

Benign Nonconvex Landscapes in Optimal and Robust Control, Part II: Extended Convex Lifting ^{*}

Yang Zheng¹, Chih-Fan Pai¹, and Yujie Tang²

¹Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California San Diego

²Department of Industrial Engineering & Management, Peking University

7th June, 2024

Abstract

Many optimal and robust control problems are nonconvex and potentially nonsmooth in their policy optimization forms. In Part II of this paper, we introduce a new and unified Extended Convex Lifting (ECL) framework to reveal *hidden convexity* in classical optimal and robust control problems from a modern optimization perspective. Our ECL offers a bridge between nonconvex policy optimization and convex reformulations, enabling convex analysis for nonconvex problems. Despite non-convexity and non-smoothness, the existence of an ECL not only reveals that minimizing the original function is equivalent to a convex problem but also certifies a class of first-order *non-degenerate* stationary points to be globally optimal. Therefore, no spurious stationarity exists in the set of non-degenerate policies. This ECL framework can cover many benchmark control problems, including state feedback linear quadratic regulator (LQR), dynamic output feedback linear quadratic Gaussian (LQG) control, and \mathcal{H}_∞ robust control. ECL can also handle a class of distributed control problems when the notion of quadratic invariance (QI) holds. We further show that all static stabilizing policies are non-degenerate for state feedback LQR and \mathcal{H}_∞ control under standard assumptions. We believe that the new ECL framework may be of independent interest for analyzing nonconvex problems beyond control.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Non-convexity and Non-smoothness in Control	3
1.2	Our Techniques — Extended Convex Lifting (ECL)	4
1.3	Related Work	5
1.4	Paper Outline	6
2	Motivating Examples	7
2.1	Three Examples	7
2.2	A Simple Fact on Epigraphs	10
3	Extended Convex Lifting (ECL) for Benign Non-convexity	11
3.1	A Framework of Extended Convex Lifting (ECL)	11
3.2	Non-degenerate Stationarity Implies Global Optimality	13
3.3	Proof of Theorem 3.2	15
3.4	Conditions for the Non-strict Epigraph to be Closed	18

^{*}The work of Y. Zheng and C. Pai is supported by NSF ECCS-2154650, NSF CMMI-2320697, and NSF CAREER 2340713. The work of Y. Tang is supported by NSFC through grant 72301008.

4 Applications in Optimal and Robust Control	19
4.1 Linear Matrix Inequalities in Control	19
4.2 State Feedback Policy Optimization	20
4.3 Output Feedback Policy Optimization	26
4.4 Policy Optimization for Distributed Control with Quadratic Invariance	32
5 Conclusion	34
References	34
A Computational Details	38
A.1 Details of Figure 1	38
A.2 Details of Example 2.2	39
B Stationary Points in Optimal and Robust Control	40
B.1 State Feedback Policy Optimization	40
B.2 Output Feedback Policy Optimization	44
C Proofs for State Feedback Policy Optimization	45
C.1 Convexity of \mathcal{F}_{LQR}	45
C.2 Proofs for State Feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ Control	46
D Proofs for Output Feedback Policy Optimization	48
D.1 Auxiliary Notations and Results	48
D.2 A Critical Lemma for Establishing ECL	51
D.3 Proofs for LQG Control	52
D.4 Proofs for \mathcal{H}_∞ Output Feedback Control	57

1 Introduction

Many optimal and robust control problems, including linear quadratic regulator (LQR), linear quadratic Gaussian (LQG) control, and robust \mathcal{H}_∞ control, have been extensively studied in classical control since the 1960s [1–3]. It is well-known that almost all these control problems are naturally nonconvex in the space of controller (i.e., policy¹) parameters. Still, many fruitful results, such as optimal solution structures (static or dynamic), stability margin of LQR, the separation principle for LQG, and Riccati-based strategies for \mathcal{H}_∞ control, have been obtained. We refer the interested reader to classical textbooks [4–6] and excellent monographs [7, 8].

Most classical techniques either rely on proper controller re-parameterizations, leading to convex problems in terms of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) [6–8], or develop suitable Riccati-based strategies to characterize optimal or suboptimal controllers [4, 5]. All these methods do not optimize over the space of policy parameters directly, and they often require an explicit underlying system model for re-parameterizing the controller space or solving Riccati equations. On the other hand, the optimization landscapes of optimal and robust control problems can also offer fruitful results (see [9–11] for surveys), in which we consider the control costs as functions of the policy parameters and study their analytical and geometrical properties. Indeed, this optimization perspective is naturally amenable for data-driven design paradigms such as reinforcement learning [12], but it

¹We use the terminologies “controller” and “policy” interchangeably in this paper. Both of them are certain *functions* that map system outputs to system inputs.




Figure 1: Illustration of nonconvexity and non-smoothness in control: (a) a slice of the set of static feedback gains K such that the closed-loop system $A + BK$ is stable, where $A = 0, B = I_2$; (b) nonconvex and smooth LQR cost; (c) nonsmooth and nonconvex \mathcal{H}_∞ cost. Computational details are given in [Appendix A.1](#).

leads to nonconvex and potentially nonsmooth problems. Despite the lack of convexity (and possibly smoothness), in Part I [13], we have established that in a class of *non-degenerate* policies, all Clarke stationary points are globally optimal for both LQG and \mathcal{H}_∞ control with output measurements.

In Part II of this paper, we introduce a unified framework to reveal *hidden convexity* in classical optimal and robust control problems from a modern optimization perspective. This framework covers many iconic control problems, including state feedback LQR, dynamic output feedback LQG and \mathcal{H}_∞ control, and a class of distributed control problems with quadratic invariance [14]. The global optimality results for LQG and \mathcal{H}_∞ control in Part I [13, Theorems 4.2 & 5.2] will be direct corollaries.

1.1 Non-convexity and Non-smoothness in Control

For many iconic optimal control problems, nonconvexity naturally arises when we directly search over a suitably parameterized policy space to optimize their control objectives. For example, given a linear system $\dot{x} = Ax + Bu$, it is well-known that the set of static state feedback gains K that stabilize the system via $u = Kx$ is a nonconvex set [15], meaning that we need to search over a nonconvex policy space to find an optimal feedback gain; see [Figure 1\(a\)](#) for an illustration of the policy space and [Figure 1\(b\)](#) for a typical nonconvex LQR landscape. If we consider output feedback controller synthesis such as linear quadratic Gaussian (LQG) control, then the parameterized set of dynamic policies can even be disconnected [16]. Furthermore, the LQG objective function may have spurious stationary points [17], and there can be uncountably infinitely many globally optimal policies that reside on a nonconvex manifold due to the symmetry induced by *similarity transformations* [16–18]. In fact, one fundamental problem in output feedback controller synthesis is to re-parameterize the set of stabilizing dynamic controllers in a convex way, and a classical solution is the celebrated Youla parameterization [19] and two recent ones are the system-level parameterization [20] and input-output parameterization [21–23].

In addition to non-convexity, non-smoothness may also arise when we consider robust control problems that address the worst-case performance against uncertainties or adversarial noises. In this case, a typical performance measure is the \mathcal{H}_∞ norm of a certain closed-loop transfer function [4], which is known to be both *nonconvex* and *nonsmooth* in the policy space [9, 24]. In fact, robust control problems were one of the early motivations and applications for nonsmooth optimization [9]. [Figure 1\(c\)](#) illustrates the nonconvex and nonsmooth landscape in an \mathcal{H}_∞ control instance.

For nonconvex and nonsmooth optimization problems, it is generally very hard to derive theoretical guarantees or certificates for local policy search algorithms. Intuitively, the local geometry of nonconvex problems does not give a global performance guarantee, and there may be spurious local




Figure 2: Local geometry of a smooth function $\phi(x)$: (a) a non-stationary point with non-zero gradient $\nabla\phi(x) \neq 0$; (b) (strict) saddle; (c) local maximizer; (d) local minimizer. A general nonconvex function $\phi(x)$ may have all these stationary points. If $\phi(x)$ has *hidden convexity* and is equipped with an ECL, all non-degenerate stationary points are global minimizers (see [Theorem 3.2](#)); no saddle and local maximizers exist.

minimizers (including saddles). [Figure 2](#) illustrates possible local geometry of a smooth function. As summarized in Part I [[13](#)], a series of recent findings have revealed *favorable benign nonconvex landscape properties* in many benchmark control problems, including LQR [[15](#), [25](#), [26](#)], risk-sensitive control [[27](#)], LQG control [[16](#), [17](#), [28](#)], dynamic filtering [[29](#), [30](#)], and \mathcal{H}_∞ control [[31–33](#)], etc. One goal of our work is to provide a unified framework that can explain the benign nonconvex landscape properties for all these iconic control problems.

1.2 Our Techniques — Extended Convex Lifting (ECL)

In this paper, we aim to develop a new and unified framework, called **Extended Convex Lifting** (ECL) (see [Figure 3](#) for an illustration), which reconciles the gap between nonconvex policy optimization and convex reformulations. The remarkable (now classical) results in control theory reveal that many optimal and robust control problems admit “convex reformulations”² in terms of LMIs, via a suitable change of variables [[6–8](#)]. These changes of variables enable us to analyze the nonconvex policy optimization problems through their convex reformulations.

Here we provide a simple example to demonstrate some intuition. Suppose $f(x)$ is a potentially nonconvex function, and there exists a smooth bijection $y = \Phi(x)$ such that $g(y) = f(\Phi^{-1}(y))$ is convex. Then, it is clear that minimizing $f(x)$ is equivalent to minimizing $g(y)$, which is a convex problem. Furthermore, all stationary points of $f(x)$ are globally optimal, and there exist no local maximizers or saddle points. Interestingly, this simple process is almost sufficient to guarantee that any stationary point is globally optimal for a large class of LQR policy optimization problems (see [Example 2.2](#) and [Remark 4.1](#)).

For many other control problems, however, such a simple process is insufficient and the bijection Φ does not exist due to the natural appearance of Lyapunov variables. Instead, we develop a generic template for *extended* convex reparameterization of epigraphs of nonconvex functions $f(x)$, which significantly generalizes the simple setup above. We call this generic template **Extended Convex Lifting** (ECL). As illustrated in [Figure 3](#), we first *lift* the (non-)strict epigraph to a higher dimensional set by appending auxiliary variables (which often corresponds to Lyapunov variables) and then assume a smooth bijection Φ that maps this lifted nonconvex set to a “partially” convex set $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$; see [Definition 3.1](#) for a precise procedure. In many control problems, \mathcal{F}_{cvx} is a convex set represented by an LMI, while \mathcal{G}_{aux} can be nonconvex and can be used to account for similarity transformations of dynamic output feedback policies.

Despite non-convexity and non-smoothness, the existence of an ECL not only reveals that minimizing the original function is equivalent to a convex problem ([Theorem 3.1](#)) but also identifies

²For state feedback LQR and \mathcal{H}_∞ control, convex reformulations are relatively straightforward; see [[8](#)]. However, convex reformulations for output feedback control are non-trivial and subtle; see [Remarks 3.3](#) and [3.4](#).




Figure 3: A schematic illustration of ECL. Left figure: We begin with the epigraph $\text{epi}_{\ge}(J)$ of a potentially *nonconvex* and *nonsmooth* function $J(\mathbf{K})$; Middle figure: We lift the epigraph $\text{epi}_{\ge}(J)$ to a set \mathcal{L}_{ft} of a higher dimension; Right figure: We identify a smooth and invertible mapping Φ that maps \mathcal{L}_{ft} to a “partially” convex set $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$. In many control problems, \mathcal{F}_{cvx} is a convex set represented by LMIs, while \mathcal{G}_{aux} can be nonconvex and provides the flexibility of capturing similarity transformations (cf. Section 4). The schematic here serves an illustrative role, and the full ECL details are elaborated in Section 3.

a class of first-order (*non-degenerate*) stationary points to be globally optimal (Theorem 3.2). While our ECL constructions and the corresponding guarantees in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 have a strong geometrical intuition, the details in the construction as well as in the proofs require resolving some subtleties. We thus believe our ECL framework is of independent interest.

Our ECL framework presents a unified template for convex re-parameterizations of many iconic control problems [6–8]. Many recent results on global optimality of (non-degenerate) stationary points, such as LQR in [15, 25], LQG in [16], state feedback \mathcal{H}_{∞} control in [32], Kalman filter in [29], some distributed control problem [14], are special cases once the corresponding ECL is constructed. We note that the exact ECL constructions, especially those for output feedback control problems, require special treatments that have not been discussed in existing literature, which will be presented in detail in Section 4. From our perspective of ECL, standard state feedback and output feedback control problems are *almost convex problems* in disguise; all the non-convexity and non-smoothness in Section 1.1 are benign in this sense.

We finally highlight that almost all existing convex reformulations [6–8] for control problems rely on strict LMIs. They are sufficient for deriving suboptimal policies in control, but typically fail to characterize globally optimal policies. To characterize global optimality, our use of non-strict LMIs in the ECL framework requires resolving non-trivial technical details, especially in the LQG and output feedback \mathcal{H}_{∞} cases (see Proposition 4.4 and 4.5).

1.3 Related Work

We here summarize some closely related work in two directions: 1) solutions to optimal and robust control, and 2) lifting strategies in analyzing nonconvex problems.³

Solutions of optimal LQG control and \mathcal{H}_{∞} robust control. The LQG (or \mathcal{H}_2) optimal control theory was heavily studied in the 1960s [1]. Many structural properties are now well-understood, such as the existence of the optimal LQG controller and the separation principle of the controller structure. It is known that the globally optimal LQG controller is unique in the frequency domain, and can be found by solving two Riccati equations [4, Chap. 14]. It is also well-known that the LQG optimal controller has no guaranteed stability margin [3], and thus robustness does not come

³For other related work on policy optimization in control, please refer to Part I [13] and the references therein

free from linear quadratic optimization in the output feedback case. This fact partially motivated the development of \mathcal{H}_∞ robust control, which was heavily studied in the 1980s [34–36]. One key milestone was reached in the seminal paper [37], where state-space solutions via solving two Riccati equations were derived to get all suboptimal \mathcal{H}_∞ controllers. The suboptimal \mathcal{H}_∞ controller in [37] also has a separation structure reminiscent of classical LQG theory. However, unlike the LQG theory, the optimal \mathcal{H}_∞ controllers are not only generally non-unique in the frequency domain [4, Page 406], [38, Section 3.2] (also see [13, Example 5.4]), but also quite subtle to characterize [36, Section 5.1]. Besides Riccati-based solutions, LMI-based approaches for both LQG and \mathcal{H}_∞ control were developed in 1990s [39, 40].

Lifting strategies in analyzing nonconvex problems Recent years have witnessed a surge of interest in analyzing nonconvex problems using convex analysis; see e.g., [16, 25, 29, 32, 33, 41, 42]. Most of these results rely on a suitable change of variables that makes the original problem simpler to deal with. For example, a recent study in [41] examines landscapes in nonconvex optimization by smoothly parameterizing its domain. The work [43] discusses concise descriptions of convex sets by exploiting the concept of lifting as simplified higher-dimensional representations that project onto the original sets. As for nonconvex control problems, many of them admit suitable convex reformulations using LMIs, which leads to the desired landscape properties for policy optimization. For instance, the authors of [25] leveraged such a technique to study global convergence properties of policy optimization for continuous-time LQR. The analysis via convex parameterizations was also studied in [42] for state feedback problems with smooth objectives. More recently, it has been shown that for nonsmooth discrete-time static state feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ control, all Clarke stationary points are global minima [32], in which the key proof idea is also based on convex reformulations. All these results focused on static state feedback policies. A differentiable convex lifting strategy was proposed in [29], applicable to dynamic output feedback estimation problems (e.g., Kalman filter). Our previous work [16] also utilized a classical change of variables to reveal some nice geometry of stabilizing dynamic feedback policies, which is shown to have at most two path-connected components.

Inspired by these recent advances, our ECL framework offers a unified way to bridge the gap between nonconvex policy optimization and classical convex reformulations in control. This ECL framework is more general than [16, 25, 29, 32, 42], in the sense that it can directly handle static state feedback and dynamic output feedback policies, as well as smooth and nonsmooth cost functions. More importantly, our ECL framework naturally classifies degenerate and non-degenerate policies, which reflects the subtleties between strict and non-strict LMIs in control.

1.4 Paper Outline

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. [Section 2](#) presents three motivating examples to illustrate hidden convexity via a diffeomorphism. We present the full technical details of ECL in [Section 3](#), including its construction and theoretical guarantees. In [Section 4](#), we construct appropriate ECLs for nonconvex (and potentially nonsmooth) policy optimization problems in benchmark control problems. We finally conclude the paper in [Section 5](#). Some auxiliary results, additional discussions, and technical proofs are provided in [Appendices A to D](#).

Notations. The set of $k \times k$ real symmetric matrices is denoted by \mathbb{S}^k , and \mathbb{S}_+^k (resp. \mathbb{S}_{++}^k) denotes the set of $k \times k$ positive semidefinite (resp. positive definite) matrices. We denote the set of $k \times k$ real invertible matrices by $\text{GL}_k = \{T \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k} \mid \det T \neq 0\}$. Given a matrix M , M^\top denotes its transpose, and M^H denotes its conjugate transpose. For any $M_1, M_2 \in \mathbb{S}^k$, we use $M_1 \prec (\preceq) M_2$ and $M_2 \succ (\succeq) M_1$ to mean that $M_2 - M_1$ is positive (semi)definite. We use I_n (resp. $0_{m \times n}$) to denote




Figure 4: Illustration of nonconvex functions and their transformation in [Example 2.1](#).

the $n \times n$ identity matrix (resp. $m \times n$ zero matrix), and sometimes omit their subscripts when the dimensions can be inferred from the context. For a subset S of a topological space, we let $\text{int } S$ denote its interior and $\text{cl } S$ denote its closure.

2 Motivating Examples

To motivate our discussion, we consider three simple examples in [Section 2.1](#): one academic example, and two state feedback control instances. All of them are essentially (or equivalent to) convex problems. In [Section 2.2](#), we summarize a useful fact on hidden convexity via a diffeomorphism over epigraphs. This section serves as a better motivation and can be skipped if the reader wishes to see the full mathematical theory behind ECL, which is summarized in [Section 3](#).

2.1 Three Examples

Our first example highlights that a suitable change of variables (i.e., nonlinear coordinate transformation) can render a nonconvex function convex. This type of invertible, nonlinear, and smooth coordinate transformation will be a key component in our ECL framework.

Example 2.1. Consider a bivariate function

$$f_1(x_1, x_2) = \left(\frac{x_2}{x_1} - 2 \right)^2 + (x_2 - 1)^2, \quad \text{dom}(f_1) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0\}. \quad (1a)$$

It is not difficult to see that this function f_1 is smooth but nonconvex (see [Figure 4a](#)). It is also clear that its global minimizer is $x^* = (0.5, 1)$ by inspection. In fact, we can define a diffeomorphism

$$g(x_1, x_2) := (x_2/x_1, x_2), \quad \forall x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0, \quad (1b)$$

which leads to

$$h_1(y_1, y_2) := f_1(g^{-1}(y_1, y_2)) = (y_1 - 2)^2 + (y_2 - 1)^2, \quad \forall y_1 > 0, y_2 > 0. \quad (1c)$$

It is obvious that h_1 is strongly convex with the global minimizer as $y^* = (2, 1)$, confirming the global minimizer $x^* = (1/2, 1)$ for f_1 in [\(1a\)](#). We illustrate the shape of h_1 in [Figure 4b](#).

Consider another nonsmooth and nonconvex bivariate function (see [Figure 4c](#))

$$f_2(x_1, x_2) = \left| \frac{x_2}{x_1} - 2 \right| + |x_2 - 1|, \quad \text{dom}(f_2) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0\}. \quad (2a)$$

By the same diffeomorphism (1b), we have

$$h_2(y_1, y_2) := f_2(g^{-1}(y_2, y_2)) = |y_1 - 2| + |y_2 - 1|, \quad \forall y_1 > 0, y_2 > 0, \quad (2b)$$

which becomes convex (but remains nonsmooth); see Figure 4d. Despite being nonconvex, both f_1 and f_2 enjoy hidden convexity properties, revealed by the diffeomorphism (1b). \square

While Example 2.1 serves an academic purpose and is purely illustrative, it is important to highlight that invertible and smooth coordinate transformations, similar to (1b), indeed appear very often in feedback controller synthesis. We will detail several benchmark applications in Section 4.

Before presenting those formally, consider a linear time-invariant (LTI) dynamical system

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t), \quad (3)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n, u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m, w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are system state, control input, and disturbance, respectively. A central control task is to design a suitable $u(t)$ to regulate the behavior of $x(t)$ in the presence of $w(t)$. For illustration, we next consider two simple benchmark control cases: 1) linear quadratic regulator (LQR) with stochastic noises, and 2) \mathcal{H}_∞ robust control with adversarial noises.

Example 2.2 (A simple LQR instance). We here consider an LTI system (3) with problem data

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $w(t)$ is a white Gaussian noise with an intensity matrix $\mathbb{E}[w(t)w(\tau)] = 4I_2\delta(t - \tau)$. We aim to design a stabilizing state feedback policy $u(t) = kx(t)$ where $k = [k_1 \quad k_2] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2}$ to minimize an average mean performance $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (x_1(t)^2 + x_2(t)^2 + u(t)^2) dt \right]$.

After simple algebra, we derive the LQR cost function in terms of (k_1, k_2) as

$$J(k_1, k_2) = \frac{1 - 2k_2 + 3k_2^2 - 2k_2^3 - 2k_1^2k_2}{k_2^2 - 1}, \quad \forall k_1 \in \mathbb{R}, k_2 < -1. \quad (4a)$$

It is not obvious from (4a) to see whether it is convex or admits a convex parameterization⁴. However, following a classical change of variables (see Appendix A.2 for more computational details), we define a nonlinear mapping as

$$y = (y_1, y_2) = g(k_1, k_2) := \left(\frac{k_1}{1 - k_2}, \frac{2k_2 - k_1^2 - 2k_2^2}{k_2^2 - 1} \right) \quad \forall k_1 \in \mathbb{R}, k_2 < -1. \quad (4b)$$

This mapping turns out to be invertible, and it can be further verified that

$$h(y_1, y_2) := J(g^{-1}(y_1, y_2)) = -y_2 - 1 + y^\top \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_1 \\ y_1 & -y_2 - 2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} y, \quad \forall \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_1 \\ y_1 & -y_2 - 2 \end{bmatrix} \succ 0. \quad (4c)$$

It is now clear that h is convex since its epigraph is convex, as shown below:

$$\{(y, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid h(y) \leq \gamma\} = \left\{ (y, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \begin{bmatrix} \gamma + y_2 + 1 & y^\top \\ y^\top & \text{aff}(y) \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \text{aff}(y) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_1 \\ y_1 & -y_2 - 2 \end{bmatrix} \succ 0 \right\}, \quad (4d)$$

where we have applied the Schur complement. Thanks to the smooth and invertible mapping (4b), we see that minimizing (4a) is equivalent to a convex problem of minimizing (4c). Consequently, any stationary point of (4a) is globally optimal (in fact, the stationary point of (4a) is unique). Figure 5 illustrates these two functions (4a) and (4c), both of which are indeed convex. \square




Figure 5: Optimization landscape of the LQR instance in [Example 2.2](#): (a) the original LQR cost [\(4a\)](#); (b) the cost function after convexification [\(4c\)](#).

Example 2.3 (A simple \mathcal{H}_∞ instance). We consider another LTI system [\(3\)](#) with problem data

$$A = -1, B = 1.$$

Unlike the stochastic noise in [Example 2.2](#), we here consider an adversarial disturbance w with bounded energy $\|w\|_{\ell_2}^2 := \int_0^\infty \|w(t)\|_2^2 dt \leq 1$. We aim to design a stabilizing state feedback policy $u(t) = kx(t)$ where $k \in \mathbb{R}$ to minimize the worst-case performance, given by the square root of $\max_{\|w\|_{\ell_2} \leq 1} \int_0^\infty (0.1x(t)^2 + u(t)^2) dt$. From classical control theory, this cost function is the same as the \mathcal{H}_∞ norm of the transfer function from w to $z := [\sqrt{0.1}x \quad kx]^\top$. Some simple calculations lead to an analytical expression of the cost function

$$J_\infty(k) = \|\mathbf{T}_{zw}(k)\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = \frac{\sqrt{0.1 + k^2}}{1 - k}, \quad \forall k < 1. \quad (5)$$

In this case, the non-convexity of J_∞ can be seen from the fact that the second derivative $J_\infty''(k) < 0$ for some $k < 1$. Indeed, we can observe from [Figure 6a](#) that J_∞ is nonconvex. Note that this \mathcal{H}_∞ cost function J_∞ is also not coercive since $\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} J_\infty(k) = 1$.

Still, classical control theory [\[44\]](#) has revealed the hidden convex structure in J_∞ , i.e., we have

$$\min_{k < 1} J_\infty(k) = \min_{(\gamma, y, x) \in \mathcal{F}_\infty} \gamma,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \{(\gamma, y, x) : x > 0, 2\gamma(x - y) - (0.1x^2 + y^2 + 1) \geq 0\}$ is a convex set. The convexity can be seen from the equivalence between the second inequality in \mathcal{F}_∞ and the LMI

$$\begin{bmatrix} -2x + 2y & 1 & \sqrt{0.1}x & y \\ 1 & -\gamma & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{0.1}x & 0 & -\gamma & 0 \\ y & 0 & 0 & -\gamma \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0.$$

In fact, the convex set \mathcal{F}_∞ is derived from a classical change of variables $(p, k) \rightarrow (y, x)$:

$$y = kp^{-1}, \quad x = p^{-1}, \quad \forall p > 0, \quad (6)$$

where p is an extra Lyapunov variable from the bounded real lemma (more details will be provided in [Section 4.2.2](#)). Thus, we can solve the nonconvex \mathcal{H}_∞ control with [\(5\)](#) via convex optimization.

⁴With some efforts, one can show that [\(4a\)](#) is actually convex.




Figure 6: Optimization landscape of the \mathcal{H}_∞ instance in [Example 2.3](#): (a) the \mathcal{H}_∞ cost (5), where the red dot denotes the stationary point $k^* = -0.1$; (b) the convex set \mathcal{F}_∞ after the lifting procedure, where the red dot denotes the optimal solution (γ^*, y^*, x^*) of the convex problem $\min_{(\gamma, y, x) \in \mathcal{F}_\infty} \gamma$.

The convex set \mathcal{F}_∞ is illustrated in [Figure 6b](#), where the red dot denotes the optimal solution $(\gamma^*, y^*, x^*) \approx (0.3015, -0.3015, 3.015)$ to the convex problem $\min_{(\gamma, y, x) \in \mathcal{F}_\infty} \gamma$ and $\gamma^* \approx 0.3015$ corresponds to the optimal value of the original nonconvex problem $\min_{k < 1} J_\infty(k)$. Furthermore, since the change of variables in (6) is invertible, one can recover the stationary point $k^* = -0.1$ of J_∞ from (y^*, x^*) by $k^* = y^*/x^*$. \square

Unlike the LQR case in [Example 2.2](#), a direct convex parameterization for \mathcal{H}_∞ cost function (5) in [Example 2.3](#) is not straightforward, and instead, we have introduced two extra variables $p > 0$ and γ to derive a convex representation for the nonconvex epigraph of (5). Similar to [Examples 2.1](#) and [2.2](#), the existence of such a lifted convex representation can further imply the global optimality of certain stationary points. More details will be provided in [Section 3](#).

2.2 A Simple Fact on Epigraphs

All instances in [Examples 2.1](#) to [2.3](#) involve a diffeomorphism, which allows for an explicit and equivalent convex representation in a new set of coordinates. We here present a simple fact summarizing the key features in the previous examples from an epigraph perspective.

The fact below guarantees any stationary points are globally optimal for a class of continuous functions when their non-strict epigraphs admit *direct convex reparameterization*.

Fact 2.1. *Let $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Denote its non-strict epigraph by $\text{epi}_\geq(f) := \{(x, \gamma) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{R} \mid \gamma \geq f(x)\}$. Suppose that*

- *there exists a convex set $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ and a diffeomorphism Φ between $\text{epi}_\geq(f)$ and \mathcal{F}_{cvx} ;*
- *Φ further satisfies $(y, \gamma) = \Phi(x, \gamma), \forall (x, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_\geq(f)$ (i.e., the mapping Φ directly outputs γ).*

Then the following statements hold.

- 1) *The minimization of $f(x)$ over $x \in \mathcal{D}$ is equivalent to a convex problem in the sense that*

$$\inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x) = \inf_{(y, \gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}} \gamma.$$

- 2) *Let \mathcal{D} be an open domain and $f(x)$ be subdifferentially regular.⁵ If x^* is a Clarke stationary point (i.e., $0 \in \partial f(x^*)$), then x^* is globally optimal to $f(x)$ over $x \in \mathcal{D}$.*

⁵This is a very large class of continuous functions, covering all optimal and robust control problems in [Section 4](#). Also, see Part I of this paper [[13](#), [Appendix B](#)] for the background of subdifferential regularity and Clarke stationarity.

The first statement in [Fact 2.1](#) is easy to see from the following facts

$$\inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x) = \inf_{(x, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_{\geq}(f)} \gamma = \inf_{(y, \gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}} \gamma,$$

where the first equality is due to the definition of epigraphs and the second equality is directly from the diffeomorphism Φ . The second statement in [Fact 2.1](#) is closely related to the fact that a locally optimal point of a convex optimization problem is also globally optimal. We postpone the rigorous proof of [Fact 2.1](#) to [Section 3](#), as a special case of our general ECL framework.

Note that the epigraph form in [Fact 2.1](#) is a standard trick and has been widely used in convex optimization [45]. Also, [Fact 2.1](#) works for nonsmooth and nonconvex functions. It is clear that both [Examples 2.1](#) and [2.2](#) are special cases of [Fact 2.1](#). For illustration, in [Example 2.1](#), we have

$$\Phi(x, \gamma) = (x_2/x_1, x_2, \gamma), \quad \forall (x, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_{\geq}(f),$$

while in [Example 2.2](#), we have (recall $g(k)$ in (4b))

$$\Phi(k, \gamma) = (g(k), \gamma), \quad \forall (k, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_{\geq}(J).$$

As for [Example 2.3](#), the change of variables $y = kp^{-1}$ is also related to a diffeomorphism. However, this case is not covered by [Fact 2.1](#) due to the lifting variable p in [Example 2.3](#). Inspired by [Example 2.3](#), we will introduce a much more generalized version of [Fact 2.1](#) in [Section 3](#).

Remark 2.1 (LMI/semidefinite representable sets). In [Example 2.2](#), the set \mathcal{F}_{cvx} shown in (4d) is not only convex but also represented by an LMI. This class of convex sets is called LMI representable or semidefinite representable sets [46]. Thus, the minimization of γ over $(y, \gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}$ is an LMI (or semidefinite programs), which is ready to be solved using many existing conic solvers (even in a large scale when special structures appear [47]). \square

3 Extended Convex Lifting (ECL) for Benign Non-convexity

In this section, we present a generic template for extended convex reparameterization of epigraphs of nonconvex functions, which significantly generalizes the setup in [Fact 2.1](#). We call this generic template **Extended Convex Lifting (ECL)**: We first lift its (non)-strict epigraph to a higher dimensional set by appending auxiliary variables, and then assume a diffeomorphism Φ that maps this lifted nonconvex set to a “partially” convex set (see [Figure 3](#) for illustration).

Despite non-convexity and non-smoothness, the existence of an ECL not only reveals that minimizing the original function is equivalent to a convex problem ([Theorem 3.1](#)) but also identifies a class of first-order stationary points to be globally optimal ([Theorem 3.2](#)).

3.1 A Framework of Extended Convex Lifting (ECL)

For a real-valued function f with domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we define its strict and non-strict epigraphs by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{epi}_{>}(f) &:= \{(x, \gamma) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{R} \mid \gamma > f(x)\}, \\ \text{epi}_{\geq}(f) &:= \{(x, \gamma) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{R} \mid \gamma \geq f(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.1 (Extended Convex Lifting). Let $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function, where $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. We say that the tuple $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$ is an ECL of f , if the following conditions hold:

- 1) $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\xi}$ is a lifted set with an extra variable $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\xi}$, such that the canonical projection of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}$ onto the first $d+1$ coordinates, given by $\pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}) = \{(x, \gamma) : \exists \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\xi} \text{ s.t. } (x, \gamma, \xi) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}\}$, satisfies

$$\text{epi}_>(f) \subseteq \pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}) \subseteq \text{cl epi}_\geq(f). \quad (7a)$$

- 2) $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ is a convex set, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ is an auxiliary set, and Φ is a C^2 diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$.⁶
- 3) For any $(x, \gamma, \xi) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}$, we have

$$\Phi(x, \gamma, \xi) = (\gamma, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \quad \text{and} \quad (\gamma, \zeta_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \quad (7b)$$

for some $\zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $\zeta_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$ (i.e., the mapping Φ directly outputs γ in the first component).

Compared to the basic [Fact 2.1](#), the notion of ECL gives more flexibility by 1) introducing an extra variable to *lift* the epigraph to a higher dimension, 2) relaxing the projection of the lifted set to sit between the strict epigraph and the closure of the non-strict epigraph (*chain of inclusion*), and 3) adding an auxiliary set \mathcal{G}_{aux} to extend the convex image under a diffeomorphism (*extended convex parameterization*). The setup in [Fact 2.1](#) is a special case of ECL by letting $d_\xi = 0$ (no lifting), requiring $\pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}) = \text{epi}_\geq(f)$ (transforming exactly the non-strict epigraph), and letting $\mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}} = \{0\}$ (no auxiliary set).

The interested reader may wonder why we need such a peculiar chain of inclusion in [\(7a\)](#). A simpler and more straightforward requirement for the lifting process might be

$$\pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}) = \text{epi}_\geq(f). \quad (8)$$

Evidently, [\(7a\)](#) includes [\(8\)](#) as a special case. Note that [\(7a\)](#) further allows for the case $\text{epi}_\geq(f) \subseteq \pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}) \subseteq \text{cl epi}_\geq(f)$ when the non-strict epigraph $\text{epi}_\geq(f)$ is not closed; see [Section 3.4](#) for conditions when $\text{epi}_\geq(f)$ is closed. We will see in [Section 4](#) that one indeed needs to employ the more general condition [\(7a\)](#) for many policy optimization problems in control (e.g., LQG and \mathcal{H}_∞ output-feedback control [[13](#), [Facts 4.1 & 5.2](#)]). In fact, one technical difficulty of establishing the main results in Part I of this paper [[13](#), [Theorems 4.2 & 5.2](#)] lies in the proof of [\(7a\)](#) for a diffeomorphism arising in the classical change of variables (cf. [Proposition 4.4](#) and [4.5](#)).

An almost immediate benefit from the ECL $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$ is that we can reformulate the minimization of $f(x)$ over $x \in \mathcal{D}$ as a convex optimization problem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function equipped with an ECL $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$. Then, we have*

$$\inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x) = \inf_{(\gamma, \zeta_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}} \gamma.$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. We have $(x, f(x) + \epsilon) \in \text{epi}_>(f)$ by definition. By [\(7a\)](#), there exists $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\xi}$ such that $(x, f(x) + \epsilon, \xi) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}$. Then by [\(7b\)](#), we can find $\zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ such that $(f(x) + \epsilon, \zeta_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}$, which implies $f(x) + \epsilon \geq \inf_{(\gamma, \zeta_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}} \gamma$. By the arbitrariness of $x \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we get

$$\inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x) \geq \inf_{(\gamma, \zeta_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}} \gamma.$$

⁶Precisely, this means that Φ can be extended to a C^2 function $\tilde{\Phi}$ defined on some open subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\xi}$ with $U \supseteq \mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}$, such that $\tilde{\Phi}$ is a bijection from U to $\tilde{\Phi}(U)$ and its inverse $\tilde{\Phi}^{-1}$ is C^2 .

The auxiliary set \mathcal{G}_{aux} can be nonconvex or even disconnected. We also allow $d_2 = 0$, in which case we adopt the convention that $\mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}} = \mathbb{R}^0 = \{0\}$, and identify the set $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \{0\}$ with \mathcal{F}_{cvx} .

To show the other direction, let $(\gamma, \zeta_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}$ be arbitrary, and pick any $\zeta_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$. Noting that Φ is a diffeomorphism from \mathcal{L}_{ift} to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$. Using (7b), we can get

$$\Phi^{-1}(\gamma, \zeta_1, \zeta_2) = (x, \gamma, \xi) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}$$

for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\xi}$. Then (7a) implies $(x, \gamma) \in \text{cl epi}_{\geq}(f)$, which means that for any $\epsilon > 0$ we can find $x_\epsilon \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\gamma_\epsilon \geq f(x_\epsilon)$ such that $\|x_\epsilon - x\| < \epsilon$ and $|\gamma_\epsilon - \gamma| < \epsilon$. Consequently,

$$f(x_\epsilon) \leq \gamma_\epsilon \leq |\gamma_\epsilon - \gamma| + \gamma < \gamma + \epsilon,$$

which further implies $\gamma + \epsilon \geq \inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x)$. By the arbitrariness of $\epsilon > 0$ and $(\gamma, \zeta_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}$, we see that

$$\inf_{(\gamma, \zeta_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}} \gamma \geq \inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x),$$

and the proof is complete. \square

In [Theorem 3.1](#), the function f can be nonsmooth and nonconvex (see [Examples 2.1 to 2.3](#)), but the existence of an ECL reveals its hidden convexity, and consequently, optimizing $f(x)$ over $x \in \mathcal{D}$ is equivalent to a convex problem. In many control applications, the convex set \mathcal{F}_{cvx} is represented by certain LMIs, and [Theorem 3.1](#) can indeed be considered as the rationale behind many LMI formulations in control [\[7, 8\]](#). In [Section 4](#), we will provide specific examples of the ECLs corresponding to various control problems.

Remark 3.1 (Lifting and auxiliary set in ECL). We shall see in [Section 4](#) that the flexibility of ECL is crucial for the existence of such a C^2 -diffeomorphism in many control problems, especially dynamic output control such as LQG and \mathcal{H}_∞ control. Indeed, we need to use the closure of non-strict epigraphs to account for non-strict LMIs for \mathcal{H}_2 and \mathcal{H}_∞ norms. The additional lifting variable ξ often corresponds to Lyapunov variables, and the auxiliary set \mathcal{G}_{aux} will represent the set of similarity transformations in dynamic policies. For policy optimization with static state feedback, no auxiliary set is needed (since there exist no similarity transformations in static feedback policies), and in this case, \mathcal{G}_{aux} will be $\{0\}$. Still, the lifting variable ξ is useful for static policy optimization since Lyapunov variables are naturally involved, as already previewed in [Example 2.3](#). \square

Remark 3.2 (When the infimum is achieved). Note that in an ECL, the sets \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{F}_{cvx} are not necessarily closed or bounded. No guarantees are provided in [Theorem 3.1](#) when their infimums are achieved. In fact, almost all existing LMI formulations in controller synthesis from [\[7\]](#) rely on strict LMIs where the corresponding \mathcal{F}_{cvx} is not closed and the infimum $\inf_{(\gamma, \zeta_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}} \gamma$ typically cannot be achieved. Our control applications in [Section 4](#) will focus on non-strict LMIs, as advocated in Part I of this paper [\[13\]](#). Even in the case of non-strict LMIs, the infimum may not be attained and can only be approached as the variable tends to infinity; we will provide an \mathcal{H}_∞ control instance in [Appendix C.2.1](#) as one such example. \square

3.2 Non-degenerate Stationarity Implies Global Optimality

In addition to convex re-parameterization in terms of \mathcal{F}_{cvx} as shown in [Theorem 3.1](#), the existence of an ECL can further reveal *global optimality of certain first-order stationary points* for the original function f that can potentially be nonconvex or nonsmooth. This allows us to optimize $f(x)$ over $x \in \mathcal{D}$ by direct local search without relying on the ECL, since we may only know its existence but not its particular form. This feature is particularly important for learning-based model-free control applications [\[10, 11\]](#).

Before proceeding, we here re-emphasize that the chain of inclusion (7a) is critical to the existence of the diffeomorphism Φ in many control problems. This might be considered reminiscent of the subtleties between strict and non-strict LMIs (see Lemma 4.1 and 4.2 in Section 4). Particularly, this definition allows existence of points $(x, f(x))$ that are not covered by $\pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}})$, as well as members of $\pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}})$ that are only accumulation points of $\text{epi}_{\geq}(f)$. We introduce the notion of (*non-*)*degeneracy* to characterize the former type of points.

Definition 3.2 (Non-degenerate points). Let $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function equipped with an ECL $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$. A point $x \in \mathcal{D}$ is called *non-degenerate* if $(x, f(x)) \in \pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}})$, otherwise *degenerate*. The set of non-degenerate points in \mathcal{D} will be denoted by \mathcal{D}_{nd} .

The notion of non-degenerate points depends on a particular choice of ECL $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$. From Definition 3.2, we have a quick fact below.

Fact 3.1. *If (8) holds for the ECL $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$, then all points $x \in \mathcal{D}$ are non-degenerate.*

Thus, it is clear that all points $x \in \mathcal{D}$ for Examples 2.1 and 2.2 are non-degenerate. Indeed, we will prove in Section 4.2 that all stabilizing LQR or state-feedback \mathcal{H}_{∞} policies are non-degenerate using a standard ECL (cf. Proposition 4.1 and 4.3). Moreover, we will see that for LQG and \mathcal{H}_{∞} control, the set of non-degenerate dynamic policies defined in Part I [13, Definitions 3.1 & 3.2] indeed corresponds to the set of non-degenerate points in the sense of Definition 3.2.

Despite the generality of ECL, we have almost the same guarantees as Fact 2.1, as summarized in the theorem below, which is one main technical result in this paper. The proof idea has a strong geometrical intuition, but the details are technically involved and are postponed to Section 3.3.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a subdifferentially regular function defined on an open domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$ be an ECL of f . If $x^* \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{nd}}$ is a Clarke stationary point, i.e., $0 \in \partial f(x^*)$, then x^* is a global minimizer of $f(x)$ over \mathcal{D} .*

This theorem guarantees that *non-degenerate stationarity implies global optimality* for any subdifferentially regular function with an ECL. We remark that subdifferentially regular functions are a very large class of functions, covering all optimal and robust control problems discussed in Section 4 (see [13, Appendix B] for a review of subdifferential regularity and Clarke stationarity).

Now it is clear that Fact 2.1 becomes a special case of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 (by choosing $d_{\xi} = 0$ and $d_2 = 0$, i.e., with no extra variable ξ and no auxiliary set \mathcal{G}_{aux}). Considering Fact 3.1, we also have a quick corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a subdifferentially regular function defined on an open domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$ be an ECL of f . If (8) holds, then any Clarke stationary point is a global minimizer of $f(x)$ over \mathcal{D} .*

Remark 3.3 (Degenerate points and saddles). By definition (7a), $\pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}})$ may not cover the whole non-strict epigraph (i.e., we may have feasible points that $(x, f(x)) \notin \pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}})$), and thus the convex re-parameterization over \mathcal{F}_{cvx} may not be able to search over all the feasible points \mathcal{D} (but their infimum are the same as shown in Theorem 3.1). Consequently, Theorem 3.2 only guarantees the global optimality for *non-degenerate stationary* points. We do not have global optimality guarantees for degenerate stationary points $x \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\text{nd}}$ since they cannot be covered by convex parameterization.⁷ There might exist sub-optimal saddle points for f even when it is

⁷In this sense, some classical LMI formulations are not “equivalent” convex parameterizations for original control problems, especially in dynamic output feedback cases. This subtle point has been less emphasized in classical literature since most of them focus on suboptimal control policies [7, 8, 40].

equipped with an ECL. Indeed, it has been revealed that there exist strictly sub-optimal saddle points in LQG control [16, Theorem 5] [17, Theorem 2], which are all degenerate per Definition 3.2 (see Part I [13] for more discussions). These saddle points may even be high-order in the sense that their Hessian are zero and characterizing their local behavior requires high-order (beyond second-order) approximations [17, Theorem 2]. We suspect that for policy optimization of many control problems, locally optimal solutions that are not globally optimal *do not exist* even in the set of degenerate points $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\text{nd}}$, but neither a proof nor a counterexample is known yet. \square

Remark 3.4 (Applications in control). It is well-known that many state feedback and full-order dynamic feedback synthesis problems are nonconvex in their natural forms, but admit “convex reparameterization” in terms of LMIs using a suitable change of variables [6–8, 39, 40]. We argue that our notion of ECL presents a unified treatment for many of these convex reparameterizations, including LQR, LQG, state-feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ control, and dynamic output-feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ control; the equivalence in Theorem 3.1 provides the rationale behind all of their convex re-parameterizations. Thus, many recent results on global optimality of (non-degenerate) stationary points (such as LQR in [15, 25, 42], LQG in [16], state-feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ control in [32], Kalman filter in [29]) are special cases of Theorem 3.2 once the corresponding ECL is constructed. However, despite the wide use of convex reparameterization in terms of LMIs in control, exact constructions of ECL require special care, especially in dynamic output feedback. We will present some ECL construction details in Section 4. \square

3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Basically, we prove Theorem 3.2 by showing its contrapositive: Given $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{nd}}$, if there exists $x' \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $f(x') < f(x)$, then x cannot be a Clarke stationary point of f due to the existence of the ECL $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$.

On a high level, the proof consists of four steps (see Figure 7 for a graphical illustration):

- **Step 1: Lifting and mapping $(x, f(x))$ and $(x', f(x') + \epsilon)$ into $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$.** By the definition of non-degenerate points, we have $(x, f(x)) \in \pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}})$, while for $\epsilon > 0$, we have $(x', f(x') + \epsilon) \in \text{epi}_{>}(f) \subseteq \pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}})$. Thus we may lift both of them and then map them into $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$ via the diffeomorphism Φ , to obtain $(f(x), \zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ and $(f(x') + \epsilon, \zeta'_1, \zeta'_2)$ that are in $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$.
- **Step 2: Constructing a C^2 curve in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}$.** The line segment from $(f(x), \zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ to $(f(x') + \epsilon, \zeta'_1, \zeta'_2)$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$ thanks to convexity, and also the value from $f(x)$ to $f(x') + \epsilon$ is strictly decreasing as long as ϵ is sufficiently small (since $f(x) > f(x')$ by assumption). The pre-image of this line segment under Φ is then a C^2 curve in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}$.
- **Step 3: Negative derivative along the projected curve in \mathcal{D} .** We project the curve constructed in Step 2 onto \mathcal{D} to obtain a projected curve φ . Then, thanks to the property (7b), it is not difficult to show that $f(x)$ has a negative derivative along φ since the value from $f(x)$ to $f(x') + \epsilon$ is strictly decreasing.
- **Step 4: Constructing a decreasing direction.** Assuming the domain is open, we can let $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to be the tangent vector of φ at x . The associated directional derivative $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} (f(x + tv) - f(x))/t$ will then be strictly negative. This would indicate that x cannot be a Clarke stationary point, provided that f is subdifferentially regular.

We now formalize the idea above, and prove the following lemma that provides stronger and more general results. It is not hard to see that Theorem 3.2 is just a direct corollary of the first part of Lemma 3.1.




Figure 7: Illustration of the proof of [Theorem 3.2](#). The main proof is via contrapositive: Given $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{nd}}$, if there exists $x' \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $f(x') < f(x)$, then we must have $0 \notin \partial f(x)$ due to the ECL $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$. *Left figure:* we pick two points $(x, f(x))$ and $(x', f(x') + \epsilon)$ in $\pi_{x,\tau}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}})$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is chosen such that $f(x') + \epsilon < f(x)$. *Middle figure:* We lift and map the two points to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$ via Φ and get a line segment from $(f(x), \zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ to $(f(x') + \epsilon, \zeta'_1, \zeta'_2)$ inside $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$. *Right figure:* The pre-image under Φ is then a C^2 curve in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}$, and we project this C^2 curve onto \mathcal{D} ; then $f(x)$ has a negative derivative along φ since $f(x) > f(x') + \epsilon$, confirming that x cannot be a Clarke stationary point.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz continuous function equipped with the ECL $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{lift}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}}, \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \Phi)$. Suppose $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{nd}}$ is not a global minimizer of f on \mathcal{D} .*

1) *If \mathcal{D} is open, then there exists a non-zero direction $v \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ such that*

$$\limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{f(x + tv) - f(x)}{t} < 0, \quad (9a)$$

and if f is also subdifferentially regular, we have $0 \notin \partial f(x)$.

2) *If \mathcal{D} is closed, then there exists a C^2 curve $\varphi : [0, \delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that $\varphi(0) = x$, $\varphi'(0) \neq 0$ and*

$$\limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\varphi(t)) - f(x)}{t} < 0. \quad (9b)$$

One subtle technical difference between open and closed domains is that we allow a straight direction $v \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ in (9a), while (9b) only allows the derivative along a curve $\varphi(t)$. This is because the point x might be on the boundary of \mathcal{D} when it is closed, and in this case, $x + tv$ might be outside \mathcal{D} for any $t > 0$ (thus $f(x + tv)$ is not defined). When \mathcal{D} is open, any $x \in \mathcal{D}$ will be an interior point, and there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $x + tv \in \mathcal{D}, \forall t \in [0, \delta)$.

Proof. For technical convenience, we introduce the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \left\{ y \in \text{cl } \mathcal{D} \mid \liminf_{y' \rightarrow y, y' \in \mathcal{D}} f(y') < +\infty \right\}$$

and the auxiliary function

$$\tilde{f}(y) = \liminf_{y' \rightarrow y, y' \in \mathcal{D}} f(y'), \quad y \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}.$$

It can be shown that $\text{epi}_{\geq}(\tilde{f}) = \text{cl epi}_{\geq}(f)$ (see, e.g., [48, Section 1.D]), and that $\tilde{f}(x) = f(x)$ whenever $x \in \mathcal{D}$ since f is continuous on \mathcal{D} .

Step 1. Since $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{nd}}$, we have $(x, f(x)) \in \pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}})$. Thus, there exists $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\xi}$ such that $(x, f(x), \xi) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}$. The relation (7b) then establishes that

$$\Phi(x, f(x), \xi) = (f(x), \zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}} \quad (10)$$

for some $\zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $\zeta_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$.

Next, since $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{nd}}$ is not a global minimizer of f on \mathcal{D} , we can find another point $x' \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $f(x') < f(x)$. We let $\epsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small such that $f(x') + \epsilon < f(x)$. Then, we have $(x', f(x') + \epsilon) \in \text{epi}_{>}(f)$, which, by (7a), further leads to the existence of some $\xi' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\xi}$ such that $(x', \gamma', \xi') \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}$. By using (7b), we find $\zeta'_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $\zeta'_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$ such that

$$\Phi(x', f(x') + \epsilon, \xi') = (f(x') + \epsilon, \zeta'_1, \zeta'_2) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$$

Step 2. Now we use the two points constructed above to define a line segment $\psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(t) &= (1-t) \times (f(x), \zeta_1, \zeta_2) + t \times (f(x') + \epsilon, \zeta'_1, \zeta'_2) \\ &= ((1-t)f(x) + t(f(x') + \epsilon), (1-t)\zeta_1 + t\zeta'_1, \zeta_2), \quad t \in [0, 1], \end{aligned}$$

(note that in constructing ψ , we let the endpoint of ψ to be $(f(x') + \epsilon, \zeta'_1, \zeta'_2)$ rather than $(f(x') + \epsilon, \zeta'_1, \zeta'_2)$). It is obvious that ψ is a C^2 curve, and by the convexity of \mathcal{F}_{cvx} , we have

$$\psi(t) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

Since Φ^{-1} is a C^2 diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cvx}} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{aux}}$ to \mathcal{L}_{ift} , we see that $\Phi^{-1} \circ \psi$ is a C^2 curve defined over $[0, 1]$ with image in \mathcal{L}_{ift} .

Step 3. We then let

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &= \pi_x \circ \Phi^{-1} \circ \psi, \\ \varrho &= \pi_\gamma \circ \Phi^{-1} \circ \psi, \end{aligned}$$

where π_x (resp. π_γ) denotes the canonical projection operator onto the first d coordinates (resp. the $(d+1)$ 'th coordinate). It is obvious that we have

$$\varphi(0) = \pi_x(\Phi^{-1}(\psi(0))) = \pi_x(\Phi^{-1}(f(x), \zeta_1, \zeta_2)) \stackrel{(10)}{=} \pi_x(x, f(x), \xi) = x,$$

and since $\Phi^{-1} \circ \psi$ is a curve in \mathcal{L}_{ift} ,

$$(\varphi(t), \varrho(t)) = \pi_{x,\gamma}(\Phi^{-1}(\psi(t))) \in \pi_{x,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}) \subseteq \text{cl epi}_{\geq}(f), \quad \forall t \in [0, 1],$$

where the last inclusion relationship is due to the definition (7a). Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho(t) &= \pi_\gamma(\Phi^{-1}(\psi(t))) \\ &= \pi_\gamma(\Phi^{-1}((1-t)f(x) + t(f(x') + \epsilon), (1-t)\zeta_1 + t\zeta'_1, \zeta_2)) \\ &= (1-t)f(x) + t(f(x') + \epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

thanks to the property (7b). Since $\text{cl epi}_{\geq}(f) = \text{epi}_{\geq}(\tilde{f})$, we have $\tilde{f}(\varphi(t)) \leq \varrho(t), \forall t \in [0, 1]$. Consequently, noting that $\varrho(0) = f(x) = \tilde{f}(x)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{f}(\varphi(t)) - \tilde{f}(x)}{t} &\leq \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\varrho(t) - \varrho(0)}{t} \\ &\stackrel{(11)}{=} \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{(1-t)f(x) + t(f(x') + \epsilon) - f(x)}{t} \\ &= f(x') + \epsilon - f(x) < 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Step 4. We let $v = \varphi'(0)$, and we will argue below that $v \neq 0$ for both open and closed domains. First, the subdifferential regularity of f implies its local Lipschitz continuity, and so there exist $L > 0$ and a bounded open set $U_x \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ containing x such that $|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \leq L\|x_1 - x_2\|$ for any $x_1, x_2 \in U_x \cap \mathcal{D}$.

Next, we consider the following two cases:

- 1) \mathcal{D} is open: In this case, $U_x \cap \mathcal{D}$ is a bounded open neighborhood of x . Since φ is a C^2 curve in \mathbb{R}^d , we can find some $\delta \in (0, 1]$ such that $\varphi(t) \in U_x \cap \mathcal{D}$ for all $t \in [0, \delta)$, and also find $M > 0$ such that

$$\|\varphi(t) - x - tv\| \leq \frac{M}{2}t^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, \delta).$$

As a result, if $v = 0$, we would get

$$\frac{|f(\varphi(t)) - f(x)|}{t} \leq \frac{L\|\varphi(t) - x\|}{t} \leq \frac{LM}{2}t \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \downarrow 0,$$

which contradicts (12) as $\tilde{f}(\varphi(t)) = f(\varphi(t))$ for all $t \in [0, \delta)$. Thus $v \neq 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(x+tv) - f(x)}{t} &\leq \frac{f(\varphi(t)) - f(x)}{t} + \frac{|f(x+tv) - f(\varphi(t))|}{t} \\ &\leq \frac{f(\varphi(t)) - f(x)}{t} + \frac{L\|x+tv - \varphi(t)\|}{t} \\ &\leq \frac{f(\varphi(t)) - f(x)}{t} + \frac{LM}{2}t. \end{aligned}$$

By taking the limit superior as $t \downarrow 0$, and combining it with (12) and $\tilde{f}(\varphi(t)) = f(\varphi(t))$ for all $t \in [0, \delta)$, we get

$$\limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{f(x+tv) - f(x)}{t} \leq f(x') + \epsilon - f(x) < 0.$$

If f is also subdifferentially regular, then we have

$$f^\circ(x; v) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{f(x+tv) - f(x)}{t} = \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{f(x+tv) - f(x)}{t} < 0,$$

confirming that $0 \notin \partial f(x)$ (see [13, Lemma B.2]).

- 2) \mathcal{D} is closed: In this case, since f is continuous on the closed set \mathcal{D} , we see that the set $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is just the original domain \mathcal{D} , and $\tilde{f} = f$. Consequently, the curve φ lies in \mathcal{D} , and (12) holds with \tilde{f} replaced by f .

Since φ is a C^2 curve, we can find $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi(t) \in U_x \cap \mathcal{D}$ for all $t \in [0, \delta)$. We can then mimic the proof for the case with \mathcal{D} open and show that $\varphi'(0) \neq 0$.

The proof is now complete. □

3.4 Conditions for the Non-strict Epigraph to be Closed

We finish this section by providing some conditions for the non-strict epigraph to be a closed set. First, we note the following necessary and sufficient condition:

Proposition 3.1. *Given $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\text{epi}_{\geq}(f) = \text{cl epi}_{\geq}(f)$ if and only if the extended real-valued function $\bar{f} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ defined as*

$$\bar{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & x \in \mathcal{D}, \\ +\infty, & x \notin \mathcal{D} \end{cases}$$

is lower semicontinuous.

Proof. This is a directly consequence of the equivalence between the lower semicontinuity of \bar{f} and the closedness of $\text{epi}_{\geq}(f)$ as shown by [48, Theorem 1.6]. \square

By applying sufficient conditions for lower semicontinuity, we directly get the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function defined on the domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. We have $\text{epi}_{\geq}(f) = \text{clepi}_{\geq}(f)$ if any one of the following conditions holds:*

- 1) \mathcal{D} is closed.
- 2) \mathcal{D} is open, and for any sequence $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ that converges to some point on the boundary of \mathcal{D} , we have $f(x_t) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

As we will see next in Section 4, the objective function in some policy optimization problems in control may not have a closed non-strict epigraph.

4 Applications in Optimal and Robust Control

In this section, we reveal hidden convexity in several benchmark optimal and robust control problems, including LQR [15], state feedback \mathcal{H}_{∞} control [32], LQG [16], output feedback \mathcal{H}_{∞} control [33], and a class of distributed control problems [14]. In particular, we will construct appropriate ECLs for nonconvex (and potentially nonsmooth) policy optimization problems in control. Then, convex re-parameterization in Theorem 3.1 and global optimality in Theorem 3.2 directly apply to these nonconvex policy optimization problems. The main global optimality characterizations in Part I of this paper [13, Theorems 4.2 & 5.2] are direct corollaries of the results in this section. We remark that ECL constructions for LQG and output feedback \mathcal{H}_{∞} control require resolving non-trivial technical challenges.

We first review standard LMI characterizations for $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$ norms in Section 4.1. Static policy optimization with state feedback and dynamic policy optimization with output feedback are discussed in Section 4.2 and Section 4.3, respectively. Finally, we will discuss a class of distributed policy optimization problems [14] in Section 4.4.

4.1 Linear Matrix Inequalities in Control

We first review a state-space characterization for the \mathcal{H}_2 norm of a stable transfer function using Lyapunov equations and LMIs.

Lemma 4.1. *Consider a transfer function $\mathbf{G}(s) = C(sI - A)^{-1}B$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$. The following statements hold.*

- 1) (Lyapunov equations). *Suppose A is stable. We have $\|\mathbf{G}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 = \text{tr}(B^{\top}L_oB) = \text{tr}(CL_cC^{\top})$, where L_o and L_c are observability and controllability Gramians which can be obtained from the Lyapunov equations*

$$AL_c + L_cA^{\top} + BB^{\top} = 0, \quad (13a)$$

$$A^{\top}L_o + L_oA + C^{\top}C = 0. \quad (13b)$$

- 2) (Strict LMI). $\|\mathbf{G}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} < \gamma$ if and only if there exist $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ and $\Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^p$ such that the following strict LMI is feasible:

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^{\top}P + PA & PB \\ B^{\top}P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \prec 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} P & C^{\top} \\ C & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, \quad \text{tr}(\Gamma) < \gamma. \quad (14)$$

3) (Non-strict LMI). Suppose A is stable. We have $\|\mathbf{G}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq \gamma$ if there exist $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ and $\Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_+^p$ such that the following non-strict LMI is feasible:

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^\top P + PA & PB \\ B^\top P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} P & C^\top \\ C & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad \text{tr}(\Gamma) \leq \gamma. \quad (15)$$

The converse holds if (A, B) is controllable.

We next present the celebrated *bounded real lemma* that gives a state-space characterization for the \mathcal{H}_∞ norm of a stable transfer function using LMIs.

Lemma 4.2 (Bounded real lemma). Consider $\mathbf{G}(s) = C(sI - A)^{-1}B + D$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$. Let $\gamma > 0$ be arbitrary. The following statements hold.

1) (Strict version) $\|\mathbf{G}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} < \gamma$ if and only if there exists $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^\top P + PA & PB & C^\top \\ B^\top P & -\gamma I & D^\top \\ C & D & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \prec 0. \quad (16)$$

2) (Non-strict version) Suppose A is stable. We have $\|\mathbf{G}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \gamma$ if there exists $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^\top P + PA & PB & C^\top \\ B^\top P & -\gamma I & D^\top \\ C & D & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0. \quad (17)$$

The converse holds if (A, B) is controllable.

Both [Lemma 4.1](#) and [Lemma 4.2](#) are classical results in control, but the subtleties between strict and non-strict LMI characterizations ((14) vs. (15); (16) vs. (17)) have been less emphasized before. We refer the interested reader to Part I of this paper [[13](#), Section 3.1 & Appendix A.3] for more discussions. We here only remark that the non-strict LMIs in both [Lemma 4.1](#) and [Lemma 4.2](#) assume that the system is stable; but when applying them to controller synthesis, stability is a design constraint; converse results for the non-strict LMIs also require controllability of the (closed-loop) system. These subtleties motivate our inclusion in [\(7a\)](#) and the notion of non-degenerate points ([Definition 3.2](#)).

4.2 State Feedback Policy Optimization

We consider a continuous-time⁸ linear time-invariant (LTI) dynamical system

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + B_w w(t), \quad (18)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector of state variables, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ the vector of control inputs, and $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the disturbance on the system process. We introduce the matrix $B_w \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ for a unified treatment of LQR and \mathcal{H}_∞ control problems in this section. We consider the following performance signal

$$z(t) = \begin{bmatrix} Q^{1/2} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} x(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ R^{1/2} \end{bmatrix} u(t), \quad (19)$$

where $Q \succeq 0$ and $R \succ 0$ are performance weight matrices. A standard assumption is:

⁸Within the scope of this paper, we only consider the continuous-time case. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, analogous results for discrete-time systems are also available.

Assumption 1. (A, B) is controllable and $(Q^{1/2}, A)$ is observable.

Further assumptions will be imposed as needed in specific setups. For both LQR and \mathcal{H}_∞ control, their cost values depend on B_w only via $B_w B_w^\top$. We thus define the weight matrix $W := B_w B_w^\top$, and assume $B_w = W^{1/2}$ without loss of generality. We also assume that $W \succ 0$, or equivalently that B_w is of full row rank.

For policy optimization regarding state feedback control problems, we restrict ourselves to the class of static state feedback policies of the form $u(t) = Kx(t)$, with $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, to regulate the behavior of (19) under the influence of $w(t)$. This restriction has no loss of generality [4, Theorem 14.2]. The set of stabilizing state feedback policies is then parameterized by K and can be represented by

$$\mathcal{K} := \{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \mid \max_i \operatorname{Re} \lambda_i(A + BK) < 0\},$$

and the closed-loop transfer function from w to z becomes

$$\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s) = \begin{bmatrix} Q^{1/2} \\ R^{1/2} K \end{bmatrix} (sI - A - BK)^{-1} B_w. \quad (20)$$

4.2.1 Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR)

For the linear quadratic regulator (LQR) problem, we consider $w(t)$ as white Gaussian noise with an identity intensity matrix, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[w(t)w(\tau)] = \delta(t - \tau)I_n$. The policy optimization formulation for LQR then reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \quad & \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T x^\top(t) Q x(t) + u^\top(t) R u(t) dt \right] \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + B_w w(t), \\ & u(t) = Kx(t). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Thanks to $W \succ 0$, the objective value is finite if and only if $A + BK$ is stable, i.e., $K \in \mathcal{K}$. Moreover, it can be shown that the objective value equals to $\|\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$ whenever $K \in \mathcal{K}$. Thus we can equivalently reformulate (21) as the following \mathcal{H}_2 optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_K \quad & J_{\text{LQR}}(K) := \|\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & K \in \mathcal{K}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

It is known that the policy optimization for LQR (22) is smooth and nonconvex, but has nice landscape properties that $J_{\text{LQR}}(K)$ has a unique stationary point which is globally optimal and is gradient dominated on any sublevel set when $W \succ 0$ [15, 49]. These nice properties are closely related to the hidden convexity of $J_{\text{LQR}}(K)$, and the aim of this subsection is to construct an ECL for (22). Then Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 will directly apply.

Our ECL construction for LQR consists of the following three steps.

Step 1: Lifting. We first define a lifted set with an extra Lyapunov variable X as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQR}} = \left\{ (K, \gamma, X) \mid X \succ 0, (A + BK)X + X(A + BK)^\top + W = 0, \gamma \geq \operatorname{tr}((Q + K^\top R K)X) \right\}.$$

By (13a) in Lemma 4.1, it is not difficult to verify that⁹ $\gamma \geq J_{\text{LQR}}(K)$ with $K \in \mathcal{K}$ if and only if there exists X such that $(K, \gamma, X) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQR}}$. This further implies that $\pi_{K, \gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQR}}) = \operatorname{epi}_{\geq}(J_{\text{LQR}})$. In fact, we further have $\operatorname{epi}_{\geq}(J_{\text{LQR}}) = \operatorname{clepi}_{\geq}(J_{\text{LQR}})$ thanks to the coercivity of J_{LQR} (see Corollary 3.2).

⁹This equivalence requires the assumption that $W := B_w B_w^\top \succ 0$. In this case, we know that $A + BK$ is stable if and only if the Lyapunov equation $(A + BK)X + X(A + BK)^\top + W = 0$ has a unique positive definite solution $X \succ 0$.

Step 2: Convex set. We define the convex set

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQR}} = \left\{ (\gamma, Y, X) \mid X \succ 0, AX + BY + XA^\top + Y^\top B^\top + W = 0, \gamma \geq \text{tr}(QX + X^{-1}Y^\top RY) \right\},$$

and let the auxiliary set be $\mathcal{G}_{\text{LQR}} = \{0\}$. It is obvious that the first two constraints in \mathcal{F}_{LQR} are convex, and the convexity of the last inequality is due to the fact that the matrix fractional function $f(X, Y) = \text{Tr}(QX + X^{-1}Y^\top RY)$ is jointly convex over $X \succ 0, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ (this is a known fact, but we provide some details in [Appendix C.1](#) for completeness).

Step 3: Diffeomorphism. To construct a full ECL, we employ a classical change of variables $Y = KX$ [[8](#), [50](#)] and introduce the mapping

$$\Phi_{\text{LQR}}(K, \gamma, X) = (\gamma, \underbrace{KX, X}_{\zeta_1}), \quad \forall (K, \gamma, X) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQR}}.$$

This mapping naturally satisfies [\(7b\)](#); we do not need an auxiliary variable ζ_2 as no similarity transformation exists for static state feedback policies. It is straightforward to check that $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQR}} = \Phi_{\text{LQR}}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQR}})$, and that Φ_{LQR} admits an inverse on \mathcal{F}_{LQR} given by $\Phi_{\text{LQR}}^{-1}(\gamma, Y, X) = (YX^{-1}, \gamma, X) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQR}}$ for any $(\gamma, Y, X) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQR}}$. Furthermore, Φ_{LQR} is a C^2 (and in fact C^∞) diffeomorphism between the lifted set \mathcal{L}_{LQR} and the convex set \mathcal{F}_{LQR} .

Consequently, $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQR}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQR}}, \{0\}, \Phi_{\text{LQR}})$ is an ECL of $J_{\text{LQR}}(K)$ in [\(22\)](#). One key step in the construction above is the utilization of the classical change of variables $Y = KX$ or equivalently $K = YX^{-1}$. For this ECL constructed above, we have the following nice result, which is due to $\pi_{K, \gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQR}}) = \text{epi}_{\geq}(J_{\text{LQR}})$ by our construction (see [Fact 3.1](#)).

Proposition 4.1. *Under [Assumption 1](#), consider the LQR [\(22\)](#) with $W \succ 0, Q \succeq 0, R \succ 0$. Then all stabilizing policies $K \in \mathcal{K}$ are non-degenerate with respect to the ECL $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQR}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQR}}, \{0\}, \Phi_{\text{LQR}})$ constructed above.*

Thus, our ECL framework immediately implies the following two established results:

- 1) The policy optimization of LQR is a convex problem in disguise, confirmed by [Theorem 3.1](#), i.e., we have^{[10](#)}

$$\min_{K \in \mathcal{K}} J_{\text{LQR}}(K) = \min_{(\gamma, Y, X) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQR}}} \gamma,$$

where the right-hand-side problem is convex and equivalent to an LMI, and their optimal solutions K^* and (γ^*, Y^*, X^*) are related by $K^* = Y^*X^{*-1}$ and $\gamma^* = J_{\text{LQR}}(K^*)$.

- 2) Any stationary point K^* of J_{LQR} (i.e., $\nabla J_{\text{LQR}}(K^*) = 0$) is globally optimal, confirmed by [Theorem 3.2](#).

In the global optimality, we have used the fact that $J_{\text{LQR}}(K)$ is continuously differentiable (and indeed infinitely differentiable) over \mathcal{K} [[2](#)]. Thus, Clarke stationarity is reduced to the normal stationarity with zero gradient. For completeness, we review the calculation of stationary points in [Appendix B](#). Furthermore, it is known that $J_{\text{LQR}}(K)$ has a unique stationary point, is *coercive*, is *L-smooth* and *gradient dominated* over any sublevel set [[15](#)]. These properties are fundamental to establishing global convergence of direct policy search and their model-free extensions for solving LQR [[25](#), [51](#)]. We point out that some of these results cannot be obtained by our current ECL framework without imposing further geometrical properties on \mathcal{F}_{LQR} , and we left such refinements of ECL to our future work.

¹⁰In this case, the infima can be achieved for both formulations due to the coerciveness of $J_{\text{LQR}}(K)$ and the compactness of $\{(Y, X) \mid (\gamma, Y, X) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQR}}\}$ for any given $\gamma > 0$, but we will not delve into the details here.

Remark 4.1 (Elimination of the lifting variable X). Thanks to the affine constraint $AX + BY + XA^\top + Y^\top B^\top + W = 0$, in the set \mathcal{F}_{LQR} , we can express the variable X as a function of Y when the linear mapping $X \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(X) := AX + XA^\top$ is invertible; see [4, Lemma 2.7]. By this observation, with \mathcal{A} being invertible, we may define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{LQR}} &= \left\{ (K, \gamma) \left| \begin{array}{l} \exists X \succ 0 \text{ s.t. } (A + BK)X + X(A + BK)^\top + W = 0 \\ \text{and } \gamma \geq \text{tr}\left((Q + K^\top RK)X\right) \end{array} \right. \right\} = \text{epi}_{\geq}(J_{\text{LQR}}), \\ \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{LQR}} &= \left\{ (\gamma, Y) \left| \begin{array}{l} -\mathcal{A}^{-1}(BY + Y^\top B^\top + W) \succ 0, \\ \gamma \geq \text{tr}\left(-Q\mathcal{A}^{-1}(BY + Y^\top B^\top + W) - \left(\mathcal{A}^{-1}(BY + Y^\top B^\top + W)\right)^{-1}Y^\top RY\right) \end{array} \right. \right\}, \\ \tilde{\Phi}_{\text{LQR}}(K, \gamma) &= (\gamma, KX), \end{aligned}$$

and it can be shown that $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{LQR}}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{LQR}}, \{0\}, \tilde{\Phi}_{\text{LQR}})$ also gives an ECL for LQR. In this ECL formulation, we essentially eliminate the lifting variable X . In fact, we have employed this elimination technique for the simple LQR instance in [Example 2.2](#). Similar techniques have been used in the recent work [25] to derive the gradient dominance property. \square

Remark 4.2 (ECL for deterministic LQR). Our formulation of the LQR problem considers stochastic noise and infinite-horizon averaged cost. Another commonly studied form of LQR is the deterministic infinite-horizon LQR with a random initial state, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \quad & \mathbb{E}_{x(0) \sim D} \left[\int_0^\infty x^\top(t)Qx(t) + u^\top(t)Ru(t) dt \right] \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \\ & u(t) = Kx(t), \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where D is a probability distribution over \mathbb{R}^n with zero mean. It is not difficult to check that this form of LQR admits almost the same ECL: The objective value of (23) has the same dependence on K except that the covariance matrix $\Omega = \mathbb{E}_{x(0) \sim D}[x(0)x(0)^\top]$ now plays the role of W , which we assume to be positive definite, similar to the setup in [15, 25]. Then, the same ECL construction applies here.

We note that in all existing policy optimization formulations for LQR [15, 25], it is assumed $W \succ 0$ or $\Omega \succ 0$. However, this assumption is not needed for Riccati-based solutions. \square

4.2.2 \mathcal{H}_∞ State Feedback Control

In \mathcal{H}_∞ state feedback control, we consider $w(t)$ as adversarial disturbance with bounded energy. Let $\mathcal{L}_2^k[0, \infty)$ be the set of square-integrable (bounded energy) signals of dimension k , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_2^k[0, \infty) := \left\{ w : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k \left| \|w\|_{\ell_2}^2 := \int_0^\infty w(t)^\top w(t) dt < \infty \right. \right\}.$$

A standard form of policy optimization for \mathcal{H}_∞ robust control with state feedback reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \quad & \sup_{\|w\|_{\ell_2} \leq 1} \int_0^\infty x^\top(t)Qx(t) + u^\top(t)Ru(t) dt \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + B_w w(t), \quad x(0) = 0, \\ & u(t) = Kx(t). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Again, when $W \succ 0$, the objective value is finite if and only if $A + BK$ is stable. Standard techniques in control allow us to equivalently reformulate (24) as the following \mathcal{H}_∞ optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} J_\infty(K) := \|\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \\ & \text{subject to } K \in \mathcal{K}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Note that (24) and (25) have the same feasible region but the objective value of (24) is the square of that of (25). The infimum of (25) might not be attainable, and there exist simple examples where the infimum can be approached only by letting the policy K go to infinity (see Appendix C.2.1).

It is known that the policy optimization for the \mathcal{H}_∞ control (25) is nonconvex and nonsmooth, but it admits a convex reformulation [7]. Very recently, it has been revealed in [32] that the discrete-time version of (25) enjoys a nice property that any Clarke stationary point is globally optimal. However, unlike the LQR, it is currently unclear when the stationary point of (25) is unique. Moreover, we have the following interesting fact; see Example 2.3 and another explicit example in Appendix C.2.1.

Fact 4.1. *The objective function $J_\infty : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined in (25) is in general not coercive, even when (A, B) is controllable and W, Q, R are all positive definite.*

This fact is different from the discrete-time version of \mathcal{H}_∞ control, whose corresponding objective function is shown to be coercive [32]. Our aim here is to construct an ECL for (25), which then allows us to draw conclusions from Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 directly. The construction process is very similar to the LQR case. The only key difference is that the \mathcal{H}_∞ case relies on the non-strict version of the bounded real lemma in (17).

We have the following three steps.

Step 1: Lifting. Based on Lemma 4.2, we define a lifted set with an extra Lyapunov variable P as

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty = \left\{ (K, \gamma, P) \left| P \succ 0, \begin{bmatrix} (A + BK)^\top P + P(A + BK) & PB_w & Q^{1/2} & K^\top R^{1/2} \\ B_w^\top P & -\gamma I & 0 & 0 \\ Q^{1/2} & 0 & -\gamma I & 0 \\ R^{1/2} K & 0 & 0 & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0 \right. \right\}. \quad (26)$$

We will show below that this lifted set satisfies $\pi_{K, \gamma}(\mathcal{L}_\infty) = \text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty)$.

Step 2: Convex set. We define a convex set

$$\mathcal{F}_\infty = \left\{ (\gamma, Y, X) \left| \begin{array}{l} X \succ 0, \\ Y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} AX + BY + XA^\top + Y^\top B^\top & B_w & XQ^{1/2} & Y^\top R^{1/2} \\ B_w^\top & -\gamma I & 0 & 0 \\ Q^{1/2} X & 0 & -\gamma I & 0 \\ R^{1/2} Y & 0 & 0 & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0 \right. \right\}, \quad (27)$$

and let the auxiliary set be $\mathcal{G}_\infty = \{0\}$.

Step 3: Diffeomorphism. To construct a full ECL, we employ the classical change of variables $Y = KP^{-1}$, $X = P^{-1}$ and introduce the mapping

$$\Phi_\infty(K, \gamma, P) = (\gamma, \underbrace{KP^{-1}, P^{-1}}_{\zeta_1}), \quad \forall (K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty. \quad (28)$$

Similar to the LQR case, no auxiliary variable ζ_2 is needed.

For the construction above, we have the following results, whose proof is given in Appendix C.2.

Proposition 4.2. *Under Assumption 1, consider the state feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ policy optimization problem (25), where B_w is full row rank and $Q \succ 0, R \succ 0$. The following statements hold.*

- 1) We have $\gamma \geq J_\infty(K)$ with $K \in \mathcal{K}$ if and only if there exists P such that $(K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$. This further implies $\pi_{K,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_\infty) = \text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty)$.
- 2) The mapping Φ_∞ in (28) is a C^2 (and in fact C^∞) diffeomorphism between the lifted set \mathcal{L}_∞ in (26) and the convex set \mathcal{F}_∞ in (27).

The proof is not very difficult, but one needs to be careful about one technical subtlety: Lemma 4.2 already assumes that the system is stable, while the stability is a design constraint in (25). Therefore, the proof needs to explicitly ensure the stability of $A + BK$ for any $(K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$, and also argue that P obtained from (17) in Lemma 4.2 is positive definite, to show that $\pi_{K,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_\infty)$ and $\text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty)$ are equal to each other. The details are provided in Appendix C.2.

Proposition 4.2 guarantees that $(\mathcal{L}_\infty, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \{0\}, \Phi_\infty)$ is an ECL of $J_\infty(K)$ in (25). For this ECL, we further have the following nice result, which is directly from the fact $\pi_{K,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_\infty) = \text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty)$.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds, B_w is full row rank, and $Q \succ 0, R \succ 0$. Then all stabilizing policies $K \in \mathcal{K}$ are non-degenerate with respect to the ECL $(\mathcal{L}_\infty, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \{0\}, \Phi_\infty)$ constructed above.*

Considering that $J_\infty(K)$ is sudifferentiably regular,¹¹ the following result is a direct corollary of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

Corollary 4.1. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds, B_w is full row rank, and $Q \succ 0, R \succ 0$. Then, the state feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ policy optimization (25) is equivalent to a convex problem in the sense that*

$$\inf_{K \in \mathcal{K}} J_\infty(K) = \inf_{(\gamma, Y, X) \in \mathcal{F}_\infty} \gamma, \quad (29)$$

Furthermore, any Clarke stationary point of (25) is globally optimal.

Note that the convex problem in (29) is indeed an LMI, which has been widely used in state feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ control [7]. The global optimality of Clarke stationary points is the continuous-time counterpart of the discrete-time result established in [32]. Either of the formulations in (29) might not be solvable, i.e., the infimum may not be achieved. In this case, the Clarke stationary point does not exist. An explicit single-input and single-output example is provided in Appendix C.2.1.

Remark 4.3 (Lifting variable). Unlike the LQR case, the lifting variable P in (26) comes from an LMI due to the bounded real lemma (Lemma 4.2). The solution P in (26) is in general not unique. Thus, the lifting procedure is necessary for \mathcal{H}_∞ control. A similar strategy has been used in [32] for discrete-time \mathcal{H}_∞ control. This is also why we used a lifting variable in Example 2.3. \square

Remark 4.4 (The diffeomorphisms in state feedback policy optimization). The diffeomorphisms Section 4.2.1 and (28) are essentially in the same form. We have used the classical change of variable $K = YX^{-1}$ [8, 50, 52], which linearizes many bilinear matrix inequalities in centralized state feedback controller synthesis (see Notes and References in [8, Chapter 7] for a historical perspective). A central block in all these bilinear matrix inequalities is the standard Lyapunov inequality $(A + BK)X + X(A + BK)^\top \prec 0, X \succ 0$ (or $P(A + BK) + (A + BK)^\top P \prec 0, P \succ 0$). The simple change of variables $Y = KX$ (or $K = YX^{-1}$ with $P = X^{-1}$) leads to the same LMI $AX + BY + (AX + BY)^\top \prec 0, X \succ 0$. As we will see in the next section, the linearization process for dynamic output feedback policies is much more complicated. It is noted in [8, Chapter 7] that “We suspect, however, that output feedback synthesis problems have high complexity and are therefore unlikely to be recast as LMI problems”. Fortunately, the developments in [7, 40] proposed a linearization procedure for dynamic output feedback policies. We will utilize those techniques in [7, 40] to construct ECLs for LQG and \mathcal{H}_∞ control. \square

¹¹See Part I of this paper [13] (Lemma 5.1 and Appendix D.5) for relevant discussions.

4.3 Output Feedback Policy Optimization

In many cases, we may not have full observation of the system state, and we need to use partial output observation for feedback control. In this section, we show that ECL is also applicable to dynamic output feedback policies, including LQG control and robust \mathcal{H}_∞ control.

Consider an LTI system with partial output observations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t) + B_w w(t), \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + D_v v(t), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector of state variables, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ the vector of control inputs, $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the vector of measured outputs available for feedback, and $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n, v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are the disturbances on the system process and measurement at time t . Here we introduce the matrices $B_w \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $D_v \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ for a unified treatment of LQG and \mathcal{H}_∞ control problems. For both problems, their cost values depend on B_w and D_v only via $B_w B_w^\top$ and $D_v D_v^\top$. We thus define the weight matrices $W := B_w B_w^\top, V := D_v D_v^\top$, and assume $B_w = W^{1/2}$ and $D_v = V^{1/2}$. The following assumption is standard.

Assumption 2. *The weight matrices satisfy $Q \succeq 0, R \succ 0, W \succeq 0, V \succ 0$. Furthermore, $(A, W^{1/2})$ is controllable, and $(Q^{1/2}, A)$ is observable. Also, (A, B) is controllable and (C, A) is observable.*

We consider the same performance signal $z(t)$ in (19). To properly regulate the signal $z(t)$, we design a linear full-order dynamic feedback policy of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}(t) &= A_K \xi(t) + B_K y(t), \\ u(t) &= C_K \xi(t) + D_K y(t), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $\xi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the internal state, and A_K, B_K, C_K and D_K are matrices of proper dimensions that specify the policy dynamics. We parameterize dynamic feedback policies of the form (31) by

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} D_K & C_K \\ B_K & A_K \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}. \quad (32)$$

Combining (31) with (30) via simple algebra leads to the closed-loop system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \xi \end{bmatrix} &= A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \xi \end{bmatrix} + B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \begin{bmatrix} w \\ v \end{bmatrix}, \\ z &= C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \xi \end{bmatrix} + D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \begin{bmatrix} w \\ v \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (33a)$$

where we denote the closed-loop system matrices by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) &:= \begin{bmatrix} A + BD_K C & BC_K \\ B_K C & A_K \end{bmatrix}, & B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) &:= \begin{bmatrix} W^{1/2} & BD_K V^{1/2} \\ 0 & B_K V^{1/2} \end{bmatrix}, \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) &:= \begin{bmatrix} Q^{1/2} & 0 \\ R^{1/2} D_K C & R^{1/2} C_K \end{bmatrix}, & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) &:= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & R^{1/2} D_K V^{1/2} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (33b)$$

A dynamic feedback policy (31) is said to *internally stabilize* the plant (30) if the the closed-loop matrix $A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})$ is (Hurwitz) stable. We denote

$$\mathcal{C}_n := \left\{ \mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} D_K & C_K \\ B_K & A_K \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)} \mid A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \text{ is stable} \right\}, \quad (34a)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,0} := \mathcal{C}_n \cap \mathcal{V}_{n,0}, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{V}_{n,0} := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} D_K & C_K \\ B_K & A_K \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)} \mid D_K = 0_{m \times p} \right\}. \quad (34b)$$

The policies in \mathcal{C}_n are *proper* and those in $\mathcal{C}_{n,0}$ are *strictly proper*. It can be shown that \mathcal{C}_n is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}$, and $\mathcal{C}_{n,0}$ is an open subset of the linear space $\mathcal{V}_{n,0}$. The transfer matrix from the disturbance $d(t) = \begin{bmatrix} w(t) \\ v(t) \end{bmatrix}$ to the performance signal $z(t)$ becomes

$$\mathbf{T}_{zd}(\mathbf{K}, s) = C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) (sI - A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}))^{-1} B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) + D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}). \quad (35)$$

For notational simplicity, in later construction of ECLs, we define the following matrices corresponding to the general dynamics (see [13, Appendix A.6] for more details):

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} W^{\frac{1}{2}} & 0_{n \times p} \end{bmatrix}, B_2 = B, C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ 0_{m \times n} \end{bmatrix}, C_2 = C, D_{12} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n \times m} \\ R^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix}, D_{21} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{p \times n} & V^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

4.3.1 Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG)

When $w(t)$ and $v(t)$ are white Gaussian noises with identity intensity matrices, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[w(t)w(\tau)] = \delta(t - \tau)I_n$ and $\mathbb{E}[v(t)v(\tau)] = \delta(t - \tau)I_p$, we consider an averaged mean performance

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{\text{LQG}} := \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T z(t)^\top z(t) dt \right] = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (x^\top Qx + u^\top Ru) dt \right].$$

The classical LQG control problem can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}} \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{\text{LQG}} \\ & \text{subject to} \quad (30), (31), \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,0}. \end{aligned}$$

This problem is equivalent to an \mathcal{H}_2 optimization problem below (see Part I [13] for further details)

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{K}} J_{\text{LQG},n}(\mathbf{K}) := \|\mathbf{T}_{zd}(\mathbf{K}, s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,0}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

It is known that the policy optimization for LQG (37) is smooth and nonconvex, but all stationary points corresponding to minimal controllers are globally optimal [16, Theorem 6]. Part I of this paper in [13, Theorem 4.2] has revealed that any *non-degenerate stationary points are globally optimal*; see [13] for further landscape discussions. This subsection aims to prove [13, Theorem 4.2] using our ECL framework. Our strategy is to construct an ECL for (37) from the classical change of variables in [7], then Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 directly apply.

Similar to Section 4.2, our construction has three main steps.

Step 1: Lifting. Motivated by (15) in Lemma 4.1, we first introduce a lifted set \mathcal{L}_{LQG} as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}} = \left\{ (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, \underbrace{P, \Gamma}_{\xi}) \left| \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{V}_{n,0}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}, P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n, \Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_+^{n+m}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0, \\ \begin{bmatrix} P & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \text{tr}(\Gamma) \leq \gamma \end{array} \right. \right\}, \quad (38)$$

where $A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}), B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}), C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})$ are the closed-loop matrices of the policy parameter \mathbf{K} defined in (33b), and P_{12} denotes the off-diagonal block of P formed by elements in the first n rows and last n columns of P . The extra variables (P, Γ) play the role of ξ as lifting variables in ECL.

Step 2: Convex and auxiliary sets. We let the auxiliary set \mathcal{G}_{LQG} be the set of $n \times n$ invertible matrices GL_n , which captures the effect of similarity transformations. We then let the convex set be

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} = \left\{ (\gamma, \underbrace{\Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma}_{\zeta_1}) \left| \begin{array}{l} \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \Lambda \in \mathcal{V}_{n,0}, \begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}, \Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_+^{n+m}, \\ \mathcal{A}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \leq 0, \\ \mathcal{B}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \succeq 0, \text{tr}(\Gamma) \leq \gamma \end{array} \right. \right\},$$

where \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are two affine operators defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}\left(\gamma, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}, X, Y, \Gamma\right) &:= \begin{bmatrix} AX + B_2F + (AX + B_2F)^\top & M^\top + A & B_1 \\ * & YA + HC_2 + (YA + HC_2)^\top & YB_1 + HD_{21} \\ * & * & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{B}\left(\gamma, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}, X, Y, \Gamma\right) &:= \begin{bmatrix} X & I & (C_1X + D_{12}F)^\top \\ * & Y & C_1^\top \\ * & * & \Gamma \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $*$ denotes the symmetric part. These two linear operators \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} resemble the matrix inequalities in (38).

Step 3: Diffeomorphism. We next build a smooth bijection from \mathcal{L}_{LQG} to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} \times \text{GL}_n$. Define the mapping Φ_{LQG} by

$$\Phi_{\text{LQG}}(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) = \left(\gamma, \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & C_{\mathbf{K}}(P^{-1})_{21} \\ P_{12}B_{\mathbf{K}} & \Phi_M \end{bmatrix}}_{\zeta_1}, (P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, \Gamma, \underbrace{P_{12}}_{\zeta_2} \right), \quad \forall (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}, \quad (39)$$

where

$$\Phi_M = P_{12}B_{\mathbf{K}}C_2(P^{-1})_{11} + P_{11}B_2C_{\mathbf{K}}(P^{-1})_{21} + P_{11}A(P^{-1})_{11} + P_{12}A_{\mathbf{K}}(P^{-1})_{21}.$$

Furthermore, we can construct its inverse explicitly (see Appendix D.3 for details): Define the mapping Ψ_{LQG} by

$$\Psi_{\text{LQG}}(\mathbf{Z}, \Xi) = (\Psi_{\mathbf{K}}, \gamma, \Psi_P, \Gamma), \quad \forall \mathbf{Z} = \left(\gamma, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}, X, Y, \Gamma \right) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}, \Xi \in \text{GL}_n, \quad (40)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\mathbf{K}} &= \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ YB_2 & \Xi \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F \\ H & M - YAX \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & C_2X \\ 0 & -\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \\ \Psi_P &= \begin{bmatrix} Y & \Xi \\ \Xi^\top & \Xi^\top(Y - X^{-1})^{-1}\Xi \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The constructions of Φ_{LQG} and Ψ_{LQG} are highly nontrivial, but have become classical in control; see e.g., [7]. Our next result shows that Φ_{LQG} is a diffeomorphism from \mathcal{L}_{LQG} to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} \times \text{GL}_n$.

Proposition 4.4. *Under Assumption 2, the canonical projection of \mathcal{L}_{LQG} in (38) onto (\mathbf{K}, γ) satisfies*

$$\text{epi}_{>}(\mathcal{J}_{\text{LQG},n}) \subseteq \pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}) \subseteq \text{cl epi}_{\geq}(\mathcal{J}_{\text{LQG},n}).$$

Furthermore, the mapping Φ_{LQG} given by (39) is a C^2 (and in fact C^∞) diffeomorphism from \mathcal{L}_{LQG} to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} \times \text{GL}_n$, and its inverse Φ_{LQG}^{-1} is given by Ψ_{LQG} .

Unlike the state feedback cases in [Section 4.2](#), the proof of [Proposition 4.4](#) is much more involved for the reasons highlighted in the remark below. We present the proof details in [Appendix D.3](#).

Remark 4.5 (Internal stability). While the lifted set \mathcal{L}_{LQG} in [\(38\)](#) is motivated by [\(15\)](#) in [Lemma 4.1](#), there is one main technical subtlety: [Lemma 4.1](#) already assume the system to be stable, but the internal stability $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,0}$ is a domain constraint in [\(37\)](#). Indeed, the policy \mathbf{K} from $\pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}})$ might not internally stabilize the plant (*the closed-loop system $A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})$ may have eigenvalues with zero real parts*), and some point in $\pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}})$ may be only in the closure $\text{cl epi}_{\geq}(J_{\text{LQG},n})$ (note that $J_{\text{LQG},n}$ is not coercive). Another difference is that we require $P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n$ which does not appear in [\(15\)](#). As highlighted in Part I, this invertibility requirement on P_{12} is very important for constructing a diffeomorphism; also see [\(39\)](#). These two differences complicate the proof of [Proposition 4.4](#). In [Appendix D](#), we will present a key technical lemma ([Lemma D.4](#)) and the proof details. \square

[Proposition 4.4](#) guarantees that $(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}, \text{GL}_n, \Phi_{\text{LQG}})$ constructed above is an ECL of the LQG policy optimization $J_{\text{LQG},n}(\mathbf{K})$ in [\(37\)](#). For convenience, we restate the definition of non-degenerate LQG policies from [[13](#), Definition 3.1] below, which is the same as [Definition 3.2](#).

Definition 4.1. A full-order dynamic policy $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,0}$ is called *non-degenerate for LQG* if there exists a $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ with $P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n$ and Γ such that $(\mathbf{K}, J_{\text{LQG},n}(\mathbf{K}), P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}$.

We refer the interested reader to Part I [[13](#)] for more discussions on non-degenerate LQG policies. Then, [[13](#), Theorem 4.2] is a direct corollary of [Theorems 3.1](#) and [3.2](#).

Corollary 4.2. Under [Assumption 2](#), the LQG policy optimization [\(37\)](#) is equivalent to a convex problem in the sense that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,0}} J_{\text{LQG},n}(\mathbf{K}) = \inf_{(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}} \gamma, \quad (41)$$

Furthermore, for a non-degenerate policy $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,0}$, if it is a stationary point, i.e. $0 \in \nabla J_{\text{LQG},n}(\mathbf{K})$, then it is globally optimal for [\(37\)](#).

We remark that the equivalence in [\(41\)](#) is essentially the same as [[7](#), Corollary 4.7], but with one main difference that all the LMIs in [[7](#), Corollary 4.7] are strict (which naturally avoids the issue of internal stability in [Remark 4.5](#)) while we used non-strict LMIs in [\(38\)](#). This allows us to derive the global optimality of non-degenerate stationary points. A direct application of [[7](#), Corollary 4.7] can only characterize the upper bound of $J_{\text{LQG},n}(\mathbf{K})$, but not the function $J_{\text{LQG},n}(\mathbf{K})$ itself. Thus, the global optimality of non-degenerate stationary points cannot be derived from [[7](#), Corollary 4.7].

4.3.2 \mathcal{H}_{∞} Output Feedback Control

When $w(t)$ and $v(t)$ are deterministic disturbances, we consider the worst-case performance in an adversarial setup. Assume that the system starts from a zero initial state $x(0) = 0$. Denote $d(t) = \begin{bmatrix} w(t) \\ v(t) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+n}$, and consider the worst-case performance when the disturbance signal $d(t)$ has bounded energy less than or equal to 1:

$$\mathfrak{J}_{\infty} := \sup_{\|d\|_{\ell_2} \leq 1} \int_0^{\infty} z(t)^{\top} z(t) dt = \sup_{\|d\|_{\ell_2} \leq 1} \int_0^{\infty} (x^{\top} Q x + u^{\top} R u) dt.$$

The \mathcal{H}_{∞} output feedback control problem can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\mathbf{K}} \mathfrak{J}_{\infty} \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \text{(30), (31), } x(0) = 0, \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_n \end{aligned}$$

This problem is equivalent to the following \mathcal{H}_∞ policy optimization problem (see Part I [13] for further details):

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mathbf{K}} J_{\infty,n}(\mathbf{K}) &:= \|\mathbf{T}_{zd}(\mathbf{K}, s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \\ \text{subject to } \mathbf{K} &\in \mathcal{C}_n. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

It is known that the \mathcal{H}_∞ policy optimization (42) is nonsmooth and nonconvex. Part I of this paper has revealed that all *non-degenerate Clarke stationary points* are globally optimal to (42) [13, Theorem 5.2]. This subsection aims to prove [13, Theorem 5.2] using our ECL framework.

Similar to the LQG case, our ECL construction has three main steps.

Step 1: Lifting. Motivated by (17) in Lemma 4.2, we first introduce a lifted set

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d} = \left\{ (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, \underbrace{P}_{\xi}) \left| \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}, P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n, \\ \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0 \end{array} \right. \right\}. \quad (43)$$

where $A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}), B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}), C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})$ are the closed-loop matrices of the policy parameter \mathbf{K} defined in (33b), and P_{12} denotes the off-diagonal block of P formed by elements in the first n rows and last n columns of P . The extra variable P plays the role of ξ as lifting variables in ECL.

Step 2: Convex and auxiliary sets. We let the auxiliary set be the set of $n \times n$ invertible matrices GL_n , and let the convex set be given by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d} = \left\{ (\gamma, \underbrace{\Lambda, X, Y}_{\zeta_1}) \left| \begin{array}{l} \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}, \begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}, \\ \mathcal{M}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \preceq 0 \end{array} \right. \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{M}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y)$ is an affine operator defined as (we have denoted $\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} G & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}$)

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{M} \left(\gamma, \begin{bmatrix} G & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}, X, Y \right) \\ &:= \begin{bmatrix} AX + B_2 F + (AX + B_2 F)^\top & M^\top + A + B_2 G C_2 & B_1 + B_2 G D_{21} & (C_1 X + D_{12} F)^\top \\ * & Y A + H C_2 + (Y A + H C_2)^\top & Y B_1 + H D_{21} & (C_1 + D_{12} G C_2)^\top \\ * & * & -\gamma I & (D_{11} + D_{12} G D_{21})^\top \\ * & * & * & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Diffeomorphism. We define the mapping $\Phi_{\infty,d}$ by

$$\Phi_{\infty,d}(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) = \left(\gamma, \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} D_{\mathbf{K}} & \Phi_F \\ \Phi_H & \Phi_M \end{bmatrix}}_{\zeta_1}, (P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, \underbrace{P_{12}}_{\zeta_2} \right), \quad (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}, \quad (44a)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_M &= P_{12} B_{\mathbf{K}} C_2 (P^{-1})_{11} + P_{11} B_2 C_{\mathbf{K}} (P^{-1})_{21} + P_{11} (A + B_2 D_{\mathbf{K}} C_2) (P^{-1})_{11} + P_{12} A_{\mathbf{K}} (P^{-1})_{21}, \\ \Phi_H &= P_{11} B_2 D_{\mathbf{K}} + P_{12} B_{\mathbf{K}}, \\ \Phi_F &= D_{\mathbf{K}} C_2 (P^{-1})_{11} + C_{\mathbf{K}} (P^{-1})_{21}. \end{aligned} \quad (44b)$$

Furthermore, we can construct its inverse explicitly (see [Appendix D.4](#) for details): Define the mapping $\Psi_{\infty,d}$ by

$$\Psi_{\infty,d}(Z, \Xi) := (\Psi_K, \gamma, \Psi_P) \quad (44c)$$

for any $Z = \left(\gamma, \begin{bmatrix} G & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}, X, Y \right) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}$ and $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$, where the components are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_K &= \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ YB & \Xi \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} G & F \\ H & M - YAX \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & CX \\ 0 & -\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \\ \Psi_P &= \begin{bmatrix} Y & \Xi \\ \Xi^\top & \Xi^\top(Y - X^{-1})^{-1}\Xi \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (44d)$$

The following result shows that $(\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}, \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}, \text{GL}_n, \Phi_{\infty,d})$ constructed above is an ECL for $J_{\infty,n}$.

Proposition 4.5. *Under [Assumption 2](#), the canonical projection of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}$ in [\(43\)](#) onto (K, γ) satisfies*

$$\text{epi}_{>}(J_{\infty,n}) \subseteq \pi_{K,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}) \subseteq \text{cl epi}_{\geq}(J_{\infty,n}).$$

Furthermore, the mapping $\Phi_{\infty,d}$ [\(44a\)](#) is a C^2 (and in fact C^∞) diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d} \times \text{GL}_n$, and its inverse $\Phi_{\infty,d}^{-1}$ is given by $\Psi_{\infty,d}$.

The proof of [Proposition 4.5](#) is technically involved due to a similar issue of internal stability as [Remark 4.5](#): A policy K in [\(43\)](#) may not internally stabilize the plant [\(30\)](#), i.e., we may have $K \notin \mathcal{C}_n$. We present the proof details in [Appendix D.4](#).

[Proposition 4.5](#) guarantees that $(\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}, \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}, \text{GL}_n, \Phi)$ constructed above is an ECL of $J_{\infty,n}(K)$ in [\(42\)](#). For convenience, we restate the definition of non-degenerate \mathcal{H}_∞ policies from [[13](#), Definition 3.2] below, which is the same as [Definition 3.2](#).

Definition 4.2. A full-order dynamic policy $K \in \mathcal{C}_n$ is called *non-degenerate* for \mathcal{H}_∞ control if there exists a $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ with $P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n$ such that $(K, J_{\infty,n}(K), P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}$ in [\(43\)](#).

Then, [[13](#), Theorem 5.2] is a direct corollary of [Theorems 3.1](#) and [3.2](#).

Corollary 4.3. *Under [Assumption 2](#), the \mathcal{H}_∞ policy optimization [\(42\)](#) is equivalent to a convex problem in the sense that*

$$\inf_{K \in \mathcal{C}_n} J_{\infty,n}(K) = \inf_{(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}} \gamma, \quad (45)$$

Furthermore, for a non-degenerate policy $K \in \mathcal{C}_n$, if it is a Clarke stationary point, i.e. $0 \in \partial J_{\infty,n}(K)$, then it is globally optimal for [\(42\)](#).

We have used the fact that the \mathcal{H}_∞ cost function $J_{\infty,n}$ is subdifferentially regular (see Part I [[13](#)] for more discussions). The equivalency in [\(45\)](#) is essentially the same as [[7](#), Chapter 4.2.3]. However, the global optimality of non-degenerate \mathcal{H}_∞ policies cannot be derived from [[7](#), Chapter 4.2.3] due to its use of strict LMIs.

Remark 4.6 (The diffeomorphisms in output feedback policy optimization). The diffeomorphisms [\(39\)](#) and [\(44\)](#) are essentially the same, which are derived from [[7](#)]. They are much more complicated than the state feedback cases in [Section 4.2](#). This complexity arises even when we deal with the internal stability constraint using Lyapunov inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} A + BD_K C & BC_K \\ B_K C & A_K \end{bmatrix} \text{ is stable} \\ \iff & \exists P \succ 0, P \begin{bmatrix} A + BD_K C & BC_K \\ B_K C & A_K \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} A + BD_K C & BC_K \\ B_K C & A_K \end{bmatrix}^\top P \prec 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the coupling between the auxiliary variable P and the controller parameters A_K, B_K, C_K, D_K are much more involved. Note that this is also a bilinear matrix inequality (as the matrix depends on P and K bilinearly), but its linearization procedure for this bilinear matrix inequality requires the complicated change of variables in (39) and (44) (see [7, Lemma 4.1] for more details). \square

4.4 Policy Optimization for Distributed Control with Quadratic Invariance

All discussions in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 so far focus on centralized policies, which admit equivalent convex reformulations using the classical change of variables. Applications arising from the control of networked systems e.g., smart grid [53] or automated highways [54], may not have centralized information available for feedback, due to privacy concerns, geographic distance, or limited communication. The lack of centralized information can enormously complicate the design of optimal distributed policies. The seminal work [55] has introduced the notion of *Quadratic Invariance* (QI) to quantify an algebraic relation that allows for an equivalent convex reformulation in the frequency domain; see also [56] for related discussions.

Here, we show that our ECL framework is also applicable to a class of distributed control problems when QI holds. This class of problems was first discussed in [14], where a model-free learning-based algorithm was also introduced. In particular, we focus on a finite-time horizon distributed optimal control problem. In this case, we may allow the linear system to be time-varying, and the stability constraint is not necessary. Consider a linear time-varying system in discrete-time

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= A_t x_t + B_t u_t + w_t, \\ y_t &= C_t x_t + v_t, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the system state at time t affected by process noise $w_t \sim \mathcal{D}_w$ with $x_0 = \mu_0 + \delta_0$, $\delta_0 \sim \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}$, $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the observed output at time t affected by measurement noise $v_t \sim \mathcal{D}_v$, and $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input at time t . We assume that the distributions $\mathcal{D}_w, \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}, \mathcal{D}_v$ are bounded, have zero mean and variances $\Sigma_w, \Sigma_{\delta_0}, \Sigma_v \succ 0$ respectively.

We consider the following optimal control problem in a finite horizon of length N

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{u_0, \dots, u_{N-1}} \quad & \mathbb{E}_{w_t, v_t} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \left(y_t^\top M_t y_t + u_t^\top R_t u_t \right) + y_N^\top M_N y_N \right] \\ \text{subject to} \quad & (46), \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $M_t \succeq 0$ and $R_t \succ 0, t = 0, \dots, N$ are performance weight matrices. In (47), at each time t , the input u_t can use the information available in (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_t) with an additional information constraint that will be imposed below. In particular, we consider linear feedback policies of the form

$$u_t = K_{t,0} y_0 + K_{t,1} y_1 + \dots + K_{t,t} y_t, \quad t = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (48)$$

where $K_{t,i} \in \mathcal{S}_{t,i}, i = 1, \dots, t$ and $\mathcal{S}_{t,i} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ is a subspace constraint encoding communications.

To derive a compact form of (47), let us collect all signals in the finite horizon N into a single vector as follows:

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 \\ \vdots \\ x_N \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_0 \\ \vdots \\ y_N \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} u_0 \\ \vdots \\ u_{N-1} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{w} = \begin{bmatrix} w_0 \\ \vdots \\ w_{N-1} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} v_0 \\ \vdots \\ v_N \end{bmatrix}.$$

We also define the matrices

$$\mathbf{A} = \text{blkdg}(A_0, \dots, A_N), \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{blkdg}(B_0, \dots, B_{N-1}) \\ 0_{n \times mN} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C} = \text{blkdg}(C_0, \dots, C_N),$$

where $\text{blkdg}(\cdot)$ means a block-diagonal matrix, and defines a block down-shift matrix

$$\mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{1 \times N} & 0 \\ I_N & 0_{N \times 1} \end{bmatrix} \otimes I_n.$$

Then, we can write the evaluation of (46) over the horizon N compactly as $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w}$, $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$, leading to $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{P}_{11}\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{P}_{12}\mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}$, where $\mathbf{P}_{11} = (I - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A})^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{P}_{12} = (I - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}$. The distributed policies in (48) can be written compactly as $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{S}$, where \mathcal{S} is a subspace in $\mathbb{R}^{mN \times p(N+1)}$ which ensures causality of \mathbf{K} by setting to 0 those entries corresponding to future outputs, and also enforces the time-varying spatio-temporal information structure $\mathcal{S}_{t,i}$ for distributed policies.

Then, the problem (47) with a distributed linear policy (48) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{mN \times p(N+1)}} \quad & J(\mathbf{K}), \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{S}, \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

where the cost $J(\mathbf{K})$ correspond to the cost in (47) for the policy \mathbf{K} . Note that (49) does not have a stability constraint since we focus on a finite horizon. Yet, due to the information constraint $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{S}$, this nonconvex distributed control problem (49) is in general hard to solve.

Thanks to the seminal work of [55], it is known that problem (49) can be equivalently transformed into a convex program if and only if quadratic invariance (QI) holds, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{K}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{P}_{12}\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \forall \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{50}$$

One key observation from [14, Lemma 5 & Proposition 7] is that the following smooth and invertible mapping $\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{R}^{mN \times p(N+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{mN \times p(N+1)}$

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{Q}) := (I + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{P}_{12})^{-1}\mathbf{Q}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathbf{K}) = \mathbf{K}(I - \mathbf{C}\mathbf{P}_{12}\mathbf{K})^{-1}$$

can convexify (49), and that the QI property (50) ensures the information constraint on \mathbf{K} can be transferred to \mathbf{Q} , i.e., $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{S} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{S}$. In particular, let us consider the epigraph of (49)

$$\text{epi}_{\geq}(J) := \{(\mathbf{K}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R} \mid J(\mathbf{K}) \leq \gamma\},$$

which is nonconvex. We can further show the following set is convex (see [14])

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{QI}} := \{(\gamma, \mathbf{Q}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S} \mid g(\mathbf{Q}) := J(\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{Q})) \leq \gamma\}.$$

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose the set \mathcal{S} is QI with respect to $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{P}_{12}$, i.e., (50) holds. Then, the mapping $\Phi : (\mathbf{K}, \gamma) \mapsto (\gamma, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathbf{K}))$ is a C^2 (and in fact C^∞)-diffeomorphism from $\text{epi}_{\geq}(J)$ to \mathcal{F}_{QI} .*

The lemma is simply a restatement of the results in [14, Lemma 5 & Proposition 7] using our ECL terminologies. Thus, the distributed control (49) is equivalent to the following convex problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{mN \times p(N+1)}} \quad & g(\mathbf{Q}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{S}, \end{aligned}$$

and any stationary point of (49) in the subspace \mathcal{S} is globally optimal. These two results of hidden convexity and global optimality for (49) are indeed covered by Fact 2.1 (a special case of ECL), once Lemma 4.3 is established. We note that no lifting procedure is required in this distributed control problem (49), which is similar to Examples 2.1 and 2.2.

Remark 4.7 (Hidden convexity in distributed policies). In many control instances (either with static policies or dynamic policies), a change of variables in the form of $K = YX^{-1}$ is one key step to convexify the problems and get a convex reformulation in terms of the new variables X and Y . In static state feedback cases, the variables X and Y often arise from Lyapunov theory (see [Section 4.2](#) and [Remark 4.4](#)). In dynamic output feedback cases, the variables X and Y can be related to certain closed-loop responses in the frequency domain (such as Youla parameterization [[19](#)], system-level synthesis [[20](#)], and input-output parameterization [[21–23](#)]). In the case of distributed control, this seemingly innocent constraint $K \in \mathcal{S}$ becomes nonconvex in X and Y as it requires $YX^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus, the change of variables $K = YX^{-1}$ cannot lead to a convex reformulation for distributed control. The notion of QI [[55](#)] can translate the constraint $K \in \mathcal{S}$ into convex constraints on the new variables X and Y ; see [[22](#), [56](#)] for related discussions on sparsity invariance. Thus, together with classical changes of variables, the notion of QI reveals the hidden convexity in distributed control. \square

5 Conclusion

In this work, we have introduced a unified **Extended Convex Lifting** (ECL) framework to reveal hidden convexity in nonconvex and potentially nonsmooth optimization problems. Our ECL can be viewed as a bridge to connect nonconvex optimization problems with their convex reformulations, thus enabling convex analysis for benign nonconvex landscapes. Despite non-convexity and non-smoothness, the existence of an ECL guarantees that minimizing the original function is equivalent to a convex problem ([Theorem 3.1](#)), and also certifies a class of first-order non-degenerate stationary points to be globally optimal ([Theorem 3.2](#)).

We have shown that ECL allows for a unified analysis of the hidden convexity and global optimality in benchmark optimal and robust control problems from a modern optimization perspective. We have built explicit ECLs for LQR, state feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ control, LQG, dynamic output feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ control, as well as a class of distributed control problems, many of which were analyzed on a case-by-case basis in the literature. The guarantees for LQG and dynamic output feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ control are new and only reported in Part I of this paper [[13](#)]. We believe this ECL framework will be helpful to reveal hidden convexity for other control problems where LMI-based solutions have been revealed [[6](#), [7](#)]. We hope the ECL framework will be useful for analyzing nonconvex optimization problems in other areas beyond control.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Chengkai Yao for his assistance with creating some illustrative figures, particularly [Figure 1\(b\)](#), [Figures 2](#) and [5](#), in this paper.

References

- [1] Rudolf E. Kalman. The theory of optimal control and the calculus of variations. In Richard Bellman, editor, *Mathematical Optimization Techniques*. University of California Press, 1963.
- [2] William Levine and Michael Athans. On the determination of the optimal constant output feedback gains for linear multivariable systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, 15(1):44–48, 1970.
- [3] John C. Doyle. Guaranteed margins for LQG regulators. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 23(4):756–757, 1978.

- [4] Kemin Zhou, John C. Doyle, and Keith Glover. *Robust and Optimal Control*. Prentice Hall, 1996.
- [5] Michael Green and David J. N. Limebeer. *Linear Robust Control*. Dover Publications, Inc., 2012.
- [6] Geir E. Dullerud and Fernando Paganini. *A Course in Robust Control Theory: A Convex Approach*. Springer, 2000.
- [7] Carsten Scherer and Siep Weiland. *Linear Matrix Inequalities in Control*. Lecture Notes, 2015. URL: <https://www.imng.uni-stuttgart.de/mst/files/LectureNotes.pdf>.
- [8] Stephen Boyd, Laurent El Ghaoui, Eric Feron, and Venkataramanan Balakrishnan. *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1994.
- [9] Adrian S. Lewis. Nonsmooth optimization and robust control. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 31(2):167–177, 2007.
- [10] Bin Hu, Kaiqing Zhang, Na Li, Mehran Mesbahi, Maryam Fazel, and Tamer Başar. Toward a theoretical foundation of policy optimization for learning control policies. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 6:123–158, 2023.
- [11] Shahriar Talebi, Yang Zheng, Spencer Kraissler, Na Li, and Mehran Mesbahi. Policy optimization in control: Geometry and algorithmic implications. preprint, 2024.
- [12] Benjamin Recht. A tour of reinforcement learning: The view from continuous control. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 2:253–279, 2019.
- [13] Yang Zheng, Chih-fan Pai, and Yujie Tang. Benign nonconvex landscapes in optimal and robust control, Part I: Global optimality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15332*, 2023.
- [14] Luca Furieri, Yang Zheng, and Maryam Kamgarpour. Learning the globally optimal distributed LQ regulator. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Learning for Dynamics and Control*, volume 120 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 287–297, 2020.
- [15] Maryam Fazel, Rong Ge, Sham Kakade, and Mehran Mesbahi. Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1467–1476, 2018.
- [16] Yujie Tang, Yang Zheng, and Na Li. Analysis of the optimization landscape of Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) control. *Mathematical Programming*, 202:399–444, 2023.
- [17] Yang Zheng, Yue Sun, Maryam Fazel, and Na Li. Escaping high-order saddles in policy optimization for Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) control. In *Proceedings of the 61st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5329–5334, 2022.
- [18] Spencer Kraissler and Mehran Mesbahi. Output-feedback synthesis orbit geometry: Quotient manifolds and LQG direct policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17157*, 2024.
- [19] Dante C. Youla, Hamid A. Jabr, and Joseph J. Bongiorno, Jr. Modern Wiener–Hopf design of optimal controllers — Part II: The multivariable case. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 21(3):319–338, 1976.
- [20] Yuh-Shyang Wang, Nikolai Matni, and John C. Doyle. A system-level approach to controller synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 64(10):4079–4093, 2019.
- [21] Luca Furieri, Yang Zheng, Antonis Papachristodoulou, and Maryam Kamgarpour. An input–output parametrization of stabilizing controllers: amidst Youla and system level synthesis. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 3(4):1014–1019, 2019.
- [22] Yang Zheng, Luca Furieri, Antonis Papachristodoulou, Na Li, and Maryam Kamgarpour. On

- the equivalence of Youla, system-level and input-output parameterizations. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(1):413–420, 2021.
- [23] Yang Zheng, Luca Furieri, Maryam Kamgarpour, and Na Li. System-level, input-output and new parameterizations of stabilizing controllers, and their numerical computation. *Automatica*, 140:110211, 2022.
- [24] Pierre Apkarian and Dominikus Noll. Nonsmooth H_∞ synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 51(1):71–86, 2006.
- [25] Hesameddin Mohammadi, Armin Zare, Mahdi Soltanolkotabi, and Mihailo R Jovanović. Convergence and sample complexity of gradient methods for the model-free linear–quadratic regulator problem. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(5):2435–2450, 2022.
- [26] Ilyas Fatkhullin and Boris Polyak. Optimizing static linear feedback: Gradient method. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(5):3887–3911, 2021.
- [27] Kaiqing Zhang, Bin Hu, and Tamer Başar. Policy optimization for \mathcal{H}_2 linear control with \mathcal{H}_∞ robustness guarantee: Implicit regularization and global convergence. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(6):4081–4109, 2021.
- [28] Jingliang Duan, Wenhan Cao, Yang Zheng, and Lin Zhao. On the optimization landscape of dynamic output feedback linear quadratic control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 69(2):920–935, 2024.
- [29] Jack Umenberger, Max Simchowitz, Juan Perdomo, Kaiqing Zhang, and Russ Tedrake. Globally convergent policy search for output estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 22778–22790. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.
- [30] Xiangyuan Zhang, Bin Hu, and Tamer Başar. Learning the Kalman filter with fine-grained sample complexity. In *2023 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2023.
- [31] Bin Hu and Yang Zheng. Connectivity of the feasible and sublevel sets of dynamic output feedback control with robustness constraints. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:442–447, 2022.
- [32] Xingang Guo and Bin Hu. Global convergence of direct policy search for state-feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ robust control: A revisit of nonsmooth synthesis with Goldstein subdifferential. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 32801–32815, 2022.
- [33] Yujie Tang and Yang Zheng. On the global optimality of direct policy search for nonsmooth \mathcal{H}_∞ output-feedback control. In *Proceedings of the 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6148–6153, 2023.
- [34] George Zames. Feedback and optimal sensitivity: Model reference transformations, multiplicative seminorms, and approximate inverses. *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, 26(2):301–320, 1981.
- [35] Bruce A. Francis. *A Course in \mathcal{H}_∞ Control Theory*. Springer, 1987.
- [36] Keith Glover and John C. Doyle. A state space approach to \mathcal{H}_∞ optimal control. In Hendrik Nijmeijer and Johannes M. Schumacher, editors, *Three Decades of Mathematical System Theory: A Collection of Surveys at the Occasion of the 50th Birthday of Jan C. Willems*, pages 179–218. Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- [37] John C. Doyle, Keith Glover, Pramod P. Khargonekar, and Bruce A. Francis. State-space solutions to standard \mathcal{H}_2 and \mathcal{H}_∞ control problems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 34(8):831–847, 1989.
- [38] Keith Glover and Andrew Packard. Some numerical considerations in \mathcal{H}_∞ control. *Systems & Control Letters*, 101:15–20, 2017. Jan C. Willems Memorial Issue, Volume 2.
- [39] Pascal Gahinet and Pierre Apkarian. A linear matrix inequality approach to \mathcal{H}_∞ control. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 4(4):421–448, 1994.

- [40] Carsten Scherer, Pascal Gahinet, and Mahmoud Chilali. Multiobjective output-feedback control via LMI optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 42(7):896–911, 1997.
- [41] Eitan Levin, Joe Kileel, and Nicolas Boumal. The effect of smooth parametrizations on nonconvex optimization landscapes. *Mathematical Programming*, 2024.
- [42] Yue Sun and Maryam Fazel. Learning optimal controllers by policy gradient: Global optimality via convex parameterization. In *Proceedings of the 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 4576–4581, 2021.
- [43] Hamza Fawzi, Joao Gouveia, Pablo A. Parrilo, James Saunderson, and Rekha R. Thomas. Lifting for simplicity: Concise descriptions of convex sets. *SIAM Review*, 64(4):866–918, 2022.
- [44] Stephen Boyd and Craig Barratt. *Linear Controller Design: Limits of Performance*. Prentice-Hall, 1991.
- [45] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [46] J. William Helton and Jiawang Nie. Semidefinite representation of convex sets. *Mathematical Programming*, 122:21–64, 2010.
- [47] Yang Zheng, Giovanni Fantuzzi, and Antonis Papachristodoulou. Chordal and factor-width decompositions for scalable semidefinite and polynomial optimization. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 52:243–279, 2021.
- [48] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar and Roger J-B Wets. *Variational Analysis*. Springer, 2009.
- [49] Hesameddin Mohammadi, Armin Zare, Mahdi Soltanolkotabi, and Mihailo R Jovanović. Global exponential convergence of gradient methods over the nonconvex landscape of the linear quadratic regulator. In *Proceedings of the 58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 7474–7479. IEEE, 2019.
- [50] J. Bernussou, P. L. D. Peres, and J. C. Geromel. A linear programming oriented procedure for quadratic stabilization of uncertain systems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 13(1):65–72, 1989.
- [51] Dhruv Malik, Ashwin Pananjady, Kush Bhatia, Koulik Khamaru, Peter L. Bartlett, and Martin J. Wainwright. Derivative-free methods for policy optimization: Guarantees for linear quadratic systems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(202):1–51, 2020.
- [52] Pramod P. Khargonekar and Mario A. Rotea. Mixed H_2/H_∞ control: A convex optimization approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 36(7):824–837, 1991.
- [53] Florian Dörfler, Mihailo R Jovanović, Michael Chertkov, and Francesco Bullo. Sparsity-promoting optimal wide-area control of power networks. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 29(5):2281–2291, 2014.
- [54] Shengbo Eben Li, Yang Zheng, Keqiang Li, Yujia Wu, J Karl Hedrick, Feng Gao, and Hongwei Zhang. Dynamical modeling and distributed control of connected and automated vehicles: Challenges and opportunities. *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, 9(3):46–58, 2017.
- [55] Michael Rotkowitz and Sanjay Lall. A characterization of convex problems in decentralized control. *IEEE transactions on Automatic Control*, 50(12):1984–1996, 2005.
- [56] Luca Furieri, Yang Zheng, Antonis Papachristodoulou, and Maryam Kamgarpour. Sparsity invariance for convex design of distributed controllers. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 7(4):1836–1847, 2020.

Appendix

This appendix contains auxiliary results, additional discussions, and technical proofs. We divide it into four parts:

- [Appendix A](#) presents some computational details for [Figure 1](#) and [Example 2.2](#).
- [Appendix B](#) reviews stationary points in the benchmark control problems in [Section 4](#).
- [Appendix C](#) presents technical proofs for state feedback control problems ([Section 4.2](#)).
- [Appendix D](#) presents technical proofs for output feedback control problems ([Section 4.3](#)).

A Computational Details

A.1 Details of [Figure 1](#)

For [Figure 1\(a\)](#), we consider $A = 0$ and $B = I_2$. To illustrate the non-convexity of the set

$$\mathcal{K} = \{K \mid A + BK \text{ is stable}\},$$

let us define \mathcal{K}' as the intersection of \mathcal{K} and a linear subspace, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{K}' := \mathcal{K} \cap \left\{ K = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & k_1 \\ k_2 & -1 \end{bmatrix} : k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Using the Routh-Hurwitz criterion, it is straightforward to derive that

$$\mathcal{K}' = \left\{ K = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & k_1 \\ k_2 & -1 \end{bmatrix} : k_1 k_2 < 1 \right\}$$

and thus \mathcal{K}' is a nonconvex set, which implies that \mathcal{K} is also nonconvex. [Figure 1\(a\)](#) plots the projection of \mathcal{K}' onto (k_1, k_2) .

[Figure 1\(b\)](#) illustrates the nonconvex landscape of an LQR example. We consider

$$A = 0, \quad B = B_w = Q = R = I_2$$

in the problem formulation [\(21\)](#). The feasible set has been demonstrated in [Figure 1\(a\)](#). By fixing the diagonal entries of K to be -1 (i.e., $K \in \mathcal{K}'$), the LQR cost around the optimal policy $K = -I_2$ is shown in [Figure 1\(b\)](#), where the red dot corresponds to the optimal policy K^* .

[Figure 1\(c\)](#) illustrates the nonconvex and nonsmooth landscape of an \mathcal{H}_∞ instance. We consider

$$A = B = C = Q = R = W = V = 1$$

in the problem formulation [\(42\)](#). We consider the set \mathcal{C}_1 of full-order dynamic output feedback policies defined in [\(34a\)](#). Using the Routh-Hurwitz criterion, \mathcal{C}_1 is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \left\{ \mathbb{K} = \begin{bmatrix} D_{\mathbb{K}} & C_{\mathbb{K}} \\ B_{\mathbb{K}} & A_{\mathbb{K}} \end{bmatrix} : A_{\mathbb{K}} + D_{\mathbb{K}} < -1, B_{\mathbb{K}} C_{\mathbb{K}} < A_{\mathbb{K}} + A_{\mathbb{K}} D_{\mathbb{K}} \right\}$$

By fixing $A_{\mathbb{K}} = -1$ and $D_{\mathbb{K}} = -1 - \sqrt{3}$, the \mathcal{H}_∞ cost around the dynamic policy $\mathbb{K} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 - \sqrt{3} & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ is shown in [Figure 1\(c\)](#), where a set of nonsmooth points are highlighted by red lines.

A.2 Details of Example 2.2

Example 2.2 is a particular application of Remark 4.1. Using the problem formulation (21), this is an LQR example with matrices

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_w = 2I_2, \quad Q = I_2, \quad R = 1.$$

Let $K = [k_1 \ k_2] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2}$. The set of stabilizing policies is given by

$$\mathcal{K} := \{K : A + BK \text{ is Hurwitz}\} = \{K : k_1 \in \mathbb{R}, k_2 < -1\}.$$

For $K \in \mathcal{K}$, the LQR cost function can be evaluated by

$$J_{\text{LQR}}(k_1, k_2) = \text{tr} \left((Q + K^\top R K) X \right) = \text{tr} \left((I + K^\top K) X \right), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where X is the unique positive definite solution to the Lyapunov equation below, and can be explicitly expressed in terms of k_1 and k_2 as follows

$$(A + BK)X + X(A + BK)^\top + B_w B_w^\top = 0, \quad X = \frac{1}{k_2^2 - 1} \begin{bmatrix} k_2^2 - 1 & -k_1(k_2 + 1) \\ -k_1(k_2 + 1) & k_1^2 - 2k_2 + 2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Substituting X in (A.2) into (A.1) gives

$$J_{\text{LQR}}(k_1, k_2) = \frac{1 - 2k_2 + 3k_2^2 - 2k_2^3 - 2k_1^2 k_2}{k_2^2 - 1}, \quad \forall k_1 \in \mathbb{R}, k_2 < -1.$$

Let $Y = [y_1 \ y_2]$. Now define the change of variables $Y = g(K) := KX$, i.e.,

$$y_1 = \frac{k_1}{1 - k_2}, \quad y_2 = \frac{2k_2 - 2k_2^2 - k_1^2}{k_2^2 - 1}, \quad \forall k_1 \in \mathbb{R}, k_2 < -1, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and note that g is invertible with its inverse $K = g^{-1}(Y) = YX^{-1}$. We then define

$$h(y_1, y_2) := J_{\text{LQR}}(g^{-1}(y_1, y_2)) = \text{tr} \left(QX + X^{-1}Y^\top RY \right) = \text{tr} \left(X + X^{-1}Y^\top Y \right), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where X is now viewed as the unique positive definite solution to the Lyapunov equation below, and can be explicitly solved in terms of y_1 and y_2 as follows

$$AX + XA^\top + (B_w B_w^\top + BY + Y^\top B^\top) = 0, \quad X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_1 \\ y_1 & -y_2 - 2 \end{bmatrix} \succ 0. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Substituting X in (A.5) into (A.4) gives

$$h(y_1, y_2) = -y_2 - 1 + [y_1 \ y_2] \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_1 \\ y_1 & -y_2 - 2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \forall \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_1 \\ y_1 & -y_2 - 2 \end{bmatrix} \succ 0.$$

Note that the inverse mapping $g^{-1}(Y) = YX^{-1}$ is given by

$$k_1 = \frac{2y_1(y_2 + 1)}{y_1^2 + y_2 + 2}, \quad k_2 = \frac{y_1^2 - y_2}{y_1^2 + y_2 + 2},$$

and one can verify both $g \circ g^{-1}$ and $g^{-1} \circ g$ are the identity functions. We next show that the epigraph of h , $\text{epi}_{\geq}(h) := \{(y_1, y_2, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \gamma \geq h(y_1, y_2)\}$, is a convex set. From the Schur complement, we have

$$\gamma \geq h(y_1, y_2) = \text{tr} \left(X + X^{-1}Y^\top Y \right) \Leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \gamma - \text{tr}(X) & Y \\ Y^\top & X \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0$$

and thus

$$\text{epi}_{\geq}(h) = \left\{ (y, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \begin{bmatrix} \gamma + y_2 + 1 & y^\top \\ y & \text{aff}(y) \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \text{aff}(y) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_1 \\ y_1 & -y_2 - 2 \end{bmatrix} \succ 0 \right\}.$$

B Stationary Points in Optimal and Robust Control

In this section, we review (sub)-gradient computations of the benchmark control problems in [Section 4](#). To further illustrate our ECL framework, we also provide examples of stationary points in the benchmark control problems.

B.1 State Feedback Policy Optimization

For convenience, we recall that the set of stabilizing static state feedback policies is

$$\mathcal{K} := \{K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \mid \max_i \operatorname{Re} \lambda_i(A + BK) < 0\},$$

and the closed-loop transfer function from w to z is

$$\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s) = \begin{bmatrix} Q^{1/2} \\ R^{1/2}K \end{bmatrix} (sI - A - BK)^{-1} B_w. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

B.1.1 The LQR Problem (22)

It is well known that for $K \in \mathcal{K}$, the LQR cost $J_{\text{LQR}}(K)$ in (22) can be evaluated by

$$J_{\text{LQR}}(K) = \operatorname{tr} \left((Q + K^\top RK) X_K \right) = \operatorname{tr}(P_K W), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where X_K and P_K are the unique positive semidefinite solutions to the Lyapunov equations

$$(A + BK)X_K + X_K(A + BK)^\top + W = 0, \quad (\text{B.3a})$$

$$(A + BK)^\top P_K + P_K(A + BK) + Q + K^\top RK = 0. \quad (\text{B.3b})$$

The computation in (B.2) can be seen from (13) in [Lemma 4.1](#). Note that we can also see the equality of $\operatorname{tr} \left((Q + K^\top RK) X_K \right) = \operatorname{tr}(P_K W)$ from the manipulation of the Lyapunov equations (B.3) and the trace operator, as shown below

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr} \left((Q + K^\top RK) X_K \right) &= -\operatorname{tr} \left(((A + BK)^\top P_K + P_K(A + BK)) X_K \right) \\ &= -\operatorname{tr} \left(P_K (X_K(A + BK)^\top + (A + BK)X_K) \right) = \operatorname{tr}(P_K W), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality uses the fact $-Q - K^\top RK = (A + BK)^\top P_K + P_K(A + BK)$ from (B.3b), the second equality is from the trace property, and the last equality applies $-W = (A + BK)X_K + X_K(A + BK)^\top$ from (B.3a).

From (B.2) and (B.3), it is clear that $J_{\text{LQR}}(K)$ is a rational function (i.e., a ratio of two polynomials) with respect to the elements of K , thus it is infinitely differentiable over \mathcal{K} . Indeed, we have a closed-form formula to compute its gradient at any point $K \in \mathcal{K}$.

Lemma B.1 ([2, Section IV]). *The LQR cost in (22) is infinitely differentiable over \mathcal{K} . Its gradient is given by*

$$\nabla J_{\text{LQR}}(K) = 2(RK + B^\top P_K)X_K, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}.$$

where X_K and P_K are the unique positive semidefinite solutions to Lyapunov equations (B.3).

If $(A + BK, B_w)$ is controllable, then X_K from (B.3a) is always positive definite. Then, the only case for the stationary condition $\nabla J_{\text{LQR}}(K) = 0$ is $RK + B^\top P_K = 0$, which implies

$$K = -R^{-1}B^\top P_K.$$

Plugging this into (B.3b) leads to the famous Riccati equation $A^\top P_K + P_K A + Q - P_K B R^{-1} B^\top P_K = 0$. We summarize this fact into the following lemma.

Lemma B.2. *Suppose $(A + BK, B_w)$ is controllable for all $K \in \mathcal{K}$ (which is implied by B_w being full row rank), then the LQR cost (22) has a unique stationary point, which is in the form of $K^* = -R^{-1}B^\top P^* \in \mathcal{K}$, where P^* is the unique stabilizing solution to the following Riccati equation*

$$A^\top P^* + P^* A + Q - P^* B R^{-1} B^\top P^* = 0. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

It is well-known that the Riccati equation (B.4) has a unique positive semidefinite solution P^* when (A, B) is stabilizable and $(Q^{1/2}, A)$ is detectable [4, Corollary 13.8]. This solution is also stabilizing (i.e., $A - B R^{-1} B^\top P^*$ is stable, implying $K^* = -R^{-1}B^\top P^* \in \mathcal{K}$). From the classical result in [4, Theorem 14.2], the unique stationary point in Lemma B.2 is indeed globally optimal, which is consistent with our ECL guarantee in Theorem 3.2.

Example B.1. We here provide a simple example to illustrate Lemma B.1 and B.2. Consider LQR with problem data from Example 2.2, i.e.,

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_w = 2I_2, \quad Q = I_2, \quad R = 1.$$

Consider for instance $K = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{K}$, i.e., $A + BK$ is Hurwitz. It is straightforward to solve the Lyapunov equations (B.3) and get

$$X_K = \frac{1}{3} \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 7 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_K = \frac{1}{12} \begin{bmatrix} 7 & 2 \\ 2 & 30 \end{bmatrix},$$

which are both positive definite. Then, its cost and policy gradient can be evaluated via (B.2) and Lemma B.1 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\text{LQR}}(K) &= \text{tr} \left((Q + K^\top R K) X_K \right) = \text{tr}(P_K W) = 12 \frac{1}{3}, \\ \nabla J_{\text{LQR}}(K) &= 2(RK + B^\top P_K) X_K = \frac{1}{9} [24 \quad 28]. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma B.2, by solving the Riccati equation (B.4), we obtain the unique stabilizing solution P^* and the unique stationary point as follows

$$P^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0.25 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad K^* = -R^{-1}B^\top P^* = [0 \quad -1 - \sqrt{2}].$$

It is easy to verify that $\nabla J_{\text{LQR}}(K^*) = 0$ and $J_{\text{LQR}}(K^*) = 5 + 4\sqrt{2}$. This controller is the globally optimal policy, which is consistent with our ECL guarantee in Theorem 3.2.

B.1.2 The State Feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ Control Problem (25)

The \mathcal{H}_∞ cost J_∞ in (25) is in general nonconvex and also nonsmooth. A nice property is that J_∞ is subdifferential regular [24, Proposition 3.1], [13, Lemma 5.1]. We here briefly discuss the computation of the Clarke subdifferential of $J_\infty(K)$.

Let $j\mathbb{R}$ denote the imaginary axis in \mathbb{C} . Fix $K \in \mathcal{K}$, and define the set of frequencies achieving the \mathcal{H}_∞ norm as

$$\mathcal{Z} := \{s \in j\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \mid \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s)) = J_\infty(K)\},$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s)$ is the closed-loop transfer function from w to z in (B.1). For each $s \in \mathcal{Z}$, let Q_s be a complex matrix whose columns form an orthonormal basis of the eigenspace of $\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s)\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s)^H$ associated with its maximal eigenvalue $J_\infty^2(K)$, where $(\cdot)^H$ denotes the Hermitian transpose.

The following lemma characterizes the subdifferential $\partial J_\infty(K)$, which is a special case in [13, Lemma 5.2].

Lemma B.3 ([13, Lemma 5.2]). *Fix $K \in \mathcal{K}$. A matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is a member of $\partial J_\infty(K)$ if and only if there exist finitely many $s_1, \dots, s_q \in \mathcal{Z}$ and positive semidefinite Hermitian matrices Y_1, \dots, Y_q of compatible dimensions with $\sum_{\kappa=1}^q \text{tr}(Y_\kappa) = 1$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi = \frac{1}{J_\infty(K)} \sum_{\kappa=1}^q \text{Re} \left\{ (s_\kappa I - A - BK)^{-1} B_w \cdot \mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, s_\kappa)^H Q_{s_\kappa} Y_\kappa Q_{s_\kappa}^H \right. \\ \left. \cdot \left(\begin{bmatrix} Q^{1/2} \\ R^{1/2} K \end{bmatrix} (s_\kappa I - A - BK)^{-1} B_w + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ R^{1/2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\}^\top. \end{aligned}$$

This result is stronger than previous subdifferential calculations in [24], as it presents sufficient and necessary conditions for the subdifferential even when the \mathcal{H}_∞ norm is attained at infinitely many frequencies; see a technical comparison in [13, Remark B.1]. As shown in Lemma B.3, the analytical computation of $\partial J_\infty(K)$ for the \mathcal{H}_∞ cost in (25) is much more complicated than the smooth LQR case in Lemma B.1.

We here present arguably the simplest \mathcal{H}_∞ instance in Example 2.3, which involves an open-loop stable system with one scalar state. As we have seen, this \mathcal{H}_∞ example is already nonconvex.

Example B.2 (Nonconvex and smooth \mathcal{H}_∞ instance). Consider the \mathcal{H}_∞ state feedback policy optimization (25) with problem data

$$A = -1, \quad B = 1, \quad B_w = 1, \quad Q = 0.1, \quad R = 1.$$

It turns out that this simple example has a nonconvex differentiable cost function

$$J_\infty(K) = \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \sqrt{\frac{0.1 + K^2}{(1 - K)^2 + \omega^2}} = \frac{\sqrt{0.1 + K^2}}{1 - K}, \quad \forall K < 1, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

whose gradient is given by

$$\nabla J_\infty(K) = \frac{0.1 + K}{(1 - K)^2 \sqrt{0.1 + K^2}}, \quad \forall K < 1. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

The optimal policy occurs at the stationary point $K^* = -0.1$ with $J_\infty(K^*) = 0.3015$.

Note that for this differentiable case, the subgradient computation using Lemma B.3 yields the same value as the gradient. Indeed from (B.5), one can see that for all $K < 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{0\}, \quad \mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, 0)^\top = \frac{1}{1 - K} [\sqrt{0.1} \quad K], \quad Q_0^\top = \frac{1}{\sqrt{0.1 + K^2}} [\sqrt{0.1} \quad K],$$




Figure 8: Optimization landscape of the state feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ instances: (a) nonconvex and smooth J_∞ in [Example B.2](#); (b) nonconvex and nonsmooth J_∞ in [Example B.3](#).

where Q_0 is an orthonormal eigenvector of $\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, 0)\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, 0)^\top$ associated with the maximal eigenvalue $J_\infty^2(K) = (0.1 + K^2)/(1 - K)^2$. The only choice for Y_1 is $Y_1 = 1$ to satisfy $\text{tr}(Y_1) = 1$. Therefore, the subgradient at K only contains one element given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \frac{1}{J_\infty(K)} \left((-A - BK)^{-1} B_w \cdot \mathbf{T}_{zw}(K, 0)^\top Q_0 Y_1 Q_0^\top \cdot \left(\begin{bmatrix} Q^{1/2} \\ R^{1/2} K \end{bmatrix} (-A - BK)^{-1} B + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ R^{1/2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)^\top \\ &= \frac{1 - K}{\sqrt{0.1 + K^2}} \left(\frac{1}{(1 - K)^3 (0.1 + K^2)} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{0.1} & K \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & \sqrt{0.1} K \\ \sqrt{0.1} K & K^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{0.1} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \frac{0.1 + K}{(1 - K)^2 \sqrt{0.1 + K^2}} = \nabla J_\infty(K). \end{aligned}$$

The fact that $\Phi = \nabla J_\infty$ also confirms the differentiability of J_∞ in this instance. The nonconvex landscape is illustrated in [Figure 8a](#). \square

Example B.3 (Nonconvex and nonsmooth \mathcal{H}_∞ instance). Consider the \mathcal{H}_∞ state feedback policy optimization [\(25\)](#) with problem data

$$A = -I_2, \quad B = B_w = Q = R = I_2.$$

The \mathcal{H}_∞ problem is nonconvex since its feasible set \mathcal{K} is already nonconvex. Indeed, we can find $K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.1 \\ 9.9 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{K}$ and $K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 9.9 \\ 0.1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{K}$ but $(K_1 + K_2)/2 \notin \mathcal{K}$.

By solving the equivalent convex problem in [\(29\)](#), the optimal policy is given by $K^* = -I_2$, which is a Clarke stationary point, i.e., $0 \in \partial J_\infty(K^*)$. In addition, we can check that there exist multiple subgradients for all $K_\ell = \begin{bmatrix} k & 0 \\ 0 & k \end{bmatrix}$ where $k < 0$, justifying the nonsmoothness of J_∞ . Indeed, the cost at K_ℓ can be evaluated by

$$J_\infty(K_\ell) = \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K_\ell, i\omega)^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{T}_{zw}(K_\ell, i\omega)) = \frac{\sqrt{k^2 + 1}}{1 - k}, \quad \forall K_\ell = \begin{bmatrix} k & 0 \\ 0 & k \end{bmatrix}, \quad k < 0,$$

where the supremum occurs at $\omega = 0$. Since the maximal eigenvalue $J_\infty^2(K_\ell)$ of $\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K_\ell, 0)\mathbf{T}_{zw}(K_\ell, 0)^\mathbf{H}$ has algebraic multiplicities equal to 2, the corresponding eigenspace has dimension equal to 2. Therefore, in [Lemma B.3](#), one has the freedom to choose different $Y_1 \in \mathbb{S}_+^2$ to find multiple subgradients at K_ℓ as long as $\text{tr}(Y_1) = 1$.

By fixing the off-diagonal entries of K to be 0, i.e., $K = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & 0 \\ 0 & k_2 \end{bmatrix}$, we illustrate the nonsmooth \mathcal{H}_∞ cost $J_\infty(K)$ around the optimal policy K^* in [Figure 8b](#), where the red dot corresponds to K^* and the red dash line corresponds to K_ℓ . It is clear that $J_\infty(K)$ is nonsmooth on the red dash line. \square

B.2 Output Feedback Policy Optimization

We briefly review the gradient computation for LQG cost and the Clarke subdifferential characterization for the \mathcal{H}_∞ cost. More detailed discussions on the structure of stationary points can be found in [\[16\]](#) and Part I of this paper [\[13\]](#).

B.2.1 The LQG Problem [\(37\)](#)

It is known that the LQG cost function $J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})$ can be computed by solving a Lyapunov equation, which is summarized in the lemma below.

Lemma B.4. *Fix $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{C}_{q,0} \neq \emptyset$. Given any $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,0}$, we have*

$$J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K}) = \sqrt{\text{tr}(C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})X_{\mathbf{K}}C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top)} = \sqrt{\text{tr}(B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top Y_{\mathbf{K}}B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}))}, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ and $Y_{\mathbf{K}}$ are the unique positive semidefinite solutions to the following Lyapunov equations

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & BC_{\mathbf{K}} \\ B_{\mathbf{K}}C & A_{\mathbf{K}} \end{bmatrix} X_{\mathbf{K}} + X_{\mathbf{K}} \begin{bmatrix} A & BC_{\mathbf{K}} \\ B_{\mathbf{K}}C & A_{\mathbf{K}} \end{bmatrix}^\top + \begin{bmatrix} W & 0 \\ 0 & B_{\mathbf{K}}V B_{\mathbf{K}}^\top \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad (\text{B.8a})$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & BC_{\mathbf{K}} \\ B_{\mathbf{K}}C & A_{\mathbf{K}} \end{bmatrix}^\top Y_{\mathbf{K}} + Y_{\mathbf{K}} \begin{bmatrix} A & BC_{\mathbf{K}} \\ B_{\mathbf{K}}C & A_{\mathbf{K}} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & C_{\mathbf{K}}^\top R C_{\mathbf{K}} \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (\text{B.8b})$$

Recall that the LQG cost $J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})$ is a real analytical function over its domain $\mathcal{C}_{q,0}$ [\[16, Lemma 2.3\]](#), which implies that $J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})$ is infinitely differentiable. The following lemma gives the closed-form expression to compute the gradient of $J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})$.

Lemma B.5 ([\[16, Lemma 4.2\]](#)). *Fix $q \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{C}_{q,0} \neq \emptyset$. For every $\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C_{\mathbf{K}} \\ B_{\mathbf{K}} & A_{\mathbf{K}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,0}$, the gradient of $J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})$ is given by*

$$\frac{\partial J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})}{\partial A_{\mathbf{K}}} = \frac{1}{J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})} \left(Y_{12}^\top X_{12} + Y_{22} X_{22} \right), \quad (\text{B.9a})$$

$$\frac{\partial J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})}{\partial B_{\mathbf{K}}} = \frac{1}{J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})} \left(Y_{22} B_{\mathbf{K}} V + Y_{22} X_{12}^\top C^\top + Y_{12}^\top X_{11} C^\top \right), \quad (\text{B.9b})$$

$$\frac{\partial J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})}{\partial C_{\mathbf{K}}} = \frac{1}{J_{\text{LQG},q}(\mathbf{K})} \left(R C_{\mathbf{K}} X_{22} + B^\top Y_{11} X_{12} + B^\top Y_{12} X_{22} \right), \quad (\text{B.9c})$$

where $X_{\mathbf{K}}$ and $Y_{\mathbf{K}}$, partitioned as

$$X_{\mathbf{K}} = \begin{bmatrix} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ X_{12}^\top & X_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_{\mathbf{K}} = \begin{bmatrix} Y_{11} & Y_{12} \\ Y_{12}^\top & Y_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

are the unique positive semidefinite solutions to [\(B.8a\)](#) and [\(B.8b\)](#), respectively.

B.2.2 The Output Feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ Control Problem (42)

The \mathcal{H}_∞ cost $J_{\infty,n}(\mathbf{K})$ in (42) is in general nonconvex and also nonsmooth. A nice property is that $J_{\infty,n}$ is subdifferential regular [24, Proposition 3.1], [13, Lemma 5.1]. We here briefly discuss the computation of the Clarke subdifferential of $J_{\infty,n}(\mathbf{K})$ at any feasible point $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_n$.

Let $j\mathbb{R}$ denote the imaginary axis in \mathbb{C} . Fix $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_q$, and define

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{s \in j\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \mid \sigma_{\max}(\mathbf{T}_{zd}(\mathbf{K}, s)) = J_{\infty,n}(\mathbf{K})\}.$$

For each $s \in \mathcal{Z}$, let Q_s be a complex matrix whose columns form an orthonormal basis of the eigenspace of $\mathbf{T}_{zd}(\mathbf{K}, s)\mathbf{T}_{zd}(\mathbf{K}, s)^H$ associated with its maximal eigenvalue $J_{\infty,n}^2(\mathbf{K})$. The following lemma characterizes the subdifferential $\partial J_{\infty,n}(\mathbf{K})$, whose proof is technically involved and presented in [13, Lemma 5.2].

Lemma B.6. *A matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}$ is a member of $\partial J_{\infty,n}(\mathbf{K})$ if and only if there exist finitely many $s_1, \dots, s_K \in \mathcal{Z}$ and associated positive semidefinite Hermitian matrices Y_1, \dots, Y_K with $\sum_{\kappa=1}^K \text{tr} Y_\kappa = 1$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi = \frac{1}{J_{\infty,n}(\mathbf{K})} \sum_{\kappa=1}^K \text{Re} \left\{ \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & V^{1/2} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} (s_\kappa I - A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}))^{-1} B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \right) \mathbf{T}_{zd}(\mathbf{K}, s_\kappa)^H Q_{s_\kappa} Y_\kappa Q_{s_\kappa}^H \right. \\ \left. \cdot \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ R^{1/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} + C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})(s_\kappa I - A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}))^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\}^\top. \end{aligned}$$

We refer the interested reader to Part I of this paper [13, Section 5] for analytical examples of Clarke stationary points in \mathcal{H}_∞ control.

C Proofs for State Feedback Policy Optimization

In this section, we provide some extra discussions and missing proofs for ECL applied to the policy optimization problems for state feedback control in Section 4.2.

C.1 Convexity of \mathcal{F}_{LQR}

We provide some details to show that the following matrix fractional function arising in LQR

$$f(X, Y) = \text{tr}(QX + X^{-1}Y^\top RY), \quad \text{dom}(f) := \{(X, Y) \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}\}$$

is convex. This is a known fact; see e.g., [52, Lemma 4.4] and [25, Section IV.A].

First, $\text{dom}(f)$ is evidently a convex set. Second, note that

$$f(X, Y) = \text{tr}(QX) + \text{tr}\left((Y^\top R^{1/2})^\top X^{-1} Y^\top R^{1/2}\right) = \text{tr}(QX) + \sum_{i=1}^n g(X, (Y^\top R^{1/2})_i),$$

where $(Y^\top R^{1/2})_i$ denotes the i -th column of $Y^\top R^{1/2}$, and

$$g(X, w) = w^\top X^{-1} w, \quad X \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n, w \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Since $X \mapsto \text{tr}(QX)$ is linear and $Y \mapsto (Y^\top R^{1/2})_i$ is a linear transformation, it suffices to show that $g(X, w)$ is jointly convex in (X, w) , or that the epigraph $\text{epi}_{\succeq}(g) = \{(X, w, \gamma) \mid X \succ 0, \gamma \geq g(X, w)\}$ is convex. By using Schur complement, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{epi}_{\succeq}(g) &= \left\{ (X, w, \gamma) \mid X \succ 0, \gamma \geq w^\top X^{-1} w \right\} \\ &= \left\{ (X, w, \gamma) \mid X \succ 0, \begin{bmatrix} \gamma & w^\top \\ w & X \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

which is a convex set. The proof is now complete.

C.2 Proofs for State Feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ Control

C.2.1 A Non-coercive Example of State Feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ Policy Optimization

[Example 2.3](#) has already shown the \mathcal{H}_∞ cost function is not coercive, but the globally optimal policy is achieved. In [Example 2.3](#), the system is open-loop stable. Here, we show another simple instance where the \mathcal{H}_∞ cost function is not coercive, and the optimal \mathcal{H}_∞ policy is not attained.

Consider a state feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ instance [\(24\)](#) with the following problem data (which is open-loop unstable):

$$A = 1, B = -1, B_w = 1, Q = 1, R = 1.$$

This \mathcal{H}_∞ instance satisfies all the assumptions in [Fact 4.1](#), i.e. (A, B) is controllable, B_w has full row rank, and $Q \succ 0, R \succ 0$. Let us consider a linear state feedback policy $u(t) = kx(t)$ with stabilizing $k > 1$. According to [\(20\)](#) and after some simple calculations, we can compute the \mathcal{H}_∞ cost function analytically below

$$\begin{aligned} J_\infty(k) &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} (s - (1 - k))^{-1} \right\|_\infty = \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \lambda_{\max}^{1/2} \left((-i\omega - (1 - k))^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} (i\omega - (1 - k))^{-1} \right) \\ &= \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \sqrt{\frac{1 + k^2}{(k - 1)^2 + \omega^2}} = \frac{\sqrt{1 + k^2}}{k - 1}, \quad \forall k > 1. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} J_\infty(k) = 1$, and this function is not coercive. The infimum of $J_\infty(k)$ is not attained (we have $\inf_{k > 1} J_\infty(k) = 1$, requiring $k \rightarrow \infty$). In this example, there exists no finite Clarke stationary point.

Moreover, for this instance, we will see that the corresponding LMI in [\(29\)](#) is not solvable. Indeed, the problem $\inf_{(\gamma, y, x) \in \mathcal{F}_\infty} \gamma$ reads as

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\gamma, y, x} \gamma \\ &\text{subject to } x > 0, \begin{bmatrix} 2(x - y) & 1 & x & -y \\ 1 & -\gamma & 0 & 0 \\ x & 0 & -\gamma & 0 \\ -y & 0 & 0 & -\gamma \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

which, via the Shur complement, is equivalent to (note that it is easy to see that $\gamma > 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\gamma, y, x} \gamma \\ &\text{subject to } x > 0, 2(x - y) + \gamma^{-1}(1 + x^2 + y^2) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to argue that achieving the infimum requires $(\gamma, y, x) = (1, 1, 0)$. However, this point $(1, 1, 0)$ is on the boundary but outside \mathcal{F}_∞ , and we have $k = yx^{-1} = \infty$. The feasible region of \mathcal{F}_∞ in [\(C.1\)](#) is shown in [Figure 9](#).




Figure 9: The LMI feasible region \mathcal{F}_∞ in (C.1) of the 1-dim \mathcal{H}_∞ example. The infimum of (C.1) is achieved on the boundary point $(\gamma, y, x) = (1, 1, 0) \notin \mathcal{F}_\infty$ (highlighted as the red circle). In this case, the corresponding controller $k = yx^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$.

C.2.2 Proof of Proposition 4.2

We divide the proof of Proposition 4.2 into two parts.

Part I: Proving $\text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty) = \pi_{K,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_\infty)$.

We first prove the inclusion $\text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty) \subseteq \pi_{K,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_\infty)$. Let $(K, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty)$ be arbitrary. We then have $K \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\gamma \geq J_\infty(K)$. With $A + BK$ stable and $(A + BK, B_w)$ controllable (since B_w has full row rank), it follows from the non-strict version of Lemma 4.2 that there exists a symmetric matrix P satisfying the LMI in (26). We now argue that $P \succ 0$. Indeed by Schur complement, (26) is equivalent to

$$(A + BK)^\top P + P(A + BK) + \gamma^{-1} \left(Q + K^\top R K + P B_w B_w^\top P \right) \preceq 0,$$

which implies that P is a solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$(A + BK)^\top P + P(A + BK) + Q' = 0 \tag{C.2}$$

for some $Q' \succ 0$ since $Q \succ 0$. With $A + BK$ stable and $Q' \succ 0$, the standard Lyapunov argument [4, Lemma 3.18 (ii)] guarantees $P \succ 0$. Thus, we have $(K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$. By the arbitrariness of $(K, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty)$, we know $\text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty) \subseteq \pi_{K,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_\infty)$.

Next we show the inclusion $\pi_{K,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_\infty) \subseteq \text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty)$. Let $(K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$. Using the same argument as above, we know that $P \succ 0$ is a solution to (C.2) for some $Q' \succ 0$, and thus the standard Lyapunov argument [4, Lemma 3.19 (ii)] guarantees that $A + BK$ is stable, i.e., $K \in \mathcal{K}$. With $A + BK$ stable, it follows from the non-strict version of Lemma 4.2 that $\gamma \geq J_\infty(K)$. Thus $(K, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty)$, and by the arbitrariness of $(K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$ we have $\pi_{K,\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_\infty) \subseteq \text{epi}_\geq(J_\infty)$. The proof of Part I is now complete.

Part II: Proving Φ_∞ is a diffeomorphism between \mathcal{L}_∞ and \mathcal{F}_∞ .

Consider the mapping Φ_∞ given by $\Phi_\infty(K, \gamma, P) = (\gamma, KP^{-1}, P^{-1})$ in (28). We will first show that $\Phi_\infty(\mathcal{L}_\infty) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\infty$, i.e.,

$$\Phi_\infty(K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{F}_\infty, \quad \forall (K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty.$$

Let $(K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$ be arbitrary, and let $X = P^{-1} \succ 0$ and $Y = KP^{-1}$ so that $\Phi_\infty(K, \gamma, P) =$

(γ, Y, X) . We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \succ 0 \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} (A+BK)^\top P + P(A+BK) & PB_w & Q^{1/2} & K^\top R^{1/2} \\ B_w^\top P & -\gamma I & 0 & 0 \\ Q^{1/2} & 0 & -\gamma I & 0 \\ R^{1/2} K & 0 & 0 & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0 \\
\iff X \succ 0 \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} X & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (A+BK)^\top P + P(A+BK) & PB_w & C^\top \\ B_w^\top P & -\gamma I & 0 \\ C & 0 & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0 \\
\iff X \succ 0 \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} AX + BY + XA^\top + Y^\top B^\top & B_w & XQ^{1/2} & Y^\top R^{1/2} \\ B_w^\top & -\gamma I & 0 & 0 \\ Q^{1/2} X & 0 & -\gamma I & 0 \\ R^{1/2} Y & 0 & 0 & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $(\gamma, Y, X) \in \mathcal{F}_\infty$. By the definitions of \mathcal{L}_∞ and \mathcal{F}_∞ we see that $\Phi_\infty(\mathcal{L}_\infty) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\infty$.

Then, we define the mapping

$$\Psi_\infty(\gamma, Y, X) = (YX^{-1}, \gamma, X^{-1}), \quad \forall (\gamma, Y, X) \in \mathcal{F}_\infty. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

By reversing the derivation above, we can easily verify that $\Psi_\infty(\mathcal{F}_\infty) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\infty$.

Finally, it is straightforward to check that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_\infty \circ \Psi_\infty(\gamma, Y, X) &= (\gamma, Y, X), \quad \forall (\gamma, Y, X) \in \mathcal{L}_\infty \\
\Psi_\infty \circ \Phi_\infty(K, \gamma, P) &= (K, \gamma, P), \quad \forall (K, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{F}_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e., we have $\Phi_\infty^{-1} = \Psi_\infty$. It is clear that Φ_∞ in (28) and its inverse Ψ_∞ in (C.3) are both in fact C^∞ over their domains, since each element of Φ_∞ or Ψ_∞ is a rational function.

D Proofs for Output Feedback Policy Optimization

In this section, we provide some extra discussions and missing proofs for ECL applied to output feedback control problems (Section 4.3).

D.1 Auxiliary Notations and Results

Here we present some auxiliary notations and results for subsequent analysis. Note that with the notations in (36), the closed-loop matrices in (33b) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) &= \begin{bmatrix} A + B_2 D_{\mathbf{K}} C_2 & B_2 C_{\mathbf{K}} \\ B_{\mathbf{K}} C_2 & A_{\mathbf{K}} \end{bmatrix}, & B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) &= \begin{bmatrix} B_1 + B_2 D_{\mathbf{K}} D_{21} \\ B_{\mathbf{K}} D_{21} \end{bmatrix}, \\
C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) &= [C_1 + D_{12} D_{\mathbf{K}} C_2 \quad D_{12} C_{\mathbf{K}}], & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) &= D_{12} D_{\mathbf{K}} D_{21}.
\end{aligned}$$

We will extensively use the inverse identity for a 2 by 2 block matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} (M_{11} - M_{12} M_{22}^{-1} M_{21})^{-1} & - (M_{11} - M_{12} M_{22}^{-1} M_{21})^{-1} M_{12} M_{22}^{-1} \\ -M_{22}^{-1} M_{21} (M_{11} - M_{12} M_{22}^{-1} M_{21})^{-1} & (M_{22} - M_{21} M_{11}^{-1} M_{12})^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where $M = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ is any invertible matrix. It turns out that it will be convenient to introduce the mappings Φ_M and Φ_Λ defined on $\mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)} \times \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_M(\mathbf{K}, P) &:= P_{12}B_{\mathbf{K}}C_2(P^{-1})_{11} + P_{11}B_2C_{\mathbf{K}}(P^{-1})_{21} + P_{12}A_{\mathbf{K}}(P^{-1})_{21} \\ &\quad + P_{11}(A + B_2D_{\mathbf{K}}C_2)(P^{-1})_{11}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2a})$$

$$\Phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{K}, P) := \begin{bmatrix} D_{\mathbf{K}} & D_{\mathbf{K}}C_2(P^{-1})_{11} + C_{\mathbf{K}}(P^{-1})_{21} \\ P_{11}B_2D_{\mathbf{K}} + P_{12}B_{\mathbf{K}} & \Phi_M(\mathbf{K}, P) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{D.2b})$$

where the parameter \mathbf{K} is partitioned as (32). We also define the mappings $\Psi_{\mathbf{K}}$ and Ψ_P by

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{K}}(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi) := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ YB_2 & \Xi \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \left(\Lambda - \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m \times p} & 0_{m \times n} \\ 0_{n \times p} & YAX \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} I & C_2X \\ 0 & -\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \quad (\text{D.3a})$$

$$\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi) := \begin{bmatrix} Y & \Xi \\ \Xi^\top & \Xi^\top(Y - X^{-1})^{-1}\Xi \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{D.3b})$$

for any $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}$, $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$ and $X, Y \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ satisfying $\begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \succ 0$. Note that $\begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \succ 0$ implies $X \succ 0$ and $Y - X^{-1} \succ 0$ by Schur complement, which is why we can invert $Y - X^{-1}$ and $-\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X$ in the definitions of Ψ_P and $\Psi_{\mathbf{K}}$. By straightforward algebraic calculation, it can be checked that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Psi_{\mathbf{K}}\left(\begin{bmatrix} G & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}, X, Y, \Xi\right) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -\Xi^{-1}YB_2 & \Xi^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} G & F \\ H & M - YAX \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & -C_2X(-\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X)^{-1} \\ 0 & (-\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} G & (F - GC_2X)(-\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X)^{-1} \\ \Xi^{-1}(H - YB_2G) & \Xi^{-1}(M - Y(A - B_2GC_2)X - HC_2X - YB_2F)(-\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

The mappings Φ_M, Φ_Λ and $\Psi_{\mathbf{K}}, \Psi_P$ will be used for establishing the ECLs for both LQG and \mathcal{H}_∞ output feedback control.

The following three lemmas will be useful for later analysis.

Lemma D.1. 1) Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ satisfy $\begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \succ 0$, and let $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$ be arbitrary. Then

$$\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi) \succ 0.$$

2) Let $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ be arbitrary with $P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n$. Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} (P^{-1})_{11} & I \\ I & P_{11} \end{bmatrix} \succ 0.$$

Proof of Lemma D.1. 1) Note that $\begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \succ 0$ implies $X \succ 0$ and $Y \succ X^{-1}$. From the invertibility of Ξ , we see that $\Xi^\top(Y - X^{-1})^{-1}\Xi \succ 0$ and

$$Y - \Xi \left(\Xi^\top(Y - X^{-1})^{-1}\Xi \right)^{-1} \Xi^\top = X^{-1} \succ 0.$$

By Schur complement, we get $\begin{bmatrix} Y & \Xi \\ \Xi^\top & \Xi^\top(Y - X^{-1})^{-1}\Xi \end{bmatrix} \succ 0$.

2) Given an arbitrary $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ satisfying $P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n$, by (D.1), we have

$$(P^{-1})_{11} = \left(P_{11} - P_{12}P_{22}^{-1}P_{12}^\top \right)^{-1},$$

and thus

$$P_{11} - (P^{-1})_{11}^{-1} = P_{12}P_{22}^{-1}P_{12}^\top \succ 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from $P_{22} \succ 0$ and $P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n$. Together with $P_{11} \succ 0$, we can apply Schur complement to get $\begin{bmatrix} (P^{-1})_{11} & I \\ I & P_{11} \end{bmatrix} \succ 0$. \square

Lemma D.2. Let $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}$, $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$ be arbitrary, and let $X, Y \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ satisfy $\begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \succ 0$. Then

$$(\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)^{-1})_{11} = X,$$

and

$$\Phi_\Lambda(\Psi_K(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi), \Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)) = \Lambda.$$

Proof of Lemma D.2. By straightforward calculation, it is not hard to check that

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & -X(Y - X^{-1})\Xi^{-\top} \\ -\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X & \Xi^{-1}(YXY - Y)\Xi^{-\top} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y & \Xi \\ \Xi^\top & \Xi^\top(Y - X^{-1})^{-1}\Xi \end{bmatrix} = I,$$

which justifies that

$$\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} X & -X(Y - X^{-1})\Xi^{-\top} \\ -\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X & \Xi^{-1}(YXY - Y)\Xi^{-\top} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X & \Pi^\top \\ \Pi & \Xi^{-1}(YXY - Y)\Xi^{-\top} \end{bmatrix},$$

where we denote $\Pi = -\Xi^{-1}(Y - X^{-1})X$. Consequently,

$$(\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)^{-1})_{11} = X, \quad (\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)^{-1})_{12} = \Pi^\top, \quad (\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)^{-1})_{21} = \Pi.$$

Next, we write Λ as $\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} G & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}$ where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ and F, H, M are real matrices with proper dimensions. From (D.4) we have

$$\Psi_K(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi) = \begin{bmatrix} G & (F - GC_2X)\Pi^{-1} \\ \Xi^{-1}(H - YB_2G) & \Xi^{-1}(M - Y(A - B_2GC_2)X - HC_2X - YB_2F)\Pi^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By plugging these identities into the definitions of Φ_M and Φ_Λ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_M(\Psi_K(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi), \Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)) &= (H - YB_2G)C_2X + YB_2(F - GC_2X) + Y(A + B_2GC_2)X \\ &\quad + (M - Y(A - B_2GC_2)X - HC_2X - YB_2F) \\ &= M, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\Lambda(\Psi_K(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi), \Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)) &= \begin{bmatrix} G & GC_2X + (F - GC_2X) \\ YB_2G + (H - YB_2G) & \Phi_M(\Psi_K(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi), \Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} G & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix} = \Lambda, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Lemma D.3. Let $\mathsf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}$ and $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ be arbitrary. Then

$$\Psi_P((P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}) = P,$$

and

$$\Psi_{\mathsf{K}}(\Phi_{\Lambda}(\mathsf{K}, P), (P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}) = \mathsf{K}.$$

Proof of Lemma D.3. For the first identity, straightforward calculation leads to

$$\Psi_P((P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}) = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{12}^{\top} & P_{12}^{\top} (P_{11} - (P^{-1})_{11}^{-1})^{-1} P_{12} \end{bmatrix}.$$

On the other hand, the identity (D.1) gives $(P^{-1})_{11} = (P_{11} - P_{12}P_{22}^{-1}P_{12}^{\top})^{-1}$, and so,

$$P_{12}^{\top} (P_{11} - (P^{-1})_{11}^{-1})^{-1} P_{12} = P_{12}^{\top} \left(P_{11} - \left(P_{11} - P_{12}P_{22}^{-1}P_{12}^{\top} \right) \right)^{-1} P_{12} = P_{22}, \quad (\text{D.5})$$

which justifies $\Psi_P((P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}) = P$.

To show the second identity, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} (P^{-1})_{21} &= -P_{22}^{-1}P_{12}^{\top}(P^{-1})_{11} \\ &= -P_{12}^{-1} (P_{11} - (P^{-1})_{11}^{-1}) P_{12}^{-\top} \cdot P_{12}^{\top}(P^{-1})_{11}, \\ &= -P_{12}^{-1} (P_{11} - (P^{-1})_{11}^{-1}) (P^{-1})_{11}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from (D.1), and the second step uses the identity (D.5). As a result, by (D.4),

$$\begin{aligned} &\Psi_{\mathsf{K}}(\Phi_{\Lambda}(\mathsf{K}, P), (P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} D_{\mathsf{K}} & (D_{\mathsf{K}}C_2(P^{-1})_{11} + C_{\mathsf{K}}(P^{-1})_{21} - D_{\mathsf{K}}C_2(P^{-1})_{11})(P^{-1})_{21}^{-1} \\ P_{12}^{-1}(P_{11}B_2D_{\mathsf{K}} + P_{12}B_{\mathsf{K}} - P_{11}B_2D_{\mathsf{K}}) & (1) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} D_{\mathsf{K}} & C_{\mathsf{K}} \\ B_{\mathsf{K}} & (1) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

in which

$$\begin{aligned} (1) &= P_{12}^{-1} (\Phi_M(\mathsf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) - P_{11}(A - B_2D_{\mathsf{K}}C_2)(P^{-1})_{11}) (P^{-1})_{21}^{-1} \\ &\quad - P_{12}^{-1} (P_{11}B_2D_{\mathsf{K}}C_2(P^{-1})_{11} + P_{12}B_{\mathsf{K}}C_2(P^{-1})_{11}) (P^{-1})_{21}^{-1} \\ &\quad - P_{12}^{-1} (P_{11}B_2D_{\mathsf{K}}C_2(P^{-1})_{11} + P_{11}B_2C_{\mathsf{K}}(P^{-1})_{21}) (P^{-1})_{21}^{-1} \\ &= A_{\mathsf{K}}, \end{aligned}$$

justifying that $\Psi_{\mathsf{K}}(\Phi_{\Lambda}(\mathsf{K}, P), (P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}) = \mathsf{K}$. \square

D.2 A Critical Lemma for Establishing ECL

For LQG and \mathcal{H}_{∞} output feedback control, one of the main difficulties in establishing the corresponding ECLs is showing the inclusion

$$\pi_{x,\lambda}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{ift}}) \subseteq \text{cl epi}_{\geq}(f),$$

which is mostly due to the intricacy between the strict and non-strict versions of the LMIs used in constructing the lifted set \mathcal{L}_{ift} . Here we provide a technical lemma that will be useful for establishing the second inclusion in the definition of ECL (7a) for LQG and \mathcal{H}_{∞} output feedback control.

Lemma D.4. *Suppose there exist sets C, F_0, G and functions $h : F_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q, \Psi : F_0 \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ such that the following conditions hold:*

- 1) C is a convex set in \mathbb{R}^q with a nonempty interior, and F_0 is a finite-dimensional convex set.
- 2) h is an affine function, and $h^{-1}(\text{int } C)$ is nonempty.
- 3) $\Psi(\cdot, z)$ is continuous on F_0 for any $z \in G$.

Then

$$\Psi(h^{-1}(C) \times G) \subseteq \text{cl } \Psi(h^{-1}(\text{int } C) \times G).$$

Proof. Let $x \in \Psi(h^{-1}(C) \times G)$ be arbitrary, and find $y \in h^{-1}(C), z \in G$ such that $\Psi(y, z) = x$. Moreover, let $y^\circ \in h^{-1}(\text{int } C)$ be arbitrary. We now define

$$y_n = \frac{n-1}{n}y + \frac{1}{n}y^\circ, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

By the convexity of $h^{-1}(C)$, we can see that $y_n \in h^{-1}(C)$ for all $n \geq 1$. Moreover, $y^\circ \in h^{-1}(\text{int } C)$ implies that $h(y^\circ) + \epsilon \mathbb{B}_q \subseteq C$ for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, where \mathbb{B}_q denotes the open unit ball in \mathbb{R}^q . This further leads to

$$h(y_n) + \frac{\epsilon}{n} \mathbb{B}_q = \frac{n-1}{n}h(y) + \frac{1}{n}(h(y^\circ) + \epsilon \mathbb{B}_q) \subseteq C$$

for all sufficiently small ϵ . Therefore $h(y_n) \in \text{int } C$, i.e., $y_n \in h^{-1}(\text{int } C)$.

Now let $x_n = \Psi(y_n, z) \in \Psi(h^{-1}(\text{int } C) \times G)$. By the continuity of $\Psi(\cdot, z)$ on F_0 , we can infer from $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = y$ that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(y_n, z) = \Psi(y, z) = x$. By the arbitrariness of $x \in \Psi(h^{-1}(C) \times G)$, we get the desired conclusion. \square

D.3 Proofs for LQG Control

We here provide the proof details for [Proposition 4.4](#), which include two parts:

- The mapping Φ_{LQG} given by [\(39\)](#) is a C^2 diffeomorphism from \mathcal{L}_{LQG} to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} \times \text{GL}_n$, and its inverse Φ_{LQG}^{-1} is given by Ψ_{LQG} defined in [\(40\)](#). This is proved in [Appendix D.3.1](#).
- The following inclusion relationship holds

$$\text{epi}_>(J_{\text{LQG},n}) \subseteq \pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}) \subseteq \text{cl } \text{epi}_\geq(J_{\text{LQG},n}). \quad (\text{D.6})$$

This is proved in [Appendix D.3.2](#).

D.3.1 Diffeomorphism from \mathcal{L}_{LQG} to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} \times \text{GL}_n$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0 &= \{(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \mid \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{V}_{n,0}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}, P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n, \Gamma \in \mathbb{S}^{n+m}\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 &= \left\{(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \mid \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \Lambda \in \mathcal{V}_{n,0}, \begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}, \Gamma \in \mathbb{S}^{n+m}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Evidently $\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ can be identified with certain open subsets of some Euclidean spaces, and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ is convex. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}} = \left\{ (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \left| \begin{array}{l} \left[\begin{array}{cc} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + PA_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & PB_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I \end{array} \right] \in \mathbb{S}_+^{3n+p}, \\ \left[\begin{array}{cc} P & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & \Gamma \end{array} \right] \in \mathbb{S}_+^{3n+m}, \text{tr}(\Gamma) \leq \gamma \end{array} \right. \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} = \left\{ (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \left| \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{A}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathbb{S}_+^{3n+p}, \\ \mathcal{B}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathbb{S}_+^{3n+m}, \text{tr}(\Gamma) \leq \gamma \end{array} \right. \right\},$$

where we remind the readers of the notations

$$\mathcal{A}\left(\gamma, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}, X, Y, \Gamma\right) = \begin{bmatrix} AX + B_2F + (AX + B_2F)^\top & M^\top + A & B_1 \\ * & YA + HC_2 + (YA + HC_2)^\top & YB_1 + HD_{21} \\ * & * & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{B}\left(\gamma, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}, X, Y, \Gamma\right) = \begin{bmatrix} X & I & (C_1X + D_{12}F)^\top \\ * & Y & C_1^\top \\ * & * & \Gamma \end{bmatrix}.$$

We extend the domain of Φ_{LQG} so that it is now defined on the larger set $\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$:

$$\Phi_{\text{LQG}}(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) = (\gamma, \Phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{K}, P), (P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, \Gamma, P_{12}), \quad \forall (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0,$$

where $\Phi_\Lambda(\mathbf{K}, P)$ is defined in (D.2). We also extend the domain of Ψ_{LQG} so that it is now defined on $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$:

$$\Psi_{\text{LQG}}(\mathbf{Z}, \Xi) = (\Psi_\mathbf{K}(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi), \gamma, \Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi), \Gamma), \quad \forall \mathbf{Z} = (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0, \Xi \in \text{GL}_n,$$

where $\Psi_\mathbf{K}(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi)$ and $\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)$ are defined in (D.3).

Our subsequent proof consists of the following parts:

- 1) Showing that Φ_{LQG} is a C^2 diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$, with $\Phi_{\text{LQG}}^{-1} = \Psi_{\text{LQG}}$.
- 2) Showing that for any $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$, we have $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}$ if and only if $\Phi_{\text{LQG}}(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$.

Part I. We first show that

$$\Psi_{\text{LQG}}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0.$$

By the definitions of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ and Ψ_{LQG} , it is not hard to see that this inclusion holds as long as $\Psi_\mathbf{K}(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi) \in \mathcal{V}_{n,0}$ and $\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi) \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ for any $(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ and $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$, which can be directly justified by (D.4) and the first part of Lemma D.1 respectively.

Next, we show that

$$\Phi(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n.$$

By definition, we only need to show

$$\begin{bmatrix} (P^{-1})_{11} & I \\ I & P_{11} \end{bmatrix} \succ 0 \quad \forall P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n} \text{ with } P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n,$$

which can be directly justified by the second part of Lemma D.1.

We are now allowed to form the compositions $\Psi_{\text{LQG}} \circ \Phi_{\text{LQG}} : \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ and $\Phi \circ \Psi : \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$. We will now show that these two compositions are the identity functions on their domains:

1) Let $Z = (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ and $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$ be arbitrary. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{\text{LQG}} \circ \Psi_{\text{LQG}}(Z, \Xi) &= (\gamma, \Phi_\Lambda(\Psi_K(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi), \Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)), (\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)^{-1})_{11}, Y, \Gamma, \Xi) \\ &= (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma, \Xi) = (Z, \Xi),\end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from [Lemma D.2](#). By the arbitrariness of $(Z, \Xi) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$, we see that $\Phi_{\text{LQG}} \circ \Psi_{\text{LQG}}$ is the identity function on $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$.

2) Let $(K, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ be arbitrary. Then by definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{\text{LQG}} \circ \Phi_{\text{LQG}}(K, \gamma, P, \Gamma) &= (\Psi_K(\Phi_\Lambda(K, P), (P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}), \gamma, \Psi_P((P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}), \Gamma) \\ &= (K, \gamma, P, \Gamma),\end{aligned}$$

where we used [Lemma D.3](#). We see that $\Psi_{\text{LQG}} \circ \Phi_{\text{LQG}}$ is indeed the identity function on $\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$.

Summarizing the previous results, we can conclude that Φ_{LQG} is a bijection from $\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$ and Ψ_{LQG} is its inverse. The fact that Φ_{LQG} and Ψ_{LQG} are both C^2 functions follows directly from their explicit expressions.

Part II. We next show that for any $(K, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$, we have $(K, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}$ if and only if $\Phi_{\text{LQG}}(K, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} \times \text{GL}_n$. We shall prove a stronger result that will be used in later proofs:

Lemma D.5. *Suppose $\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{3n+p}$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{3n+m}$ satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned}T_1^\top M_1 T_1 &\in \mathcal{C}_1, & \forall M_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1, T_1 \in \text{GL}_{3n+p}, \\ T_2^\top M_2 T_2 &\in \mathcal{C}_2, & \forall M_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2, T_2 \in \text{GL}_{3n+m}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $(K, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ be arbitrary, and denote $(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma, \Xi) = \Phi_{\text{LQG}}(K, \gamma, P, \Gamma)$. Then

$$-\begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(K)^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(K) & P B_{\text{cl}}(K) \\ B_{\text{cl}}(K)^\top P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} P & C_{\text{cl}}(K)^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(K) & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}_2$$

if and only if

$$-\mathcal{A}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{C}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{C}_2.$$

Proof of Lemma D.5. Denote $\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}$, i.e.,

$$F = C_K(P^{-1})_{21}, \quad H = P_{12}B_K, \quad M = \Phi_M(K, P).$$

Let

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} (P^{-1})_{11} & I \\ (P^{-1})_{21} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}. \quad (\text{D.7})$$

We can infer from $PP^{-1} = I$ that

$$PT = \begin{bmatrix} I & P_{11} \\ 0 & P_{12}^\top \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n$, we know that PT is invertible, which implies that T is also invertible.

Then, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}T^\top P A_{\text{cl}}(K) T &= \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ P_{11} & P_{12} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A & B_2 C_K \\ B_K C_2 & A_K \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (P^{-1})_{11} & I \\ (P^{-1})_{21} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} A(P^{-1})_{11} + B_2 C_K (P^{-1})_{21} & A \\ P_{11} A (P^{-1})_{11} + P_{12} B_K C_2 (P^{-1})_{11} + P_{11} B_2 C_K (P^{-1})_{21} + P_{12} A_K (P^{-1})_{21} & P_{11} A + P_{12} B_K C_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} AX + B_2 F & A \\ M & YA + HC_2 \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Similarly, it can be verified that

$$T^\top P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ Y B_1 + H D_{21} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T^\top C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top = \begin{bmatrix} (C_1 X + D_{12} F)^\top \\ C_1^\top \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Summarizing these identities (D.8) and (D.9), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) &= \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{B}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) &= \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} P & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix}$ are invertible, by the conditions on \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 , we see that

$$-\mathcal{A}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{C}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{C}_2$$

is equivalent to

$$-\begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} P & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}_2,$$

which completes the proof. \square

As a corollary of Lemma D.5, by letting $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathbb{S}_+^{3n+p}$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \mathbb{S}_+^{3n+m}$ and noting that γ and Γ remain unchanged under the mapping Φ_{LQG} , we see that

$$\Phi_{\text{LQG}}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}) = \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} \times \text{GL}_n.$$

We can now conclude that Φ_{LQG} is a C^2 diffeomorphism from \mathcal{L}_{LQG} to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} \times \text{GL}_n$.

D.3.2 Proof of the Inclusion (D.6) in LQG

Part I. We first prove the inclusion

$$\text{epi}_>(J_{\text{LQG},n}) \subseteq \pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}).$$

Let $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_>(J_{\text{LQG},n})$ be arbitrary. We then have $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,0}$ and $\gamma > J_{\text{LQG},n}(\mathbf{K})$. Consequently, $A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})$ is stable, and the transfer matrix $C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})(sI - A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}))^{-1}B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})$ has an \mathcal{H}_2 norm that is strictly upper bounded by γ . By applying the strict LMI in Lemma 4.1, we see that there exist $P \in \mathbb{S}_+^{2n}$ and $\Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_+^{n+m}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \prec 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} P & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, \quad \text{trace}(\Gamma) < \gamma.$$

Since the above inequalities are all strict, we can add a sufficiently small perturbation on the matrix P to ensure that P_{12} is invertible without violating the above inequalities. By comparing the obtained properties of \mathbf{K} , γ , P and Γ with the definition of \mathcal{L}_{LQG} , we see that $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}$. By the arbitrariness of $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_>(J_{\text{LQG},n})$, we get the inclusion $\text{epi}_>(J_{\text{LQG},n}) \subseteq \pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}})$.

Part II. We next prove the other inclusion

$$\pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}) \subseteq \text{cl epi}_\geq(J_{\text{LQG},n}).$$

This part is more involved compared to Part I. In particular, the proof will rely on [Lemma D.4](#). Define the affine function $h : \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{3n+p} \times \mathbb{S}^{3n+m} \times \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) = (-\mathcal{A}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma), \mathcal{B}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma), \gamma - \text{tr}(\Gamma)), \quad (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0.$$

Also, define

$$C = \mathbb{S}_+^{3n+p} \times \mathbb{S}_+^{3n+m} \times [0, +\infty).$$

It can be seen from the definition of \mathcal{F}_{LQG} that $\mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}} = h^{-1}(C)$, and consequently,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}} = \Psi(h^{-1}(C) \times \text{GL}_n).$$

Now let $(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{LQG}}^0$ and $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$ be arbitrary, and denote $\mathbf{K} = \Phi_{\mathbf{K}}(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi)$, $P = \Phi_P(X, Y, \Xi)$. Since

$$\text{int } C = \mathbb{S}_{++}^{3n+p} \times \mathbb{S}_{++}^{3n+m} \times (0, +\infty),$$

by applying [Lemma D.5](#) with $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathbb{S}_{++}^{3n+p}$, $\mathcal{C}_2 = \mathbb{S}_{++}^{3n+m}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in h^{-1}(\text{int } C) &\iff \begin{cases} -\mathcal{A}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{3n+p}, \\ \mathcal{B}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{3n+m}, \text{tr}(\Gamma) < \gamma, \end{cases} \\ &\iff \begin{cases} -\begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{3n+p}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} P & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{3n+m}, \text{tr}(\Gamma) < \gamma, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{LQG}} &:= \Psi(h^{-1}(\text{int } C) \times \text{GL}_n) \\ &= \left\{ (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}^0 \left| \begin{array}{l} \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \prec 0, \\ \begin{bmatrix} P & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, \text{tr}(\Gamma) < \gamma \end{array} \right. \right\} \\ &= \left\{ (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \left| \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{V}_{n,0}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}, P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n, \Gamma \in \mathbb{S}^{n+m}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \prec 0, \\ \begin{bmatrix} P & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, \text{tr}(\Gamma) < \gamma \end{array} \right. \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By using the strict LMI in [Lemma 4.1](#), we see that $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{LQG}}$ implies $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_{>}(J_{\text{LQG},n})$, i.e.,

$$\pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{LQG}}) \subseteq \text{epi}_{>}(J_{\text{LQG},n}).$$

On the other hand, [Lemma D.4](#) shows that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}} \subseteq \text{cl } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{LQG}}.$$

As a result, we have

$$\pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\text{LQG}}) \subseteq \pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\text{cl } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{LQG}}) \subseteq \text{cl } \pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{LQG}}) \subseteq \text{cl } \text{epi}_{>}(J_{\text{LQG},n}) = \text{cl } \text{epi}_{\geq}(J_{\text{LQG},n}),$$

and the proof is complete.

D.4 Proofs for \mathcal{H}_∞ Output Feedback Control

We here provide the proof details for [Proposition 4.5](#), which include two parts:

- The mapping $\Phi_{\infty,d}$ defined in [\(44a\)](#) is a C^2 diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d} \times \text{GL}_n$, and its inverse $\Phi_{\infty,d}^{-1}$ is given by $\Psi_{\infty,d}$ defined in [\(44c\)](#). This is proved in [Appendix D.4.1](#).
- The following inclusion relationship holds

$$\text{epi}_{>}(J_{\infty,n}) \subseteq \pi_{\mathbb{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}) \subseteq \text{cl epi}_{\geq}(J_{\infty,n}). \quad (\text{D.10})$$

This is proved in [Appendix D.4.2](#).

For both of them, the proofs follow similarly as those in in [Appendix D.3](#).

D.4.1 Diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d} \times \text{GL}_n$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0 &= \left\{ (\mathbb{K}, \gamma, P) \mid \mathbb{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}, P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n \right\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 &= \left\{ (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \mid \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}, \begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Evidently $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0$ can be identified with certain open subsets of some Euclidean spaces, and $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0$ is convex. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d} &= \left\{ (\mathbb{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0 \mid \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^\top P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^\top \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^\top P & -\gamma I & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d} &= \left\{ (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \mid -\mathcal{M}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathbb{S}_+^{4n+p+m} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we remind the readers of the notation

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{M}\left(\gamma, \begin{bmatrix} G & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}, X, Y\right) \\ := &\begin{bmatrix} AX + B_2 F + (AX + B_2 F)^\top & M^\top + A + B_2 G C_2 & B_1 + B_2 G D_{21} & (C_1 X + D_{12} F)^\top \\ * & YA + H C_2 + (YA + H C_2)^\top & Y B_1 + H D_{21} & (C_1 + D_{12} G C_2)^\top \\ * & * & -\gamma I & (D_{11} + D_{12} G D_{21})^\top \\ * & * & * & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We extend the domain of $\Phi_{\infty,d}$ so that it is now defined on the larger set $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$:

$$\Phi_{\infty,d}(\mathbb{K}, \gamma, P) = (\gamma, \Phi_\Lambda(\mathbb{K}, P), (P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}), \quad \forall (\mathbb{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0,$$

where $\Phi_\Lambda(\mathbb{K}, P)$ is defined in [\(D.2\)](#). We also extend the domain of $\Psi_{\infty,d}$ so that it is now defined on $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$:

$$\Psi_{\infty,d}(Z, \Xi) = (\Psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi), \gamma, \Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)), \quad \forall Z = (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0, \Xi \in \text{GL}_n,$$

where $\Psi_{\mathbb{K}}(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi)$ and $\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)$ are defined in [\(D.3\)](#).

Our subsequent proof consists of the following parts:

- 1) Showing that $\Phi_{\infty,d}$ is a C^2 diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$, with $\Phi_{\infty,d}^{-1} = \Psi_{\infty,d}$.
- 2) Showing that for any $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$, we have $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}$ if and only if $\Phi_{\infty,d}(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d} \times \text{GL}_n$.

Part I. We first show that

$$\Psi_{\infty,d}(\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \times \text{GL}_n) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0.$$

By the definitions of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$, $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0$ and $\Psi_{\infty,d}$, it is not hard to see that this inclusion holds as long as $\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi) \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ for any $(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0$ and $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$, which can be directly justified by the first part of [Lemma D.1](#).

Next, we show that

$$\Phi(\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \times \text{GL}_n.$$

By definition, we only need to show

$$\begin{bmatrix} (P^{-1})_{11} & I \\ I & P_{11} \end{bmatrix} \succ 0 \quad \forall P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n} \text{ with } P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n,$$

which can be directly justified by the second part of [Lemma D.1](#).

We are now allowed to form the compositions $\Psi_{\infty,d} \circ \Phi_{\infty,d} : \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$ and $\Phi_{\infty,d} \circ \Psi_{\infty,d} : \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \times \text{GL}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$. We will now show that these two compositions are the identity functions on their domains:

- 1) Let $\mathbf{Z} = (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0$ and $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$ be arbitrary. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\infty,d} \circ \Psi_{\infty,d}(\mathbf{Z}, \Xi) &= (\gamma, \Phi_{\Lambda}(\Psi_{\mathbf{K}}(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi), \Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)), (\Psi_P(X, Y, \Xi)^{-1})_{11}, Y, \Xi) \\ &= (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Xi) = (\mathbf{Z}, \Xi), \end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from [Lemma D.2](#). By the arbitrariness of $(\mathbf{Z}, \Xi) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$, we see that $\Phi_{\infty,d} \circ \Psi_{\infty,d}$ is the identity function on $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$.

- 2) Let $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$ be arbitrary. Then by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\infty,d} \circ \Phi_{\infty,d}(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) &= (\Psi_{\mathbf{K}}(\Phi_{\Lambda}(\mathbf{K}, P), (P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12}), \gamma, \Psi_P((P^{-1})_{11}, P_{11}, P_{12})) \\ &= (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P), \end{aligned}$$

where we used [Lemma D.3](#). We see that $\Psi_{\infty,d} \circ \Phi_{\infty,d}$ is indeed the identity function on $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$.

Summarizing the previous results, we can conclude that $\Phi_{\infty,d}$ is a bijection from $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \times \text{GL}_n$ and $\Psi_{\infty,d}$ is its inverse. The fact that $\Phi_{\infty,d}$ and $\Psi_{\infty,d}$ are both C^2 functions follow directly from their explicit expressions.

Part II. We next show that for any $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$, we have $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}$ if and only if $\Phi_{\infty,d}(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d} \times \text{GL}_n$. We shall prove a stronger result that will be used in later proofs:

Lemma D.6. *Suppose $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{4n+p+m}$ satisfy*

$$T^{\top} M T \in \mathcal{C}, \quad \forall M \in \mathcal{C}, T \in \text{GL}_{4n+p+m}.$$

Let $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0$ be arbitrary, and denote $(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y, \Xi) = \Phi_{\infty,d}(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P)$. Then

$$- \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^{\top} P + P A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & P B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^{\top} \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^{\top} P & -\gamma I & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^{\top} \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}$$

if and only if

$$-\mathcal{M}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Proof of Lemma D.6. Denote $\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} D_{\mathbb{K}} & F \\ H & M \end{bmatrix}$, i.e.,

$$F = D_{\mathbb{K}}C_2(P^{-1})_{11} + C_{\mathbb{K}}(P^{-1})_{21}, \quad H = P_{11}B_2D_{\mathbb{K}} + P_{12}B_{\mathbb{K}}, \quad M = \Phi_M(\mathbb{K}, P).$$

We again introduce the matrix

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} (P^{-1})_{11} & I \\ (P^{-1})_{21} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}, \quad (\text{D.7})$$

and $PP^{-1} = I$ implies that

$$PT = \begin{bmatrix} I & P_{11} \\ 0 & P_{12}^{\top} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n$, we know that PT is invertible, which implies that T is also invertible.

Then, it can be checked by straightforward calculation that the following equality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\top}PA_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})T &= \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ P_{11} & P_{12} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A + B_2D_{\mathbb{K}}C_2 & B_2C_{\mathbb{K}} \\ B_{\mathbb{K}}C_2 & A_{\mathbb{K}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (P^{-1})_{11} & I \\ (P^{-1})_{21} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} AX + B_2F & A + B_2GC_2 \\ M & YA + HC_2 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.11})$$

Similarly, it can be verified that

$$T^{\top}PB_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 + B_2GD_{21} \\ YB_1 + HD_{21} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T^{\top}C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^{\top} = \begin{bmatrix} (C_1X + D_{12}F)^{\top} \\ (C_1 + D_{12}GC_2)^{\top} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{D.12})$$

Summarizing these identities (D.11) and (D.12), we can show that

$$\mathcal{M}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix}^{\top} \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^{\top}P + PA_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & PB_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^{\top} \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^{\top}P & -\gamma I & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^{\top} \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\begin{bmatrix} T & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible, by the condition on \mathcal{C} , we see that

$$-\mathcal{M}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathcal{C}$$

is equivalent to

$$- \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^{\top}P + PA_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & PB_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^{\top} \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^{\top}P & -\gamma I & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K})^{\top} \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbb{K}) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C},$$

which completes the proof. \square

As a corollary of Lemma D.6, by letting $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{S}_+^{4n+p+m}$, we see that

$$\Phi_{\infty, \text{d}}(\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \text{d}}) = \mathcal{F}_{\infty, \text{d}} \times \text{GL}_n.$$

We can now conclude that $\Phi_{\infty, \text{d}}$ is a C^2 diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \text{d}}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\infty, \text{d}} \times \text{GL}_n$.

D.4.2 Proof of the Inclusion (D.10) in \mathcal{H}_∞ Output Feedback Control

The proof follows almost the same outline as the proof in [Appendix D.3.2](#).

Part I. We first prove the inclusion $\text{epi}_>(J_{\infty,n}) \subseteq \pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d})$. Let $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_>(J_{\infty,n})$ be arbitrary. We then have $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{C}_n$ and $\gamma > J_{\infty,n}(\mathbf{K})$. Consequently, $A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})$ is stable, and the transfer matrix $C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})(sI - A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}))^{-1}B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) + D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})$ has an \mathcal{H}_∞ norm that is strictly upper bounded by γ . By applying the strict LMI in [Lemma 4.2](#), we see that there exists a $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + PA_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & PB_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \prec 0.$$

Since the above inequalities are all strict, we can add a sufficiently small perturbation on the matrix P to ensure that P_{12} is invertible without violating the above inequalities. By comparing the obtained properties of \mathbf{K} , γ and P with the definition of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}$, we see that $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}$. By the arbitrariness of $(\mathbf{K}, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_>(J_{\infty,n})$, we get the inclusion $\text{epi}_>(J_{\infty,n}) \subseteq \pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d})$.

Part II. We next prove the other inclusion $\pi_{\mathbf{K},\gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}) \subseteq \text{cl epi}_>(J_{\infty,n})$. Define $h : \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{4n+m+p}$ by

$$h(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) = -\mathcal{M}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y), \quad \forall (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0,$$

and let

$$C = \mathbb{S}_+^{4n+m+p}.$$

It can be seen from the definition of $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}$ that $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,d} = h^{-1}(C)$, and consequently,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,d} = \Psi_{\infty,d}(h^{-1}(C) \times \text{GL}_n).$$

Now let $(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathcal{F}_{\infty,d}^0$ and $\Xi \in \text{GL}_n$ be arbitrary, and denote $\mathbf{K} = \Phi_{\mathbf{K}}(\Lambda, X, Y, \Xi)$, $P = \Phi_P(X, Y, \Xi)$. Since

$$\text{int } C = \mathbb{S}_{++}^{4n+p+m},$$

by applying [Lemma D.6](#) with $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{S}_{++}^{4n+p+m}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in h^{-1}(\text{int } C) &\iff -\mathcal{M}(\gamma, \Lambda, X, Y) \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{4n+p+m} \\ &\iff -\begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + PA_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & PB_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{4n+p+m}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,d} &:= \Psi_{\infty,d}(h^{-1}(\text{int } C) \times \text{GL}_n) \\ &= \left\{ (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty,d}^0 \left| \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + PA_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & PB_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0 \right. \right\} \\ &= \left\{ (\mathbf{K}, \gamma, P) \left| \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (p+n)}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{2n}, P_{12} \in \text{GL}_n, \\ \begin{bmatrix} A_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P + PA_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & PB_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ B_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top P & -\gamma I & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K})^\top \\ C_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & D_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{K}) & -\gamma I \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0 \end{array} \right. \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By using the strict LMI in [Lemma 4.2](#), we see that $(K, \gamma, P) \in \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty, d}$ implies $(K, \gamma) \in \text{epi}_{>}(J_{\infty, n})$, i.e.,

$$\pi_{K, \gamma}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty, d}) \subseteq \text{epi}_{>}(J_{\infty, n}).$$

On the other hand, [Lemma D.4](#) shows that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty, d} \subseteq \text{cl } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty, d}.$$

As a result, we have

$$\pi_{K, \gamma}(\mathcal{L}_{\infty, d}) \subseteq \pi_{K, \gamma}(\text{cl } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty, d}) \subseteq \text{cl } \pi_{K, \gamma}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty, d}) \subseteq \text{cl } \text{epi}_{>}(J_{\infty, n}) = \text{cl } \text{epi}_{\geq}(J_{\infty, n}),$$

and the proof is complete.