LINEAR MATRIX INEQUALITY APPROACH FOR SYNCHRONIZATION OF CHAOTIC FUZZY CELLULAR NEURAL NETWORKS WITH DISCRETE AND UNBOUNDED DISTRIBUTED DELAYS BASED ON SAMPLED-DATA CONTROL
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Abstract. In this paper, linear matrix inequality (LMI) approach for synchronization of chaotic fuzzy cellular neural networks (FCNNs) with discrete and unbounded distributed delays based on sampled-data control is investigated. Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional combining with the input delay approach as well as the free-weighting matrix approach are employed to derive several sufficient criteria in terms of LMIs ensuring the delayed FCNNs to be asymptotically synchronous. The restriction such as the time-varying delay required to be differentiable or even its time-derivative assumed to be smaller than one, are removed. Instead, the time-varying delay is only assumed to be bounded. Finally, numerical examples and its simulations are provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of the derived results.

1. Introduction

Cellular neural networks (CNNs) are locally connected nonlinear networks. They originally stemmed from cellular automata and artificial neural networks (ANNs). Local connectedness is the most significant property of CNN. Continuous dynamics distinguish CNN from cellular automata. The local connectedness restricts the ability of CNN to solve many global problems that cannot be decomposed into local components. However, the local property has its advantages, such as easy implementation using VLSI technology and efficiency for solving local problems. CNNs were first introduced in twin papers by Chua and Yang (1988) [6, 7].

Fuzzy set theory provides an inference methodology that approximates human reasoning capabilities and can be applied to knowledge-based systems [36]. It provides mathematical support to the capture of uncertainties associated with human cognitive processes, for example, thinking and reasoning. Also, it provides a mathematical methodology to model linguistic statements and knowledge. FCNN is a generalized case of the CNN structure. FCNNs introduced by Yang et al. [32, 33], is proved to be a useful tool in image processing and pattern recognition [9, 31].
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Consider the linear system
\[ \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t), \] (1)
where \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) and \( x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Assume that (1) has equilibrium \( x^* = 0 \).

**Definition 1.1.** Let \( V : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is a Lyapunov function for (1) if
(i) \( V(x(t)) \geq 0 \) with equality if and only if \( x^* = 0 \), and
(ii) \( \dot{V}(x(t)) \leq 0 \).

This leads to the celebrated theorem of Lyapunov of (1).

**Theorem 1.2.** (Lyapunov’s Second Theorem on \( \mathbb{R} \)) Given system (1) with equilibrium \( x^* = 0 \), if there exists an associated Lyapunov function \( V \), then \( x^* = 0 \) is Lyapunov stable. Furthermore, if \( \dot{V}(x(t)) < 0 \), then \( x^* = 0 \) is asymptotically stable.

The power of Theorem 1.2 is that one can make conclusions about trajectories of a system (1) without actually solving the differential equation. For the system (1), a common choice of Lyapunov function candidate is the quadratic form,
\[ V(x(t)) = x^T(t)Px(t). \]
Investigating the stability of (1) is considering the time derivative of \( V(x(t)) \)
\[ \dot{V}(x(t)) = x^T(t)P\dot{x}(t) + \dot{x}^T(t)Px(t) = x^T(t)PAx(t) + x^T(t)A^TPx(t) = x^T(t)[PA + A^TP]x(t). \]
The quadratic form of this derivative proves, if the central quantity satisfies
\[ PA + A^TP < 0, \]
then
\[ \dot{V}(x(t)) < 0. \]

**Example 1.3.** Consider the linear system
\[ \dot{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix} x(t). \]
Using Matlab LMI control toolbox and solving the above LMI \( PA + A^TP < 0 \), one can get the following positive definite matrix \( P = \begin{bmatrix} 1.1956 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5861 \end{bmatrix} \). For this \( P \),
\[ PA + A^TP = \begin{bmatrix} -2.3912 & 0 \\ 0 & -2.3443 \end{bmatrix}, \]
which is negative definite. This implies that the given system is asymptotically stable in the sense of Lyapunov.

It is well known that time-delay is usually a cause of instability and oscillations of recurrent neural networks (RNNs). Therefore, the problem of stability of RNNs with time-delay is of importance in both theory and practical applications. With the help of the LMI approach, a number of research works have been devoted to analysis and synthesis of RNNs with various types of delays, such as stability analysis \([2, 20, 25]\), and state estimation \([1, 21]\).

Chaos has long-term unpredictable behavior. This is usually couched mathematically as sensitivity to initial conditions—where the system’s dynamics takes it is
hard to predict from the starting point. Although a chaotic system can have a pattern (an attractor) in state space, determining where on the attractor the system is at a distant, future time given its position in the past is a problem that becomes exponentially harder as time passes [23]. One way to demonstrate this is to run, two identical chaotic systems side by side, starting both at close, but not exactly equal initial conditions. The systems soon diverge from each other, but both retain the same attractor pattern. That is, each has its own attractor without having any relation to the other system. It is possible to force the two chaotic systems to follow the same path on the attractor, namely synchronization. Carroll and Pecora [5, 22] have introduced the drive-response concept, and used the output of the drive system to control the response system to achieve the state synchronization.

Many results on synchronization of FCNNs with time-delays can be found in the literature [3, 12, 13, 24, 34, 35]. The controllers used for controlling and synchronizing chaos in continuous-time systems can be implemented by analog circuits. However, in order to take advantage of the modern high-speed computers, microelectronics, and communication networks, it is more preferable to use digital controllers instead of analog circuits, particularly in aerospace systems and industries [10, 11, 15, 17, 19, 37]. It allows synchronization of chaotic systems using the samples of the state variables of the master and the slave chaotic system at discrete time instants. These samples are used by sampled-data controllers to control the slave chaotic system and result in synchronization between the master and the slave chaotic systems [19]. This drastically reduces the amount of synchronization information transmitted from the master chaotic system to the slave chaotic system and increase the efficiency of bandwidth usage, which makes this method more efficient.

In many real-world applications, it is difficult to guarantee that the state variables transmitted to controllers are continuous. In addition, in order to make full use of modern computer technique, the sampled-data feedback control is applied to synchronize delayed FCNNs. The block diagram of master-slave FCNNs with a sampling controller is shown in Figure 1. Referring to this Figure 1, the operation of this closed-system can be described as follows: Firstly, the system states of both the master and slave systems form error signal, which is fed to the sampler with a sampling interval, $\Delta_k$. Then, the sampled system states information is processed by the sampled-data controller to produce an appropriate control signal. Finally, the control signal is kept constant during the sampling interval by the zero-order holder.
and fed to the slave system to realize the synchronization. Moreover, the contribution of this paper is that we have compared our proposed results with the existing literature [3] and shown in Example 4.3 along with numerical simulations (Figures 13-14) and Table 1. However, to the best of authors’ knowledge, the results on LMI approach for synchronization of chaotic FCNNs with discrete and unbounded distributed delays based on sampled-data control has never been investigated yet.

Motivated by the aforementioned discussions, in this paper, we derive new criteria for the synchronization of chaotic FCNNs based on sampled-data control, Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional, free-weighting matrix approach and LMI technique. Finally, two numerical examples and its simulations are given to show the effectiveness of proposed method.

**Notations:** \( \mathbb{R}^n \) denotes the n-dimensional Euclidean Space; for any matrix \( A = [a_{ij}]_{n \times n} \), let \( A^T \) and \( A^{-1} \) denote the transpose and the inverse of \( A \), respectively; \( |A| = |[a_{ij}]|_{n \times n} \); let \( A > 0 \) (\( A < 0 \)) denotes the positive-definite (negative-definite) symmetric matrix, respectively; the notation \( C^2(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n) \) denotes the family of all nonnegative functions \( V(t,x(t)) \) on \( \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n \) which are continuously twice differentiable in \( x \) and once differentiable in \( t \); \( I \) denotes the identity matrix of appropriate dimension and \( \Lambda = \{1,2,...,n\} \); \( \ast \) denotes the symmetric terms in a symmetric matrix.

### 2. Model Formulation and Preliminaries

Consider the following general drive-response type chaotic FCNNs with discrete and unbounded distributed delays

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_i(t) &= -d_i x_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} f_j(x_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij} f_j(x_j(t - \tau_i(t))) + I_i, \\
&\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{t} \alpha_{ij} \int_{s}^{t} \beta_{ij} k_j(t-s) f_j(x_j(s)) ds, \\
&\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{t} \alpha_{ij} \int_{s}^{t} \beta_{ij} k_j(t-s) f_j(x_j(s)) ds, \quad i \in \Lambda, \\
x_i(s) &= \phi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty,0], \\
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{y}_i(t) &= -d_i y_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} f_j(y_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij} f_j(y_j(t - \tau_i(t))) + I_i, \\
&\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{t} \alpha_{ij} \int_{s}^{t} \beta_{ij} k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds, \\
&\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{t} \alpha_{ij} \int_{s}^{t} \beta_{ij} k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds + u_i(t), \quad i \in \Lambda, \\
y_i(s) &= \varphi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty,0],
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \phi_i(.) \in C((-\infty,0], \mathbb{R}) \) and \( \varphi_i(.) \in C((-\infty,0], \mathbb{R}) \) are the initial conditions in drive system (2) and response system (3), respectively; \( \alpha_{ij} \) and \( \beta_{ij} \) are the elements of fuzzy feedback MIN template and fuzzy feedback MAX template, respectively; \( a_{ij} \) and \( b_{ij} \) are the elements of feedback template; \( \int \) and \( \int \) denote the fuzzy AND and fuzzy OR operation, respectively; \( x_i \) and \( y_i \) denote the state vectors in drive system (2) and response system (3) of the \( i \)th neuron, respectively; \( I_i \) denotes the external input of the \( i \)th neuron; \( d_i \) is a diagonal matrix; \( d_i \) represents the rates with which the \( i \)th neuron will reset their potential to the resting state in isolation when disconnected from the networks and external inputs; \( f_j \) represents the neuron activation function; \( u(t) = (u_1(t), u_2(t), ..., u_n(t))^T \) is a control input to be designed.
\[ k_j(s) \geq 0 \] is the feedback kernel and satisfies
\[ \int_0^\infty k_i(s) ds = 1, \quad i \in \Lambda. \] (4)

Let \( e(t) = (e_1(t), e_2(t), ..., e_n(t)) := x(t) - y(t) \) be the error state. Then, the error dynamical system between (2) and (3) is given by
\[
\begin{cases}
\dot{e}_i(t) = -d_i \epsilon_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} g_j(e_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} g_j(e_j(t - \tau_j(t))) \\
+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \alpha_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(x_j(s)) ds - \int_{-\infty}^0 \alpha_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds \\
+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \beta_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(x_j(s)) ds - \int_{-\infty}^0 \beta_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds \\
- u_i(t), \quad i \in \Lambda,
\end{cases}
\]
\[ e_i(s) = \phi_i(s) - \varphi_i(s) = \psi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty, 0]. \] (5)

where \( g_j(e_j(t)) = f_j(x_j(t)) - f_j(y_j(t)), \quad j \in \Lambda \).

The sampled-data control law can be adopted as follows:
\[ u_i(t) := h_{ij} e_j(t_k), \quad t_k \leq t < t_{k+1}, \quad i, \ j \in \Lambda, \] (6)
where \( h_{ij} \) is the element of sampled-data feedback controller gain matrix to be determined, \( e(t_k) \) is discrete measurement of \( e(t) \) at the sampling instant \( t_k \); and \( t_k \) satisfies the following conditions:
\[ 0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < ... < t_k < ... < \lim_{k \to +\infty} t_k = +\infty. \]

Moreover, the sampling period under consideration is assumed to be bounded by a known constant \( \tau_2 \), that is, \( \Delta_k = t_{k+1} - t_k \leq \tau_2 \) for \( k \geq 0 \).

Substituting control law (6) into the error system (5) yields
\[
\begin{cases}
\dot{e}_i(t) = -d_i \epsilon_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} g_j(e_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} g_j(e_j(t - \tau_j(t))) \\
+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \alpha_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(x_j(s)) ds - \int_{-\infty}^0 \alpha_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds \\
+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \beta_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(x_j(s)) ds - \int_{-\infty}^0 \beta_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds \\
- h_{ij} e_j(t_k), \quad i \in \Lambda,
\end{cases}
\]
\[ e_i(s) = \psi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty, 0]. \] (7)

Clearly, it is difficult to analyze the synchronization of chaotic FCNNs based on error system (7) because of the discrete term, \( e(t_k) \). Therefore, the input delay approach [10] is applied, by defining
\[ \tau_2(t) = t - t_k, \quad t_k \leq t < t_{k+1}. \] (8)

It is easily seen that
\[ 0 \leq \tau_2(t) < \tau_2. \] (9)

Therefore, the state-feedback controller takes the following form
\[ u_i(t) = h_{ij} e_i(t - \tau_2(t)), \quad t_k \leq t < t_{k+1}, \quad i, \ j \in \Lambda. \] (10)

Consequently, connecting (10) to system (7) yields
\[
\begin{cases}
\dot{e}_i(t) = -d_i \epsilon_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} g_j(e_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} g_j(e_j(t - \tau_j(t))) \\
+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \alpha_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(x_j(s)) ds - \int_{-\infty}^0 \alpha_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds \\
+ \int_{-\infty}^0 \beta_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(x_j(s)) ds - \int_{-\infty}^0 \beta_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^t k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds \\
- h_{ij} e_i(t - \tau_2(t)), \quad i \in \Lambda,
\end{cases}
\]
\[ e_i(s) = \psi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty, 0]. \] (11)
We list two assumptions as follows:

(A1) The neuron activation function \( f_j(\cdot), j \in \Lambda \), are continuously bounded and satisfies

\[
I_j^- \leq \frac{f_j(u) - f_j(v)}{u - v} \leq I_j^+,
\]

for any \( u, v \in \mathbb{R}, u \neq v, j \in \Lambda \),

where \( I_j^- \) and \( I_j^+ \) are some real constants and they may be positive, zero or negative.

(A2) The transmission delay \( \tau_1(t) \) is a time varying delay, and it satisfies

\[
0 \leq \tau_1(t) \leq \tau_1,
\]

where \( \tau_1 \) is a positive constant.

We state the following lemmas which will be used in the sequel to prove the main result.

**Lemma 2.1.** (Schur Complement [4]) The LMI

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
Q(x) & S(x) \\
S^T(x) & R(x)
\end{bmatrix} > 0,
\]

where

\[
Q(x) = Q^T(x), R(x) = R^T(x),
\]

is equivalent to

\[
R(x) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Q(x) - S(x)R^{-1}(x)S^T(x) > 0.
\]

**Lemma 2.2.** [26] For any \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \epsilon > 0 \) and positive definite matrix \( Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \), the following matrix inequality holds

\[
2x^T y \leq \epsilon x^T Q x + \epsilon^{-1} y^T Q^{-1} y.
\]

**Lemma 2.3.** [31] Let \( z, z' \) be two states of system (2), then we have

\[
\left| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} f_j(z) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} f_j(z') \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} |\alpha_{ij}| |f_j(z) - f_j(z')|,
\]

\[
\left| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} f_j(z) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} f_j(z') \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} |\beta_{ij}| |f_j(z) - f_j(z')|.
\]

**Lemma 2.4.** [18] For any \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), any constant matrix \( A = [a_{ij}]_{n \times n} \) with \( a_{ij} \geq 0 \), the following matrix inequality holds

\[
x^T A^T A x \leq nx^T A_s^T A_s x,
\]

where \( A_s = \text{diag}\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i1}, \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i2}, \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{in} \right\} \).

**Lemma 2.5.** [14] Given any real matrix \( M = M^T > 0 \) of appropriate dimension, and a vector function \( \omega(\cdot) : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^n \), such that the integrations concerned are well defined, then

\[
\left[ \int_{a}^{b} \omega(s) ds \right]^T M \left[ \int_{a}^{b} \omega(s) ds \right] \leq (b-a) \int_{a}^{b} \omega^T(s) M \omega(s) ds.
\]

The main purpose of this paper is to design controller with the form (10) to ensure the master system (2) synchronize with slave system (3). In other words, we are interested in finding a feedback gain matrix \( H \) such that the error system (11) is asymptotically stable.

3. Main Results

**Theorem 3.1.** Assume that assumptions (A1) – (A2) hold. The error dynamical system (11) is globally asymptotically stable, if there exist \( n \times n \) positive diagonal matrices \( P, R, U_1, U_2, U_3 \), some \( n \times n \) positive definite symmetric matrices
Consider the following Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional

\[ V(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_i(t), \]

where \( i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, 16 \) with

\[
\begin{align*}
\Omega_{1,1} &= -2PD + Q_1 + Q_2 - \frac{1}{\tau_1} M_1 - \frac{1}{\tau_2} M_2 - 2M_3 - 2M_4 - U_1 \Sigma_1, \\
\Omega_{1,2} &= \frac{1}{\tau_1} M_1, \Omega_{1,3} = T_{12}, \Omega_{1,4} = \frac{1}{\tau_2} M_2, \Omega_{1,5} = -Q_0 + V_{12}, \Omega_{1,6} = -D^T P, \\
\Omega_{1,9} &= \frac{2}{\tau_1} M_{35}, \Omega_{1,10} = \frac{2}{\tau_1} M_3, \Omega_{1,11} = \frac{2}{\tau_2} M_4, \Omega_{1,12} = \frac{2}{\tau_2} M_4, \Omega_{1,13} = PA + U_1 \Sigma_2, \\
\Omega_{1,14} &= PB \Omega_{2,2} + Q_1 - \frac{1}{\tau_1} M_1, \Omega_{3,3} = \tau_1 T_{11} - 2T_{12}^T - U_2 \Sigma_1, \Omega_{3,4} = U_2 \Sigma_2, \\
\Omega_{4,4} &= -Q_2 - \frac{1}{\tau_2} M_2, \Omega_{5,5} = \tau_2 V_{11} - 2V_{12} - U_3 \Sigma_1, \Omega_{5,6} = -Q_0, \Omega_{5,15} = U_3 \Sigma_2, \\
\Omega_{6,6} &= -2P + W_1 + W_2 + \tau_1 M_1 + \tau_2 M_2 + \tau_1^2 M_3 + \tau_2^2 M_4 + \tau_1 T_{22} + \tau_2 V_{22}, \\
\Omega_{6,13} &= PA, \Omega_{6,14} = PB, \Omega_{7,7} = -W_1, \Omega_{8,8} = -W_2, \Omega_{9,9} = \frac{2}{\tau_1} M_3, \\
\Omega_{9,10} &= \frac{2}{\tau_1} M_3, \Omega_{9,10} = \frac{2}{\tau_2} M_3, \Omega_{11,11} = -\frac{2}{\tau_1} M_4, \Omega_{11,12} = -\frac{2}{\tau_2} M_4, \\
\Omega_{12,12} &= -\frac{2}{\tau_1} M_4, \Sigma_{13,13} = R - U_1, \Omega_{14,14} = -U_2, \Omega_{15,15} = -U_3, \\
\Omega_{16,16} &= \mu_1 I + \mu_2 I - R, |\alpha|_s = diag\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_{i1}|, \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_{i2}|, \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_{in}| \right\}, \\
|\beta|_s &= diag\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\beta_{i1}|, \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\beta_{i2}|, \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\beta_{in}| \right\}, S = |\alpha|_s + |\beta|_s, \\
\Sigma_1 &= diag\left\{ l_1^+, l_2^+, \ldots, l_n^+ \right\}, \Sigma_2 = diag\left\{ l_1^+, l_2^+, \ldots, l_n^+, l_n^- + l_n^+ \right\}, \\
\Gamma_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} PS & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T, \\
\Gamma_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T.
\end{align*}
\]

Moreover, the controller gain matrix \( H = P^{-1} Q_0 \).

**Proof.** Consider the following Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional

\[ \Omega = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega_{i,j} & \Gamma_1^T \Gamma_2 \end{bmatrix} < 0, \]

where

\[ i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, 16 \]
\[ V_1(t) = e^T(t)P_e(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_ie_i^2(t), \]
\[ V_2(t) = \int_{t-\tau_1}^{t} e^T(s)Q_1e(s)ds + \int_{t-\tau_2}^{t} e^T(s)Q_2e(s)ds + \int_{t-\tau_1}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)W_1\dot{e}(s)ds + \int_{t-\tau_2}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)W_2\dot{e}(s)ds, \]
\[ V_3(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} r_j \int_{0}^{\infty} k_j(\theta) \int_{t-\theta}^{t} g_j^2(e_j(s))dsd\theta, \]
\[ V_4(t) = \int_{-\tau_1}^{0} \int_{t+\theta}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)M_1\dot{e}(s)dsd\theta + \int_{-\tau_2}^{0} \int_{t+\theta}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)M_2\dot{e}(s)dsd\theta, \]
\[ V_5(t) = \int_{-\tau_1}^{0} \int_{t+\theta}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)M_3\dot{e}(s)dsd\theta + \int_{-\tau_2}^{0} \int_{t+\theta}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)M_4\dot{e}(s)dsd\theta, \]
\[ V_6(t) = \int_{0}^{t} \int_{0}^{\theta - \tau_1(\theta)} \left[ e(\theta - \tau_1(\theta)) \right]^T \left[ \begin{array}{c} T_{11} & T_{12} \\ T_{21} & T_{22} \end{array} \right] \left[ e(\theta - \tau_1(\theta)) \right] dsd\theta + \int_{-\tau_2}^{0} \int_{t+\theta}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)M_5\dot{e}(s)dsd\theta, \]
\[ V_7(t) = \int_{-\tau_1}^{0} \int_{t+\theta}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)T_{22}\dot{e}(s)dsd\theta + \int_{-\tau_2}^{0} \int_{t+\theta}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)V_{22}\dot{e}(s)dsd\theta. \]

From Lemma 2.3, we obtain
\[
\left| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^{t} k_j(t-s)f_j(x_j)ds - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^{t} k_j(t-s)f_j(y_j)ds \right| \\
\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} |\alpha_{ij}| \left| \int_{-\infty}^{t} k_j(t-s)g_j(e_j(s))ds \right|. \]

By calculating the time derivation of \( V_1(t) \) along the trajectory of system (11), we obtain
\[
\dot{V}_1(t) \leq -2e^T(t)PDe(t) - 2e^T(t)Q_0e(t - \tau_2(t)) + 2e^T(t)PAge(t) + 2e^T(t)PB \times g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) + \mu_1^{-1}ne^T(t)P(|\alpha|_s + |\beta|_s)(|\alpha|_s + |\beta|_s)^T Pe(t) + \mu_1 \left( \int_{-\infty}^{t} K(t-s)g(e(s))ds \right)^T \left( \int_{-\infty}^{t} K(t-s)g(e(s))ds \right) - 2e^T(t)P\dot{e}(t) - 2e^T(t)PDe(t) + 2e^T(t)PAge(t) + 2e^T(t)PB \times g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) + \mu_2^{-1}ne^T(t)P(|\alpha|_s + |\beta|_s)(|\alpha|_s + |\beta|_s)^T P\dot{e}(t) + \mu_2 \left( \int_{-\infty}^{t} K(t-s)g(e(s))ds \right)^T \left( \int_{-\infty}^{t} K(t-s)g(e(s))ds \right) - 2e^T(t)Q_0e(t - \tau_2(t)), \]
(14)
\[ \dot{V}_2(t) = e^T(t)Q_1e(t) - e^T(t - \tau_1)Q_1e(t - \tau_1) + e^T(t)Q_2e(t) - e^T(t - \tau_2)Q_2e(t - \tau_2) + e^T(t)W_1\dot{e}(t) - e^T(t - \tau_1)W_1\dot{e}(t - \tau_1) + e^T(t)W_2\dot{e}(t) - e^T(t - \tau_2)W_2\dot{e}(t - \tau_2), \]  

(15)

\[ \dot{V}_3(t) = g^T(e(t))Rg(e(t)) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} r_j \left( \int_{0}^{\infty} k_j(\theta)g_j(e_j(t - \theta))d\theta \right)^2 \]

\[ = g^T(e(t))Rg(e(t)) - \left( \int_{-\infty}^{t} K(t - s)g(e(s))ds \right)^T R \left( \int_{-\infty}^{t} K(t - s)g(e(s))ds \right), \]  

(16)

\[ \dot{V}_4(t) \leq \tau_1 e^T(t)M_1\dot{e}(t) - \frac{1}{\tau_1} e^T(t)M_1e(t) + \frac{2}{\tau_1} e^T(t)M_1e(t - \tau_1) - \frac{1}{\tau_1} e^T(t - \tau_1)M_1e(t - \tau_1) + \tau_2 e^T(t)M_2\dot{e}(t) - \frac{1}{\tau_2} e^T(t - \tau_2)M_2\dot{e}(t - \tau_2) + M_2\dot{e}(t - \tau_2) - \frac{1}{\tau_2} e^T(t - \tau_2)M_2\dot{e}(t - \tau_2), \]  

(17)

\[ \dot{V}_5(t) \leq \frac{\tau_1^2}{2} e^T(t)M_3\dot{e}(t) - 2e^T(t)M_3e(t) + \frac{2}{\tau_1} e^T(t)M_3 \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e(s)ds + \frac{2}{\tau_1} \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_3e(t) \]

\[ - \frac{2}{\tau_1} \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_3 \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e(s)ds - \frac{2}{\tau_1} \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_3 \]

\[ \times \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e(s)ds + \frac{2}{\tau_1} \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_3e(t) - \frac{2}{\tau_1} \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e^T(s)ds \]

\[ \times M_3 \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e(s)ds - \frac{2}{\tau_1} \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_3 \int_{t - \tau_1(t)}^{t} e(s)ds \]

\[ + \frac{\tau_1^2}{2} e^T(t - \tau_1(t))M_4\dot{e}(t) - 2e^T(t - \tau_1(t))M_4e(t) + \frac{2}{\tau_2} e^T(t - \tau_2(t))M_4 \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e(s)ds + \frac{2}{\tau_2} \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_4e(t) \]

\[ - \frac{2}{\tau_2} \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_4 \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e(s)ds - \frac{2}{\tau_2} \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_4 \]

\[ \times \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e(s)ds + \frac{2}{\tau_2} \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_4e(t) - \frac{2}{\tau_2} \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e^T(s)ds \]

\[ \times M_4 \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e(s)ds - \frac{2}{\tau_2} \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e^T(s)dsM_4 \int_{t - \tau_2(t)}^{t} e(s)ds, \]  

(18)
\[
\dot{V}_d(t) \leq e^T(t - \tau_1(t)) \left[ \tau_1 T_{11} - 2T_{12}^T e(t - \tau_1(t)) + 2e^T(t)T_{12}^T e(t - \tau_1(t)) \right] + \int_{t - \tau_1}^t \dot{e}^T(s)T_{22}\dot{e}(s)ds + e^T(t - \tau_2(t)) \left[ \tau_2 V_{11} - 2V_{12}^T e(t - \tau_2(t)) \right] + 2e^T(t)V_{12}^T e(t - \tau_2(t)) + \int_{t - \tau_2}^t \dot{e}^T(s)V_{22}\dot{e}(s)ds,
\]

(19)

\[
\dot{V}_r(t) = \tau_1 e^T(t)T_{22}\dot{e}(t) - \int_{t - \tau_1}^t \dot{e}^T(t + \theta)T_{22}\dot{e}(t + \theta)d\theta + \tau_2 e^T(t)V_{22}\dot{e}(t)
\]

- \int_{t - \tau_2}^t \dot{e}^T(t + \theta)V_{22}\dot{e}(t + \theta)d\theta

= \tau_1 e^T(t)T_{22}\dot{e}(t) - \int_{t - \tau_1}^t \dot{e}^T(s)T_{22}\dot{e}(s)ds

+ \tau_2 e^T(t)V_{22}\dot{e}(t) - \int_{t - \tau_2}^t \dot{e}^T(s)V_{22}\dot{e}(s)ds.
\]

(20)

In addition, for any \( n \times n \) diagonal matrices \( U_1 > 0, \ U_2 > 0, \ U_3 > 0 \), the following inequality holds by the methods proposed in [16]:

\[
\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} e(t) \\ g(e(t)) \end{bmatrix} \right\}^T \begin{bmatrix} -U_1 \Sigma_1 & U_1 \Sigma_2 \\ * & -U_1 \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} e(t) \\ g(e(t)) \end{bmatrix} \right\} + \begin{bmatrix} e(t - \tau_1(t)) \\ g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} -U_2 \Sigma_1 & U_2 \Sigma_2 \\ * & -U_2 \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} e(t - \tau_1(t)) \\ g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) \end{bmatrix} \right\} + \begin{bmatrix} e(t - \tau_2(t)) \\ g(e(t - \tau_2(t))) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} -U_3 \Sigma_1 & U_3 \Sigma_2 \\ * & -U_3 \end{bmatrix} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} e(t - \tau_2(t)) \\ g(e(t - \tau_2(t))) \end{bmatrix} \right\} \geq 0.
\]

(21)

Hence, from (13)-(21) we have

\[
\dot{V}(t) \leq \xi^T(t) \left[ \Omega_{i,j} + \Gamma_1^T \mu_1^{-1} n \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2^T \mu_2^{-1} n \Gamma_2 \right] \xi(t) \leq \xi^T(t) \Omega \xi(t),
\]

(22)

where

\[
\xi(t) = \begin{bmatrix} e^T(t), e^T(t - \tau_1), e^T(t - \tau_1(t)), e^T(t - \tau_2), e^T(t - \tau_2(t)), e^T(t), \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\dot{e}^T(t - \tau_1), \dot{e}^T(t - \tau_2), \int_{t - \tau_1}^t \dot{e}^T(s)ds, \int_{t - \tau_1}^{t - \tau_2} e^T(s)ds, \int_{t - \tau_2}^t \dot{e}^T(s)ds, \int_{t - \tau_2}^{t - \tau_1} e^T(s)ds, g^T(e(t)), g^T(e(t - \tau_1(t))),
\]

\[
g^T(e(t - \tau_2(t))), \int_{-\infty}^t K(t - s)g^T(e(s))ds \right]^T,
\]

\[
\Omega = \Omega_{i,j} + \Gamma_1^T \mu_1^{-1} n \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2^T \mu_2^{-1} n \Gamma_2.
\]

By (12), it yields
\[ \dot{V}(t) \leq -\xi^T(t) \Omega^* \xi(t), \quad t > 0, \]

where \(\Omega^* = -\Omega > 0\). Therefore, we can conclude that the error dynamical system (11) is globally asymptotically stable. As a result, the slave chaotic FCNNs with discrete and unbounded distributed delays (3) is globally synchronized with the master FCNNs (2). This completes the proof. \(\square\)

**Remark 3.2.** The motivation for the use of null terms with the introduction of free-weighting matrices, when considering the stability analysis of neural networks has been investigated [27, 28, 29]. In Theorem 3.1, we have introduced the diagonal matrix \(P\) as free-weighting matrix by using the artifice: \(-\dot{e}(t) + \dot{e}(t) = 0\). It is worth pointing out that the less free-weighting matrices method is regarded as an effective way to reduce the conservatism of the derived theoretical stability results. Note that the assumptions \((A_1), (A_2)\) on activation function and time-varying delay in this paper are weaker than those generally used in the literature [8, 30]; namely, the boundedness of the activation function \(f_j\). Further the differentiability of the time varying delay \(\tau_1(t)\) is not required in this paper.

**Remark 3.3.** In the absence of unbounded distributed delay, the master FCNNs system (2) becomes as follows

\[
\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_i(t) &= -d_i x_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} f_j(x_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij} f_j(x_j(t-\tau_1(t))) + I_i \\
\quad &+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} f_j(x_j(t-\tau_1(t))) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} f_j(x_j(t-\tau_1(t))), \quad i \in \Lambda, \\
x_i(s) &= \phi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty, 0],
\end{aligned}
\]

and the corresponding response system of (23) is given by

\[
\begin{aligned}
\dot{y}_i(t) &= -d_i y_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} f_j(y_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij} f_j(y_j(t-\tau_1(t))) + I_i \\
\quad &+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} f_j(y_j(t-\tau_1(t))) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} f_j(y_j(t-\tau_1(t))) + u_i(t), \quad i \in \Lambda, \\
y_i(s) &= \varphi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty, 0],
\end{aligned}
\]

where \(\phi_i(\cdot), \varphi_i(\cdot), d_i, a_{ij}, b_{ij}, \alpha_{ij}, \beta_{ij}, I_i, f_j\) and \(u_i(t)\) described in (23) and (24) are the same as (2) and (3), respectively.

Let \(e(t) = (e_1(t), e_2(t), ..., e_n(t)) := x(t) - y(t)\) be the error state. Then, the error dynamical system between (23) and (24) is given by

\[
\begin{aligned}
\dot{e}_i(t) &= -d_i e_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} g_j(e_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij} g_j(e_j(t-\tau_1(t))) \\
\quad &+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} f_j(x_j(t-\tau_1(t))) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} f_j(y_j(t-\tau_1(t))) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} f_j(x_j(t-\tau_1(t))) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} f_j(y_j(t-\tau_1(t))) - h_i e_i(t-\tau_2(t)), \quad i \in \Lambda, \\
e_i(s) &= \phi_i(s) - \varphi_i(s) = \psi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty, 0],
\end{aligned}
\]

where \(g_j(e_j(\cdot)) = f_j(x_j(\cdot)) - f_j(y_j(\cdot)), \quad j \in \Lambda\).

Moreover, the following Corollary 3.4 is a special case of Theorem 3.1.

**Corollary 3.4.** Assume that assumptions \((A_1) - (A_2)\) hold. The error dynamical system (25) is globally asymptotically stable, if there exist \(n \times n\) positive diagonal matrices \(P, U_1, U_2, U_3,\) some \(n \times n\) positive definite symmetric matrices \(Q_0, Q_1, Q_2, W_1, W_2, M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4,\) a positive scalar \(\mu,\) and the \(2n \times 2n\)
matrices $\begin{pmatrix} T_{11} & T_{12} \\ \ast & T_{22} \end{pmatrix} > 0$, $\begin{pmatrix} V_{11} & V_{12} \\ \ast & V_{22} \end{pmatrix} > 0$, such that the following LMI has feasible solution:

$$\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega_{i,j} & \Gamma^T \\ \ast & -\mu^{-1}I \end{bmatrix} < 0,$$

(26)

where $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, 15$ with

$$
\begin{align*}
\Omega_{1,1} &= -2PD + P + Q_1 + Q_2 - \frac{1}{\tau_1}M_1 - \frac{1}{\tau_2}M_2 - 2M_3 - 2M_4 - U_1\Sigma_1, \\
\Omega_{1,2} &= \frac{1}{\tau_1}M_1, \Omega_{1,3} = T_{12}, \Omega_{1,4} = \frac{1}{\tau_2}M_2, \Omega_{1,5} = -Q_0 + V_{12}, \Omega_{1,6} = -D^TP, \\
\Omega_{1,9} &= \frac{2}{\tau_1}M_3, \Omega_{1,10} = \frac{2}{\tau_1}M_3, \Omega_{1,11} = \frac{2}{\tau_2}M_4, \Omega_{1,12} = \frac{2}{\tau_2}M_4, \\
\Omega_{1,13} &= PA + U_1\Sigma_2, \Omega_{1,14} = PB, \Omega_{2,2} = -Q_1 - \frac{1}{\tau_1}M_1, \\
\Omega_{3,3} &= \tau_1T_{11} - 2T_{12} - U_2\Sigma_1, \Omega_{3,14} = U_2\Sigma_2, \Omega_{4,4} = -Q_2 - \frac{1}{\tau_2}M_2, \\
\Omega_{5,5} &= \tau_2V_{11} - 2V_{12} - U_3\Sigma_1, \Omega_{5,6} = -Q_0, \Omega_{5,15} = U_3\Sigma_2, \\
\Omega_{6,6} &= -2P + W_1 + W_2 + \tau_1M_1 + \tau_2M_2 + \frac{\tau_1^2}{2}M_3 + \frac{\tau_2^2}{2}M_4 + \tau_1T_{12} + \tau_1V_{22}, \\
\Omega_{6,13} &= PA, \Omega_{6,14} = PB, \Omega_{7,7} = -W_1, \Omega_{8,8} = -W_2, \Omega_{9,9} = -\frac{2}{\tau_1}M_4, \\
\Omega_{9,10} &= -\frac{2}{\tau_1}M_4, \Omega_{10,10} = \frac{2}{\tau_1}M_3, \Omega_{11,11} = -\frac{2}{\tau_2}M_4, \Omega_{11,12} = -\frac{2}{\tau_2}M_4, \\
\Omega_{12,12} &= -\frac{2}{\tau_2}M_4, \Omega_{13,13} = -U_1, \Omega_{14,14} = nS^TPS + \mu I - U_2, \Omega_{15,15} = -U_3,
\end{align*}
$$

$$
|\alpha| = \text{diag}\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_{i1}|, \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_{i2}|, \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_{in}| \right\},
$$

$$
|\beta| = \text{diag}\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\beta_{i1}|, \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\beta_{i2}|, \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\beta_{in}| \right\},
$$

$$
S = |\alpha| + |\beta|, \Sigma_1 = \text{diag}\left\{ l_1^+, \ldots, l_n^+ \right\}, \Sigma_2 = \text{diag}\left\{ \frac{l_1 + l_1^+}{2}, \ldots, \frac{l_n + l_n^+}{2} \right\},
$$

$$
\Gamma^T = \left[ \begin{array}{ccccccccccccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & (PS)^T & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right]^T.
$$

Moreover, the controller gain matrix $H = P^{-1}Q_0$.

Proof. Consider the following Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional

$$V(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{6} V_i(t),$$

(27)

where

$$
\begin{align*}
V_1(t) &= e^T(t)Pe(t), \\
V_2(t) &= \int_{t-\tau_1}^{t} e^T(s)Q_1e(s)ds + \int_{t-\tau_2}^{t} e^T(s)Q_2e(s)ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t-\tau_1}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)W_1\dot{e}(s)ds + \int_{t-\tau_2}^{t} \dot{e}^T(s)W_2\dot{e}(s)ds,
\end{align*}
$$
\[ V_3(t) = \int_{\tau_1}^{t} e^T(s) M_1 \dot{e}(s) ds \theta + \int_{\tau_2}^{t} e^T(s) M_2 \dot{e}(s) ds \theta, \]
\[ V_4(t) = \int_{\tau_1}^{t} \int_{\lambda}^{t} e^T(s) M_3 \dot{e}(s) ds \lambda ds \theta + \int_{\tau_2}^{t} \int_{\lambda}^{t} e^T(s) M_4 \dot{e}(s) ds \lambda ds \theta, \]
\[ V_5(t) = \int_{\tau_1}^{t} \int_{\theta}^{t} \left[ \begin{array}{c} e(\theta - \tau_1(\theta)) \\ e(\theta - \tau_2(\theta)) \end{array} \right] ^T \left[ \begin{array}{cc} T_{11} & T_{12} \\ T_{12} & T_{22} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} e(\theta - \tau_1(\theta)) \\ e(\theta - \tau_2(\theta)) \end{array} \right] ds \theta + \int_{\tau_1}^{t} \int_{\theta}^{t} \left[ \begin{array}{c} e(\theta - \tau_1(\theta)) \\ e(\theta - \tau_2(\theta)) \end{array} \right] ^T \left[ \begin{array}{cc} V_{11} & V_{12} \\ V_{12} & V_{22} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} e(\theta - \tau_1(\theta)) \\ e(\theta - \tau_2(\theta)) \end{array} \right] ds \theta, \]
\[ V_6(t) = \int_{\tau_1}^{t} \int_{\lambda}^{t} e^T(s) \theta \dot{e}(s) ds \theta + \int_{\tau_2}^{t} \int_{\lambda}^{t} e^T(s) \theta \dot{e}(s) ds \theta. \]

By calculating the time derivation of \( V_i(t) \) along the trajectory of system (25), we obtain
\[
V_i(t) \leq 2e^T(t)P \left[ -D(e(t) - H(e(t - \tau_2(t)) + A \eta(e(t)) + B \eta(e(t - \tau_1(t))) \right] \\
+ 2e^T(t)P \left( |\alpha| + |\beta| \right) g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) \\
\leq -2e^T(t)P D e(t) - 2e^T(t)Q_0 e(t - \tau_2(t)) + 2e^T(t)P A \eta(e(t)) + 2e^T(t)P B \\
\times g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) + e^T(t)P e(t) + g^T(e(t - \tau_1(t))) \left( |\alpha| + |\beta| \right) \left( |\alpha| + |\beta| \right) T \\
\times (|\alpha| + |\beta|) g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) + 2e^T(t)P \left[ -e(t) + \dot{e}(t) \right] \\
\leq -2e^T(t)P D e(t) - 2e^T(t)Q_0 e(t - \tau_2(t)) + 2e^T(t)P A \eta(e(t)) \\
+ 2e^T(t)P B g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) + e^T(t)P e(t) + n g^T(e(t - \tau_1(t))) \left( |\alpha| + |\beta| \right) \left( |\alpha| + |\beta| \right) T \\
\times (|\alpha| + |\beta|) g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) - 2e^T(t)P \dot{e}(t) - 2e^T(t)P D e(t) \\
-2e^T(t)Q_0 e(t - \tau_2(t)) + 2e^T(t)P A \eta(e(t)) + 2e^T(t)P B g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) \\
+ \mu^{-1} n e^T(t)P (|\alpha| + |\beta|) \left( (|\alpha| + |\beta|) \right)^T \dot{e}(t) \\
+ \mu \left( g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) \right)^T \left( g(e(t - \tau_1(t))) \right). \tag{28} \]

The proof of this remaining Corollary 3.4 is immediately follows from Theorem 3.1. \qed

Remark 3.5. LMI approach is used in Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.4. When the size of LMI is increased, the feasible solution of the LMI can be easily obtained by using the effective interior point algorithms in convex optimization technique and the LMI toolbox in MATLAB, however the computational time get increased.

4. Illustrative Examples

Example 4.1. Consider the drive chaotic FCNNs system
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_i(t) &= -d_i x_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} f_j(x_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} b_{ij} f_j(x_j(t - \tau_i(t))) + I_i + \sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^{t} k_j(s) f_j(x_j(s)) ds \quad &\text{if} \quad i \in \Lambda, \\
x_i(s) &= \phi_i(s), &\text{if} \quad s \in (-\infty, 0].
\end{align*}
\]
The simulation results can be described as follows. Figures 2-3 describe the chaotic behavior in phase space of the drive system (29) and the response system (30) with control input (31), respectively. Figures 4-7 show that the state trajectories and error trajectories of the drive system (29) and the response system (30) with control input (31) to be asymptotically synchronized and the error trajectories between the drive system (29) and the response system (30) without control input cannot be synchronized. One may observe that the drive system (29) and the response system (30) without control input cannot be synchronized. Figure 12 exhibits the response curve of control input $u(t)$.

The controller gain matrix $H$ is designed as follows:

$$ H = P^{-1}Q_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1996 & -0.0567 & 0.1983 \\ -0.0502 & 0.1075 & -0.1013 \\ 0.2500 & -0.1443 & 0.3667 \end{bmatrix}. $$

By Theorem 3.1, systems (29) and (30) are asymptotically synchronized. The simulation results are illustrated in the Figures 4-7, in which the controller designed in (31) is applied.

**Remark 4.2.** The simulation results can be described as follows. Figures 2-3 describe the chaotic behavior in phase space of the drive system (29) and the response system (30) with control input (31), respectively. Figures 4-7 show that the state trajectories and error trajectories of the drive system (29) and the response system (30) with control input (31) to be asymptotically synchronized. Figures 8-11 provide the state trajectories and the error trajectories between the drive system (29) and the response system (30) without control input. One may observe that the drive system (29) and the response system (30) without control input cannot be synchronized. Figure 12 exhibits the response curve of control input $u(t)$. The numerical simulations clearly verify the effectiveness of the developed sampled-data control approach to the synchronization of chaotic FCNNs with discrete and bounded distributed delays.
Example 4.3. [3] Consider the drive chaotic FCNNs system

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_i(t) &= -d_i x_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} f_j(x_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij} f_j(x_j(t - \tau_1(t))) + I_i + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} \int_{t-s}^{t} k_j(t-s)f_j(x_j(s))ds + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} \int_{-\infty}^{t} k_j(t-s)f_j(x_j(s))ds, \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[i \in \Lambda, \quad x_i(s) = \phi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty, 0]. \tag{32} \]
Figure 5. State Trajectories of Drive System (29) with State $x_2(t)$ and Response System (30) with State $y_2(t)$ Through Control Input (31), when $\tau_2 = 0.03$

Figure 6. State Trajectories of Drive System (29) with State $x_3(t)$ and Response System (30) with State $y_3(t)$ Through Control Input (31), when $\tau_2 = 0.03$

Figure 7. Convergence Dynamics of Errors Between Drive System (29) and Response System (30) with Control Input (31), when $\tau_2 = 0.03$
Figure 8. State Trajectories of Drive System (29) with State $x_1(t)$ and Response System (30) with State $y_1(t)$ without Control Input, when $\tau_2 = 0.03$.

Figure 9. State Trajectories of Drive System (29) with State $x_2(t)$ and Response System (30) with State $y_2(t)$ without Control Input, when $\tau_2 = 0.03$.

Figure 10. State Trajectories of Drive System (29) with State $x_3(t)$ and Response System (30) with State $y_3(t)$ without Control Input, when $\tau_2 = 0.03$.
with parameters defined as

\[
\phi(s) = (1,-1,-0.5)^T, \quad s \in (-\infty, 0], \quad f_j(x_j) = \frac{1}{2}(|x_j + 1| - |x_j - 1|), \quad j = 1,2,3, \\
I_i = 0, \quad i = 1,2,3, \quad \tau_1(t) = 0.04 |\sin(t)|, \\
A = \begin{bmatrix} 1.25 & -3.21 & -3.2 \\ -3.2 & 1.1 & -4.4 \\ -3.2 & 4.4 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 4.3 & -7.5 & -3 \\ -3 & 1.2 & -5 \\ -3.2 & 4.5 & -2.3 \end{bmatrix}, \\
D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha = \beta = \begin{bmatrix} -1/32 & -1/32 & 1/32 \\ -1/32 & -1/32 & 1/32 \\ -1/32 & -1/32 & 1/32 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

The corresponding response system is designed as

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{y}_i(t) &= -d_i y_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} f_j(y_j(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} f_j(y_j(t - \tau_1(t))) + I_i \\
&\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{t-\tau_1(t)} \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{ij} \int_s^{t-\tau_1(t)} k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds ds \\
&\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{t-\tau_1(t)} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} \int_s^{t-\tau_1(t)} k_j(t-s) f_j(y_j(s)) ds ds + u_i(t), \quad i \in \Lambda,
\end{align*}
\]

\[
y_i(s) = \varphi_i(s), \quad s \in (-\infty, 0],
\]

(33)

where \( u \) is given by (10) and the initial condition is

\[
\varphi(s) = (0.5, -0.7, -1)^T, \quad s \in (-\infty, 0].
\]

Moreover, the sampling period is taken as \( \tau_2 = 0.03 \). By using the Matlab LMI toolbox to solve the LMI (12) in Theorem 3.1, it can be found that the LMI is
feasible. Consequently, the controller gain matrix $H$ is designed as follows:

$$H = P^{-1}Q_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4592 & -0.0205 & 0.1853 \\ -0.0145 & 0.4107 & -0.1235 \\ 0.1805 & -0.1701 & 0.6363 \end{bmatrix}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

By Theorem 3.1, systems (32) and (33) are asymptotically synchronized. The simulation results are illustrated in the Figure 13, in which the controller designed in (34) is applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorem</th>
<th>Maximum allowable upper bound (MAUB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theorem 1 [3]</td>
<td>$\tau = 0.0534$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theorem 3.1</td>
<td>$\tau_1 = 0.0772$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The MAUB $\tau_1$ of Example 4.3

**Figure 13.** [3] State Trajectories and Error Trajectories of Drive System (32) and Response System (33) with Control Input (34), when $\tau_2 = 0.03$

**Remark 4.4.** The simulation results for comparison of [3] can be described as follows. Figure 13 shows that the state trajectories and error trajectories of the drive system (32) and the response system (33) with control input (34) to be asymptotically synchronized. Figure 14 provides the state trajectories and the error trajectories between the drive system (32) and the response system (33) without control input. One may observe that the drive system (32) and the response system (33) without control input cannot be synchronized.
5. Conclusions

In this paper, synchronization of chaotic FCNNs with discrete and unbounded distributed delays have been considered. Based on the sampled-data control techniques, Lyapunov stability theory and LMI approach, sufficient conditions have been developed to guarantee synchronization of coupled FCNNs. Moreover, the result is novel for synchronization of chaotic FCNNs with discrete and unbounded distributed delays based on the sampled-data control rather than existing literatures \[3, 12, 13, 24, 34, 35\]. Further, in the absence of unbounded distributed delay the results have been derived by employing a Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional and using the LMI approach based on the sampled-data control. The effectiveness of the proposed results and comparison have been demonstrated through two numerical examples and simulations well.

Moreover, impulsive effects may be unavoidable while implementing electronic networks in the cases of switching phenomenon, frequency change or other sudden noise etc. In future, the above results may be extended further with impulsive effects by using delay partitioning and convex combination technique to obtain less conservative results.
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