

On the stability of port-Hamiltonian descriptor systems ^{*}

Hannes Gernandt[†] Frédéric E. Haller[‡]

June 16, 2021

Abstract

We study stable differential-algebraic equations and stabilizable differential-algebraic systems. Besides characterizing the stability in terms of a generalized Lyapunov inequality, we show that these systems can always be rewritten as port-Hamiltonian systems on the subspace where the solutions evolve.

Keywords: Descriptor systems, port Hamiltonian systems, stability, differential-algebraic equations, linear matrix inequalities.

1 Introduction

In this note, we consider generalized port-Hamiltonian systems of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}Ex(t) &= (J - R)Qx(t) + (B - P)u(t), \\ y(t) &= (B + P)^TQx(t) + (S - N)u(t), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $E, J, R, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B, P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $S, N \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} R & P \\ P^T & S \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} J & B \\ -B^T & N \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} J & B \\ -B^T & N \end{bmatrix}^T, \quad (2)$$

see e.g. [MM19]. In comparison to classical port-Hamiltonian systems where the coefficient E is the identity, here it might be singular. Besides the explicit formulation (1) of generalized port-Hamiltonian DAEs there is also an implicit definition of generalized pH-systems given in [vdSM18] via so called Lagrangian and Dirac subspaces. This geometric formulation of pH-systems was studied extensively for classical systems, i.e., $E = I_n$, in [vdSJ14]. Recently, the authors compared this geometric and the explicit formulation (1) in [GHR21] but for DAEs

$$\frac{d}{dt}Ex(t) = (J - R)Qx(t). \quad (3)$$

In this case the conditions (2) simplify to

$$D + D^T \leq 0, \quad \text{with } D := J - R, \quad Q^TE = E^TQ,$$

and such matrices D are called *dissipative*.

^{*}H.G. acknowledges the support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) within the Research Training Group GRK 2583 "Modeling, Simulation and Optimization of Fluid Dynamic Applications".

[†]Institut für Mechanik und Meerestechnik, TU Hamburg, Eißendorfer Straße 42, 21073 Hamburg, Germany (hannes.gernandt@tuhh.de).

[‡]Universität Hamburg, Bundesstraße 55, 20146 Hamburg (frederic.haller@uni-hamburg.de).

The main objective of this paper is to show that stable DAEs can be rewritten as pH-DAEs (3). We show that the matrix Q in (3) can be obtained from the solution of a generalized Lyapunov equation. For this rewriting we have to restrict to the smallest subspace where the solutions evolve, also called the *system space*, see [RRV15]. Furthermore, we show that such a rewriting is also possible for stabilizable systems. After finishing this manuscript, we found similar recent results by [GS18] who showed that positive real or passive systems can be rewritten as pH-systems based on invertible solutions of the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov inequality.

The second aim of the paper is to show how systems of the form (1) fit into the geometric port-Hamiltonian framework from [vdSM18].

Outline of the paper is as follows. After recalling some terminologies on matrix pencils in Section 2, we study the behavior and determine the system space of differential-algebraic systems in Section 3. The stability of DAEs in behavioral sense is recalled in Section 4. We provide sufficient conditions for stability, rewrite stable DAEs as pH-DAEs and give an additional assumption under which pH-DAEs are stable. In Section 5 we show how behaviorally stabilizable differential-algebraic systems can be rewritten as pH-systems. Finally, in Section 6 we show how the pH-systems (1) can be embedded into the geometric framework from [vdSM18].

2 Preliminaries

The matrix pencil $sE - A \in \mathbb{R}[s]^{n \times n}$ is called *regular* if $\det(sE - A)$ is non-zero. The *spectrum* $\sigma(E, A)$ of a matrix pencil $sE - A$ is set of all complex numbers λ for which $\lambda E - A$ is not invertible. An eigenvalue is called simple if $\ker(\lambda E - A)$ has dimension one and semi-simple if the dimension of this subspace coincides with the multiplicity of λ as a root of $\det(sE - A)$.

Recall that every pencil $sE - A \in \mathbb{R}[s]^{n \times m}$ can be transformed to Kronecker canonical form, see e.g. [Gan59, Chapter XII], i.e., there exists invertible $S \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ and $T \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ such that $S(sE - A)T$ is block diagonal with the following four types of blocks

$$sI_{n_i} - J_{n_i}(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} s-\lambda & -1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & -1 \\ & & & s-\lambda \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}[s]^{n_i \times n_i}, \quad (4a)$$

$$sN_{\alpha_i} - I_{\alpha_i} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & s & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & s \\ & & & -1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}[s]^{\alpha_i \times \alpha_i}, \quad (4b)$$

$$sK_{\beta_i} - L_{\beta_i} = \begin{bmatrix} s & -1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & s \\ & & & -1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}[s]^{(\beta_i-1) \times \beta_i}, \quad sK_{\gamma_i}^T - L_{\gamma_i}^T \in \mathbb{R}[s]^{\gamma_i \times (\gamma_i-1)}. \quad (4c)$$

It is also possible to choose $S, T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ but then the blocks $sI_{n_i} - J_{n_i}(\lambda)$ have to be replaced by blocks in real Jordan form, see e.g. [HJ13]. The indices in the above blocks are collected in $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell_\alpha}) \in \mathbb{N}^{\ell_\alpha}$, $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^{\ell_\beta}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^{\ell_\gamma}$ and $|\alpha| := \sum_{k=1}^{\ell_\alpha} \alpha_k$. Then the Kronecker form can be briefly written as

$$S(sE - A)T = \text{diag}(sI_{n_0} - J, sN_\alpha - I_{|\alpha|}, sK_\beta - L_\beta, sK_\gamma^T - L_\gamma^T) \quad (5)$$

where $N_\alpha := \text{diag}(N_{\alpha_1}, \dots, N_{\alpha_{\ell_\alpha}})$, and $J, K_\beta, L_\beta, K_\gamma, L_\gamma$ are defined accordingly. The indices β_i and γ_i are called the *row* and *column minimal indices*. Note that we do not exclude $\beta_i = 1$ and $\gamma_i = 1$. In this case the diagonal operator will add a zero column and a zero row to the matrix, respectively. The largest α_i is called the *index* of the DAE. Furthermore, we write $\mathbb{C}_+ := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Re } z > 0\}$, $\mathbb{C}_- := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Re } z < 0\}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{C}_-} := \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{C}_+$.

3 Solutions, behavior and system space

In this section, we study the solutions of the system

$$\frac{d}{dt}Ex(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \quad Ex(0) = Ex_0, \quad (6)$$

with $sE - A \in \mathbb{R}[s]^{n \times n}$ regular, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The set of these systems is denoted by $\Sigma_{n,k}$ and we write $[E, A, B] \in \Sigma_{n,k}$. If the system (6) has no input variables u , i.e., $k = 0$, then we write $[E, A] \in \Sigma_n$.

Here we consider solutions in the behavioral sense, see [PW97]. The *behavior* of $[E, A, B] \in \Sigma_{n,k}$ is given by

$$\mathfrak{B}_{[E,A,B]}^\infty := \{(x, u) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^k) \mid \frac{d}{dt}Ex = Ax + Bu\}.$$

Here we consider only smooth trajectories. A more general definition using weak derivatives can be found in [BR13].

In the following, we will characterize the behavior and the set of initial values using the transformation to a certain canonical form. Recall that the DAEs $[E, A, B], [\hat{E}, \hat{A}, \hat{B}] \in \Sigma_{n,k}$ are called *feedback equivalent*, see [RRV15, Definition 2.7], if there exist invertible $S, T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ such that

$$[s\hat{E} - \hat{A}, \hat{B}] = S[sE - A, B] \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ -FT & I_k \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

A system can then be transformed to feedback equivalence form, see [RRV15, Proposition 2.9], i.e., there exist invertible $S, T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ such that

$$S[sE - A, B] \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ -FT & I_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} sI_{n_1} - A_1 & 0 & 0 & B_1 \\ 0 & I_{n_2} & sE_{23} & B_2 \\ 0 & 0 & sE_{33} - I_{n_3} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = n$ and E_{33} is nilpotent.

If $k = 0$ then $[E, A]$ and $[\hat{E}, \hat{A}]$ are called *equivalent* if $[\hat{E}, \hat{A}] = [SET, SAT]$ for some invertible $S, T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. The behavior transforms as follows

$$\mathfrak{B}_{[SET, SAT]}^\infty = T^{-1}\mathfrak{B}_{[E, A]}^\infty, \quad \mathfrak{B}_{[SET, SAT, SB]}^\infty = \begin{bmatrix} T^{-1} & 0 \\ F & I_k \end{bmatrix} \mathfrak{B}_{[E, A, B]}^\infty. \quad (9)$$

Based on this, we define the *system space* as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E, A, B]} &:= \{(x(0), u(0)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \mid (x, u) \in \mathfrak{B}_{[E, A, B]}^\infty\}, \\ \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E, A]} &:= \{x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in \mathfrak{B}_{[E, A]}^\infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

Another equivalent definition of system space was given in [RRV15, Prop. 3.3] based on Wong-sequences of subspaces.

Below, we describe this subspace using the feedback equivalence form, see also [RRV15, p. 162].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $[E, A] \in \Sigma_n$ and let $S, T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that $S(sE - A)T$ is in Kronecker form (4). Then*

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E, A]} = T(\mathbb{R}^{n_0} \times \{0\}^{|\alpha|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\beta|} \times \{0\}^{|\gamma| - \ell_\gamma}). \quad (10)$$

Let $[E, A, B] \in \Sigma_{n,k}$ and let $S, T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ transform $[E, A, B]$ to feedback equivalence form (8) then

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E, A, B]} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ -FT & I_k \end{bmatrix} (\mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \text{ran } B_2 \times \{0\}^{n_3} \times \mathbb{R}^k). \quad (11)$$

Proof. To prove (10) we can apply (9) and hence assume that $sE - A$ is already given in Kronecker form (4). The formula (10) follows then by computing the solutions for each of the four types of blocks. Clearly, $\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[I_{n_0}, J]} = \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ and a short calculation reveals $\mathfrak{B}_{[N_\alpha, I_{|\alpha|}]}^\infty = \{0\}^{|\alpha|}$. Next, we consider $\frac{d}{dt}K_{\beta_i}x(t) = L_{\beta_i}x(t)$ with $\beta_i \geq 2$. Using integration it is immediate that for every $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\beta_i|}$ there exists $x \in \mathfrak{B}_{[E, A]}^\infty$. If $\beta_i = 1$ then, by definition, we add a zero column in (5) and hence the system space is also the whole space. Finally, the DAE $\frac{d}{dt}K_{\gamma_i}^T x(t) = L_{\gamma_i}^T x(t)$ for $\gamma_i \geq 2$ has only the trivial solution. For $\gamma_i = 1$, by definition, a zero row is added in (5) which leads to a zero component in the system space. This altogether implies (10). The equation (11) was obtained in the proof of [RRV15, Prop. 3.3]. \square

4 Relation between stable and pH-DAEs

In this section, we focus on the case where the input matrix B is not present in the system (6), i.e.,

$$\frac{d}{dt}Ex(t) = Ax(t), \quad Ex(0) = Ex_0. \quad (12)$$

The aim is to characterize when there exists $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that this system can be rewritten as a pH-DAE of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}Ex(t) = DQx(t), \quad D + D^T \leq 0, \quad Q^T E \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

These DAEs are also called *dissipative Hamiltonian* in [MMW20].

We say that $[E, A]$ is *stable* if

$$\forall x \in \mathfrak{B}_{[E, A]}^\infty \exists M > 0 : \sup_{t \geq 0} \|x(t)\| \leq M.$$

Below, the stability is characterized either in terms of the eigenvalues or a Lyapunov inequality on the system space. To this end, for a subspace $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and symmetric matrices $M, N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ we say that

$$\begin{aligned} M \geq_{\mathcal{L}} N & : \Leftrightarrow x^T M x \geq x^T N x \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{L}, \\ M >_{\mathcal{L}} N & : \Leftrightarrow x^T M x > x^T N x \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $[E, A] \in \Sigma_n$ then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) $[E, A]$ is stable.
- (b) The pencil $sE - A$ is regular and there exists symmetric $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $X >_{E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E, A]}} 0$ and

$$A^T X E + E^T X A \leq_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E, A]}} 0. \quad (14)$$

- (c) The pencil $sE - A$ is regular, $\sigma(E, A) \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{C}_-}$ and the eigenvalues on the imaginary axis are semi-simple.

Proof. Since the above conditions are invariant under multiplication from left and right with invertible matrices, we can assume that $sE - A$ is already given in Kronecker form (4). If the DAE is stable then by definition β cannot be present in the Kronecker form. Since $sE - A$ is square also γ is not present and therefore $sE - A$ is regular. Furthermore, computing the solutions for the ODEs $[I_{n_i}, J_{n_i}(\lambda)]$ shows $\sigma(E, A) \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{C}_-}$ and that all eigenvalues on

the imaginary axis are semi-simple. This proves (c). Clearly, (c) implies (a). To prove the equivalence of (b) and (c), we assume that $sE - A$ is regular. Then Lemma 3.1 implies that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} = \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \times \{0\}^{|\alpha|}, \quad E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} = \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}.$$

Furthermore, (14) holds if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} J^T & 0 \\ 0 & I_{|\alpha|} \end{bmatrix} X \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_0} & 0 \\ 0 & N \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_0} & 0 \\ 0 & N^T \end{bmatrix} X \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & I_{|\alpha|} \end{bmatrix} \leq_{\mathbb{R}^{n_0} \times \{0\}^{|\alpha|}} 0$$

which is equivalent to the existence of some $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times n_0}$ with $X_1 > 0$ such that

$$J^T X_1 + X_1 J \leq 0$$

and hence to $\sigma(J) \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{C}_-}$ and semi-simple eigenvalues on the imaginary axis. \square

Remark 4.2. *Oftentimes asymptotically stable DAEs are of interest which are defined by*

$$\forall x \in \mathfrak{B}_{[E,A]}^\infty : \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|x(t)\| = 0.$$

Analogously to Proposition 4.1, asymptotically stable DAEs can be characterized by a strict inequality in (14) or by having eigenvalues only in \mathbb{C}_- . Related characterizations with Lyapunov equations were previously given in [Lew86, Sty02], see also the recent study of stability of pH-DAEs and its connection to hypocoercivity by [AAM21] and in particular Theorem 4 therein for a related Lyapunov equation.

If $[E, A]$ is stable, then the symmetric solution X of the Lyapunov-like inequality (14) can be used to rewrite a stable DAE in pH-form (13). To this end, we consider positive semi-definite matrix $\hat{X}x := Xx$ for all $x \in E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ and $\hat{X}x = 0$ for $x \in (E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]})^\perp$. Further, let $Q := \hat{X}EP_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}}$, where $P_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}}$ is the orthogonal projector onto the system space. In the following, we restrict the coefficients E, A to the system space $\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$. Note that $E : \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \rightarrow E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ is invertible and therefore $Q : \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \rightarrow E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ is also invertible. Hence we can define $D := AQ^{-1}$ which is dissipative according to (14) and leads to

$$Q^T E = E^T \hat{X} E \succ_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} 0, \quad A = \underset{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}}{=} AQ^{-1}Q = DQ.$$

This provides a port-Hamiltonian formulation (13) on the system space.

The second possibility is to use the pseudo-inverse Q^\dagger of Q . We have by definition that

$$QQ^\dagger = P_{\text{ran } Q} = P_{E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}}, \quad Q^\dagger Q = P_{\text{ran } Q^T} = P_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}}$$

and if we define $D := AQ^\dagger$ we obtain $DQ = AQ^\dagger Q = AP_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} = \underset{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}}{=} A$.

The following example from [MMW18] shows that not every port-Hamiltonian DAE given by (13) is stable. Consider

$$sE - DQ = \begin{bmatrix} s & -1 \\ 0 & s \end{bmatrix}, \quad D := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which is port-Hamiltonian and has a Jordan block of size 2 at zero. The above example is an ordinary differential equation and the quadratic form $x \mapsto x^T Q^T E x$ is not a Lyapunov function for the system. Thus, no stability can be concluded.

It will be shown below, that an additional assumption which guarantees the stability of pH-DAEs is

$$\ker Q \subseteq \ker E. \tag{15}$$

Proposition 4.3. *Given a pH-DAE (13) with $\ker Q \subseteq \ker E$. Then the following holds:*

- (a) *If $sE - Q$ is regular then Q is invertible.*
- (b) *Let Q be invertible. Then the pH-DAE (13) is stable if and only if $\ker D \cap (Q \ker E) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. If $sE - Q$ is regular then $\ker E \cap \ker Q = \{0\}$. This together with $\ker E \supset \ker Q$ implies $\ker Q = \{0\}$ and hence Q is invertible. This proves (a).

Let Q be invertible. To characterize the stability of (13), we use Proposition 4.1 (c). If (13) is stable then $sE - DQ$ is regular. Hence,

$$(Q \ker E) \cap \ker D = \ker EQ^{-1} \cap \ker D = \{0\}.$$

Conversely, if $\ker D \cap (Q \ker E) = \{0\}$ then Corollary 5.1 in [GHR21] yields the regularity of $sE - DQ$. Since Q is invertible the pencil $sEQ^{-1} - I_n$ is positive real and hence according to [AV73, Sec. 2.7] the eigenvalue conditions in Proposition 4.1 (c) are satisfied. Hence $sE - DQ$ is stable. \square

Finally, we would like to remark that similar considerations can be done analogously for systems which are stable in reversed time, i.e.,

$$\forall x \in \mathfrak{B}_{[E,A]}^\infty \exists M > 0 : \sup_{t \leq 0} \|x(t)\| \leq M. \quad (16)$$

Since $[E, A]$ fulfills (16) if and only if $[-E, A]$ is stable, a characterization similar to Proposition 4.1 is straightforward. As a consequence every DAE which has semi-simple eigenvalues on the imaginary axis can be rewritten on the system space $\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ in the form (13) but with $Q^T E = E^T Q$ instead of $Q^T E \geq 0$.

5 Stabilizable systems as pH-systems

In this section, we consider differential-algebraic systems which can be stabilized in a certain sense and study their connection to port-Hamiltonian systems.

The system class $\Sigma_{n,k}$ consists of tripels $E, A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ where $sE - A$ is regular. We say that the system $[E, A, B] \in \Sigma_{n,k}$ is *behaviorally stabilizable* if

$$\forall x_0 \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A,B]} \exists (x, u) \in \mathfrak{B}_{[E,A,B]}^\infty : x(0) = x_0, \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|x(t)\| = 0.$$

Furthermore, we consider for $[E, A, B] \in \Sigma_{n,k}$ the following property:

$$\forall x_0 \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \exists (x, u) \in \mathfrak{B}_{[E,A,B]}^\infty : x(0) = x_0, \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|x(t)\| = 0. \quad (17)$$

where $\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ is the system space of the homogeneous equation. Clearly, $\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A,B]}$ and hence behavioral stabilizability implies (17).

Below we show that the converse implication is also valid and construct a stabilizing feedback. Using the Weierstraß canonical form there exists some invertible $S, T \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, $n_1, n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{N}$, $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = n$, and N nilpotent such that

$$S(sE - A)T = \begin{bmatrix} sI_{n_1} - A_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & sI_{n_2} - A_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & sN - I_{n_3} \end{bmatrix}, \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad SB = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \\ B_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

$$\sigma(A_1) \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{C}_+}, \quad \sigma(A_2) \subseteq \mathbb{C}_-.$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let $[E, A, B] \in \Sigma_{n,k}$ then the following holds.*

- (a) *If $[E, A, B]$ fulfills (17) then it is behaviorally stabilizable.*
- (b) *If $[E, A, B]$ fulfills (18) with $S = T = I_n$ then a stabilizing feedback is given by $u(t) = -B_1^T P_1 x_1(t)$ and $P_1 > 0$ is the unique solution of*

$$A_1^T P_1 + P_1 A_1 - P_1 B_1 B_1^T P_1 = 0. \quad (19)$$

Proof. Assume that (17) holds. Then the $[I_{n_1}, A_1, B_1]$ is stabilizable. This implies that

$$\text{rk}[\lambda I_{n_1} - A_1, B_1] = n_1, \quad \forall \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_+}$$

and hence (18) together with the trivial equations

$$\text{rk}[\lambda I_{n_2} - A_2, B_2] = n_2, \quad \text{rk}[\lambda N - I_{n_3}, B_3] = n_3, \quad \forall \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_+}, \quad (20)$$

lead to

$$\text{rk}[\lambda E - A, B] = n, \quad \forall \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_+}.$$

Hence [BR13, Cor. 5.2] implies that $[E, A, B]$ is behaviorally stabilizable. This proves (a).

Next we show (b). A stabilizing feedback for $[I_{n_1}, A_1, B_1] \in \Sigma_{n_1,k}$ is according to [LR95, Thm. 16.3.3] given by $u(t) = -B_1^T P_1 x_1(t)$ where $P_1 > 0$ is a solution of (19). We prove that this feedback also stabilizes $[E, A, B]$ which is by assumption given by (18) with $S = T = I_n$. Without restriction we can assume that the nilpotent matrix N is equal to a Jordan block at zero $J_{n_3}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_3 \times n_3}$. In the closed loop system we have $u(t) = -B_1^T P_1 x_1(t)$ and hence $\sigma(A_1 - B_1 B_1^T P_1) \subseteq \mathbb{C}_-$ with

$$x_1(t) = e^{(A_1 - B_1 B_1^T P_1)t} x_1(0), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Hence there exist $M, \beta > 0$ such that for all $k \geq 0$ which are smaller than the index of $[E, A]$ it holds

$$\|x_1^{(k)}(t)\| \leq M e^{-\beta t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Therefore, we have for some $\hat{M} > 0$ and for all $k \geq 0$ which are smaller than the index of $[E, A]$

$$\|u^{(k)}(t)\| \leq \hat{M} e^{-\beta t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (21)$$

Since $\sigma(A_2) \subseteq \mathbb{C}_-$ the variation of constants formula implies that the solution x_2 of $\dot{x}_2 = A_2 x_2(t) + B_2 u(t)$ tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Further, the solution $x_3(t) = (x_{3,1}(t), \dots, x_{3,n_3}(t))^T$ fulfills

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_{3,2} \\ \vdots \\ \dot{x}_{3,n_3} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{d}{dt} J_{n_3}(0) \begin{pmatrix} x_{3,1} \\ \vdots \\ x_{3,n_3-1} \\ x_{3,n_3} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{3,1} \\ \vdots \\ x_{3,n_3-1} \\ x_{3,n_3} \end{pmatrix} + B_3 u$$

and inspecting the last row leads to

$$\|x_{3,n_3}(t)\| = \|B_3 u(t)\| \leq \|B_3\| \hat{M} e^{-\beta t},$$

which tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, the second last row leads to

$$x_{3,n_3-1}(t) = \dot{x}_{3,n_3}(t) - e_{n_3-1}^T B_3 u(t) = B_3 \dot{u}(t) - e_{n_3-1}^T B_3 u(t)$$

which is again by (21) exponentially bounded. Repeating the last step with the remaining rows starting with the $n_3 - 2$ th row shows that $\|x_3(t)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ which completes the proof that u stabilizes the solution of $[E, A, B]$. \square

Remark 5.2. *The feedback given in Proposition 5.1 (b) is stabilizing in the sense of [RV19], i.e., it holds*

$$\text{rk} \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda E + A & B \\ B_1^T P_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = n + k, \quad \forall \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_+}. \quad (22)$$

If we define $X_1 := \text{diag}(P_1, 0_{n_2}, 0_{n_3})$ then

$$\text{rk} \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda E + A & B \\ B^T X_1 E & I_k \end{bmatrix} = \text{rk} \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda I_{n_1} + A_1 & 0 & 0 & B_1 \\ 0 & -\lambda I_{n_2} + A_2 & 0 & B_2 \\ 0 & 0 & -\lambda N + I_{n_3} & B_3 \\ B_1^T P_1 & 0 & 0 & I_k \end{bmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

In particular, using (20) together with the Schur complement in (23), it is stabilizing if

$$\text{rk}(-\lambda I_{n_1} + A_1^T - P_1 B_1 B_1^T) = n_1 + k, \quad \forall \lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_+},$$

where we also used the transposed which preserves the rank. This is equivalent to

$$\text{rk}(-\lambda I_{n_1} + P_1^{-1/2} A_1^T P_1^{1/2} - P_1^{1/2} B_1 B_1^T P_1^{1/2}) = n_1 + k$$

and we denote the above matrix by M_λ . Assume that there exists non-zero $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ with $x \in \ker M_\lambda$ then (19) implies

$$0 = x^* (\text{Re } M_\lambda) x = -\text{Re } \lambda \|x\|^2 - 1/2 x^* P_1^{1/2} B_1 B_1^T P_1^{1/2} x.$$

Hence $x = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. If $\text{Re } \lambda = 0$ then $x \in \ker(B_1^T P_1^{1/2})$. Furthermore, since $[\lambda I_{n_1} - A_1, B_1]$ is stabilizable, we have for all $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_+}$

$$\ker \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{n_1} - A_1^T \\ B_1^T \end{bmatrix} = \{0\} = \ker \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I_{n_1} - P_1^{-1/2} A_1^T P_1^{1/2} \\ B_1^T P_1^{1/2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This yields $(\lambda I_{n_1} - P_1^{-1/2} A_1^T P_1^{1/2})x \neq 0$ which contradicts $x \in \ker M$. In summary, the feedback $u = -B_1^T P_1$ is stabilizing in the sense of (22).

Below, we obtain another characterization of stabilizability using solutions to certain matrix equalities on the system space which allows us to reformulate the system in a port-Hamiltonian way. Similar equations for stabilization of DAEs have been studied under the name *generalized algebraic Bernoulli equation* in [BBQ07, Ben11, Var95].

Lemma 5.3. *Let $[E, A, B] \in \Sigma_{n,k}$ be stabilizable. Then there exists some $X_1, X_2 \geq_{E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} 0$ such that the following holds*

$$A^T X_1 E + E^T X_1 A - E^T X_1 B B^T X_1 E =_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} 0, \quad (24)$$

$$A^T X_2 E + E^T X_2 A + E^T X_2^2 E =_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} 0 \quad (25)$$

and the mappings $X_1 \pm X_2 : E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \rightarrow E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ are invertible with $X_1 + X_2$ being positive definite.

Proof. All conditions are invariant under system equivalent. Hence we can assume without restriction that $[E, A, B]$ is already given in the block diagonal form on the right-hand side of (18). Introduce $\tilde{E} = \text{diag}(I_{n_2}, N)$, $\tilde{A} = \text{diag}(A_2, I_{n_3})$ and then we set $X_1 := \text{diag}(P_1, 0_{n_2+n_3})$, where $P_1 > 0$ is a solution of (19) and $X_2 := \text{diag}(0_{n_1}, P_2^{-1}, 0_{n_3})$ where $P_2 > 0$ is a solution of the Lyapunov equation $A_2^T P_2 + P_2 A_2 = -I_{n_2}$. Clearly, $X_1, X_2 \geq_{E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} 0$ and they satisfy (24) and (25), respectively. Furthermore, $E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} = \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2} \times \{0\}^{n_3}$ and hence the mappings $X_1 \pm X_2 = \text{diag}(P_1, \pm P_2^{-1}, 0_{n_3})$ map this subspace into itself with $X_1 + X_2$ being positive definite. \square

Based on this result, we now show how to interpret a stabilizable system as a port-Hamiltonian system which can be viewed as an analogue to the rewriting in Section 4.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $[E, A, B] \in \Sigma_{n,k}$ be behaviorally stabilizable. Then there exist $X_1, X_2 \geq_{E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} 0$ such that with the choices of*

$$Q := (X_2 - X_1)E, \quad J := \frac{1}{2}(AQ^\dagger - (Q^\dagger)^T A^T), \quad R := -\frac{1}{2}(AQ^\dagger + (Q^\dagger)^T A^T), \quad (26)$$

the system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}Ex(t) &= (J - R)Qx(t) + Bu(t), \\ y(t) &= B^T Qx(t) + u(t), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

is port-Hamiltonian on $\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} J & B \\ -B^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} &=_{E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \times \mathbb{R}^k} - \begin{bmatrix} J & B \\ -B^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T, \quad \begin{bmatrix} R & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \geq_{E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \times \mathbb{R}^k} 0, \\ E^T Q &=_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} Q^T E, \quad A =_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} (J - R)Q. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Furthermore, $Q : \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \rightarrow E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ is invertible.

Proof. Choose X_1, X_2 as given by Lemma 5.3. By (26), we have $(J - R)Q = AQ^\dagger Q$. Since $X_2 - X_1$ is invertible on $E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ we have $Q^\dagger Q =_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} E^\dagger E =_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} I$ and thus $A =_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} (J - R)Q$. Since E is injective on $\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ and $X_2 - X_1$ is invertible on $E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$ also Q is invertible on $\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}$. The first and last equalities in (28) hold trivially. For the third, observe

$$R \geq_{E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad 2Q^T R Q \geq_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 2Q^T R Q &= -Q^T A - A^T Q = -E^T (X_2 - X_1) A - A^T (X_2 - X_1) E \\ &=_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]}} E^T X_2^2 E + E^T X_1 B B^T X_1 E. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Remark 5.5. (a) *In the context of Proposition 5.4, one can show that the solution (x, u) of the system $[E, A - BB^T(X_2 - X_1)E]$ corresponds to the solutions (x, u, y) of (27) when imposing $Ky + Lu = 0$ for some matrices $K, L \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ with $KL^T = -LK^T$ and $\text{rk} \begin{bmatrix} K & L \end{bmatrix} = n$. This restriction corresponds to an interconnection (cf. [CvdSBn07]) with respect to the Dirac structure $\text{ran} \begin{bmatrix} L^T \\ K^T \end{bmatrix}$. The latter plays a central role in the geometric formulation of port-Hamiltonian systems we present in the following section. Here, one chooses $K = I$, $L = 0$ and one can show, as for the system $[E, A - BB^T X_1 E]$ (cf. Remark 5.2), that the system $[E, A - BB^T(X_2 - X_1)E]$ is stable.*

(b) *If $[E, A]$ has index one then $N = 0$ in (18) and $E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} \times \mathbb{R}^k = \begin{bmatrix} E & 0 \\ 0 & I_k \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A,B]}$. In particular, if E is invertible then $\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A,B]} = \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ and $E\mathcal{V}_{\text{sys}}^{[E,A]} = \mathbb{R}^n$.*

In Proposition 5.4 we defined a suitable output to obtain a pH-system. More generally, in [GS18, Thm. 3.6] it was shown that differential-algebraic systems with output $y(t) = Cx(t) + Du(t)$ can be rewritten as a pH-system of the form (1) if there exists an invertible solution X of the so called *Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov* inequality, see also [FJ04]. Moreover, one has $X = Q$ in (1). However, in comparison to the ODE case, i.e. $E = I_n$, the existence of such an invertible solution X is not clear in general. However in the formulation of Proposition 5.4 we observe that such an invertible solution can be obtained after restriction to the system space $\mathcal{V}^{[E,A]}$. Furthermore, the decomposition (18) can be used to obtain an invertible solution of Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov inequality on the system space based on invertible solutions for the ODE case which exist if the system is minimal and passive [Wil72].

6 Geometric formulation of port-Hamiltonian systems

In this section we show how systems of the form (1) fit into the geometric formulation of generalized pH-systems introduced in [vdSM18].

In comparison to (1), the equations are given here implicitly. To this end, let \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{D} be subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with *range representations* $\mathcal{L} = \text{ran} \begin{bmatrix} L_1 \\ L_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \text{ran} \begin{bmatrix} D_1 \\ D_2 \end{bmatrix}$ for some $L_1, L_2, D_1, D_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Then \mathcal{L} is *Lagrangian* and \mathcal{D} is *maximally dissipative* if

$$L_1^T L_2 - L_2^T L_1 = 0, \quad \dim \mathcal{L} = n, \quad \text{and} \quad (29)$$

$$D_2^T D_1 + D_1^T D_2 \leq 0, \quad \dim \mathcal{D} = n. \quad (30)$$

These \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{L} can be used to implicitly define a DAE by demanding that the system trajectories described by $z, e : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy

$$(e(t), -\frac{d}{dt}z(t)) \in \mathcal{D}, \quad (z(t), e(t)) \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (31)$$

These systems were called generalized pH in [vdSM18]. Therein, \mathcal{D} was assumed to be a so-called *Dirac structure*, i.e., (30) holds with equality. In [GHR21], \mathcal{D} in (31) is allowed to be dissipative and we include the port and the resistive variables already in the state for simplicity.

The DAE is then explicitly given by the range representation of the following linear relation

$$\mathcal{D}\mathcal{L} := \{(x, z) \mid \exists e \in \mathbb{R}^n : (x, e) \in \mathcal{L}, (e, z) \in \mathcal{D}\} = \text{ran} \begin{bmatrix} E \\ A \end{bmatrix} \quad (32)$$

for some $E, A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Moreover, the functions which fulfill $\frac{d}{dt}Ex(t) = Ax(t)$ and (31) with $z(t) = Ex(t)$ coincide, see [GHR21, Section 4].

To show that the system equations (1) can be rewritten as (31), we define

$$\mathcal{D} := \text{gr } D = \text{gr} \begin{bmatrix} J-R & B-P \\ (B+P)^T & S-N \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{L} := \text{ran} \begin{bmatrix} E & 0 \\ 0 & I_k \\ Q & 0 \\ 0 & I_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

It follows from (2) that D is dissipative and, hence, \mathcal{D} fulfills (30). Moreover, \mathcal{L} is Lagrangian if and only if $Q^T E = E^T Q$ and $sE - Q$ is regular, see [GHR21, Corollary 5.1].

The system (1) is then implicitly given by

$$(z(t), u(t), -\frac{d}{dt}z(t), -y(t)) \in \mathcal{D}\mathcal{L} = \text{ran} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{E} \\ \hat{A} \end{bmatrix},$$

with $\hat{E} := \begin{bmatrix} E & 0 \\ 0 & I_k \end{bmatrix}$, $\hat{A} := D \begin{bmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & I_k \end{bmatrix}$.

Under the additional assumptions $\ker Q \subseteq \ker E$ and $Q^T E \geq 0$, Proposition 4.3 implies that Q is invertible that the underlying DAE $\frac{d}{dt}Ex(t) = (J - R)Qx(t)$ for $u = 0$ is stable.

A more general characterization of the eigenvalues of the index of port-Hamiltonian DAEs which are given by maximally dissipative subspaces that are not necessarily graphs of dissipative matrices can be found in [GHR21, Sec. 6]. The results therein can be used to characterize the regularity and stability of DAEs induced by (32). To this end, we recall some notions for a linear relation \mathcal{L} in \mathbb{R}^n

$$\begin{aligned} \ker \mathcal{L} &:= \{x \mid (x, 0) \in \mathcal{L}\}, & \text{ran } \mathcal{L} &:= \{y \mid (x, y) \in \mathcal{L}\}, \\ \text{dom } \mathcal{L} &:= \{x \mid (x, y) \in \mathcal{L}\}, & \text{mul } \mathcal{L} &:= \{y \mid (0, y) \in \mathcal{L}\}, \end{aligned}$$

which are called the *kernel*, *range*, *domain* and *multivalued part*. Furthermore, if \mathcal{V} is a subspace of \mathbb{R}^n then $P_{\mathcal{V}}$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto this space.

If \mathcal{L} is in addition *maximally nonnegative*, i.e. $\mathcal{L} = \begin{bmatrix} L_1 \\ L_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is Lagrangian with $L_1^T L_2 \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{D} = \text{ran} \begin{bmatrix} D_1 \\ D_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is maximally dissipative. Then one can choose L_1 and L_2 in such a way that $L_1 \geq 0$ and D_1, D_2 such that $D_2 + D_2^T \leq 0$. Then the underlying matrix pencil $sE - A$ given by (32) is regular as a consequence of [GHR21, Prop. 5.1] if for $X_1 := \text{ran } D_1 \cap \text{ran } L_2$

$$\ker P_{X_1} L_1|_{X_1} \cap \ker P_{X_1} D_2|_{X_1} = \{0\}, \quad (33)$$

$$\text{mul } \mathcal{D} \cap \ker \mathcal{L} = D_2(\ker D_1) \cap L_1(\ker L_2) = \{0\}. \quad (34)$$

Moreover, the DAE given by (32) is stable if in addition $\ker \mathcal{L} = L_1(\ker L_2) = \{0\}$. This follows immediately from the proof of [GHR21, Thm. 6.6]. In the special case of $\mathcal{D} = \text{gr } D$ and $\mathcal{L} = \text{ran} \begin{bmatrix} E \\ Q \end{bmatrix}$ the condition $\ker \mathcal{L} = \{0\}$ is equivalent to $\ker Q \subseteq \ker E$.

Acknowledgements

The authors are indebted to Timo Reis for his valuable remarks and suggestions on an earlier draft of this manuscript. Furthermore, the authors would like to thank Volker Mehrmann for providing valuable references.

References

- [AAM21] F. Achleitner, A. Arnold, and V. Mehrmann. Hypocoercivity and controllability in linear semi-dissipative ODEs and DAEs. *arXiv:2104.07619*, pages 1–34, 2021.
- [AV73] B.D.O. Anderson and S. Vongpanitlerd. *Network Analysis and Synthesis - A Modern Systems theory approach*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1973.
- [BBQO07] S. Barrachina, P. Benner, and E.S. Quintana-Ortí. Efficient algorithms for generalized algebraic Bernoulli equations based on the matrix sign function. *Numer. Algorithms*, 46:351–368, 2007.
- [Ben11] P. Benner. Partial stabilization of descriptor systems using spectral projectors. In *Numerical Linear Algebra in Signals, Systems and Control*, pages 55–76. Springer, 2011.
- [BR13] T. Berger and T. Reis. Controllability of linear differential-algebraic systems—a survey. In *Surveys in differential-algebraic equations I*, pages 1–61. Springer, 2013.
- [CvdSBn07] J. Cervera, A. J. van der Schaft, and A. Baños. Interconnection of port-hamiltonian systems and composition of dirac structures. *Automatica*, 43:212–225, 2007.
- [FJ04] R. Freund and F. Jarre. An extension of the positive real lemma to descriptor systems. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, 19:69–87, 2004.
- [Gan59] F. Gantmacher. *The Theory of Matrices, Vol. II*. Chelsea, New York, 1959.
- [GHR21] H. Gernandt, F.E. Haller, and T. Reis. A linear relations approach to port-Hamiltonian differential-algebraic equations. *To appear in SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 2021.
- [GS18] N. Gillis and P. Sharma. Finding the nearest positive-real system. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 56(2):1022–1047, 2018.

- [HJ13] R. Horn and C. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2013.
- [Lew86] F.L. Lewis. A survey of linear singular systems. *Circuits Systems Signal Process.*, 5:3–36, 1986.
- [LR95] P. Lancaster and L. Rodman. *Algebraic Riccati Equations*. Clarendon press, Oxford, 1995.
- [MM19] V. Mehrmann and R. Morandin. Structure-preserving discretization for port-Hamiltonian descriptor systems. In *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6863–6868, 2019.
- [MMW18] C. Mehl, V. Mehrmann, and M. Wojtylak. Linear algebra properties of dissipative Hamiltonian descriptor systems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 39:1489–1519, 2018.
- [MMW20] C. Mehl, V. Mehrmann, and M. Wojtylak. Distance problems for dissipative Hamiltonian systems and related matrix polynomials. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 2020.
- [PW97] J. W. Polderman and J. C. Willems. *Introduction to Mathematical Systems Theory: A Behavioral Approach*, volume 26. Springer Science & Business Media, 1997.
- [RRV15] T. Reis, O. Rendel, and M. Voigt. The Kalman–Yakubovich–Popov inequality for differential-algebraic systems. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 485:153–193, 2015.
- [RV19] T. Reis and M. Voigt. Linear-quadratic optimal control of differential-algebraic systems: The infinite time horizon problem with zero terminal state. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 57(3):1567–1596, 2019.
- [Sty02] T. Stykel. Stability and inertia theorems for generalized Lyapunov equations. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 355:297–314, 2002.
- [Var95] A. Varga. On stabilization methods of descriptor systems. *Systems Control Lett.*, 24(2):133–138, 1995.
- [vdSJ14] A.J. van der Schaft and D. Jeltsema. Port-Hamiltonian systems theory: An introductory overview. *Foundations and Trends® in Systems and Control*, 1(2-3):173–378, 2014.
- [vdSM18] A. J. van der Schaft and B. Maschke. Generalized port-Hamiltonian DAE systems. *Systems Control Lett.*, 121:31–37, 2018.
- [Wil72] J.C. Willems. Dissipative dynamical systems part ii: Linear systems with quadratic supply rates. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 45:352–393, 1972.