* E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_{i+1} - s)^\alpha) G = 0 \quad (40)$$

on $s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$. By formula (23) and the assumption that the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable, there exist control inputs $u_{i-1}(t)$ and $u_i(t)$ such that $x(t_i) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} x(t_{i+1}) &= I_i(0) E_{\alpha,1} (At_{i+1}^\alpha) \\ &+ \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (t_{i+1} - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_{i+1} - s)^\alpha) \\ &\cdot (Bx(s - \tau) + Gu_i(s)) ds = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Similarly, there exists a control input $\hat{u}_i(t)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} x(t_{i+1}) &= I_i(0) E_{\alpha,1} (At_{i+1}^\alpha) \\ &+ \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (t_{i+1} - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_{i+1} - s)^\alpha) \\ &\cdot (Bx(s - \tau) + G\hat{u}_i(s)) ds = Z_i. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

By (42), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_i(0) E_{\alpha,1} (At_{i+1}^\alpha) \\ &+ \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (t_{i+1} - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_{i+1} - s)^\alpha) Bx(s - \tau) ds \\ &= Z_i - \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (t_{i+1} - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_{i+1} - s)^\alpha) G\hat{u}_i(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Inserting (43) into (41) yields

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i &+ \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (t_{i+1} - s)^{\alpha-1} \\ &\times E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_{i+1} - s)^\alpha) G(u_i(s) - \hat{u}_i(s)) ds = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Multiplying Z_i^* on both side of (44) yields

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i^* Z_i &+ \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (t_{i+1} - s)^{\alpha-1} Z_i^* \\ &\times E_{\alpha,\alpha} (A(t_{i+1} - s)^\alpha) G(u_i(s) - \hat{u}_i(s)) ds = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Combining (45) with (40) yields $Z_i^* Z_i = 0$. Thus, $Z_i = 0$. This is a contradiction.

Thus, $W_c[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ is nonsingular for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 8. *The system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[0, T]$ if and only if*

$$\text{rank}(G \mid AG \mid \dots \mid A^{n-1}G) = n. \quad (46)$$

Proof. Necessity. Suppose that system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[0, T]$. Then, the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[0, t_1]$. Then, for any $Z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a control input $u_0(t)$ such that $x(t_1) = Z_0$. By the formula (23), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0 = x(t_1) &= \omega E_{\alpha,1}(At_1^\alpha) \\ &+ \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) \\ &\times (Bx(s - \tau) + Gu(s)) ds. \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

By Cayley-Hamilton theorem, we have

$$t^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(At^\alpha) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_j(t) A^j, \tag{48}$$

where $c_j(t)$ are functions in t , $j = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$. Combining the formula (48) and the equality (47), we have

$$\begin{aligned} x(t_1) - \omega E_{\alpha,1}(At_1^\alpha) &- \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) Bx(s - \tau) ds \\ &= \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_1 - s)^\alpha) Gu(s) ds \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} A^j G \int_0^{t_1} c_j(t_1 - s) u(s) ds \\ &= (G \mid AG \mid \dots \mid A^{n-1}G) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} d_0 \\ d_1 \\ \vdots \\ d_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

where $d_j = \int_0^{t_1} c_j(t_1 - s)u(s)ds$, $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$. For arbitrary state Z_0 and initial function $\phi(t)$, the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[0, t_1]$ if and only if there exists a control input $u(t)$ such that (47) or (49) holds. Obviously, for arbitrary initial function $\phi(t)$ and Z_0 , the sufficient and necessary condition to have a control input $u(t)$ satisfying (49) is that

$$\text{rank}(G \mid AG \mid \dots \mid A^{n-1}G) = n. \tag{50}$$

Sufficiency. Suppose that $\text{rank}(G \mid AG \mid \dots \mid A^{n-1}G) = n$. In order to prove that the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[0, T]$, it is sufficient to prove that the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, respectively.

The formula (23) together with (48) yields (49). By the assumption that $\text{rank}(G \mid AG \mid \dots \mid A^{n-1}G) = n$, the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[0, t_1]$.

Now we prove that the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $[t_1, t_2]$. The complete controllability of the system (8)–(12) on $[0, t_1]$ implies that there exists a control

input $u_0(t)$ such that $x(t_1) = 0$. Inserting $x(t_1) = 0$ into the formula (23), we have, for $t \in (t_1, t_2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= I_1(0) E_{\alpha,1}(At^\alpha) \\ &+ \int_{t_1}^t (t - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t - s)^\alpha) \\ &\times (Bx(s - \tau) + Gu(s)) ds, \quad t \in (t_1, t_2]. \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Thus, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} x(t_2) &= I_1(0) E_{\alpha,1}(At_2^\alpha) \\ &+ \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (t_2 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_2 - s)^\alpha) \\ &\times (Bx(s - \tau) + Gu(s)) ds. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

By (48) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} x(t_2) - I_1(0) E_{\alpha,1}(At_2^\alpha) &- \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (t_2 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_2 - s)^\alpha) Bx(s - \tau) ds \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (t_2 - s)^{\alpha-1} E_{\alpha,\alpha}(A(t_2 - s)^\alpha) Gu(s) ds \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} A^j G \int_{t_1}^{t_2} c_j(t_2 - s) u(s) ds \\ &= (G \mid AG \mid \dots \mid A^{n-1}G) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} d'_0 \\ d'_1 \\ \vdots \\ d'_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where $d'_j = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} c_j(t_2 - s)u(s)ds$, $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$. Similar to the previous arguments, we can conclude that system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $(t_1, t_2]$.

Repeating the process on $(t_i, t_{i+1}]$, respectively, we can prove that the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $(t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $i = 2, \dots, k$. In conclusion, the system (8)–(12) is completely controllable on $J = [0, T]$. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 9. From Theorem 8, we can conclude that the complete controllability of the system (8)–(12) is unrelated to the matrix B and initial function $\phi(t)$. The matrices A, G determine if the the system (8)–(12) possesses complete controllability.

4. Examples

Example 1. Consider the system (8)–(12). Choose $\alpha = 1/2$, $J = [0, 2]$, $t_0 = 0$, $t_1 = 1$, $t_2 = 2$, $\Delta x(t_1) = x(t_1^+) - x(t_1^-) = 3$, $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $G = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Now, we employ Theorems 7 and 8 to

prove if that the system (8)–(10) is completely controllable, respectively.

By computation, we have

$$E_{1/2,1/2} (A(1-s)^{1/2}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^k (1-s)^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2 + 1/2)} \tag{54}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\Gamma(1/2)} I + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} (1-s)^{1/2},$$

$$GG^* = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} (2 \ 1) = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{55}$$

$$E_{1/2,1/2} (A^* (1-s)^{1/2}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(A^*)^k (1-s)^{k(1/2)}}{\Gamma(k(1/2) + 1/2)} \tag{56}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\Gamma(1/2)} I + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} (1-s)^{1/2},$$

$$E_{1/2,1/2} (A(2-s)^{1/2}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^k (2-s)^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2 + 1/2)} \tag{57}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\Gamma(1/2)} I + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} (2-s)^{1/2},$$

$$E_{1/2,1/2} (A^* (2-s)^{1/2}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(A^*)^k (2-s)^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2 + 1/2)} \tag{58}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\Gamma(1/2)} I + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} (2-s)^{1/2}.$$

By the formula (24)

$$W_c [t_i, t_{i+1}] = \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (t_{i+1} - s)^{-1/2} \left[E_{1/2,1/2} (A(t_{i+1} - s)^{1/2}) G \right] \times \left[G^* E_{1/2,1/2} (A^* (t_{i+1} - s)^{1/2}) \right] ds, \tag{59}$$

we have

$$W_c [0, 1] = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{8}{\pi} + \frac{4}{\pi^{0.5}} + \frac{2}{3} & \frac{4}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\pi^{0.5}} \\ \frac{4}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\pi^{0.5}} & \frac{2}{\pi} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{60}$$

$$W_c [1, 2] = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4}{\pi} + \frac{6}{\pi^{0.5}} + \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\pi^{0.5}} \\ \frac{2}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\pi^{0.5}} & \frac{1}{\pi} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is obvious that $W_c[0, 1]$ and $W_c[1, 2]$ are nonsingular. By Theorem 7, the system is completely controllable.

On the other hand,

$$\text{rank}(G | AG) = \text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 2. \tag{61}$$

By Theorem 8, the system is completely controllable.

Example 2. Consider the time-invariant system (8)–(12). Choose

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -4 & -2 \\ 0 & 6 & -1 \\ 1 & 7 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = \frac{1}{3}, \quad G = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{62}$$

By computation, we have

$$\text{rank}(G | AG | A^2G) = \text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -4 & 6 \\ 0 & -1 & 7 \\ 1 & 1 & -12 \end{pmatrix} = 3. \tag{63}$$

By Theorem 8, the system is completely controllable.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the referee for his or her valuable comments, which help us to improve the quality of the paper. This paper is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11071001), Research Fund for Doctoral Program of Educational Ministry of China (20103401120002 and 20123401120001), Program of Natural Science Research in Anhui Universities (KJ2011A020 and KJ2013A032), Scientific Research Starting Fund for Dr. of Anhui University (023033190001, 023033190181), and the 211 Project of Anhui University (KJQN1001, 023033050055).

References

- [1] K. Balachandran, S. Kiruthika, and J. J. Trujillo, “Remark on the existence results for fractional impulsive integrodifferential equations in Banach spaces,” *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 2244–2247, 2012.
- [2] M. Benchohra and F. Berhoun, “Impulsive fractional differential equations with variable times,” *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1245–1252, 2010.
- [3] J. Cao and H. Chen, “Impulsive fractional differential equations with nonlinear boundary conditions,” *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, vol. 55, no. 3-4, pp. 303–311, 2012.
- [4] Y.-K. Chang, A. Anguraj, and K. Karthikeyan, “Existence for impulsive neutral integrodifferential inclusions with nonlocal initial conditions via fractional operators,” *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications. An International Multidisciplinary Journal. Series A: Theory and Methods*, vol. 71, no. 10, pp. 4377–4386, 2009.
- [5] Y.-K. Chang, V. Kavitha, and M. M. Arjunan, “Existence results for impulsive neutral differential and integrodifferential equations with nonlocal conditions via fractional operators,” *Nonlinear Analysis. Hybrid Systems. An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 32–43, 2010.
- [6] T. L. Guo and W. Jiang, “Impulsive fractional functional differential equations,” *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 3414–3424, 2012.

- [7] G. M. Mophou, "Existence and uniqueness of mild solutions to impulsive fractional differential equations," *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications. An International Multidisciplinary Journal. Series A: Theory and Methods*, vol. 72, no. 3-4, pp. 1604-1615, 2010.
- [8] M. H. M. Rashid and A. Al-Omari, "Local and global existence of mild solutions for impulsive fractional semilinear integro-differential equation," *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 16, no. 9, pp. 3493-3503, 2011.
- [9] X.-B. Shu, Y. Lai, and Y. Chen, "The existence of mild solutions for impulsive fractional partial differential equations," *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications. An International Multidisciplinary Journal. Series A: Theory and Methods*, vol. 74, no. 5, pp. 2003-2011, 2011.
- [10] G. Wang, B. Ahmad, and L. Zhang, "Impulsive anti-periodic boundary value problem for nonlinear differential equations of fractional order," *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications. An International Multidisciplinary Journal. Series A: Theory and Methods*, vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 792-804, 2011.
- [11] J. R. Wang, Y. Zhou, and M. Fečkan, "Nonlinear impulsive problems for fractional differential equations and Ulam stability," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 3389-3405, 2012.
- [12] J. R. Wang, X. Li, and W. Wei, "On the natural solution of an impulsive fractional differential equation of order $q \in (1, 2)$," *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 4384-4394, 2012.
- [13] X. Zhang, X. Huang, and Z. Liu, "The existence and uniqueness of mild solutions for impulsive fractional equations with non-local conditions and infinite delay," *Nonlinear Analysis. Hybrid Systems. An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 775-781, 2010.
- [14] Z. Yan, "Existence of solutions for nonlocal impulsive partial functional integrodifferential equations via fractional operators," *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 235, no. 8, pp. 2252-2262, 2011.
- [15] J. R. Wang, Y. Zhou, and M. Fečkan, "On recent developments in the theory of boundary value problems for impulsive fractional differential equations," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 3008-3020, 2012.
- [16] J. R. Wang, M. Fečkan, and Y. Zhou, "On the new concept of solutions and existence results for impulsive fractional evolution equations," *Dynamics of Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 345-361, 2011.
- [17] T. L. Guo, "Controllability and observability of impulsive fractional linear time-invariant system," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 3171-3182, 2012.
- [18] Z. Tai and S. Lun, "On controllability of fractional impulsive neutral infinite delay evolution integrodifferential systems in Banach spaces," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 104-110, 2012.
- [19] Z. Tai, "Controllability of fractional impulsive neutral integrodifferential systems with a nonlocal Cauchy condition in Banach spaces," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 2158-2161, 2011.
- [20] A. Debbouche and D. Baleanu, "Controllability of fractional evolution nonlocal impulsive quasilinear delay integro-differential systems," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 1442-1450, 2011.
- [21] X.-F. Zhou, J. Wei, and L.-G. Hu, "Controllability of a fractional linear time-invariant neutral dynamical system," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 418-424, 2013.
- [22] T. Kaczorek, *Selected Problems of Fractional Systems Theory*, Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2011.
- [23] Y. Q. Chen, H. S. Ahn, and D. Xue, "Robust controllability of interval fractional order linear time invariant systems," *Signal Process*, vol. 86, pp. 2794-2802, 2006.
- [24] J. Wei, "The controllability of fractional control systems with control delay," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 3153-3159, 2012.
- [25] A. B. Shamardan and M. R. A. Moubarak, "Controllability and observability for fractional control systems," *Journal of Fractional Calculus*, vol. 15, pp. 25-34, 1999.
- [26] J. L. Adams and T. F. Hartley, "Finite time controllability of fractional order systems," *Journal of Computational and Nonlinear Dynamics*, vol. 3, no. 2, Article ID 021402, 2008.
- [27] I. Podlubny, *Fractional Differential Equations*, Academic Press, New York, NY, USA, 1999.
- [28] A. A. Kilbas, H. M. Srivastava, and J. J. Trujillo, *Theory and Applications of Fractional Differential Equations*, Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2006.