

Optimal and H_∞ Control of Stochastic Reaction Networks*

Corentin Briat and Mustafa Khammash[†]
D-BSSE, ETH-Zürich

November 30, 2021

Abstract

Stochastic reaction networks is a powerful class of models for the representation a wide variety of population models including biochemistry. The control of such networks has been recently considered due to their important implications for the control of biological systems. Their optimal control, however, has been relatively few studied until now. The continuous-time finite-horizon optimal control problem is formulated first and explicitly solved in the case of unimolecular reaction networks. The problems of the optimal sampled-data control, the continuous H_∞ control, and the sampled-data H_∞ control of such networks are then addressed next.

Keywords. Stochastic reaction networks, Markov processes, Optimal and H_∞ control, Dynamic Programming

1 Introduction

Reaction networks are a very general class of systems that can represent a wide variety of real-world processes including population models, ecological models, biochemical models, epidemiological models, social models, etc. See [1] for a survey. Deterministic reaction network can be usually represented as differential equations and their extensions such as delay-differential equations or partial differential equations, when delays or diffusion effects need to be taken into account. Tools for analyzing and controlling them are well established even though some more specialized tools, tailored to the framework of reaction networks, have also been derived for analyzing their stability using, for instance, chemical reaction

*This work was supported by the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme / ERC Grant agreement under Grant 743269 (CyberGenetics)

[†]email: corentin@briat.info, mustafa.khammash@bsse.ethz.ch; url: www.briat.info, https://www.bsse.ethz.ch/ctsb.

network theory [2, 3] or Lyapunov methods [4–6]. The control of such networks has been recently a central problem in the control community [7–16].

In a biological context, deterministic models are only accurate when the populations are large in size and homogeneously distributed so that the interactions between the different components in the network can be assumed to evolve in a continuous fashion. However, when network participants are in low-copy number, the assumption of homogeneity breaks down and the randomness in some of the reactions can not be neglected anymore. In such a case, it is necessary to consider stochastic reaction networks which have been shown to be of crucial importance in biology as they were able to capture both intra- and inter-cellular variability [17]. Such networks can be represented as continuous time Markov jump processes [18] for which analysis tools [19–21] have been developed. Their control has been subsequently addressed in [22–24] in the moment equations framework and in [7, 25–28] in the framework of chemical reaction network controllers, that is, controllers implemented as reaction networks. Practical implementations of such control strategies in the biology setting have been reported in [29–34], and in [32, 34, 35] in the contexts of *in-silico* controllers and *in-vivo* controllers, respectively.

Until now, all the designed controllers were chosen such that some control objectives were satisfied, such as set-point regulation, disturbance rejection, robustness, etc. and the classes of control problems naturally led to Proportional-Integral-Derivative-like (PID) controller structures. While this is a perfectly viable solution in the Single-Input-Single-Output (SISO) case, the Multiple-Input-Multiple-Output (MIMO) case makes the tuning of such controllers a much harder task. A natural step forward is, therefore, the design of controllers that would minimize some cost in order to solve optimal MIMO control problems as historically done in the field of control with the introduction of the Linear Quadratic (LQ) and the Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) control, to cite a few. Two approaches have been considered for the design of an optimal control law. The first one is based on Pontryagin’s Maximum Principle and is essentially based on the calculus of variations, which is an extension of the usual Lagrange multiplier approach for standard optimization [36–38]. It can be seen as a trajectory based approach and is convenient to use whenever state and control constraints are involved. The second one, Dynamic Programming, is based on Bellman’s Principle of Optimality [39]. Unlike the Maximum Principle, this approach is a potential approach and relies on the construction of the so-called *value function* associated with the optimal control problem. Both approaches have benefits and drawbacks but they are two sides of the same coin, and their connection is now well understood.

The objective of this paper is to develop an optimal control theory for stochastic reaction networks. This problem, despite its importance, has been relatively few studied until now. General results on the optimal control of general Markov processes have been obtained for instance in [40, 41]. The optimal control of stochastic reaction networks is considered in [42] under the assumption that the copy number of the involved species is large, which justifies the use of limiting arguments. Some approximate online algorithms are proposed based on state-space truncation and on the empirical evaluation of the cost to optimize. It is also assumed there that the set of possible actions is finite. The optimal control of infinite-dimensional

piecewise deterministic Markov processes is considered in [43] with some application to the control of neuronal dynamics via optogenetics. In this setup, the process switches from one dynamics to another following a finite Markov chain whose rates are control input. An alternative approach relies on the approximation of the stochastic dynamics as diffusion processes on which standard tools could be used. However, it is known that those dynamics may dramatically differ from that of the original jump Markov process.

We propose in this paper to keep the original formulation and to address the optimal control problem using Dynamic Programming. Even though it is known that such an approach suffers from the curse of dimensionality, it seems interesting, at least, to develop it for theoretical reasons. Approximate methods will be considered in future works. The optimal control of Markov chains and Markov processes has also been addressed but essentially only in the finite-state space setting [43–45] which is has also been adapted to the infinite state-space case through its discretization and/or its truncation [42], as often done in Reinforcement Learning and Control of Markov Decision Processes [46]. The approach we consider here keeps the structure of the problem intact and deals with the actual state-space structure directly. We first address the finite-horizon optimal continuous-time control of stochastic reaction networks and provide the characterization of the optimal continuous-time control law in terms of a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation which takes the form of a differential-difference equation. In this regard, it is not necessary to consider viscosity solutions [47] but mild solutions instead, i.e. absolutely continuous (in time) solutions. In the special case of unimolecular networks, this equation exactly reduces to a nonstandard Riccati differential equation which does not seem to have been previously obtained in the literature; see e.g. [48].

We provide then a solution to the optimal sampled-data control of stochastic reaction networks. To this aim, we first reformulate the overall system as a stochastic hybrid system [49] which contains both random and deterministic jumps. While the former correspond to reactions then latter corresponds to the control input updates, which are assumed to occur periodically. The advantage of this reformulation lies in the fact that the data of the system does not need to be transformed as it would be the case had we used a discretization-based method. Note also that the overall procedure to exactly discretize a stochastic reaction network is unclear and, if possible, would result in a dramatic reformulation of the data (i.e. the propensity functions) of the network. A final drawback of discretization-based methods is the loss of the so-called inter-sample behavior and this remark motivated the introduction of lifting methods [50, 51]. Based on this reformulation, we characterize the optimal control law in terms of hybrid Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. In the unimolecular case, those equations reduce to a Lyapunov differential equation and a discrete-time Riccati difference equation.

In the developed solutions, it is tacitly assumed that the uncontrolled inputs are time-varying and known. To remove this assumption and account for unknown exogenous disturbances, the above optimal control framework can be modified to include an H_∞ performance criterion. Such a performance criterion, introduced in the control literature in [52] and refined in [53, 54] in the context of optimal control and game theory, can be used to quantify

the impact of those exogenous inputs on the so-called controlled outputs in an L_2 -sense. We, therefore, develop an approach to compute the optimal control law that minimizes the worst-case gain of the transfer from exogenous inputs to some controlled outputs in the L_2 -sense. This is achieved using a game-theoretic approach and the optimal control law as well as the worst-case exogenous inputs are characterized and computed as the solution of a Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equation which extends the classical Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equation of game theory [55] to the case of jump Markov process and, more specifically, stochastic reaction networks. This equation takes the form of differential-difference equation which reduces, in the unimolecular case, to a Riccati differential equation. As before, this Riccati differential equation is fairly nonstandard and has neither been reported nor studied before elsewhere.

Similarly to as in the optimal control case, we also extend those results to the sampled-data case and use a hybrid formulation of the system. Again the use of a hybrid reformulation is essential as it allows to capture the behavior of the system and how it responds to the exogenous inputs between the sampling instants. The discretization of the process would result in the loss of the inter-sample behavior while the use of lifting methods would force us to work with operator theoretic techniques in order to deal with infinite-dimensionality of the input and output spaces. The hybrid approach circumvents all those issues in an elegant way and allows to characterize the optimal sampled-data control law and the worst-case exogenous disturbance in terms of the initial data of the problem and hybrid Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equations. In the unimolecular case, those equations reduce to a Riccati differential equation and a discrete-time Riccati difference equation.


Notations. The cone of real positive (semi)definite matrices of dimension n is denoted by $(\mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^n) \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$. For a square real matrix A , we denote $\text{Sym}[A] := A + A^T$. For a differentiable function $V(t, x)$, we denote by V_t by t , respectively. For some scalars x_1, \dots, x_n , the vector consisting of stacking those entries vertically with x_1 on top is denoted by $\text{col}_{i=1}^n(x_i)$ or $\text{col}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. The vector of zeros of dimension n except at the position $d + 1$ (where $n \geq d + 1$) where the entry is one is denoted by e_{d+1} .

Outline. Preliminaries on stochastic reaction networks are recalled in Section 2. The optimal continuous-time control of stochastic reaction networks and its sampled-data counterpart are considered in Section 3 and Section 4, respectively. Similarly, the optimal continuous-time H_∞ control of stochastic reaction networks and its sampled-data counterpart are addressed in Section 3 and Section 6, respectively.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Stochastic Reaction Networks

A reaction network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ consists of a set of d molecular species $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_d\}$ that interacts through K reaction channels $\mathcal{R} = \{\mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_K\}$ denoted as



where $\rho_k : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the (time-varying) reaction rate parameter and $\zeta_{k,i}^\ell, \zeta_{k,i}^r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d$ are the left and right stoichiometric vectors meaning. The stoichiometric vector of reaction \mathcal{R}_k is given by $\zeta_k := \zeta_k^r - \zeta_k^\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ where $\zeta_k^r = \text{col}(\zeta_{k,1}^r, \dots, \zeta_{k,d}^r)$ and $\zeta_k^\ell = \text{col}(\zeta_{k,1}^\ell, \dots, \zeta_{k,d}^\ell)$. That is, when the reaction \mathcal{R}_k fires, the state jumps from x to $x + \zeta_k$. The stoichiometry matrix $S \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times K}$ is defined as $S := [\zeta_1 \dots \zeta_K]$. When the kinetics is mass-action, the propensity function of reaction \mathcal{R}_k is given by $\lambda_k(t, x) = \rho_k(t)P_k(t, x)$ where

$$P_k(t, x) = \prod_{i=1}^d \binom{x_i}{\zeta_{k,i}} \quad (2)$$

and is such that $\lambda_k(t, x) = 0$ if $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d$ and $x + \zeta_k \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d$. Under the well-mixed assumption, this network can be described by a continuous-time Markov process $(X_1(t), \dots, X_d(t))_{t \geq 0}$ with state-space $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d$; see e.g. [56].

For any locally bounded function $V : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, the generator \mathbb{A} of the Markov process associated with the reaction network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ is defined as

$$(\mathbb{A}V)(t, x) = V_t(t, x) + \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i(t, x) \Delta_i V(t, x) \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta_i V(t, x) := V(t, x + \zeta_i) - V(t, x)$.

2.2 Kolmogorov's equations

Let $(X_1(t), \dots, X_d(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be the CTMC representing the reaction network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ with some initial state $X(0) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d$. For any state x , we can define the probability to be in that state at time t as

$$p(t, x) = \mathbb{P}(X(t) = x | X(0)) \quad (4)$$

and this probability evolves over time following the so-called Forward Kolmogorov Equation or Chemical Master Equation (CME) [56] given by

$$p_t(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(t, x - \zeta_k) p(t, x - \zeta_k) - \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(t, x) p(t, x), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d. \quad (5)$$

The CME is a linear differential equation of dimension equal to the number of elements in the state-space. It can be expressed in abstract/matrix form as $\dot{p}(t) = \mathcal{A}p(t)$ and is analytically or numerically solvable only in very few particular cases.

On the other hand, the Backward Kolmogorov equation describes the evolution of a function $V(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[f(X(T)) | X(t) = x]$, with $\mathbb{E}[f(X(T))]$ finite, in the time interval $[0, T]$ and is given by

$$-V_t(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(t, x) (V(t + \zeta_k) - V(t, x)) \quad (6)$$

with the terminal condition $V(T, x) = f(x)$. This equation will play a crucial role in the optimal control of stochastic reaction networks.

2.3 Moment equations

Based on the CME, dynamical expressions for the first- and second-order moments may be easily derived and are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbb{E}[X(t)]}{dt} &= S\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t, X(t))], \\ \frac{d\mathbb{E}[X(t)X(t)^T]}{dt} &= \text{Sym}[S\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t, X(t))X(t)^T]] + S \text{diag}\{\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t, X(t))]\}S^T. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Those equations cannot be directly solved in the general case due to some moment closure issues, among others; see e.g. [57]. However, those equations become exactly solvable in the unimolecular case. Indeed, this case corresponds to the case of state-affine propensity functions $\lambda(t, x) = \Lambda(t)x + \lambda_0(t)$, for some functions $\Lambda : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{K \times d}$, $\lambda_0 : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^K$. In such a case, the above moment equations can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbb{E}[X(t)]}{dt} &= S\Lambda(t)\mathbb{E}[X(t)] + S\lambda_0(t), \\ \frac{d\Sigma(t)}{dt} &= \text{Sym}[S\Lambda(t)\Sigma(t)] + S \text{diag}(\Lambda(t)\mathbb{E}[X(t)] + \lambda_0(t))S^T \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\Sigma(t) := \mathbb{E}[(X(t) - \mathbb{E}[X(t)])(X(t) - \mathbb{E}[X(t)])^T]$ is the covariance matrix.

3 Optimal Continuous-Time Control of Stochastic Reaction Networks

The objective of this section is the development of optimal control results for stochastic reaction networks. A particular emphasis will be made on the control of unimolecular networks for which an explicit solution, analogous to that in the finite-dimensional LTI setting, can be obtained.

3.1 Preliminaries

The class of reaction networks considered in Section 2 are autonomous networks in the sense that those networks do not possess input channels to act on them. In this regard, we need to extend the class of networks of Section 2 to incorporate m input channels acting at the level of propensity functions; e.g. at the level of the reaction rates. This is motivated by Cybergenetical applications where reactions have been controlled using some external stimulus such as light [33, 43, 58, 59] or chemical inducers [30]. In this regard, it seems natural to make the following assumption on the propensity functions:

Assumption 1 *The propensity functions of the network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ are of the form $\lambda(t, x, u)$ where $u \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ is the control input vector.*

In order to capture a suitable way to control the system, we introduce the following cost

$$J_T(u) := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T q(s, X(s), u(s)) ds + q_T(X(T)) \right] \quad (9)$$

where $q : [0, T] \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the running cost and $q_T : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the terminal cost. The control input is then chosen such that this cost is minimized

$$u^* = \underset{u \in \mathcal{U}_{0,T}}{\operatorname{argmin}} J_T(u) \quad (10)$$

where we have assumed that such a minimum exists and where $\mathcal{U}_{s,t}$, $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$, is the set of admissible control inputs defined as

$$\mathcal{U}_{s,t} := \left\{ u \in L_2([s, t] \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m) : u \text{ measurable} \right\}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T. \quad (11)$$

In order to solve the above optimization problem, we consider the Dynamic Programming framework [44, 45, 60] which relies on the concept of *value function* defined as

$$V(t, X(t)) := \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,T}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T q(s, X(s), u(s)) ds \right], \quad V(T, x) = q_T(x) \quad (12)$$

The value function is known to verify the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation given by

$$V_t(t, x) + \min_u \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i(t, x, u) \Delta_i V(t, x) + q(t, x, u) \right\} = 0, \quad V(T, x) = q_T(x) \quad (13)$$

and, in such a case, the optimal cost $J_T(u^*)$ coincides with $V(0, X(0))$.

It seems important to stress here that the above equation is vastly different from the standard Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation for the optimal control of continuous-time systems governed by (stochastic) differential equations. In those cases, the value function is described in terms of first-order or second-order elliptic partial differential equations. In the present case, we simply have a differential equation in time whereas the partial derivative operator with respect to the state is replaced by difference operators due to the presence of jump dynamics. In this regard, the solutions are expected to be quite different from those in the standard setup of the control of systems governed by differential equations and stochastic differential equations. Interestingly, the concept of viscosity solutions may not play an essential role as in the control of usual stochastic control problems.

3.2 General networks

In the case of networks with general mass-action kinetics, the propensity functions can be written as

$$\lambda_i(t, x, u) = f_i(t, x) + g_i(t, x)u, \quad i = 1, \dots, K \quad (14)$$

where the $f_i(t, x)$'s are suitable polynomials and the $g_i(t, x)$'s are suitable row-vector polynomials. This leads to the following result:

Theorem 2 Consider the reaction network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ with propensities (14) and assume that

$$q(t, x, u) = \tilde{q}(t, x) + u^T R(t)u \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{q}(t, x)$ is some nonnegative polynomial and $R(\cdot) \succ 0$. Then, the optimal control law minimizing the cost (9) with (15) is given by

$$u^*(t, x) = -\frac{1}{2}R(t)^{-1}g(t, x)^T \Delta V(t, x), \quad (16)$$

where the value function $V(t, x)$ solves the differential equation

$$V_t(t, x) + \sum_{i=1}^K f_i(t, x) \Delta_i V(t, x) - \frac{1}{4} \Delta V(t, x)^T g(t, x) R(t)^{-1} g(t, x)^T \Delta V(t, x) + \tilde{q}(t, x) = 0, \quad (17)$$

with terminal condition $V(T, x) = q_T(x)$ and $\Delta V(t, x) = \text{col}_{i=1}^K(\Delta_i V(t, x))$.

Proof : The Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation is given in this case by

$$V_t(t, x) + \sum_{i=1}^K f_i(t, x) \Delta_i V(t, x) + \min_u \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K g_i(t, x) u \Delta_i V(t, x) + q(t, x, u) \right\} = 0 \quad (18)$$

Since $q(t, x, u)$ is strictly convex in u and $\lambda(t, x, u)$ is affine in u , then there exists a unique global minimum to (13). Computing the derivative of the expression in brackets in (18) with respect to u yields the optimal control input given in (16) and substituting this expression in (13) yields (17). \diamond

Remark 3 The differential equation (17) is difficult to solve in the general setting due to some closure issues similar to that of the moments equation and numerical schemes can be used to approximately solving it. A first step towards this is to turn the equation into an inequality constraint as

$$V_t(t, x) + \sum_{i=1}^K f_i(t, x) \Delta_i V(t, x) - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j=1}^K g_i(t, x)^T R(t)^{-1} g_j(t, x) \Delta V_i(t, x) \Delta V_j(t, x) + \tilde{q}(t, x) \geq 0 \quad (19)$$

and, in such a case, $V(0, X(0))$ will result in an upper-bound on the optimal cost. Optimization methods such as SOS programming [61] can then be used to solve for this differential inequality in the general polynomial case.

3.3 Unimolecular networks

In the case of unimolecular stochastic reaction networks with mass action kinetics, the propensity functions reduce to

$$\lambda_i(t, x, u) = \bar{w}_i(t)^T \bar{x} + \bar{b}_i(t)^T u \quad (20)$$

where $\bar{x} := \text{col}(x, 1)$, where $\bar{w}_i(t) = \text{col}(w_{i,x}(t), w_{i,0}(t))$, $w_{i,x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, $w_{i,0}(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and $\bar{b}_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$, $i = 1, \dots, K$. A major feature of unimolecular reaction networks is that their moment equation is closed. The first-order moment equation is notably given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[X(t)] = A(t) \mathbb{E}[X(t)] + B(t) \mathbb{E}[u(t)] + d(t) \quad (21)$$

where

$$A(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{w}_{k,x}(t)^T, \quad B(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{b}_k(t)^T, \quad \text{and} \quad d(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{w}_{k,0}(t). \quad (22)$$

As unimolecular reaction networks are analogues of linear systems, the following Linear Quadratic cost is considered

$$J_T(u) := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (\bar{X}(s)^T Q(s) \bar{X}(s) + u(s)^T R(s) u(s)) ds + \bar{X}(T)^T Q_T \bar{X}(T) \right] \quad (23)$$

where $Q : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^{d+1}$, $R : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}_{> 0}^m$, and $Q_T \in \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^{d+1}$.

We then have the following result:

Theorem 4 *Let us consider the unimolecular reaction network $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})$ with propensity functions (20). Then, the optimal control input minimizing the cost (23) is given by*

$$u^*(t) = -\frac{1}{2} R(t)^{-1} (2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) \bar{x}(t) + \Gamma(t)) \quad (24)$$

where $\Gamma(t) := \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i \bar{b}_i(t)$ and $P : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}^{d+1}$, $P(T) = Q_T$, solves the Riccati differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}(t) + \bar{A}(t)^T P(t) + P(t) \bar{A}(t) + Q(t) - \frac{1}{4} (2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \Gamma(t) e_{d+1}^T)^T R(t)^{-1} (2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \Gamma(t) e_{d+1}^T) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K (\bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T + e_{d+1} \bar{\zeta}_k^T P(t) \bar{A}_k(t)) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $\bar{A}_k(t) = \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{w}_k(t)^T$,

$$\bar{A}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} A(t) & d(t) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{B}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} B(t) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\zeta}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

Moreover, we have that $J_T^* = J_T(u^*) = V(0, X(0))$.

Proof : Since the running cost is strictly convex in u and the propensity functions are affine in u , then a minimum for $J_T(u)$ exists. We will show that a quadratic value function of the form $V(t, x) = \bar{x}^T P(t) \bar{x}$ verifies the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation (13) which is given in this case by

$$\bar{x}^T \dot{P}(t) \bar{x} + \bar{x}^T Q(t) \bar{x} + \min_u \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i(t, x, u) \Delta_i V(t, x) + u^T R(t) u \right\} = 0 \quad (27)$$

and $P(T) = Q_T$ where

$$\Delta_i V(t, x) = \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t) \bar{x} + \bar{x}^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i + \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i \quad (28)$$

and where $\bar{\zeta}_k$ is defined in the result. Computing the derivative with respect to u and equating it to zero yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \Delta_i V(t, x) \bar{b}_i(t) + 2R(t)u = 0, \quad (29)$$

which yields the optimal control

$$u^*(t, x) := \frac{1}{2} R(t)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^K \Delta_i V(t, x) \bar{b}_i(t) \right). \quad (30)$$

Substituting the explicit expressions for the $\Delta_i V(t, x)$'s yields (24) and substituting, in turn, (24) in (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{x}^T \dot{P}(t) \bar{x} - \frac{1}{4} (2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) \bar{x} + \Gamma(t))^T R(t)^{-1} (2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) \bar{x} + \Gamma(t)) \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{w}_k(t) \bar{x} (2\bar{\zeta}_k^T P(t) \bar{x} + \bar{\zeta}_k^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k) + \bar{x}^T Q(t) \bar{x} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}_k(t)^T \bar{x} (2\bar{\zeta}_k^T P \bar{x} + \bar{\zeta}_k^T P \bar{\zeta}_k) &= \bar{x}^T \left(\text{Sym} \left[P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{w}_k(t)^T + \frac{1}{2} \bar{w}_k(t) \bar{\zeta}_k^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T \right] \right) \bar{x} \\ &= \bar{x}^T \left(\text{Sym} \left[P(t) \bar{A}_k(t) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T \right] \right) \bar{x}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(t, x) (2\bar{\zeta}_k^T P(t) \bar{x} + \bar{\zeta}_k^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k) = \bar{x}^T \left(\text{Sym} \left[P(t) \bar{A}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T \right] \right) \bar{x} \quad (33)$$

Finally, noting that $\Gamma(t) = \Gamma(t)e_{d+1}^T \bar{x}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{x}^T \dot{P}(t) \bar{x} - \bar{x}^T \frac{1}{4} (2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \Gamma(t)e_{d+1}^T)^T R(t)^{-1} (2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \Gamma(t)e_{d+1}^T) \bar{x} \\ & + \bar{x}^T \left(\text{Sym} \left[P(t)\bar{A}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T \right] \right) \bar{x} + \bar{x}^T Q(t) \bar{x} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

As this expression holds for all $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d$, then this is equivalent to the Riccati differential equation (25). \diamond

As a matter of comparison, we can state here the more classical result on the optimal LQ control of the moment equation (21):

Theorem 5 *Let us consider the moment system (21). Then, the optimal (deterministic) control input that minimizes the cost*

$$J_T^E(u) := \int_0^T (\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}(s)]^T Q(s) \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}(s)] + u(s)^T R(s) u(s)) ds + \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}(T)]^T Q_T \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}(T)] \quad (35)$$

is given by

$$u^*(t) := -R(t)^{-1} \bar{B}(t)^T P(t) \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}(t)] \quad (36)$$

where $P : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}^{d+1}$, $P(T) = Q_T$, solves the Riccati differential equation

$$\dot{P}(t) + \bar{A}(t)^T P(t) + P(t) \bar{A}(t) + Q(t) - P(t) \bar{B}(t) R(t)^{-1} \bar{B}(t)^T P(t) = 0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (37)$$

Moreover, we have that $J_T^{E*} := J_T^E(u^*) = \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_0]^T P(0) \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}_0]$.

It is important to stress that the obtained Riccati differential equation obtained in Theorem 4 is dramatically different from the classical one provided in Theorem 5 and those obtained in the LQ control of linear stochastic differential equations. Firstly, we can observe the presence of the additional $\Gamma(t)$ terms in both the optimal control law and in the Riccati differential equation. Secondly, there is an extra sum, linear in $P(t)$, in the Riccati differential equation. This is a consequence of the fact that jumps act on the state in the additive way $x \mapsto x + \zeta_k$.

It seems also important to clarify under which conditions a solution to the Riccati differential equation exists on the interval $[0, T]$ as such equations may have a finite escape time. From the theory of Riccati differential equations [48], we know that a solution will exist in an interval $(T - \varepsilon, T]$ for some sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. However, using the fact that the matrix P is symmetric and positive semidefinite, the standard arguments for the global existence of a solution P on $[0, T]$ can be straightforwardly adapted to the current Riccati equation. However, it seems that the characterization of the solution in terms of a Hamiltonian matrix is out of reach. The main argument is that the Hamiltonian matrix is related to the two-point boundary value problem obtained from Pontryagin's Maximum principle, which is not available for the current class of systems.

4 Optimal Sampled-Data Control of Stochastic Reaction Networks

There are multiple ways for solving the sampled-data control problem for dynamical system. Historically, the first one that was proposed was to simply discretize the dynamics of the process. While this procedure is quite straightforward in the linear deterministic case, this is way more involved in the stochastic and the nonlinear settings. Another approach was based on so-called "lifting" and turned the sampled-data system into an infinite-dimensional system [50,51]. Alternative formulations kept the dimension of the state-space finite but the input and output spaces were considered as infinite-dimensional [62,63]. Impulsive systems formulations were then introduced in [64] and had the advantage of keeping the state-space as well as the input- and output spaces finite-dimensional at the affordable expense of making the dynamics of the system hybrid. This framework is now included in the very general hybrid systems framework [65].

The main limitation in using a discrete-time approach in the current setting lies in the difficulty in computing or even considering a map $F : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \mapsto \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d$ such that

$$X(t_{k+1}) = F(k, X(t_k), u(t_k)), \quad t_k = kT_s \quad (38)$$

where $T_s > 0$ is the sampling period and $u(t_k)$ is the control input value at t_k . This map clearly relates to the transition kernel $\mathbb{P}(X(t_{k+1}) = x^+ | X(t_k) = x)$ but this transition kernel is, in general, a complex function of the propensity functions related to the exponential of the CME operator \mathcal{A} , which is not computable in the current setting. The map F is a probabilistic map that can be defined in terms of that exponential. Even if were computable, the resulting dependence on $u(t_k)$ would be highly nonlinear unlike in the original formulation where the propensities are affine in the input. Finally, the inter-sample behavior is lost when discretizing a system and an optimal controller for the discrete-time system is not necessarily optimal for the associated sampled-data system where an arbitrary number of reactions can occur between two sampling instants. The lifting approach is not as convenient to use as the hybrid formulation as the latter keeps the state-space finite and allows for the use of standard and simpler analysis arguments, and this is the reason why it will be the one considered here.

4.1 Sampled-data stochastic reaction networks as stochastic hybrid systems

A sampled-data stochastic reaction network is stochastic reaction network having a control input which is piecewise constant and updated every sampling period value. Such a system takes the form of the following stochastic hybrid system consisting of the **flow map**

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \dot{X}(t) &= 0 \\ \dot{v}(t) &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ if } t \neq kT_s, \quad (39)$$

K **spontaneous jump maps**

$$\left. \begin{aligned} X^+ &= X + \zeta_k \\ v^+ &= v \end{aligned} \right\} \sim \lambda_k(t, X, v), \text{ and} \quad (40)$$

the **deterministic jump map**

$$\left. \begin{aligned} X^+ &= X \\ v^+ &= u \end{aligned} \right\} \text{ if } t = kT_s. \quad (41)$$

It seems important to explain this model in more details. Since the molecular counts are piecewise constant, it is immediate to see that the derivative of the molecular counts between jumps should be zero. The second state, $v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, has been added in order to model the zero-order hold that keeps the value of the control input constant over each sampling period. The spontaneous jumps, which are exponentially distributed with rate $\lambda_k(t, X, v)$, correspond to the firings of the reactions which only change the values of the state. Finally, the deterministic jump map updates the value of the control input but leaves the state unchanged. This shows that the model of sampled-data stochastic reaction network consists of a stochastic hybrid with a trivial flow map.

4.2 General stochastic reaction networks

In the case of general networks, the propensity functions can be written as $\lambda_i(t, x, v)$ as defined in (14).

We consider here the following cost

$$J_T(u) := \int_0^T q_c(s, x(s), v(s)) ds + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} q_d(k, x(t_k), v(t_k), u(t_k)) + q_{c,T}(x(T), v(T)) \quad (42)$$

and the control law is defined as

$$u^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in \mathcal{V}_{0,T}} J_T(u) \quad (43)$$

where we have assumed that such a minimum exists and

$$\mathcal{V}_{s,t} := \left\{ u \in \ell_2([s, t] \cap \{t_0, \dots, t_N\}) \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \right\} : u \text{ measurable} \}, \quad t \geq s. \quad (44)$$

Considering the value function

$$V(t, X(t), v(t)) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{V}_{t,T}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T q_c(s, x(s), v(s)) ds + \sum_{k:t < t_k \leq (N-1)T} q_d(k, x(t_k), v(t_k), u(t_k)) \right] \quad (45)$$

we obtain the following result:

Theorem 6 *Let us consider the sampled-data reaction network represented by (39), (40), (41), and (14). The optimal control input is given by*

$$u^*(t_k) = \operatorname{argmin}_u \{V(t_k^+, x, u) + q_d(k, x, u)\}, \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1 \quad (46)$$

where the value function V verifies the following hybrid Dynamic Programming equations

$$\begin{aligned} V_t(t, x, v) + \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(t, x, v)(V(t, x + \zeta_k, v) - V(t, x, v)) \\ + q_c(t, x, v) = 0, \quad t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}], \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1 \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

and

$$V(t_k^+, x, u^*(t_k)) - V(t_k, x, v) + q_d(k, x, v, u^*(t_k)) = 0, \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1 \quad (48)$$

with the terminal condition $V(T, x, v) = q_{c,T}(x, v)$.

Proof : The proof simply consists of applying Dynamic Programming to the system (39), (40), (41), and (14). \diamond

4.3 Unimolecular stochastic reaction networks

In this case, the propensity functions vector is given by

$$\lambda_i(t, x, v) = \bar{w}_i(t)^T \bar{x} + \bar{b}_i(t)^T v =: \bar{\lambda}_i(t)^T z \quad (49)$$

where $\bar{w}_i(t) = \text{col}(w_{i,x}(t), w_{i,0}(t))$, $w_{i,x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, $\bar{w}_{i,0}(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\bar{b}_i(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$, $\bar{\lambda}_i(t) := \text{col}(\bar{w}_i(t), \bar{b}_i(t))$, $\bar{x} := \text{col}(x, 1)$, and $z := \text{col}(x, 1, v)$.

As in the continuous-time case, we can write the moment equations in closed-form with the difference that it takes now the form of a linear impulsive system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[X(t)] \\ \mathbb{E}[v(t)] \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} A(t) & B(t) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[X(t)] \\ \mathbb{E}[v(t)] \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} d(t) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad t \neq t_k \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[X(t_k^+)] \\ \mathbb{E}[v(t_k^+)] \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[X(t_k)] \\ \mathbb{E}[v(t_k)] \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[u(t_k)], \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1 \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where

$$A(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{w}_{k,x}(t)^T, \quad B(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{b}_k(t)^T, \quad \text{and} \quad d(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{w}_{k,0}(t)^T. \quad (51)$$

We also introduce the following hybrid LQ cost

$$\begin{aligned} J_T(u) &:= \int_0^T z(s)^T Q_c(s) z(s) ds + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (z(t_k)^T Q_d(k) z(t_k) + u(t_k)^T R_d(k) u(t_k)) \\ &\quad + z(T)^T Q_{c,T} z(T). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where $Q_c : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^{d+1+m}$, $Q_{c,T} \in \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^{d+1+m}$, $Q_d : \{0, \dots, N-1\} \mapsto \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^{d+1+m}$ and $R_d : \{0, \dots, N-1\} \mapsto \mathbb{S}_{> 0}^{d+m+1}$.

This leads to the following result:

Theorem 7 *Let us consider the sampled-data unimolecular stochastic reaction network (39), (40), and (41) with propensities (49). Then, the optimal control input that minimizes the cost (52) is given by*

$$u^*(t_k) = K(k)z(t_k) = -(R_d(k) + P_3(t_k^+))^{-1}P_2(t_k^+)^T \bar{x}(t_k) \quad (53)$$

where $P : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}^{d+1+m}$, $P(T) = Q_T$, solves the Lyapunov differential equation

$$\dot{P}(t) + Q_c(t) + \bar{A}(t)^T P(t) + P(t)\bar{A}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \text{Sym}(\bar{\lambda}_i(t)\bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t)\bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+m+1}^T) = 0, t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}] \quad (54)$$

and the Riccati difference equation

$$\begin{aligned} P_1(t_k^+) - P_2(t_k^+)(P_3(t_k^+) + R_d(k))^{-1}P_2(t_k^+)^T + Q_{d,1}(k) - P_1(t_k) &= 0 \\ Q_{d,2}(k) - P_2(t_k) &= 0 \\ Q_{d,3}(k) - P_3(t_k) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

for $k = 0, \dots, N-1$ and where $\bar{\zeta}_i = \text{col}(\zeta_i, 0, 0)$ together with

$$\bar{A}(t) = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} A(t) & d(t) & B(t) \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right], \quad P(t) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} P_1(t) & P_2(t) \\ \hline P_2(t)^T & P_3(t) \end{array} \right], \quad Q_d(k) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} Q_{d,1}(k) & Q_{d,2}(k) \\ \hline Q_{d,2}(k)^T & Q_{d,3}(k) \end{array} \right] \quad (56)$$

with $P_1(t) \in \mathbb{S}^{d+1}$, $P_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times m}$, $P_3(t) \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $Q_{d,1}(k) \in \mathbb{S}^{d+1}$, $Q_{d,2}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times m}$, and $Q_{d,3}(k) \in \mathbb{S}^m$.

Proof: Let $\bar{\zeta}_i = (\zeta_i, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+m+1}$. We will show that the value function $V(t, x, v) := z^T P(t)z$, $P(t) \in \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^{d+1+m}$, verifies the hybrid Dynamic Programming equations of Theorem 6. For the flow part, we get that

$$z^T \dot{P}(t)z + z^T Q_{c,k}(t)z + \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i(t, x, v) \Delta_i V(t, x, v) = 0 \quad (57)$$

where

$$\Delta_i V(t, x, v) := \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t)z + \bar{z}^T P(t)\bar{\zeta}_i + \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t)\bar{\zeta}_i. \quad (58)$$

We, therefore, have the expression

$$z^T \dot{P}(t)z + z^T Q_c(t)z + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{\lambda}_i(t)^T z (\bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t)z + z^T P(t)\bar{\zeta}_i + \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t)\bar{\zeta}_i) = 0. \quad (59)$$

The above expression can be decomposed as the sum of

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \bar{\lambda}_i(t)^T z (\bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t)z + z^T P(t)\bar{\zeta}_i) = \bar{A}(t)^T P(t) + P(t)\bar{A}(t) \quad (60)$$

with

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \bar{\lambda}_i(t)^T z \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K z^T \text{Sym}(\bar{\lambda}_i(t) \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T) z. \quad (61)$$

Substituting those two expressions in (59) yields the differential equation (54). This proves the result for the flow part.

We now look at the jump part of the dynamics. The Dynamic Programming equation is given in this case by

$$\min_{u(t_k)} \begin{bmatrix} x(t_k) \\ 1 \\ u(t_k) \end{bmatrix}^T P(t_k^+) \begin{bmatrix} x(t_k) \\ 1 \\ u(t_k) \end{bmatrix} - z(t_k)^T P(t_k) z(t_k) + z(t_k)^T Q_d(k) z(t_k) + u(t_k)^T R_d(k) u(t_k) = 0. \quad (62)$$

Let us then partition P as in (56) and computing the derivative with respect to $u(t_k)$ yields

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u(t_k)} \left(\begin{bmatrix} x(t_k) \\ 1 \\ u(t_k) \end{bmatrix}^T P(t_k^+) \begin{bmatrix} x(t_k) \\ 1 \\ u(t_k) \end{bmatrix} + u(t_k)^T R_d(k) u(t_k) \right) = 2 [P_2(t_k^+)^T \mid P_3(t_k^+)] \begin{bmatrix} x(t_k) \\ 1 \\ u(t_k) \end{bmatrix} + 2u(t_k)^T R_d(k). \quad (63)$$

This means that the optimal control input verifies the expression

$$(R_d(k) + P_3(t_k^+))u(t_k) + P_2(t_k^+)^T \bar{x}(t_k) = 0 \quad (64)$$

which yields, in turn, the expression $u(t_k) = K(k)\bar{x}(t_k)$ with $K(k) = -(R_d(k) + P_3(t_k^+))^{-1} P_2(t_k^+)^T$. If we now define $H(k)$ as

$$H(k) := \left[\begin{array}{c|c} I_{d+1} & 0 \\ \hline K(k) & 0 \end{array} \right] \quad (65)$$

then, we get that

$$\begin{bmatrix} x(t_k) \\ 1 \\ u(t_k) \end{bmatrix} = H(k)z(k), \quad (66)$$

and, substituting this expression in (62), we obtain the expression

$$H(k)^T P(t_k^+) H(k) + Q_d(k) + [K(k) \ 0]^T R_d(k) [K(k) \ 0] - P(t_k) = 0. \quad (67)$$

Expanding the above equality yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_1(t_k^+) + \text{Sym}[P_2(t_k^+)K(k)] + K(k)^T (R_d(k) + P_3(t_k^+)K(k)) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + Q_d(k) - P(t_k) = 0, \quad (68)$$

which reduces to $Q_{d,2}(k) - P_2(t_k) = 0$, $Q_{d,3}(k) - P_3(t_k) = 0$, and

$$P_1(t_k^+) + \text{Sym}[P_2(t_k^+)K(k)] + K(k)^T (R_d(k) + P_3(t_k^+)K(k)) + Q_{d,1}(k) - P_1(t_k) = 0. \quad (69)$$

Finally, since $K(k) = -(R_d(k) + P_3(t_k^+))^{-1}P_2(t_k^+)^T$, the above expression simplifies to

$$P_1(t_k^+) - P_2(t_k^+)(P_3(t_k^+) + R_d(k))^{-1}P_2(t_k^+)^T + Q_{d,1}(k) - P_1(t_k) = 0 \quad (70)$$

together with $Q_{d,2}(k) - P_2(t_k) = 0$, $Q_{d,3}(k) - P_3(t_k) = 0$, which proves (55) and the desired result. \diamond

5 Optimal Continuous-Time H_∞ Control of Stochastic Reaction Networks

The objective of this section is to develop an H_∞ (or L_2) control theory for stochastic reaction networks. The key idea is to derive a control law that can guarantee a certain attenuation level from exogenous inputs to control outputs. Such a result exists in a wide variety of contexts; see e.g. [66]. In the linear case, such a result can be retrieved using, among others, optimal control theory and dissipativity theory. This has led to some important results in the linear setting, the most famous one being certainly the so-called Bounded Real Lemma. A general result is first derived and is specialized to the unimolecular case.

5.1 Preliminaries

Similarly as in the previous section, we extend the reaction network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ to not only involve m control inputs but also p exogenous inputs, all of them acting at the propensity level. This gives rise to the following structural assumption

Assumption 8 *The propensity functions of the network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ are of the form $\lambda(t, x, u, w)$ where $u \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ is the control input vector and $w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^p$ is the vector of exogenous disturbances. We also define the so-called controlled output vector $z(t) = h(t, x(t), u(t), w(t))$ where $h : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}^q$ is assumed to be a continuous function.*

The H_∞ control is tightly connected to the concept of L_2 -gain of operators and the L_2 -norm of signals.

Definition 9 *The finite time L_2 -norm of the signal $w : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^p$ is defined as*

$$\|w\|_{L_2([0, T])} := \left(\int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\|w(s)\|_2^2] ds \right)^{1/2}. \quad (71)$$

We can now define the concept of L_2 -gain of operators:

Definition 10 *The finite-horizon L_2 -gain of the transfer/operator $w \mapsto z$ associated with the stochastic reaction network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ under Assumption 8 is defined as*

$$\|w \mapsto z\|_{L_2([0, T]) \rightarrow L_2([0, T])} := \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}_{0, T}, \|w\|_{L_2([0, T])} = 1, X(0) = 0} \|z\|_{L_2([0, T])} \quad (72)$$

where

$$\mathcal{W}_{s, t} := \{w \in L_2([s, t] \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^p) : w \text{ measurable}\}, \quad t \geq s. \quad (73)$$

The H_∞ control problem consists of solving the following optimization problem

$$\min_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{0,T}} \|w \mapsto z\|_{L_2([0,T]) - L_2([0,T])} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{0,T}} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T}, \|w\|_{L_2([0,T])} = 1, X(0)=0} \|z\|_{L_2([0,T])}. \quad (74)$$

A way to solve this In order to solve this problem, the following cost is introduced:

$$J_T(u, w) := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (r(s, u(s)) + \|z(s)\|_2^2 - \gamma^2 \|w(s)\|_2^2) ds + q_T(X(T)) \right] \quad (75)$$

where $r : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the running input cost and $q_T : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is the terminal cost. The control input is chosen in such a way that it minimizes the worst case

$$J_T^* = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{0,T}} \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T}} J_T(u, w) \quad (76)$$

It will be shown later that for the considered class of networks and for a suitable choice for $r(\cdot, \cdot)$, those optimums exist. As previously, we consider Dynamic Programming for solving such a dynamic optimization problem. To this aim, the value function is introduced

$$V(t, X(t)) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{t,T}} \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}_{t,T}} \int_t^T (r(s, u(s)) + \|z(s)\|_2^2 - \gamma^2 \|w(s)\|_2^2) ds, \quad V(T, x) = q_T(x). \quad (77)$$

It is known [54] that such this value function satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs (HJI) equation given by

$$V_t(t, x) + \min_u \max_w \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i(t, x, u, w) \Delta_i V(t, x) + r(t, u) + z(s)^T z(s) - \gamma^2 w(s)^T w(s) \right\} = 0 \quad (78)$$

and $V(T, x) = q_T(x)$. In such a case, the optimal cost $J_T^* := J_T(u^*, w^*)$ coincides with $V(0, X(0))$ and we have that

$$V(0, X(0)) = \|z\|_{L_2([0,T])}^2 - \gamma^2 \|w^*\|_{L_2([0,T])}^2 + \int_0^T r(s, u^*(s)) ds + \mathbb{E}[q_T(X(T))]. \quad (79)$$

This is equivalent to say that

$$\|z(s)\|_{L_2([0,T])}^2 = \gamma^2 \|w^*(s)\|_{L_2([0,T])}^2 - \int_t^T r(s, u^*(s)) ds - \mathbb{E}[q_T(X(T))] + V(0, X(0)) \quad (80)$$

Under zero initial conditions and no terminal cost, this reduces to

$$\|z(s)\|_{L_2([0,T])}^2 = \gamma^2 \|w^*(s)\|_{L_2([0,T])}^2 - \int_t^T r(s, u^*(s)) ds \leq \gamma^2 \|w(s)\|_{L_2([0,T])}^2 \quad (81)$$

where we have used the fact that r is nonnegative.

5.2 Control of unimolecular reaction networks

In the unimolecular case, the propensity functions can be written as

$$\lambda_i(t, x, u, w) = \bar{w}_i(t)^T \bar{x} + \bar{b}_i(t)^T u + \bar{e}_i(t)^T w, \quad i = 1, \dots, K \quad (82)$$

where $\bar{w}_i(t) = (w_{i,x}(t), w_{i,0}(t))$, $w_{i,x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, $\bar{w}_{i,0}(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\bar{b}_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$, and $\bar{e}_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^p$, $i = 1, \dots, K$. The controlled output z is assumed to depend linearly on the signals, that is

$$z(t) = C(t)X(t) + D(t)u(t) + F(t)w(t) + f(t) \quad (83)$$

where $C : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{q \times d}$, $D : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{q \times m}$, $F : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{q \times p}$, and $f : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^q$ are assumed to be continuous functions. We also define $\bar{C}(t) = [C(t) \quad f(t)]$.

For this class of unimolecular networks, the moment equations read

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[X(t)] &= A(t) \mathbb{E}[X(t)] + B(t) \mathbb{E}[u(t)] + E(t) \mathbb{E}[w(t)] + d(t) \\ \mathbb{E}[z(t)] &= C(t) \mathbb{E}[X(t)] + D(t) \mathbb{E}[u(t)] + F(t) \mathbb{E}[w(t)] + f(t) \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

where

$$A(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{w}_{k,x}(t)^T, \quad B(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{b}_k(t)^T, \quad E(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{e}_k(t) \quad \text{and} \quad d(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \zeta_k \bar{w}_{k,0}(t)^T. \quad (85)$$

Finally, we consider the following quadratic version of the cost (75) given by

$$J_T(u, w) := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (u(s)^T R(s) u(s) + \|z(s)\|_2^2 - \gamma^2 \|w(s)\|_2^2) ds + \bar{X}(T)^T Q_T \bar{X}(T) \right] \quad (86)$$

where $\bar{X} = \text{col}(X, 1)$, $R : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}_{>0}^m$, $Q_T \in \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^{d+1}$, and $\gamma > 0$.

We then have the following result:

Theorem 11 *Assume that $D(\cdot)^T F(\cdot) \equiv 0$ and let $\gamma > 0$. Let us further consider a unimolecular reaction network $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})$ with propensity functions (82) and controlled output (83). Then, the optimal pair (u^*, w^*) that solves the optimization problem*

$$\min_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{0,T}} \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T}} J_T(u, w) \quad (87)$$

where $J_T(u, w)$ is given in (86) are given by

$$u^*(t, x(t)) = -\frac{1}{2} (R(t) + D(t)^T D(t))^{-1} \left(2(\bar{B}^T P(t) + D(t)^T \bar{C}(t)) \bar{x}(t) + \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{B}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k \right) \quad (88)$$

and

$$w^*(t, x(t)) = (\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t))^{-1} \left(2(\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + F(t)^T \bar{C}(t)) \bar{x}(t) + \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{E}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k \right), \quad (89)$$

where $P : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}^{d+1}$, $P(T) = Q_T$, solves the Riccati differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}(t) + \bar{A}(t)^T P(t) + P(t) \bar{A}(t) + \bar{C}(t)^T \bar{C}(t) - \frac{1}{4} \Omega_u(t)^T (R(t) + D(t)^T D(t))^{-1} \Omega_u(t) \\ + \frac{1}{4} \Omega_w(t)^T (\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t))^{-1} \Omega_w(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Sym} [\bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

where $\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t) \succ 0$, $\bar{A}_k(t) = \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{w}_k(t)^T$, $\bar{B}_k(t) = \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{b}_k(t)^T$, $\bar{E}_k(t) = \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{e}_k(t)^T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_u(t) &:= 2D(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + 2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{B}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T \\ \Omega_w(t) &:= 2F(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + 2\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{E}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T, \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

$$\bar{A}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} A(t) & d(t) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{B}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} B(t) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{E}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} E(t) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and } \bar{C}(t) = [C(t) \quad f(t)]. \quad (92)$$

Moreover, in such a case, we have that

$$\|z\|_{L_2([0, T])}^2 = \gamma^2 \|w^*\|_{L_2([0, T])}^2 - V(0, X(0)) - \|R^{1/2} u^*\|_{L_2([0, T])}^2 - \|Q_T^{1/2} \bar{X}(T)\|_2^2 \quad (93)$$

which reduces to

$$\|z\|_{L_2([0, T])}^2 < \gamma^2 \|w^*\|_{L_2([0, T])}^2 \quad (94)$$

whenever $X(0) = 0$ and $Q_T = 0$.

Proof : In the present case, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equation reads

$$V_t(t, x) + \min_u \max_w \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i(t, x, u, w) \Delta_i V(t, x) + u^T R(t) u + z^T z - \gamma^2 w^T w \right\} = 0. \quad (95)$$

First of all, note that

$$z(t)^T z(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x} \\ u \\ w \end{bmatrix}^T \mathcal{M}(t) \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x} \\ u \\ w \end{bmatrix} \quad (96)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}(t) := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{C}(t)^T \bar{C}(t) & \bar{C}(t)^T D(t) & \bar{C}(t)^T F(t) \\ D(t)^T \bar{C}(t) & D(t)^T D(t) & 0 \\ F(t)^T \bar{C}(t) & 0 & F(t)^T F(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (97)$$

and where we have used the fact that $D(t)^T F(t) = 0$. Then, computing the derivative of the expression in the min-max expression in (95) with respect to u and w , and equating those expressions to zero yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{b}_i^T \Delta_i V(t, x) + 2\bar{x}^T \bar{C}(t)^T D(t) + 2u^T (R(t) + D(t)^T D(t)) &= 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{e}_i^T \Delta_i V(t, x) + 2\bar{x}^T \bar{C}(t)^T F(t) + 2w^T (F(t)^T F(t) - \gamma^2 I) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

Solving those equations for u and w yields

$$\begin{aligned} u^* &= -\frac{1}{2} (R(t) + D(t)^T D(t))^{-1} \left[2D(t)^T \bar{C}(t) \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{b}_i \Delta_i V(t, x) \right], \\ w^* &= \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t))^{-1} \left[2F(t)^T \bar{C}(t) \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{e}_i \Delta_i V(t, x) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

where we have used the fact that $\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t) \succ 0$, and hence invertible, since $\gamma^2 \|w\|_{L_{2,T}}^2 \geq \|z\|_{L_{2,T}}^2 > \|Fw\|_{L_{2,T}}^2$. Similarly, $R(t) + D(t)^T D(t)$ is invertible since $R(t) + D(t)^T D(t) \succeq R(t) \succ 0$. The Hessian at (u^*, w^*) is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} R(t) + D(t)^T D(t) & 0 \\ 0 & F(t)^T F(t) - \gamma^2 I \end{bmatrix} \quad (100)$$

which proves that we have a minimum at $u = u^*$ since $R(t) + D(t)^T D(t) \succ 0$ and a maximum at $w = w^*$ since $F(t)^T F(t) - \gamma^2 I \prec 0$.

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{b}_i \Delta_i V(t, x) &= \sum_{i=1}^K [2\bar{b}_i \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t) \bar{x} + b_i \bar{\zeta}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i] \\ &= 2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{E}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i \\ &= \left(2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{B}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T \right) \bar{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \bar{e}_i \Delta_i V(t, x) = \left(2\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{E}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T \right) \bar{x}. \quad (102)$$

Therefore, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
u^*(t) &= -\frac{1}{2}(R(t) + D(t)^T D(t))^{-1} \left[2D(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + 2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{B}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T \right] \bar{x} \\
&=: -\frac{1}{2} Z_u(t) \bar{x}, \\
w^*(t) &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t))^{-1} \left[2F(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + 2\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{E}_i^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T \right] \bar{x} \\
&=: \frac{1}{2} Z_w(t) \bar{x}.
\end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

Therefore, the following expression holds at optimality

$$z^*(t)^T z^*(t) - \gamma^2 w^*(t)^T w(t) + u^*(t)^T R(t) u^*(t) = \bar{x}^T \begin{bmatrix} I \\ -Z_u(t)/2 \\ Z_w(t)/2 \end{bmatrix}^T \mathcal{M}(t) \begin{bmatrix} I \\ -Z_u(t)/2 \\ Z_w(t)/2 \end{bmatrix} \bar{x}. \tag{104}$$

As previously, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{w}_k(t)^T \bar{x} (2\bar{\zeta}_k^T P \bar{x} + \bar{\zeta}_k^T P \bar{\zeta}_k) &= \bar{x}^T \left(\text{Sym} \left[P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{w}_k(t)^T + \frac{1}{2} \bar{w}_k(t) \bar{\zeta}_k^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T \right] \right) \bar{x} \\
&= \bar{x}^T \left(\text{Sym} \left[P(t) \bar{A}_k(t) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T \right] \right) \bar{x}
\end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

and, hence,

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \bar{w}_k(t)^T \bar{x} (2\bar{\zeta}_k^T P \bar{x} + \bar{\zeta}_k^T P \bar{\zeta}_k) = \bar{x}^T \left(\text{Sym} \left[P(t) \bar{A}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T \right] \right) \bar{x}. \tag{106}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^K \bar{b}_k(t)^T u^*(t) \Delta_k V(t, x) &= u^*(t)^T \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{b}_k(t) \Delta_k V(t, x) \\
&= u^*(t)^T \left(2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{B}_i(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T \right) \bar{x} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \bar{x}^T Z_u(t)^T \left(2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{B}_i(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T \right) \bar{x}
\end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_k \bar{e}_k(t)^T w^*(t) \Delta_k V(t, x) = \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}^T Z_w(t)^T \left(2\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{E}_i(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T \right) \bar{x} \tag{108}$$

Summing all those terms yields the following explicit expression for (95)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}^T & \left[\dot{P}(t) + P(t)\bar{A} + \bar{A}^T P(t) + \bar{C}(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + \frac{1}{4} Z_u(t)^T (D(t)^T D(t) + R(t)) Z_u(t) \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{4} Z_w(t)^T (F(t)^T F(t) - \gamma^2 I) Z_w(t) - Z_u(t)^T D(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + Z_w(t) F(t)^T \bar{C}(t) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} Z_u(t)^T \left(2\bar{B}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{B}_i(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T \right) \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{2} Z_w(t)^T \left(2\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^K \bar{E}_i(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_i e_{d+1}^T \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Sym}[\bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T] \right] \bar{x} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

which simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}^T & \left[\dot{P}(t) + P(t)\bar{A} + \bar{A}^T P(t) + \bar{C}(t)^T \bar{C}(t) - \frac{1}{2} Z_u(t)^T (D(t)^T D(t) + R(t)) Z_u(t) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{4} Z_w(t)^T (\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t)) Z_w(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Sym}[\bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T] \right] \bar{x} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

Since this must hold for all $\bar{x} = \text{col}(x, 1)$ with $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d$, then this is equivalent to saying that

$$\begin{aligned} & \dot{P}(t) + P(t)\bar{A}(t) + \bar{A}(t)^T P(t) + \bar{C}(t)^T \bar{C}(t) - \frac{1}{2} Z_u(t)^T (D(t)^T D(t) + R(t)) Z_u(t) \\ & + \frac{1}{4} Z_w(t)^T (\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t)) Z_w(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Sym}[\bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

The proof is completed. \diamond

As for the LQ control, the Riccati equation obtained for stochastic reaction networks is quite different that the deterministic counterpart. A word should be said on how the actual closed-loop H_∞ -norm (or, equivalently, the L_2 -gain) can be computed. It can be computed using a bisection algorithm. If the chosen γ is smaller than the minimum achievable closed-loop H_∞ -norm, then the Riccati equation will have a finite escape time.

5.3 H_∞ analysis of stochastic unimolecular reaction networks

The finite-time L_2 -gain of the unimolecular stochastic reaction network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ with propensity functions

$$\lambda_i(t, x, w) = \bar{w}_i(t)^T \bar{x} + \bar{e}_i(t)^T w, \quad i = 1, \dots, K, \quad (112)$$

and the controlled output is defined as

$$z(t) = C(t)X(t) + F(t)w(t) \quad (113)$$

It is important to note that the network is not controlled here due to the absence of control input.

Theorem 12 (Bounded Real Lemma) *Let γ be a positive scalar. Let us further consider a unimolecular reaction network $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})$ with propensity functions (112). Then, this reaction network has finite-time L_2 -gain if there exists a matrix-valued function $P : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}^{d+1}$, $P(T) = 0$, that solves the Riccati differential equation*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}(t) + \bar{A}(t)^T P(t) + P(t) \bar{A}(t) + \bar{C}(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Sym} [\bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T] \\ + \frac{1}{4} \Omega_w(t)^T (\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t))^{-1} \Omega_w(t) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

where $\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t) \succ 0$, $\bar{A}_k(t) = \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{w}_k(t)^T$, $\bar{E}_k = \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{e}_k(t)^T$, and

$$\Omega_w(t) := 2F(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + 2\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{E}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T, \quad (115)$$

where the matrices are the same as those in Theorem 11. Moreover, in such a case, the worst-case disturbance input is given by

$$w^*(t, x(t)) = (\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t))^{-1} \left(2(\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + F(t)^T \bar{C}(t)) \bar{x}(t) + \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{E}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k \right). \quad (116)$$

and we have that

$$\|z\|_{L_2([0, T])}^2 = \gamma^2 \|w^*\|_{L_2([0, T])}^2. \quad (117)$$

Proof : The proof is based on that of Theorem 11 where we have set $\bar{B}(\cdot) = \bar{B}_k(\cdot) = 0$, $D(\cdot) = 0$. In such a case, the optimal control input defined in (88) collapses to zero whereas the differential Riccati equation reduces to (114). Finally, assuming no terminal cost (i.e. $Q_T = 0$), and zero initial conditions yield the result. \diamond

This result is a Bounded Real Lemma for unimolecular reaction networks. In fact, it can be reformulated, in perhaps a more familiar form, in terms of the Linear Matrix Inequalities $\gamma^2 I - F(t)^T F(t) \succ 0$ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{P}(t) + \text{Sym} \left[P(t) \bar{A}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T \right] + \bar{C}(t)^T \bar{C}(t) & \frac{1}{2} \Omega_w(t)^T \\ \frac{1}{2} \Omega_w(t) & F(t)^T F(t) - \gamma^2 I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0 \quad (118)$$

which must hold for all $t \in [0, T]$. An approximate solution can then be found by using polynomial optimization methods such as SOS programming.

6 Optimal Sampled-data H_∞ Control of Stochastic Reaction Networks

We now generalize the results of the previous sections to derive an H_∞ control strategy in the sampled-data setting. Again, we exploit the hybrid formulation to represent the

sampled-data controlled reaction network with uncertain norm-bounded inputs. Besides the already discussed difficulties in discretizing the dynamics of the stochastic reaction network in Section 5, it is important to also add here that the hybrid formulation allows one to consider the input and output function spaces without needing to consider integral operators acting on the infinite-dimensional input space as required for instance in [63]. Using the hybrid formulation, we can deal with the original system directly and rely on tools from the theory of hybrid systems.

6.1 Preliminaries

As previously, we consider that the network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ has m control inputs and p exogenous inputs. This motivates the following assumption

Assumption 13 *The propensity functions of the network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ are of the form $\lambda(t, x, v, w_c)$ where $v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ is the zero-order hold value vector and $w_c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_c}$ is the vector of continuous exogenous disturbances. We also define the controlled outputs $z_c(t) = h_c(t, x(t), v(t), w_c(t))$ and $z_d(k) = h_d(t_k, x(t_k), v(t_k), w_d(k))$ where $w_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_d}$ is the vector of discrete exogenous disturbances and*

$$\begin{aligned} h_c : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_c} &\mapsto \mathbb{R}^{q_c}, \\ h_d : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_d} &\mapsto \mathbb{R}^{q_d} \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

are assumed to be continuous functions.

We extend here the notion of L_2 -norm to hybrid signals

Definition 14 *The $L_2 \times \ell_2$ -norm of a hybrid signal $w := (w_c, w_d)$ where $w_c : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_c}$ and $w_d : \{0, \dots, N\} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_d}$ is defined as*

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} w_c \\ w_d \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{L_2([0, T]) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\})} := \left(\int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\|w_c(s)\|_2^2] ds + \sum_{k=0}^N \mathbb{E}[\|w_d(k)\|_2^2] \right)^{1/2}. \quad (120)$$

Definition 15 *Let us consider the reaction network $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{R})$ which satisfies Assumption 13 and assume that it defines an operator $L_2([0, T], \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_c}) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_d}) \ni (w_c, w_d) \mapsto z \mapsto w := (z_c, z_d) \in L_2([0, T], \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{q_c}) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{q_d})$. Then, the finite-horizon $L_2 \times \ell_2$ -gain of that operator is defined as*

$$\|w \mapsto z\|_{L_2([0, T]) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\}) - L_2([0, T]) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\})} := \sup_{\substack{\|w\|_{L_2([0, T]) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\})} = 1 \\ X(0) = 0}} \|z\|_{L_2([0, T]) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\})} \quad (121)$$

for all adapted signals w in $L_2([0, T]) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\})$.

Based on the above definitions we can state the main problem of the section which is to solve the following optimization problem

$$\min_u \left\| \begin{bmatrix} w_c \\ w_d \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} z_c \\ z_d \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{L_2([0, T]) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\}) - L_2([0, T]) \times \ell_2(\{0, \dots, N\})} \quad (122)$$

where the control input u is adapted and independent of w .

In order to solve this problem, the following cost is introduced:

$$J_T(u, w_c, w_d) := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (||z_c(s)||_2^2 - \gamma^2 ||w_c(s)||_2^2) ds + q_T(\bar{X}(T), v(T)) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (r(t_k, u(t_k)) + ||z_d(k)||_2^2 - \gamma^2 ||w_d(k)||_2^2) \right] \quad (123)$$

where $r : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the running cost and $q_T : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is the terminal cost. The control input is chosen in such a way that it minimizes the worst case cost

$$J_T^* = \min_{u \in \mathcal{V}_{0,T}} \max_{w_c \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T}^c, w_d \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T}^d} J_T(u, w_c, w_d) \quad (124)$$

where we have assumed that the minimum and maximum both exist, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{s,t} &:= \{u \in \ell_2([s, t] \cap \{t_0, \dots, t_N\}) \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m) : u \text{ measurable}\}, \\ \mathcal{W}_{s,t}^c &:= \{w_c \in L_2([s, t] \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_c}) : w_c \text{ measurable}\}, \\ \mathcal{W}_{s,t}^d &:= \{w_d \in \ell_2([s, t] \cap \{t_0, \dots, t_N\}) \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p_d}) : w_d \text{ measurable}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

for all $T \geq t \geq s \geq 0$.

To solve this problem, we rely, once again, on Dynamic Programming and we introduce the value function

$$V(t, X(t)) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{V}_{t,T}} \max_{w_c \in \mathcal{W}_{t,T}^c, w_d \in \mathcal{W}_{t,T}^d} \left\{ \int_t^T (||z(s)||_2^2 - \gamma^2 ||w_c(s)||_2^2) ds + \sum_{k|t_k > t}^{N-1} (r(t_k, u(t_k)) + ||z_d(k)||_2^2 - \gamma^2 ||w_d(k)||_2^2) \right\} \quad (126)$$

which satisfies $V(T, x, v) = q_T(x, v)$ and this yields the following result:

Theorem 16 *Let us consider the sampled-data reaction network represented by (39), (40), (41), which also satisfies Assumption 13. Then, the optimal control input and worst-case exogenous inputs are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} u^*(t_k) &= \operatorname{argmin}_u \{V(t_k^+, x, u) + r(k, u) + z_d(k)^T z_d(k)\}, \\ w_c^*(t) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{w_c} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i(t, x, v, w_c) \Delta V_i(t, x) + z_c(t)^T z_c(t) - \gamma^2 w_c(t)^T w_c(t) \right\}, \\ w_d^*(k) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{w_d} \{z_d(k)^T z_d(k) - \gamma^2 w_d(k)^T w_d(k)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

which hold for all $t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}]$ and $k = 0, \dots, N-1$, and where the value function V verifies the following hybrid Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs (HJI) equation

$$V_t(t, x, v) + \max_{w_c} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i(t, x, v, w_c) \Delta_i V(t, x, v) + z_c^T z_c - \gamma^2 w_c^T w_c \right\} = 0, \quad (128)$$

and

$$\min_u \max_{w_d} \{V(t_k^+, x, u) - V(t_k, x, v) + r(t_k, u) + z_d^T z_d - \gamma^2 w_d^T w_d\} = 0, \quad (129)$$

which hold for all $t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}]$ and $k = 0, \dots, N-1$, together with the terminal condition $V(T, x, v) = 0$.

6.2 Control of unimolecular reaction networks

In this case of unimolecular networks, the propensity functions can be expressed as

$$\lambda_i(t, x, v, w_c) = \bar{w}_i^T \bar{x} + \bar{b}_i^T v + \bar{e}_i^T w_c, \quad i = 1, \dots, K \quad (130)$$

where $\bar{w}_i(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $\bar{b}_i(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\bar{e}_i(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{p_c}$, $i = 1, \dots, K$. Similarly, we have that (119) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} z_c(t) &= C_c(t)X(t) + D_c(t)v(t) + F_c(t)w_c(t) + f_c(t), \\ z_d(k) &= C_d(k)X(t_k) + D_{d,v}(k)v(t_k) + D_{d,u}(k)u(t_k) + F_d(t_k)w_d(k) + f_d(k), \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

where the above matrix-valued functions are continuous and of appropriate dimensions.

Defining now the quadratic cost

$$\begin{aligned} J_T(u, w_c, w_d) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (\|z_c(s)\|_2^2 - \gamma^2 \|w_c(s)\|_2^2) ds + \tilde{x}(T)^T Q_T \tilde{x}(T) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (u(t_k)^T R(k)u(t_k) + \|z_d(k)\|_2^2 - \gamma^2 \|w_d(k)\|_2^2) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (132)$$

allows one to formulate the following result:

Theorem 17 *Assume that $D_{d,u}(\cdot)^T F_d(\cdot) \equiv 0$ and let $\gamma > 0$. Let us further consider a sampled-data unimolecular reaction network $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})$ of the form (39), (40) and (41) with propensity functions (130). Then, the optimal triplet (u^*, w_c^*, w_d^*) that solves the optimization problem*

$$J_T^* = \min_{u \in \mathcal{V}_{0,T}} \max_{w_c \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T}^c, w_d \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T}^d} J_T(u, w_c, w_d) \quad (133)$$

where $J_T(u, w_c, w_d)$ is given in (132) are given by

$$u^*(t_k, x, v) = -(P_3(t_k^+) + R(k) + D_{d,u}(k)^T D_{d,u}(k))^{-1} [(P_2(t_k^+)^T + D_{d,u}(k)^T C_d(k))\bar{x} + D_{d,u}(k)^T D_{d,v}(k)v] \quad (134)$$

$$w_c^*(t, x, v) = (\gamma^2 I - F_c(t)^T F_c(t))^{-1} \left(2(\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + F(t)^T \bar{C}(t))\bar{x}(t) + \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{E}_k(t)^T P(t)\bar{\zeta}_k \right). \quad (135)$$

and

$$w_d^*(k, x, v) = (\gamma^2 I - F_d(k)^T F_d(k))^{-1} F_d(k)^T (C_d(k)\bar{x} + D_{d,v}(k)v) \quad (136)$$

where $P : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{S}^{d+m+1}$, $P(T) = Q_T$, solves the Riccati differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}(t) + \bar{A}(t)^T P(t) + P(t) \bar{A}(t) + \bar{C}(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Sym} [\bar{A}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T] \\ + \frac{1}{4} \Omega_w(t)^T (\gamma^2 I - F_c(t)^T F_c(t))^{-1} \Omega_w(t) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (137)$$

where $\gamma^2 I - F_c(t)^T F_c(t) \succ 0$, $\bar{A}_k(t) = \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{w}_k(t)^T$, $\bar{B}_k(t) = \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{b}_k(t)^T$, $\bar{E}_k(t) = \bar{\zeta}_k \bar{e}_k(t)^T$,

$$\Omega_w(t) := 2F_c(t)^T \bar{C}(t) + 2\bar{E}(t)^T P(t) + \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{E}_k(t)^T P(t) \bar{\zeta}_k e_{d+1}^T, \quad (138)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} P_1(t_k^+) \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}^T - P(t_k) + \bar{C}_d(k)^T \bar{C}_d(k) \\ + \bar{C}_d(k)^T F_d(k) (\gamma^2 I - F_d(k)^T F_d(k))^{-1} F_d(k)^T \bar{C}_d(k) \\ - \begin{bmatrix} P_2(t_k^+) - C_d(k)^T D_{d,u}(k) \\ D_{d,v}(k)^T D_{d,u}(k) \end{bmatrix} (P_3(t_k^+) + R(k) + D_{d,u}^T D_{d,u})^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} P_2(t_k^+) - C_d(k)^T D_{d,u}(k) \\ D_{d,v}(k)^T D_{d,u}(k) \end{bmatrix} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (139)$$

where $\bar{C}_c(t) := [C_c(t) \ D_c(t) \ f_c(t)]$, $\bar{C}_d(k) := [C_d(k) \ D_{d,v}(k) \ f_d(k)]$,

$$\bar{A}(t) := \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} A(t) & d(t) & B(t) \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right], \bar{E}(t) := \begin{bmatrix} E(t) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \bar{\zeta}_k := \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_k \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, P(t) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} P_1(t) & P_2(t) \\ \hline P_2(t)^T & P_3(t) \end{array} \right], \quad (140)$$

and $P_1(\cdot) \in \mathbb{S}^{d+1}$, $P_2(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times m}$, and $P_3(\cdot) \in \mathbb{S}^m$.

Proof : In the present case, we have that

$$V_t(t, x, v) + \max_w \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i(t, x, v, w) \Delta_i V(t, x, v) + z_c(t)^T z_c(t) - \gamma^2 w_c(t)^T w_c(t) \right\} = 0 \quad (141)$$

$$\min_u \max_w \left\{ V_t(t_k^+, x, u) - V_t(t_k, x, v) + u^T R(k) u + z_d(k)^T z_d(k) - \gamma^2 w_d(k)^T w_d(k) \right\} = 0 \quad (142)$$

and $V(T, x) = q_T(x)$.

Computing the derivative with respect to w_c in (141) yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \bar{e}_i(t)^T \Delta_i V(t, x, v) + 2\bar{x}^T C_c(t)^T F_c(t) + 2v^T D_c(t)^T F_c(t) + 2w_c^T F_c(t)^T F_c(t) - 2\gamma^2 w_c^T. \quad (143)$$

Equating this to zero and solving for w_c yields

$$w_c^*(t) = \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^2 I - F_c(t)^T F_c(t))^{-1} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \bar{e}_k(t) \Delta_k V(t, x, v) + 2F_c(t)^T \bar{C}_c(t) \tilde{x}(t) \right] \quad (144)$$

where $\tilde{x} = (x, 1, v)$. This is, indeed, a maximum if and only if $F_c^T F_c - \gamma^2$ is negative definite. Substituting this expression in (141) yields the Riccati differential equation (137).

Analogously, the derivative of (142) with respect to w_d is given by

$$2\bar{x}^T P_2(t_k^+) + 2u^T P_3(t_k^+) + 2u^T R(k) + 2\bar{x}^T C_d(k)^T D_{d,u}(k) + 2v^T D_{d,v}(k)^T D_{d,u}(k) + 2u^T D_{d,u}(k)^T D_{d,u}(k) \quad (145)$$

and equating it to 0 yields

$$\begin{aligned} u^*(t_k, \bar{x}, v) &= -(P_3(t_k^+) + R(k) + D_{d,u}(k)^T D_{d,u}(k))^{-1} (P_2(t_k^+)^T \bar{x} + D_{d,u}^T C_d(k) \bar{x} + D_{d,u}(k)^T D_{d,v}(k) v) \\ &=: K_x(k) \bar{x} + K_v(k) v := K(k) \tilde{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

Similar calculations for w_d yield

$$2\bar{x}^T C_d(k)^T F_d(k) + 2v^T D_{d,v}(k)^T F_d(k) + 2w_d^T F_d(k)^T F_d(k) - 2\gamma^2 w_d^T \quad (147)$$

which leads to the optimal value

$$w_d^*(k) = (\gamma^2 I - F_d(k)^T F_d(k))^{-1} F_d(k)^T (C_d(k) \bar{x} + D_{d,v}(k) v) = W_x(k) \bar{x} + W_v(k) v := W(k) \tilde{x}. \quad (148)$$

The Hessian matrix is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_3(t_k^+) + R(k) + D_{d,u}(k)^T D_{d,u}(k) & 0 \\ 0 & F_d(k)^T F_d(k) - \gamma^2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (149)$$

and shows that we get a maximum in w_d if and only if $F_d^T F_d - \gamma^2$ is negative definite where and a minimum in u if and only if $P_3(t_k^+) + R(k) + D_{d,u}(k)^T D_{d,u}(k)$ is positive definite. The latter condition is the case since $R(k) \succ 0$ while the former is enforced by the condition in the result. Let $u^* =: K_x \bar{x} + K_v v$ and $w_d^* =: W_x \bar{x} + W_v v$. Substituting those expressions in (142) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ K_x(k) & K_v(k) \end{bmatrix}^T P(t_k^+) \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ K_x(k) & K_v(k) \end{bmatrix} - P(t_k) + K(k)^T R(k) K(k) \\ &+ \Omega_d(k)^T \Omega_d(k) - \gamma^2 W(k)^T W(k) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

where $\Omega_d(k) := \bar{C}_d(k) + \bar{D}_{d,u}(k) K(k) + F_d(k) W(k)$. This can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} P_1(t_k^+) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \text{Sym} \left(\begin{bmatrix} P_2(t_k^+) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} K \right) + K(k)^T (P_3(t_k^+) + R(k) + D_{d,u}^T D_{d,u}) K(k) \\ &+ \text{Sym}(\bar{C}_d^T D_{d,u} K(k)) + W(k)^T (F_d(k)^T F_d(k) - \gamma^2 I) W(k) \\ &+ \text{Sym}(\bar{C}_d^T F_d W(k)) + \bar{C}_d^T \bar{C}_d = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

Using now equalities

$$\begin{aligned} W(k)^T (F_d(k)^T F_d(k) - \gamma^2 I) W(k) &= -\bar{C}_d(k)^T F_d(k) (\gamma^2 I - F_d(k)^T F_d(k))^{-1} F_d(k)^T \bar{C}_d(k) \\ \bar{C}_d(k)^T F_d W(k) &= \bar{C}_d(k)^T F_d(k) (\gamma^2 I - F_d(k)^T F_d(k))^{-1} F_d(k)^T \bar{C}_d(k). \\ K(k)^T (P_3(t_k^+) + R(k) + D_{d,u}^T D_{d,u}) K(k) &= \Omega_d(k)^T (P_3(t_k^+) + R(k) + D_{d,u}^T D_{d,u})^{-1} \Omega_d(k) \\ \left(\begin{bmatrix} P_2(t_k^+) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \bar{C}_d(k)^T D_{d,u}(k) \right) K &= -\Omega_d(k)^T (P_3(t_k^+) + R(k) + D_{d,u}^T D_{d,u})^{-1} \Omega_d(k) \end{aligned} \quad (152)$$

where

$$\Omega_d(k) = \begin{bmatrix} P_2(t_k^+) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \bar{C}_d(k)^T D_{d,u}(k), \quad (153)$$

yields the desired result. \diamond

7 Concluding statements

Optimal control results have been obtained for stochastic reaction networks. A difficulty of the approach is the impossibility of ensuring the nonnegativity of the control input, which results in the non-optimality of the control laws when restricted to nonnegative values. Such optimal control problems have been considered in the past [67] but using the Pontryagin’s Maximum Principle, which is not available in the current context. So, an alternative approach needs to be developed. Future extensions of the results would be the consideration of cost with infinite horizon through long-run average cost criterion.

References

- [1] J. Goutsias and G. Jenkinson, “Markovian dynamics on complex reaction networks,” *Physics reports*, vol. 529, pp. 199–264, 2013.
- [2] F. Horn and R. Jackson, “General mass action kinetics,” *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis*, vol. 47(2), pp. 81–116, 1972.
- [3] M. Feinberg, “Complex balancing in general kinetic systems,” *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis*, vol. 49(3), pp. 187–194, 1972.
- [4] F. Blanchini and G. Giordano, “Piecewise-linear Lyapunov functions for structural stability of biochemical networks,” *Automatica*, vol. 50(10), pp. 2482–2493, 2014.
- [5] M. A. Al-Radhawi and D. Angeli, “New approach to the stability of chemical reaction networks: Piecewise linear in rates Lyapunov functions,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61(1), pp. 76–89, 2016.
- [6] M. A. Al-Radhawi, D. Angeli, and E. D. Sontag, “A computational framework for a Lyapunov-enabled analysis of biochemical reaction networks,” *PLOS Computational Biology*, vol. 16(2), p. e1007681, 2020.
- [7] C. Briat, A. Gupta, and M. Khammash, “Antithetic integral feedback ensures robust perfect adaptation in noisy biomolecular networks,” *Cell Systems*, vol. 2, pp. 17–28, 2016.
- [8] C. Cuba Samaniego and E. Franco, “An ultrasensitive biomolecular network for robust feedback control,” in *20th IFAC World Congress*, 2017, pp. 11 437–11 443.

- [9] F. Xiao and J. C. Doyle, “Robust perfect adaptation in biomolecular reaction networks,” *BioRxiv*, p. 299057, 2018.
- [10] C. Briat, “A biology-inspired approach to the positive integral control of positive systems - the antithetic, exponential, and logistic integral controllers,” *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, vol. 19(1), pp. 619–664, 2020.
- [11] C. Cuba Samaniego, N. A. Delateur, G. Giordano, and E. Franco, “Biomolecular stabilisation near the unstable equilibrium of a biological system,” in *58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Nice, France, 2019, pp. 958–964.
- [12] D. K. Agrawal, R. Marshall, M. Ali Al-Radhawi, V. Noireaux, and E. Sontag, “Some remarks on robust gene regulation in a biomolecular integral controller,” in *58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Nice, France, 2019, pp. 2820–2825.
- [13] D. Del Vecchio and R. M. Murray, Eds., *Biomolecular Feedback Systems*. Princeton University Press, 2015.
- [14] D. Del Vecchio, A. J. Dy, and Y. Qian, “Control theory meets synthetic biology,” *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, vol. 13, no. 120, 2016.
- [15] D. Del Vecchio, H. Abdallah, Y. Qian, and J. J. Collins, “A blueprint for a synthetic genetic feedback controller to reprogram cell fate,” *International Journal of Control*, vol. 4, pp. 1–12, 2017.
- [16] M. Khammash, M. di Bernardo, and D. di Bernardo, “Cybergenetics: Theory and methods for genetic control systems,” in *58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Nice, France, 2019, pp. 916–926.
- [17] M. B. Elowitz, A. J. Levine, E. D. Siggia, and P. S. Swain, “Stochastic gene expression in a single cell,” *Science*, vol. 297(5584), pp. 1183–1186, 2002.
- [18] D. F. Anderson and T. G. Kurtz, *Stochastic Analysis of Biochemical Systems*, ser. Mathematical Biosciences Institute Lecture Series. Springer Verlag, 2015, vol. 1.2.
- [19] A. Gupta, C. Briat, and M. Khammash, “A scalable computational framework for establishing long-term behavior of stochastic reaction networks,” *PLOS Computational Biology*, vol. 10(6), p. e1003669, 2014.
- [20] S. Engblom, “On the stability of stochastic jump kinetics,” *ArXiv:1202.3892*, 2012. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1202.3892>
- [21] M. Rathinam, “Moment growth bounds on continuous time Markov processes on non-negative integer lattices,” *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, vol. LXXIII, no. 2, pp. 347–364, 2015.

- [22] C. Briat and M. Khammash, “Computer control of gene expression: Robust setpoint tracking of protein mean and variance using integral feedback,” in *51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Maui, Hawaii, USA, 2012, pp. 3582–3588.
- [23] —, “Integral population control of a quadratic dimerization process,” in *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Florence, Italy, 2013, pp. 3367–3372.
- [24] —, “In-silico proportional-integral moment control of stochastic gene expression,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66(7), pp. 3007–3019, 2021.
- [25] —, “Ergodicity analysis and antithetic integral control of a class of stochastic reaction networks with delays,” *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, vol. 19(3), pp. 1575–1608, 2020.
- [26] C. Briat, A. Gupta, and M. Khammash, “Variance reduction for antithetic integral control of stochastic reaction networks,” *Journal of the Royal Society: Interface*, vol. 15(143), p. 20180079, 2018.
- [27] A. Gupta and M. Khammash, “An antithetic integral rein controller for bio-molecular networks,” in *58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Nice, France, 2019, pp. 2808–2813.
- [28] C. Briat and M. Khammash, “Ergodicity, output-controllability, and antithetic integral control of uncertain stochastic reaction networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66(5), pp. 2087–2098, 2020.
- [29] A. Miliadis-Argeitis, S. Summers, J. Stewart-Ornstein, I. Zuleta, D. Pincus, H. El-Samad, M. Khammash, and J. Lygeros, “In silico feedback for in vivo regulation of a gene expression circuit,” *Nature Biotechnology*, vol. 29, pp. 1114–1116, 2011.
- [30] J. Uhlenhof, A. Miermont, T. Delaveau, G. Charvin, F. Fages, S. Bottani, G. Batt, S. Bottani, G. Batt, and P. Hersen, “Long-term model predictive control of gene expression at the population and single-cell levels,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 109(35), pp. 14 271–14 276, 2012.
- [31] A. Miliadis-Argeitis, M. Rullan, S. K. Aoki, P. Buchmann, and M. Khammash, “Automated optogenetic feedback control for precise and robust regulation of gene expression and cell growth,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 7(12546), pp. 1–11, 2016.
- [32] G. Fiore, G. Perrino, M. di Bernardo, and D. di Bernardo, “In vivo real-time control of gene expression: A comparative analysis of feedback control strategies in yeast,” *ACS Synthetic Biology*, vol. 5(2), pp. 154–162, 2016.
- [33] J.-B. Lugagne, S. Sosa Carrillo, M. Kirch, A. Köhler, G. Batt, and P. Hersen, “Balancing a genetic toggle switch by real-time feedback control and periodic forcing,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 8, pp. 1–8, 2017.

- [34] B. Shannon, C. G. Zamora-Chimal, L. Postiglione, D. Salzano, C. S. Grierson, L. Marucci, N. J. Savery, and M. di Bernardo, “Optimal control of markov jump processes: Asymptotic analysis, algorithms and applications to the modeling of chemical reaction systems,” *ACS Synthetic Biology*, vol. 9(10), pp. 2617–2624, 2018.
- [35] S. Aoki, G. Lillacci, A. Gupta, A. Baumschlager, D. Schweingruber, and M. Khammash, “A universal biomolecular integral feedback controller for robust perfect adaptation,” *Nature*, vol. 570, pp. 533–537, 2019.
- [36] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [37] D. G. Luenberger, *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*. John Wiley and Sons, 1969.
- [38] I. M. Ross, *A Primer on Pontryagin’s Principle in Optimal Control*. Collegiate Publishers, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2015.
- [39] R. Bellman, “The theory of dynamic programming,” *Bulleting of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 60, pp. 503–515, 1954.
- [40] R. H. Stockbridge, “Time-average control of martingale problems: a linear programming formulation,” *The Annals of Probability*, vol. 18(1), pp. 206–217, 1990.
- [41] T. G. Kurtz and R. H. Stockbridge, “Existence of Markov controls and characterization of optimal Markov controls,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 609–653, 1998.
- [42] W. Zhang, C. Hartmann, and M. von Kleist, “Optimal control of markov jump processes: Asymptotic analysis, algorithms and applications to the modeling of chemical reaction systems,” *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 16(2), pp. 293–331, 2018.
- [43] V. Renault, M. Thieullen, and E. Trélat, “Optimal control of infinite-dimensional piecewise deterministic markov processes and application to the control of neuronal dynamics via optogenetics,” *Networks & Heterogeneous Media*, vol. 12(3), pp. 417–459, 2017.
- [44] D. Bertsekas, *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control Vol. I - 4th Edition*. Athena Scientific, 2017.
- [45] —, *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control Vol. II - 4th Edition*. Athena Scientific, 2012.
- [46] D. P. Bertsekas, *Reinforcement Learning and Optimal Control*. Athena Scientific, 2019.
- [47] W. H. Fleming, H., and H. M. Soner, *Controlled Markov processes and viscosity solutions*, ser. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Springer, New York, 2006, vol. 25.

- [48] H. Abou-Kandil, G. Freiling, V. Ionecu, and G. Jank, *Matrix Riccati Equations in Control and Systems Theory*. Springer Basel, 2003.
- [49] A. R. Teel, A. Subbaraman, and A. Sferlazza, “Stability analysis for stochastic hybrid systems: A survey,” *Automatica*, vol. 50(10), pp. 2435–2456, 2014.
- [50] Y. Yamamoto, “New approach to sampled-data control systems - a function space method,” in *29th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, Honolulu, Hawaii*, 1990, pp. 1882–1887.
- [51] —, “A function space approach to sampled data control systems and tracking problems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 39(4), pp. 703–713, 1994.
- [52] G. Zames, “Feedback and optimal sensitivity: Model reference transformations, multiplicative seminorms, and approximate inverses,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 26(2), pp. 301–320, 1981.
- [53] J. C. Doyle, K. Glover, P. P. Khargonekar, and B. A. Francis, “State space solutions to standard \mathcal{H}_2 and \mathcal{H}_∞ control problems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 34, pp. 831–847, 1989.
- [54] T. Basar and P. Bernard, *\mathcal{H}_∞ Optimal Control and Related Minimax design problems - A Dynamic Game Approach*. *Systems and Control: Foundation and Applications*. Boston: Birkhauser, 1995.
- [55] R. Isaacs, *Differential Games*. John Wileys and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- [56] D. Anderson and T. G. Kurtz, “Continuous time Markov chain models for chemical reaction networks,” in *Design and analysis of biomolecular circuits - Engineering Approaches to Systems and Synthetic Biology*, H. Koeppl, D. Densmore, G. Setti, and M. di Bernardo, Eds. Springer Science+Business Media, 2011, pp. 3–42.
- [57] A. Singh and J. P. Hespanha, “Approximate moment dynamics for chemically reacting systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56(2), pp. 414–418, 2011.
- [58] A. Miliadis-Argeitis, S. Summers, J. Stewart-Ornstein, I. Zuleta, D. Pincus, H. El-Samad, M. Khammash, and J. Lygeros, “In silico feedback for in vivo regulation of a gene expression circuit,” *Nature Biotechnology*, vol. 29, pp. 1114–1116, 2011.
- [59] M. Rullan, D. Benzinger, G. W. Schmidt, A. Gupta, A. Miliadis-Argeitis, and M. Khammash, “Optogenetic single-cell control of transcription achieves mrna tunability and reduced variability,” *BioRxiv*, 2017.
- [60] R. Bellman, *Dynamic Programming*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, USA, 1957.

- [61] P. Parrilo, “Structured semidefinite programs and semialgebraic geometry methods in robustness and optimization,” Ph.D. dissertation, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, 2000.
- [62] B. Bamieh, J. B. Pearson, B. A. Francis, and A. Tannenbaum, “A lifting technique for linear periodic systems with applications to sampled-data control,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 17, pp. 79–88, 1991.
- [63] T. Chen and B. Francis, *Optimal Sampled-Data Control Systems*. Berlin: Springer, 1995.
- [64] N. Sivashankar and P. P. Khargonekar, “Characterization of the \mathcal{L}_2 -induced norm for linear systems with jumps with applications to sampled-data systems,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 32(4), pp. 1128–1150, 1994.
- [65] R. Goebel, R. G. Sanfelice, and A. R. Teel, *Hybrid Dynamical Systems. Modeling, Stability, and Robustness*. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [66] A. van der Schaft, *L_2 -Gain and Passivity Techniques in Nonlinear Control*. Springer-Verlag, London, 2000.
- [67] W. P. M. H. Heemels, S. J. L. Van Eijndhoven, and A. A. Stoorvogel, “Linear quadratic regulator problem with positive controls,” *International Journal of Control*, vol. 70(4), pp. 551–578, 1998.