

Stability of Asynchronous Networked Control Systems with Probabilistic Clocks

Andrew Lamperski

Abstract—This paper studies the stability of sampled and networked control systems with sampling and communication times governed by probabilistic clocks. The clock models have few restrictions, and can be used to model numerous phenomena such as deterministic sampling, jitter, and transmission times of packet dropping networks. Moreover, the stability theory can be applied to an arbitrary number of clocks with different distributions, operating asynchronously. The paper gives Lyapunov-type sufficient conditions for stochastic stability of nonlinear networked systems. For linear systems, the paper gives necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential mean square stability, based on linear matrix inequalities. In both the linear and nonlinear cases, the Lyapunov inequalities are constructed from a simple linear combination of the classical inequalities for continuous and discrete time. Crucially, the stability theorems only depend on the mean sampling intervals. Thus, they can be applied with only limited statistical information about the clocks. The Lyapunov theorems are then applied to systems with multirate sampling, asynchronous communication, delays, and packet losses.

Index Terms—Networked control systems, Stability analysis, Stochastic processes

I. INTRODUCTION

Most modern control systems rely on sampling, since control is typically implemented by digital computers. When sampling is fast and regular, continuous-time models can adequately describe the system behavior. If, on the other hand, sampling is slow, or subject to timing jitter, continuous-time analysis may not be appropriate. More difficulties arise when signals are passed over communication networks, since samples could be delayed or lost. For control systems with numerous computational elements, sampling and communication could occur asynchronously, and with different rates.

This paper examines the stability of continuous-time differential equations with jumps. The timing of the jumps is governed by probabilistic clock models. The continuous-time dynamics as well as the jump dynamics could be nonlinear. Many systems from subfields such as sampled-data control, networked control, and multirate systems can be modeled using the framework in this paper. Existing stability theory from these fields will be reviewed briefly.

The stability of systems with random sampling has a long history [1]. Most studies of sampled-data control, however, assume that sampling intervals are uniform and deterministic [2], [3]. Recently, stability analysis of sampled-data control systems has been extended to include time delays [4], [5].

For networked control systems, a wider range of sampling phenomena have been studied [6]. A common framework assumes that sample intervals and time delays occur within some bounded interval and performs worst-case stability analysis [7]–[9]. Random sampling intervals are less common in the literature, but they studied in works such as [10]–[12].

Most results on sampled-data and networked control systems focus on a single sampling process. Multirate systems model the effect of different sampling, computing, and communication rates among the components of a control system. As with sampled-data control, works on multirate systems typically assume that sampling times are deterministic and periodic [13]–[15]. If the sampling of multirate systems is not deterministic, then it becomes asynchronous. Several works analyze the stability of asynchronous systems in which sampling occurs over some bounded time interval [16]–[18]. There are fewer results on stability of asynchronous systems with random sampling times, though closely related systems with random delays have been studied [19].

This paper presents a method for stability analysis that is significantly different from the approaches described above. Nearly all existing methods to study sampled data systems fall into three categories: 1) continuous-time approximation with fast sampling assumptions, 2) discrete-time analysis of the system at sampling instants, and 3) hybrid system analysis. This paper uses a probabilistic method to average over the sampling times, enabling continuous-time analysis without approximations or fast sampling assumptions.

The work in this paper also differs from the majority of works on randomly sampled systems, in that sampling intervals do not need to be bounded. Furthermore, the sample times of the various subsystems could be generated by asynchronous clocks with different probability distributions.

The main results of the paper are stochastic Lyapunov theorems for systems with randomly distributed sample times. The Lyapunov inequalities result from a linear combination of classical Lyapunov inequalities for continuous and discrete time systems. For linear systems, necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential mean square stability are given in terms of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs). The stability theorems only depend on the mean sampling intervals generated by the various clock processes. It is shown how these theorems can be applied to systems with asynchronous multirate sampling, delays, and packet dropping links.

The paper is structured as follows. Section II presents the modeling framework. Section III presents the stability results and example applications. The proofs are given in Section IV. The paper concludes with Section V.

A. Lamperski is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA (alampers@umn.edu).

Notation: For a random variable X , its expected value is denoted by $\mathbb{E}[X]$. The probability of an event A is denoted by $\mathbb{P}(A)$. The conditional probability of an event A given an event B is written as $\mathbb{P}(A | B)$. The conditional expectation of a random variable X given event B is written as $\mathbb{E}[X | B]$. The notation $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$ is used to denote that random variables X and Y are identically distributed. If $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is a stochastic process and f is a function, the conditional expectation of $f(\mathbf{x}(t))$ given that $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$ is written more compactly as $\mathbb{E}^x[f(\mathbf{x}(t))]$. The probability that event A occurs given that $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$ is written compactly as $\mathbb{P}^x(A)$.

The Laplace transform and inverse Laplace transform are denoted by \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^{-1} , respectively.

For a function f , the left and right limits are given by $f(t^-) = \lim_{s \uparrow t} f(s)$ and $f(t^+) = \lim_{s \downarrow t} f(s)$, respectively.

For a set S , the function χ_S is the indicator function, with $\chi_S(x) = 1$ if $x \in S$ and $\chi_S(x) = 0$ otherwise.

For a vector, x , its Euclidean norm is denoted by $\|x\|$.

II. MODELING ASYNCHRONOUS SAMPLED SYSTEMS

This section presents the modeling framework used in this paper. First, the clock models are defined in Subsection II-A. Several example clock models are given. Next, the dynamic system models are defined in Subsection II-B.

A. Clock Models

The clock model used in this paper, $c(t)$, is an integer-valued stochastic process which will now be defined. For $k \geq 0$, let $\zeta(k)$ be a monotonically increasing sequence of random variables, which denote the tick times of the clock. The process $c(t)$ is defined by

$$c(t) = k \text{ if } \zeta(k) \leq t < \zeta(k+1). \quad (1)$$

Note that (1) implies that $c(t)$ is right-continuous, i.e. $c(t^+) = c(t)$.

Now the distribution of $\zeta(k)$ will be specified. Let ρ be a non-negative random variable. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, assume that the increments $\zeta(k+1) - \zeta(k) = \rho(k+1)$ are independent random variables distributed identically to ρ .

Throughout the paper, assume that ρ has the following properties:

- ($\rho 1$) There is a constant $b > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[e^{b\rho}] < \infty$
- ($\rho 2$) ρ has a generalized probability density function h which is infinitely differentiable in a neighborhood of 0.

Aside from these constraints, the distribution of ρ is otherwise unconstrained.

The first assumption implies that all moments exist. In other words, the distribution cannot have a heavy tail.

The generalized function h could contain Dirac delta terms, but the assumption of continuity at 0 guarantees that $\mathbb{P}(\rho = 0) = 0$. Furthermore, the assumption implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(k) = \infty$, almost surely. Further, assume that $\zeta(0) \leq 0$ and $\zeta(1) > 0$ (For any $\zeta(k)$ with $\zeta(0) \leq 0$, this can be made to be true by shifting the indices.) This assumption then implies that $c(0) = 0$.

The distribution of $\zeta(k)$, and thus $c(t)$ is fully specified, then, by choosing the distribution of $\zeta(0)$. This distribution

will be given in the following lemma. It is proved in Subsection IV-B.

Lemma 1: The function $q : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined by

$$q(x) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\rho > x)}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} \quad (2)$$

is a probability density function. Furthermore, if $-\zeta(0)$ is distributed according to q , then the following properties hold:

- 1) The process which measures the times since the last jump:

$$\ell(t) = t - \zeta(c(t)) \quad (3)$$

is stationary, and distributed according to q .

- 2) The clock has identically distributed increments: if $r, t \geq 0$, then $\mathbb{P}(c(r+t) - c(r) = k) = \mathbb{P}(c(t) = k)$.

Properties 1 and 2 are crucial for the stability analysis in this paper.

Example 1: One of the simplest examples occurs when ρ has an exponential distribution with rate parameter λ . In this case ρ has a probability density function $h(\rho) = \lambda e^{-\lambda\rho}$, and furthermore $q(x) = h(x)$. It can be shown that $c(t)$ is Poisson process with $\mathbb{P}(c(t) = k) = e^{-\lambda t} \frac{(\lambda t)^k}{k!}$.

Example 2: Now say that $\zeta(k) - \zeta(k-1)$ takes a fixed deterministic value, τ . Then, $h(\rho) = \delta(\rho - \tau)$, $\mathbb{E}[\rho] = \tau$, and $q(x) = \chi_{[0, \tau)}(x)/\tau$. In this case, $-\zeta(0)$ is uniformly distributed over $[0, \tau)$.

Example 3: In the empirical study of jitter, ρ is commonly modeled by a Gaussian distribution with mean $\mu > 0$ and standard deviation $\sigma > 0$ [20], [21]. To exclude the possibility that $\rho < 0$, consider instead, a truncated normal distribution, with lower bound at $\rho = 0$. In this case,

$$h(\rho) = \frac{\frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{\rho - \mu}{\sigma}\right)}{1 - \Phi\left(-\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\rho] = \mu + \sigma \frac{\phi\left(-\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)}{1 - \Phi\left(-\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)},$$

$$\text{and } q(x) = \frac{1 - \Phi\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma}\right)}{\mu \left(1 - \Phi\left(-\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)\right) + \sigma \phi\left(-\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)},$$

where $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ and $\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \phi(y) dy$.

Remark 1 (Unbounded Sampling Intervals): In the literature on sampled systems with random sampling, e.g. [10]–[12], it is typically assumed that the sampling intervals $\rho(k)$ are bounded. The results in this paper can be applied equally well to bounded sampling intervals, as in Example 2, and unbounded sampling intervals, as in Examples 1 and 3.

The following proposition is meant to give some intuition for the choice of the initial distribution q . The stability theorems below do not rely on the proposition, however. It is proved in Subsection IV-B.

Proposition 1: Assume that $\zeta(0)$ is set deterministically to 0 (as opposed to according to q). Recall the process $\ell(t)$ from

(3). The following equality holds almost surely for all $r \geq 0$:

$$\int_0^r q(s)ds = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^T \chi_{[0,r]}(\ell(t))dt}{T}. \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, if the distribution of $\ell(t)$ converges to a stationary distribution, then this distribution has the pdf q .

Recall that $\chi_{[0,r]}(x) = 1$ if $x \in [0, r]$ and $\chi_{[0,r]}(x) = 0$ otherwise.

Remark 2 (Clock Initialization): It can be shown that for exponentially distributed $\rho(k)$, Example 1, that the distribution of $\ell(t)$ converges to a stationary distribution for any initial condition $\zeta(0)$. In this case, having $-\zeta(0) = 0$ distributed according to q can be interpreted as resetting the clock counter after $\ell(t)$ has become stationary.

On the other hand, for deterministic sampling intervals, Example 2, if $\zeta(0)$ is set to 0 deterministically, then $\ell(t)$ is periodic and deterministic, so the distribution will never become stationary. In this case, note that the left hand side of (4) is the cdf of q , while the function on the right side gives the probability that $\ell(\hat{t}) \leq r$, if \hat{t} is generated uniformly over $[0, T]$. Thus, in general, having $\ell(0)$ distributed according to q can be interpreted as the result of resetting the clock counter at a large randomly chosen time.

B. System Models

This subsection presents the dynamic system modeling framework used in the paper. In general, the models consist of continuous-time differential equations with jumps. The jumps times are governed by the clock processes described above.

In order to present the system models, the following lemma is useful. It states that independent clocks do not jump at the same time.

Lemma 2: If $\zeta_1(k)$ and $\zeta_2(k')$ are jump times of independent clock processes, then $\zeta_1(k) \neq \zeta_2(k')$ almost surely.

General Model: Now the general dynamic model studied in this paper will be defined. Let $c_1(t), \dots, c_n(t)$ be independent clock processes, with corresponding jump times $\zeta_1(k), \dots, \zeta_n(k)$. Furthermore, let ρ_i be random variables which are identically distributed to $\zeta_i(k) - \zeta_i(k-1)$.

Let F and G_1, \dots, G_n be functions from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^d . The general dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= F(\mathbf{x}(t)) \text{ for } t \notin \{\zeta_i(k) : i = 1, \dots, n, k \in \mathbb{N}\} \\ \mathbf{x}(\zeta_i(k)^+) &= G_i(\mathbf{x}(\zeta_i(k)^-)) \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

It will be assumed that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is right continuous, so that in particular, $\mathbf{x}(\zeta_i(k)) = \mathbf{x}(\zeta_i(k)^+)$ at the jump times.

It will also be assumed that $F(0) = 0$ and $G_i(0) = 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, so that the origin is an equilibrium.

Linear Dynamics: Linear dynamics form an important special case, which will now be defined. Let A and J_1, \dots, J_n be $d \times d$ matrices. The dynamics of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are given by.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= A\mathbf{x}(t) \text{ for } t \notin \{\zeta_i(k) : i = 1, \dots, n, k \in \mathbb{N}\} \\ \mathbf{x}(\zeta_i(k)^+) &= J_i\mathbf{x}(\zeta_i(k)^-) \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

As in the nonlinear case, it will be assumed that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is right-continuous.

Lemma 2 implies that the jump times are distinct, and so given $\mathbf{x}(0)$, (5) or (6) unambiguously specify the dynamics of $\mathbf{x}(t)$. Furthermore, note that the different clock processes could potentially have very different distributions.

In Subsection III-B, it is shown how various examples from sampled-data, networked, and multirate systems can be cast in terms of (5) and (6).

Remark 3 (Deterministic Clock Models): The results in this paper do not directly apply to systems with deterministic sampling times of the form $\zeta(k) = k\tau$. Based on Example 2, however, the work can be applied to systems with deterministic sampling rates and a random offset: $\zeta(k) = k\tau + \zeta(0)$, where $\zeta(0)$ is uniformly distributed over $(-\tau, 0]$. Arguably, this is a reasonable assumption for most digital control systems since the computer clock and the plant will typically not be initialized at precisely the same time.

III. STOCHASTIC STABILITY

This section presents the main results of this paper, which are Lyapunov theorems for systems of the form (5) and (6). Subsection III-A presents the definitions of stability used in the paper, and then gives the corresponding Lyapunov theorems. Subsection III-B demonstrates how these theorems can specialize to classical stability results, as well as several classes of sampled systems.

A. Stochastic Lyapunov Theory

This subsection presents a collection of stochastic Lyapunov stability theorems for the process defined in (5) and (6). Just as stability of deterministic systems can take various forms, several different notions of stability for stochastic systems can be used. The various notions of stability used in the paper will be defined, followed by a collection of Lyapunov theorems corresponding to each type of stability. The terminology follows [22].

Throughout this subsection, $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ will be an open set containing the origin. The Lyapunov function candidate $V : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to be continuously differentiable, with $V(0) = 0$ and $V(x) > 0$ for $x \in D \setminus \{0\}$. The initial condition is given by $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$.

Definition 1: The process $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is

- *stable in probability* if for all $\epsilon > 0$ and all $\eta > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|\mathbf{x}\| < \delta$ implies that

$$\mathbb{P}^x \left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}(t)\| > \epsilon \right) < \eta,$$

- *asymptotically stable in probability* if it is stable in probability and for all $\eta > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|\mathbf{x}\| < \delta$ implies that

$$\mathbb{P}^x \left(\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{x}(t)\| = 0 \right) > 1 - \eta.$$

- *exponentially p -stable*, for $p \geq 1$, if there are positive constants C and a such that the following inequality holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\mathbb{E}^x [\|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^p] \leq C\|x\|^p e^{-at},$$

A system that is exponentially p -stable for $p = 2$ will be called *exponentially mean square stable*.

Now the theorems will be presented. They will be proved in Section IV.

Theorem 1: Say that F is locally Lipschitz on D and G_1, \dots, G_n are continuous on D . If

$$\frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x} F(x) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho_i]} (V(G_i(x)) - V(x)) \leq 0 \quad (7)$$

for all $x \in D$, then $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is stable in probability.

Furthermore, if

$$\frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x} F(x) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho_i]} (V(G_i(x)) - V(x)) < 0$$

for all $x \in D \setminus \{0\}$, then $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is asymptotically stable in probability.

Theorem 2: Say that $D = \mathbb{R}^d$, and the functions F and G_1, \dots, G_n are globally Lipschitz. If there are positive constants C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 , and b such that the following inequalities hold for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$C_1\|x\|^p \leq V(x) \leq C_2\|x\|^p, \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x} F(x) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho_i]} (V(G_i(x)) - V(x)) \leq -C_3\|x\|^p, \quad (9)$$

$$\left\| \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x} \right\| \leq C_4(1 + \|x\|^b), \quad (10)$$

then $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is exponentially p -stable. Furthermore, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}(t) = 0$, almost surely.

Theorem 3: Say that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ has linear dynamics given in (6). The process $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is exponentially mean square stable if only if there exists $Z \succ 0$ such that

$$A^\top Z + ZA + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho_i]} (J_i^\top Z J_i - Z) \prec 0. \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, if (11) holds, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}(t) = 0$, almost surely.

B. Special Cases

This subsection demonstrates how Theorems 1, 2, and 3 contain several existing results as special cases. Furthermore, it is shown how to cast several systems from sampled-data control, networked control, and multirate systems as jump systems specified by (5), so that the theorems can be applied.

Continuous-Time Stability: If $G_1 = \dots = G_n = I$, then (5) specifies the continuous dynamics $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = F(\mathbf{x}(t))$. In this case, Theorem 1 reduces to the classical Lyapunov stability theorem. Similarly, if the system is linear, and governed by (6) with $J_1 = \dots = J_n = I$, then the dynamics become $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = A\mathbf{x}(t)$, and (11) reduces to the classical continuous-time linear Lyapunov inequality.

Discrete-Time Stability: If $F = 0$ and $n = 1$, then (5) reduces to the discrete-time dynamics

$$\mathbf{x}(\zeta_1(k+1)) = G_1(\mathbf{x}(\zeta_1(k))).$$

In this case Theorem 1 reduces to the classical discrete-time Lyapunov theorem. Similarly, if $A = 0$ and $n = 1$, then (6) reduces to the discrete-time dynamics

$$\mathbf{x}(\zeta_1(k+1)) = J_1 \mathbf{x}(\zeta_1(k)).$$

In this case, (11) is equivalent to $J_1^\top Z J_1 - Z \prec 0$, the classical discrete-time Lyapunov inequality.

Jump Linear Systems: Consider a discrete-time jump linear system defined by

$$y(k+1) = J_{\sigma(k)} y(k), \quad (12)$$

where $\sigma(0), \sigma(1), \dots$ are iid random variables specified by $\mathbb{P}(\sigma(k) = i) = p_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Here $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$. Corollary 2.2 of [23] implies that this system is exponentially mean square stable if and only if the following LMI holds for some $Z \succ 0$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i (J_i^\top Z J_i - Z) \prec 0. \quad (13)$$

The following proposition shows how (12) can be analyzed using Theorem 3. The proof is omitted for brevity.

Proposition 2: Let $A = 0$ and let ρ_i be exponential random variables with rate parameters p_i . Let t_k be the jump times of the process $\tilde{c}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(t)$. Then $\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}(t_k)$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$, and the discrete-time process $\mathbf{x}(t_k)$ is equivalently distributed to $y(k)$ defined in (12). Furthermore, in this case, $\mathbb{E}[\rho_i] = 1/p_i$, so that (11) reduces to (13).

The analysis of jump linear systems here is limited to the case of iid $\sigma(k)$ switching variables. It would be interesting to extend the analysis in the paper to the case of $\sigma(k)$ generated by a Markov chain, as studied in [23].

Exponential Sampling Intervals: If (6) holds with ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n exponentially distributed, then Theorem 3 reduces to Theorem 1 of [24].

Sampled-Data Control: Let x_P, u be the state and input, respectively, of a sampled-data state-feedback system defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_P(t) &= F_P(x_P(t), u(t)), \\ u(t) &= H(x_P(\zeta(k))), \text{ for } t \in [\zeta(k), \zeta(k+1)) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $\zeta(k)$ are the jump times of a clock as in Section II-A.




Fig. 1: A Continuous-time system controlled over a packet dropping network.

This system can be cast as a special case of (5) by setting $x = [x_P^T \ u^T]^T$, setting $n = 1$, and defining F and G by

$$F(x_P, u) = \begin{bmatrix} F_P(x_P, u) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad G(x_P, u) = \begin{bmatrix} x_P \\ H(x_P) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Here, the subscript on G_1 was dropped, since there is no ambiguity.

Existing methods for sampled-data control system stability analysis typically either assume that sampling rate is fast and apply continuous-time analysis, or examine the behavior at sample times using discrete-time approximations. See [2] for more information about these two approaches.

The following corollary of Theorem 1 gives a sufficient condition for stochastic stability that does not depend on an approximate discrete-time model, and can be applied to systems with a wide range of random sampling period models.

Corollary 1: Assume that F and G defined in (15) satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1. If

$$\frac{\partial V(x_P, u)}{\partial x_P} F_P(x_P, u) + \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} (V(x_P, H(x_P)) - V(x_P, u)) \leq 0$$

for all $[x_P^T \ u^T]^T \in D$, then $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is stable in probability. Furthermore, if the inequality is strict on $D \setminus \{0\}$, then $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is asymptotically stable in probability.

Packet Dropping Networks: Consider the feedback loop over a packet-dropping network depicted in Figure 1. It will be shown that for an appropriate distribution for ρ , networks with Bernoulli dropout probability can be modeled using (14), above. Thus, Corollary 1 can be used to analyze packet dropping networks.

Say that $\dot{x}_P(t)$ satisfies the continuous-time dynamics specified in (14). The effect of drawing a sample every τ units of time, but dropping the corresponding packet with probability $1 - \theta$ can be modeled with the following rule

$$u(\psi + (k+1)\tau) = \begin{cases} H(x_P(\psi + (k+1)\tau)) & \text{with prob. } \theta \\ u(\psi + k\tau) & \text{with prob. } (1 - \theta). \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Between sample times, u is held fixed: $u(t) = u(\psi + k\tau)$ for $t \in [\psi + k\tau, \psi + (k+1)\tau)$. Here ψ is a scalar random variable, which will be described later later.




Fig. 2: A variant of the system from [25] with no exogenous inputs. Blocks S_1, S_2, \dots, S_p represent samplers, while blocks H_1, H_2, \dots, H_q represent hold elements.

Let $\rho(k)$ denote the time intervals between successful packet transmissions. The update rule implies the $\rho(k)$ are independent and distributed identically to ρ , which is defined by the following generalized pdf:

$$h(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta(\rho - i\tau)(1 - \theta)^{i-1}\theta. \quad (17)$$

By direct calculation, it can be shown that $\mathbb{E}[\rho] = \tau/\theta$ and the pdf $q(x)$ from (2) is given by $q(x) = \frac{\theta}{\tau}(1 - \theta)^{\lfloor x/\tau \rfloor}$. Then setting $\psi = \zeta(0)$, and $\zeta(k) = \zeta(0) + \sum_{i=1}^k \rho(i)$, the update rule from (16) is equivalent to the dynamics for $u(t)$ specified in (14). Thus, the packet-dropping network has been cast as a special case of (14).

Multirate Systems: Consider the network depicted in Figure 2. Let $\zeta_1^s(k), \dots, \zeta_p^s(k)$ and $\zeta_1^h(k), \dots, \zeta_q^h(k)$ be the jump times of independent clock processes, which model the sample times of the plant output and the times that control signals get sent to the hold elements, respectively.

Assume that the continuous-time dynamics are given by

$$\dot{x}_P(t) = F_P(x_P(t), u(t)),$$

which has output $y(t) = [y_1(t)^T \ \dots \ y_p(t)^T]^T$, which have dynamics specified by $y(t) = H_i(x_P(\zeta_i^s(t)))$ for $t \in [\zeta_i^s(k), \zeta_i^s(k+1))$.

At the sampling times, the state of the discrete-time controller is updated as

$$x_C(\zeta_i^s(k)^+) = G_C(x_C(\zeta_i^s(k)^-), y(\zeta_i^s(k)^+)),$$

and held constant at other times. The control signal $u(t) = [u_1(t)^T \ \dots \ u_q(t)^T]^T$ has dynamics given by $u_i(t) = K_i(x_C(\zeta_i^h(k)), y(\zeta_i^h(k)))$ for $t \in [\zeta_i^h(k), \zeta_i^h(k+1))$.

The \mathcal{H}_∞ control problem for a similar class of models was studied in [25], though the paper focused on worst case synthesis, and so did not put a statistical structure on the sample and hold times.

Now the dynamics above will be cast as a special case of (5). Let E_i be the block matrix, partitioned to conform to y or u , depending on context, defined by $E_i^T y = y_i$ or $E_i^T u = u_i$. Let M_i be the block diagonal matrix given by $M_i = I - E_i E_i^T$.

Define the functions \tilde{H}_i and \tilde{K}_i by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_i(x_P, y) &= E_i H_i(x_P) + M_i y, \\ \tilde{K}_i(x_C, y, u) &= E_i K_i(x_C, y) + M_i u. \end{aligned}$$

The reduction is completed by setting $x = [x_P^\top \ y^\top \ x_C^\top \ u^\top]^\top$ and defining

$$F(x) = \begin{bmatrix} F_P(x_P, u) \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad G_i(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x_P \\ \tilde{H}_i(x_P, y) \\ G_C(x_C, \tilde{H}_i(x_P, y)) \\ u \end{bmatrix},$$

$$G_{p+j}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x_P \\ y \\ x_C \\ \tilde{K}_j(x_C, y, u) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, p$ and $j = 1, \dots, q$.

It is possible to formulate a corollary for multirate systems analogous to Corollary 1. The statement is omitted for space purposes.

Random Delays: Note that random delays can be captured as a special case of the multirate setup from Figure 2. Indeed, consider the case of a single sampling and a single hold element, and discrete-time controller given by $u = y$. In this case, if y is sampled at $\zeta^s(k)$, then it will not get passed back to the continuous-time plant until some time $\zeta^h(k') > \zeta^s(k)$. Note, that in this case, the sample would simply be lost if another sample is drawn before $y(\zeta^s(k))$ passes to the hold element. Such phenomena pose no difficulties for the stability methods in this paper.

Example 4: A numerical example of Theorem 3 will now be presented. Consider the special class of multirate systems depicted in Figure 3a. In particular, let P be a continuous-time plant and C be a discrete-time controller with state-space realizations given by

$$P = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 \end{array} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad C = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} 0.8 & -0.2 \\ \hline 2 & 0 \end{array} \right].$$

The sample times are governed by a jittering clock process with jump interval distributions given by the truncated normal distribution from (3). The control inputs pass over the packet dropping network which has interval distribution given in (17).


Specializing (18) to linear systems leads to a system of the form in (6) given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$


and

$$J_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.2 & 0 & 0.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad J_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If the mean of the jittering clock interval, ρ_1 , and the packet dropping interval, ρ_2 , is sufficiently small, then (11) has a positive definite solution. If, however, either mean is too large, then (11) will not have a positive definite solution. Figure 3b shows simulations of this system for varying parameter values.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 3: 3a A special case of Figure 2 with a single jittering sampling element and a hold element that models a packet dropping network. 3b Each of the graphs depicts 20 realizations of $x_P(t)$ from Example 4 for a particular set of parameter values and random initial conditions. In all three cases, the truncated normal distribution has parameter $\mu = 0.1$ and the packet dropping network has base sampling rate $\tau = 0.1$. The top graph depicts runs with $\sigma = 0.1$ and $\theta = 0.9$. In this case, (11) has a positive definite solution, and so $x(t)$ is exponentially mean square stable. The middle and bottom graphs depict runs with $(\sigma, \theta) = (0.2, 0.9)$ and $(0.1, 0.4)$, respectively. In each case, (11) has no positive definite solution, so exponential mean square stability fails. Note that in these cases, the trajectories can oscillate or diverge. A detailed description of these plots along with source code can be found at <http://nbviewer.ipython.org/url/www.ece.umn.edu/~alampers/code/networksimulation/NetworkSimulation.ipynb>.

IV. PROOFS

This section gives proofs of the results in this paper. Subsection IV-A gives proofs of Theorems 1 - 3. These proofs, in turn depend on several supporting lemmas. The lemmas that only depend on the clock processes are proved in Subsection IV-B. That subsection also gives proofs of Lemma 1, Lemma 2, and Proposition 1 stated above. The lemmas that depend on the system dynamics, (5) or (6), are proved in Subsection IV-C.

A. Stability Proofs

This subsection gives proofs of Theorems 1 - 3. The arguments are based on established techniques from stochastic Lyapunov theory, [22], [26]. The main difficulties arise in proving the supporting lemmas which allow the existing stability theory to be applied.

Stochastic Lyapunov results usually focus on Markov processes. The process $\mathbf{x}(t)$ will typically not be Markov, however. (Though, it will be if all of the clocks are Poisson processes.) The Markov property can fail, since $\mathbf{x}(t')$ for $t' > t$ will depend on the clock jumps that occur between t and t' , and the corresponding jump times can depend on jumps that occurred before time t . The next lemma states that this problem can be rectified by tracking how much time has passed since the most recent jump. It is proved in Subsection IV-C.

Lemma 3: Let $\mathbf{x}(t)$ satisfy (5) and let $\boldsymbol{\ell}(t) = [\ell_1(t) \ \cdots \ \ell_n(t)]^\top$, where $\ell_i(t)$ are defined according to (3). The process $\mathbf{y}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(t) \\ \boldsymbol{\ell}(t) \end{bmatrix}$ is a time-homogeneous Markov process.

In order to formulate a Lyapunov argument, a suitable generalization of the Lie derivative is required. The *infinitesimal generator* of $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is defined as the following limit:

$$\mathcal{G}V(x) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (\mathbb{E}^x [V(\mathbf{x}(t))] - V(x)), \quad (19)$$

where V is sufficiently well behaved for the limit to exist.

When F and G_1, \dots, G_n are nonlinear, the limit in (19) may not be finite. The following approach to circumvent this problem is based on a technique from [26]. Let $B_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| \leq \epsilon\}$. Let τ_ϵ be the stopping time defined by

$$\tau_\epsilon = \inf\{t : \mathbf{x}(t) \notin B_\epsilon\}.$$

Define the *stopped processes* $\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)$ and $\mathbf{y}_\epsilon(t)$ by

$$\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t) = \mathbf{x}(\min\{t, \tau_\epsilon\}), \quad \mathbf{y}_\epsilon(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(\min\{t, \tau_\epsilon\}) \\ \boldsymbol{\ell}(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{y}(t)$ was defined in Lemma 3.

Note that $\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)$ can be described by the augmented version of (5):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon(t) &= \chi_{B_\epsilon}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t))F(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)) \\ &\quad \text{for } t \notin \{\zeta_i(k) : k \geq 0 \ i = 1, \dots, n\} \\ \mathbf{x}_\epsilon(\zeta_i(k)^+) &= \chi_{B_\epsilon}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(\zeta_i(k)^-))G_i(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(\zeta_i(k)^-)) \\ &\quad + \chi_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_\epsilon}(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(\zeta_i(k)^-))\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(\zeta_i(k)^-). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Lemma 3 implies that $\mathbf{y}_\epsilon(t)$ is a time-homogeneous Markov process, as well.

Now define the infinitesimal generator of $\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)$ similar to (19):

$$\mathcal{G}_\epsilon V(x) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (\mathbb{E}^x [V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t))] - V(x)). \quad (20)$$

The next lemma presents an explicit form of the infinitesimal generators \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}_ϵ , and gives conditions for when they will exist. It is proved in Subsection IV-C.

Lemma 4: Let D be an open set containing the origin. Say that $V : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable, F is locally Lipschitz, and G_1, \dots, G_n are continuous. If $B_\epsilon \subset D$, then the limit in (20) exists and is equal to

$$\mathcal{G}_\epsilon V(x) = \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x} F(x) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho_i]} (V(G_i(x)) - V(x)). \quad (21)$$

In this case, the corresponding Dynkin formula holds:

$$\mathbb{E}^x [V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t))] = V(x) + \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{G}_\epsilon V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)) dt \right]. \quad (22)$$

Furthermore, say that F and G_1, \dots, G_n are globally Lipschitz, and there are positive constants C_4 and b

$$\left\| \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(x) \right\| \leq C_4(1 + \|x\|^b).$$

Then the limit in (19) exists and is equal to

$$\mathcal{G}V(x) = \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x} F(x) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho_i]} (V(G_i(x)) - V(x)). \quad (23)$$

Similarly, the corresponding Dynkin formula holds:

$$\mathbb{E}^x [V(\mathbf{x}(t))] = V(x) + \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{G}V(\mathbf{x}(t)) dt \right]. \quad (24)$$

The constants were denoted by C_4 and b for consistency with the conditions (10) of Theorem 2.

Using Lemmas 3 and 4, the theorems can now be proved.

Proof of Theorem 1: The proof of stability in probability is similar to the proof of Lemma 1 in Chapter II of [26]. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$. Without loss of generality, say that ϵ is sufficiently small so that $B_\epsilon \subset D$. Thus, it can be assumed that \mathcal{G}_ϵ is given according to (21). Furthermore, (7), combined with Dynkin's formula, (22), implies that $\mathbb{E}^x [V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t))] \leq V(x)$. In other words, $V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t))$ is a supermartingale. Then the following bound holds:

$$\mathbb{P}^x \left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}(t)\| > \epsilon \right) = \mathbb{P}^x \left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)\| > \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{V(x)}{\epsilon},$$

where the equality holds by construction of $\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)$, and the upper bound follows from the supermartingale inequality. Now, continuity and positive definiteness of V imply that $V(x)/\epsilon < \eta$ for all sufficiently small x . Thus $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is stable in probability.

Now say that the Lyapunov inequality is strict for all $x \in D \setminus \{0\}$. It will be shown that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is asymptotically stable in probability. The proof strategy is motivated by the proof of Theorem 2 of Chapter II of [26], but the details are different.

It will be shown that if $\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)\| \leq \epsilon$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t) = 0$ with probability 1. If this is true, then the proof would be complete, since then

$$\mathbb{P}^x \left(\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t) = 0 \right) \geq \mathbb{P}^x \left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)\| \leq \epsilon \right) > 1 - \eta,$$

from the argument above.

Recall that $V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t))$ is a non-negative supermartingale. Doob's first martingale convergence theorem implies that there

is a non-negative random variable v_∞ such that the following limit holds almost surely:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)) = v_\infty.$$

Assume for the sake of contradiction that

$$\mathbb{P}^x \left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)\| \leq \epsilon, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)) > 0 \right) > 0.$$

It follows that there must exist $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}^x \left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)\| \leq \epsilon, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)) \geq \gamma \right) > 0.$$

Continuity of $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon V$ implies that there exists $g > 0$ such that $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon V(x) \leq -g$ for all x such that $V(x) \geq \gamma$ and $\|x\| \leq \epsilon$. Note then, for every realization of $\mathbf{x}(t)$ such that $\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)\| \leq \epsilon$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)) \geq \gamma$, the integral from Dynkin's formula, (22), goes to $-\infty$:

$$\int_0^\infty \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)) dt = -\infty.$$

It follows that the right side of (22) must converge to $-\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, but the left side is non-negative. Thus, a contradiction has been obtained and the proof is complete. ■

Proof of Theorem 2: In this case, Lemma 4 implies that (23) and (24) hold. Combining (8) and (9) with (23) and (24) implies the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^x [\|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^p] &\leq \frac{1}{C_1} \mathbb{E}^x [V(\mathbf{x}(t))] \\ &= \frac{1}{C_1} V(x) + \frac{1}{C_1} \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{G}V(\mathbf{x}(r)) dr \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C_2}{C_1} \|x\|^p - \frac{C_3}{C_1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}^x [\|\mathbf{x}(r)\|^p] dr. \end{aligned}$$

The final inequality also uses Fubini's theorem to switch the expectation and integral. It now follows from Gronwall's inequality that

$$\mathbb{E}^x [\|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^p] \leq \frac{C_2}{C_1} \|x\|^p e^{-\frac{C_3}{C_1} t}, \quad (25)$$

and so exponential p -stability holds.

Now it will be shown that $\mathbf{x}(t) \rightarrow 0$ almost surely as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The method is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.1 from [22]. Let $\gamma = C_3/C_2$. An argument analogous to the derivation of (25), shows that $\mathbb{E}^x [V(\mathbf{x}(t))] \leq V(x) e^{-\gamma t}$. Thus, $e^{\gamma t} V(\mathbf{x}(t))$ is a non-negative supermartingale. Then Doob's first martingale convergence theorem implies that $e^{\gamma t} V(\mathbf{x}(t))$ has a finite limit almost surely. Thus, there is a non-negative random variable S , which is finite almost surely, defined by

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} e^{\gamma t} V(\mathbf{x}(t)) = S.$$

It follows that $V(\mathbf{x}(t)) \leq S e^{-\gamma t}$, which implies that $\mathbf{x}(t) \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. ■

Proof of Theorem 3: Say that $V(x) = x^\top Z x$ with $Z \succ 0$. Then if (11) holds, then the conditions of Theorem 2 hold with $p = 2$. It follows that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is exponentially mean square stable and that $\mathbf{x}(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, almost surely.

Conversely, say that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is exponentially mean square stable. Let Y be a positive definite matrix. Since $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is a linear function of $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}^x [\mathbf{x}(t)^\top Y \mathbf{x}(t)]$ is a quadratic function of x . Furthermore, exponential convergence of second moments shows that there must be a matrix Z such that

$$x^\top Z x = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}^x [\mathbf{x}(t)^\top Y \mathbf{x}(t)] dt. \quad (26)$$

Since $\mathbf{x}(t)$ does not jump to zero instantaneously from a non-zero initial condition (since $\zeta_i(1) > 0$), it follows that $Z \succ 0$.

Furthermore, for any $t > 0$, the following decomposition holds:

$$x^\top Z x = \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^t \mathbf{x}(r)^\top Y \mathbf{x}(r) dr + \int_t^\infty \mathbf{x}(r)^\top Y \mathbf{x}(r) dr \right]. \quad (27)$$

Now it will be shown that the second term on the right of (27) is equal to $\mathbb{E}^x [\mathbf{x}(t)^\top Z \mathbf{x}(t)]$.

Recall the processes $\ell(t)$ and $\mathbf{y}(t)$, from Lemma 3. Let \mathcal{F}_t be the filtration generated by $\mathbf{y}(t)$, and define shifted processes by $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(r) = \mathbf{x}(t+r)$ and $\tilde{\ell}(r) = \ell(t+r)$. The following chain of equalities holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_t^\infty \mathbf{x}(r)^\top Y \mathbf{x}(r) dr \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^x \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty \mathbf{x}(t+r)^\top Y \mathbf{x}(t+r) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \right] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}^x \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(r)^\top Y \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(r) dr \middle| \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0) = \mathbf{x}(t), \tilde{\ell}(0) = \ell(t) \right] \right] \quad (29)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}^x \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(r)^\top Y \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(r) dr \middle| \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0) = \mathbf{x}(t) \right] \right] \quad (30)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}^x [\mathbf{x}(t)^\top Z \mathbf{x}(t)], \quad (31)$$

The first equation, (28), holds since $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$ is measurable in \mathcal{F}_t . Next, (28) follows from the definition of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\ell}$, and the fact that $\mathbf{y}(t)$ is a Markov process. Marginalizing over $\ell(t)$ gives (30). Furthermore, time homogeneity of $\mathbf{y}(t)$, combined with stationarity of $\ell(t)$ implies that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(r)$ given that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0) = \hat{x}$ is identically distributed to $\mathbf{x}(r)$ given that $\mathbf{x}(0) = \hat{x}$. Thus, (31) holds.

Combining (31) with (27) implies that the following equality holds for all $t > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{t} \left(\mathbb{E}^x [\mathbf{x}(t)^\top Z \mathbf{x}(t)] - x^\top Z x \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}^x [\mathbf{x}(r)^\top Y \mathbf{x}(r)] dr \end{aligned}$$

Take the limit as $t \rightarrow 0$. The left side goes to $\mathcal{G}V(x)$, where $V(x) = x^\top Z x$, while the right side goes to $-x^\top Y x$, as in the proof of Lemma 4. Thus $Z \succ 0$ solves (11), and the theorem is proved. ■

B. Clock Analysis

The proofs of Theorems 1 - 3 heavily rely on Lemmas 3 and 4. These lemmas, in turn, depend on a collection of results proved in this subsection that only depend on the properties of the clock processes, defined in Subsection II-A. First, the

Laplace transform methods used in the proofs are introduced. Next, Lemma 1 and Proposition 1, from Subsection II-A, which describe properties of the initial clock distribution, q , are proved. Later, two lemmas used for approximating the jump probability over small time intervals are presented. These approximations are then used to prove Lemma 2 from Subsection II-B, which states that independent clocks have distinct jump times.

Let h be the generalized pdf associated with ρ . Let $H(s)$ be the Laplace transform of h :

$$H(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} h(t) dt = \mathbb{E}[e^{-s\rho}]. \quad (32)$$

Note that the integral converges whenever $\text{Re } s \geq 0$. Furthermore, $H(s)$ completely characterizes the distribution of ρ , since its cdf may be recovered by the inverse Laplace transform:

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho \leq t) = \int_0^t h(\rho) d\rho = \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{s} H(s) \right) (t). \quad (33)$$

See [27] for an introduction to Laplace transform techniques in probability.

Let $Q(s)$ be the Laplace transform of transform of q defined in Lemma 1:

$$\begin{aligned} Q(s) &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} \int_0^\infty e^{-st} \mathbb{P}(\rho > t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} \int_0^\infty e^{-st} \left(1 - \int_0^t h(r) dr \right) dt \\ &= \frac{1 - H(s)}{s\mathbb{E}[\rho]} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

With the Laplace transforms introduced, the supporting lemmas and proposition can be proved.

Proof of Lemma 1: First it will be shown that q is a pdf. Since $q(x) \geq 0$, it suffices to show that $\int_0^\infty q(x) dx = 1$, or equivalently, that $Q(0) = 1$.

First note that $H(0) = 1$, so that $Q(s)$ has a removable singularity at $s = 0$. Now, it will be shown that $Q(0) = 1$.

Based on Assumption $\rho 1$, it can be shown¹ that $H(s)$ is analytic at all s with $\text{Re } s > -b$. In particular, $H(s)$ is analytic at $s = 0$ with derivative given by

$$H'(0) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\infty (-t) e^{-st} h(t) dt = -\mathbb{E}[\rho]. \quad (35)$$

This equation, combined with (34), implies that

$$Q(0) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - H(s)}{s\mathbb{E}[\rho]} = -\frac{H'(0)}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} = 1.$$

Thus q is a pdf.

In order to show that $\ell(t) = t - \zeta(c(t))$ is stationary and distributed according to q , it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \ell(t)}] = Q(\alpha). \quad (36)$$

Note that the right side is independent of t .

¹ Sketch: Take a small contour around \bar{s} with $\text{Re } \bar{s} > -b$: $\oint \mathbb{E}[e^{-s\rho}] ds = \mathbb{E}[\oint e^{-s\rho} ds] = 0$. So, $H(s)$ is analytic at \bar{s} , by Morera's theorem.

To prove (36), the Laplace transform (over t) of the left side will be evaluated:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty e^{-st} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \ell(t)}] dt &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-(s+\alpha)t} e^{\alpha \zeta(c(t))} \right] dt \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\alpha \zeta(0)} \int_0^{\zeta(1)} e^{-(s+\alpha)t} dt \right] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^\infty e^{\alpha \zeta(k)} \int_{\zeta(k)}^{\zeta(k+1)} e^{-(s+\alpha)t} dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{s+\alpha} (e^{\alpha \zeta(0)} - e^{-s\zeta(0)} e^{-(s+\alpha)\rho(1)}) \right] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{e^{-s\zeta(k)}}{s+\alpha} (1 - e^{-(s+\alpha)\rho(k+1)}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Recall that $\rho(k) = \zeta(k) - \zeta(k-1)$.

Now, the terms in (37) will be evaluated separately.

By the assumption that $-\zeta(0)$ is distributed according to q , it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \zeta(0)}] = Q(\alpha) = \frac{1 - H(\alpha)}{\alpha \mathbb{E}[\rho]}. \quad (38)$$

The second term in the top expectation requires more care. By assumption, $\zeta(0) \leq 0$ and $\zeta(1) > 0$, which then implies that $\rho(1) > -\zeta(0)$. Using Bayes rule, the conditional cdf of $\rho(1)$ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho(1) \leq t \mid -\zeta(0) = x) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\rho > x)} \int_{x^+}^t h(r) dr. \quad (39)$$

Using that $-\zeta(0)$ has the pdf given in (2), the second term of (37) can be evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[e^{-s\zeta(0)} e^{-(s+\alpha)\rho(1)}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-s\zeta(0)} \mathbb{E}[e^{-(s+\alpha)\rho(1)} \mid \zeta(0)] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-s\zeta(0)} \int_{-\zeta(0)^+}^\infty \frac{e^{-(s+\alpha)t} h(t)}{\mathbb{P}(\rho > -\zeta(0))} dt \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} \int_0^\infty e^{sx} \int_{x^+}^\infty e^{-(s+\alpha)t} h(t) dt dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} \int_0^\infty \int_0^t e^{sx} dx e^{-(s+\alpha)t} h(t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{s\mathbb{E}[\rho]} \int_0^\infty (e^{-\alpha t} - e^{-(s+\alpha)t}) h(t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{s\mathbb{E}[\rho]} (H(\alpha) - H(s+\alpha)). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

A similar derivation, based on (39), shows that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-s\zeta(1)}] = Q(s). \quad (41)$$

Furthermore, when $k > 1$, $\zeta(k) = \zeta(1) + \sum_{i=2}^k \rho(i)$, where $\rho(i)$ are iid, independent of $\zeta(1)$, and distributed identically to ρ . Thus, the distribution of $\zeta(k)$ has a Laplace transform given by

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-s\zeta(k)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{-s\zeta(1)} \prod_{i=2}^k e^{-s\rho(i)}] = Q(s) H(s)^{k-1}. \quad (42)$$

It follows that the sum in (37) may be evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-s\zeta(k)} (1 - e^{-(s+\alpha)\rho(k+1)}) \right] \\ &= Q(s)(1 - H(s + \alpha)) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} H(s)^{k-1} \\ &= \frac{1 - H(s + \alpha)}{s\mathbb{E}[\rho]}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Plugging (38), (40), and (43) into (37) yields

$$\frac{1}{(s + \alpha)\mathbb{E}[\rho]} \left(\frac{1 - H(\alpha)}{\alpha} - \frac{H(\alpha) - H(s + \alpha)}{s} + \frac{1 - H(s + \alpha)}{s} \right) = \frac{1}{s} Q(\alpha).$$

It follows that (36) holds.

Now it remains to prove that $\mathbb{P}(c(r + t) - c(r) = k) = \mathbb{P}(c(t) = k)$. Take $\tilde{\ell} \geq 0$. Note that the conditional probability of $c(r + t) - c(r) = k$ can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(c(r + t) - c(r) = k \mid c(r) = i, t - \zeta(i) = \tilde{\ell}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\zeta(k + i) - \zeta(i) \leq t < \zeta(k + i) - \zeta(i) + \rho(k + i + 1) \mid \\ & c(r) = i, t - \zeta(i) = \tilde{\ell}) \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(\zeta(k) \leq t < \zeta(k) + \rho(k + 1) \mid -\zeta(0) = \tilde{\ell}) \quad (45)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(c(t) = k \mid -\zeta(0) = \tilde{\ell}) \quad (46)$$

Here, (44) and (46) follow by definition of $c(t)$, while (45) follows because the increments $\zeta(k) - \zeta(k - 1)$ are identically distributed.

Marginalizing over i shows that

$$\mathbb{P}(c(r + t) - c(r) = k \mid \ell(t) = \tilde{\ell}) = \mathbb{P}(c(t) = k \mid \ell(0) = \tilde{\ell}).$$

Marginalizing over $\ell(t)$ and $\ell(0)$ shows that $\mathbb{P}(c(r + t) - c(r) = k) = \mathbb{P}(c(t) = k)$ because $\ell(t)$ and $\ell(0)$ are identically distributed. Thus, the proof is complete. ■

Proof of Proposition 1: First assume that given the initial condition, $\ell(0) = 0$, the distribution of $\ell(t)$ converges to a stationary distribution. It will be shown that the following limit holds for all α with $\text{Re } \alpha \geq 0$:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^0 \left[e^{-\alpha \ell(t)} \right] = Q(\alpha). \quad (47)$$

If (47) holds, then the stationary distribution of $\ell(t)$ must be given by q .

Note when $\ell(0) = 0$, $\zeta(k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \rho(i)$, where $\rho(i)$ are independent, and distributed according to ρ . In this case, similar to the derivations of (37) and (43) in the proof of

Lemma 1, the following chain of equalities holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\infty} e^{-st} \mathbb{E}^0 \left[e^{-\alpha \ell(t)} \right] dt \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s\zeta(k)}}{s + \alpha} \left(1 - e^{-(s+\alpha)\rho(k+1)} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{H(s)^k}{s + \alpha} (1 - H(s + \alpha)) \\ &= \frac{1 - H(s + \alpha)}{(s + \alpha)(1 - H(s))}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (35), the final value theorem now implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^0 \left[e^{-\alpha \ell(t)} \right] = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s \frac{1 - H(s + \alpha)}{(s + \alpha)(1 - H(s))} = Q(\alpha).$$

Thus, the stationary distribution of $\ell(t)$ is given by q .

Now (4) will be shown to hold for any distribution of ρ satisfying conditions $\rho 1$ and $\rho 2$, including those for which $\ell(t)$ does not converge to a stationary distribution when $\ell(0)$ is set to 0 deterministically.

Note that the left side of (4) has Laplace transform given by

$$\int_0^{\infty} e^{-sr} \int_0^r q(t) dt dr = \frac{1}{s} Q(s) = \frac{1 - H(s)}{s^2 \mathbb{E}[\rho]}. \quad (48)$$

The value of the right side of (4) can be expressed alternatively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^T \chi_{[0,r]}(\ell(t)) dt}{T} \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{\zeta(k-1)}^{\zeta(k)} \chi_{[0,r]}(\ell(t)) dt}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \rho(k)} \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

$$= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \min\{r, \rho(k)\}}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \rho(k)} \quad (50)$$

$$= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\min\{r, \rho\}]}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]}. \quad (51)$$

The first equation, (49), holds because $\zeta(k) \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely. Next, (50) follows from the definitions of $\ell(t)$ and $\chi_{[0,r]}$. The last equality, (51), holds almost surely because of the strong law of large numbers.

Comparing (48) with (51) shows that (4) holds if and only if the following equation is true:

$$\int_0^{\infty} e^{-rs} \mathbb{E}[\min\{r, \rho\}] dr = \frac{1 - H(s)}{s^2}. \quad (52)$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[\min\{r, \rho\}]$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\min\{r, \rho\}] &= \int_0^{r^-} \rho h(\rho) d\rho + r \int_{r^+}^{\infty} h(\rho) d\rho \\ &= r + \int_0^{r^-} \rho h(\rho) d\rho - r \int_0^{r^-} h(\rho) d\rho. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

The Laplace transform of each term on the right of (53) will now be handled separately.

As is standard, $\int_0^\infty e^{-sr} r dr = \frac{1}{s^2}$. The second term has Laplace transform given by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty e^{-rs} \int_0^{r^-} \rho h(\rho) d\rho &= \frac{1}{s} \int_0^\infty e^{-rs} r h(r) dr \\ &= -\frac{H'(s)}{s}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

The Laplace transform of the third term is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty e^{-rs} r \int_0^{r^-} h(\rho) d\rho dr &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \int_0^\infty e^{-rs} \int_0^{r^-} h(\rho) d\rho dr \\ &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \frac{H(s)}{s} \\ &= \frac{H(s)}{s^2} - \frac{H'(s)}{s}, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Combining (54) and (55), with the Laplace transform of r proves (52). Thus, the proof of the Proposition is complete. ■

The following two results, Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, are crucial for the derivation of the infinitesimal generator in Lemma 4.

Lemma 5: For a clock model $c(t)$, $\mathbb{P}(c(t) = k)$ can be approximated at small $t \geq 0$ as

$$\mathbb{P}(c(t) = k) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{t}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} + o(t) & k = 0 \\ \frac{h(0)^{k-1} t^k}{\mathbb{E}[\rho] k!} + o(t^k) & k \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

Proof: First note that

$$\mathbb{P}(c(t) = k) = \mathbb{P}(c(t) \leq k) - \mathbb{P}(c(t) \leq k-1),$$

and that

$$\mathbb{P}(c(t) \leq k) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta(k+1) > t) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\zeta(k+1) \leq t).$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(c(t) = k) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta(k) \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(\zeta(k+1) \leq t). \quad (57)$$

Thus, the desired approximation can be derived from an approximation of $\mathbb{P}(\zeta(k) \leq t)$.

Note that $t \geq 0$ implies that $\mathbb{P}(\zeta(0) \leq t) = 1$. Now consider the case that $k \geq 1$.

It will be shown by induction that

$$\frac{d^i}{dt^i} \mathbb{P}(\zeta(k) \leq t)|_{t=0} = \begin{cases} 0 & i < k \\ \frac{h(0)^{k-1}}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} & i = k \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

If (58) holds, then Taylor's theorem implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta(k) \leq t) = \frac{h(0)^{k-1} t^k}{\mathbb{E}[\rho] k!} + o(t^k). \quad (59)$$

Thus, (57) combined with (59) implies the lemma.

Now, only (58) remains to be proved. Note that Assumption $\rho 2$ implies that all of the derivatives are well defined. Indeed the pdf of $\zeta(k)$ is constructed entirely from integrals of h , which is infinitely differentiable near 0.

Applying relation (33) to (42) from the proof of Lemma 1 implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta(k) \leq t) = \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(\frac{Q(s)H(s)^{k-1}}{s} \right) (t).$$

The initial value theorem then implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta(k) \leq 0) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s \frac{Q(s)H(s)^{k-1}}{s} = 0,$$

since $Q(s)$ and $H(s)$ go to 0 as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Thus (58) holds for $i = 0$.

Now consider $m \leq k$, and assume that for all $i < m$, (58) holds. Recall the differentiation formula for Laplace transforms:

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-st} f'(t) dt = sF(s) - f(0), \quad (60)$$

where $F(s) = \mathcal{L}(f)(s)$.

Repeatedly applying (60), implies that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-st} \frac{d^m}{dt^m} \mathbb{P}(c(t) = k) dt = s^m \frac{Q(s)H(s)^{k-1}}{s}.$$

Note that the initial value terms in the application of (60) vanish by the inductive assumption.

Plugging in (34), the initial value theorem implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^m}{dt^m} \mathbb{P}(c(t) = k)|_{t=0} &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s^{m+1} \frac{Q(s)H(s)^{k-1}}{s} \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s^{m-1} \frac{(1-H(s))H(s)^{k-1}}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & m < k \\ \frac{h(0)^{k-1}}{\mathbb{E}[\rho]} & m = k. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (58) has been shown, and so the proof is complete. ■

Lemma 6: Define $\tilde{c}(t)$ by

$$\tilde{c}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(t), \quad (61)$$

where $c_i(t)$ are independent clock processes. There exist positive constants B and β such that for all $k \geq 0$, the following bound holds for all sufficiently small t :

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{c}(t) = k) \leq B \frac{\beta^k t^k}{k!}. \quad (62)$$

Proof: The lemma will be proved by induction over n . Say that $n = 1$. Lemma 5 implies that (62) holds for $\beta > h_1(0)$ and $B > \max\{1, \frac{1}{\beta \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]}\}$.

Now say that (62) holds for some $n \geq 1$. Take $\gamma > h_{n+1}(0)$ and $C > \max\{1, \frac{1}{\gamma \mathbb{E}[\rho_{n+1}]}\}$. Let $\tilde{c}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(t)$. Using independence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{c}(t) + c_{n+1}(t) = k) &= \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{P}(\tilde{c}(t) = i) \mathbb{P}(c_{n+1}(t) = k-i) \\ &\leq BC \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{\beta^i \gamma^{k-i} t^k}{i!(k-i)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\hat{B} \geq BC$ and $\hat{\beta} \geq 2 \max\{\beta, \gamma\}$. Using the identity²

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \frac{1}{i!(k-i)!} = \frac{2^k}{k!},$$

it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} c_i(t) = k\right) \leq \hat{B} \frac{\hat{\beta}^k t^k}{k!}.$$

Thus, the lemma has been proved. \blacksquare

This subsection concludes with a proof of Lemma 2.

Proof of Lemma 2: First consider a single clock. It will be shown that $\mathbb{P}(c(t^-) < c(t^+)) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. That is, the probability of jumping at any particular point in time is 0.

For any $t > 0$, the probability of jumping at t is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(c(t^+) \neq c(t^-)) &\leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(c(t-r) < c(t+r)) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(c(2r) > 0) \\ &\leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} B \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2\beta r)^k}{k!} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first equality follows from Lemma 1, while B and β are the constants from Lemma 6. The $t = 0$ case is similar.

Now consider two independent clocks, c_1 and c_2 , with jump times ζ_1 and ζ_2 . The argument above implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\zeta_2(k') = \zeta_1(k) \mid \zeta_1(k)) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}(c_2(\zeta_1(k)^-) < c_2(\zeta_1(k)^+) \mid \zeta_1(k)) \\ = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Marginalizing over $\zeta_1(k)$ proves the lemma. \blacksquare

C. System Analysis

This subsection gives proofs of Lemmas 3 and 4. Some notation used in the proofs will now be given.

Let $t_0 = 0$ and let t_1, t_2, \dots denote the jump times of $\tilde{c}(t)$, from (61). Define the discrete-time process $\sigma(k)$ by $\sigma(k) = i$ if t_k is a jump time of clock c_i . Recall from Lemma 2 that only one clock jumps at t_k , almost surely. Note, however, unlike the process from the discussion of jump linear systems in Subsection III-B, $\sigma(k)$ in this case may not be iid.

With the required notation defined, the lemmas will be proved.

Proof of Lemma 3: Recall the definition of $\mathbf{y}(t)$ from the statement of the lemma. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tilde{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary vectors, and let $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = [\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\top \quad \tilde{\ell}^\top]^\top$.

First, it will be shown that the components, ℓ_i , are time-homogeneous Markov processes. Assume that $\ell_i(r) = \tilde{\ell}_i$.

²Derived from the binomial formula $(1+1)^k = \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i}$.

Then $\ell_i(t+r)$ can be expanded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_i(t+r) &= t+r - \zeta_i(c_i(t+r)) \\ &= t+r - \zeta_i(c_i(r)) - \sum_{k=c_i(r)+1}^{c_i(t+r)} \rho_i(k) \\ &= \tilde{\ell}_i + t - \sum_{k=c_i(r)+1}^{c_i(t+r)} \rho_i(k) \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{\ell}_i + t - \sum_{k=1}^{c_i(t)} \rho_i(k), \quad \text{given that } \ell_i(0) = \tilde{\ell}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Here, (64) follows because $\rho_i(k)$ are iid and Lemma 1 implies that $c_i(t)$ and $c_i(t+r) - c_i(r)$ are equivalently distributed.

According to (63), given that $\ell_i(r) = \tilde{\ell}_i$, $\ell_i(t+r)$ only depends on $\rho_i(k)$ for $k = c_i(r)+1, \dots, c_i(t+r)$. Furthermore, recall that $\ell_i(\tau)$ may be computed from $\ell_i(0)$ and $\rho_i(k)$ for $k = 1, \dots, c_i(\tau)$. Independence of the $\rho_i(k)$ terms implies that $\ell_i(r+t)$ is independent of $\ell_i(\tau)$ with $\tau < r$, given that $\ell_i(r) = \tilde{\ell}_i$. Thus, ℓ_i is a Markov process. It is time-homogeneous, since the term in (64) is identically distributed to $\ell_i(t)$, given that $\ell_i(0) = \tilde{\ell}_i$.

Now it will be shown that, given that $\mathbf{y}(r) = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$, $\mathbf{x}(r+t)$ depends only on the terms $\rho_i(k)$ for $k = c_i(r)+1, \dots, c_i(t+r)$. The Markov property and time-homogeneity will then be established using similar arguments as above.

Say that $\mathbf{x}(r) = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. Say that $t_k \leq r < t_{k+1}$. It follows that if $t_k \leq r+t < t_{k+1}$, then

$$\mathbf{x}(r+t) = \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \int_r^{r+t} F(\mathbf{x}(\tau)) d\tau.$$

Combining this equation with (5) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t_{k+1}^+) &= \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \int_r^{t_{k+1}} F(\mathbf{x}(\tau)) d\tau \\ &\quad + G_{\sigma(k+1)}(\mathbf{x}(t_{k+1}^-)) - \mathbf{x}(t_{k+1}^-). \end{aligned}$$

Repeating this process shows that for $t_{\bar{k}} \leq r+t < t_{\bar{k}+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(r+t) &= \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \int_r^{r+t} F(\mathbf{x}(\tau)) d\tau \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=k+1}^{\bar{k}} (G_{\sigma(j)}(\mathbf{x}(t_j^-)) - \mathbf{x}(t_j^-)) \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \int_r^{r+t} F(\mathbf{x}(\tau)) d\tau \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{c_i(r)+1}^{c_i(r+t)} (G_i(\mathbf{x}(\zeta_i(k)^-)) - \mathbf{x}(\zeta_i(k)^-)). \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Furthermore, for $k > c_i(r)$, $r - \zeta_i(c_i(r)) = \tilde{\ell}_i$ implies that $\zeta_i(k)$ can be expressed as

$$\zeta_i(k) = r - \tilde{\ell}_i + \sum_{m=c_i(r)+1}^k \rho_m(k).$$

Thus, $\mathbf{x}(t+r)$ may be computed from $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ and the terms $\rho_i(k)$ for $k = c_i(r)+1, \dots, c_i(t+r)$. Therefore, given that

$\mathbf{y}(r) = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$, $\mathbf{x}(r+t)$ is independent of $\mathbf{x}(\tau)$ for all $\tau < r$. Time-homogeneity again follows because the $\rho_i(k)$ terms are identically distributed for $k = 1, 2, \dots$, and $c_i(t+r) - c_i(r)$ is distributed identically to $c_i(t)$. Thus, the lemma has been proved. ■

Proof of Lemma 4: First consider the case that F and G_1, \dots, G_n are globally Lipschitz. The formulas (23) and (24) will be derived. The derivations of (21) and (22) will be similar, and the differences will be described at the end of the proof.

Similar to (65), an expression for $V(\mathbf{x}(t))$ will be derived by interlacing flows and jumps:

$$V(\mathbf{x}(t)) = V(\mathbf{x}(t_k^+)) + \int_{t_k}^t \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{x}(r))}{\partial x} F(\mathbf{x}(r)) dr$$

for $t_k < t < t_{k+1}$

$$V(\mathbf{x}(t_k^+)) = V(G_{\sigma(k)}(\mathbf{x}(t_k^-))).$$

If $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$, it follows that $V(\mathbf{x}(t)) - V(x)$ is given by

$$V(\mathbf{x}(t)) - V(x) = \int_0^t \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{x}(r))}{\partial x} F(\mathbf{x}(r)) dr + \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{c}(t)} (V(G_{\sigma(k)}(\mathbf{x}(t_k^-))) - V(\mathbf{x}(t_k^-))). \quad (66)$$

To evaluate the limit in (19), the terms on the right of (66) will be examined separately.

Consider the integral term on the right of (19). For compact notation, let $f(t)$ denote the integrand:

$$f(t) = \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{x}(t))}{\partial x} F(\mathbf{x}(t)).$$

In order to bound the expectation in (19), it will be shown that there are positive numbers C and γ such that

$$|f(r)| \leq C e^{\gamma t} \gamma^{\tilde{c}(t)} \quad (67)$$

for all $r \in [0, t]$.

Let $K \geq 1$ be a Lipschitz constant for F and G_1, \dots, G_n . Since 0 is an equilibrium, it follows that $\|F(x)\| \leq K\|x\|$ and $\|G_i(x)\| \leq K\|x\|$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. If $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$, it then follows that

$$\|\mathbf{x}(t)\| \leq \|x\| e^{Kt} K^{\tilde{c}(t)}. \quad (68)$$

Combining (68) with the bound on $\frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x}$ shows that

$$|f(t)| \leq C_2 K (1 + \|\mathbf{x}(t)\|^b) \|\mathbf{x}(t)\| \leq 2C_2 K \max\{\|x\|, \|x\|^{b+1}\} e^{K(b+1)t} (K^{b+1})^{\tilde{c}(t)}.$$

Thus, (67) holds.

Now, the expectation of the integral term will be evaluated. Consider the case that $\tilde{c}(t) = 0$. Then the integrand is continuous, and so the integral may be approximated as

$$\int_0^t f(r) dr = \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x} F(x) t + o(t). \quad (69)$$

For $\tilde{c}(t) = k \geq 1$, the integral is bounded using (67) to give

$$\int_0^t f(r) dr \leq t C e^{\gamma t} \gamma^k.$$

Using Lemma 6, the expected value of these terms can be bounded as

$$\left| \mathbb{E}^x \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^t f(r) dr \mid \tilde{c}(t) = k \right] \right] \right| \leq B C t e^{\gamma t} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(t\beta\gamma)^k}{k!}.$$

Note that the right side is of order t^2 as $t \downarrow 0$. It follows that the desired limit is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^t f(r) dr \right] &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}^x \left[\mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^t f(r) dr \mid \tilde{c}(t) = 0 \right] \right] \\ &= \frac{\partial V(x)}{\partial x} F(x). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Now consider the summation on the right of (66). For compact notation, define $g(k)$ by

$$g(k) = V(G_{\sigma(k)}(\mathbf{x}(t_k^-))) - V(\mathbf{x}(t_k^-)).$$

The mean value theorem implies that there is some number $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that for $\hat{x} = \alpha G_{\sigma(k)}(\mathbf{x}(t_k^-)) + (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{x}(t_k^-)$, $g(k)$ is given by

$$g(k) = \frac{\partial V(\hat{x})}{\partial x} (G_i(\mathbf{x}(t_k^-)) - \mathbf{x}(t_k^-)).$$

Thus, similar to (67), there are positive constants D and ν such that

$$|g(k)| \leq D e^{\nu t} \nu^{\tilde{c}(t)} \quad (71)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, \tilde{c}(t)$.

Note that the by construction, the sum is zero if $\tilde{c}(t) = 0$. So, consider the case that $\tilde{c}(t) = 1$. By assumption, $t_1 \leq t$, and so $\mathbf{x}(t_1^-)$ and $\mathbf{x}(t_1^+)$, so as $t \downarrow 0$, $\mathbf{x}(t_1^-) \rightarrow x$ and $G_{\sigma(1)}(\mathbf{x}(t_1^-)) \rightarrow G_{\sigma(1)}(x)$. Continuity of V then implies that $g(1) \rightarrow V(G_{\sigma(1)}(x)) - V(x)$ as $t \downarrow 0$.

Now, say that $\tilde{c}(t) = k \geq 2$. Using (71), the summation can then be bounded as

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^k g(i) \right| \leq k D e^{\nu t} \nu^k.$$

Again, using Lemma 6 the expected value for terms with $\tilde{c}(t) \geq 2$ can be bounded as

$$\left| \mathbb{E}^x \left[\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}^x \left[\sum_{i=1}^k g(i) \mid \tilde{c}(t) = k \right] \right] \right| \leq B D e^{\nu t} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k \frac{(t\nu)^k}{k!}.$$

The summation on the right is of order t^2 as $t \downarrow 0$. It follows that in the limit as t goes to 0, the only term that does not vanish corresponds to $\tilde{c}(t) = 1$. Thus, the desired limit may be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}^x \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{c}(t)} g(i) \right] &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}^x [g(1) \mid \tilde{c}(t) = 1] \\ &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^n (V(G_i(x)) - V(x)) \cdot \\ &\quad \mathbb{P}(c_i(t) = 1) \prod_{k \neq i} \mathbb{P}(c_k(t) = 0) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\rho_i]} (V(G_i(x)) - V(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Note that the final equality follows from Lemma 5.

The proof of (23) is completed by plugging (66), (70) and (72) into (19).

Now, the Dynkin formula, (24), will be proved. Recall that \mathcal{F}_t is the filtration generated by $\mathbf{y}(t)$, from Lemma 3. Using similar reasoning to the derivation of (28) - (31), the following equalities hold for all $t \geq 0$ and $\delta > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^x[V(\mathbf{x}(t + \delta))] - \mathbb{E}^x[V(\mathbf{x}(t))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^x[\mathbb{E}[V(\mathbf{x}(t + \delta)) - V(\mathbf{x}(t)) \mid \mathcal{F}_t]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^x[\mathbb{E}[V(\mathbf{x}(t + \delta)) - V(\mathbf{x}(t)) \mid \mathbf{x}(t), \ell(t)]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^x[\mathbb{E}[V(\mathbf{x}(t + \delta)) - V(\mathbf{x}(t)) \mid \mathbf{x}(t)]] . \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E}^x[V(\mathbf{x}(t + \delta)) - V(\mathbf{x}(t))] = \mathbb{E}^x[\mathcal{G}V(\mathbf{x}(t))] .$$

The formula (24) now follows from the fundamental theorem of calculus.

For the stopped process, $\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(t)$, the derivation of the infinitesimal generator, (21), uses a similar argument as above. The main difference is that the bounds (67) and (71) can be replaced by $|f(t)| \leq M$ and $|g(k)| \leq M$ for some positive constant M . The derivation of Dynkin's formula, (22), is essentially the same. ■

V. CONCLUSION

This paper gave a framework for stochastic Lyapunov stability of systems with sample times governed by stochastic clocks. The main insight of the paper is that by choosing the appropriate initial distribution of the clock processes, the sample times can be removed by averaging, and system stability can be studied in continuous time without approximations. Furthermore, it was shown how numerous types of sampled systems can be cast into the modeling framework in this paper.

Several interesting directions for future work remain. Because the Lyapunov conditions consist of linear combinations of classical Lyapunov inequalities, the results appear to be amenable to sum-of-squares programming [28]. Furthermore, it is likely that the methods could be extended to study phenomena such as passivity and input-to-state stability. It may also be possible to adapt LMI synthesis techniques [29], [30] to the linear systems with jumps studied in this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. J. Kushner and L. Tobias, "On the stability of randomly sampled systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 319–324, 1969.
- [2] D. Nešić and A. R. Teel, *Sampled-data control of nonlinear systems: An overview of recent results*. Springer, 2001, ch. 14, pp. 221 – 239.
- [3] I. Karafyllis and C. Kravaris, "Global stability results for systems under sampled-data control," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 19, pp. 1105 – 1128, 2009.
- [4] I. Karafyllis and M. Krstic, "Nonlinear stabilization under sampled and delayed measurements, and with inputs subject to delay and zero-order hold," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 1141 – 1154, 2012.
- [5] B. Castillo-Toledo, S. D. Gennaro, and G. S. Castro, "Stability analysis for a class of sampled nonlinear systems with timedelay," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2012.
- [6] J. P. Hespanha, P. Naghshtabrizi, and Y. Xu, "A survey of recent results in networked control systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 138–162, 2007.
- [7] N. van de Wouw, D. Nešić, and W. Heemels, "A discrete-time framework for stability analysis of nonlinear networked control systems," *Automatica*, vol. 48, pp. 1144 – 1153, 2012.
- [8] Y. S. Suh, "Stability and stabilization of nonuniform sampling systems," *Automatica*, vol. 44, pp. 3222 – 3226, 2008.
- [9] H. Fujioka, "A discrete-time approach to stability analysis of systems with aperiodic sample-and-hold devices," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 2440 – 2445, 2009.
- [10] L. A. Montestruque and P. Antsaklis, "Stability of model-based control systems with time-varying transmission time," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 9, 2004.
- [11] M. Donkers, W. Heemels, D. Bernardini, A. Bemporad, and V. Shneer, "Stability analysis of stochastic networked control systems," *Automatica*, vol. 48, pp. 917 – 925, 2012.
- [12] D. Antunes, J. P. Hespanha, and C. Silvestre, "Stochastic networked control systems with dynamic protocols," *Asian Journal of Control*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1 – 12, 2014.
- [13] G. Kranc, "Input-output analysis of multirate feedback systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 3, pp. 21 – 28, 1957.
- [14] I. G. Polushin and H. J. Marquez, "Multirate versions of sampled-data stabilization of nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 40, pp. 1035 – 1041, 2004.
- [15] J. H. Ahrens, X. Tan, and H. K. Khalil, "Multirate sampled-data output feedback control with application to smart material actuated systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 11, pp. 2518 – 2529, 2009.
- [16] G. E. Dullerud and S. Lall, "Asynchronous hybrid systems with jumps analysis and synthesis methods," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 37, pp. 61 – 69, 1999.
- [17] A. Seuret, "A novel stability analysis of linear systems under asynchronous samplings," *Automatica*, vol. 48, pp. 177 – 182, 2011.
- [18] B. Tavassoli, "Stability of nonlinear networked control systems over multiple communication links with asynchronous sampling," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 511 – 515, 2014.
- [19] D. Huang and S. K. Nguang, "State feedback control of uncertain networked control systems with random time delays," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 3, 2008.
- [20] J. A. McNeill, "Jitter in ring oscillators," *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 32, no. 6, 1997.
- [21] B. Casper and F. O'Mahony, "Clocking analysis, implementation and measurement techniques for high-speed data links—a tutorial," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems—I: Regular Papers*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 17 – 39, 2009.
- [22] R. Khasminskii, *Stochastic Stability of Differential Equations*, 2nd ed. Springer, 2012.
- [23] Y. Fang and K. A. Loparo, "Stochastic stability of jump linear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 47, no. 7, 2002.
- [24] A. Lamperski and A. Papachristodoulou, "Stability and consensus for multi-agent systems with clock noise," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2014.
- [25] S. Lall and G. Dullerud, "An LMI solution to the robust synthesis problem for multi-rate sampled-data systems," *Automatica*, vol. 37, pp. 1909 – 1922, 2001.
- [26] H. J. Kushner, *Stochastic Stability and Control*. Academic Press, 1967.
- [27] W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications. Volume II*, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, 1971.
- [28] A. Papachristodoulou and S. Prajna, "On the construction of lyapunov functions using the sum of squares decomposition," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2002.
- [29] C. Scherer, P. Gahinet, and M. Chilali, "Multiobjective output-feedback control via lmi optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 896–911, 1997.
- [30] M. C. De Oliveira, J. C. Geromel, and J. Bernussou, "Extended \mathcal{H}_2 and \mathcal{H}_∞ norm characterizations and controller parametrizations for discrete-time systems," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 75, no. 9, pp. 666 – 679, 2002.