

Conditions for singular optimal control of port-Hamiltonian systems

M. Soledad Aronna * Volker Mehrmann †

July 4, 2024

Abstract

We study singular optimal control problems of port-Hamiltonian systems. We study general control-affine cost functionals that include as a special case the energy supplied to the system. We derive optimality conditions for the case with and without control bounds by applying the general theory to the specially structured port-Hamiltonian case, and show that this leads to nice optimality conditions, in particular in the linear case.

Keywords: singular optimal control, port-Hamiltonian system, Goh condition, Legendre-Clebsch condition, minimal supplied energy.

AMS subject classification: 49J15, 37J99, 34A09

1 Introduction

The energy based modeling of physical systems employing the model class of port-Hamiltonian systems, see e.g. [38], has become an accepted modeling paradigm which has been successfully used in a multitude of applications from a wide variety of application domains: mechanics [6, 7, 23, 37], electrical engineering [32, 36], thermodynamics and fluid dynamics [2, 15, 30, 31], economics [22]. See [10, 16, 38] and the recent survey [26] which also includes systems with algebraic constraints, so-called port-Hamiltonian descriptor systems [26].

[†]Institut für Mathematik, MA 4-5, TU Berlin, Str. des 17. Juni 136, D-10623 Berlin, FRG. mehrmann@math.tu-berlin.de.

^{*}Escola de Matemática Aplicada FGV EMAp, Praia de Botafogo, 190, 22250-900 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. soledad.aronna@fgv.br.

In this paper we consider the classical form of a *real nonlinear port-Hamiltonian (pH) system*, see e.g. [38],

$$\dot{x} = (J(x) - R(x)) \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial x}(x) + G(x)u(t), \quad (1.1)$$

with the *state* $x \in \mathcal{X}$, *input (control)* $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and the energy function $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (often called *Hamiltonian* or *storage function*) is assumed to be nonnegative and quadratic. The *output* $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is given by

$$y = G^T(x) \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial x}(x). \quad (1.2)$$

Here the state-space \mathcal{X} is an appropriate Hilbert or Banach space of functions $x : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\mathbb{I} = [t_0, T]$ is a time interval and for convenience we choose $t_0 = 0$. Furthermore, in port-Hamiltonian systems one has the following structure of the coefficients.

- $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$ is skew-symmetric;
- $R : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$ is symmetric and positive semidefinite;
- $G : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n,m}$.

The success of modeling within the class of pH systems is due to its many important properties which include the invariance of the class under power-conserving interconnection, which greatly simplifies modularized automated modeling, and the invariance under Galerkin projection which makes the class very suitable for discretization and model reduction. Physical properties like *energy dissipation*, *Lyapunov stability* and *passivity* are encoded in the structure of the equations leading directly to another key property of port-Hamiltonian systems, the power balance equation and the resulting dissipation inequality, see e.g. [38].

Theorem 1.1. *Consider a pH system of the form (1.1). Then for any input function u the power balance equation*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{E}(x) = -x^T R x + y^T u =: -\mathcal{D}(x) + \mathcal{S}(y, u) \quad (1.3)$$

holds along any solution x . In particular, the dissipation inequality

$$\mathcal{E}(x(t_2)) - \mathcal{E}(x(t_1)) \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} y(\tau)^T u(\tau) d\tau \quad (1.4)$$

is satisfied for any input, state, output triple.

From a physics point of view, pH systems model the interaction of three types of energy/power. The *stored energy* (in the energy storing components) is presented by the nonnegative quadratic form $\mathcal{E}(x)$, the *dissipated energy* by the nonnegative quadratic form $\mathcal{D}(x)$ and the *supplied energy* by the form $\mathcal{S}(y, u) = y^T u$.

Example 1.2. A classical example of pH modeling are (dissipative) Hamiltonian equations of motion, see e.g. [1, 38], which, in first order representation using the position coordinate q and the momentum $p = M(q)\dot{q}$ together with a force term $B(q)u$, take the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{p} \\ \dot{q} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -D(p, q) & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}(q, p)}{\partial p} \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}(q, p)}{\partial q} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B(q) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u \quad (1.5)$$

together with a collocated output

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} B(q)^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}(q, p)}{\partial p} \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}(q, p)}{\partial q} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.6)$$

Here the energy function (Hamiltonian) is

$$\mathcal{E}(q, p) = \frac{1}{2} p^T M(q)^{-1} p + P(q) = \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^T M(q) \dot{q} + P(q),$$

i.e., kinetic plus potential energy, and $D(q, p) = D(q, p)^T$ is a positive semidefinite coefficient matrix that models internal damping.

With an increased understanding of the many advantageous properties of modeling with pH systems, in recent years also feedback control and optimal control problems for this model class have become an important research topic, [8, 9, 18, 41].

In many optimal control applications a typical cost function involves a quadratic and positive term in the control u which makes sure that every control action contributes to the cost. In the optimal control of port-Hamiltonian systems, however, a natural *cost function* is the integral of the supplied energy

$$\mathcal{J}(x, u) = \int_{t_0}^T S(y(\tau), u(\tau)) d\tau = \int_{t_0}^T \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial x}(x)^T G(x) u(\tau) d\tau.$$

It is readily available as a mathematical expression in terms of the ports and it is interesting from an application point of view to employ it as the

objective to be minimized in optimal control problems (OCPs) [11, 12, 27, 33]. However, using the supplied energy as cost function, the resulting OCP is typically singular (it is missing the positive quadratic term in u) and standard solution techniques, for instance the construction of Riccati state feedback, see e.g. [20, 24], are not directly applicable.

In view of this difficulty, the topic of this paper is the analysis of singular OCPs with constraints given by pH systems without the regularization approach. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present optimality conditions for general singular optimal control problems associated with control-affine cost functions. In Section 3 we analyze how these general optimality conditions look when we specialize the constraint function from general ordinary differential equations to port-Hamiltonian systems and we show that the structure helps to obtain much more elegant solutions. We present some conclusions and directions of future work in Section 5.

2 Singular optimal control of nonlinear systems

In this section we recall some of the general results for singular optimal control with constraints given by a system of ordinary differential equations

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u) = f_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x)u_i, \quad (2.7)$$

with $f_i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 0 \dots, m$, together with a given initial condition $x(0) = x_0$.

2.1 Optimal control problems with general control-affine cost

Consider as a cost-functional to be minimized, a control-affine (nonlinear in the state) functional

$$\mathcal{J}(x, u) := \int_0^T \ell_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \ell_i(x)u_i dt. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that, as is common in optimal control theory, we could incorporate also a quadratic regularization term in u with a small parameter, but one of our goals in this paper is to show that the optimal (feedback) control of port-Hamiltonian systems also works without this extra term. Furthermore, in general the feedback solutions to this regularized problem may diverge when the small parameter tends to zero.

Remark 2.1. It is well-known (see, e.g., [28, 39]) that the problem of controlling a system to approach a given reference trajectory x_{ref} can be reformulated by considering the difference $x - x_{\text{ref}}$ instead of x itself (see Remark 4.3). Additionally, the cost functional can be expressed in terms of an output rather than the state, as follows:

$$\mathcal{J}(y, u) := \int_0^T \tilde{\ell}_0(y) + \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\ell}_i(y) u_i dt, \quad (2.9)$$

However, this can be rewritten in the form (2.8) by incorporating the output equation. Therefore, we will use the cost functional (2.8) in the following discussion.

The optimal control problem for (2.8) then takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \mathcal{J}(x, u) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (2.7) \\ & x(0) = x_0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Introducing the scalar variable x_{n+1} for the right hand side of (2.8), we can rewrite problem (2.10) in *Mayer form* [21] (i.e., using only the terminal cost):

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & x_{n+1}(T) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (2.7) \\ & \dot{x}_{n+1} = \ell_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \ell_i(x) u_i, \\ & x(0) = x_0, \quad x_{n+1}(0) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Setting $z = [x_1 \ \dots \ x_n \ x_{n+1}]^T$, the adjoint variable λ takes the form

$$\lambda = [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n \ \lambda_{n+1}]^T,$$

where λ_{n+1} is scalar.

Having reformulated the optimal control problem in Mayer form we can employ the general theory for this case.

2.2 Optimality conditions and feedback formula for general control-affine problems

In this subsection we recall the optimality conditions for general control-affine optimal control problems. For this, throughout this subsection, we assume that u is in an open set $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$.

Problem (2.11) is in the class of control-affine problems with terminal cost, i.e., we can write it in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \Psi(z(T)) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \dot{z} = \tilde{f}_0(z) + \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{f}_i(z)u_i, \\ & z(0) = z_0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

now with functions $\tilde{f}_i : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}_{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. The *pre-Hamilton function* (or *un-maximized Hamilton function*) for (2.12) has the form (leaving off arguments)

$$\mathcal{H} = [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] \left(\tilde{f}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \tilde{f}_i \right) \tag{2.13}$$

where $[\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}]$ is the adjoint vector used in the variational formulation, so that the partial derivative w.r.t u_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{u_i} = \partial_{u_i} \mathcal{H} = [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] \tilde{f}_i. \tag{2.14}$$

By applying the Pontryagin Maximum Principle [29], it follows that latter expression vanishes along optimal trajectories, i.e.

$$\mathcal{H}_{u_i} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \tag{2.15}$$

Since (2.15) does not depend explicitly on the control variable, one can differentiate with respect to time and obtains

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_{u_i} = \frac{d}{dt} [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] \tilde{f}_i + [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] \tilde{f}'_i \dot{z} \\ &= -[\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] \left(\tilde{f}'_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j \tilde{f}'_j \right) \tilde{f}_i \\ &\quad + [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] \tilde{f}'_i \left(\tilde{f}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j \tilde{f}_j \right) \\ &= [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] \left([\tilde{f}'_0, \tilde{f}_i] + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j [\tilde{f}'_j, \tilde{f}_i] \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

where \tilde{f}'_i is the Jacobian, i.e. the derivative of \tilde{f}_i with respect to z . Here, for any pair of smooth vector fields $h, k: \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $[h, k] := k'h - h'k$ is the *Lie bracket* of h and k , with k', h' being the Jacobians of k, h with respect to z .

At this point it is worth mentioning that the traditional technique of adding a regularizing term of the form $\alpha \sum_{i=1}^m u_i^2$ with positive α and then taking $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ does not work in this context, since (2.15) will depend on u and then expression (2.16) would not be attainable. On the other hand, if one aims at obtaining a feedback formula for the controls on singular arcs by applying Pontryagin's Maximum Principle to the modified quadratic cost and taking $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, the expression contains α in the denominator and the limit may fail to exist, see e.g. [17].

Remark 2.2 (On the multiplier λ_{n+1} and normality). Note that in the absence of (state or terminal) constraints, the multiplier λ_{n+1} is unique and the associated extremal is *normal*, i.e., the corresponding multiplier λ_{n+1} is equal to 1. On the contrary, when terminal or state constraints are present, several multipliers can exist and *abnormality* (i.e., extremals with $\lambda_{n+1} = 0$) may occur. For a matter of completeness, we keep λ_{n+1} throughout the presentation.

The following necessary condition is well-known, see e.g. [4, 14, 35].

Theorem 2.1 (Goh necessary condition for weak optimality). *For the optimal control problem (2.12), the Goh condition*

$$\lambda(t)^T [\tilde{f}'_i, \tilde{f}'_j](x(t)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i, j = 1, \dots, m \quad (2.17)$$

holds along optimal trajectories.

Applying the Goh condition (2.17) to the expression $\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_{u_i}$ in (2.16) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_{u_i} = [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}'_0, \tilde{f}'_i], \quad (2.18)$$

so that $\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_{u_i}$ is differentiable with respect to t . Hence one can differentiate

(2.18) once more and gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \mathcal{H}_{u_i} &= \dot{\lambda}^T [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i] + [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]' \dot{x} \\
&= -[\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] \left(f'_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j f'_j \right) [f_0, f_i] \\
&\quad + [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]' \left(\tilde{f}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j \tilde{f}_j \right) \\
&= [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_0, [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]] + \sum_{j=1}^m u_j [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_j, [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, from $\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \mathcal{H}_{u_i} = 0$ one gets a linear system for $u = [u_1 \ u_2 \ \dots \ u_m]^T$ given by

$$Wu + d = 0, \quad (2.19)$$

with the *Hessian matrix* $W = [w_{i,j}]$ and the right hand side vector

$d = [d_1 \ d_2 \ \dots \ d_m]^T$ where, for $i, j = 1, \dots, m$,

$$w_{ij} := [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_j, [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]], \quad d_i := [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_0, [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]]. \quad (2.20)$$

This leads to a *generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition*, see e.g. [19, Theorem 6.2 and/or Corollary 6.3], [4], or [14].

Theorem 2.2 (Generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition). *For the general nonlinear control-affine problem in Mayer form (2.12), the associated Hessian matrix W in (2.20) is negative semidefinite along optimal trajectories.*

Observe that if W is actually negative definite then, from (2.19), one can express the optimal control in *feedback form* as

$$u = -W^{-1}d. \quad (2.21)$$

Having reviewed the Goh conditions (2.17) for general control-affine problems, in the next subsection we recall the optimality conditions for OCPs with control bounds.

2.3 Control-affine problems with control bounds

In this section we study problem (2.12) with bounds on the control. This means that we no longer assume that \mathbb{U} is open, but consider a set of admissible controls

$$\mathbb{U} = [\underline{u}_1, \bar{u}_1] \times \dots \times [\underline{u}_m, \bar{u}_m], \quad (2.22)$$

with real numbers $\underline{u}_i \leq \bar{u}_i$, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$.

In this case, the Goh optimality condition is restricted to the components that lie in the interior of the control set and one has the following optimality condition, see [4, 14].

Theorem 2.3 (Goh necessary conditions under control constraints). *Consider the general Mayer problem (2.12) under the control bounds $u(t) \in \mathbb{U}$, for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$, with the set \mathbb{U} as in (2.22). Then, on any open time interval over which*

$$\underline{u}_i < u_i^*(t) < \bar{u}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{u}_j < u_j^*(t) < \bar{u}_j,$$

it holds that

$$[\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_{n+1}] (t) [\tilde{f}_i, \tilde{f}_j] z_*(t) = 0. \quad (2.23)$$

One gets the following generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition for the square submatrix of W corresponding to singular components.

Theorem 2.4 (Generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition and feedback expression under control constraints). *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 2.3, let (a, b) be an open interval on which*

$$\begin{cases} \underline{u}_i < u_i^*(t) < \bar{u}_i, & \text{for } i \in S, \\ u_i^*(t) = \underline{u}_i, & \text{for } i \in \underline{B}, \\ u_i^*(t) = \bar{u}_i, & \text{for } i \in \bar{B}. \end{cases}$$

Here $\{S, \underline{B}, \bar{B}\}$ is a partition of $\{1, \dots, m\}$ into singular, lower-bang and upper-bang components of the control u^* . Then, on (a, b) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_0, [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]] + \sum_{j \in S} u_j^* [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_j, [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]] \\ & + \sum_{j \in \underline{B}} \underline{u}_j [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_j, [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]] \\ & + \sum_{j \in \bar{B}} \bar{u}_j [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_j, [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]] = 0, \quad \text{for } i \in S. \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

Moreover, the $|S| \times |S|$ -matrix $W_S(t)$ with entries $W_{ij} = [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_{n+1}] [\tilde{f}_j, [\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_i]]$ for $i, j \in S$, is negative semidefinite.

Proof. The expression (2.25) follows from calculations analogous to (2.14)-(2.16), (2.18)-(2.19) and Goh condition (2.23). The negative semidefiniteness of W_S holds in view of [14, Theorem 4.1]. \square

Remark 2.3 (A feedback formula for the singular controls). The matrix W_S in Theorem 2.4 is the submatrix of W in (2.20) corresponding to the singular components of the control. Whenever W_S is negative definite, by using expression (2.25), one can write the singular control in terms of the state variable z , the adjoint variable λ and the bang controls.

In this section we have considered the Goh optimality conditions for general nonlinear singular optimal control problems with control affine cost. In the next section we apply these results to the case when the constraint equation is given by a pH system.

3 Optimality conditions for nonlinear pH systems

The optimality conditions for general constraints presented in Section 2 do not make use of the pH structure. In this section we therefore make explicit use of the nonlinear pH structure in (1.1) and generalize results of [11, 12, 33].

We consider the optimal control problem governed by the nonlinear pH dynamics (1.1) and minimizing the integral cost (2.8). Writing it in Mayer form, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & x_{n+1}(T) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \dot{x} = (J(x) - R(x)) \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial x}(x) + G(x)u(t), \\ & \dot{x}_{n+1} = \ell_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m \ell_i(x)u_i, \\ & z(0) = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ x_{n+1} \end{bmatrix}(t_0) = z_0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

For the sake of simplicity in the presentation of the results, we introduce the abbreviations

$$g_0(x) := (J(x) - R(x)) \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial x}; \quad f_0(x) := \begin{bmatrix} g_0(x) \\ \ell_0(x) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3.26}$$

and, using g_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$ to denote the columns of G , we set

$$f_i(x) := \begin{bmatrix} g_i(x) \\ \ell_i(x) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.27)$$

In this case, the adjoint variable λ again takes the form

$$\lambda = [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_{n+1}]^T,$$

where λ_{n+1} is scalar.

Proposition 3.1 (Goh conditions for nonlinear pH control). *For problem (3.25) the Goh conditions in Theorem 2.1 read*

$$\begin{cases} 0 = [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] [g_i, g_j], \\ 0 = \lambda_{n+1} (\ell'_j g_i - \ell'_i g_j) = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, m.$$

With these conditions we compute the expressions for W and d in (2.20) given previously in the context of problem (2.11). We have

$$[f_0, f_i] = \begin{bmatrix} [g_0, g_i] \\ \ell'_i g_0 - \ell'_0 g_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.28)$$

and

$$[f_j, [f_0, f_i]] = \begin{bmatrix} [g_j, [g_0, g_i]] \\ \ell'_i g_0 g_j + \ell'_i g'_0 g_j - \ell''_0 g_i g_j - \ell'_0 g'_i g_j - \ell'_j [g_0, g_j] \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence

$$W_{ij} = [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] [g_j, [g_0, g_i]] + \lambda_{n+1} (\ell'_i g_0 g_j + \ell'_i g'_0 g_j - \ell''_0 g_i g_j - \ell'_0 g'_i g_j - \ell'_j [g_0, g_i]), \quad (3.29)$$

and

$$d_i = [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] [g_0, [g_0, g_i]] + \lambda_{n+1} (\ell''_i g_0 g_0 + \ell'_i g'_0 g_0 - \ell''_0 g_i g_0 - \ell'_0 g'_i g_0 - \ell'_0 [g_0, g_i]). \quad (3.30)$$

Proposition 3.2 (Legendre-Clebsch condition for nonlinear pH control). *For problem (3.25) the generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition in Theorem 2.2 states that matrix W in (3.29) is negative semidefinite.*

Additionally, whenever W is negative definite over some interval then, on that interval, one can write the optimal control in feedback form as in (2.21).

Remark 3.1. An important case is when we have $R = 0$ and J, ℓ_0 are constant, i.e. if we consider general Hamiltonian equations without dissipation and no cost on just x . We then have the following simplified expression

$$[f_j, [f_0, f_i]] = \begin{bmatrix} -JH_{xxx}g_i g_j \\ \ell_i''(JH_x)g_j + \ell_i' JH_{xx}g_j + \ell_j' [JH_{xx}g_j] \end{bmatrix}.$$

3.1 Nonlinear pH systems with control bounds

For the problem with control bounds in the port-Hamiltonian optimal control problem (3.25), the Goh conditions of Theorem 2.3 specialize as described next.

Proposition 3.3 (Goh condition for nonlinear pH control under control constraints). *Consider the nonlinear pH-governed problem (3.25) under the control constraint $u(t) \in \mathbb{U}$, for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$, with the set \mathbb{U} as in (2.22). Then, on any open interval over which*

$$\underline{u}_i < u_i^*(t) < \bar{u}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{u}_j < u_j^*(t) < \bar{u}_j,$$

for some pair $i, j = 1, \dots, m$, it holds that

$$[\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] [g_i, g_j] = 0, \quad \lambda_{n+1} (\ell_j' g_i - \ell_i' g_j) = 0.$$

In view of the calculations in (3.28)-(3.29), the results in Theorem 2.4 written in the pH setting take the following form.

Proposition 3.4 (Generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition and feedback formula for nonlinear pH control under control constraints). *Under the settings of Proposition 3.3, the results in Theorem 2.4 hold where, for $j = 0, \dots, m$ and $i = 1, \dots, m$, the expression of $W_{ij} = [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] [f_j, [f_0, f_i]]$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} W_{ij} &= [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] [g_j, [g_0, g_i]] \\ &\quad + \lambda_{n+1} (\ell_i'' g_0 g_j + \ell_i' g_0' g_j - \ell_0'' g_i g_j - \ell_0' g_i' g_j - \ell_j' [g_0, g_i]) \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.5. Considering Example 1.2 with and the associated cost of minimizing the energy supply $\int_0^T y^\top u dt = \int_0^T \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial p}^\top B(q) u dt$ leads to an OCP in which the Lie brackets $[f_i, \tilde{f}_j]$ are

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ B_j^\top \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{E}}{\partial p^2} B_i \end{bmatrix}$$

which vanish identically for sufficiently regular \mathcal{E} , so that Goh conditions (2.17) hold trivially. Unless significant simplifications are applied to the model (1.5), the expressions for the second-order Lie brackets remain too complex to provide meaningful geometric insight.

4 Linear port-Hamiltonian systems

The results presented in the last section show that for pH systems the Goh conditions strongly simplify. This is even more the case for linear pH systems, where the representation of the optimality conditions is very nice.

4.1 Linear port-Hamiltonian system without control constraints

In this subsection we analyze the Goh optimality conditions for problems when the constraint equation is given by the linear port-Hamiltonian system and the energy function $\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2}x^T Qx$ is quadratic in the state

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= (J - R)Qx(t) + Gu(t), & x(0) &= x^0, \\ y(t) &= G^T Qx(t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

with

- $J : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$ is skew-symmetric,
- $R : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$ is symmetric positive semidefinite,
- $Q : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$ is symmetric positive definite,
- $G = [g_1 \ \dots \ g_m] : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n,m}$ has full rank $m \leq n$,
- $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$.

Note that more general linear port-Hamiltonian formulations are possible, such as those presented in [5, 25], but we follow here the formulation considered in [11, 13, 33].

Let us first treat the case that the set of admissible controls \mathcal{U} is open and we consider the optimal control problem with quadratic cost

$$\begin{aligned} \min & \int_0^T y^T M y + y^T N u + \ell^T u \, dt, \\ \text{s.t.} & (4.31), \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

where the matrices involved in the cost functional satisfy

- $M : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$ is symmetric and positive semidefinite,
- $N = [n_1 \ \dots \ n_m] : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m,m}$, and
- $\ell = [\ell_1 \ \dots \ \ell_m]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

In the following, for simplicity of notation we often use the abbreviation

$$A := (J - R)Q. \quad (4.33)$$

To compute the Lie bracket expressions for problem (4.32), we again add an auxiliary state variable to transform the problem into Mayer form (with only terminal cost) given by

$$\dot{x}_{n+1} = y^T M y + y^T N u + \ell^T u = x^T Q G M G^T Q x + x^T Q G N u + \ell^T u. \quad (4.34)$$

Then

$$f_0 = \begin{bmatrix} Ax \\ x^T Q G M G^T Q x \end{bmatrix}, \quad f_i = \begin{bmatrix} g_i \\ x^T Q G n_i + \ell_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

are functions from \mathbb{R}^{n+1} to \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . We obtain

$$[f_i, f_j] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ n_j^T G^T Q g_i - n_i^T G^T Q g_j \end{bmatrix}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, m,$$

so that

$$[\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] [f_i, f_j] = \lambda_{n+1} (n_j^T G^T Q g_i - n_i^T G^T Q n_j), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, m, \quad (4.35)$$

and we have the following Goh conditions.

Proposition 4.1 (Goh condition for problem (4.32)). *If the optimal control problem (4.32) for the linear pH system (4.31) admits an optimal solution, then, necessarily*

$$N^T G^T Q G \text{ is symmetric.} \quad (4.36)$$

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1, taking into account that $\lambda_{n+1} = 1$ in this context (see Remark 2.2). \square

An optimality condition for linear pH systems has been studied in [34].

Remark 4.1 (Comparison to [34]). To compare with the results in [34] we see that the optimality condition (4.36) is automatically satisfied in their framework, since there $N = I_m$ is a standing hypothesis. Additionally, observe that we do not need the normality hypothesis used in [34], since our problem (4.32) does not involve terminal constraints, while in [34] the terminal point is fixed.

We next compute the expressions for W and d in (2.20), for the linear problem (4.32). For $i = 1, \dots, m$ we get

$$[f_0, f_i] = \begin{bmatrix} -Ag_i \\ n_i^T G^T QAx - x^T QG(M + M^T)G^T Qg_i \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$[f_0, [f_0, f_i]] = \begin{bmatrix} A^2 g_i \\ n_i^T G^T QA^2 x - 2g_i^T QGMG^T QAx + 2x^T QGMG^T QAg_i \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d_i &= [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] [f_0, [f_0, f_i]] \\ &= \lambda_{n+1} \left(n_i^T G^T QA^2 x - 2g_i^T QGMG^T QAx + 2x^T QGMG^T QAg_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, for $i, j = 1, \dots, m$, we have

$$[f_j, [f_0, f_i]] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ n_i^T G^T QAg_j - 2g_i^T QGMG^T Qb_j + n_j^T G^T QAg_i \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$[\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] [f_j, [f_0, f_i]] = \lambda_{n+1} \left(n_i^T G^T QAg_j - 2g_i^T QGMG^T Qg_j + n_j^T G^T QAg_i \right).$$

Consequently, since $\lambda_{n+1} = 1$ in this context, the matrix W for (4.32) is given by

$$W = N^T G^T QAG - 2G^T QGMG^T QG + (N^T G^T QAG)^T.$$

Inserting the structure of the matrix $A = (J - R)Q$ and using the skew symmetry of J , we get

$$W = -N^T G^T QRQG - 2G^T QGMG^T QG - (N^T G^T QRQG)^T. \quad (4.37)$$

In the often considered special case that $M = 0$, $\ell = 0$, and $N = I$ we then have that W is just twice the negative of the symmetric positive semidefinite matrix $G^T Q R Q G$ which is required to be positive definite along optimal trajectories. This means that along such trajectories the solution is asymptotically stable because the dissipation term acts in this direction.

We have the following Legendre-Clebsch condition.

Corollary 4.2 (Generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition for (4.32)). *If the optimal control problem (4.32) of the linear port-Hamiltonian admits an optimal solution, then W given by (4.37) is negative semidefinite.*

Remark 4.2 (Comparison to [34]). Under the hypotheses used in [34], namely,

$$M = 0, \quad N = I_m, \quad \text{Im}(G) \cap \text{Ker}(RQ) = 0, \quad (4.38)$$

the expression of W in (4.37) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} W &= G^T Q (J - R) Q G + (G^T Q (J - R) Q G)^T \\ &= -2G^T Q R Q G, \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

which is negative definite in view of the last condition in (4.38) and since Q is positive definite and R is positive semidefinite. Here we see directly that under the conditions in (4.38) a feedback solution exists. On the other hand our analysis is more general, since we get these conditions under possibly weaker assumptions.

Remark 4.3 (Cost functional with reference trajectory). In many applications one wants to control a system towards a given reference trajectory x_{ref} . Replacing $x = \tilde{x} - x_{\text{ref}}$ one gets a given inhomogeneity in the state and the output equation. In this case, the system results in

$$\dot{\tilde{x}} = (J - R) Q \tilde{x} + G u + h(t), \quad (4.40)$$

$$y = G^T Q (\tilde{x} - x_{\text{ref}}) = G^T Q \tilde{x} + k(t). \quad (4.41)$$

The cost functional takes the form

$$\int_0^T [(x - x_{\text{ref}})^T Q G M G^T Q (x - x_{\text{ref}}) + (x - x_{\text{ref}})^T Q G N u + \ell^T u] dt.$$

which, removing the terms depending only on the reference trajectory, can be written as

$$\int_0^T [(x - 2x_{\text{ref}})^T Q G M G^T Q x + (x - x_{\text{ref}})^T Q G N u + \ell^T u] dt, \quad (4.42)$$

For the optimal control problem governed by system (4.40)-(4.41) and associated to the cost (4.42), the expressions for the Lie brackets coincides with (4.35), the matrix W matches with (4.37), and the vector d is such that

$$d_i = \lambda_{n+1} \left[n_i^T G^T Q A^2 x - 2g_i^T Q G M G^T Q A x + 2(x - x_{\text{ref}})^T Q G M G^T Q A g_i \right],$$

so that the optimality conditions do not change.

Example 4.3. To illustrate the nice properties of the optimality conditions, consider the following example of a second order linear control problem that is discussed in detail in [11] and arises e.g. in the control of high rise buildings [40],

$$M \frac{d^2}{dt^2} q + D \frac{d}{dt} q + K q = B u \quad (4.43)$$

with real symmetric positive definite matrices M, K . In contrast to [11] we assume that the damping does not work on the whole position vector, i.e. that D is only positive semidefinite and B is of full column rank. Setting $x_1 = M\dot{q}$, $x_2 = q$,

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q = \begin{bmatrix} M^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & K \end{bmatrix}, \quad G = \begin{bmatrix} B \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad x = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

and introducing a collocated output $y = GQx$, the system has the form (4.31). Unfortunately the condition $\text{Im}(G) \cap \text{Ker}(RQ) = \{0\}$ that is used in [33] does not hold, since DM^{-1} has a kernel and $W = -2B^T M^{-1} D M^{-1} B$ is only semidefinite. Hence the techniques in [33] cannot be applied. Also the linear system with W for the feedback is, in general, not (uniquely) solvable. However, still a (non-unique) feedback solution may exist if the right hand side d is in the image of W , see [11, 24].

In this subsection we have seen that by using the general theory we can generalize the conditions for optimality presented in [34]. In the next subsection we consider the case of control bounds.

4.2 The linear pH constrained problem subject to control bounds

If we require control bounds, i.e.

$$\mathbb{U} = [\underline{u}_1, \bar{u}_1] \times \dots \times [\underline{u}_m, \bar{u}_m],$$

and u is subject to the inequalities

$$\underline{u}_i \leq u_i(t) \leq \bar{u}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (4.44)$$

then we obtain the optimal control problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \int_0^T y^T M y + y^T N u + \ell^T u \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \dot{x}(t) = (J - R)Qx(t) + Gu(t), \\ & x(0) = x^0, \\ & y(t) = G^T Qx(t), \\ & \underline{u}_i \leq u_i(t) \leq \bar{u}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

In order to study (4.45), we have to include *switching functions*.

For the i -th component of the control, the switching function is given by

$$s_i := \mathcal{H}_{u_i} = p^T f_i = [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] g_i + \lambda_{n+1} (x^T Q G n_i + \ell_i). \quad (4.46)$$

Introduce the *set of switching points*

$$Z_i := \{t \in [0, T] : s_i(t) = 0\},$$

and the *interior set* for control variable i , for $i = 1, \dots, m$:

$$W_i := \{t \in [0, T] : \underline{u}_i < u_i^*(t) < \bar{u}_i\}.$$

In view of the maximum condition of Pontryagin's Maximum Principle, one then has that W_i is contained, up to a set of measure zero, in Z_i .

Now, following the notation in [34, Theorem 8], for any subset $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$, we set

$$u_{\mathcal{I}} := (u_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}^T, \quad G_{\mathcal{I}} := (g_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}^T, \quad s_{\mathcal{I}} := (s_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}^T,$$

and analogous notations are used for other involved matrices and vectors.

At this point it is useful to present the adjoint equation for (4.45) which reads

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] = - [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] A \\ \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad - \lambda_{n+1} (x^T Q G (M + M^T) G^T Q + u^T N^T G^T Q), \\ \dot{\lambda}_{n+1} = 0 \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.4 (Goh and generalized Legendre-Clebsch conditions for linear pH problems under control constraints). *For problem (4.45), the Goh conditions of Theorem 2.3 read*

$$[\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] [f_i, f_j] = n_j^T G^T Q g_i - n_i^T G^T Q n_j = 0, \quad (4.47)$$

on any open interval (a, b) on which

$$\underline{u}_i < u_i^*(t) < \bar{u}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{u}_j < u_j^*(t) < \bar{u}_j$$

holds.

The generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition states that the matrix

$$N_{\mathcal{I}}^T G^T Q A B_{\mathcal{I}} - 2G_{\mathcal{I}}^T Q G M G^T Q G_{\mathcal{I}} + (N_{\mathcal{I}}^T G^T Q A G_{\mathcal{I}})^T \quad (4.48)$$

is negative semidefinite, on any open interval $(a, b) \subset [0, T]$, contained in $\bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} W_i$ for $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$. This is, \mathcal{I} is any subset of indexes of simultaneous singular components of the control.

Remark 4.4 (Special cases $N = 0$ and $N = I_m$). When $N = 0$ or $N = I_m$, using the notation introduced in (3.27) for the vector fields f_i , one has that $[f_i, f_j] = 0$ in the whole space \mathbb{R}^n , independently of the trajectories. Therefore, the Goh conditions hold trivially. Additionally, for $N = 0$, the matrix in the generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition of Proposition 4.4 reads

$$-2G_{\mathcal{I}}^T Q G M G^T Q G_{\mathcal{I}}, \quad (4.49)$$

and for $N = I_m$, it has the form

$$-2G_{\mathcal{I}}^T Q [R + G M G^T] Q G_{\mathcal{I}}, \quad (4.50)$$

We can apply these result to obtain feedback formulas.

Theorem 4.5 (Feedback formulas for singular controls). *For any subset $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$, given an open interval $(a, b) \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} W_i$, the following expressions for the control hold*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] A^2 G_{\mathcal{I}} \\ & + \lambda_{n+1} x^T [2Q G M G^T Q A G_{\mathcal{I}} - 2A^T Q G M G^T Q G_{\mathcal{I}} + A^T A^T Q G N_{\mathcal{I}}] \\ & + \lambda_{n+1} u_{\mathcal{I}}^T \left[N_{\mathcal{I}}^T G^T Q A G_{\mathcal{I}} - 2G_{\mathcal{I}}^T Q G M G^T Q G_{\mathcal{I}} + (N_{\mathcal{I}}^T G^T Q A G_{\mathcal{I}})^T \right] \\ & + \lambda_{n+1} u_{\mathcal{A}}^T \left[N_{\mathcal{A}}^T G^T Q A G_{\mathcal{I}} - 2G_{\mathcal{A}}^T Q G M G^T Q G_{\mathcal{I}} + G_{\mathcal{A}}^T A^T Q G N_{\mathcal{I}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.51)$$

Additionally, for the special case $N = 0$, one gets the reduced expression

$$0 = [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] A^2 G_{\mathcal{I}} + \lambda_{n+1} x^T [2QGMG^T QAG_{\mathcal{I}} - 2A^T QGMG^T QG_{\mathcal{I}}] \\ - 2\lambda_{n+1} (u_{\mathcal{I}}^T G_{\mathcal{I}}^T + u_{\mathcal{A}}^T G_{\mathcal{A}}^T) QGMG^T QG_{\mathcal{I}},$$

and for $N = I_m$,

$$0 = [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] A^2 G_{\mathcal{I}} \\ + \lambda_{n+1} x^T [2QGMG^T Q(J - R) - 2A^T QGMG^T + A^T A^T] QG_{\mathcal{I}} \\ - 2\lambda_{n+1} (u_{\mathcal{I}}^T G_{\mathcal{I}}^T + u_{\mathcal{A}}^T G_{\mathcal{A}}^T) Q [R + GMG^T] QG_{\mathcal{I}}.$$

Proof. Following the notation introduced above, and from (4.46), one gets

$$s_{\mathcal{I}} = [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] G_{\mathcal{I}} + \lambda_{n+1} (x^T QGN_{\mathcal{I}} + \ell_{\mathcal{I}}).$$

Therefore,

$$\dot{s}_{\mathcal{I}} = \frac{d}{dt} [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] G_{\mathcal{I}} + \lambda_{n+1} \dot{x}^T QGN_{\mathcal{I}} \\ = - [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] AG_{\mathcal{I}} - \lambda_{n+1} x^T QG(M + M^T)G^T QG_{\mathcal{I}} \quad (4.52) \\ - \lambda_{n+1} u^T \underbrace{N^T G^T QG_{\mathcal{I}}}_{(N^T G^T QG)_{\mathcal{I}}} + \lambda_{n+1} x^T A^T QGN_{\mathcal{I}} + \lambda_{n+1} u^T \underbrace{G^T QGN_{\mathcal{I}}}_{(G^T QGN)_{\mathcal{I}}}.$$

We split the remainder of the proof in two cases.

Case 1: $N = 0$ or $N = I_m$. From (4.52) one gets that

$$\dot{s}_{\mathcal{I}} = - [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] AG_{\mathcal{I}} - \lambda_{n+1} x^T QG(M + M^T)G^T QG_{\mathcal{I}} + \lambda_{n+1} x^T A^T QGN_{\mathcal{I}}. \quad (4.53)$$

Thus,

$$\ddot{s}_{\mathcal{I}} = [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] A^2 G_{\mathcal{I}} \\ + \lambda_{n+1} x^T [2QGMG^T QAG_{\mathcal{I}} - 2A^T QGMG^T QG_{\mathcal{I}} + A^T A^T QGN_{\mathcal{I}}] \\ + \lambda_{n+1} u^T [N^T G^T QAG_{\mathcal{I}} - 2G^T QGMG^T QG_{\mathcal{I}} + G^T A^T QGN_{\mathcal{I}}]. \quad (4.54)$$

Now, for $N = 0$, splitting the control vector in $u_{\mathcal{I}}$ and $u_{\mathcal{A}}$, one gets from latter equation that

$$\ddot{s}_{\mathcal{I}} = [\lambda_1 \ \dots \ \lambda_n] A^2 G_{\mathcal{I}} + \lambda_{n+1} x^T [2QGMG^T QAG_{\mathcal{I}} - 2A^T QGMG^T QG_{\mathcal{I}}] \\ - 2\lambda_{n+1} (u_{\mathcal{I}}^T G_{\mathcal{I}}^T + u_{\mathcal{A}}^T G_{\mathcal{A}}^T) QGMG^T QG_{\mathcal{I}},$$

where $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{I}^c$.

For $N = I_m$, from (4.54), one derives

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{s}_{\mathcal{I}} &= [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] A^2 G_{\mathcal{I}} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{n+1} x^T [2QGMG^T Q(J - R) - 2A^T QGMG^T + A^T A^T] QG_{\mathcal{I}} \\ &\quad - 2\lambda_{n+1} (u_{\mathcal{I}}^T G_{\mathcal{I}}^T + u_{\mathcal{A}}^T G_{\mathcal{A}}^T) Q [R + GMG^T] QG_{\mathcal{I}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we replaced the matrix A by its expression in (4.33).

Case 2: arbitrary matrix N . From expression (4.52) for $\dot{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{s}_{\mathcal{I}} &= [\lambda_1 \quad \dots \quad \lambda_n] A^2 G_{\mathcal{I}} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{n+1} x^T [2QGMG^T QAG_{\mathcal{I}} - 2A^T QGMG^T QG_{\mathcal{I}} + A^T A^T QGN_{\mathcal{I}}] \\ &\quad + \lambda_{n+1} u_{\mathcal{I}}^T [N_{\mathcal{I}}^T G^T QAG_{\mathcal{I}} - 2G_{\mathcal{I}}^T QGMG^T QG_{\mathcal{I}} + (N_{\mathcal{I}}^T G^T QAG_{\mathcal{I}})^T] \\ &\quad + \lambda_{n+1} u_{\mathcal{A}}^T [N_{\mathcal{A}}^T G^T QAG_{\mathcal{I}} - 2G_{\mathcal{A}}^T QGMG^T QG_{\mathcal{I}} + G_{\mathcal{A}}^T A^T QGN_{\mathcal{I}}]. \end{aligned}$$

□

5 Conclusions and future work

For the singular optimal control problem of controlling a port-Hamiltonian system with the supplied energy as cost function, the Goh optimality conditions are derived. It is shown that the use of the specific port-Hamiltonian structure leads to very elegant solution formulas, in particular in the case of linear port-Hamiltonian systems with quadratic Hamiltonian. Optimality conditions are also presented for the case of control constraints.

It remains an open problem how to give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a feedback control in the case when the matrix W in the generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition is only semidefinite. This is closely related to the topic to derive the optimality conditions for port-Hamiltonian descriptor systems.

Another classical application of optimal control is the computation of (feedback) controls $u = k(x)$ or output feedbacks $u = k(y)$ so that the closed loop system is asymptotically stable. To achieve this, one just chooses an infinite interval, i.e. $T = \infty$, and requires that for the closed loop solution $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = 0$. For this case, analogous results to the ones obtained in this work are expected to hold. It is also an interesting question what happens

when the usual approach, of adding a quadratic penalty term $\alpha \sum_{j=1}^m u_j^2$ to the cost function is used, and one considers the convergence behavior for $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, see [17]. The Goh conditions will not appear in that context, since \mathcal{H}_u depends on the control and, consequently, it is, in general, not differentiable in time.

We have studied problems without terminal constraints, which admit a unique multiplier that verifies *normality*, i.e. the multiplier associated to the integral cost can be normalized to 1. In [4, 3] a framework for dealing with general terminal constraints of the form $\varphi_i(x(T)) \leq 0$, $\eta_j(x(T)) = 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, d_\varphi$, and $j = 1, \dots, d_\eta$ was introduced. Also, [14] consider terminal constraints of the form $x(T) \in K$ under an additional hypothesis.

Using the techniques in [4, 3] one may as well discuss the derivation of second order sufficient conditions.

Acknowledgment

M.S.A. acknowledges the financial support of the Brazilian agencies FAPERJ process E-26/203.223/2017, CNPq process 310452/2019-8 and CAPES process 88881.162133/2017-01. The current research was mainly developed while M.S.A. was holding a Humboldt Fellowship at TU Berlin (Germany). V.M. has been supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) through the SPP1984 “Hybrid and multimodal energy systems” Project: *Distributed Dynamic Security Control* and by the DFG Research Center Math+, Project No. 390685689. *Advanced Modeling, Simulation, and Optimization of Large Scale Multi-Energy Systems*.

References

- [1] R. Abraham and J. E. Marsden. *Foundations of mechanics*. American Mathematical Soc., 2008.
- [2] R. Altmann and P. Schulze. A port-Hamiltonian formulation of the Navier–Stokes equations for reactive flows. *Systems & Control Letters*, 100:51–55, 2017.
- [3] M. S. Aronna. Second order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for singular solutions of partially-affine control problems. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. - S*, 11(6):1179–1199, 2018.

- [4] M.S. Aronna, J.F. Bonnans, A.V. Dmitruk, and P.A. Lotito. Quadratic order conditions for bang-singular extremals. *Numer. Algebra, Control Optim., AIMS Journal, special issue dedicated to Professor Helmut Maurer on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, 2(3):511–546, 2012.
- [5] C. Beattie, V. Mehrmann, H. Xu, and H. Zwart. Port-Hamiltonian descriptor systems. *Math. Control, Signals, Sys.*, 30:17, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00498-018-0223-3>.
- [6] A. Brugnoli, D. Alazard, V. Pommier-Budinger, and D. Matignon. Port-Hamiltonian formulation and symplectic discretization of plate models part i: Mindlin model for thick plates. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 75:940–960, 2019.
- [7] A. Brugnoli, D. Alazard, V. Pommier-Budinger, and D. Matignon. Port-Hamiltonian formulation and symplectic discretization of plate models part ii: Kirchhoff model for thin plates. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 75:961–981, 2019.
- [8] D. Chu and V. Mehrmann. Stabilization of linear port-hamiltonian descriptor systems via output feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18967*, 2024.
- [9] O.T. Doganay, K. Klamroth, B. Lang, M. Stiglmayr, and C. Totzeck. Optimal control for port-Hamiltonian systems and a new perspective on dynamic network flow problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15082*, 2023.
- [10] V. Duindam, A. Macchelli, S. Stramigioli, and H. Bruyninckx. *Modeling and control of complex physical systems: the port-Hamiltonian approach*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [11] T. Faulwasser, J. Kirchhoff, V. Mehrmann, F. Philipp, M. Schaller, and K. Worthmann. Hidden regularity in singular optimal control of port-hamiltonian systems. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [12] T. Faulwasser, B. Maschke, F. Philipp, M. Schaller, and K. Worthmann. Optimal control of port-Hamiltonian descriptor systems with minimal energy supply. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 60:2132–2158, 2022.
- [13] T. Faulwasser, B. Maschke, M. Philipp, F. and Schaller, and K. Worthmann. Optimal control of port-hamiltonian descriptor systems with minimal energy supply. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 60(4):2132–2158, 2022.

- [14] H. Frankowska and D. Tonon. Pointwise second-order necessary optimality conditions for the Mayer problem with control constraints. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(5):3814–3843, 2013.
- [15] H Hoang, Françoise Couenne, Christian Jallut, and Yann Le Gorrec. The port Hamiltonian approach to modeling and control of continuous stirred tank reactors. *Journal of Process Control*, 21(10):1449–1458, 2011.
- [16] B. Jacob and H. J. Zwart. *Linear port-Hamiltonian systems on infinite-dimensional spaces*, volume 223. Birkhäuser Basel, 2012.
- [17] D. Jacobson, S. Gershwin, and M. Lele. Computation of optimal singular controls. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 15(1):67–73, 1970.
- [18] L. Kölsch, P. J. Soneira, F. Strehle, and S. Hohmann. Optimal control of port-Hamiltonian systems: A continuous-time learning approach. *Automatica*, 130:109725, 2021.
- [19] A.J. Krener. The high order maximal principle and its application to singular extremals. *SIAM J. on Control*, 15(2):256–293, 1977.
- [20] P. Kunkel and V. Mehrmann. Optimal control for linear descriptor systems with variable coefficients. In *Numerical Linear Algebra in Signals, Systems and Control*, pages 313–339. Springer New York, 2011.
- [21] D. Liberzon. *Calculus of Variations and Optimal Control Theory. A Concise Introduction*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, Oxford, 2012.
- [22] A. Macchelli. Towards a port-based formulation of macro-economic systems. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 351(12):5235–5249, 2014.
- [23] A. Macchelli, C. Melchiorri, and S. Stramigioli. Port-based modeling of a flexible link. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 23(4):650–660, 2007.
- [24] V. Mehrmann. *The Autonomous Linear Quadratic Control Problem. Theory and Numerical Solution*, volume 163 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*. Berlin etc.: Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [25] V. Mehrmann and R. Morandin. Structure-preserving discretization for port-hamiltonian descriptor systems. In *58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 9.-12.12.19, Nice*, pages 6863–6868. IEEE, 2019.

- [26] V. Mehrmann and B. Unger. Control of port-Hamiltonian differential-algebraic systems and applications. *Acta Numerica*, In press, 2023.
- [27] F. Philipp, M. Schaller, T. Faulwasser, B. Maschke, and K. Worthmann. Minimizing the energy supply of infinite-dimensional linear port-Hamiltonian systems. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 54(19):155–160, 2021.
- [28] L. Pontryagin, V. Boltyanski, R. Gamkrelidze, and E. Michtchenko. *The Mathematical Theory of Optimal Processes*. Wiley Interscience, New York, 1962.
- [29] L.S. Pontryagin. *Mathematical theory of optimal processes*. Routledge, 2018.
- [30] R. Rashad, F. Califano, F. P. Schuller, and S. Stramigioli. Port-Hamiltonian modeling of ideal fluid flow: Part i. foundations and kinetic energy. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 164:104201, 2021.
- [31] R. Rashad, F. Califano, F. P. Schuller, and S. Stramigioli. Port-Hamiltonian modeling of ideal fluid flow: Part ii. compressible and incompressible flow. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 164:104199, 2021.
- [32] T. Reis and T. Stykel. Passivity, port-Hamiltonian formulation and solution estimates for a coupled magneto-quasistatic system, 2021. Preprint arXiv:2205.15259.
- [33] M. Schaller, F. Philipp, T. Faulwasser, B. Maschke, and K. Worthmann. Control of port-Hamiltonian systems with minimal energy supply. *European Journal of Control*, 60:33–40, 2021.
- [34] M. Schaller, F. Philipp, T. Faulwasser, K. Worthmann, and B. Maschke. Control of port-hamiltonian systems with minimal energy supply. *European Journal of Control*, 2021.
- [35] H. Schättler and U. Ledzewicz. *Geometric optimal control: theory, methods and examples*, volume 38. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [36] M. Schöberl, H. Ennsbrunner, and K. Schlacher. Modelling of piezoelectric structures—a Hamiltonian approach. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling of Dynamical Systems*, 14(3):179–193, 2008.

- [37] A. Siuka, M. Schöberl, and K. Schlacher. Port-Hamiltonian modelling and energy-based control of the timoshenko beam. *Acta mechanica*, 222(1):69–89, 2011.
- [38] A. van der Schaft and D. Jeltsema. Port-Hamiltonian systems theory: An introductory overview. *Foundations and Trends in Systems and Control*, 1(2-3):173–378, 2014.
- [39] R. Vinter. *Optimal control*. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2000.
- [40] Alexander Warsewa, Michael Böhm, Oliver Sawodny, and Cristina Tarín. A port-Hamiltonian approach to modeling the structural dynamics of complex systems. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 89:1528–1546, 2021.
- [41] Y. Wu, B. Hamroun, Y. Le Gorrec, and B. Maschke. Reduced order LQG control design for infinite dimensional port Hamiltonian systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(2):865–871, 2020.