

An Asymptotically Optimal Two-Part Coding Scheme for Networked Control under Fixed-Rate Constraints

Jonathan Keeler, Tamás Linder and Serdar Yüksel

Abstract—It is known that fixed rate adaptive quantizers can be used to stabilize an open-loop-unstable linear system driven by unbounded noise. These quantizers can be designed so that they have near-optimal rate, and the resulting system will be stable in the sense of having an invariant probability measure, or ergodicity, as well as the boundedness of the state second moment. However, results on the minimization of the state second moment for such quantizers, an important goal in practice, do not seem to be available. In this paper, we construct a two-part adaptive coding scheme that is asymptotically optimal in terms of the second moments. The first part, as in prior work, leads to ergodicity (via positive Harris recurrence) and the second part attains order optimality of the invariant second moment, resulting in near optimal performance at high rates.

I. INTRODUCTION

We consider the linear system

$$x_{t+1} = ax_t + bu_t + d_t, \quad (1)$$

where $|a| \geq 1$, $b \neq 0$, and d_t is a sequence of i.i.d. Gaussian random variables $d_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. The state variable x_t is driven by the noise d_t and the aim is to control the state through the action u_t . The system is open-loop-unstable but is stabilizable.

First suppose that the system is fully observed. If one minimizes the average quadratic cost of the state, $E[x_t^2]$, over any time horizon (with no penalty on control) then the optimal control is $u_t = -\frac{a}{b}x_t$ and the optimal cost is σ^2 (via a Riccati equation optimality argument with no cost on control [1]). In contrast, here we assume that the controller only has access to x_t through a discrete noiseless channel of capacity C bits.




Fig. 1. Block diagram of the communication and control loop.

Thus, the data rate is fixed, and we assume zero coding delay. In this setup, it becomes necessary to describe not just a control policy, but also a coding scheme with which to communicate information about the current state variable.

For systems of this nature, various authors have obtained the smallest channel capacity above which stabilization is possible, under various assumptions on the system and the

admissible coders and controllers. This result is usually referred to as a *data-rate theorem*, and in the scalar case (1) we consider, it reduces to simply $C > \log|a|$. Some of the earliest works in this context are [2] and [3]. More general versions of the data-rate theorem have been proven in [4] and [5]. For noisy systems and mean-square stabilization, or more generally, moment-stabilization, analogous data-rate theorems have been proven in [6] and [7], see also [8], [9].

In [10], [11], a joint fixed-rate coding and control scheme is given which stabilizes the system (1) while being nearly rate-optimal, in that the rate used satisfies only $C > \log(|a| + 1)$. This is achieved using an adaptive uniform quantization scheme, where the quantizer bin sizes "zoom" in and out exponentially to track the state x_t . Here, the notion of stability is ergodicity and finiteness of all limiting system moments. By increasing a sampling period T the achievable rate $\frac{1}{T} \log(|a|^T + 1)$ gets arbitrarily close to $C > \log|a|$ [12, Theorem 2.3]. The same result also applies to multi-dimensional systems [12]. Furthermore, this scheme leads to a closed loop system which is positive Harris recurrent, and hence, ergodic. For related recent fixed-rate constructions, we refer the reader to [13] and [14].

However, despite being near rate-optimal for achieving stability (i.e., *finite* system moments), the scheme in [10], [11] has not been shown to be asymptotically second-moment optimal as the data rate grows large.

In this paper, we present a variation on the coding and control scheme used in [10], [11] by including an additional quantization stage, which is fixed in time, unlike the first stage of the coding scheme. Crucially utilizing the ergodicity results of the first coding stage, we show that this two-part coding scheme attains second-moment optimality with near optimal rate of convergence. While multi-stage quantization schemes have been studied before in the source coding literature [15], our implementation is novel in that one stage of the code is time-adaptive and stabilizing. An inspiration for this approach also comes to us from Berger [16] and Sahai [17].

In this paper, we show that this new scheme retains key stability and ergodicity properties ensured by the original one-stage scheme, closely appealing to the existing arguments made in [10], [11]. In our main results, Theorems 3.3 and 3.7, we show that the new scheme is asymptotically second-moment optimal, i.e., as the data rate goes to infinity, the system second moment converges to the optimum σ^2 at a rate which is arbitrarily close to order-optimal in a polynomial sense. We also illustrate this convergence by numerical results.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Quantization

To communicate over a finite capacity channel, it is necessary to employ quantization schemes. We will work solely with the following class of quantizers, as used in [10], [11]. For a given bin size $\Delta > 0$ and even number of bins $M \geq 2$, we define the *modified uniform quantizer* Q_M^Δ by,

$$Q_M^\Delta(x) = \begin{cases} \Delta \lfloor \frac{x}{\Delta} \rfloor + \frac{\Delta}{2}, & \text{if } x \in [-\frac{M}{2}\Delta, \frac{M}{2}\Delta) \\ \frac{M}{2}\Delta - \frac{\Delta}{2}, & \text{if } x = \frac{M}{2}\Delta \\ 0, & \text{if } |x| > \frac{M}{2}\Delta. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

This quantizer uniformly quantizes $x \in [-\frac{M}{2}\Delta, \frac{M}{2}\Delta]$ into M bins of size Δ and maps all larger x to zero. This requires $M + 1$ output levels.

This quantizer is almost as simple as possible (aside from the overload symbol, this is typical uniform quantization), and its use leads to stability of the closed-loop process with near rate-optimality, as discussed in Section I.

We will consider two primary applications of this class of quantizers. First, we consider *adaptive* quantizers, whose bin sizes vary with time. Fix an even number of bins $K \geq 2$ and let $\{\Delta_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ be a sequence of strictly positive bin sizes. We will then make use of the adaptive modified uniform quantizer $Q_K^{\Delta_t}$.

Secondly, we consider quantizers fixed in time, whose bin size is a function of the number of bins. For a given (even) number of bins $N \geq 2$, we choose a bin size $\Delta_{(N)}$ and consider the quantizer $Q_N^{\Delta_{(N)}}$. To distinguish this from the adaptive case, we denote $U_N := Q_N^{\Delta_{(N)}}$. We also allow for $N = 0$, for which we write $U_0 \equiv 0$.

B. System Description

Recall the linear system (1) with the information constraints of Figure 1. Since the system is open-loop-unstable, any fixed quantization policy will make the system transient. We will consider a two-part coding scheme, where the first part is adaptive and the second is fixed. The adaptive part will yield stability, and the fixed part will yield an optimal rate of convergence.

Suppose $\{\Delta_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a sequence such that Δ_{t+1} is a function of only Δ_t and the indicator random variable $\mathbf{1}_{\{|x_t| \leq \frac{K}{2}\Delta_t\}}$. Also assume that both the encoder and the decoder (controller) know Δ_0 . Then so long as $Q_K^{\Delta_t}(x_t)$ is sent over the channel, it is possible to synchronize knowledge of Δ_t between the quantizer and the controller, since $|x_t| \leq \frac{K}{2}\Delta_t$ if and only if $Q_K^{\Delta_t}(x_t) \neq 0$.

We now describe the proposed communication and control scheme. For $\{\Delta_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ as above, we calculate the adaptive quantizer output $Q_K^{\Delta_t}(x_t)$ and the adaptive system error $e_t := x_t - Q_K^{\Delta_t}(x_t)$. Then, using a fixed (i.e., non-adaptive) quantizer U_N with bin size $\Delta_{(N)}$ as in Section II-A, we calculate the fixed quantizer output $U_N(e_t)$. We then send $Q_K^{\Delta_t}(x_t)$ and $U_N(e_t)$ across the noiseless channel using a total of $C = \log_2(K + 1) + \log_2(N + 1)$ bits.

The controller then applies the control given by

$$u_t = -\frac{a}{b} \left(Q_K^{\Delta_t}(x_t) + U_N(e_t) \right).$$

This coding and control scheme is illustrated below.




Fig. 2. Block diagram of the two-stage coding and control scheme.

We note that the term $U_N(e_t)$ distinguishes our control scheme from [10], [11]. This control is chosen to mirror the optimal fully observed control, where $Q_K^{\Delta_t}(x_t) + U_N(e_t)$ is a good estimate of the true state x_t . By (1), this results in the state dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= a(x_t - Q_K^{\Delta_t}(x_t) - U_N(e_t)) + d_t \\ &= a(e_t - U_N(e_t)) + d_t. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In the case $N = 0$, this reduces to [10], [11] with

$$x_{t+1} = a(x_t - Q_K^{\Delta_t}(x_t)) + d_t. \quad (4)$$

We briefly motivate the given scheme. For the bin update rules we will describe below, the pair (x_t, Δ_t) forms a Markov chain. The update dynamics (4) with no fixed quantization ($N = 0$) ensure that the system is stochastically stable and ergodic, due to results of [11].

Our main contribution is analyzing the performance of the proposed two-stage scheme. Through an intricate stochastic stability analysis, we ultimately prove that the addition of a fixed quantization stage leads to optimal convergence of the second moment with near-optimality in the rate of convergence.

Finally, we describe the bin update dynamics. As in [10], [11], a simple *zooming* scheme is employed. Assuming that $K > |a|$ (which ensures stability), choose $\frac{|a|}{K} < \alpha < 1$, $\delta > 0$ and $L > 0$. The update is:

$$\Delta_{t+1} = \begin{cases} (|a| + \delta)\Delta_t, & \text{if } |x_t| > \frac{K}{2}\Delta_t \\ \alpha\Delta_t, & \text{if } |x_t| \leq \frac{K}{2}\Delta_t, \Delta_t \geq L \\ \Delta_t, & \text{if } |x_t| \leq \frac{K}{2}\Delta_t, \Delta_t < L. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The above rules imply that $\Delta_t \geq \alpha L$. We choose an arbitrary initial $\Delta_0 > 0$.

Then we consider the process $\{\phi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty = \{(x_t, \Delta_t)\}_{t=0}^\infty$ with the dynamics described above. This process is a Markov chain. The state space of this process highly depends on the following "countability condition" utilized in [10], [11].

Condition A. There exist relatively prime integers $j, k \geq 1$ such that $\alpha^j(|a| + \delta)^k = 1$. Equivalently, $\log_\alpha(|a| + \delta)$ is rational.

If this condition holds, then starting from an arbitrary $\Delta_0 > 0$ there exists $\kappa, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\log \Delta_t$ always belongs to a subset of $\mathbb{Z}\kappa + b = \{n\kappa + b : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. If the condition fails, then starting from any fixed Δ_0 , the set of reachable bin sizes is a dense but countable subset of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

We restrict our analysis to the case where Condition A holds. We let the state space for Δ_t be

$$\Omega_\Delta := \{\alpha^j(|a| + \delta)^k \Delta_0 : j, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}.$$

The state space for the Markov chain $\{(x_t, \Delta_t)\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is then $\mathbb{R} \times \Omega_\Delta$.

C. Stochastic Stability

Suppose $\{\phi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a Markov chain with state space \mathbb{X} , where \mathbb{X} is a complete separable metric space that is locally compact; its Borel sigma algebra is denoted $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. The transition probability is denoted by P , so that for any $\phi \in \mathbb{X}$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$, the probability of moving in one step from state ϕ to the set A is given by $P(\phi_{t+1} \in A \mid \phi_t = \phi) = P(\phi, A)$. The n -step transitions are obtained in the usual way, $P(\phi_{t+n} \in A \mid \phi_t = \phi) = P^n(\phi, A)$ for any $n \geq 1$. The transition law acts on measurable functions $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and measures μ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ via

$$Pf(\phi) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} P(\phi, dy) f(y), \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{X}$$

and

$$\mu P(A) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mu(d\phi) P(\phi, A), \quad \text{for all } A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}).$$

A probability measure π on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ is called invariant if $\pi P = \pi$, that is:

$$\int_{\mathbb{X}} \pi(d\phi) P(\phi, A) = \pi(A), \quad \text{for all } A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}).$$

For any initial probability measure ν on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ we can construct a stochastic process with transition law P and $\phi_0 \sim \nu$. We let P_ν denote the resulting probability measure on the sample space, with the usual convention that $\nu = \delta_\phi$ (i.e., $\nu(\{\phi\}) = 1$) when the initial state is $\phi \in \mathbb{X}$. When $\nu = \pi$ the resulting process is stationary.

There is at most one stationary solution under the following irreducibility assumption. For a set $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ we denote,

$$\tau_A := \min \{t \geq 1 : \phi_t \in A\}. \quad (6)$$

Definition 2.1. Let φ denote a σ -finite measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$.

(i) The Markov chain is called φ -irreducible if for any $\phi \in \mathbb{X}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ satisfying $\varphi(B) > 0$ we have

$$P_\phi(\tau_B < \infty) > 0.$$

(ii) A φ -irreducible Markov chain is *Harris recurrent* if $P_\phi(\tau_B < \infty) = 1$ for any $\phi \in \mathbb{X}$ and any $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ satisfying $\varphi(B) > 0$. It is *positive Harris recurrent* if in addition there is an invariant probability measure π .

Notably, the positive Harris recurrence property leads to ergodicity of the closed-loop process: for every initial state and every $g \in L_1(\pi)$, the following holds almost surely: $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g(\phi_k) = \int \pi(d\pi) g(\phi)$. This almost sure sample path convergence also holds in expectation under mild Lyapunov conditions [18] (which will be the case in our analysis).

III. ANALYSIS OF SCHEME

A. Supporting Lemma on Optimality at High-Rates

For the class of fixed quantizers U_N introduced in Section II-A, we present the following result bounding the expected MSE of a family of well-behaved random variables.

Lemma 3.1. Suppose $\{X_N\}_{N=2}^\infty$ are random variables satisfying the following uniform moment bound:

$$E[|X_N|^m] \leq B_m \quad \text{for all } m = 1, 2, \dots \quad (7)$$

where $\{B_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is independent of N . Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and set the bin size for U_N as $\Delta_{(N)} = AN^{-1+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon}$, for fixed $A > 0$. Then we have

$$E[(X_N - U_N(X_N))^2] = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\varepsilon}}\right),$$

i.e., there exists a constant $C > 0$ which depends on ε with

$$E[(X_N - U_N(X_N))^2] \leq CN^{-2+\varepsilon}, \quad \text{for all } N \geq 2.$$

Proof: For brevity, denote $Y_N = X_N - U_N(X_N)$. First note that when $|X_N| \leq \frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)}$, we have $|Y_N| \leq \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{(N)}$. Therefore,

$$E[Y_N^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_N| \leq \frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)}\}}] \leq \frac{1}{4}\Delta_{(N)}^2 = \frac{1}{4}A^2N^{-2+\varepsilon}. \quad (8)$$

Next we will consider the region $|X_N| > \frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)}$. Here, note that $Y_N = X_N$ since $U_N(X_N) = 0$. Therefore,

$$E[Y_N^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_N| > \frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)}\}}] = E[X_N^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_N| > \frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)}\}}].$$

We then apply Hölder's inequality with conjugates $\frac{2+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$ and $\frac{2+\varepsilon}{2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & E[X_N^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_N| > \frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)}\}}] \\ & \leq E\left[|X_N|^{2+\frac{4}{\varepsilon}}\right]^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}} E\left[\left(\mathbf{1}_{\{|X_N| > \frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)}\}}\right)^{1+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon}\right]^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} \\ & = E\left[|X_N|^{2+\frac{4}{\varepsilon}}\right]^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}} P\left(|X_N| > \frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)}\right)^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Now, choose an integer $m \geq 2 + \frac{4}{\varepsilon}$ such that $-\frac{m\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon} \leq -2$. First, note that by Jensen's inequality and the uniform moment bound (7),

$$E\left[|X_N|^{2+\frac{4}{\varepsilon}}\right]^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}} \leq E[|X_N|^m]^{\frac{1}{m}(2+\frac{4}{\varepsilon})\frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}} \leq (B_m)^{\frac{2}{m}}.$$

Secondly, note that by Markov's inequality and the uniform moment bound, for any $u > 0$ we have

$$P(|X_N| > u) \leq \frac{E[|X_N|^m]}{u^m} \leq B_m u^{-m}.$$

Therefore,

$$P(|X_N| > \frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)})^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} \leq (B_m)^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} (\frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)})^{-\frac{2m}{2+\varepsilon}}.$$

We conclude that the product in (9) is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & (B_m)^{\frac{2}{m}} (B_m)^{\frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} (\frac{1}{2}N\Delta_{(N)})^{-\frac{2m}{2+\varepsilon}} \\ &= (B_m)^{\frac{2}{m} + \frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{1}{2}AN^{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon}\right)^{-\frac{2m}{2+\varepsilon}} \\ &= (B_m)^{\frac{2}{m} + \frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{1}{2}A\right)^{-\frac{2m}{2+\varepsilon}} \cdot N^{-\frac{m\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq (B_m)^{\frac{2}{m} + \frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{1}{2}A\right)^{-\frac{2m}{2+\varepsilon}} \cdot N^{-2} \\ &\leq (B_m)^{\frac{2}{m} + \frac{2}{2+\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{1}{2}A\right)^{-\frac{2m}{2+\varepsilon}} \cdot N^{-2+\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Combining (8) and (10) gives the upper bound $\mathcal{O}(N^{-2+\varepsilon})$, completing the proof. \square

The above lemma will allow us, via the second part of our code, to bound the rate at which the MSE for a random variable decreases to zero as we increase the number of quantization bins N .

B. System Stability and Rate Optimality

First, we will establish key stability results. As stated before, we will assume that Condition A holds. Consider the case where $N = 0$. By [11, Theorem 3.1], if $K > |a|$, then $\{(x_t, \Delta_t)\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a positive Harris recurrent Markov chain with unique invariant measure π . We offer the following extension:

Theorem 3.2. *For all $N \geq 0$, $\{(x_t, \Delta_t)\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is positive Harris recurrent.*

Sketch of Proof: To prove this result, the proof program of [11, Theorem 3.1] (i.e. for positive Harris recurrence in the case $N = 0$) can be adopted almost verbatim. In particular, φ -irreducibility can be established and the drift criteria of [11, Corollary 2.1] can be established for the same choice of Lyapunov functions as in [11].

The only major change is that the upper bound of [11, Lemma 5.2] for the tail probabilities $P_{x_0, \Delta_0}(\mathcal{T}_1 \geq k)$ must be re-derived in some form, as the out-of-view state dynamics change significantly due to the fixed quantization stage. We address this by providing a similar bound in Lemma 3.11 (compare to equation (26) in [11]), which decays suitably fast for summability in the proof program. \square

Now suppose that the system is positive Harris recurrent with fixed parameters $(a, \sigma^2, K, L, \alpha, \delta)$ and given $N \geq 2$ (this is possible so long as $K > |a|$). Let π_N be the resulting invariant measure depending on N , and let $(x_N^*, \Delta_N^*) \sim \pi_N$. Since the adaptive quantization error e_t is a deterministic function of (x_t, Δ_t) , this invariant measure will also induce a stationary distribution for e_t , which we denote by $e_N \sim \pi_N^{\text{eff}}$.

Theorem 3.3. *For all $N \geq 2$, for every initial condition,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E[x_t^2] = E[(x_N^*)^2] = \int \pi_N(dx, d\Delta)x^2.$$

Proof: This result follows from [11, Theorem 2.1(iii)] and the drift criteria we establish in Section III-D. \square

It is obvious from the state update equation (3) that $E[(x_N^*)^2] \geq \sigma^2$, so we wish to derive bounds for the "rate" at which $E[(x_N^*)^2] - \sigma^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. To make this precise, we will say that $E[(x_N^*)^2]$ converges (to σ^2) at a rate $r > 0$ if

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^r (E[(x_N^*)^2] - \sigma^2) < \infty.$$

The key contributions of this section are as follows. First, we show in Lemma 3.4 that regardless of our choice of $\Delta_{(N)}$, any such r satisfies $r \leq 2$. Secondly, in Theorem 3.7 we show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, an appropriate choice of $\Delta_{(N)}$ ensures that the second moment converges at a rate $r \geq 2 - \varepsilon$. This provides a control scheme leading to a convergence rate which is arbitrarily close to optimal in a polynomial sense.

The following result implies that any rate for the second moment satisfies $r \leq 2$.

Lemma 3.4. *The following lower bound on $E[(x_N^*)^2]$ holds:*

$$E[(x_N^*)^2] - \sigma^2 \geq \frac{a^2\sigma^2}{(K+1)^2(N+1)^2 - a^2}.$$

To prove this result, we will need the following intermediate result due to [19].

Proposition 3.5 ([19, Theorem 11.3.2]). *Consider the linear Gaussian system $x_{t+1} = ax_t + bu_t + d_t$ with $b \neq 0$ and $\{d_t\}$ a zero-mean Gaussian i.i.d. sequence with variance σ^2 . To satisfy*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E[x_t^2] \leq d$$

over a memoryless communication channel with noiseless feedback under some policy, the channel capacity must satisfy:

$$C \geq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(\frac{a^2 d}{d - \sigma^2} \right).$$

Remark. It is clear that any such d must satisfy $d > \sigma^2$. More subtly, it must be the case that $2^C > |a|$. Assuming the converse allows one to show that the above inequality holds in the reverse direction, for all $d > \sigma^2$.

Now suppose that for some choice of control, the second moment $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E[x_t^2]$ exists and is finite. Setting $d = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E[x_t^2]$ and rearranging with the above remark in mind yields the following:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E[x_t^2] \geq \frac{(2^C \sigma)^2}{(2^C)^2 - a^2} \quad (11)$$

We proceed with the proof that any rate r must satisfy $r \leq 2$.

Proof of Lemma 3.4: The system (1) is of the form needed for the previous proposition. Furthermore, as we will show in Section III-D, the limiting second moment exists and is finite. Therefore with $C = \log_2(K+1) + \log_2(N+1)$, (11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} E[(x_N^*)^2] - \sigma^2 &\geq \frac{(K+1)^2(N+1)^2\sigma^2}{(K+1)^2(N+1)^2 - a^2} - \sigma^2 \\ &= \frac{a^2\sigma^2}{(K+1)^2(N+1)^2 - a^2} \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

To show that we can achieve r arbitrarily close to 2, we will apply Lemma 3.1 to the stationary adaptive error e_N , so it will be necessary to show that e_N admits uniformly bounded moments:

Lemma 3.6. *The stationary adaptive error $\{e_N\}_{N=2}^\infty$ has uniformly bounded moments, i.e.,*

$$E[|e_N|^m] \leq B_m \quad \text{for all } m = 1, 2, \dots$$

for some $\{B_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ independent of N .

Remark. While this result is not surprising, the proof program is quite involved. We discuss this in further detail in Section III-D.

Finally, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that we can achieve a rate $r \geq 2 - \varepsilon$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

Theorem 3.7. *Choose any $\varepsilon > 0$ and set the bin size for U_N as $\Delta_{(N)} = AN^{-1+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon}$, for fixed $A > 0$. Then we have*

$$E[(x_N^*)^2] - \sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\varepsilon}}\right), \quad (12)$$

i.e., there exists $C > 0$ which depends on ε , such that

$$E[(x_N^*)^2] - \sigma^2 \leq CN^{-2+\varepsilon}, \quad \text{for all } N \geq 2.$$

Proof: Let $(x_N^*, \Delta_N^*) \sim \pi_N$ and let $e_N = x_N^* - Q_K^{\Delta_N^*}(x_N^*)$ so that $e_N \sim \pi_N^{\text{err}}$. Now let x' be the one-step pushforward of x_N^* using e_N , that is

$$x' = a(e_N - U_N(e_N)) + Z, \quad (13)$$

where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is independent of e_N . Since we started under the invariant measure, x' is distributed identically to x_N^* . Furthermore, since $E[e_N^2]$ is finite by Lemma 3.6, it follows from (13) that $E[(x_N^*)^2] = E[(x')^2]$ is finite. For brevity, let $q_N = e_N - U_N(e_N)$, then by total expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} E[(x_N^*)^2] &= E[(x')^2] = E[E[(x')^2 | e_N]] \\ &= E[E[a^2 q_N^2 + 2a q_N Z + Z^2 | e_N]] \\ &= a^2 E[q_N^2] + 2a E[q_N] E[Z] + E[Z^2] \\ &= a^2 E[(e_N - U_N(e_N))^2] + \sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $E[(x_N^*)^2] - \sigma^2 = a^2 E[(e_N - U_N(e_N))^2]$. Since e_N has uniformly bounded moments, Lemma 3.1 implies that our choice of $\Delta_{(N)}$ causes this MSE to be $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N^{2-\varepsilon}}\right)$. The result follows since the optimality gap is linearly related to this MSE. \square

C. Drift Criteria for Moment Stability

In this section, we provide a result which will be critical to the proof program for Lemma 3.6. To this end, we introduce a set of random-time Lyapunov drift criteria and show that if these criteria are satisfied, we can upper bound the expectation of functions under invariant measure. As in Section II-C, we consider a quite general Markov chain $\{\phi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ with state space \mathbb{X} .

Suppose that $\{\mathcal{T}_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of strictly increasing stopping times with $\mathcal{T}_0 = 0$. Then for a measurable function $V : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, measurable functions $f, d : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, a constant b and a set $C \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$, we say that $\{\phi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ satisfies the random-time Lyapunov drift criteria if for all $z = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$E[V(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_{z+1}}) | \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}_z}] \leq V(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z}) - d(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z}) + b\mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z} \in C\}},$$

and

$$E\left[\sum_{t=\mathcal{T}_z}^{\mathcal{T}_{z+1}-1} f(\phi_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}_z}\right] \leq d(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z}). \quad (14)$$

These drift criteria (as well as variations) can be used to establish important stability properties, in combination with irreducibility and other conditions (see [11, Theorem 2.1]). We present the following application for moment stability.

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose $\{\phi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is positive Harris recurrent with unique invariant measure π and satisfies the random-time Lyapunov drift criteria (14). Then, $E_\pi[f(\phi)] \leq b$.*

Proof. We will utilize supermartingale arguments for this proof. Define the sequence of random variables $\{M_z\}_{z \geq 0}$ by $M_0 = V(\phi_0)$, and for any $z \geq 0$,

$$M_{z+1} = V(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_{z+1}}) + \sum_{t=0}^{\mathcal{T}_{z+1}-1} f(\phi_t) - b \sum_{k=0}^z \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{\mathcal{T}_k} \in C\}}.$$

Then the supermartingale property for M_z follows from the assumed drift criteria (14):

$$\begin{aligned} E[M_{z+1} | \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}_z}] - M_z &= E[V(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_{z+1}}) | \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}_z}] - V(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=\mathcal{T}_z}^{\mathcal{T}_{z+1}-1} f(\phi_t) - b\mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z} \in C\}} \\ &\leq -d(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z}) + b\mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z} \in C\}} + d(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z}) - b\mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{\mathcal{T}_z} \in C\}} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\{M_z\}_{z \geq 0}$ is a supermartingale sequence. It follows that for any integer $n \geq 1$ we have $E[M_n | \mathcal{F}_0] \leq M_0$. This expands as

$$E\left[V(\phi_{\mathcal{T}_n}) + \sum_{t=0}^{\mathcal{T}_n-1} f(\phi_t) - b \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{\mathcal{T}_k} \in C\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_0\right] \leq V(\phi_0).$$

Since V is strictly positive and $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{\mathcal{T}_k} \in C\}} \geq M$, we can relax the above to

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\mathcal{T}_n-1} f(\phi_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_0\right] &\leq V(\phi_0) + bn \\ \iff \frac{1}{n} E\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\mathcal{T}_n-1} f(\phi_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_0\right] &\leq \frac{1}{n} V(\phi_0) + b. \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, recall that the sequence of stopping times \mathcal{T}_k is strictly increasing with $\mathcal{T}_0 = 0$. It follows that $\mathcal{T}_k \geq k$ for

all $k \geq 0$, so that $n \leq \mathcal{T}_n$. In light of (15) this gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} E \left[\sum_{t=0}^{n-1} f(\phi_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_0 \right] &\leq \frac{1}{n} E \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\mathcal{T}_n-1} f(\phi_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} V(\phi_0) + b. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

For integer $k \geq 1$, let $f_k(\phi) := \min(f(\phi), k)$. Due to positive Harris recurrence of $\{\phi_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$, ergodicity holds for bounded functions. Since f_k is bounded and $f_k \leq f$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_\pi [f_k(\phi)] &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E \left[\sum_{t=0}^{n-1} f_k(\phi_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E \left[\sum_{t=0}^{n-1} f(\phi_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \\ &\leq b \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by (16). Finally, since f_k converges monotonically to f from below, it follows from the monotone convergence theorem that

$$E_\pi [f(\phi)] = E_\pi \left[\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_k(\phi) \right] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_\pi [f_k(\phi)] \leq b$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark. If the stopping times $\{\mathcal{T}_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are the sequential return times to a set $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$, that is for $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{T}_{k+1} = \min \{t > \mathcal{T}_k : \phi_t \in B\}$$

then Lemma 3.8 holds if the drift criteria (14) is established only for $z = 0$, where we assume that $\phi_0 \in B$. Once we show this, the full drift criteria follows for all $z \geq 1$ by induction. What is missing is only the case $z = 0$ where $\phi_0 \in B^C$, but the proof of Lemma 3.8 can be made to work with the sequence of stopping times $\{\mathcal{T}_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \setminus \{\mathcal{T}_0\}$.

D. Proof Program for Uniformly Bounded Moments

The proof program for Lemma 3.6 is quite long. Therefore, we motivate this section by stating its key result first. As in Section III-B, we let $(x_N^*, \Delta_N^*) \sim \pi_N$ where π_N is the invariant measure depending on N , and we denote the stationary adaptive error as e_N .

First, note that if the state x_N^* admits uniformly bounded moments, then so too does e_N . This can be argued by setting $e_N = x_N^* - Q_K^{\Delta_N^*}(x_N^*)$ and recognizing that $|e_N| \leq |x_N^*|$. Therefore, it suffices to show that the state x_N^* admits uniformly bounded moments. To do so, we will use Lemma 3.8. We define the following sequence of "in-view" stopping times,

$$\mathcal{T}_{k+1} = \min \{t > \mathcal{T}_k : |x_t| \leq \frac{K}{2} \Delta_t\}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_0 = 0$. These are the times for which the state x_t is properly quantized by the adaptive quantizer $Q_K^{\Delta_t}$. Let

$m \geq 1$ be arbitrary and choose arbitrary $\gamma \in (0, 1 - \alpha^m)$. Let $\beta > 0$ and $D > 0$, then set

$$\begin{aligned} V(x, \Delta) &= \Delta^m, \\ d(x, \Delta) &= \gamma \Delta^m, \\ f(x, \Delta) &= \gamma \beta \left(\frac{2}{K}\right)^m |x|^m, \\ C &= \{(x, \Delta) : \Delta \leq D\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.9. *There exists choice of β sufficiently small, D sufficiently large, and b sufficiently large, all independent of N , so that the system $\{(x_t, \Delta_t)\}_{t=0}^\infty$ satisfies the random-time Lyapunov drift criteria (14). It follows directly from Lemma 3.8 that*

$$E[|x_N^*|^m] \leq \frac{b}{\gamma \beta} \left(\frac{K}{2}\right)^m =: B_m$$

and so the state x_N^* admits uniformly bounded moments. By our initial discussion, so too does the stationary adaptive error e_N , completing the proof of Lemma 3.6.

We note that the stopping times $\{\mathcal{T}_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are the sequential stopping times of the system to the in-view set,

$$\Lambda := \left\{ (x, \Delta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega_\Delta : |x| \leq \frac{K}{2} \Delta \right\}.$$

Therefore, as remarked in Section III-C, it suffices to assume that $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$ and show that the drift criteria (14) holds for only $z = 0$. The remainder of this section will be dedicated to proving this. The following concentration bound for Gaussian random variables will be useful.

Proposition 3.10. *Suppose $\{d_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a sequence of i.i.d. normal random variables with zero mean, i.e. $d_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Then for any integer $k \geq 1$ and $b > 0$,*

$$P \left(\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| > b \right) \leq 2^k \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(\frac{b}{\sqrt{k}} \right)^2 \right).$$

Proof: First, note that for any $u > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| > b \right) &= P \left(u \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| > bu \right) \\ &= P \left(\exp \left(u \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| \right) > e^{bu} \right) \\ &\leq e^{-bu} E \left[\exp \left(u \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$= e^{-bu} (M_{|Z|}(u))^k \quad (18)$$

where $M_{|Z|}(\cdot)$ is the moment-generating function for a half-normal random variable (e.g. $|d_0|$). Above, (17) follows by Markov's inequality while (18) follows from the i.i.d. property of $\{d_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$. We note that $M_{|Z|}(u) = 2\Phi(\sigma u) e^{\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 u^2} \leq 2e^{\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 u^2}$ where Φ is the standard normal CDF which is bounded above by 1. Therefore, for any $u > 0$ we have

that

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| > b\right) &\leq e^{-bu} \left(2e^{\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 u^2}\right)^k \\ &= 2^k \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}k\sigma^2 u^2 - bu\right). \end{aligned}$$

This expression can be minimized in u , and by derivative test we find that the global minimum is $u = \frac{b}{k\sigma^2}$. Using this value of u and simplifying yields the claimed bound. \square

Before proving Proposition 3.9, we give the following tail bound for \mathcal{T}_1 .

Lemma 3.11. *Define the constants*

$$\xi := \frac{|a| + \delta}{|a|}, \quad W := \frac{K\alpha}{|a| + \delta}.$$

For $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$, we have for any $k \geq 1$ that

$$P_{x_0, \Delta_0}(\mathcal{T}_1 \geq k+1) \leq 2^k \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta_0^2}{8\sigma^2} \left(\frac{W\xi^k - 1}{\sqrt{k}}\right)^2\right).$$

Furthermore, for any $\omega > 0$,

$$P_{x_0, \Delta_0}(\mathcal{T}_1 \geq k+1) \leq B_\omega \Delta_0^{-2\omega} \cdot \frac{2^k k^\omega}{(W\xi^k - 1)^{2\omega}}$$

where

$$B_\omega := \left(\frac{8\sigma^2\omega}{e}\right)^\omega.$$

Proof: Starting from $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$, let $e_0 := x_0 - Q_{\Delta_0}^K(x_0)$. For brevity, define

$$S(x) := x - U_N(x).$$

Now we construct the following "zoom-out" process y_t . Let $y_0 = x_0$, $y_1 = x_1 = aS(e_0) + d_0$, and for $t \geq 1$ let

$$y_{t+1} = aS(y_t) + d_t. \quad (19)$$

Then the following holds for all $1 \leq t \leq \mathcal{T}_1$:

$$y_t = x_t, \quad \Delta_t = (|a| + \delta)^{t-1} \alpha \Delta_0.$$

Therefore, it follows that for $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{T}_1 \geq k+1\} &\iff \bigcap_{t=1}^k \{|x_t| > \frac{K}{2} \Delta_t\} \\ &\iff \bigcap_{t=1}^k \{|y_t| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} K\alpha(|a| + \delta)^{t-1}\} \\ &\implies \{|y_k| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} K\alpha(|a| + \delta)^{k-1}\} \\ &\iff \{|y_k| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W(|a| + \delta)^k\}. \end{aligned}$$

First, assume that $k \geq 2$, then this becomes

$$\{|y_k| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W(|a| + \delta)^k\} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\iff \{|aS(y_{k-1}) + d_{k-1}| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W(|a| + \delta)^k\} \\ &\implies \{|a| |S(y_{k-1})| + |d_{k-1}| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W(|a| + \delta)^k\} \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\iff \{|S(y_{k-1})| + |a|^{-1} |d_{k-1}| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W\xi(|a| + \delta)^{k-1}\} \\ &\implies \{|S(y_{k-1})| + |d_{k-1}| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W\xi(|a| + \delta)^{k-1}\} \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies \{|y_{k-1}| + |d_{k-1}| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W\xi(|a| + \delta)^{k-1}\}. \quad (23)$$

Above, (21) follows from the triangle inequality, (22) follows since $|a| \geq 1$, and (23) follows because S satisfies $|S(y)| \leq |y|$ for any y .

The same steps as above may be repeated $k-2$ more times (where the presence of the $|d_{k-1}|$ term does not affect any of the steps taken), which leads to

$$(23) \implies \left\{ |y_1| + \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} |d_t| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W\xi^{k-1}(|a| + \delta) \right\}. \quad (24)$$

We remark that in the case $k = 1$ the above expression is exactly (20), so the following analysis holds for all $k \geq 1$. Once more we follow the steps from (20) to (23), except that in this case, since $y_1 = aS(e_0) + d_0$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} (24) &\implies \left\{ |e_0| + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W\xi^k \right\} \\ &\iff \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} W\xi^k - |e_0| \right\} \\ &\implies \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} (W\xi^k - 1) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows since $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$ implies that $|e_0| \leq \frac{\Delta_0}{2}$. Therefore, we may finally write that

$$P_{x_0, \Delta_0}(\mathcal{T}_1 \geq k+1) \leq P_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left(\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |d_t| > \frac{\Delta_0}{2} (W\xi^k - 1) \right).$$

Note that since $\alpha > \frac{|a|}{K}$ we have $W > \xi^{-1}$, so for $k \geq 1$ we have $W\xi^k - 1 > 0$. Therefore, the first claimed bound follows immediately by Proposition 3.10.

To arrive at the second bound, it suffices to note that for any $\omega > 0$, the bound $e^{-x} \leq \left(\frac{\omega}{e}\right)^\omega x^{-\omega}$ holds for all $x > 0$. This can be seen by verifying that the maximum of $f(x) = \left(\frac{e}{\omega}\right)^\omega x^\omega e^{-x}$ on $x > 0$ is $f(\omega) = 1$ (e.g. by derivative test). \square

This result enables us to complete the proof program. We note that the proof program presented here closely follows the proof of [11, Theorem 3.2], but emphasis is placed on showing independence in N of the drift criteria.

Proof of Proposition 3.9: Recall that we need only show that the drift criteria (14) holds in the case $z = 0$, where we assume that $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$. We will start with the first inequality, which simplifies to

$$E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [\Delta_{\mathcal{T}_1}^m] - (1 - \gamma)\Delta_0^m \leq b\mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta_0 \leq D\}}. \quad (25)$$

Note that starting from $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\mathcal{T}_1}^m &= (\alpha\Delta_0(|a| + \delta)^{\mathcal{T}_1-1})^m \\ &= (\alpha\Delta_0)^m r^{(\mathcal{T}_1-1)}\end{aligned}$$

where $r := (|a| + \delta)^m$ is written for brevity. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [\Delta_{\mathcal{T}_1}^m] &= (\alpha\Delta_0)^m \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_{x_0, \Delta_0} (\mathcal{T}_1 = k+1) r^k \\ &\leq (\alpha\Delta_0)^m \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_{x_0, \Delta_0} (\mathcal{T}_1 \geq k+1) r^k.\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

In view of Lemma 3.11, the above sum can be further bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_{x_0, \Delta_0} (\mathcal{T}_1 \geq k+1) r^k &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P_{x_0, \Delta_0} (\mathcal{T}_1 \geq k+1) r^k \\ &\leq 1 + B_\omega \Delta_0^{-2\omega} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^\omega (2r)^k}{(W\xi^k - 1)^{2\omega}} \\ &= 1 + B_\omega M_\omega \Delta_0^{-2\omega}\end{aligned}$$

where the sum $M_\omega := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^\omega r^k}{(W\xi^k - 1)^{2\omega}}$ converges so long as $\omega > \frac{1}{2} \log_\xi(2r)$. This is because the summand has the asymptotic behaviour $k^\omega (2r\xi^{-2\omega})^k$ which converges if and only if $2r\xi^{-2\omega} < 1$. Note that $\omega > \frac{1}{2} \log_\xi(2r) \implies \omega > \frac{m}{2}$. Define $C_\omega := \alpha^m B_\omega M_\omega$, then (26) becomes

$$E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [\Delta_{\mathcal{T}_1}^m] \leq \Delta_0^m (\alpha^m + C_\omega \Delta_0^{-2\omega}).$$

Since we aim to satisfy (25), we write this as

$$\begin{aligned}E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [\Delta_{\mathcal{T}_1}] - (1 - \gamma)\Delta_0^m &\leq -\Delta_0^m ((1 - \alpha^m) - \gamma) \\ &\quad + C_\omega \Delta_0^{-2\omega+m}.\end{aligned}\tag{27}$$

Note that since $\gamma < 1 - \alpha^m$, the first term tends to $-\infty$ as $\Delta_0 \rightarrow \infty$, while since $\omega > \frac{m}{2}$, the second term tends to 0 as $\Delta_0 \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, for D sufficiently large, if $\Delta_0 > D$ it follows that (27) is upper bounded by 0 so that (25) is satisfied for $(x_0, \Delta_0) \notin C$.

It remains to ensure that (25) holds for $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda \cap C$, that is with $\Delta_0 \leq D$. This is straightforward, as it follows from (27) that $E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [\Delta_{\mathcal{T}_1}^m] - (1 - \gamma)\Delta_0^m$ is bounded on $\Lambda \cap C$, so we may take

$$b = \sup_{(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda \cap C} E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [\Delta_{\mathcal{T}_1}^m] - (1 - \gamma)\Delta_0^m < \infty.$$

This fully satisfies the first drift inequality.

Next, we proceed to showing the second inequality of (14). For brevity, let $\lambda := \gamma\beta \left(\frac{2}{K}\right)^m$ so that $f(x, \Delta) = \lambda|x|^m$. Again, we assume that $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$. First, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\mathcal{T}_1-1} f(x_t, \Delta_t) \right] &= \lambda E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\mathcal{T}_1-1} |x_t|^m \right] \\ &= \lambda|x_0|^m + \lambda E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\mathcal{T}_1-1} |x_t|^m \right].\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

First, note that since $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda|x_0|^m &= \gamma\beta \left(\frac{2}{K}|x_0|\right)^m \leq \gamma\beta \left(\frac{2}{K} \cdot \frac{K}{2} \Delta_0\right)^m \\ &= \gamma\Delta_0^m \cdot \beta.\end{aligned}$$

We will focus next on the expectation in (28). As in the proof of Lemma 3.11, let y_t be the "zoom-out" process with $y_1 = x_1$ and state dynamics (19) so that for all $t \leq \mathcal{T}_1$, $y_t = x_t$. Thus we have that

$$E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\mathcal{T}_1-1} |x_t|^m \right] = E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\mathcal{T}_1-1} |y_t|^m \right] =: E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [Y]$$

where $Y = \sum_{t=1}^{\mathcal{T}_1-1} |y_t|^m$ is written for brevity.

First, assume that m is odd. We may do this without loss of generality, as the nesting of L^p spaces ensures that if all odd moments exist, then all even moments also exist. We apply Hölder's inequality as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [Y] &= E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_1 \geq t+1\}} |y_t|^m \right] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_1 \geq t+1\}} |y_t|^m] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[(\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_1 \geq t+1\}})^{m+1} \right]^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \\ &\quad \cdot E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [|y_t|^{m+1}]^{\frac{m}{m+1}}.\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

We will handle the two expectations separately. The first is straightforward:

$$E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [(\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{T}_1 \geq t+1\}})^{m+1}]^{\frac{1}{m+1}} = P_{x_0, \Delta_0} (\mathcal{T}_1 \geq t+1)^{\frac{1}{m+1}}$$

which by Lemma 3.11 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \left(2^t \exp \left(-\frac{\Delta_0^2}{8\sigma^2} \left(\frac{W\xi^t - 1}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^2 \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \\ &= 2^{\frac{t}{m+1}} \exp \left(-\frac{\Delta_0^2}{8(m+1)\sigma^2} \left(\frac{W\xi^t - 1}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^2 \right).\end{aligned}$$

As in the second bound of Lemma 3.11, for any $\omega > 0$ we may use the bound $e^{-s} \leq \left(\frac{\omega}{e}\right)^\omega s^{-\omega}$, yielding:

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq 2^{\frac{t}{m+1}} \left(\frac{\omega}{e}\right)^\omega \left(8(m+1)\sigma^2 \Delta_0^{-2} \cdot t (W\xi^t - 1)^{-2} \right)^\omega \\ &= \left(\frac{8(m+1)\sigma^2 \omega}{e\Delta_0^2} \right)^\omega \cdot \frac{2^{\frac{t}{m+1}} t^\omega}{(W\xi^t - 1)^{2\omega}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{8(m+1)\sigma^2 \omega}{e(\alpha L)^2} \right)^\omega \cdot \frac{2^{\frac{t}{m+1}} t^\omega}{(W\xi^t - 1)^{2\omega}} \\ &= c_1 \cdot \frac{2^{\frac{t}{m+1}} t^\omega}{(W\xi^t - 1)^{2\omega}}\end{aligned}\tag{30}$$

where c_1 is constant in terms of (x_0, Δ_0) . Next, we bound the second expectation in (29). Since m is odd, note that

$|s|^{m+1} = s^{m+1}$ for any s . Therefore, for $t \geq 2$, by the update dynamics (19) and the binomial theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [|y_t|^{m+1}] &= E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [y_t^{m+1}] \\ &= E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [(aS(y_{t-1}) + d_{t-1})^{m+1}] \\ &= E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{m+1} \binom{m+1}{s} (aS(y_{t-1}))^{m+1-s} (d_{t-1})^s \right] \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{m+1} \binom{m+1}{s} E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [(aS(y_{t-1}))^{m+1-s}] E[(d_{t-1})^s]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that since d_{t-1} is zero-mean Gaussian, all of its odd moments will be zero. Therefore, by reindexing, the sum above is equivalent to

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\frac{m+1}{2}} \binom{m+1}{2s} E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [(aS(y_{t-1}))^{m+1-2s}] E[(d_{t-1})^{2s}]. \quad (31)$$

Here, we remark that each of the moments of $aS(y_{t-1})$ are even, and so we can replace $|S(y_{t-1})|$ with its upper bound of $|y_{t-1}|$, which bounds (31) by

$$\leq \sum_{s=0}^{\frac{m+1}{2}} \binom{m+1}{2s} E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [(ay_{t-1})^{m+1-2s}] E[(d_{t-1})^{2s}].$$

Finally, we may reintroduce the odd moments to this summation (since they are all zero for d_{t-1}), which allows us to complete the binomial expansion now in terms of y_{t-1} as $(ay_{t-1} + d_{t-1})^{m+1}$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [y_t^{m+1}] \leq E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [(ay_{t-1} + d_{t-1})^{m+1}]. \quad (32)$$

If $t \geq 3$, we are free to repeat this process where instead of d_{t-1} we will have $ad_{t-2} + d_{t-1}$ which is still a zero-mean Gaussian random variable. If we carry out these steps $t-1$ times in total, we find that

$$E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [y_t^{m+1}] \leq E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\left(a^{t-1} y_1 + \sum_{n=1}^{t-1} a^{t-1-n} d_n \right)^{m+1} \right]$$

We note that in the case $t = 1$, the above expressions are exactly equal, so the following analysis holds for all $t \geq 1$. Once more we follow the steps taken above, except that in this case, since $y_1 = aS(e_0) + d_0$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [y_t^{m+1}] \\ &\leq E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\left(a^t e_0 + \sum_{n=0}^{t-1} a^{t-1-n} d_n \right)^{m+1} \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{2} |a|^t \right)^{m+1} E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\left(\frac{2}{\Delta_0} e_0 + \frac{2}{\Delta_0} \sum_{n=0}^{t-1} a^{-1-n} d_n \right)^{m+1} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Remark. Briefly, we note that if $|a| = 1$ then the analysis becomes slightly more involved, as the expectation above is then the $(m+1)$ th moment of a Gaussian random variable (the affine function of d_n terms above) with variance $\frac{4}{\Delta_0^2} t \sigma^2$. In this case, the expectation will be bounded on $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$

as we discuss below, but the bound will be polynomial in t . This will not affect the remaining convergence arguments, so the drift criteria can be established here as well. We will proceed assuming $|a| > 1$ for simplicity, in which case the variance of the Gaussian random variable is bounded in t .

Crucially, we remark that the expectation above must be bounded on $(x_0, \Delta_0) \in \Lambda$. On this set, we have $|\frac{2}{\Delta_0} e_0| \leq 1$, and as Δ_0 grows large, the contribution of the scaled Gaussian terms decay to zero. Therefore, there exists a constant G_m such that the expectation is bounded by G_m uniformly on Λ , so we may finally write that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [|y_t|^{m+1}]^{\frac{m}{m+1}} &= E_{x_0, \Delta_0} [y_t^{m+1}]^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \\ &\leq (G_m)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{2} |a|^t \right)^m \\ &= \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{2} \right)^m c_2 \cdot |a|^{mt}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Applying the upper bounds (30) and (33) to the summation (29), we find that

$$(29) \leq \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{2} \right)^m c_1 c_2 \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{\frac{t}{m+1}} t^\omega}{(W \xi^t - 1)^{2\omega}} \cdot |a|^{mt}.$$

Crucially, the terms of the summation above do not depend on (x_0, Δ_0) , so if it converges, it constitutes a uniform upper bound over Λ . For the purposes of series convergence, the summand behaves as $t^\omega \left(2^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \xi^{-2\omega} |a|^m \right)^t$, so the series converges if and only if $2^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \xi^{-2\omega} |a|^m < 1$.

We note that as $\omega \rightarrow \infty$, $2^{\frac{1}{m+1}} \xi^{-2\omega} |a|^m \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, we are always free to choose ω sufficiently large so that the series converges and we have that

$$(29) \leq \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{2} \right)^m \cdot C_m$$

for some constant C_m . Finally, we return to (28) to find that

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\mathcal{T}_1-1} f(x_t, \Delta_t) \right] \\ &= \lambda |x_0|^m + \lambda E_{x_0, \Delta_0} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\mathcal{T}_1-1} |x_t|^m \right] \\ &\leq \gamma \Delta_0^m \cdot \beta + \lambda \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{2} \right)^m \cdot C_m \\ &= \gamma \Delta_0^m \cdot \beta + \gamma \beta \left(\frac{2}{K} \right)^m \left(\frac{\Delta_0}{2} \right)^m \cdot C_m \\ &= \gamma \Delta_0^m \cdot \beta (1 + C_m K^{-m}) \\ &= d(x_0, \Delta_0) \cdot \beta (1 + C_m K^{-m}). \end{aligned}$$

The proof program can be completed by taking $\beta = (1 + C_m K^{-m})^{-1}$, which establishes the second inequality of the drift criteria (14). \square

IV. A SIMULATION

Let us note that a key issue in a numerical simulation here is that for ε too close to 0, it is not feasible to effectively demonstrate the rate of convergence. To be precise, suppose $N \leq 2^{2/\varepsilon}$. Then the quantizer support size satisfies $\frac{1}{2} N \Delta_{(N)} \leq A$. Therefore, all schemes with less than $2^{2/\varepsilon}$ bins will fail to quantize the region $(-\infty, A) \cup (A, \infty)$. As a

direct result of this, the overload distortion will not go to zero as N increases up to this point. This is especially problematic for small ε . As an example, suppose $\varepsilon = 0.001$. We would then require our fixed quantizer to have $N \gg 2^{2000}$ bins in order to demonstrate the convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1.999})$. It is infeasible on typical computing software (e.g. MATLAB) to simulate a scheme with this many bins. In view of this, we now proceed with an example simulation. To ensure that the convergence is observable, we modestly choose $\varepsilon = 1$ so that the rate of convergence is at worst $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$. The system parameters are $a = 2$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$. $K = 16$ bins are used to stabilize the system, with zooming parameters $\alpha = 0.5$, $\delta = 0.2$, and $L = 1$. We start the simulation from $x_0 = 0$, $\Delta_0 = L$. With the parameters above, the system was run for all $N \in \{10, 12, \dots, 100\}$ and the average second moment was recorded. The second moment achieved in each trial for N is shown below. As the convergence is at worst $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$, we include an estimate of this order for the tail of the data.




Fig. 3. Convergence to the optimum $\sigma^2 = 1$. The order of convergence is approximately $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1.066})$ for the tail end of the data, overlaid in red.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we studied the optimal coding and control problem for a linear system driven by unbounded noise over a finite-rate noiseless channel. We presented a two-part coding scheme where the first part, via an adaptive zooming scheme, led to stochastic stability and positive Harris recurrence of a controlled linear system over a channel and the second part was a time-invariant high-rate quantizer. We showed the stochastic stability and order optimality of this coding scheme, where optimality was established via convergence to a lower bound in high-rates. Crucial to our analysis was the positive Harris recurrence of the first part of the coding scheme. In future work, we aim to generalize the analysis to multi-dimensional systems and multi-sensor systems [12] and non-linear systems [20], where related ergodicity and stochastic stability results are available. For stochastic stability, it is known that a finite $(2+\varepsilon)$ th moment of the noise process d_t is sufficient for stability [12]. In this paper we assumed d_t to be Gaussian, which we aim to relax in the future by a more refined analysis.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Bertsekas, *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control Vol. 1*. Athena Scientific, 2000.
- [2] W. S. Wong and R. W. Brockett, "Systems with finite communication bandwidth constraints - part II: Stabilization with limited information feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 42, pp. 1294–1299, September 1997.
- [3] J. Baillieul, "Feedback designs for controlling device arrays with communication channel bandwidth constraints," in *Proceedings of the 4th ARO Workshop on Smart Structures, State College, PA*, August 1999.
- [4] S. Tatikonda and S. Mitter, "Control under communication constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 1056–1068, 2004.
- [5] L. V. J. Hespanha, A. Ortega, "Towards the control of linear systems with minimum bit-rate," in *Proc. 15th Int. Symp. on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems (MTNS)*, Citeseer, 2002.
- [6] G. N. Nair and R. J. Evans, "Stabilizability of stochastic linear systems with finite feedback data rates," *SIAM J. Control and Optimization*, vol. 43, pp. 413–436, July 2004.
- [7] A. Sahai and S. Mitter, "The necessity and sufficiency of anytime capacity for stabilization of a linear system over a noisy communication link part I: Scalar systems," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 3369–3395, 2006.
- [8] N. C. Martins, M. A. Dahleh, and N. Elia, "Feedback stabilization of uncertain systems in the presence of a direct link," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 438–447, 2006.
- [9] A. S. Matveev and A. Savkin, "An analogue of Shannon information theory for detection and stabilization via noisy discrete communication channels," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 46, pp. 1323–1367, 2007.
- [10] S. Yüksel, "Stochastic stabilization of noisy linear systems with fixed-rate limited feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, pp. 2847–2853, December 2010.
- [11] S. Yüksel and S. P. Meyn, "Random-time, state-dependent stochastic drift for Markov chains and application to stochastic stabilization over erasure channels," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, pp. 47 – 59, January 2013.
- [12] A. Johnston and S. Yüksel, "Stochastic stabilization of partially observed and multi-sensor systems driven by unbounded noise under fixed-rate information constraints," *IEEE Transactions Automatic Control*, vol. 59, pp. 792–798, March 2014.
- [13] V. Kostina, Y. Peres, G. Ranade, and M. Sellke, "Exact minimum number of bits to stabilize a linear system," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2021.
- [14] O. Sabag, V. Kostina, and B. Hassibi, "Stabilizing dynamical systems with fixed-rate feedback using constrained quantizers," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2855–2860, IEEE, 2020.
- [15] B.-H. Juang and A. Gray, *Multiple stage vector quantization for speech coding*, vol. 7. 1982.
- [16] T. Berger, "Information rates of Wiener processes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 16, pp. 134–139, 1970.
- [17] A. Sahai, "Coding unstable scalar Markov processes into two streams," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, p. 462, 2004.
- [18] S. P. Meyn and R. Tweedie, *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. London: Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [19] S. Yüksel and T. Başar, *Stochastic Networked Control Systems*. Springer, 2013.
- [20] S. Yüksel, "Stationary and ergodic properties of stochastic non-linear systems controlled over communication channels," *SIAM J. on Control and Optimization*, vol. 54, pp. 2844–2871, 2016.