

# Optimal Covariance Steering for Discrete-Time Linear Stochastic Systems

Fengjiao Liu, George Rapakoulias, and Panagiotis Tsiotras

## Abstract

In this paper we study the optimal control for steering the state covariance of a discrete-time linear stochastic system over a finite time horizon. First, we establish the existence and uniqueness of the optimal control law for a quadratic cost function. Then, we develop efficient computational methods for solving for the optimal control law, which is identified as the solution to a semi-definite program. During the analysis, we also obtain some useful results on a matrix Riccati difference equation, which may be of independent interest.

## Index Terms

Stochastic control, covariance steering, discrete-time linear stochastic systems, Riccati difference equation, convex optimization.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the need for quantifying and controlling the uncertainty in physical systems prompts a burgeoning interest in studying the evolution of the distribution of the trajectories of a stochastic system. A special case of this point of view is covariance control, the earliest research of which can be traced back to a series of articles from 1985 onward on the assignability of state covariance over an infinite time horizon [1]–[5]. Later, the optimal control that assigns a

This work has been supported by NASA University Leadership Initiative award 80NSSC20M0163 and ONR award N00014-18-1-2828.

F. Liu, G. Rapakoulias, and P. Tsiotras are with the School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332 USA (e-mail: {fengjiao, grap, tsiotras}@gatech.edu).

prescribed stationary state covariance with minimum control energy was developed in [6]. More recent studies address the problem of optimally steering the state covariance of a linear stochastic system over a finite time horizon [7]–[11]. For discrete-time optimal covariance steering, the approach taken by most state-of-the-art current works involves three steps: 1) reformulate the problem as an optimization problem; 2) relax the non-convex constraints to convex constraints for a tractable convex optimization problem; 3) solve the convex optimization problem numerically to approximate the optimal control. One of the reasons for the above approach is that with chance constraints present on the sample paths of the input and the state, the state-mean and state-covariance constraints are coupled, which makes it difficult to find the optimal control analytically [7], [8], [10]. When there are no chance constraints, the desired terminal covariance can be replaced with a soft constraint on the Wasserstein distance between the desired and the actual terminal Gaussian distributions, which can be solved using a randomized state feedback control in terms of a (convex) semi-definite programming (SDP) [12]. Finite-horizon covariance control has also been applied to a model-predictive-control setting [13], [14], in which at each time step  $k$ , an optimal covariance steering problem is solved in a receding-horizon fashion. In addition to controlling the first two moments of the state in a stochastic system, it is also possible to steer the entire state distribution using optimization techniques [15]. The continuous-time counterpart for finite-horizon covariance steering is investigated in [16]–[20]. With the advantage of quantifying the uncertainty directly, covariance control theory can be applied to various practical scenarios, such as spacecraft landing [21], spacecraft trajectory optimization [22], vehicle path planning [14], [23], and aircraft motion planning [24].

Despite the success in finding an approximate solution of the optimal covariance steering problem using convex optimization, little is known regarding fundamental questions, such as existence and uniqueness of the optimal control. Additionally, very little is known regarding the conservativeness of the approximate solution compared to the optimal control, if one exists. These questions are answered in this paper.

In this work, we first establish an analytic result on the existence and uniqueness of the optimal control law for steering the state covariance of a discrete-time linear stochastic system with respect to a quadratic cost function. Some interesting properties of a matrix Riccati difference equation are derived in the process. Then, we show that the optimal control law can be computed via a problem reformulation as an SDP with a lossless convex relaxation. In other words, it

is shown that the optimal solution to the SDP problem also solves the original non-convex covariance steering problem. Lastly, we compare the results from the SDP and from the Newton's method through a numerical example. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to analyze the optimal control for steering the state covariance to any given terminal value in discrete time, and to show that the optimal control can be solved exactly.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The discrete-time covariance steering problem considered in this paper is formulated in Section II. The existence and uniqueness of the optimal control is shown in Section III. The methods for computing the optimal control are provided in Section IV. A numerical example is presented in Section V.

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider the linear time-varying stochastic system corrupted by noise,

$$x_{k+1} = A_k x_k + B_k u_k + D_k w_k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (1)$$

where  $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state,  $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is the control input at time step  $k$ ,  $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^q$  is the square integrable noise independent of  $x_k$  and  $u_k$ , such that  $\mathbb{E}[w_k] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[w_k w_k^\top] = I_n$ , and  $A_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $B_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ , and  $D_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$  are the coefficient matrices.

**Assumption 1.** *The matrix  $A_k$  is invertible for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ .*

With Assumption 1, we can define the state transition matrix  $\Phi_A(k, \ell)$  from time  $\ell$  to  $k$  as

$$\Phi_A(k, \ell) \triangleq \begin{cases} A_{k-1} A_{k-2} \cdots A_\ell, & 0 \leq \ell < k \leq N, \\ I_n, & 0 \leq \ell = k \leq N, \\ A_k^{-1} A_{k+1}^{-1} \cdots A_{\ell-1}^{-1}, & 0 \leq k < \ell \leq N. \end{cases}$$

Then, the controllability Gramian  $G(k, s)$  from time  $s$  to  $k$  is defined as

$$G(k, s) \triangleq \begin{cases} \sum_{i=s}^{k-1} \Phi_A(s, i+1) B_i B_i^\top \Phi_A(s, i+1)^\top, & 0 \leq s < k \leq N, \\ 0_{n \times n}, & 0 \leq s = k \leq N, \\ -\sum_{i=k}^{s-1} \Phi_A(s, i+1) B_i B_i^\top \Phi_A(s, i+1)^\top, & 0 \leq k < s \leq N. \end{cases}$$

**Assumption 2.** *System (1) is controllable from time 0 to  $N$ . That is, the controllability Gramian  $G(N, 0) \succ 0$ .*

The initial state  $x_0$  and the desired terminal state  $x_N$  are characterized by their mean and covariance matrices given by

$$\mathbb{E}[x_0] = \bar{\mu}_0, \quad \mathbb{E}[(x_0 - \bar{\mu}_0)(x_0 - \bar{\mu}_0)^\top] = \bar{\Sigma}_0 \succ 0, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[x_N] = \bar{\mu}_N, \quad \mathbb{E}[(x_N - \bar{\mu}_N)(x_N - \bar{\mu}_N)^\top] = \bar{\Sigma}_N \succ D_{N-1}D_{N-1}^\top. \quad (3)$$

A control input  $\{u_k\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$ , is said to be *admissible* if each  $u_k$  depends only on  $k$  and, perhaps, on the past history of the states  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$ , such that the desired boundary constraints (2) and (3) are satisfied with a finite cost defined by

$$J \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^\top Q_k x_k + u_k^\top R_k u_k \right] < \infty, \quad (4)$$

where  $Q_k \succeq 0$  and  $R_k \succ 0$  are matrices of dimensions  $n \times n$  and  $p \times p$ , respectively. The problem is to determine the optimal admissible control  $u_k^*$  that minimizes the quadratic cost (4) subject to the initial and terminal state constraints (2), (3).

### III. EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF THE OPTIMAL CONTROL

The main theorem on the existence and uniqueness of the optimal control is summarized below.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\bar{\Sigma}_0 \succ 0$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}_N \succ D_{N-1}D_{N-1}^\top$ . Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the unique optimal control law that solves the covariance steering problem for system (1) is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} u_k^* = & - (R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k)^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} A_k x_k - (R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k)^{-1} B_k^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, k+1)^\top \\ & \times \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1) B_i (R_i + B_i^\top \Pi_{i+1} B_i)^{-1} B_i^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1)^\top \right)^{-1} \left( \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, 0) \bar{\mu}_0 - \bar{\mu}_N \right), \\ & k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\Pi_k$  is the unique solution that solves the coupled matrix difference equations

$$\Pi_k = A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} (I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k + Q_k, \quad (6)$$

$$\Sigma_{k+1} = (I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k \Sigma_k A_k^\top (I_n + \Pi_{k+1} B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top)^{-1} + D_k D_k^\top, \quad (7)$$

$$\Sigma_0 = \bar{\Sigma}_0, \quad \Sigma_N = \bar{\Sigma}_N, \quad (8)$$

and satisfies  $R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k \succ 0$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ , and  $\Phi_{\bar{A}}(\ell, s)$  is the state transition matrix of

$$\bar{A}_k \triangleq (I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (9)$$

from time  $s$  to  $\ell$ , which is defined by

$$\Phi_{\bar{A}}(\ell, s) \triangleq \begin{cases} \bar{A}_{\ell-1} \bar{A}_{\ell-2} \cdots \bar{A}_s, & 0 \leq s < \ell \leq N, \\ I_n, & 0 \leq s = \ell \leq N, \\ \bar{A}_\ell^{-1} \bar{A}_{\ell+1}^{-1} \cdots \bar{A}_{s-1}^{-1}, & 0 \leq \ell < s \leq N. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The corresponding optimal process is given by

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1}^* &= (I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k x_k^* - B_k (R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k)^{-1} B_k^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, k+1)^\top \\ &\quad \times \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1) B_i (R_i + B_i^\top \Pi_{i+1} B_i)^{-1} B_i^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1)^\top \right)^{-1} \left( \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, 0) \bar{\mu}_0 - \bar{\mu}_N \right) \\ &\quad + D_k w_k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

For the ease of reference, in the rest of the paper we label the following property of  $\Pi_k$ .

**Property 1.** *The matrix  $R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k \succ 0$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ .*

**Remark 1.** *Since  $R_k \succ 0$ , Property 1 implies that the matrix  $I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1}$  is invertible for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ , according to the Sherman–Morrison–Woodbury formula [25].*

**Remark 2.** *In light of (7), it is clear that, under Assumption 1 and Property 1, if  $\Sigma_0 \succ 0$ , then  $\Sigma_{k+1} \succ D_k D_k^\top$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ .*

**Remark 3.** *In the continuous-time case, when  $D(t)D(t)^\top \equiv \kappa B(t)R^{-1}(t)B(t)^\top$  for some  $\kappa > 0$ , there exists a closed-form solution of  $\Pi(0)$  for the continuous-time counterpart of the coupled matrix equations (6), (7), (8) [16], [18]. In the discrete-time case, however, there may not be a closed-form solution of  $\Pi_0$  even when  $D_k D_k^\top \equiv B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top$ . Interestingly, a closed-form solution exists for the discrete-time maximum entropy optimal density control problem considered in [26].*

The rest of this section is dedicated to proving Theorem 1, for which a sequence of results is needed. First, we show that (5) is a candidate optimal control law, provided the coupled matrix difference equations (6), (7), (8) admit a solution which satisfies Property 1. Then, we give

a necessary and sufficient condition for the Riccati difference equation (6) to have a unique solution. Next, we discuss properties of the state transition matrix for the Riccati difference equation. We then present a necessary and sufficient condition for the solution of (6) to satisfy Property 1. Finally, we show the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the equations (6), (7), (8).

### A. Candidate Optimal Control

A candidate optimal control law is derived using a ‘‘completion of squares’’ argument.

Let matrices  $\Pi_0, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be symmetric, and let vectors  $\psi_0, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_N \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . In view of (2) and (3), the expected values  $\mathbb{E}[x_0^\top \Pi_0 x_0]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[x_N^\top \Pi_N x_N]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\psi_0^\top x_0]$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\psi_N^\top x_N]$  are independent of the control. Then, the cost function (4) can be equivalently written as

$$\begin{aligned}
J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^\top Q_k x_k + u_k^\top R_k u_k \right] + \mathbb{E} [x_N^\top \Pi_N x_N - x_0^\top \Pi_0 x_0 + 2\psi_N^\top x_N - 2\psi_0^\top x_0] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^\top Q_k x_k + u_k^\top R_k u_k + x_{k+1}^\top \Pi_{k+1} x_{k+1} - x_k^\top \Pi_k x_k + 2\psi_{k+1}^\top x_{k+1} - 2\psi_k^\top x_k \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^\top Q_k x_k + u_k^\top R_k u_k + (x_k^\top A_k^\top + u_k^\top B_k^\top) \Pi_{k+1} (A_k x_k + B_k u_k) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + w_k^\top D_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} D_k w_k - x_k^\top \Pi_k x_k + 2\psi_{k+1}^\top (A_k x_k + B_k u_k) - 2\psi_k^\top x_k \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^\top (Q_k + A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} A_k - \Pi_k) x_k + u_k^\top (R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k) u_k \right] + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{trace} (\Pi_{k+1} D_k D_k^\top) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^\top A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k u_k + u_k^\top B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} A_k x_k + 2\psi_{k+1}^\top A_k x_k + 2\psi_{k+1}^\top B_k u_k - 2\psi_k^\top x_k \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Define the matrix

$$S_k \triangleq R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J = \mathbb{E} & \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (u_k^\top + x_k^\top A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k S_k^{-1} + \psi_{k+1}^\top B_k S_k^{-1}) S_k (u_k + S_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} A_k x_k + S_k^{-1} B_k^\top \psi_{k+1}) \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^\top (Q_k + A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} A_k - \Pi_k - A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k S_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} A_k) x_k \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} 2 \left( \psi_{k+1}^\top (I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k - \psi_k^\top \right) x_k \right] \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left[ \text{trace} (\Pi_{k+1} D_k D_k^\top) - \psi_{k+1}^\top B_k S_k^{-1} B_k^\top \psi_{k+1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

To this end, let  $\Pi_k$  satisfy the difference equation (6) and let  $\psi_k$  satisfy the difference equation

$$\psi_k = A_k^\top (I_n + \Pi_{k+1} B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top)^{-1} \psi_{k+1}. \quad (12)$$

Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
J = \mathbb{E} & \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (u_k^\top + x_k^\top A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k S_k^{-1} + \psi_{k+1}^\top B_k S_k^{-1}) S_k (u_k + S_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} A_k x_k + S_k^{-1} B_k^\top \psi_{k+1}) \right] \\
& + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left[ \text{trace} (\Pi_{k+1} D_k D_k^\top) - \psi_{k+1}^\top B_k S_k^{-1} B_k^\top \psi_{k+1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} [\text{trace} (\Pi_{k+1} D_k D_k^\top) - \psi_{k+1}^\top B_k S_k^{-1} B_k^\top \psi_{k+1}]$  is independent of the control, a candidate optimal control is given by

$$u_k^* = -(R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k)^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} A_k x_k - (R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k)^{-1} B_k^\top \psi_{k+1}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (13)$$

provided that  $S_k \succ 0$ , that is, Property 1 holds.

Hence, the corresponding optimal process for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$  is given by

$$x_{k+1}^* = (I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k x_k^* - B_k (R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k)^{-1} B_k^\top \psi_{k+1} + D_k w_k. \quad (14)$$

Let  $\mu_k \triangleq \mathbb{E}[x_k^*]$  denote the state mean at time  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ , which satisfies the difference equation

$$\mu_{k+1} = (I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k \mu_k - B_k (R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k)^{-1} B_k^\top \psi_{k+1}. \quad (15)$$

and the boundary conditions  $\mu_0 = \bar{\mu}_0$  and  $\mu_N = \bar{\mu}_N$ .

In light of (12) and (9), we can rewrite equation (15) as

$$\mu_{k+1} = \bar{A}_k \mu_k - B_k (R_k + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k)^{-1} B_k^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, k+1)^\top \psi_N. \quad (16)$$

From (16) and the boundary conditions  $\mu_0 = \bar{\mu}_0$  and  $\mu_N = \bar{\mu}_N$ , we obtain

$$\bar{\mu}_N = \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, 0) \bar{\mu}_0 - \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1) B_i (R_i + B_i^\top \Pi_{i+1} B_i)^{-1} B_i^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1)^\top \psi_N. \quad (17)$$

To proceed, we need the following auxiliary result.

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose Assumption 1, Assumption 2, and Property 1 hold. Then,*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1) B_i (R_i + B_i^\top \Pi_{i+1} B_i)^{-1} B_i^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1)^\top \succ 0.$$

*Proof of Lemma 1.* For some  $1 \leq s \leq N$  and for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , let

$$\Xi_{s,k} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} B_{s-1} & \bar{A}_{s-1} B_{s-2} & \cdots & \bar{A}_{s-1} \bar{A}_{s-2} \cdots \bar{A}_{s-k+1} B_{s-k} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let

$$\Lambda \triangleq \text{blkdiag} \left( (R_{N-1} + B_{N-1}^\top \Pi_N B_{N-1})^{-1}, (R_{N-2} + B_{N-2}^\top \Pi_{N-1} B_{N-2})^{-1}, \dots, (R_0 + B_0^\top \Pi_1 B_0)^{-1} \right).$$

Then,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1) B_i (R_i + B_i^\top \Pi_{i+1} B_i)^{-1} B_i^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1)^\top = \Xi_{N,N} \Lambda \Xi_{N,N}^\top.$$

By Property 1, the block diagonal matrix  $\Lambda \succ 0$ . Thus, it suffices to show that  $\text{rank } \Xi_{N,N} = n$ .

Similarly, for some  $1 \leq s \leq N$  and for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , let

$$G_{s,k} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} B_{s-1} & A_{s-1} B_{s-2} & \cdots & A_{s-1} A_{s-2} \cdots A_{s-k+1} B_{s-k} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Assumption 1, Assumption 2, and Property 1 together imply that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_A(N, i+1) B_i B_i^\top \Phi_A(N, i+1)^\top = G_{N,N} G_{N,N}^\top \succ 0.$$

It follows that  $\text{rank } G_{N,N} = n$ . To this end, it suffices to show the following stronger statements

$$\text{range } \Xi_{s,k} = \text{range } G_{s,k}, \quad s = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, s, \quad (18)$$

$$\bar{A}_{s-1} \bar{A}_{s-2} \cdots \bar{A}_{s-k+1} B_{s-k} = A_{s-1} A_{s-2} \cdots A_{s-k+1} B_{s-k} + \Xi_{s,k-1} Z_{s,k}, \quad Z_{s,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m(k-1) \times m}. \quad (19)$$



Clearly, equations (18) and (19) hold for all  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $k = 1$ . Assume that equations (18) and (19) hold for all  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $k = \ell \geq 1$ . By the Sherman–Morrison–Woodbury formula [25], we can write

$$\bar{A}_k = (I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k = A_k - B_k X_k, \quad \text{for some } X_k \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}_{s-1} \bar{A}_{s-2} \cdots \bar{A}_{s-\ell} B_{s-\ell-1} &= (A_{s-1} - B_{s-1} X_{s-1}) (A_{s-2} \cdots A_{s-\ell} B_{s-\ell-1} + \Xi_{s-1, \ell-1} Z_{s-1, \ell}) \\ &= A_{s-1} A_{s-2} \cdots A_{s-\ell} B_{s-\ell-1} - B_{s-1} Y_{s, \ell+1} + \bar{A}_{s-1} \Xi_{s-1, \ell-1} Z_{s-1, \ell}, \quad \text{for some } Y_{s, \ell+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \\ &= A_{s-1} A_{s-2} \cdots A_{s-\ell} B_{s-\ell-1} + \Xi_{s, \ell} Z_{s, \ell+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, equation (19) holds for all  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $k = \ell + 1$ . It follows from

$$\Xi_{s, \ell+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{s, \ell} & A_{s-1} A_{s-2} \cdots A_{s-\ell} B_{s-\ell-1} + \Xi_{s, \ell} Z_{s, \ell+1} \end{bmatrix}$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{range } \Xi_{s, \ell+1} &= \text{range} \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{s, \ell} & A_{s-1} A_{s-2} \cdots A_{s-\ell} B_{s-\ell-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \text{range} \begin{bmatrix} G_{s, \ell} & A_{s-1} A_{s-2} \cdots A_{s-\ell} B_{s-\ell-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \text{range } G_{s, \ell+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, equation (18) holds for all  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $k = \ell + 1$ . Therefore, equations (18) and (19) hold for all  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots, s$ .  $\blacksquare$

By equation (17) and Lemma 1, we obtain

$$\psi_N = \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1) B_i (R_i + B_i^\top \Pi_{i+1} B_i)^{-1} B_i^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1)^\top \right)^{-1} \left( \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, 0) \bar{\mu}_0 - \bar{\mu}_N \right).$$

It follows from (12) and the above equation that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{k+1} &= \\ \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, k+1)^\top &\left( \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1) B_i (R_i + B_i^\top \Pi_{i+1} B_i)^{-1} B_i^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i+1)^\top \right)^{-1} \left( \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, 0) \bar{\mu}_0 - \bar{\mu}_N \right). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above expression for  $\psi_{k+1}$  into (13) and (14) yields (5) and (11), respectively.

It is clear from (14) and (15) that

$$x_{k+1}^* - \mu_{k+1} = (I_n + B_k R_k^{-1} B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k (x_k^* - \mu_k) + D_k w_k.$$

Therefore, the state covariance  $\Sigma_k \triangleq \mathbb{E}[(x_k^* - \mu_k)(x_k^* - \mu_k)^\top]$  at time  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$  satisfies the difference equation (7) and the boundary conditions (8).

To this end, we have shown the following result.

**Proposition 1.** *Assume there exist  $\Pi_k, \Sigma_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  such that Property 1 holds and equations (6), (7), (8) hold for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ . Then, the state feedback control  $u^*$  given by (5) is optimal for the covariance steering problem. Furthermore, if there exists a unique solution to the equations (6), (7), (8), then, the optimal control  $u^*$  is unique. The corresponding optimal process is given by (11).*

Since  $R_k \succ 0$  can always be absorbed into  $B_k$  by defining  $\bar{B}_k \triangleq B_k R_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , without loss of generality and for the sake of notational simplicity, we assume  $R_k \equiv I_p$  for the rest of this paper.

### B. Riccati Difference Equation

In this subsection we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the unique solution  $\Pi_k$  of the Riccati difference equation (6) to exist for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ . A stronger condition for the solution of (6) to satisfy Property 1 will be provided in Section III-D. We also present a simple monotone property of Riccati difference equation in this subsection.

First, we establish the uniqueness of the solution of (6).

**Proposition 2.** *If (6) has a solution from time 0 to  $N$  for a given initial condition  $\Pi_0$ , then, the solution is unique.*

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Let  $\mathcal{S}_n$  be the set of  $n \times n$  symmetric matrices. In view of (6), it suffices to show that the map  $g : \{\Pi \mid \Pi \in \mathcal{S}_n, I_n + BB^\top \Pi \text{ is invertible}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$  with  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ , defined by

$$g : \Pi \mapsto \Pi(I_n + BB^\top \Pi)^{-1},$$

is injective.

Suppose  $H = g(\Pi)$  for some  $\Pi$ . If  $H$  is invertible, then  $\Pi$  must be invertible. It follows that  $H = (\Pi^{-1} + BB^\top)^{-1}$ . Then,  $\Pi = (H^{-1} - BB^\top)^{-1}$  is unique.

If  $H$  is singular, then any  $\Pi$  that satisfies  $H = g(\Pi)$  must be singular. Moreover, for any such  $\Pi$ , we have  $\ker H = \ker \Pi$ , since  $x^\top H = 0$  if and only if  $x^\top \Pi = 0$  for some  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Hence, we can quotient out the common kernel of  $H$  and  $\Pi$ . Since  $H, \Pi \in \mathcal{S}_n$ , there exists an  $n \times n$  orthogonal matrix  $V \triangleq [\bar{V} \ \tilde{V}]$  such that

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{V} & \tilde{V} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Lambda} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{V}^\top \\ \tilde{V}^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Pi = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{V} & \tilde{V} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Pi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{V}^\top \\ \tilde{V}^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\ker H = \ker \Pi = \text{range } \tilde{V}$  and  $\bar{\Lambda}$  is an  $r \times r$  diagonal matrix. It can be checked that  $\bar{\Lambda} = \bar{\Pi}(I_r + T\bar{\Pi})^{-1}$ , where  $T$  is the  $r$ th leading principal submatrix (that is, the upper-left  $r \times r$  submatrix) of  $V^\top B B^\top V$ . Since  $\bar{\Pi}$  is invertible by construction, we have  $\bar{\Lambda} = (\bar{\Pi}^{-1} + T)^{-1}$ . Thus,  $\bar{\Pi}$  is unique. It follows immediately that  $\Pi$  is also unique.  $\blacksquare$

Then, we give the condition for the existence of the solution of (6). To this end, let

$$M_k \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A_k + B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} Q_k & -B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} \\ -A_k^{-\top} Q_k & A_k^{-\top} \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} M_{k,1} & M_{k,2} \\ M_{k,3} & M_{k,4} \end{bmatrix}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (20)$$

It can be checked that  $M_k$  is invertible, as  $A_k^{-\top}$  and its Schur complement  $A_k + B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} Q_k - B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} A_k^\top A_k^{-\top} Q_k = A_k$  in  $M_k$  are invertible. The state transition matrix of  $M_k$  from time  $s$  to  $k$  is denoted by

$$\Phi_M(k, s) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{11}(k, s) & \Phi_{12}(k, s) \\ \Phi_{21}(k, s) & \Phi_{22}(k, s) \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \begin{cases} M_{k-1} M_{k-2} \cdots M_s, & 0 \leq s < k \leq N, \\ I_{2n}, & 0 \leq s = k \leq N, \\ M_k^{-1} M_{k+1}^{-1} \cdots M_{s-1}^{-1}, & 0 \leq k < s \leq N. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Given an initial condition  $\Pi_0$ , (6) has a solution from time 0 to  $N$  if and only if the matrix  $\Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0$  is invertible for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ . The unique solution of (6) is given by*

$$\Pi_k = \left( \Phi_{21}(k, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1}. \quad (22)$$

*Proof of Proposition 3.* (Sufficiency) Suppose that for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ , the matrix  $\Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0$  is invertible. We will show that the matrix  $\Pi_k$  given by (22) is a solution of (6). Since  $\Phi_M(k+1, 0) = M_k\Phi_M(k, 0)$ , it follows that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \\ \Phi_{21}(k, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \end{bmatrix} = M_k^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{11}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 \\ \Phi_{21}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Moreover, we can compute that

$$M_k^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} A_k^{-1} & A_k^{-1}B_kB_k^\top \\ Q_kA_k^{-1} & A_k^\top + Q_kA_k^{-1}B_kB_k^\top \end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

Putting these together, it can be checked that the  $\Pi_k$  given by (22) satisfies (6).

(Necessity) Suppose (6) has a solution from time 0 to  $N$ , denoted by  $\Pi_k$ . Clearly,  $\Phi_{11}(0, 0) + \Phi_{12}(0, 0)\Pi_0 = I_n$  is invertible. Assume that there exists  $0 \leq k \leq N-1$  such that, for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ , the matrix  $\Phi_{11}(i, 0) + \Phi_{12}(i, 0)\Pi_0$  is invertible, but the matrix  $\Phi_{11}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0$  is singular. In view of the proof for sufficiency, the unique solution of (6) up to time  $k$  is given by (22). By (6), and since  $A_k$  is invertible and  $\Pi_k$  is symmetric,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_k &= A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} (I_n + B_k B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k + Q_k \\ &= \left( A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} + Q_k (A_k^{-1} + A_k^{-1} B_k B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1}) \right) \left( A_k^{-1} + A_k^{-1} B_k B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left( A_k^{-\top} + \Pi_{k+1} B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} \right)^{-1} \left( \Pi_{k+1} A_k + (A_k^{-\top} + \Pi_{k+1} B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top}) Q_k \right). \end{aligned}$$

From (22) and (23),

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_k &= \left( \Phi_{21}(k, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left( Q_k A_k^{-1} \left[ \Phi_{11}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (A_k^\top + Q_k A_k^{-1} B_k B_k^\top) \left[ \Phi_{21}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 \right] \right) \\ &\quad \times \left( A_k^{-1} \left[ \Phi_{11}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A_k^{-1} B_k B_k^\top \left[ \Phi_{21}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 \right] \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Equating the above two equations and canceling out the common terms yields

$$\Phi_{21}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 = \Pi_{k+1} \left( \Phi_{11}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 \right).$$

There exists  $\Pi_{k+1}$  such that the above equation holds if and only if

$$0 \neq \ker \left( \Phi_{11}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 \right) \subseteq \ker \left( \Phi_{21}(k+1, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k+1, 0)\Pi_0 \right).$$

It follows that there exists  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\xi \neq 0$  such that the right-hand side of (23) times  $\xi$  equals zero. But the left-hand side of (23) times  $\xi$  is nonzero, since  $\Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0$  is invertible. We have reached a contradiction. ■

**Corollary 1.** *Under Assumption 1, suppose the condition in Proposition 3 holds so that (6) admits a solution  $\Pi_k$  from time 0 to  $N$ . Then, for all  $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, N$ ,*

$$\Pi_k = \left( \Phi_{21}(k, \ell) + \Phi_{22}(k, \ell)\Pi_\ell \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k, \ell) + \Phi_{12}(k, \ell)\Pi_\ell \right)^{-1}. \quad (25)$$

*Proof of Corollary 1.* We will prove (25) by induction. For  $\ell = 0$ , we know (25) holds because of (22). Assume that (25) holds for  $\ell = i$ , where  $i \leq N - 1$ . It can be checked that  $\Phi_M(k, i) = \Phi_M(k, i+1)M_i$  regardless of  $i < k$  or  $i \geq k$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_k &= \left( \Phi_{21}(k, i) + \Phi_{22}(k, i)\Pi_i \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k, i) + \Phi_{12}(k, i)\Pi_i \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left( \Phi_{21}(k, i+1)(A_i - B_i B_i^\top A_i^{-\top}(\Pi_i - Q_i)) + \Phi_{22}(k, i+1)(A_i^{-\top}(\Pi_i - Q_i)) \right) \\ &\quad \times \left( \Phi_{11}(k, i+1)(A_i - B_i B_i^\top A_i^{-\top}(\Pi_i - Q_i)) + \Phi_{12}(k, i+1)(A_i^{-\top}(\Pi_i - Q_i)) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left( \Phi_{21}(k, i+1) + \Phi_{22}(k, i+1)\Pi_{i+1} \right) \left( I_n + B_i B_i^\top \Pi_{i+1} \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad \times \left( I_n + B_i B_i^\top \Pi_{i+1} \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k, i+1) + \Phi_{12}(k, i+1)\Pi_{i+1} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left( \Phi_{21}(k, i+1) + \Phi_{22}(k, i+1)\Pi_{i+1} \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k, i+1) + \Phi_{12}(k, i+1)\Pi_{i+1} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (25) holds for  $\ell = i + 1$ . ■

Next, we show the monotonicity of the solution to (6). We need the following auxiliary result.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $X \succ 0$  be a  $j \times j$  matrix, written as*

$$X \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \\ X_2^\top & X_4 \end{bmatrix} \succ 0,$$

where  $X_1$  is an  $i \times i$  matrix for some  $i < j$ . Let  $Y$  be an  $i \times i$  symmetric matrix. Then,

$$X^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \\ X_2^\top & X_4 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \succ \text{(respectively, } \succeq) \begin{bmatrix} Y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \iff X_1^{-1} \succ \text{(respectively, } \succeq) Y.$$

*Proof of Lemma 2.* The fact of  $X \succ 0$  implies that  $X_1 \succ 0$  and its Schur complement  $X/X_1 \triangleq X_4 - X_2^\top X_1^{-1} X_2 \succ 0$  [25]. By using the expression for  $X^{-1}$ , we get

$$Z \triangleq X^{-1} - \begin{bmatrix} Y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X_1^{-1} + X_1^{-1} X_2 (X/X_1)^{-1} X_2^\top X_1^{-1} - Y & -X_1^{-1} X_2 (X/X_1)^{-1} \\ -(X/X_1)^{-1} X_2^\top X_1^{-1} & (X/X_1)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We can check that the Schur complement of  $(X/X_1)^{-1}$  in  $Z$  is  $X_1^{-1} - Y$ . Since  $(X/X_1)^{-1} \succ 0$ , it follows that  $Z \succ 0$  (respectively,  $Z \succeq 0$ ) if and only if the Schur complement  $X_1^{-1} - Y \succ 0$  (respectively,  $X_1^{-1} - Y \succeq 0$ ). ■

**Proposition 4.** Let  $P_k$  and  $\Pi_k$  be the respective solutions to the following Riccati difference equations

$$\begin{aligned} P_k &= A_k^\top P_{k+1} (I_n + \Upsilon_k P_{k+1})^{-1} A_k + \Omega_k, & P_0 &= 0_{n \times n}, \\ \Pi_k &= A_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} (I_n + \Gamma_k \Pi_{k+1})^{-1} A_k + Q_k, & \Pi_0 &= 0_{n \times n}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_k$  is invertible and  $\Upsilon_k, \Gamma_k, \Omega_k, Q_k \succeq 0$  over the maximal integer time intervals of existence of the respective solutions  $P_k$  and  $\Pi_k$ . Let  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$  denote the common integer time intervals of existence of  $P_k$  and  $\Pi_k$ . If for all  $k \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $\Omega_k \succeq Q_k$  and  $\Upsilon_k \preceq \Gamma_k$ , then,

$$P_k \succeq \Pi_k \succeq 0, \quad k \in \mathcal{I}, \quad k \leq 0, \quad (26)$$

$$P_k \preceq \Pi_k \preceq 0, \quad k \in \mathcal{I}, \quad k \geq 0. \quad (27)$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.* For the case when  $k \leq 0$ , (26) follows directly from [27]. We will prove (27) by induction. Since  $P_0 = \Pi_0 = 0$ , (27) holds for  $k = 0$ . Assume (27) holds for  $k = i \geq 0$ . We will show that (27) also holds for  $k = i + 1 \in \mathcal{I}$ . Since  $\Omega_i \succeq Q_i$ , we have

$$P_{i+1} (I_n + \Upsilon_i P_{i+1})^{-1} \preceq \Pi_{i+1} (I_n + \Gamma_i \Pi_{i+1})^{-1} \preceq 0. \quad (28)$$

It follows that  $\ker P_{i+1} \subseteq \ker \Pi_{i+1}$ .

If  $P_{i+1}$  and  $\Pi_{i+1}$  are invertible, it follows that

$$(P_{i+1}^{-1} + \Upsilon_i)^{-1} \preceq (\Pi_{i+1}^{-1} + \Gamma_i)^{-1} \prec 0.$$

Hence,  $\Pi_{i+1}^{-1} + \Gamma_i \preceq P_{i+1}^{-1} + \Upsilon_i \prec 0$ . Since  $\Gamma_k \succeq \Upsilon_k \succeq 0$ , it follows that  $\Pi_{i+1}^{-1} \preceq P_{i+1}^{-1} \prec 0$ . Thus, we have  $P_{i+1} \preceq \Pi_{i+1} \prec 0$ .

Without loss of generality, assume  $P_{i+1}$  and  $\Pi_{i+1}$  are singular and  $\ker P_{i+1}$  is a proper subset of  $\ker \Pi_{i+1}$ . The cases when  $P_{i+1}$  is invertible and  $\Pi_{i+1}$  is singular or when  $\ker P_{i+1} = \ker \Pi_{i+1}$  can be proved in a similar way. Since  $\ker P_{i+1} \subseteq \ker \Pi_{i+1}$ , there exists an  $n \times n$  orthogonal matrix  $U \triangleq [\bar{U} \ \tilde{U}]$  such that

$$P_{i+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{U} & \tilde{U} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{P} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{U}^\top \\ \tilde{U}^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Pi_{i+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{U} & \tilde{U} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Pi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{U}^\top \\ \tilde{U}^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\ker P_{i+1} = \text{range } \tilde{U}$  and  $\bar{P}$  is an  $r \times r$  diagonal matrix. It suffices to show that  $\bar{P} \preceq \bar{\Pi} \preceq 0$ .

Since  $\ker P_{i+1} \neq \ker \Pi_{i+1}$ , there exists an  $r \times r$  orthogonal matrix  $V \triangleq [\hat{V} \ \tilde{V}]$  such that

$$\bar{\Pi} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{V} & \tilde{V} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Pi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{V}^\top \\ \tilde{V}^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\ker \bar{\Pi} = \text{range } \tilde{V}$  and  $\hat{\Pi}$  is an  $\rho \times \rho$  diagonal matrix. To this end, it suffices to show that

$$V^\top \bar{P} V \preceq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Pi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0.$$

Multiplying (28) by  $U^\top$  on the left and by  $U$  on the right yields the matrix inequality

$$(\bar{P}^{-1} + \tilde{\Upsilon})^{-1} = \bar{P}(I_r + \tilde{\Upsilon}\bar{P})^{-1} \preceq \bar{\Pi}(I_r + \tilde{\Gamma}\bar{\Pi})^{-1} \preceq 0, \quad (29)$$

where  $\tilde{\Upsilon}$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  are the  $r$ th leading principal submatrices of  $U^\top \Upsilon_i U$  and  $U^\top \Gamma_i U$ , respectively.

Multiplying (29) by  $V^\top$  on the left and by  $V$  on the right yields

$$(V^\top \bar{P}^{-1} V + V^\top \tilde{\Upsilon} V)^{-1} \preceq \begin{bmatrix} (\hat{\Pi}^{-1} + \hat{\Upsilon})^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0, \quad (30)$$

where  $\hat{\Gamma}$  is the  $\rho$ th leading principal submatrix of  $V^\top \bar{\Gamma} V$ . Let

$$V^\top \bar{P}^{-1} V \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{Z} & \hat{Z}_2 \\ \hat{Z}_2^\top & \hat{Z}_4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V^\top \bar{\Upsilon} V \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Upsilon} & \hat{\Upsilon}_2 \\ \hat{\Upsilon}_2^\top & \hat{\Upsilon}_4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since  $(V^\top \bar{P}^{-1} V + V^\top \bar{\Upsilon} V)^{-1} \prec 0$ , (30) and Lemma 2 imply that

$$(\hat{Z} + \hat{\Upsilon})^{-1} \preceq (\hat{\Pi}^{-1} + \hat{\Gamma})^{-1} \prec 0.$$

It follows that  $\hat{\Pi}^{-1} + \hat{\Gamma} \preceq \hat{Z} + \hat{\Upsilon} \prec 0$ . Since  $\hat{\Gamma} \succeq \hat{\Upsilon} \succeq 0$ , it follows that  $\hat{\Pi}^{-1} \preceq \hat{Z} \prec 0$ . Thus, we have  $\hat{Z}^{-1} \preceq \hat{\Pi} \prec 0$ . The fact of  $(V^\top \bar{P}^{-1} V + V^\top \bar{\Upsilon} V)^{-1} \prec 0$  implies that  $V^\top \bar{P} V \prec 0$ . Then, it follows from Lemma 2 that

$$V^\top \bar{P} V = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{Z} & \hat{Z}_2 \\ \hat{Z}_2^\top & \hat{Z}_4 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \preceq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Pi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0.$$

This completes the proof. ■

### C. Properties of the State Transition Matrix

In this subsection, we present some useful properties of the state transition matrix  $\Phi_M$  defined by (21). These properties will be used to prove subsequent results.

Let

$$\Phi_M(k, s)^{-1} = \Phi_M(s, k) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{11}(s, k) & \Phi_{12}(s, k) \\ \Phi_{21}(s, k) & \Phi_{22}(s, k) \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Lemma 3.** *If  $A_k$  is invertible for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then, for all  $k, s \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{12}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{22}(k, s) &= \Phi_{22}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{12}(k, s), \\ \Phi_{21}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{11}(k, s) &= \Phi_{11}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{21}(k, s), \\ \Phi_{12}(k, s) \Phi_{11}(k, s)^\top &= \Phi_{11}(k, s) \Phi_{12}(k, s)^\top, \\ \Phi_{21}(k, s) \Phi_{22}(k, s)^\top &= \Phi_{22}(k, s) \Phi_{21}(k, s)^\top, \\ \Phi_{11}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{22}(k, s) - \Phi_{21}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{12}(k, s) &= I_n, \\ \Phi_{11}(k, s) \Phi_{22}(k, s)^\top - \Phi_{12}(k, s) \Phi_{21}(k, s)^\top &= I_n. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$



*Proof of Lemma 3.* When  $s = k$ ,  $\Phi_{11}(s, s) = \Phi_{22}(s, s) = I_n$  and  $\Phi_{12}(s, s) = \Phi_{21}(s, s) = 0$ . Clearly, Lemma 3 holds for  $s = k$ .

Let

$$\bar{J} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_n \\ -I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It can be checked that  $M_k^\top \bar{J} M_k = \bar{J} = M_k \bar{J} M_k^\top$ .

When  $s < k$ ,  $\Phi_M(k, s) = M_{k-1} \Phi_M(k-1, s)$ . It follows that,

$$\Phi_M(k, s)^\top \bar{J} \Phi_M(k, s) = \Phi_M(k-1, s)^\top M_{k-1}^\top \bar{J} M_{k-1} \Phi_M(k-1, s) = \Phi_M(k-1, s)^\top \bar{J} \Phi_M(k-1, s).$$

Since the above equation holds for all  $s < k$ , by induction, we have  $\Phi_M(k, s)^\top \bar{J} \Phi_M(k, s) = \Phi_M(s, s)^\top \bar{J} \Phi_M(s, s) = \bar{J}$ . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_M(k, s) \bar{J} \Phi_M(k, s)^\top &= M_{k-1} \Phi_M(k-1, s) \bar{J} \Phi_M(k-1, s)^\top M_{k-1}^\top \\ &= M_{k-1} \cdots M_s \Phi_M(s, s) \bar{J} \Phi_M(s, s)^\top M_s^\top \cdots M_{k-1}^\top = \bar{J}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Lemma 3 holds for  $s < k$ . Similarly, it can be shown that Lemma 3 holds for  $s > k$ . ■

**Lemma 4.** *If  $A_k$  is invertible for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then, for all  $k, s \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\Phi_{11}(k, s)$  and  $\Phi_{22}(k, s)$  are invertible. In particular,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{11}(k, s) &= \Phi_{22}(s, k)^\top \\ &= \left( \Phi_{11}(s, k) - \Phi_{12}(s, k) \Phi_{22}(s, k)^{-1} \Phi_{21}(s, k) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left( \Phi_{22}(k, s)^\top - \Phi_{12}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{11}(k, s)^{-\top} \Phi_{21}(k, s)^\top \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* First, we show that  $\Phi_{11}(k, s)$  is invertible. Let  $\Pi_k$  be the solution to (6) with  $\Pi_0 = 0_{n \times n}$ , and let  $\mathcal{I}_0 \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$  be the maximal integer time interval of existence of  $\Pi_k$ . Let  $\bar{\Pi}_k$  be the solution to (6) when  $Q_k \equiv 0_{n \times n}$  and  $\bar{\Pi}_0 = 0_{n \times n}$ . Clearly, we have  $\bar{\Pi}_k \equiv 0_{n \times n}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $\hat{\Pi}_k$  be the solution to (6) when  $B_k \equiv 0_{n \times n}$  and  $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 0_{n \times n}$ . Since when  $B_k \equiv 0_{n \times n}$ , (6) is linear, and it follows that the solution  $\hat{\Pi}_k$  exists for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Moreover, it is easy to see that  $\hat{\Pi}_k \succeq 0$  for  $k < 0$  and  $\hat{\Pi}_k \preceq 0$  for  $k > 0$ .

By the monotonicity of the matrix Riccati difference equation in Proposition 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\equiv \bar{\Pi}_k \preceq \Pi_k \preceq \hat{\Pi}_k, & k \in \mathcal{I}_0, k \leq 0, \\ \hat{\Pi}_k &\preceq \Pi_k \preceq \bar{\Pi}_k \equiv 0, & k \in \mathcal{I}_0, k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\Pi_k$  has no finite escape time and  $\mathcal{I}_0 = \mathbb{Z}$ . By Proposition 3,  $\Phi_{11}(k, 0)$  is invertible for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . A similar argument shows that  $\Phi_{11}(k, s)$  is invertible for all  $k, s \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Next, we show that  $\Phi_{11}(k, s) = \Phi_{22}(s, k)^\top$ . By (31), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{11}(k, s)^{-1} &= \Phi_{22}(k, s)^\top - \Phi_{11}(k, s)^{-1} \Phi_{12}(k, s) \Phi_{21}(k, s)^\top \\ &= \Phi_{22}(k, s)^\top - \Phi_{12}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{11}(k, s)^{-\top} \Phi_{21}(k, s)^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Phi_{11}(k, s)$  is invertible, the Schur complement of block  $\Phi_{11}(k, s)$  in the matrix  $\Phi_M(k, s)$  is given by

$$\Phi_{22}(k, s) - \Phi_{21}(k, s) \Phi_{11}(k, s)^{-1} \Phi_{12}(k, s) = \Phi_{22}(s, k)^{-1}.$$

Therefore, we have  $\Phi_{11}(k, s) = \Phi_{22}(s, k)^\top$ . The other equality can be shown analogously. ■

**Lemma 5.** *Under Assumption 1, for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ ,*

$$\Phi_{21}(k, 0) \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} = \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \Phi_{21}(k, 0)^\top \preceq 0.$$

*Proof of Lemma 5.* By Lemma 3, we have  $\Phi_{21}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{11}(k, s) = \Phi_{11}(k, s)^\top \Phi_{21}(k, s)$ . By Lemma 4,  $\Phi_{11}(k, s)$  is invertible. It follows that

$$\Phi_{21}(k, 0) \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} = \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \Phi_{21}(k, 0)^\top.$$

We show  $\Phi_{21}(k, 0) \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} \preceq 0$  by induction. When  $k = 0$ ,  $\Phi_{21}(0, 0) \Phi_{11}(0, 0)^{-1} = 0$ . For  $k = i$ , assume  $\Phi_{21}(i, 0) \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1} \preceq 0$ . It follows from  $\Phi_M(i+1, 0) = M_i \Phi_M(i, 0)$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{11}(i+1, 0) &= A_i \Phi_{11}(i, 0) + B_i B_i^\top A_i^{-\top} (Q_i - \Phi_{21}(i, 0) \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}) \Phi_{11}(i, 0), & (32) \\ \Phi_{21}(i+1, 0) &= -A_i^{-\top} (Q_i - \Phi_{21}(i, 0) \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}) \Phi_{11}(i, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{11}(i+1, 0)^\top \Phi_{21}(i+1, 0) &= -\Phi_{11}(i, 0)^\top (Q_i - \Phi_{21}(i, 0) \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}) \Phi_{11}(i, 0) \\ &\quad - \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^\top (Q_i - \Phi_{21}(i, 0) \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}) A_i^{-1} B_i B_i^\top A_i^{-\top} (Q_i - \Phi_{21}(i, 0) \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}) \Phi_{11}(i, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Phi_{21}(i, 0)\Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1} \preceq 0$  and  $Q_i \succeq 0$ , it follows that  $\Phi_{11}(i+1, 0)^\top \Phi_{21}(i+1, 0) \preceq 0$ . Therefore, it is clear that  $\Phi_{21}(i+1, 0)\Phi_{11}(i+1, 0)^{-1} \preceq 0$ .  $\blacksquare$

If  $A_k$  is invertible for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then, it follows from  $\Phi_{11}(k, s)\Phi_{12}(s, k) + \Phi_{12}(k, s)\Phi_{22}(s, k) = 0$  and Lemma 4 that,

$$-\Phi_{11}(k, s)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, s) = \Phi_{12}(s, k)\Phi_{22}(s, k)^{-1}, \quad k, s \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

**Lemma 6.** *Under Assumption 1, for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,*

$$-\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} X_i, \quad (33)$$

where

$$X_i \triangleq \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}A_i^{-1}B_i \left( I_p + B_i^\top A_i^{-\top} (Q_i - \Phi_{21}(i, 0)\Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}) A_i^{-1} B_i \right)^{-1} B_i^\top A_i^{-\top} \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-\top} \succeq 0.$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.* It follows from Lemma 5 that  $X_i \succeq 0$ . For all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ , we can compute that,

$$\begin{aligned} -\Phi_{12}(k+1, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^\top &= -M_{k,1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^\top - M_{k,2}\Phi_{22}(k, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^\top \\ &= -M_{k,1}\Phi_{11}(k, 0)\Phi_{12}(k, 0)^\top - M_{k,2}\Phi_{21}(k, 0)\Phi_{12}(k, 0)^\top - M_{k,2} \\ &= -\Phi_{11}(k+1, 0)\Phi_{12}(k, 0)^\top - M_{k,2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $M_{k,1}$  and  $M_{k,2}$  are given in (20). In view of Lemma 4 and Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Phi_{11}(k+1, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k+1, 0) &= -\Phi_{12}(k, 0)^\top \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} - \Phi_{11}(k+1, 0)^{-1}M_{k,2}\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \\ &= -\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0) + \Phi_{11}(k+1, 0)^{-1}B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that  $X_k = \Phi_{11}(k+1, 0)^{-1}B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top}$ . It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( A_k + B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (Q_k - \Phi_{21}(k, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}) \right) A_k^{-1} B_k \\ &= B_k + B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (Q_k - \Phi_{21}(k, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}) A_k^{-1} B_k \\ &= B_k \left( I_p + B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (Q_k - \Phi_{21}(k, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}) A_k^{-1} B_k \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} A_k^{-1} B_k \left( I_p + B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (Q_k - \Phi_{21}(k, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}) A_k^{-1} B_k \right)^{-1} &= \\ \left( A_k + B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (Q_k - \Phi_{21}(k, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}) \right)^{-1} B_k. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (32) and the above equation that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi_{11}(k+1, 0)^{-1} B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \\
&= \left( A_k \Phi_{11}(k, 0) + B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (Q_k - \Phi_{21}(k, 0) \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}) \Phi_{11}(k, 0) \right)^{-1} B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \\
&= \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} \left( A_k + B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (Q_k - \Phi_{21}(k, 0) \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}) \right)^{-1} B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \\
&= \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} A_k^{-1} B_k \left( I_p + B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (Q_k - \Phi_{21}(k, 0) \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}) A_k^{-1} B_k \right)^{-1} B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \\
&= X_k.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

**Lemma 7.** *Under Assumption 1, for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ ,*

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \text{range} \left( \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1} A_i^{-1} B_i \right) = \sum_{i=0}^k \text{range} \left( \Phi_A(0, i) A_i^{-1} B_i \right). \quad (34)$$

*Proof of Lemma 7.* We will show by induction the following stronger statements: for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^k \text{range} \left( \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1} A_i^{-1} B_i \right) = \sum_{i=0}^k \text{range} \left( \Phi_A(0, i) A_i^{-1} B_i \right), \\
& \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} = \Phi_A(0, k) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1} A_i^{-1} B_i Z_{i,k}, \quad Z_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}, \quad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

with the convention that (35) reduces to  $\Phi_{11}(0, 0)^{-1} = \Phi_A(0, 0) = I_n$  for  $k = 0$ .

When  $k = 0$ , we know (35) holds and we can check that  $\Phi_{11}(0, 0)^{-1} A_0^{-1} B_0 = A_0^{-1} B_0$ , so their ranges are equal.

Assume that (34) and (35) hold for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, j$ , where  $j \leq N-2$ . Since  $\Phi_M(j+1, 0) = M_j \Phi_M(j, 0)$ , we have  $\Phi_M(j, 0) = M_j^{-1} \Phi_M(j+1, 0)$ , where  $M_j^{-1}$  is given by (24). Hence,  $\Phi_{11}(j, 0) = A_j^{-1} \Phi_{11}(j+1, 0) + A_j^{-1} B_j B_j^\top \Phi_{21}(j+1, 0)$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi_{11}(j+1, 0)^{-1} = \left( A_j \Phi_{11}(j, 0) - B_j B_j^\top \Phi_{21}(j+1, 0) \right)^{-1} \\
&= \Phi_{11}(j, 0)^{-1} A_j^{-1} + \Phi_{11}(j, 0)^{-1} A_j^{-1} B_j Y_j, \quad Y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}, \\
&= \Phi_A(0, j) A_j^{-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1} A_i^{-1} B_i Z_{i,j} A_j^{-1} + \Phi_{11}(j, 0)^{-1} A_j^{-1} B_j Y_j \\
&= \Phi_A(0, j+1) + \sum_{i=0}^j \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1} A_i^{-1} B_i Z_{i,j+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (35) holds for  $k = j + 1$ . Next, we show (34). Since

$$\Phi_{11}(j+1, 0)^{-1}A_{j+1}^{-1}B_{j+1} = \Phi_A(0, j+1)A_{j+1}^{-1}B_{j+1} + \sum_{i=0}^j \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}A_i^{-1}B_i Z_{i,j+1}A_{j+1}^{-1}B_{j+1},$$

it follows from the above equation and the induction assumption that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{range} \left( \Phi_{11}(j+1, 0)^{-1}A_{j+1}^{-1}B_{j+1} \right) \\ & \subseteq \text{range} \left( \Phi_A(0, j+1)A_{j+1}^{-1}B_{j+1} \right) + \sum_{i=0}^j \text{range} \left( \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}A_i^{-1}B_i \right) \\ & = \text{range} \left( \Phi_A(0, j+1)A_{j+1}^{-1}B_{j+1} \right) + \sum_{i=0}^j \text{range} \left( \Phi_A(0, i)A_i^{-1}B_i \right) \\ & = \sum_{i=0}^{j+1} \text{range} \left( \Phi_A(0, i)A_i^{-1}B_i \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{range} \left( \Phi_A(0, j+1)A_{j+1}^{-1}B_{j+1} \right) \\ & \subseteq \text{range} \left( \Phi_{11}(j+1, 0)^{-1}A_{j+1}^{-1}B_{j+1} \right) + \sum_{i=0}^j \text{range} \left( \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}A_i^{-1}B_i \right) \\ & = \sum_{i=0}^{j+1} \text{range} \left( \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}A_i^{-1}B_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (34) holds for  $k = j + 1$ . ■

**Corollary 2.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2,*

$$-\Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0) \succ 0.$$

*It follows that  $\Phi_{12}(N, 0)$  is invertible.*

*Proof of Corollary 2.* By Lemma 6,  $-\Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0) \succeq 0$ . Assume there exists  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\zeta \neq 0$  such that  $\zeta^\top(-\Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0))\zeta = 0$ . It follows that for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ ,  $\zeta^\top X_k \zeta = 0$ . The expression of  $X_k$  implies that for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ ,  $\zeta^\top \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}A_k^{-1}B_k = 0$ . In view of Lemma 7, we have  $\zeta^\top A_0^{-1}A_1^{-1} \dots A_k^{-1}B_k = 0$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ . Thus,  $\zeta^\top G(N, 0)\zeta = 0$ , which contradicts Assumption 2. ■

Next, we specify an alternative expression for the state transition matrix of  $\bar{A}_k$  defined in Theorem 1.

**Proposition 5.** *Under Assumption 1, suppose the condition in Proposition 3 holds so that (6) admits a solution  $\Pi_k$  from time 0 to  $N$ . The state transition matrix of  $\bar{A}_k$  is given by*

$$\Phi_{\bar{A}}(k, s) = \Phi_{11}(k, s) + \Phi_{12}(k, s)\Pi_s, \quad (36)$$

for all  $s, k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ .

*Proof of Proposition 5.* When  $s = k$ , we can check that

$$\Phi_{\bar{A}}(s, s) = I_n = \Phi_{11}(s, s) + \Phi_{12}(s, s)\Pi(s).$$

It is easy to verify that  $\Phi_{\bar{A}}(k, s) = \bar{A}_{k-1}\Phi_{\bar{A}}(k-1, s)$ , regardless of  $k > s$  or  $k < s$ . In view of (21) and (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_{11}(k, s) + \Phi_{12}(k, s)\Pi_s \\ &= \left( A_{k-1} + B_{k-1}B_{k-1}^\top A_{k-1}^{-\top} Q_{k-1} \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k-1, s) + \Phi_{12}(k-1, s)\Pi_s \right) \\ & \quad - B_{k-1}B_{k-1}^\top A_{k-1}^{-\top} \left( \Phi_{21}(k-1, s) + \Phi_{22}(k-1, s)\Pi_s \right) \\ &= \left( A_{k-1} + B_{k-1}B_{k-1}^\top A_{k-1}^{-\top} (Q_{k-1} - \Pi_{k-1}) \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k-1, s) + \Phi_{12}(k-1, s)\Pi_s \right) \\ &= \left( I_n - B_{k-1}B_{k-1}^\top \Pi_k (I_n + B_{k-1}B_{k-1}^\top \Pi_k)^{-1} \right) A_{k-1} \left( \Phi_{11}(k-1, s) + \Phi_{12}(k-1, s)\Pi_s \right) \\ &= (I_n + B_{k-1}B_{k-1}^\top \Pi_k)^{-1} A_{k-1} \left( \Phi_{11}(k-1, s) + \Phi_{12}(k-1, s)\Pi_s \right) \\ &= \bar{A}_{k-1} \left( \Phi_{11}(k-1, s) + \Phi_{12}(k-1, s)\Pi_s \right). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

#### D. Riccati Difference Equation With Property 1

A few necessary and sufficient conditions for the solution of (6) to satisfy Property 1 are provided. The first one is an alternative statement of Property 1.

**Lemma 8.** *Under Assumption 1, suppose the condition in Proposition 3 holds so that (6) admits a solution  $\Pi_k$  from time 0 to  $N$ . Then, for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ , we have that*

$$I_p + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k = \left( I_p - B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (\Pi_k - Q_k) A_k^{-1} B_k \right)^{-1}.$$

Thus,  $I_p + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k \succ 0$  if and only if  $I_p - B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (\Pi_k - Q_k) A_k^{-1} B_k \succ 0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 8.* In view of (21) and (25), we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{k+1} &= \left( \Phi_{21}(k+1, k) + \Phi_{22}(k+1, k)\Pi_k \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k+1, k) + \Phi_{12}(k+1, k)\Pi_k \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left( -A_k^{-\top}Q_k + A_k^{-\top}\Pi_k \right) \left( A_k + B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top}Q_k - B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top}\Pi_k \right)^{-1} \\ &= A_k^{-\top}(\Pi_k - Q_k) \left( A_k - B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top}(\Pi_k - Q_k) \right)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}I_p + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k &= I_p + B_k^\top A_k^{-\top}(\Pi_k - Q_k) \left( A_k - B_k B_k^\top A_k^{-\top}(\Pi_k - Q_k) \right)^{-1} B_k \\ &= \left( I_p - B_k^\top A_k^{-\top}(\Pi_k - Q_k) A_k^{-1} B_k \right)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

To derive the second necessary and sufficient condition for Property 1, we need the following two auxiliary results.

**Lemma 9.** Under Assumption 1, equation (22) can be written, equivalently, as

$$\Pi_k = \Phi_{21}(k, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top}\Pi_0 \left( I_n + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 9.* In view of Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{21}(k, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k, 0)\Pi_0 &= \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \left( \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^\top \Phi_{21}(k, 0) + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^\top \Phi_{22}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right) \\ &= \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \left( \Phi_{21}(k, 0)^\top \Phi_{11}(k, 0) + (I_n + \Phi_{21}(k, 0)^\top \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0) \right) \\ &= \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \left( \Pi_0 + \Phi_{21}(k, 0)^\top (\Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0) \right).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_k &= \left( \Phi_{21}(k, 0) + \Phi_{22}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \\ &= \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \left( \Pi_0 + \Phi_{21}(k, 0)^\top (\Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0) \right) \left( \Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \\ &= \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \Pi_0 \left( \Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \Phi_{21}(k, 0)^\top \\ &= \Phi_{21}(k, 0)\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-\top} \Pi_0 \left( I_n + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

For the sake of notational simplicity, define for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L_k &\triangleq \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} A_k^{-1} B_k, \\ T_k &\triangleq I_p + B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (Q_k - \Phi_{21}(k, 0) \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}) A_k^{-1} B_k \succ 0. \end{aligned}$$

In view of Lemma 6, for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , we have

$$-\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1} \Phi_{12}(k, 0) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} X_i = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} L_i T_i^{-1} L_i^\top. \quad (37)$$

For notational simplicity, we will use the notation  $\Phi_{ij}^{k,0} \triangleq \Phi_{ij}(k, 0)$ , where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ .

For all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ , define

$$U_k \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} T_k & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & T_{k-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & T_0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} L_k^\top \\ L_{k-1}^\top \\ \vdots \\ L_0^\top \end{bmatrix} \Pi_0 \begin{bmatrix} L_k & L_{k-1} & \cdots & L_0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Lemma 10.** *Under Assumption 1, we have*

$$U_0 = I_p - B_0^\top A_0^{-\top} (\Pi_0 - Q_0) A_0^{-1} B_0,$$

and for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ , the Schur complement

$$U_k/U_{k-1} = I_p - B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (\Pi_k - Q_k) A_k^{-1} B_k.$$

*Proof of Lemma 10.* First, we check that

$$U_0 = T_0 - L_0^\top \Pi_0 L_0 = I_p - B_0^\top A_0^{-\top} (\Pi_0 - Q_0) A_0^{-1} B_0.$$



Then, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{k-1}^{-1} &= \begin{bmatrix} T_{k-1}^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T_0^{-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} T_{k-1}^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T_0^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_{k-1}^\top \\ \vdots \\ L_0^\top \end{bmatrix} \Pi_0 \\
&\quad \times \left( I_n + (\Phi_{11}^{k,0})^{-1} \Phi_{12}^{k,0} \Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} L_{k-1} & \cdots & L_0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_{k-1}^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T_0^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that the desired Schur complement is

$$\begin{aligned}
U_k/U_{k-1} &= T_k - L_k^\top \Pi_0 L_k - L_k^\top \Pi_0 \begin{bmatrix} L_{k-1} & \cdots & L_0 \end{bmatrix} U_{k-1}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} L_{k-1}^\top \\ \vdots \\ L_0^\top \end{bmatrix} \Pi_0 L_k \\
&= T_k - L_k^\top \Pi_0 L_k + L_k^\top \Pi_0 (\Phi_{11}^{k,0})^{-1} \Phi_{12}^{k,0} \Pi_0 L_k \\
&\quad - L_k^\top \Pi_0 (\Phi_{11}^{k,0})^{-1} \Phi_{12}^{k,0} \Pi_0 \left( I_n + (\Phi_{11}^{k,0})^{-1} \Phi_{12}^{k,0} \Pi_0 \right)^{-1} (\Phi_{11}^{k,0})^{-1} \Phi_{12}^{k,0} \Pi_0 L_k \\
&= I_p + B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} \left[ Q_k - \Phi_{21}^{k,0} (\Phi_{11}^{k,0})^{-1} - (\Phi_{11}^{k,0})^{-\top} \Pi_0 \left( I_n + (\Phi_{11}^{k,0})^{-1} \Phi_{12}^{k,0} \Pi_0 \right)^{-1} (\Phi_{11}^{k,0})^{-1} \right] \\
&\quad \times A_k^{-1} B_k \\
&= I_p - B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (\Pi_k - Q_k) A_k^{-1} B_k,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 9. ■

The second necessary and sufficient condition for Property 1 is as follows.

**Proposition 6.** *Under Assumption 1, the following statements are equivalent.*

- i) Property 1 holds.
- ii)  $U_0 \succ 0$  and  $U_k/U_{k-1} \succ 0$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ .
- iii)  $U_k \succ 0$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ .

iv)  $U_{N-1} \succ 0$ .

*Proof of Proposition 6.* The equivalence of i) and ii) follows from Lemma 8 and Lemma 10. The equivalence of ii), iii), and iv) follows from Sylvester's criterion [25]. ■

We are ready to present the third necessary and sufficient condition for Property 1.

**Proposition 7.** *Under Assumptions 1, the following statements are equivalent.*

i) Property 1 holds.

ii) For all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ , the eigenvalues of  $I_n + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0$  are positive.

iii) The eigenvalues of  $I_n + \Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0)\Pi_0$  are positive.

*Proof of Proposition 7.* It is easy to see that  $I_n + \Phi_{11}(0, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(0, 0)\Pi_0 = I_n$ , so ii) holds for  $k = 0$ . In view of Proposition 6, it suffices to show that, for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ ,  $U_k \succ 0$  if and only if all eigenvalues of  $I_n + \Phi_{11}(k + 1, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k + 1, 0)\Pi_0$  are positive. By (37),

$$-\Phi_{11}(k + 1, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k + 1, 0) = \sum_{i=0}^k L_i T_i^{-1} L_i^\top = \begin{bmatrix} L_k & \dots & L_0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_k^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T_0^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_k^\top \\ \vdots \\ L_0^\top \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, all eigenvalues of  $I_n + \Phi_{11}(k + 1, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k + 1, 0)\Pi_0$  are positive if and only if

$$I_n - \begin{bmatrix} T_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_k^\top \\ \vdots \\ L_0^\top \end{bmatrix} \Pi_0 \begin{bmatrix} L_k & \dots & L_0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \succ 0.$$

This is equivalent to  $U_k \succ 0$ . ■

**Remark 4.** *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. By Proposition 3, a necessary and sufficient condition for the solution of (6) to exist from time 0 to  $N$  is that  $\Phi_{11}(k, 0) + \Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0$  is invertible for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ . By Lemma 4,  $\Phi_{11}(k, \ell)$  is invertible for all  $0 \leq k, \ell \leq N$ . It follows that the solution of (6) exists if and only if  $I_n + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0$  is invertible for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ . Furthermore, Proposition 7 implies the solution of (6) satisfies Property 1 if*

and only if the eigenvalues of  $I_n + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0$  are positive for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ , which is a stronger condition than being invertible.

**Proposition 8.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, Property 1 holds if and only if*

$$\Pi_0 \prec -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0).$$

*Proof of Proposition 8.* By Corollary 2,  $-\Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0) \succ 0$ . Statement *iii*) in Proposition 7 is equivalent to

$$I_n - \left( -\Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_0 \left( -\Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \succ 0.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\left( -\Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0) \right)^{-1} - \Pi_0 \succ 0.$$

In view of Proposition 7, Property 1 holds if and only if  $\Pi_0 \prec -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0)$ . ■

For completeness, the necessary and sufficient conditions derived in this subsection are summarized below, for the solution of the matrix Riccati difference equation (6) to exist and satisfy Property 1.

**Theorem 2.** *Under Assumption 1, the following statements are equivalent.*

- i) The solution  $\Pi_k$  of (6) exists from time 0 to  $N$  and satisfies Property 1.*
- ii) The solution  $\Pi_k$  of (6) satisfies Property 1. That is,  $I_p + B_k^T \Pi_{k+1} B_k \succ 0$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ .*
- iii)  $\Pi_k$  satisfies  $I_p - B_k^T A_k^{-T} (\Pi_k - Q_k) A_k^{-1} B_k \succ 0$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ .*
- iv)  $\Pi_0$  satisfies  $U_0 \succ 0$  and  $U_k/U_{k-1} \succ 0$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ .*
- v)  $\Pi_0$  satisfies  $U_k \succ 0$  for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ .*
- vi)  $\Pi_0$  satisfies  $U_{N-1} \succ 0$ .*
- vii) The eigenvalues of  $I_n + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0$  are positive for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ .*
- viii) All eigenvalues of  $I_n + \Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0)\Pi_0$  are positive.*

Under Assumptions 1 and 2, any of the above statements is also equivalent to

$$\Pi_0 \prec -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0).$$

In view of Remark 4, we can summarize the necessary and sufficient conditions for the solution of the matrix Riccati difference equation (6) to exist.

**Theorem 3.** *Under Assumption 1, the following statements are equivalent.*

- i) *The solution  $\Pi_k$  of (6) exists from time 0 to  $N$ .*
- ii)  *$I_p + B_k^\top \Pi_{k+1} B_k$  is invertible for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ .*
- iii)  *$I_p - B_k^\top A_k^{-\top} (\Pi_k - Q_k) A_k^{-1} B_k$  is invertible for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ .*
- iv)  *$\Pi_0$  satisfies the property that  $U_0$  and  $U_k/U_{k-1}$  are invertible for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$ .*
- v)  *$\Pi_0$  satisfies the property that  $U_k$  is invertible for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ .*
- vi)  *$\Pi_0$  satisfies the property that  $U_{N-1}$  is invertible.*
- vii)  *$I_n + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0$  is invertible for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ .*
- viii)  *$I_n + \Phi_{11}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(N, 0)\Pi_0$  is invertible.*

Under Assumptions 1 and 2, any of the above statements is also equivalent to the statement that  $\Pi_0 + \Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0)$  is invertible.

### E. Existence and Uniqueness of the Solution

We show that the solution of the coupled matrix difference equations (6), (7), (8) exists and is unique.

**Proposition 9.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, suppose  $\Pi_0 \prec -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0)$ . Given  $\Sigma_0 = \bar{\Sigma}_0 \succeq 0$ , then, the solution  $\Sigma_k$  of (7) from time 0 to  $N$  is given by,*

$$\Sigma_{k+1} = \Phi_{\bar{A}}(k+1, 0)\bar{\Sigma}_0\Phi_{\bar{A}}^\top(k+1, 0) + \sum_{i=0}^k \Phi_{\bar{A}}(k+1, i+1)D_i D_i^\top \Phi_{\bar{A}}^\top(k+1, i+1), \quad (38)$$

where  $\Phi_{\bar{A}}(k, s)$  is given by (36) and  $\Pi_k$  is given by (22). In particular,

$$\lim_{\Pi_0 \rightarrow -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0)} \Sigma_N = D_{N-1} D_{N-1}^\top.$$

When  $\bar{\Sigma}_0 \succ 0$ ,

$$\lim_{\Pi_0 \rightarrow -\infty} \Sigma_N = +\infty.$$

*Proof of Proposition 9.* It is clear that (38) is the solution of (7). In light of Lemma 9, as  $\Pi_0 \rightarrow -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0)$ , then  $\Pi_N \rightarrow +\infty$ . By (9),  $\bar{A}_{N-1} \rightarrow 0_{n \times n}$ . Thus,  $\Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, i) \rightarrow 0_{n \times n}$  for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ . It follows that  $\Sigma_N \rightarrow D_{N-1}D_{N-1}^\top$ . On the other hand, since  $\Phi_{12}(N, 0)$  is invertible, in view of (36), as  $\Pi_0 \rightarrow -\infty$ , then  $\Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, 0) \rightarrow \infty$ . When  $\bar{\Sigma}_0 \succ 0$ , as  $\Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, 0) \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\Sigma_N \rightarrow +\infty$ . ■

Proposition 9 provides an explicit map from  $\Pi_0$  to  $\Sigma_N$  for the coupled matrix difference equations (6) and (7) with  $\Sigma_0 = \bar{\Sigma}_0 \succ 0$ . Specifically, define

$$\begin{aligned} f : \{ \Pi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid \Pi_0 = \Pi_0^\top \prec -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0) \} \\ \rightarrow \{ \Sigma_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid \Sigma_N = \Sigma_N^\top \succ D_{N-1}D_{N-1}^\top \}, \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\Pi_0) = & \left( \Phi_{11}(N, 0) + \Phi_{12}(N, 0)\Pi_0 \right) \left[ \bar{\Sigma}_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left( \Phi_{11}(i+1, 0) + \Phi_{12}(i+1, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} D_i D_i^\top \right. \\ & \left. \times \left( \Phi_{11}(i+1, 0)^\top + \Pi_0 \Phi_{12}(i+1, 0)^\top \right)^{-1} \right] \left( \Phi_{11}(N, 0)^\top + \Pi_0 \Phi_{12}(N, 0)^\top \right). \quad (39) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to [20], when  $n > 1$ , the map  $f$  may not be monotone in the Loewner order; however, when  $n = 1$ ,  $f$  is monotonically decreasing.

To this end, let us compute the Jacobian of the map  $f$  defined by (39). For notational simplicity, let the summand in (39) be denoted by

$$P_i \triangleq \left( \Phi_{11}^{i+1,0} + \Phi_{12}^{i+1,0}\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} D_i D_i^\top \left( \left( \Phi_{11}^{i+1,0} \right)^\top + \Pi_0 \left( \Phi_{12}^{i+1,0} \right)^\top \right)^{-1} \succeq 0.$$

Let  $\Delta\Pi_0$  denote a small increment in  $\Pi_0$ . Then, we can write [28]

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \Phi_{11}^{i+1,0} + \Phi_{12}^{i+1,0}\Pi_0 + \Phi_{12}^{i+1,0}\Delta\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} &= \left( \Phi_{11}^{i+1,0} + \Phi_{12}^{i+1,0}\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \\ &- \left( \Phi_{11}^{i+1,0} + \Phi_{12}^{i+1,0}\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \Phi_{12}^{i+1,0}\Delta\Pi_0 \left( \Phi_{11}^{i+1,0} + \Phi_{12}^{i+1,0}\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} + O\left(\|\Delta\Pi_0\|^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

After collecting all the first order terms of  $\Delta\Pi_0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\Pi_0 + \Delta\Pi_0) - f(\Pi_0) &= O\left(\|\Delta\Pi_0\|^2\right) + \Phi_{12}^{N,0}\Delta\Pi_0\left[\bar{\Sigma}_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} P_i\right]\left((\Phi_{11}^{N,0})^\top + \Pi_0(\Phi_{12}^{N,0})^\top\right) \\
&+ \left(\Phi_{11}^{N,0} + \Phi_{12}^{N,0}\Pi_0\right)\left[\bar{\Sigma}_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} P_i\right]\Delta\Pi_0(\Phi_{12}^{N,0})^\top \\
&- \left(\Phi_{11}^{N,0} + \Phi_{12}^{N,0}\Pi_0\right)\left[\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}\left[\left(\Phi_{11}^{i+1,0} + \Phi_{12}^{i+1,0}\Pi_0\right)^{-1}\Phi_{12}^{i+1,0}\Delta\Pi_0 P_i\right.\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left.+ P_i\Delta\Pi_0(\Phi_{12}^{i+1,0})^\top\left((\Phi_{11}^{i+1,0})^\top + \Pi_0(\Phi_{12}^{i+1,0})^\top\right)^{-1}\right]\right]\left((\Phi_{11}^{N,0})^\top + \Pi_0(\Phi_{12}^{N,0})^\top\right).
\end{aligned}$$

For notational simplicity, let

$$\Phi_{\bar{A}}^{N,0} \triangleq \Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, 0) = \Phi_{11}(N, 0) + \Phi_{12}(N, 0)\Pi_0,$$

and, for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ , let

$$W_{k,0} \triangleq \left(I_n + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0\right)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0) \preceq 0.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\Pi_0 + \Delta\Pi_0) - f(\Pi_0) &= O\left(\|\Delta\Pi_0\|^2\right) + \Phi_{\bar{A}}^{N,0}\left[W_{N,0}\Delta\Pi_0\bar{\Sigma}_0 + \bar{\Sigma}_0\Delta\Pi_0W_{N,0}\right. \\
&\quad \left.+ \sum_{i=0}^{N-1}\left[(W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0})\Delta\Pi_0 P_i + P_i\Delta\Pi_0(W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0})\right]\right](\Phi_{\bar{A}}^{N,0})^\top. \quad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, let  $\otimes$  denote the Kronecker product. Given an  $n \times n$  matrix  $H = [h_{ij}]$ , its vectorized version is

$$\text{vec}(H) \triangleq [h_{11} \ \dots \ h_{n1} \ h_{12} \ \dots \ h_{n2} \ \dots \ h_{1n} \ \dots \ h_{nn}]^\top.$$

Define the map  $\bar{f} : \{\text{vec}(\Pi_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2} \mid \Pi_0 = \Pi_0^\top \prec -(\Phi_{12}^{N,0})^{-1}\Phi_{11}^{N,0}\} \rightarrow \{\text{vec}(\Sigma_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2} \mid \Sigma_N = \Sigma_N^\top \succ D_{N-1}D_{N-1}^\top\}$  such that

$$\bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_0)) = \text{vec}(f(\Pi_0)),$$

where  $f$  is defined by (39).

It follows from vectorizing both sides of (40) that

$$\bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_0) + \text{vec}(\Delta\Pi_0)) - \bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_0)) = \partial\bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_0))\text{vec}(\Delta\Pi_0) + O\left(\|\Delta\Pi_0\|^2\right),$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_0)) &= \Phi_{\bar{A}}^{N,0} \otimes \Phi_{\bar{A}}^{N,0} \left[ \bar{\Sigma}_0 \otimes W_{N,0} + W_{N,0} \otimes \bar{\Sigma}_0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left[ P_i \otimes (W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0}) + (W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0}) \otimes P_i \right] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Thus,  $\partial \bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_0))$  is the Jacobian of the map  $\bar{f}$  at  $\text{vec}(\Pi_0)$ .

**Lemma 11.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, suppose  $\Pi_0 \prec -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0)$ . Then, for any  $N \geq k \geq i \geq 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} &- \left( I_n + \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0) \\ &\quad \succeq - \left( I_n + \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(i, 0)\Pi_0 \right)^{-1} \Phi_{11}(i, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(i, 0) \succeq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

*Proof of Lemma 11.* For simplicity, we use the notation

$$\Theta_k \triangleq -\Phi_{11}(k, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{12}(k, 0) \succeq 0.$$

For  $i = 0$ , we can check that  $(I_n - \Theta_0\Pi_0)^{-1}\Theta_0 = 0$ . Now, we assume  $i \geq 1$ . It follows from Lemma 6 that  $\Theta_k \succeq \Theta_i \succeq 0$ . This implies that  $\ker \Theta_k \subseteq \ker \Theta_i$ .

If  $\Theta_k \succeq \Theta_i \succ 0$ , we have  $(\Theta_k^{-1} - \Pi_0)^{-1} \succeq (\Theta_i - \Pi_0)^{-1} \succ 0$ . Hence, (42) holds.

Without loss of generality, assume  $\Theta_k$  and  $\Theta_i$  are singular and  $\ker \Theta_k$  is a proper subset of  $\ker \Theta_i$ . The case when  $\Theta_k \succ 0$  or when  $\ker \Theta_k = \ker \Theta_i$  can be proved in a similar way. Since  $\ker \Theta_k \subseteq \ker \Theta_i$ , there exists an  $n \times n$  orthogonal matrix  $U$  such that<sup>1</sup>

$$\Theta_k = U \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Theta}_k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U^\top, \quad \Theta_i = U \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Theta}_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U^\top, \quad \Theta_N^{-1} = U \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Theta}_N^{-1} & \times \\ \times & \times \end{bmatrix} U^\top, \quad \Pi_0 = U \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Pi}_0 & \times \\ \times & \times \end{bmatrix} U^\top,$$

where  $\bar{\Theta}_k \succ 0$ ,  $\bar{\Theta}_i \succeq 0$ ,  $\bar{\Theta}_N \succ 0$ , and  $\bar{\Pi}_0$  are  $r \times r$  matrices. Since  $\Theta_N^{-1} \succ \Pi_0$ , we have  $\bar{\Theta}_N^{-1} \succ \bar{\Pi}_0$ . Since  $\Theta_N \succeq \Theta_k \succeq 0$ , Lemma 2 implies that  $\bar{\Theta}_N \succeq \bar{\Theta}_k \succ 0$ . It follows that  $\bar{\Theta}_k^{-1} \succeq \bar{\Theta}_N^{-1} \succ \bar{\Pi}_0$ . In view of (42), it suffices to show that

$$\left( \bar{\Theta}_k^{-1} - \bar{\Pi}_0 \right)^{-1} \succeq \left( I_r - \bar{\Theta}_i \bar{\Pi}_0 \right)^{-1} \bar{\Theta}_i \succeq 0. \quad (43)$$

<sup>1</sup>The entries denoted by  $\times$  do not affect the logic of the proof and thus are hidden.

Since  $\ker \Theta_k \neq \ker \Theta_i$ , there exists an  $r \times r$  orthogonal matrix  $V$  such that

$$\bar{\Theta}_k^{-1} = V \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Theta}_k^{-1} & \times \\ \times & \times \end{bmatrix} V^\top, \quad \bar{\Theta}_i = V \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Theta}_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} V^\top, \quad \bar{\Pi}_0 = V \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Pi}_0 & \times \\ \times & \times \end{bmatrix} V^\top,$$

where  $\hat{\Theta}_k \succ 0$ ,  $\hat{\Theta}_i \succ 0$ , and  $\hat{\Pi}_0$  are  $\rho \times \rho$  matrices. Since  $\bar{\Theta}_k \succeq \bar{\Theta}_i \succeq 0$ , it follows from Lemma 2 that  $\hat{\Theta}_k \succeq \hat{\Theta}_i \succ 0$ . It implies that  $\hat{\Theta}_i^{-1} \succeq \hat{\Theta}_k^{-1} \succ \hat{\Pi}_0$ . To this end, in view of (43), it suffices to show that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Theta}_k^{-1} - \hat{\Pi}_0 & \times \\ \times & \times \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \succeq \begin{bmatrix} (\hat{\Theta}_i^{-1} - \hat{\Pi}_0)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

Since  $\bar{\Theta}_k^{-1} - \bar{\Pi}_0 \succ 0$ , in light of Lemma 2, it suffices to show that

$$\left( \hat{\Theta}_k^{-1} - \hat{\Pi}_0 \right)^{-1} \succeq \left( \hat{\Theta}_i^{-1} - \hat{\Pi}_0 \right)^{-1} \succ 0.$$

Hence, it is sufficient to show that

$$\hat{\Theta}_i^{-1} - \hat{\Pi}_0 \succeq \hat{\Theta}_k^{-1} - \hat{\Pi}_0 \succ 0,$$

which is a direct result of the fact that  $\hat{\Theta}_i^{-1} \succeq \hat{\Theta}_k^{-1} \succ \hat{\Pi}_0$ . ■

Since  $\Phi_{12}(N, 0)$  is invertible, it follows from Lemma 11 that  $W_{N,0} \prec 0$  and that, for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ ,  $W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0} \preceq 0$ .

**Proposition 10.** *For any given  $\bar{\Sigma}_0 \succ 0$ , the map  $f$  defined by (39) is a homeomorphism. Thus, for any  $\Sigma_N \succ D_{N-1} D_{N-1}^\top$ , there exists a unique  $\Pi_0 \prec -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1} \Phi_{11}(N, 0)$  such that  $\Sigma_N = f(\Pi_0)$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 10.* Clearly,  $\partial \bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_0))$  is continuous in  $\text{vec}(\Pi_0)$ . First, we show that  $\partial \bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_0))$  is nonsingular at each  $\Pi_0 \prec -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1} \Phi_{11}(N, 0)$ . Since  $\Phi_{\bar{A}}^{N,0} \otimes \Phi_{\bar{A}}^{N,0}$  is nonsingular, it suffices to show that the term in the square brackets of (41), that is,

$$S \triangleq \bar{\Sigma}_0 \otimes W_{N,0} + W_{N,0} \otimes \bar{\Sigma}_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left[ P_i \otimes (W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0}) + (W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0}) \otimes P_i \right],$$



is nonsingular. One can readily check that  $S$  is symmetric, because  $\bar{\Sigma}_0 \succ 0$ ,  $W_{N,0} \prec 0$ ,  $P_i \succeq 0$ , and  $W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0} \preceq 0$  are all symmetric. Let  $X \neq 0$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{vec}(X)^\top S \text{vec}(X) \\
&= \text{vec}(X)^\top \text{vec} \left( W_{N,0} X \bar{\Sigma}_0 + \bar{\Sigma}_0 X W_{N,0} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left[ (W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0}) X P_i + P_i X (W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0}) \right] \right) \\
&= \text{trace} \left( X^\top W_{N,0} X \bar{\Sigma}_0 + X^\top \bar{\Sigma}_0 X W_{N,0} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left[ X^\top (W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0}) X P_i + X^\top P_i X (W_{N,0} - W_{i+1,0}) \right] \right) \\
&\leq \text{trace} \left( \bar{\Sigma}_0^{\frac{1}{2}} X^\top W_{N,0} X \bar{\Sigma}_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + \bar{\Sigma}_0^{\frac{1}{2}} X W_{N,0} X^\top \bar{\Sigma}_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $S \prec 0$ . Therefore,  $\partial \bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_0))$  is nonsingular at each  $\text{vec}(\Pi_0)$  in the domain of  $\bar{f}$ .

Next, we show that the map  $f$  is proper, that is, for any compact subset  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{\Sigma_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid \Sigma_N = \Sigma_N^\top \succ D_{N-1} D_{N-1}^\top\}$ , the inverse image  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq \{\Pi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid \Pi_0 = \Pi_0^\top \prec -(\Phi_{12}^{N,0})^{-1} \Phi_{11}^{N,0}\}$  is compact. Since  $f$  is continuous and  $\mathcal{K}$  is closed, the inverse image  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{K})$  is also closed. Since  $\mathcal{K}$  is bounded in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , in view of (39), the set

$$\left\{ \left( \Phi_{11}^{N,0} + \Phi_{12}^{N,0} \Pi_0 \right) \bar{\Sigma}_0 \left( \left( \Phi_{11}^{N,0} \right)^\top + \Pi_0 \left( \Phi_{12}^{N,0} \right)^\top \right) \mid \Pi_0 \in f^{-1}(\mathcal{K}) \right\}$$

is also bounded in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Since  $\bar{\Sigma}_0$  and  $\Phi_{12}^{N,0}$  are invertible,  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{K})$  is bounded in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Therefore,  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{K})$  is compact, and thus  $f$  is proper.

Since the set  $\{\Sigma_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid \Sigma_N = \Sigma_N^\top \succ D_{N-1} D_{N-1}^\top\}$  is convex, it is simply connected [29]. By Hadamard's global inverse function theorem [29],  $f$  is a homeomorphism.  $\blacksquare$

#### IV. COMPUTATION OF THE OPTIMAL CONTROL

In this section, we propose two efficient algorithms for solving for the optimal control law. The first algorithm adopts Newton's root finding method to compute  $\Pi_0$  by exploiting the map  $f$  given by (39) and its Jacobian given by (41). The second algorithm recasts the non-convex optimal covariance steering problem as a convex optimization problem, more specifically, a SDP. It is shown that this convex relaxation is lossless, in the sense that the optimal solution to the SDP problem also solves the original non-convex covariance steering problem.

### A. Newton's Method

In this subsection, we describe a Newton's root finding method for solving the optimal covariance control problem formulated in Section II.

The first step is to absorb  $R_k \succ 0$  into  $B_k$  by defining  $\bar{B}_k \triangleq B_k R_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\bar{R}_k \equiv I_p$ , for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ . We shall use  $\bar{B}_k$  and  $\bar{R}_k$  in replacement of  $B_k$  and  $R_k$  for the following steps. The second step is to determine the coefficient matrices  $\Phi_{ij}(k+1, 0)$  and  $\Phi_{ij}(N, k)$  by (21), for  $i, j = 1, 2$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ . The third step is to compute  $\Pi_0$  using Newton's method. That is, make an initial guess of  $\Pi_{0,0} \prec -\Phi_{12}(N, 0)^{-1}\Phi_{11}(N, 0)$  and iterate the equation

$$\text{vec}(\Pi_{0,i+1}) = \text{vec}(\Pi_{0,i}) - \left[ \partial \bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_{0,i})) \right]^{-1} \left[ \bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_{0,i})) - \text{vec}(\bar{\Sigma}_N) \right], \quad i = 0, 1, \dots,$$

where  $\Pi_{0,i}$  denotes the value of  $\Pi_0$  at the  $i$ th iteration of the Newton's method. This iteration should be terminated when  $\|\bar{f}(\text{vec}(\Pi_{0,i})) - \text{vec}(\bar{\Sigma}_N)\|$  is sufficiently small. The fourth step is to calculate  $\Pi_{k+1}$  via (22) and  $\Phi_{\bar{A}}(N, k)$  via either (10) or (36), for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ . The last step is to find the optimal control  $u_k^*$  by (5).

### B. SDP with Lossless Convex Relaxation

In this subsection, we develop an SDP-based technique for solving the optimal covariance control problem formulated in Section II. Since Theorem 1 shows that the optimal control for a linear stochastic system is in the form of state feedback, we employ a control law of the form

$$u_k = K_k(x_k - \mu_k) + v_k,$$

where  $K_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$  is the state feedback matrix and  $v_k$  is the feed-forward term. The resulting dynamics of the state mean and covariance are

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{k+1} &= A_k \mu_k + B_k v_k, \\ \Sigma_{k+1} &= (A_k + B_k K_k) \Sigma_k (A_k + B_k K_k)^\top + D_k D_k^\top. \end{aligned}$$

With the standard transformation  $U_k \triangleq K_k \Sigma_k$  [30] and after some straightforward manipulations [7], the optimal covariance control problem can be written in an equivalent form as follows

$$\min_{\Sigma_k, U_k, \mu_k, v_k} J = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{trace} (Q_k \Sigma_k) + \text{trace} (R_k U_k \Sigma_k^{-1} U_k^\top) + \mu_k^\top Q_k \mu_k + v_k^\top R_k v_k \quad (44a)$$

such that for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$

$$\mu_{k+1} = A_k \mu_k + B_k v_k \quad (44b)$$

$$A_k \Sigma_k A_k^\top + B_k U_k A_k^\top + A_k U_k^\top B_k^\top + B_k U_k \Sigma_k^{-1} U_k^\top B_k^\top + D_k D_k^\top - \Sigma_{k+1} = 0 \quad (44c)$$

The optimization variables are  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_{N-1}, U_0, U_1, \dots, U_{N-1}, v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{N-1}, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_{N-1}$ , while  $\Sigma_0 = \bar{\Sigma}_0, \Sigma_N = \bar{\Sigma}_N, \mu_0 = \bar{\mu}_0$ , and  $\mu_N = \bar{\mu}_N$  are constants.

The cost function (44a) can be further decomposed into  $J = J_\Sigma(\Sigma_k, U_k) + J_\mu(v_k, \mu_k)$  where

$$J_\Sigma = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{trace} (Q_k \Sigma_k) + \text{trace} (R_k U_k \Sigma_k^{-1} U_k^\top)$$

$$J_\mu = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mu_k^\top Q_k \mu_k + v_k^\top R_k v_k$$

Given that there is no coupling through the constraints, the two optimization of  $J_\mu$  and  $J_\Sigma$  can be treated separately. The optimization of  $J_\mu$  subject to the constraint (44b) is trivial and can even be solved analytically. We therefore focus solely on the optimization of  $J_\Sigma$  subject to (44c). This problem is non-convex because of the non-linear term  $U_k \Sigma_k^{-1} U_k^\top$  appearing in both the cost function (44a) and the constraint (44c). To this end, we propose the following relaxation, which as proven in the the following section is lossless:

$$\min_{\Sigma_k, U_k, Y_k} J_\Sigma = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{trace} (Q_k \Sigma_k) + \text{trace} (R_k Y_k) \quad (45a)$$

such that for all  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$

$$C_k \triangleq U_k \Sigma_k^{-1} U_k^\top - Y_k \preceq 0 \quad (45b)$$

$$G_k \triangleq A_k \Sigma_k A_k^\top + B_k U_k A_k^\top + A_k U_k^\top B_k^\top + B_k Y_k B_k^\top + D_k D_k^\top - \Sigma_{k+1} = 0 \quad (45c)$$

Now the optimization problem (45) is convex, since constraint (45b) can be written using the Schur complement as an Linear Matrix Inequalities as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_k & U_k^\top \\ U_k & Y_k \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

while constraint (45c) is linear with respect to all decision variables. In the rest of this subsection, we show that this convex relaxation is lossless. To do so, we first present the following Lemma.

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{S}_n$  with  $A \succeq 0$ ,  $B \preceq 0$ , and  $\text{trace}(AB) = 0$ . If  $B$  has at least one nonzero eigenvalue, then,  $A$  has to be singular.*

*Proof of Lemma 12.* Since  $A \succeq 0$  and  $B \preceq 0$ , the product  $AB$  has only non-positive eigenvalues  $\lambda_i \leq 0$ , where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  [25]. It follows from  $\text{trace}(AB) = 0$  and

$$\text{trace}(AB) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i, \quad \lambda_i \in \text{spec}(AB),$$

that  $\text{spec}(AB) = \{0\}$ . Now we assume  $A \succ 0$ . As  $AB$  is similar to  $A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , we have

$$\text{spec}(AB) = \text{spec}(A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \{0\}.$$

Since  $B$  is congruent to  $A^{\frac{1}{2}}BA^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , they have the same number of zero and nonzero eigenvalues. It follows that all eigenvalues of  $B$  are zero, which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $A$  has to be singular. ■

**Theorem 4.** *The optimal solution to the relaxed problem (45) satisfies  $C_k = 0$  for all  $k$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Using the Lagrange multipliers  $M_k$  and  $\Lambda_k$  for the constraints in  $C_k$  and  $G_k$ , respectively, we define a Lagrangian function as

$$\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_k, U_k, Y_k) = J + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \text{trace}(M_k^\top C_k) + \text{trace}(\Lambda_k^\top G_k).$$

The first-order optimality conditions are

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \Sigma_k} = Q_k - \Sigma_k^{-1} U_k M_k U_k^\top \Sigma_k^{-1} + A_k^\top \Lambda_k A_k - \Lambda_{k-1} = 0, \quad (46a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial U_k} = 2M_k U_k \Sigma_k^{-1} + 2B_k^\top \Lambda_k A_k = 0, \quad (46b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial Y_k} = R_k - M_k + B_k^\top \Lambda_k B_k = 0, \quad (46c)$$

$$G_k = 0, \quad (46d)$$

$$M_k \succeq 0, \quad (46e)$$

$$\text{trace}(M_k C_k) = 0 \quad (46f)$$

Note that we can choose  $\Lambda_k$  to be symmetric because of the symmetric of the constraint (45b) while  $M_k$  is symmetric by definition. We would like to prove that the optimal solution to problem (45) satisfies  $C_k = 0$  for every time step  $k$ . To this end, assume that  $C_k$  has at least one nonzero eigenvalue for some  $k$ . In light of Lemma 12 and the complementary slackness condition (46f), we conclude that  $M_k$  has to be singular. Optimality condition (46b) can be rewritten as  $B_k^\top \Lambda_k = -M_k U_k \Sigma_k^{-1} A_k^{-1}$ . Substituting to (46c), it becomes

$$R_k = M_k (I_p + U_k \Sigma_k^{-1} A_k^{-1} B_k). \quad (47)$$

Calculating the determinants of both sides of (47), we obtain

$$\det(R_k) = \det(M_k) \det(I_p + U_k \Sigma_k^{-1} A_k^{-1} B_k) = 0.$$

This clearly contradicts the fact that  $R_k \succ 0$ . Therefore, in the optimal solution, the matrix  $C_k$  has all its eigenvalues equal to zero. This, along with the fact that  $C_k$  is symmetric, yields that  $C_k = 0$  for every time step  $k$ . The final step to conclude this proof is to show that the KKT conditions (46) for the relaxed problem (45) are sufficient for the optimal solution, or in other words, the duality gap for the relaxed problem is zero. In view of Slater's condition [31], it suffices to find some strictly feasible values of  $U_k$ ,  $\Sigma_k$ , and  $Y_k$ , such that  $C_k \prec 0$  and  $G_k = 0$  for all  $k$ . To this end, consider the following values of the optimization variables

$$\Sigma_{k+1} = A_k \Sigma_k A_k^\top + B_k B_k^\top + D_k D_k^\top,$$

$$U_k = 0,$$

$$Y_k = I_p, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1.$$

It is clear that the constraints in the relaxed problem (45) are strictly satisfied for these values. Thus, strong duality holds for the relaxed problem. This concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 3.** *The optimal solution to problem (45) is also the optimal solution to the covariance steering sub-problem of the non-convex problem (44).*

## V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

We will use the dynamics of a double integrator to illustrate our approaches. To this end consider a linear time-invariant system described by the coefficient matrices

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta T \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{(\Delta T)^2}{2} \\ \Delta T \end{bmatrix}, \quad D = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 & 0 \\ 0.4 & 0.6 \end{bmatrix},$$

for a time step size of  $\Delta T = 0.2$  and a horizon of  $N = 30$  steps. The boundary conditions and cost function parameters are

$$\bar{\Sigma}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{\Sigma}_N = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & -0.4 \\ -0.4 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{\mu}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{\mu}_N = \begin{bmatrix} 30 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_k \equiv 0.5I_2, \quad R_k \equiv 1.$$

Using the Newton's method described in Section IV-A, ten sample paths of the optimal process with their means and covariances are shown in Figure 1a, where the initial and target state means are marked with red dots, the initial and target three-standard-deviation tolerance regions are marked with red ellipses, the optimal state mean at each time step is marked with a black line, and the optimal three-standard-deviation tolerance region at each time step is marked with a blue ellipse. Using the SDP method described in Section IV-B, we solve the resulting optimization problem using YALMIP and MOSEK. The results are shown in Figure 1b, where ten sample paths of the system are plotted, along with the three-standard-deviation ellipses.




Fig. 1: Ten sample paths with the optimal mean and three-standard-deviation tolerance region.

## VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have established the existence and uniqueness of the optimal control for the covariance steering of a discrete-time linear stochastic system, and shown how the exact covariance steering problem can be reformulated as a convex optimization problem which can be solved efficiently for online path planning and control applications.

For future work, we will study the existence and uniqueness of the optimal control in the presence of multiplicative noise and investigate whether adding constraints to the optimization problem results in losses due to the proposed relaxation. The ultimate goal would be to incorporate coupled mean-covariance constraints such as the chance constraints into the optimal covariance steering problem.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. F. Hotz and R. E. Skelton, "A covariance control theory," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, Lauderdale, FL, 1985, pp. 552–557.
- [2] E. Collins and R. Skelton, "Covariance control of discrete systems," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, Lauderdale, FL, 1985, pp. 542–547.
- [3] E. Collins and R. Skelton, "A theory of state covariance assignment for discrete systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 35–41, 1987.
- [4] C. Hsieh and R. E. Skelton, "All covariance controllers for linear discrete-time systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 908–915, 1990.
- [5] J.-H. Xu and R. E. Skelton, "An improved covariance assignment theory for discrete systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 1588–1591, 1992.
- [6] K. M. Grigoriadis and R. E. Skelton, "Minimum-energy covariance controllers," *Automatica*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 569–578, 1997.
- [7] E. Bakolas, "Finite-horizon covariance control for discrete-time stochastic linear systems subject to input constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 91, pp. 61–68, 2018.
- [8] K. Okamoto and P. Tsiotras, "Input hard constrained optimal covariance steering," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, Nice, France, 2019, pp. 3497–3502.
- [9] G. Kotsalis, G. Lan, and A. S. Nemirovski, "Convex optimization for finite-horizon robust covariance control of linear stochastic systems," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 296–319, 2021.
- [10] J. Pilipovsky and P. Tsiotras, "Covariance steering with optimal risk allocation," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 57, no. 6, pp. 3719–3733, 2021.
- [11] I. M. Balci and E. Bakolas, "Covariance steering of discrete-time linear systems with mixed multiplicative and additive noise," *arXiv:2210.01743*, 2022.
- [12] I. M. Balci and E. Bakolas, "Exact SDP formulation for discrete-time covariance steering with Wasserstein terminal cost," *arXiv:2205.10740*, 2022.

- [13] K. Okamoto and P. Tsiotras, “Stochastic model predictive control for constrained linear systems using optimal covariance steering,” *arXiv:1905.13296*, 2019.
- [14] J. Yin, Z. Zhang, E. Theodorou, and P. Tsiotras, “Trajectory distribution control for model predictive path integral control using covariance steering,” *arXiv:2109.12147*, 2022.
- [15] V. Sivaramakrishnan, J. Pilipovsky, M. M. Oishi, and P. Tsiotras, “Distribution steering for discrete-time linear systems with general disturbances using characteristic functions,” in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, Atlanta, GA, 2022.
- [16] Y. Chen, T. T. Georgiou, and M. Pavon, “Optimal steering of a linear stochastic system to a final probability distribution, part I,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 1158–1169, 2016.
- [17] Y. Chen, T. T. Georgiou, and M. Pavon, “Optimal steering of a linear stochastic system to a final probability distribution, part II,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 1170–1180, 2016.
- [18] Y. Chen, T. T. Georgiou, and M. Pavon, “Optimal steering of a linear stochastic system to a final probability distribution, part III,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 3112–3118, 2018.
- [19] F. Liu and P. Tsiotras, “Optimal covariance steering for continuous-time linear stochastic systems with additive generic noise,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2022, submitted, arXiv:2206.11201.
- [20] F. Liu and P. Tsiotras, “Optimal covariance steering for continuous-time linear stochastic systems with multiplicative noise,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2022, submitted, arXiv:2206.11735.
- [21] J. Ridderhof and P. Tsiotras, “Uncertainty quantification and control during Mars powered descent and landing using covariance steering,” in *AIAA Guidance, Navigation, Control Conf.*, Kissimmee, FL, 2018.
- [22] J. Ridderhof, J. Pilipovsky, and P. Tsiotras, “Chance-constrained covariance control for low-thrust minimum-fuel trajectory optimization,” in *AAS/AIAA Astrodynamics Specialist Conf.*, South Lake Tahoe, CA, 2020.
- [23] K. Okamoto and P. Tsiotras, “Optimal stochastic vehicle path planning using covariance steering,” *IEEE Robot. Autom. Lett.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 2276–2281, 2019.
- [24] D. Zheng, J. Ridderhof, P. Tsiotras, and A.-a. Agha-mohammadi, “Belief space planning: a covariance steering approach,” *arXiv:2105.11092*, 2021.
- [25] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [26] K. Ito and K. Kashima, “Maximum entropy optimal density control of discrete-time linear systems and Schrödinger bridges,” *arXiv:2204.05263*, 2022.
- [27] G. Freiling, G. Jank, and H. Abou-Kandil, “Generalized Riccati difference and differential equations,” *Linear Algebra Its Appl.*, vol. 241, pp. 291–303, 1996.
- [28] H. V. Henderson and S. R. Searle, “On deriving the inverse of a sum of matrices,” *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 53–60, 1981.
- [29] S. G. Krantz and H. R. Parks, *The Implicit Function Theorem: History, Theory, and Applications*. Springer, 2002.
- [30] Y. Chen, T. T. Georgiou, and M. Pavon, “Steering state statistics with output feedback,” in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, Osaka, Japan, 2015, pp. 6502–6507.
- [31] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.