FREQUENCY ISLANDS IN THE PRIMARY RESONANCE OF NONLINEAR DELAY SYSTEMS
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Abstract
The purpose of this effort is to investigate primary resonances of nonlinear delay systems. Along these lines, the response of a Duffing oscillator with delayed-state feedback to primary resonance excitations is considered and analyzed using the method of multiple scales. Unlike previous research efforts that let the coefficients of the delay states (gains) be small to allow direct implementation of the method of multiple scales, we demonstrate that the method can be adapted to analyze nonlinear delay systems with large gains. Further, we unveil very interesting dynamic responses characterized by the presence of islands in the frequency response of the delayed Duffing oscillator. It is demonstrated that these islands grow in size and collide with the main branch of solutions (mainland) as the magnitude of the external excitation is increased or as the gain-delay combination is chosen closer to the stability boundaries of the free response.
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1 Introduction
1.1 Overview
Time-delay, hereditary, retarded, or time-lag represent different descriptions of dynamic systems that do not react instantaneously to actuation signals or whose temporal evolution is based on retarded communications or information from the past. The first systematic work on delay systems started in the early 1900s with the epidemiological studies on the prevention of malaria by Ross [Ross, 1911] followed by the work of Lotka [Lotka, 1923] in 1923, who indicated the necessity of including time-delays to account for the malaria incubation times in Ross’ model. In 1927, Volterra [Volterra, 1927] introduced the retarded forms of predator-prey models used to describe population dynamics, while Minorski, in 1942, was among the first to address the presence of delays in mechanical systems [Minorski, 1942]. Subsequently, there has been a substantial increase of research activities directed towards understanding the effects of time delays on the stability of various dynamic systems. This established a flourishing new branch of mathematics primarily concerned with stability and stabilization of Delay-Differential Equations (DDEs). Along these lines, a variety of analytical, graphical, and numerical methodologies have been proposed and implemented to capture and assess the stability of systems operating with single, multiple, discrete, or continuous time delays.

1.2 Background and Motivation
Despite the significant body of research that deals with the stability and stabilization of delay systems, most of the previous efforts were directed towards characterizing the stability of the free response by proposing various methodologies to predict and estimate the location of the eigenvalues relative to the imaginary axis [Diekmann, 1995; Bellman and Cooke, 1963]. Little attention has been paid to understanding the effect of time delays on the response of nonlinear externally-excited systems [Hu, 1998; Ji and Leung, 2002]. In particular, the nonlinear response of a delayed system to primary-resonance excitations has yet to be addressed comprehensively. Such studies were not necessary in the past due to the limited number of applications in which time delays and external excitations coexist in the operation of a dynamic system.

However, due to the emergence of micro and nanodevices as the next generation sensors and actuators, this type of analysis is becoming more imperative. Microdevices are usually excited at one of their resonant frequencies with feedback control algorithms implemented to close the loop and provide real-time infor-
mation about the states [Garcia and Perez, 2002]. Due to their large natural frequencies, these devices have relatively small response periods. The very small measurement delays in the control loop can then be of the same order as the response period, thereby channeling energy into or out of the system at incorrect time intervals and producing instabilities that render traditional controllers’ performance ineffective [Stark, 2005]. To resolve these issues, there is a growing interest in the controls and dynamics communities to utilize delayed-feedback controllers for vibration mitigation and control of microsystems. It has been shown that augmenting the system delay with a carefully and deliberately selected delay period is capable of producing substantial damping that can actually aid controller design [Abdallah, 1993]. As a result, delayed-feedback algorithms have been successfully implemented to control microcantilevers in dynamic force microscopy [Yamasue and Hikihara, 2006], to eliminate chaotic motions in tapping-mode atomic force microscopy [Sadeghian, 2007], for sensor sensitivity enhancement in nanomechanical cantilever sensors [Daqaq, 2007; Bradely, 2007], and to control the quality factor in dynamic atomic force microscopy [Stark, 2005]. Successful implementation of these controllers to nonlinear delay systems requires a deep analytical understanding of the primary resonance phenomenon in time-delayed systems, especially when the objective is to control an externally-excited system. Hu et al. [Hu, 1998] studied the primary resonance of a Duffing oscillator subjected to both position and velocity delayed-feedback control. Similarly, Ji and Leung [Ji and Leung, 2002] and Jin and Hu [Jin and Hu, 2007] studied the primary resonance of a Duffing oscillator with two time delays in the state feedback. However, all of these studies were restricted to systems with linear delay terms that have very small coefficients (gains). Accordingly, the method of multiple scales [Nayfeh, 1981] was directly implemented to obtain uniform analytical approximate solutions because the gains could be scaled at the highest order of the perturbation problem with the nonlinearities, internal damping, and external excitation. For many applications, however, especially feedback control, these coefficients can be relatively large. By scaling the linear gains at the highest order of the perturbation problem, one implicitly assumes that the response of the delay system can be approximated by the first-delay frequency which, in general, is very close to the system’s natural frequency. When the gains are large, sticking to this assumption could produce erroneous qualitative and quantitative predictions that would hide some of the essential features of the nonlinear response [Daqaq and Alhazza].

1.3 Problem Statement

In this work, we propose a modification to the approach presented earlier in Refs. [Hu, 1998] and [Ji and Leung, 2002]. Again, we make use of the method of multiple scales but adapt the implementation procedure to allow for the alleviation of the small gain restriction. Utilizing the resulting solution, we uncover interesting dynamic responses. These responses are characterized by the presence of frequency islands that have critical implications on the global stability of the response. Such islands could yield undesired consequences, especially when delayed-feedback algorithms are applied to mitigate oscillations of externally-excited systems.

2 Linear Analysis

2.1 Free Response:

Consider the Duffing oscillator with delayed-state feedback

$$\frac{d^2 u}{dt^2} + 2\mu \frac{du}{dt} + \omega_n^2 u = -K \frac{d^j u(t-\tau)}{dt^j} - \alpha u^3 + F \cos(\Omega t) \quad (1)$$

where $u \in \mathcal{R}$ is the state, $\mu \in \mathcal{R}^+$ is a linear damping term, $\omega_n \in \mathcal{R}^+$ is the natural frequency, $K \in \mathcal{R}$ is the coefficient of the linear-delayed state, loosely referred to as the gain, $\tau \in \mathcal{R}^+$ is a discrete time delay, $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$ is the coefficient of cubic nonlinearity and $j$ is the order of the delayed-state derivative. We note that the Einstein convention does not apply.

The local stability of the equilibrium solutions of the unforced system can be determined by finding the eigenvalues, $\lambda$, of the linearized equation when $F$ equals zero. These eigenvalues are obtained by substituting a homogeneous solution of the form, $u_h = e^{\lambda t}$, into Equation (1) to yield

$$\left(\omega_n^2 + \lambda^2\right) + 2\mu \lambda + K \lambda^j e^{-\lambda \tau} = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, 2. \quad (2)$$
Equation (2) is a transcendental characteristic equation that has an infinite number of solutions associated with every set of fixed parameters (K, τ). By inspecting the form of the homogeneous solution, \( u_h \), it becomes evident that the stability of the equilibrium solutions is determined by the sign of the real part of the eigenvalues \( \lambda = \zeta d + i \omega_d \). In particular, the equilibrium solutions are locally asymptotically stable if all the eigenvalues have negative real parts, \( \zeta_d < 0 \), and unstable if at least one eigenvalue has a positive real part, \( \zeta_d > 0 \). Thus, to determine the stability boundaries, we set the real part of the eigenvalue \( \zeta_d \) equal to zero and substitute \( \lambda = i \omega_d \) into Equation (2), then separate the real and imaginary parts of the outcome to obtain

\[
(\omega_n^2 - \omega_d^2) + (-1)^j \dot{K} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_j} \left\{ \cos(\hat{\omega}_d \hat{\tau}) \right\} = 0, \tag{3a}
\]

\[
2\mu \hat{\omega}_d - (-1)^j \dot{K} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_j} \left\{ \sin(\hat{\omega}_d \hat{\tau}) \right\} = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, 2. \tag{3b}
\]

where the hat denotes a value at the stability boundary. For a given gain \( K \), Equations (3) can be solved for the delay \( \hat{\tau} \) and the associated frequency at the boundary, \( \hat{\omega}_d \). To better visualize the stability of the equilibrium solutions, the gain-delay space is mapped into stable and unstable regions as depicted in Fig. 1, where shaded regions represent gain-delay combinations leading to asymptotically stable equilibria.

2.2 Forced Response:

2.2.1 The Steady-State Solution In the remainder of this work, we limit the analysis to gain-delay combinations leading to stable equilibrium solutions. In other words, we only consider gain-delay values in the shaded regions depicted in Fig. 1. As such, the homogeneous linear solution of Equation (1), \( u_h \), decays with time and does not affect the steady-state response. Next, to determine the steady-state linear response of the forced system, we retain the linear terms in Equation (1) and assume a solution of the form

\[
u_{ss}(t) = \frac{1}{2} a e^{i(\Omega t + \gamma)} + cc \tag{4}\]

where \( a \) and \( \gamma \) are, respectively, the steady-state amplitude and phase of the response and \( cc \) is the complex conjugate of the preceding term. We substitute Equation (4) into the linearized version of Equation (1), set the real and imaginary parts of the resulting expression equal to zero, and obtain

\[
\left( (\omega_n^2 - \Omega^2) + (-1)^j K \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_j} [\cos(\Omega \tau)] \right) a = -F \cos \gamma \tag{5a}
\]

\[
\left( 2\mu \Omega - (-1)^j K \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_j} [\sin(\Omega \tau)] \right) a = F \sin \gamma, \quad j = 0, 1, 2 \tag{5b}
\]

The linear steady-state amplitude of the response can be obtained by squaring and adding Equations (5) then solving the resulting equation for \( a \). The corresponding phase, \( \gamma \), is obtained by using either one of Equations (5). Accordingly, the steady-state response can be written as

\[
u_{ss}(t) = a \cos(\Omega t + \gamma) \tag{6}\]
Further, not every delay frequency, $\omega = K\tau$, gain, and delay. In other words, we let $\mu$ more than one peak. To further illustrate this fact, response curves of the forced response may exhibit ways yield a unique solution. As such, the frequency-tion frequency. The minimization problem requires that the first derivative of the denominator with respect to the system’s natural frequency unless the gains are very small [Hu, 1998]. In this section, we propose a methodology to alleviate this assumption. Towards that end, we extract the delay from the linear states and write Equation (1) in the following form:

$$\frac{d^2u}{dt^2} + 2|f_1(K, \tau)| \frac{du}{dt} + |f_2(K, \tau)| u = F \cos(\Omega t) - \epsilon u^3$$

(10)

where $f_1$ and $f_2$ are unknown nonzero functions that will be determined at a later stage in the perturbation analysis. As mentioned earlier, since the analysis is limited to asymptotically stable free responses, absolute values of the unknown functions are used to ensure this condition.

Using the method of multiple scales, we seek a second-order nonlinear solution in the form

$$u(t_0, T_1) = u_0(T_0, T_1) + \epsilon u_1(T_0, T_1) + O(\epsilon^2)$$

(11)

where $T_n = \epsilon^n t$ and $\epsilon$ is a small bookkeeping parame-
ter. In terms of the \( T_a \), the time derivative becomes
\[
\frac{d}{dt} = D_0 + \epsilon D_1 + O(\epsilon^2) \tag{12}
\]
where \( D_a = \frac{\partial}{\partial T_a} \). To analyze the effect of the primary resonance excitation, the amplitude of excitation and nonlinearities are ordered so that they appear in the same perturbation equation as \( f_1 \). In other words, we let
\[
f_1 = \epsilon f_1, \quad F = \epsilon F, \quad \alpha = \epsilon \alpha, \quad \beta = \epsilon \beta \tag{13}
\]
We express the nearness of the excitation frequency, \( \Omega \), to the unknown function, \( f_2 \), by introducing a detuning parameter, \( \sigma \), and letting
\[
\Omega^2 = |f_2| + \epsilon \sigma \tag{14}
\]
For small \( \epsilon \), Equation (14) can be written as
\[
\Omega \approx \sqrt{|f_2| + \frac{1}{2|f_2|}} \epsilon \sigma \tag{15}
\]
Substituting Equation (11), (13), and (15) into Equation (10) and equating coefficients of like powers of \( \epsilon \), we obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
O(1): & \quad D_0^2 u_0 + |f_2| u_0 = 0 \tag{16} \\
O(\epsilon): & \quad D_0^3 u_1 + |f_2| u_1 = -2D_0 D_1 u_0 - 2|f_1| D_0 u_0 \\
 & \quad + F \cos(\sqrt{|f_2|} T_0 + \sigma \sqrt{|f_2|}^{-1} T_1) \approx \alpha u_0^3 \tag{17}
\end{align*}
\]
The solution of the first order equation, Equation (16), can be written as
\[
u_0 = A(T_1) e^{i \sqrt{|f_2|} T_0} + ̃A(T_1) e^{-i \sqrt{|f_2|} T_0} \tag{18}
\]
Substituting Equation (18) into Equation (17) and eliminating the terms that produce secular terms in the solution yields
\[
-2i \sqrt{|f_2|} D_1 A - 2i |f_1| \sqrt{|f_2|} A + \frac{F}{2} e^{i \sigma \sqrt{|f_2|}^{-1} T_1} \approx 3\alpha A^2 ̃A = 0 \tag{19}
\]
To construct the modulation equations, we introduce the polar transformation \( A(T_1) = a(T_1) e^{i \beta(T_1)} / 2 \) and substitute it into Equation (19), then separate the real and imaginary parts of the outcome to obtain
\[
\sqrt{|f_2|} a' = -(|f_1| \sqrt{|f_2|}) a + \frac{F}{2} \sin \gamma \tag{20a}
\]
\[
\sqrt{|f_2|} |f_2| a'' = \frac{(\Omega^2 - |f_2|^2)}{2} a - \frac{3\alpha}{8} a^3 + \frac{F}{2} \cos \gamma \tag{20b}
\]
where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to \( T_1 \), \( \gamma = \sigma \sqrt{|f_2|}^{-1} T_1 + \beta \). Now, substituting \( T_1 = \epsilon t \) into Equations (20), then setting the bookkeeping parameter \( \epsilon \) equal to 1 yields
\[
\sqrt{|f_2|} \dot{a} = -(|f_1| \sqrt{|f_2|}) a + \frac{F}{2} \sin \gamma \tag{21a}
\]
\[
\sqrt{|f_2|} \dot{a} = \frac{(\Omega^2 - |f_2|^2)}{2} a - \frac{3\alpha}{8} a^3 + \frac{F}{2} \cos \gamma \tag{21b}
\]
where the dot denotes differentiation with respect to time, \( t \). For the steady-state response, \( \dot{a} = \dot{\gamma} = 0 \). It follows from Equations (21a) and (21b) that
\[
f_2^2 |f_2| a_0^2 + \left( \frac{|f_2| - \Omega^2}{2} a_0 - \frac{3\alpha}{8} a_0^3 \right) = \frac{F^2}{4} \tag{22}
\]
and
\[
\tan \gamma_0 = \frac{|f_1| \sqrt{|f_2|} a_0}{\frac{1}{2} (|f_2| - |f_2|^2) a_0 - \frac{3\alpha}{8} a_0^3} \tag{23}
\]
where \( a_0 \) and \( \gamma_0 \) are, respectively, the steady-state amplitude and phase of the response. Setting \( \alpha \) equal to zero in Equations (22) and (23), one would expect to obtain the linear steady-state amplitude and phase of the response as given by Equations (7). Therefore, \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) are determined by enforcing the linear steady-state amplitude and phase obtained via Equations (22) and (23) to equal those acquired via Equations (6) and (7). Imposing these conditions, we obtain
\[
f_2 = \omega_n^2 + (-1)^j K \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \cos(\Omega \tau) j = 0, 1, 2.
\]
As one would expect, for small values of \( K \) and \( \sigma \), \( f_2 \) approaches \( \omega_n \) and \( f_1 \) approaches \( \mu \). To assess the stability of the resulting solutions, we find the eigenvalues of the Jacobian of the modulation equations evaluated at the roots \( (\omega_n, \gamma_0) \) and characterize the sign of their real parts.
In Fig. 4, we validate the modified perturbation solution by comparing the frequency-response curves to solutions acquired via the method of harmonic balance. By inspecting Fig. 4, it is evident that the modified approach yields results that are almost indistinguishable
2.4 Frequency Island Behavior

For small forcing magnitudes, the feedback controller may reduce the response amplitude significantly. The frequency-response curves before application of a delayed feedback are shown in Fig. 5 and illustrate large-response amplitudes, hardening-type behavior, and hysteretic jumps. Clearly, there is at least one stable branch of steady-state solutions associated with every excitation frequency. In order to decrease this stable response amplitude, a gain, $K = 0.4$, and an associated delay, $\tau = 0.7\pi$, are chosen as parameters for the feedback controller. The frequency-response curves for various forcing magnitudes are seen in Fig. 6. For the case with the relatively small forcing magnitude, $F = 0.05$, the feedback has caused the undelayed peak amplitude to decrease from about 0.8 in Fig. 5 to approximately 0.3 in Fig. 6, which is a decrease of more than 50 percent.

Along with the stable solution branch, mainland, there exists unstable islands in the frequency-response curves in Fig. 6. Frequency island generation was encountered previously by very few researchers including Narimani et al. [Narimani, 2002] in their analysis of a piecewise linear system under harmonic excitation, and by Lacarbonara et al. [Lacarbonara, 2005] in studying the nonlinear modal interactions of imperfect beams at veering. In both cases, the frequency islands are created by either two stable branches of solutions or at least contained one stable branch of dynamic solutions. On the other hand, the frequency islands here are formed by two unstable solution branches.

As the forcing is increased, the island increases in size and grows closer to the mainland until they collide at a critical forcing amplitude, as illustrated in the descending subfigures within Fig. 6. Initial investigation also reveals that these frequency islands grow in size and collide with the mainland as the delay is chosen closer to the stability boundary. For instance, Figure 7 reveals mainland destruction as the delay time increases.

Consequently, there will be a region of excitation frequencies for which no stable solution exists. For example, as shown in Fig. 8, the response amplitude grows without limits when the system is excited at a frequency that falls within the new region without a mainland. This result has critical implications on implementing delayed-feedback controllers to stabilize externally-excited nonlinear systems, since for some gain-delay combinations that yield a linearly-stable free response, the nonlinear forced response could grow without bounds.
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