Abstract—In this paper, the exponential passivity criteria for BAM neural networks with time-varying delays is studied. By constructing new Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional and dividing the delay interval into multiple segments, a novel sufficient condition is established to guarantee the exponential stability of the considered system. Finally, a numerical example is provided to illustrate the usefulness of the proposed main results.
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I. INTRODUCTION

BIP-DIRECTIONAL associative memory (BAM) neural networks have been extensively studied in recent years due to its wide application in various areas such as image processing, automatic control, pattern recognition, and so on. Therefore, it is meaningful and important to study the BAM neural network. They were originally introduced by Kosko [1-3], have attracted many researchers. The problems of robust passivity, delay-dependent and stability have been well investigated; see, for example, [7,8,10-24] and references cited therein. Moreover, the problems of dissipativity of neural networks were proposed in [4,9].

Recently, the exponential passivity of neural networks with time-varying delays has been studied. A typical example of it is [5], where sufficient conditions have been obtained for considered neural networks to be exponential passivity. But in [5,6], the information of neuron activation functions and the involved time-varying delays has not been adequately considered, which may lead to some conservatism. In [7], the derivative of a time-varying delay be less than 1, but it is not necessary to consider the derivative of a time-varying delay less than 1.

As so far, the problems of exponential passivity of BAM neural networks with time-varying delays has not been widely studied, which motivates this work. In the present paper, we investigate the problem of delay-dependent exponential passivity for BAM neural networks with time-varying delays. The delay belongs to a given interval, and the restriction that the derivative of a time-varying delay be less than 1 is removed. A novel sufficient condition is established by dividing the delay interval into multiple segments and constructing new Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional which contains some new integral terms. Finally, in order to show the feasibility of the proposed criteria in this paper, a numerical example is considered.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider the following BAM neural networks with time-varying delays described by

$$\begin{align*}
\dot{x}(t) &= -Ax(t) + CF(y(t)) + Ef(y(t - h(t))) + \mu(t) \\
z_1(t) &= f(y(t)) + f(y(t - h(t))) + \mu(t) \\
\dot{y}(t) &= -Bg(t) + Dg(x(t)) + Fg(x(t - \varsigma(t))) + \nu(t) \\
z_2(t) &= g(x(t)) + g(x(t - \zeta(t))) + \nu(t)
\end{align*}$$

(1)

where $x(t) = [x_1(t), x_2(t), \ldots, x_n(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y(t) = [y_1(t), y_2(t), \ldots, y_n(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$. $A$ and $B$ are the external input vectors; $g(x(t)) = [g_1(x_1(t)), g_2(x_2(t)), \ldots, g_n(x_n(t))]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f(y(t)) = [f_1(y_1(t)), f_2(y_2(t)), \ldots, f_n(y_n(t))]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the neuron activation functions; $C$, $D$, $E$ and $F$ are the delayed connection weight matrices; $a(t)$ and $b(t)$ are the external input vector to neurons; $z_1(t)$ and $z_2(t)$ are the output vector of neural networks.

The following assumptions are adopted throughout the paper.

Assumption 1: The delay $h(t)$ and $\varsigma(t)$ are time-varying continuous functions and satisfies:

$$0 \leq \varsigma(t) \leq \varsigma, \varsigma(t) \leq \varsigma_D, 0 \leq h(t) \leq h, h(t) \leq h_D$$

where $\varsigma, h, \varsigma_D$ and $h_D$ are constants.

Assumption 2: Neuron activation function $g_i(\cdot)$, $f_i(\cdot)$ in (1) satisfies the following condition:

$$\begin{align*}
\delta_i^- \leq & \frac{f_i(\alpha) - f_i(\beta)}{\alpha - \beta} \leq \delta_i^+ \\
\sigma_i^- \leq & \frac{g_i(\alpha) - g_i(\beta)}{\alpha - \beta} \leq \sigma_i^+
\end{align*}$$

(3)

Thus, under this assumption, the following inequalities hold for $\alpha, \beta \in R, \alpha \neq \beta, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. $\Sigma^+ = diag\{\delta_1^+, \delta_2^+, \ldots, \delta_n^+\}, \Sigma^- = diag\{\delta_1^-, \delta_2^-, \ldots, \delta_n^-\}, \Gamma^+ = diag\{\sigma_1^+, \sigma_2^+, \ldots, \sigma_n^+\}, \Gamma^- = diag\{\sigma_1^-, \sigma_2^-, \ldots, \sigma_n^-\}$.
any diagonal matrices $R_1, R_2 > 0$
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
&y^T(t)\Sigma_1 y(t) - f^T(y(t))R_1 f(y(t)) \geq 0 \\
&\bar{\Gamma} R_2 \bar{\Gamma} y(t) - y^T(x(t)) R_2 y(x(t)) \geq 0
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
where
\[\Sigma = \text{diag}\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots, \delta_n\}, \quad \delta_i = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{ |\delta_i^+|, |\delta_i^-| \}, \]
\[\Gamma = \text{diag}\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_n\}, \quad \sigma_i = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{ |\sigma_i^+|, |\sigma_i^-| \} \]

**Definition 1** The system (1) is said to be exponentially passive from input if there exists an exponential Lyapunov function $V(x,y_i)$, and a constant $\rho > 0$ such that for all $\mu(t)$ and $\nu(t)$, all initial conditions $(x(t_0))$ and $(y(t_0))$, all $t \geq t_0$, the following inequality holds:
\[\dot{V}(x(t), y_i) + \rho V(x(t), y_i) \leq 2(\varepsilon_1)^T(t) \mu(t) + \varepsilon_2^T(t) \nu(t)), \quad t \geq t_0 \]
where $\dot{V}(x(t), y_i)$ denotes the total derivative of $V(x(t), y_i)$ along the state trajectories $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ of system (1).

**Lemma 1** [26]. The following inequalities are true:
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \int_0^{y_1(t)} (f_i(s) - \delta^-_i s) ds \leq (f_i(y_1(t)) - \delta^-_i y_1(t)) y_1(t) \tag{5}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \int_0^{y_2(t)} (\delta^+_i s - f_i(s)) ds \leq (\delta^+_i y_2(t) - f_i(y_2(t))) y_2(t) \tag{6}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

**Lemma 2** (Schur complement [25]). For any constant matrix $H_1, H_2, H_3$, where $H_1 = H_1^T$ and $H_2 = H_2^T > 0$. Then
\[H_1 + H_3^T H^{-1}_3 H_3 < 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \begin{bmatrix} H_3 & H_1 \\ H_1^T & H_3^T \end{bmatrix} < 0 \]

**III. MAIN RESULTS**

In this section, a new exponential passivity criterion for BAM neural networks with time-varying delays system is obtained. For representation convenience, the following notations are introduced:
\[\dot{x}(t) = x(t - (\tau_1(t)), \dot{y}(t) = y(t - h(t)) \]
\[\Sigma_1 = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{\delta^+_1 + \delta^-_1}{2}, \frac{\delta^+_2 + \delta^-_2}{2}, \ldots, \frac{\delta^+_n + \delta^-_n}{2} \right\} \]
\[\Sigma_2 = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{\delta^+_1 - \delta^-_1}{2}, \frac{\delta^+_2 - \delta^-_2}{2}, \ldots, \frac{\delta^+_n - \delta^-_n}{2} \right\} \]
\[\Gamma_1 = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{\varsigma^+_1 + \varsigma^-_1}{2}, \frac{\varsigma^+_2 + \varsigma^-_2}{2}, \ldots, \frac{\varsigma^+_n + \varsigma^-_n}{2} \right\} \]
\[\Gamma_2 = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{\varsigma^+_1 - \varsigma^-_1}{2}, \frac{\varsigma^+_2 - \varsigma^-_2}{2}, \ldots, \frac{\varsigma^+_n - \varsigma^-_n}{2} \right\} \]
\[\xi^T(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x^T(t), x^T(t - \tau_1(t)), x^T(t - \frac{2h}{3}), y^T(t), \mu^T(t), y^T(t - h(t)), y^T(t - \frac{h}{3}), g^T(\dot{x}(t)), g^T(y(t)), \mu^T(t), y^T(t - \frac{h}{3}) \end{bmatrix} \]
\[f^T(\dot{y}(t)), \nu^T(t) \]

**Theorem 1** Given that the Assumption 1-2 hold, the system (1) is exponentially passive if there exist symmetric positive definite matrices $P_i, Q_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6, G$. The positive diagonal matrices $W_{ij}, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and $\rho > 0$, and a constant $\rho > 0$, such that the following LMIs hold:
\[\begin{bmatrix}
E_1 & \bar{P}_6 & \bar{T}_4 & \bar{P}_4 \\
\bar{P}_6 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\bar{T}_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\bar{P}_4 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} < 0 \tag{7}
\]
\[\begin{bmatrix}
P_3 & T_1 & \bar{P}_4 \\
T_1 & 0 & 0 \\
\bar{P}_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix} > 0 \tag{8}
\]
\[\begin{bmatrix}
P_3 & T_2 & \bar{P}_4 \\
T_2 & 0 & 0 \\
\bar{P}_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix} > 0 \tag{9}
\]
\[\begin{bmatrix}
P_3 & T_3 & \bar{P}_6 \\
T_3 & 0 & 0 \\
\bar{P}_6 & 0 \end{bmatrix} > 0 \tag{10}
\]
\[\begin{bmatrix}
P_3 & T_4 & \bar{P}_6 \\
T_4 & 0 & 0 \\
\bar{P}_6 & 0 \end{bmatrix} > 0 \tag{11}
\]
where
\[E_1 = [E_{ij}] (i,j = 1, 2, \ldots, 16) \]
\[\mathbb{N} = [-A, 0_{n \times 2n}, C, E, I], \quad \mathbb{I} = [0_{n \times 5n}, D, F, I, -B, 0_{n \times 7n}] \]
\[\bar{P}_1 = h \bar{P}_4, \bar{P}_5 = \varsigma \bar{P}_6 \]
\[r(\varsigma_D) = \begin{cases} - (1 - \varsigma_D) e^{-\rho h}, & \text{if } \varsigma_D \leq 1 \\
- (1 - \varsigma_D), & \text{if } \varsigma_D > 1 \end{cases} \]
\[r(\varsigma_D) = \begin{cases} - (1 - \varsigma_D) e^{-\rho h}, & \text{if } \varsigma_D \leq 1 \\
- (1 - h_D), & \text{if } h_D > 1 \end{cases} \]
\[E_{11} = \rho P_1 - P_1 A - AP_1 + 2G_L - L_1 A - 2G^L L_2 A + GR_2 G + G_{11} - 2G_{12} G - 2G_{13} G + G_{22} G - 2G_{23} G + G_{33} G - 2G_{33} G + 2G_{13} G + Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 + \varsigma P_3 e^{\rho h} T_3 - 2P_1 \mathbb{L} + 2P_1 L + \bar{G}_2 W_3 \]
\[E_{16} = -L_1 A + L_2 A + G_{12} - G_{13} - G_{22} - G_{23} + G_{23} G - 2G_{23} G + \rho L_1 - \rho L_2 + \bar{G}_1 W_3 \]
\[E_{18} = P_1 - G_{-L_1} - G_{L_2} \]
\[E_{1,14} = P_1 C - L_1 C + G^L L_2 C \]
\[E_{1,15} = P_1 E - L_1 E + G^L L_2 E \]
\[E_{1,22} = -e^{-\rho h} Q_1, \quad E_{33} = -e^{-\rho h} Q_2 \]
\[E_{1,44} = -e^{-\rho h} (Q_3 - T_4) \]
\[E_{1,55} = r(\varsigma_D)(G_{R_2 G} + G_{11} - 2G_{12} G - 2G_{13} G + G_{22} G - 2G_{23} G + G_{33} G) - \bar{G}_2 W_4 + e^{\rho h} (T_3 - T_4) \]
\[ E_{17} = r(\varsigma(t)) (G_{12} - G_{13} - \Gamma - G_{22} + G_{13} + G_{32} + G_{33} - G_{23} - G_{31}) + \Gamma W \]

\[ E_{18} = -R_2 + G_{22} - 2G_{23} + G_{33} - W_3 \]

\[ E_{18} = L_1 - L_2, E_{09} = D^T P_2 = D^T K_1 \Sigma_+ + D^T K_2 \Sigma_+ \]

\[ E_{14,14} = I_1 - C + D^T K_1 - D^T K_2, E_{0,15} = L_1 E - L_4 E \]

\[ E_{0,16} = I, E_{17} = r(\varsigma(t)) (-R_2 + G_{22} - 2G_{23} + G_{33}) - W_4 \]

\[ E_{1,9} = F^T P_2 - F^T K_1 \Sigma_+ + F^T K_2 \Sigma_+ \]

\[ E_{1,14} = F^T K_1 - F^T K_2, E_{1,16} = -I \]

\[ E_{3,11} = -2I, E_{3,14} = -I, E_{3,15} = -I \]

\[ E_{3,19} = \rho P_3 - P_3 B = -B P_3 + 2\Sigma_- K_1 B - 2 \Sigma_+ K_2 B \]

\[ + \Sigma_1 R_1 \Sigma + M_{11} - 2M_{12} \Sigma_+ + 2M_{13} \Sigma_+ \]

\[ + \Sigma_2 R_2 \Sigma + M_{21} + \Sigma_3 \Sigma_+ \]

\[ - 2\Sigma_- M_{23} \Sigma_+ + 2\Sigma_+ M_{31} \Sigma_+ + Q_4 + Q_5 + Q_6 + h P_3 \]

\[ - e^{-\rho T} T_1 - 2p \Sigma_- K_1 + 2p \Sigma_+ K_2 - \Sigma_+ W_4 \]

\[ E_{3,14} = -B^T K_1 + BK_2 + M_{12} - M_{13} - \Sigma_- M_{22} + \Sigma_- M_{23} + \Sigma_+ M_{23} - \Sigma_- M_{33} + \Sigma_+ M_{33} + \Sigma_1 W_1 + \rho (K_1 - K_2) \]

\[ E_{0,16} = P_2 - \Sigma_- K_1 + \Sigma_+ K_2, E_{10,10} = -e^{-\frac{\rho}{2} T} Q_4 \]

\[ E_{1,11,11} = -e^{-\frac{\rho}{2} T} Q_5, E_{12,12} = -e^{-\rho (Q_6 - T_2)} \]

\[ E_{1,13,13} = r(\varsigma(t)) (\Sigma_1 R_1 \Sigma + M_{11} - 2M_{12} \Sigma_+ + 2M_{13} \Sigma_+ \]

\[ + \Sigma_- M_{22} \Sigma_+ - \Sigma_+ M_{23} \Sigma_+ + \Sigma_+ M_{33} \Sigma_+ \]

\[ - \Sigma_- W_4 + e^{-\rho T} (T_1 - T_2) \]

\[ E_{1,13,13} = r(\varsigma(t)) (M_{12} - M_{13} - \Sigma_- M_{22} + \Sigma_- M_{23} + \Sigma_+ M_{23} - \Sigma_+ M_{33} + \Sigma_1 W_1 \]

\[ E_{14,14} = -R_1 + M_{23} - 2M_{23} + M_{33} - W_1 \]

\[ E_{15,15} = \bar{r}(h_D) (-R_1 + M_{22} - 2M_{23} + M_{33}) \]

\[ E_{16,16} = K_1 - K_2, E_{16,16} = -2I \]

All other terms are 0.

**Proof:** Construct a new class of Lyapunov functional candidate as follow:

\[ V(x_{t}, y_{t}) = \sum_{i=1}^{6} V_i(x_{t}, y_{t}) \]

with

\[ V_1(x_{t}, y_{t}) = x^T (t) P_1 x(t) + y^T (t) P_2 y(t) \]

\[ V_2(x_{t}, y_{t}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} r^{y_i(t)} \left[ k_{2i} (f_i(s) - \delta_- s) + k_{2} (\delta_+ s - f_i(s)) \right] ds \]

\[ + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{t}^{s} e_{2i}^{x(t)} \left[ l_{2i} (g_i(s) - \sigma_- s) + l_{2i} (\sigma_+ s - g_i(s)) \right] ds \]

\[ V_3(x_{t}, y_{t}) = \int_{t-h(t)}^{t} \varphi^y(t) S_1 R_1 y(t) - f^y(t) R_1 f(y(t)) \]

\[ + \int_{t-c(t)}^{t} \varphi^x(t) R_2 x(t) - f^x(t) R_2 f(x(t)) \]

\[ V_4(x_{t}, y_{t}) = \int_{t-h(t)}^{t} \varphi^y(t) M_1 f(y(t)) - M_2 f(y(t)) \]

\[ - \int_{t-c(t)}^{t} \varphi^x(t) M_3 y(t) - M_2 y(t) \]

\[ + \int_{t}^{t} \varphi^x(t) Q_3 x(t) \]

\[ + \int_{t}^{t} \varphi^y(t) Q_5 y(t) \]

\[ \left[ \varphi(x(t)) - \Gamma^T x(t) \right] + \left[ \varphi(y(t)) - \Gamma^T y(t) \right] \]

\[ \left[ \varphi(x(t)) - \Gamma^T x(t) \right] \]

\[ V_5(x_{t}, y_{t}) = \int_{t-h(t)}^{t} \varphi^y(t) Q_3 y(t) \]

\[ + \int_{t-c(t)}^{t} \varphi^x(t) Q_4 x(t) \]

\[ + \int_{t}^{t} \varphi^x(t) Q_5 x(t) \]

\[ \int_{t-c(t)}^{t} \varphi^y(t) Q_4 y(t) \]

\[ \int_{t}^{t} \varphi^x(t) Q_3 x(t) \]

\[ \int_{t}^{t} \varphi^y(t) Q_5 y(t) \]

where

\[ \varphi = e^{-\rho (t-s)} \]

\[ M = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & M_{13} \\ * & M_{22} & M_{23} \\ * & * & M_{33} \end{bmatrix}, G = \begin{bmatrix} G_{11} & G_{12} & G_{13} \\ * & G_{22} & G_{23} \\ * & * & G_{33} \end{bmatrix} \]

Then, taking the derivative of \( V(x_{t}, y_{t}) \) with respect to \( t \) along the system (1) yields

\[ \dot{V}_1(x_{t}, y_{t}) = 2x^T (t) P_1 \dot{x}(t) + 2y^T (t) P_2 \dot{y}(t) \]

\[ \dot{V}_2(x_{t}, y_{t}) = 2f^T (t) \Sigma_1 K_1 y(t) \]

\[ + 2g^T (t) \Sigma_1 K_2 \dot{y}(t) \]

\[ + 2g^T (t) (x(t)) - f^T (t) \Gamma_1 \dot{x}(t) \]

\[ + 2x^T (t) \Gamma_1 \dot{x}(t) \]

\[ \dot{V}_3(x_{t}, y_{t}) = -\rho V_3 + x^T (t) \Gamma R_2 x(t) - g^T (x(t)) R_2 g(x(t)) \]

\[ + r(\varsigma(t)) (\Sigma_1 R_2 \Sigma_1 x(t) - g^T (x(t)) R_2 g(x(t))) \]

\[ + \bar{r}(h_D) (\bar{\Sigma}_1 R_1 x(t) - f^T (y(t)) R_1 f(y(t))) \]

\[ + \bar{r}(h_D) (\bar{\Sigma}_1 R_1 x(t) - f^T (y(t)) R_1 f(y(t))) \]

\[ + \bar{r}(h_D) (\bar{\Sigma}_1 R_1 x(t) - f^T (y(t)) R_1 f(y(t))) \]
\[
\dot{V}_4(x_t, y_t) \leq -\rho V_5 + x^T(t) (Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3)x(t) \\
- e^{-\frac{2\omega}{3}} x^T (t - \frac{2\omega}{3}) Q_2 x (t - \frac{2\omega}{3}) \\
- e^{-\omega} x^T (t - \frac{3}{3}) Q_3 x (t - \frac{3}{3}) \\
y^T (t) (Q_4 + Q_5 + Q_6) y (t) \\
- e^{-\frac{2\mu}{3}} y^T (t - \frac{2\mu}{3}) (Q_4 y (t) - \frac{2\mu}{3}) \\
- e^{-\rho y} x^T (t - h) Q_6 y (t - h)
\]

Here, using Lemma 1, we have
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{\rho_i(t)} \left[ k_{i_1} f_i(s) - \delta_i s + k_{i_2} (\delta_i s - f_i(s)) \right] ds \\
\leq \left( f(y(t)) - \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} y_i(t) \right)^T K_1 y(t) + \left( \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} y_i(t) - f(y(t)) \right)^T K_2 y(t) \\
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{x_i(t)} \left[ l_{i_1} g_i(s) - \sigma_i s + l_{i_2} (\sigma_i s - g_i(s)) \right] ds \\
\leq (g(x(t)) - \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} x_i(t))^T L_1 x(t) + (\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} x_i(t) - g(x(t)))^T L_2 x(t)
\]

From (3), we can get that there exist positive diagonal matrices \( W_1, W_2, W_3, W_4 \) such that the following inequalities holds:
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  y(t)^T \\
  f(y(t))
\end{bmatrix} \\
\begin{bmatrix}
  -\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} W_1 & \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} W_1 \\
  * & -W_1
\end{bmatrix} \\
\begin{bmatrix}
  y(t) \\
  f(y(t))
\end{bmatrix} \geq 0
\]
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  y(t)^T \\
  f(y(t))
\end{bmatrix} \\
\begin{bmatrix}
  -\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} W_2 & \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} W_2 \\
  * & -W_2
\end{bmatrix} \\
\begin{bmatrix}
  y(t) \\
  f(y(t))
\end{bmatrix} \geq 0
\]

From (12)-(27), we can get
\[
\dot{V}(x_t, y_t) + \rho V(x_t, y_t) - 2\mu_1 \dot{t}(t) \mu(t) - 2\mu_2 \dot{t}(t) \nu(t) \\
\leq \xi^T(t) (E^2 + \beta^T P_{\bar{S}} \beta + 3T P_{\bar{S}} \xi(t)) \\
- \int_{t-h(t)}^{t} \left[ y(s)^T (P_3 T_1 \xi(s)) * P_3 \xi(s) \right] ds \\
- \int_{t-h(t)}^{t} \left[ y(s)^T (P_3 T_1 \xi(s)) * P_3 \xi(s) \right] ds \\
- \int_{t-h(t)}^{t} \left[ x(s)^T (P_3 T_3 \xi(s)) * P_3 \xi(s) \right] ds \\
- \int_{t-h(t)}^{t} \left[ x(s)^T (P_3 T_3 \xi(s)) * P_3 \xi(s) \right] ds
\]

Using Lemma 2 and (7)-(11), we can get
\[
\dot{V}(x_t, y_t) + \rho V(x_t, y_t) \leq 2\xi^T(t) \mu(t) - 2\mu_2 \dot{t}(t) \nu(t)
\]

Based on Definition 1, the system (1) is guaranteed to be exponential passivity, which complete the proof.

**Remark 1**

Firstly, in this paper, the restriction that the derivative of a time-varying delay be less than 1 is removed. Secondly, dividing the delay interval \([0, h]\) into three different ones \([0, \frac{h}{3}], [\frac{h}{3}, \frac{2h}{3}], [\frac{2h}{3}, h]\) and \([0, \frac{h}{3}], [\frac{h}{3}, \frac{2h}{3}], [\frac{2h}{3}, h]\), respectively, and constructing new Lyapunov functional which contains some new integral terms. It have potential to yield less conservative results.

**Remark 2**

Theorem 1 reduces to the LMIs exponential stability condition for delayed BAM neural networks if the \(\mu(t) = 0\) and \(\nu(t) = 0\).
Next, we consider the special case of the system (1) with 
\( \mu(t) = 0, \nu(t) = 0 \).

**Corollary 1** Given that the Assumption 1-2 hold, the system
(1) is exponentially passive if there exist symmetric positive definite matrices \( P_i, Q_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6 \), \( G, M \), positive
diagonal matrices \( W_{ij}, j = 1, 2, 3, 4, R_1, R_2, K_1 =
diag(k_{11}, k_{21}, \ldots, k_{n1}), L_i = \text{diag}\{l_{11}, l_{21}, \ldots, l_{ni}\} i = 1, 2, \) any symmetric matrix \( T_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \)
and a constant \( \rho > 0 \) such that the following LMIs hold:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
F^1 & \mathbf{K}^T \mathbf{P}_6 & 3\mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{P}_4 & 0 \\
* & -\mathbf{P}_6 & 0 & 0 \\
* & * & -\mathbf{P}_4 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix} < 0
\]

(28)

\[
F^1_{3,13} = L_1 C - L_2 C + D^T K_1 - D^T K_2, F^1_{6,14} = L_1 E - L_2 E
\]

\[
F^1_{1,1} = r(\gamma_p)(-R_2 + G_{22} - 2G_{23} + G_{33}) - W_4
\]

\[
F^1_{7,8} = F^T P_2 - F^T K_1 \Sigma_+ + F^T K_2 \Sigma^+
\]

where

\[
\mathbf{N}_1 = [-A, 0_{n \times 1}, C, E], \mathbf{Z}_1 = [0_{n \times 5n}, D, F, B, 0_{n \times 6n}]
\]

\[
F^i = \{F^i(z) \ (i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, 14)\}
\]

\[
F^1 = \mathbf{P}_1 - \mathbf{P}_1 A - \mathbf{AP}_1 + 2\Sigma_+ L_1 - 2\Sigma_+ L_2 + \mathbf{P}_1 \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{G}^T
\]

\[
+ G_{11} - 2G_{12}\Sigma - 2G_{13}\Sigma^+ + \mathbf{G}_{22}\Sigma - 2\Sigma_+ G_{23}\Sigma^+
\]

\[
+ \mathbf{G}^T G_{33} \Sigma^+ + \mathbf{Q}_1 + \mathbf{Q}_2 + \mathbf{Q}_3 + \mathbf{c} \mathbf{P}_5 - e^{-\rho t} T_3
\]

\[
- 2\rho G_{13} L_1 + 2\rho G_{12} L_2 - \mathbf{P}_3 W_3
\]

\[
F^1 = -L_1 A + L_2 A - G_{12} - G_{13} - \Sigma_+ G_{22} + \Sigma_+ G_{23}
\]

\[
+ \Sigma_+ G_{33} + \mathbf{P}_1 L_1 - \rho L_2 + \mathbf{P}_3 W_3
\]

\[
F^1_{1,14} = P_1 E - \Sigma_+ L_1 E + \Sigma_+ L_2 E
\]

\[
F^1_{2,2} = -e^{-\rho t} Q_4, F^1_{3,3} = -e^{-2\rho t} Q_2
\]

\[
F^1_{4,4} = -e^{-\rho t} (Q_5 - T_4)
\]

\[
F^1_{5,5} = r(\gamma_p)(\mathbf{G}_2 \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{G} + G_{11} - 2G_{12}\Sigma - 2G_{13}\Sigma^+ + \mathbf{G}_{22}\Sigma - 2\Sigma_+ G_{23}\Sigma^+
\]

\[
+ \mathbf{G}^T G_{33} \Sigma^+ + \mathbf{Q}_1 + \mathbf{Q}_2 + \mathbf{Q}_3 + \mathbf{c} \mathbf{P}_5 - e^{-\rho t} (T_3 - T_4)
\]

\[
F^1_{6,6} = -R_2 + G_{22} - 2G_{23} + G_{33} - W_3
\]

\[
F^1_{7,8} = F^T P_2 - F^T K_1 \Sigma_+ + F^T K_2 \Sigma^+
\]

\[
F^1_{9,9} = -e^{-\rho t} Q_4
\]

Proof: The proof of the Corollary 1 is consequence of
Theorem 1 by choosing \( \mu(t) = 0, \nu(t) = 0 \). Hence the proof
is omitted.

**Remark 3** In this paper, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 require
the upper bound \( h_{D, \mathbf{SD}} \) to be known. However, in many cases
\( h_{D, \mathbf{SD}} \) is unknown, considering this situation, we can set
\( R_i = 0, (i = 1, 2) \), \( M = G = 0 \) in \( V(x, y) \), and employ
the same methods in Theorem 1 and Corollary 1, we can derive
the delay-dependent and delay-derivative-independent
exponential passivity criteria.
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IV. EXAMPLE

In this section, we provide an example to demonstrate the effectiveness and feasibility of our results.

Example 1 Consider the BAM neural networks with the following parameters:

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix} 1.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 2.2 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 2.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 2.2 \end{bmatrix}, C = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
D = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.1 \end{bmatrix}, E = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}, F = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.4 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\Sigma^+ = \text{diag}\{0.1, 0.1\}, \Sigma^- = \text{diag}\{-0.1, -0.1\},
\]

\[
\Gamma^+ = \text{diag}\{1, 1\}, \Gamma^- = \text{diag}\{-1, -1\},
\]

and \( f_1(s) = \tanh(-0.7s) \), \( f_2(s) = \tanh(0.2s) \),

\( g_1(s) = \tanh(-0.2s) \), \( g_2(s) = \tanh(-0.8s) \)

\( h(t) = 0.8\cos t, \varsigma(t) = 0.8\sin t \).

In Table I, we consider the case of \( h = \varsigma = n_1, h_D = \varsigma_D = n_2 \), the upper bound of \( \rho \) is derived by Theorem 1 and Corollary 1. According to Table II, we can know the maximum values of \( \rho \) for various \( h, \varsigma \) and unknown \( h_D, \varsigma_D \). By using the Matlab LMI toolbox, we solve LMI(s) (7)-(11), for the case of \( h = \varsigma = 0.6, \varsigma_D = h_D = 0.7, \rho = 1.028 \), and obtain

\[
P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2.9045 & -0.0637 \\ -0.0637 & 3.1610 \end{bmatrix}, P_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7688 & 0.1800 \\ 0.1800 & 0.4953 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
P_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4171 & 0.2033 \\ 0.2033 & 1.061 \end{bmatrix}, P_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.2005 & 0.1067 \\ 0.1067 & 0.0829 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
P_5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4354 & -0.1857 \\ -0.1857 & 2.8541 \end{bmatrix}, P_6 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.5861 & 0.1032 \\ 0.1032 & 0.2407 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
Q_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0011 & -0.0130 \\ -0.0130 & 0.1691 \end{bmatrix}, Q_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0113 & -0.0011 \\ -0.0011 & 0.1691 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
Q_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8193 & -0.0038 \\ -0.0038 & 0.8689 \end{bmatrix}, Q_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1185 & 0.0571 \\ 0.0571 & 0.0279 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
Q_5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1183 & 0.0274 \\ 0.0274 & 0.0450 \end{bmatrix}, Q_6 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0808 & 0.0389 \\ 0.0389 & 0.0190 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0027 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.0027 \end{bmatrix}, K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0026 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.0026 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
R_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3472 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.3472 \end{bmatrix}, R_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7006 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.7006 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
L_1 = 1.0 \times 10^{-3} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0.1101 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.1101 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
L_2 = 1.0 \times 10^{-3} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0.1094 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.1094 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
M = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0011 & -0.0130 \\ -0.0130 & 0.1691 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
G = \begin{bmatrix} -0.4354 & -0.1857 \\ -0.1857 & 2.8541 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix} -0.1094 & 0.1094 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]

The state trajectories of variables \( x(t) \) and \( y(t) \) with the initial condition \( x^T(t) = [1, -1]^T \) and \( y^T(t) = [2, -2]^T \) are shown in Fig. 1.

Fig. 1. The state response of system (1) in Example 1.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the issues of delay-dependent exponential passivity analysis is investigated for BAM neural networks with time-varying delays. The obtained criteria are less conservative because a bounding technique of integral terms with free-weighting matrices in different delay intervals is utilized. Finally, for this problem, one example is provided to show the feasibility of the proposed criteria in this paper.
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