A Direct Proof of a Theorem Concerning Singular Hamiltonian Systems

G. Marro

Dipartimento di Elettronica, Informatica e Sistemistica, Università di Bologna Viale Risorgimento 2, 40136 Bologna - Italy

E-mail: giovanni.marro@unibo.it

Abstract

This technical report presents a direct proof of Theorem 1 in [1] and some consequences that also account for (20) in [1]. This direct proof exploits a state space change of basis which replaces the coupled difference equations (10) in [1] with two equivalent difference equations which, instead, are decoupled.

I. INTRODUCTION

Theorem 1 in [1] provides in (19) the set of the admissible solutions (x_k, p_k, u_k) of the singular Hamiltonian system (10) defined on the discrete-time interval $0 \le k \le k_f - 1$. The proof therein presented is twofold: sufficiency is shown by direct replacement of (19) in (10); necessity relies on maximality of the involved structural invariant subspaces, as it is deducible from Properties 1 and 2. In the following, it will be shown that a direct proof, which does not distinguish between the *if* and the *only-if* part, but extensively uses relations pointed out in [1], is also feasible. The main point of the direct proof is replacing the coupled difference equations (10) in [1] with two decoupled difference equations by means of a suitable state space basis transformation. The direct proof herein presented can also be used to prove (20) in [1], that expresses the set of the admissible solutions (x_k, p_k) of the same Hamiltonian system in the extended time interval $0 \le k \le k_f$.

II. DIRECT PROOF OF RELATION (20) AND THEOREM 1 IN [1]

The direct proof is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 1: The problem of finding the sequences x_k , p_k , and u_k , with $0 \le k \le k_f - 1$, that solve the equations (10) of [1], or, equivalently,

$$x_{k+1} = A x_k + B u_k, \tag{1}$$

$$-A^{\top} p_{k+1} = Q x_k - p_k + S u_k, \tag{2}$$

$$-B^{\top} p_{k+1} = S^{\top} x_k + R u_k, \tag{3}$$

with $0 \le k \le k_f - 1$, can be reduced to that of finding the sequences v_k and w_k that solve the pair of decoupled difference equations

$$v_{k+1} = A_+ v_k, (4)$$

$$A_{+}^{\top} w_{k+1} = w_k, \tag{5}$$

with $0 \le k \le k_f - 1$, where A_+ is defined by (14) in [1], provided that the following correspondences are set up

$$x_k = v_k + W w_k, (6)$$

$$p_k = P_+ v_k + (-I + P_+ W) w_k, (7)$$

$$u_k = -K_+ v_k + \bar{K}_+ w_{k+1}, \tag{8}$$

where P_+ is the positive semidefinite symmetric solution of (11)–(12) in [1], W is the solution of the symmetric discrete Lyapunov equation (15), K_+ , and \bar{K}_+ are defined by (13) and (17).

Proof: First, the following relation will be shown:

$$-W + B\bar{K}_{+} = -AWA_{\perp}^{\mathsf{T}}.\tag{9}$$

Use of (17) in [1] yields the identity

$$-W + B\bar{K}_{+} = -W + B(R + B^{T}P_{+}B)^{-1}(B^{T} - B^{T}P_{+}AWA_{+}^{T} - S^{T}WA_{+}^{T}) =$$

and, by applying distributivity of the product with respect to the sum,

$$= -W + B (R + B^{\top} P_{+} B)^{-1} B^{\top} - B (R + B^{\top} P_{+} B)^{-1} B^{\top} P_{+} A W A_{+}^{\top}$$
$$-B (R + B^{\top} P_{+} B)^{-1} S^{\top} W A_{+}^{\top} =$$

and, by collecting WA_{+}^{\top} in the last two terms,

$$= -W + B(R + B^{\mathsf{T}}P_{+}B)^{-1}B^{\mathsf{T}} - B(R + B^{\mathsf{T}}P_{+}B)^{-1}(B^{\mathsf{T}}P_{+}A + S^{\mathsf{T}})WA_{+}^{\mathsf{T}} =$$

and, by the definition (13) of K_+ in [1], and summing and subtracting the term AWA_+^{T}

$$= -W + B(R + B^{\top}P_{+}B)^{-1}B^{\top} - BK_{+}WA_{+}^{\top} + AWA_{+}^{\top} - AWA_{+}^{\top} =$$

and, by reordering,

$$= (A - BK_{+}) WA_{+}^{\top} - W + B (R + B^{\top}P_{+}B)^{-1}B^{\top} - AWA_{+}^{\top} =$$

and, by using (14) in [1],

$$= A_{+}WA_{+}^{\top} - W + B(R + B^{\top}P_{+}B)^{-1}B^{\top} - AWA_{+}^{\top} =$$

and, eventually, tacking (15) in [1] into account,

$$= -A W A_{\perp}^{\top}$$
.

Thus, (9) is proven. Now we are ready to obtain the difference equation in the unknowns v_k and w_k . By using (6) and (8) in (1), it follows that:

$$v_{k+1} + Ww_{k+1} = Av_k + AWw_k - BK_+v_k + B\bar{K}_+w_{k+1},$$

or also

$$v_{k+1} = (A - BK_+) v_k + (-W + B\bar{K}_+) w_{k+1} + AWw_k$$

or, by the definition (14) in [1],

$$v_{k+1} = A_+ v_k + (-W + B\bar{K}_+) w_{k+1} + AWw_k,$$
(10)

or, equivalently because of (9),

$$v_{k+1} = A_+ v_k - A W A_+^{\mathsf{T}} w_{k+1} + A W w_k.$$
(11)

Similarly, by using (6)–(8) in (2), the following is obtained:

$$-A^{\top}(P_{+}v_{k+1} + (P_{+}W - I)w_{k+1}) =$$

$$= Q(v_{k} + Ww_{k}) - (P_{+}v_{k} - (P_{+}W - I)w_{k}) + S(-K_{+}v_{k} + \bar{K}_{+}w_{k+1}),$$

or

$$-A^{\top} P_{+} v_{k+1} - A^{\top} (P_{+} W - I) w_{k-1} =$$

$$= Q v_{k} + Q W w_{k} - P_{+} v_{k} - (P_{+} W - I) w_{k} - S K_{+} v_{k} + S \bar{K}_{+} w_{k+1}.$$

By the identity $-A^{\top}(P_+W-I)=QWA_+^{\top}-(P_+W-I)A_+^{\top}+S\bar{K}_+$ (see the proof of Property 2 in [1] – second row block), the following holds:

$$-A^{\top} P_{+} v_{k+1} + (QW A_{+}^{\top} - (P_{+}W - I)A_{+}^{\top} + S\bar{K}_{+}) w_{k+1} =$$

$$= Qv_{k} + QW w_{k} - P_{+} v_{k} - (P_{+}W - I)w_{k} - SK_{+} v_{k} + S\bar{K}_{+} w_{k+1},$$

and, by doing away with the terms $S\bar{K}_+w_{k+1}$ at the right of both members,

$$-A^{\top} P_{+} v_{k+1} + (QW - (P_{+}W - I)) A_{+}^{\top} w_{k+1} =$$

$$= (Q - P_{+} - SK_{+}) v_{k} + (QW - (P_{+}W - I)) w_{k}.$$

Recall the identity $Q - P_+ - SK_+ = -A^{\top}P_+A_+$ (see the proof of Property 1 in [1] – second row block), the following is obtained:

$$-A^{\top}P_{+}v_{k+1} + (QW - (P_{+}W - I))A_{+}^{\top}w_{k+1} = -A^{\top}P_{+}A_{+}v_{k} + (QW - (P_{+}W - I))w_{k}.$$
(12)

Let us multiply both members of (11) by $A^{\top}P_{+}$, thus obtaining

$$A^{\top} P_{+} v_{k+1} = A^{\top} P_{+} A_{+} v_{k} - A^{\top} P_{+} A W A_{+}^{\top} w_{k+1} + A^{\top} P_{+} A W w_{k}, \tag{13}$$

and, by summing both members of (12) and (13), it follows that

$$(QW - (P_{+}W - I))A_{+}^{\top}w_{k+1} =$$

$$= (QW - (P_{+}W - I))w_{k} - A^{\top}P_{+}AWA_{+}^{\top}w_{k+1} + A^{\top}P_{+}AWw_{k}.$$

By collecting w_{k+1} on the left and w_k on the right, it follows that

$$(QW - (P_+W - I) + A^{\mathsf{T}}P_+AW)A_+^{\mathsf{T}}w_{k+1} = (QW - (P_+W - I) + A^{\mathsf{T}}P_+AW)w_k,$$

or $A_+^{\top} w_{k+1} = w_k$, that is (5). Taking into account this latter equation in (11) one gets

$$v_{k+1} = A_+ v_k - AW w_k + AW w_k,$$

or
$$v_{k+1} = A_+ v_k$$
, that is (4).

Now we are ready to conclude the direct proof of both (20) and (19) in [1]. Refer to the pair of decoupled difference equations (4), (5), defined in the time interval $0 \le k \le k_f - 1$. Their solutions can be expressed as

$$v_k = A_+^k \alpha,$$

 $w_k = (A_+^\top)^{k_f - k} \beta,$ $0 \le k \le k_f,$ (14)

where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are parameters. Substitution of (14) in (6), (7) yields

$$x_k = A_+^k \alpha + W (A_+^\top)^{k_f - k} \beta, p_k = P_+ A_+^k \alpha + (P_+ W - I) (A_+^\top)^{k_f - k} \beta, \qquad 0 \le k \le k_f,$$

that, re-written in compact notation as

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ p_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ P_+ \end{bmatrix} A_+^k \alpha + \begin{bmatrix} W \\ P_+ W - I \end{bmatrix} (A_+^\top)^{k_f - k} \beta, \quad 0 \le k \le k_f,$$

coincides with equation (20) in [1].

To prove equation (19) in [1], let us substitute (5), i.e.,

$$w_k = A_+^{\top} w_{k+1}, \quad 0 \le k \le k_f - 1,$$

in (6), (7), thus obtaining

$$x_k = v_k + W A_+^{\top} w_{k+1}, p_k = (P_+ W - I) A_+^{\top} w_{k+1},$$
 $0 \le k \le k_f - 1.$ (15)

Using (14) in (15) yields

$$x_k = A_+^k \alpha + W A_+^{\top} (A_+^{\top})^{k_f - k - 1} \beta,$$

$$p_k = P_+ A_+^k \alpha + (P_+ W - I) A_+^{\top} (A_+^{\top})^{k_f - k - 1} \beta,$$
 $0 \le k \le k_f - 1,$ (16)

while using (14) in (8) provides

$$u_k = -K_+ A_+^k \alpha + \bar{K}_+ (A_+^\top)^{k_f - k - 1} \beta, \quad 0 \le k \le k_f - 1.$$
 (17)

Equations (16), (17) can be re-written in compact form as

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ p_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ P_+ \\ -K_+ \end{bmatrix} A_+^k \alpha + \begin{bmatrix} W A_+^\top \\ (P_+W - I)A_+^\top \\ \bar{K}_+ \end{bmatrix} (A_+^\top)^{k_f - k - 1} \beta, \quad 0 \le k \le k_f - 1,$$

that coincides with (19) in [1]. Thus, Theorem 1 in [1] has been directly proven by using the correspondences stated in Lemma 1.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Zattoni, "Structural invariant subspaces of singular Hamiltonian systems and nonrecursive solutions of finite-horizon optimal control problems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 1279–1284, June 2008.