

ON INFINITE-HORIZON MINIMUM ENERGY CONTROL

MOHAMED-ALI BELABBAS

*Electrical and Computer Engineering Department and Coordinated Science Laboratory,
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.*

XUDONG CHEN

Electrical and Systems Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis.

ABSTRACT. We address the infinite-horizon minimum energy control problem for linear time-invariant finite-dimensional systems (A, B) . We show that the problem admits a solution if and only if (A, B) is stabilizable and A does not have imaginary eigenvalues.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{F} be either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} , the field of real or complex numbers. We consider in this paper finite-dimensional linear time-invariant systems:

$$(1) \quad \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t),$$

where $A \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times m}$, $x(t) \in \mathbb{F}^n$, and $u(t) \in \mathbb{F}^m$.

Given $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{F}^n$, the *finite-horizon minimum energy control problem* for (1) is

$$(2) \quad \min_{u \in L^2([0, T], \mathbb{F}^m)} \eta_T(u) := \int_0^T \|u(t)\|^2 dt \quad \text{s.t. } x(0) = x_0 \quad \text{and} \quad x(T) = x_1.$$

It is well known [1, 5, 3] that if the pair (A, B) is controllable, then the problem has a solution for any pair $(x_0, x_1) \in \mathbb{F}^n \times \mathbb{F}^n$. Moreover, the control law $u_T(t)$ that minimizes the cost is given by

$$(3) \quad u_T(t) = -B^\dagger e^{-A^\dagger t} W_{A,B}(T)^{-1} (x_0 - e^{-AT} x_1), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T],$$

where $W_{A,B}(T)$ is the *controllability Gramian*:

$$(4) \quad W_{A,B}(T) := \int_0^T e^{-At} B B^\dagger e^{-A^\dagger t} dt.$$

Note that our definition of controllability Gramian follows [1], but other conventions are sometimes used whereby factors e^{AT} and $e^{A^\dagger T}$ are added on the left and right, respectively.

The corresponding minimal cost, i.e., the solution to (2), is

$$(5) \quad (x_0 - e^{-AT} x_1)^\dagger W_{A,B}(T)^{-1} (x_0 - e^{-AT} x_1).$$

E-mail addresses: belabbas@illinois.edu, cxudong@wustl.edu.

Both authors contributed equally to this manuscript.

In this paper, we are interested in the case where $x_1 = 0$, so the minimal cost is reduced to $x_0^\dagger W_{A,B}(T)^{-1} x_0$.

The minimum energy control problem is a staple control problem, For the case $T < \infty$, it is entirely solved as mentioned above. However, the *infinite-horizon* case remains surprisingly open. We provide a solution in this paper.

We now define the problem formally:

Definition 1 (Admissible control). *Let (A, B) be stabilizable. A control law $u : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^m$ is admissible for $\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t)$, with $x(0) = x_0$, if $u \in L^2([0, \infty), \mathbb{F}^m)$ and if the solution $x(t)$ of the system satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = 0$. We denote the set of admissible controls by $\mathcal{U}(x_0)$.*

The infinite-horizon minimum energy control problem is then given by:

Problem 1 (Infinite-horizon minimum energy control). *Given $x_0 \in \mathbb{F}^n$, the infinite-horizon minimum energy control problem for system (1), with (A, B) stabilizable, is*

$$(6) \quad \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)} \eta(u) := \int_0^\infty \|u(t)\|^2 dt \quad \text{s.t. } x(0) = x_0.$$

The main theorem of the paper states a necessary and sufficient condition on the existence of solution to Problem 1 for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{F}^n$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathbb{F} be either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . Let $(A, B) \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{F}^{n \times m}$ be a stabilizable pair. The infinite-horizon minimum energy control problem admits a solution for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{F}^n$ if and only if A has no imaginary eigenvalue.*

Extension to general quadratic cost: Theorem 1.1 still holds if we allow the cost in Problem 1 to be of the more general form $\int_0^\infty u(t)^\dagger R u(t) dt$, for some positive definite matrix R . To wit, given a triplet (A, B, R) as parameters for the optimization problem, with (A, B) stabilizable and $R > 0$, we consider the linear system $\dot{y}(t) = Ay(t) + BR^{-1/2}v(t)$. Clearly, the controllability and stabilizability properties of (A, B) and $(A, BR^{-1/2})$ are the same. Also, it is not hard to see that the trajectory $x(t)$ generated by the control input $u(t)$ for system (A, B) is identical to the trajectory $y(t)$ generated by the control $v(t) := R^{1/2}u(t)$ for system $(A, BR^{-1/2})$, as long as both trajectories have the same initial state. In particular, $x(t) \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $y(t) \rightarrow 0$. Further, note that $\|v(t)\| \leq \|R^{1/2}\| \|u(t)\|$ and, conversely, $\|u(t)\| \leq \|R^{-1/2}\| \|v(t)\|$ (the induced 2-norm is used here). Together, these items show that if u is admissible for the infinite-horizon problem with parameter (A, B, R) , then $v(t) = R^{1/2}u(t)$ is admissible for the problem with parameter $(A, BR^{-1/2}, I)$, which is exactly Problem 1 for the pair $(A, BR^{-1/2})$. Moreover, if u^* is the minimizer of the former, then v^* is the minimizer of the latter, and vice versa.

The issue with imaginary eigenvalues. Problem 1 is relatively simple if A has no imaginary eigenvalues. In that case, if the pair (A, B) is stabilizable, then there exists a unique optimal solution; we state a precise result in Proposition 3.1 (with the notation of that Proposition, $\mathbf{V}_a = \mathbb{C}^n$ when A has no imaginary eigenvalues). Moreover, the optimal control takes the familiar *feedback form* $u^*(t) = -B^\dagger K x(t)$, for a uniquely defined K which is a solution to some Riccati equation. Implementing the optimal control leads to the closed-loop system $\dot{x}(t) = (A - BB^\dagger K)x(t)$.

We will show that the eigenvalues of A and the eigenvalues of $(A - BB^\dagger K)$ are related in the following way:

$$(\star) \quad \text{if } a + ib \in \text{spec}(A), \text{ then } -|a| + ib \in \text{spec}(A - BB^\dagger K).$$

In terms of pole placement, the optimal control is a feedback control law that moves the poles of the original system that lie on the right half of the complex plane to their symmetric locations about the imaginary axis. This remarkable behavior is shown in Proposition 2.2.

The above sheds some light on why the situation when A has imaginary eigenvalues is more complex. When A has no imaginary eigenvalue, the feedback law $u = -B^\dagger Kx$ solves Problem 1 for *all* initial states $x_0 \in \mathbb{F}^n$. However, if A has imaginary eigenvalue, by (\star) , there exists initial states (e.g., initial states that are right-eigenvectors of $(A - BB^\dagger K)$ corresponding to imaginary eigenvalues) for which the above feedback control law is not even admissible. One is thus forced to either seek an optimal control law of other form or show that such optimal control law does not exist. We will show that the latter statement holds.

Outline of our approach: The remaining sections of the paper are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. The proof relies on two major results, which we state in Section 2. For ease of exposition, we assume in this outline that A is in its Jordan normal form. The first result (Theorem 2.1 below) deals with the asymptotic behavior of the inverse of the controllability Gramian $W_{A,B}(T)$, for (A, B) a controllable pair; specifically, we show that $W_{A,B}(T)^{-1}$ converges to the aforementioned matrix K , precisely defined in (12), as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Its proof is quite technical and we come back to it below. The second result (Theorem 2.3) provides a necessary and sufficient condition on the subspace, denoted by \mathbf{V}_a , of initial states x_0 for which a (unique) solution to Problem 1 exists. It turns out, as alluded in the previous paragraph, that this subspace is the entire state space if and only if A has no imaginary eigenvalue. Note that Theorem 2.3 is stated for $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$. We state and prove the case of $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ as a corollary (see Corollary 2.4).

After stating these theorems, we present in Section 3 the proof of Theorem 2.3. In the proof of the sufficiency part, we assume that $x_0 \in \mathbf{V}_a$ and build the optimal control law explicitly, using a classical completion of square argument (see Subsection 3.1). Proving the necessity of those conditions is more subtle; in a nutshell, our proof goes by showing that the following two statements are true for $x_0 \notin \mathbf{V}_a$: (i) The minimum value of Problem 1, if it exists, has to be $x_0^\dagger K x_0$; (ii) There is no *admissible* control law that can attain such value of the cost function. Together, these statements preclude the existence of a solution for these initial states.

The remainder of the paper, namely Sections 4, 5, and 6, are devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.1. The proof is technical and requires us to track the asymptotic convergence rates of the submatrices of $W_{A,B}(T)^{-1}$ — these submatrices are the ones that arise from the decomposition of the spectrum of A into eigenvalues with positive, negative, and zero real parts.

As mentioned in (5), for (A, B) a controllable pair, $x_0^\dagger W_{A,B}(T)^{-1} x_0$ is the solution to the finite-horizon minimum energy control problem. It is intuitive that the corresponding finite-horizon optimal control law for initial states in the stable subspace of A converge to zero as $T \rightarrow \infty$, since the uncontrolled dynamics of the system flows such states to the origin. The corresponding principal submatrix of $W_{A,B}(T)^{-1}$ is shown to vanish




FIGURE 1. For the controllable matrix pair (A, B) with A a 3-by-3 Jordan block with zero eigenvalues, and $B = [0; 0; 1]$, we plot in (a) the absolute value of the optimal control $u_T(t)$ in (3) which drives the system from $x_0 = [1; 1; 1]$ to $x(T) = 0$ for increasing T , and in (b) the L^2 norm of u_T . We see that as T grows, $\|u_T\|$ become smaller and, in the limit, convergence to 0. However, since the system is not stabilizable, a zero control does not drive x_0 to the origin. This illustrates the issue with imaginary eigenvalues.

asymptotically, coinciding with the expected behavior. Reciprocally, initial states in the unstable and in the center subspace of the system always require some control effort. While the principal submatrix of $W_{A,B}(T)^{-1}$ corresponding to the unstable subspace converges to an invertible matrix (which we precisely characterize below), rather surprisingly, the principal submatrix corresponding to the center subspace converges to 0, albeit at the slow rate of $1/T$. This is a key result we will prove—and it is at the root of the non-existence of optimal controls in this case.

We approach the proof by first establishing Theorem 2.1 for the special case where A has only imaginary eigenvalues, and then using *nested* Schur complements to prove the theorem for the general case. The proof for the imaginary case is presented in Section 4. Evaluating the Schur complement involves evaluating the asymptotic product of several submatrices of $W_{A,B}(T)$. However, we will see that these submatrices do not each converge on their own, and hence showing that their *product* converges is a delicate task. We approach it by introducing what we call below “buffer terms” (see Subsection 5.1) to show that some specific groupings of terms converge. Using this approach, together with the result established for the imaginary case, we prove Theorem 2.1 first for the case where the eigenvalues of A have non-positive real parts (Section 5) and then, for the general case (Section 6).

Notations: We denote by $\mathbf{1}$ the vector of all ones, whose dimension will be clear from context. Given a complex matrix Z , we let \bar{Z} be its complex conjugate and Z^\dagger be its Hermitian conjugate. Given a vector space \mathbf{V} over \mathbb{F} , we let $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbf{V}$ be its dimension. Given a square matrix A , we denote by $\text{spec}(A)$ its set of eigenvalues, allowing for repeated eigenvalues. Given a function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we denote its L^2 -norm as $\|f\|_2 = (\int_0^\infty f^2(t) dt)^{1/2}$. We say that a matrix pair $(A, B) \in \mathbb{F}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{F}^{n \times m}$ is *controllable* if the rank of the controllability

matrix

$$C(A, B) := [B \quad AB \quad \cdots \quad A^{n-1}B]$$

is full (i.e., n). Note in particular that if $A = \text{diag}(A_1, A_2)$ is block diagonal and if we decompose $B = [B_1; B_2]$ so that the dimensions of B_i match those of A_i , then (A_i, B_i) is controllable for $i = 1, 2$. The uncontrollable of (A, B) is defined as Further, we say that (A, B) is stabilizable if there exists a matrix $F \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$ such that $(A + BF)$ is Hurwitz. It is well-known that A is stabilizable if and only if the subspace spanned by the generalized eigenvectors of A corresponding to eigenvalues with nonnegative real parts is included in the range of $C(A, B)$.

2. MAIN RESULTS

We prove a stronger statement than Theorem 1.1, in that we characterize the initial conditions for which the infinite horizon minimum energy control problem has a solution. We will state the result first for the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$, and then prove in Corollary 2.4 that the result also holds for the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$.

From now on, we consider the complex case unless specified. We start with some preliminaries. Let $P \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be a nonsingular matrix such that $P^{-1}AP$ is in the Jordan normal form [4]:

$$(7) \quad P^{-1}AP = \begin{bmatrix} J_u & 0 \\ 0 & J_s \end{bmatrix} =: J,$$

where the eigenvalues of $J_u \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u \times n_u}$ (resp., $J_s \in \mathbb{C}^{n_s \times n_s}$) have positive (resp. non-positive) real parts. Let $C := P^{-1}B$ and we decompose

$$(8) \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} C_u \\ C_s \end{bmatrix},$$

where $C_u \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u \times m}$ and $C_s \in \mathbb{C}^{n_s \times m}$. For a later purpose, we further decompose

$$(9) \quad J_s = \begin{bmatrix} J_o & 0 \\ 0 & J_a \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad C_s = \begin{bmatrix} C_o \\ C_a \end{bmatrix},$$

where $J_o \in \mathbb{C}^{n_o \times n_o}$ has imaginary eigenvalues and $J_a \in \mathbb{C}^{n_a \times n_a}$ has eigenvalues with negative real parts; note that $n_o + n_a = n_s$. We correspondingly decompose C_s as above. To summarize, the real parts of the eigenvalues of

- J_u are positive;
- J_s are less than or equal to zero;
- J_o are zero;
- J_a are negative.

Let (A, B) be a stabilizable pair. Then, (J, C) is stabilizable as well and its controllable subspace contains the invariant subspace spanned by the generalized right eigenvectors of J_u . This, in particular, implies that (J_u, C_u) is controllable. Let

$$(10) \quad W_u := W_{J_u, C_u}(\infty) = \int_0^\infty e^{-J_u t} C_u C_u^\dagger e^{-J_u^\dagger t} dt \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u \times n_u},$$

which is also the unique positive semi-definite solution to the following Lyapunov equation:

$$(11) \quad J_u W_u + W_u J_u^\dagger - C_u C_u^\dagger = 0.$$

We further let

$$(12) \quad K := (P^{-1})^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} W_u^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} P^{-1} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}.$$

Note that if $n_u = 0$, then $K = 0$. From (7) and (11), we have that K satisfies the Riccati equation:

$$(13) \quad A^\dagger K + KA - KBB^\dagger K = 0.$$

The main technical result of this paper, on which the proof of Theorem 1.1 is built, is the following:

Theorem 2.1. *Let $(A, B) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ be a controllable pair, and let $W_{A,B}(T)$ and K be defined as in (4) and (12), respectively. Then,*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} W_{A,B}(T)^{-1} = K.$$




FIGURE 2. Illustration of the convergence of the inverse of the controllability Gramian for different matrix pairs (A_ϵ, B) .

To illustrate Theorem 2.1, we computed numerically the norm of the difference between $W_{A,B}(T)$ and its limit K as defined in the Theorem; the results are shown in Figure 2. We did so for several matrix pairs (A_ϵ, B) , with A_ϵ taking eigenvalues $3, 2, -1$ and ϵ , and observe that, as mentioned earlier, the convergence of $W_{A_\epsilon, B}(T)^{-1}$ gets very slow as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Precisely, we consider a parameterized family of (A_ϵ, B) pairs:

$$A_\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We now introduce the following operator: given a complex number $\lambda = a + ib$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we let

$$\theta : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} : a + ib \mapsto -|a| + ib.$$

Note that $\theta(\lambda)$ always has a nonpositive real part.

Let \mathbf{V}_u , \mathbf{V}_o , and \mathbf{V}_a be the subspaces over \mathbb{C} spanned by the generalized right eigenvectors of $(A - BB^\dagger K)$ corresponding to the eigenvalues with positive, zero, and negative real parts respectively.

The following proposition, which relates the subspaces introduced above to the θ operator, is needed to state the next main result:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $(A, B) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ be a stabilizable pair, and K be given as in (12). Then,*

$$(14) \quad \text{spec}(A - BB^\dagger K) = \theta(\text{spec}(A)).$$

In particular,

$$(15) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbf{V}_u = 0, \quad \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbf{V}_o = n_o, \quad \text{and} \quad \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbf{V}_a = n_u + n_a.$$

Proof. We define

$$(16) \quad \widetilde{K} := P^\dagger K P = \begin{bmatrix} W_u^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $\text{spec}(P^{-1}(A - BB^\dagger K)P) = \text{spec}(A - BB^\dagger K)$ and

$$P^{-1}(A - BB^\dagger K)P = J - CC^\dagger \widetilde{K} = \begin{bmatrix} J_u - C_u C_u^\dagger W_u^{-1} & 0 \\ -C_s C_u^\dagger W_u^{-1} & J_s \end{bmatrix}.$$

By construction, the eigenvalues of J_s have non-positive real parts, and are thus mapped to themselves by θ . Hence, (14) follows if we show that

$$(17) \quad \text{spec}(J_u - C_u C_u^\dagger W_u^{-1}) = \theta(\text{spec}(J_u)).$$

To establish (17), we multiply (11) by W_u^{-1} on the right (recall that W_u is nonsingular), we obtain that

$$W_u J_u^\dagger W_u^{-1} = -(J_u - C_u C_u^\dagger W_u^{-1}),$$

and hence,

$$\text{spec}(J_u^\dagger) = \text{spec}(W_u J_u^\dagger W_u^{-1}) = -\text{spec}(J_u - C_u C_u^\dagger W_u^{-1}).$$

Note that if λ has a *positive* real part, then $\theta(\lambda) = -\bar{\lambda}$. Now let $\lambda \in \text{spec}(J_u)$ (thus λ has a positive real part), then $\bar{\lambda} \in \text{spec}(J_u^\dagger)$ and, by the above relation, $-\bar{\lambda} \in \text{spec}(J_u - C_u C_u^\dagger W_u^{-1})$, which proves (17). The second part of the proposition i.e., (15) follows directly from (14). \square

Using Theorem 2.1, we will prove the following result, which is essentially Theorem 1.1 for $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$:

Theorem 2.3. *Let $(A, B) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ be a stabilizable pair, and K be given as in (12). Then, Problem 1 with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ has a solution if and only if $x_0 \in \mathbf{V}_a$ and it is then given by $x_0^\dagger K x_0$. Moreover, there exists a unique control law $u^* \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$ that minimizes the cost and it is given by $u^*(t) := -B^\dagger K x(t)$ for $t \geq 0$.*

Theorem 2.3 also holds in the real case, i.e., for real system matrices A, B , with real state $x(t)$ and real control $u(t)$. We establish this now.

First, note that if the pair (A, B) is real, then $W_{A,B}(T)$ is real for all $T > 0$. Thus, by Theorem 2.1, K is real, and so is $(A - BB^\top K)$. It follows that the complex vector spaces \mathbf{V}_o and \mathbf{V}_a are closed under conjugation, i.e., if $v \in \mathbf{V}_*$, then $\bar{v} \in \mathbf{V}_*$ for $* = o, a$.

Second, note that any complex vector space $\mathbf{V} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ of dimension k that is closed under conjugation admits a basis of *real* vectors. Indeed, if $\{v_1 + iw_1, \dots, v_k + iw_k\}$, with $v_j, w_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$, is such a basis, then so is $\{v_1 - iw_1, \dots, v_k - iw_k\}$. Thus, $v_j, w_j \in \mathbf{V}$ and, moreover, their span over \mathbb{C} is \mathbf{V} .

The above two items together show that \mathbf{V}_* , for $* = \mathbf{o}, \mathbf{a}$, admits a basis of *real* vectors. We then let \mathbf{R}_* be the vector space, over \mathbb{R} , spanned by these vectors. In particular, by Proposition 2.2, we have that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{o}} = n_{\mathbf{o}}$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{a}} = n_{\mathbf{u}} + n_{\mathbf{a}}$.

We now state the counterpart of Theorem 2.3 for the real case:

Corollary 2.4 (The real case). *Let $(A, B) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be a stabilizable pair, and $K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be given as in (12). Then, Problem 1 with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ has a solution if and only if $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{a}}$ and it is then given by $x_0^\top K x_0$. Moreover, there exists a unique control law $u^* \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$ that minimizes the cost and it is given by $u^*(t) = -B^\top K x(t)$ for $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. We will denote the set of admissible *real*- and *complex*-valued control laws by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{R}}(x_0)$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{C}}(x_0)$, respectively.

We assume that $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{a}}$ and show that Problem 1 admits the solution $\eta(u^*) = x_0^\top K x_0$, with $u^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{R}}(x_0)$ the unique minimizer. First, since K and B are real, $u^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{R}}(x_0)$. Next, since $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{a}}$ is contained in $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{a}}$ by the arguments above Corollary 2.4, we have that $x_0 \in \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{a}}$. Hence, we can apply Theorem 2.3 to system (1) with initial condition x_0 , and it yields that $u^*(t) = -B^\top K x(t)$ is the unique minimizer for Problem 1, but with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$, and the cost is $\eta(u^*) = x_0^\top K x_0$. Because an admissible solution for Problem 1 with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ is also admissible with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$, and because the (unique) minimizer u^* of the latter problem is an element of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{R}}(x_0)$, we have that u^* is the unique minimizer for the former problem.

We now assume that $x_0 \notin \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{a}}$ and show that Problem 1 with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ does not admit a solution. Proceeding by contradiction, assume that it admits a minimizer $v^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{R}}(x_0)$. First, note that $x_0 \notin \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{a}}$; indeed, since $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{a}}$ admits a basis of real vectors and since x_0 is real, if $x_0 \in \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{a}}$, then it can be expressed as a linear combination of these real vectors with necessarily real coefficients, which then implies that $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{a}}$. Next, since $x_0 \notin \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{a}}$, Theorem 2.3 implies that v^* is not a minimizer of Problem 1 for $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$. Hence, there exists control law $v' \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{C}}(x_0)$ such that

$$(18) \quad \eta(v') < \eta(v^*).$$

We write $v'(t) = v'_1(t) + iv'_2(t)$, where $v'_1(t), v'_2(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We similarly decompose the solution of $\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bv'(t)$ as $x(t) = x_1(t) + ix_2(t)$ with $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since A and B are real, the dynamics of $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$ are completely decoupled, i.e.,

$$(19) \quad \dot{x}_i(t) = Ax_i(t) + Bv'_i(t), \quad \text{with } x_{0,1} = x_0 \text{ and } x_{0,2} = 0.$$

Since v' is such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = 0$, the solution of (19) with $i = 1$ satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_1(t) = 0$. Moreover,

$$(20) \quad \int_0^\infty \|v'_1(t)\|^2 dt \leq \int_0^\infty \|v'(t)\|^2 dt < \infty.$$

The above arguments show that $v'_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{R}}(x_0)$. But then, (18) and (20) together imply that $\eta(v'_1) < \eta(v^*)$, which contradicts the optimality of v^* and proves the result. \square

We now prove Theorems 2.1 and 2.3. The proof of the first theorem is rather technical, and we delay it until after the proof of Theorem 2.3.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3

We prove the necessity and sufficiency in Subsections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively. The sufficiency is relatively straightforward, and is based on a completion of square argument. The proof of necessity is more delicate and will be carried out by contradiction. We first show that if Problem 1 admits a solution, then it *necessarily equals* $\eta(u^*)$ with $u^* = -B^\dagger Kx(t)$ the unique minimizer. This is done by introducing two auxiliary optimal control problems (see (23) and (27)) that will provide comparisons with Problem 1. Then, the optimal control yields the closed-loop system $\dot{x}(t) = (A - BB^\dagger K)x(t)$. But now, recall that \mathbf{V}_a is spanned by the generalized right eigenvectors of $(A - BB^\dagger K)$ corresponding to eigenvalues with negative real parts—by Proposition 2.2, this subspace equals \mathbb{C}^n *unless* A has imaginary eigenvalues. Thus, if $x(0) = x_0 \notin \mathbf{V}_a$, then $x(t)$ will not converge to 0, which implies that $u^*(t)$ is not admissible.

3.1. Proof of sufficiency. In this subsection, we establish the following proposition:

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that $x_0 \in \mathbf{V}_a$; then, Problem 1 has the solution $\eta(u^*) = x_0^\dagger Kx_0$, with $u^*(t) = -B^\dagger Kx(t)$.*

Proof. The proof follows a classical completion of square argument. Let $u \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$ be an admissible control, and $x(t)$ be the solution of the linear system generated by this control input $u(t)$, with x_0 the initial condition. Then, using (13), the cost incurred by $u(t)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\infty \|u(t)\|^2 dt &= \int_0^\infty \left[\|u(t)\|^2 - x(t)^\dagger (A^\dagger K + KA - KBB^\dagger K)x(t) \right] dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \left[\|u(t) + B^\dagger Kx(t)\|^2 - x(t)^\dagger K(Ax(t) + Bu(t)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (Ax(t) + Bu(t))^\dagger Kx(t) \right] dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \left[\|u(t) + B^\dagger Kx(t)\|^2 - x(t)^\dagger K\dot{x}(t) - \dot{x}(t)^\dagger Kx(t) \right] dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \|u(t) + B^\dagger Kx(t)\|^2 dt - \int_0^\infty \frac{d}{dt} (x(t)^\dagger Kx(t)) dt \\
(21) \quad &= \int_0^\infty \|u(t) + B^\dagger Kx(t)\|^2 dt + x_0^\dagger Kx_0 \geq x_0^\dagger Kx_0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = 0$ for the last equality. It should be clear from the above that the minimal value of Problem 1 is bounded below by $x_0^\dagger Kx_0$. This lower bound can be reached only by the control law $u^*(t) = -B^\dagger Kx(t)$, for all $t \geq 0$.

By Proposition 2.2, this feedback control law yields an *exponentially* stable closed loop system $\dot{x}(t) = (A - BB^\dagger K)x(t)$ when restricted to the invariant subspace \mathbf{V}_a . Thus, by the hypothesis on x_0 , we have that the solution $x^*(t)$ of (1) generated by $u^*(t)$ decays to zero exponentially fast, which implies that $u^*(t) \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$. This completes the proof of the sufficiency of Theorem 2.3. \square

The arguments in the above proof also lead to the following fact:

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that A does not have any imaginary eigenvalue and that (A, B) is stabilizable; then, there is a unique Hermitian solution K to the Riccati equation (13) such that $(A - BB^\dagger K)$ is Hurwitz, and it is given by (12).*

Proof. First, note that if A has no imaginary eigenvalue, then by Proposition 2.2, $\mathbf{V}_a = \mathbb{C}^n$. Assume that there exists another Hermitian solution K' to (13) such that $(A - BB^\dagger K')$ is Hurwitz. Let $u'(t) := -B^\dagger K' x'(t)$, where $x'(t)$ is the solution to

$$\dot{x}'(t) = Ax'(t) + Bu'(t) = (A - BB^\dagger K')x'(t), \quad \text{with } x'(0) = x_0.$$

Then, by the same arguments in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we have that $u'(t)$ minimizes the cost $\eta(u)$ and the minimal cost is given by $\eta(u') = x_0^\dagger K' x_0$. But then, from (21), we have $x_0^\dagger K' x_0 = x_0^\dagger K x_0$ which holds for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. We thus conclude that $K' = K$. \square

3.2. Proof of necessity. We show here that if $x_0 \notin \mathbf{V}_a$, then Problem 1 does not admit a solution. Given $x(t) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we let

$$y(t) := P^{-1}x(t) = \begin{bmatrix} y_u(t) \\ y_s(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $y_u(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u}$ and $y_s(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{n_s}$. The dynamics of $y(t)$ is then given by

$$(22) \quad \dot{y}(t) = Jy(t) + Cu(t).$$

Consider the following optimal control problem for (22):

$$(23) \quad \min_{u \in L^2([0, \infty), \mathbb{C}^m)} \eta(u) = \int_0^\infty \|u(t)\|^2 dt \quad \text{s.t. } y(0) = P^{-1}x_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_u(t) = 0,$$

which differs from (6) in that we require that *only* $y_u(t)$ be asymptotically zero. Observe that $u^*(t)$, defined in Theorem 1.1, can be written as a feedback control in $y(t)$ as

$$u^*(t) = -B^\dagger Kx(t) = -C^\dagger \widetilde{K}y(t), \quad \text{for } t \geq 0,$$

where \widetilde{K} is defined in (16). We have the following result:

Lemma 3.1. *The following two items hold:*

(1) *The solution to the optimal control problem (23) is given by*

$$(24) \quad \eta(u^*) = x_0^\dagger Kx_0.$$

Moreover, u^ is the unique control law that minimizes the cost.*

(2) *For any $u \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$, it holds that $\eta(u) \geq \eta(u^*)$.*

Proof. Let $y_0 = P^{-1}x_0$, and we partition $y_0 = (y_{0,u}, y_{0,s})$ with $y_{0,u} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u}$. Since J is block diagonal, the dynamics of $y_u(t)$ do not depend on $y_s(t)$, i.e.,

$$(25) \quad \dot{y}_u(t) = J_u y_u(t) + C_u u(t).$$

The optimization problem (23) is thus in fact independent from $y_s(t)$ and can be reduced to the simpler (yet equivalent) problem:

$$(26) \quad \min_{u \in L^2([0, \infty), \mathbb{C}^m)} \eta(u) = \int_0^\infty \|u(t)\|^2 dt \quad \text{s.t. } y_u(0) = y_{0,u} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_u(t) = 0,$$

for the subsystem (25).

Since all the eigenvalues of J_u have positive real parts, by the sufficiency of Theorem 2.3 proved in Subsection 3.1, we know that the above problem (26) has a solution, which is given by

$$y_{0,u}^\dagger W_{J_u, C_u}^{-1}(\infty) y_{0,u} = y_{0,u}^\dagger W_u^{-1} y_{0,u} = y_{0,u}^\dagger \widetilde{K} y_0 = x_0^\dagger K x_0,$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of W_u (see (10)) and the second equality follows directly from (16) and the construction of $y_{0,u}$. Moreover, the unique control law that minimizes the cost is $-C_u^\dagger W_u^{-1} y_u(t)$, which coincides with $u^*(t)$; indeed, we have that

$$u^*(t) = -C^\dagger \widetilde{K} y(t) = -C_u^\dagger W_u^{-1} y_u(t).$$

This proves the first item of the lemma.

To establish the second item, we note that any admissible u that drives $x(t)$ asymptotically to 0 also drives $y_u(t)$ to 0. Thus, $\eta(u) \geq \eta(u^*)$. \square

We also have the following result:

Lemma 3.2. *If Problem 1 has a solution $\eta(\tilde{u}^*)$ for some $\tilde{u}^* \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$, then $\eta(\tilde{u}^*) \leq x_0^\dagger K x_0$.*

Proof. We again let $y(t) := P^{-1}x(t)$ and decompose $J = \text{diag}(J_1, J_a)$ where

$$J_1 := \begin{bmatrix} J_u & 0 \\ 0 & J_o \end{bmatrix},$$

and where we recall that $J_u \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u \times n_u}$ and $J_o \in \mathbb{C}^{n_o \times n_o}$ have eigenvalues with positive and zero real parts, respectively. Correspondingly, we decompose C and $y(t)$ as

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 \\ C_a \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad y(t) = \begin{bmatrix} y_1(t) \\ y_a(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $C_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{(n_u+n_o) \times m}$ and $y_1(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u+n_o}$. Since (J, C) is stabilizable and since all the eigenvalues of J_1 have non-negative real parts, (J_1, C_1) is controllable.

We again let $y_0 := P^{-1}x_0$ and decompose $y_0 = (y_{0,1}, y_{0,a})$. Now, consider the auxiliary *finite-horizon* optimal control problem for the system $\dot{y}_1(t) = J_1 y_1(t) + C_1 u(t)$,

$$(27) \quad \min_{u \in L^2([0, T], \mathbb{C}^m)} \eta_T(u) = \int_0^T \|u\|^2 dt \quad \text{s.t.} \quad y_1(0) = y_{0,1} \quad \text{and} \quad y_1(T) = 0.$$

By (5), the optimal solution to (27) is given by:

$$\eta_T(u_T) = y_{0,1}^\dagger W_{J_1, C_1}(T)^{-1} y_{0,1},$$

where the optimal control u_T is

$$(28) \quad u_T(t) = -C_1^\dagger e^{-J_1^\dagger t} W_{J_1, C_1}(T)^{-1} y_{0,1}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

With some abuse of notation, we extend the domain of u_T to $[0, \infty)$ by setting $u_T(t) := 0$ for all $t > T$. It is clear that $u_T \in L^2([0, \infty), \mathbb{C}^m)$ for all $T > 0$.

We claim that $u_T \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$, i.e., the solution $x(t)$ of system (1) generated by $u_T(t)$ converges to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Because $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ are related by similarity transformation, it suffices to show that the solution $y(t)$ driven by $u_T(t)$ converges to 0. Recall that the dynamics of $y(t)$ obey (22). In particular, the dynamics $y_1(t)$ and $y_a(t)$ are decoupled if $u(t) = 0$. By construction of $u_T(t)$, the solution $y(t)$ at time T is

$$y(T) = \begin{bmatrix} y_1(T) \\ y_a(T) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ y_a(T) \end{bmatrix}.$$

where $y_a(T) = e^{J_a T} y_{0,a} + \int_0^T e^{J_a(T-t)} C_a u_T(t) dt$. Then, for $t \geq T$, we have

$$y(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ e^{J_a(t-T)} y_a(T) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The claim now follows from the fact that J_a is Hurwitz by definition, which ensures that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_a(t) = 0$.

By the hypothesis that \tilde{u}^* solves Problem 1, we have that $\eta(\tilde{u}^*) \leq \eta(u_T) = y_{0,1}^\dagger W_{J_1, C_1}(T)^{-1} y_{0,1}$ for all $T > 0$. We conclude that

$$\eta(\tilde{u}^*) \leq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} y_{0,1}^\dagger W_{J_1, C_1}(T)^{-1} y_{0,1} = y_{0,1}^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} W_u^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} y_{0,1} = y_{0,1}^\dagger \tilde{K} y_0 = x_0^\dagger K x_0,$$

where the first equality follows from Theorem 2.1 (with the (A, B) pair replaced with the (J_1, C_1) pair), the second equality follows from the definition of \tilde{K} in (16), and the last equality follows from the definition of K in (12) and the relation $y_0 = P^{-1}x_0$. \square

With the two previous lemmas, we now prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *If $x_0 \notin \mathbf{V}_a$, then there is no solution to Problem 1.*

Proof. The proof will be carried out by contradiction. Suppose that Problem 1 has a solution, which we denote by $\eta(\tilde{u}^*)$; clearly, the control law \tilde{u}^* drives $y_u(t)$ (see (25)) to 0 and meets the requirements of optimal control problem (23).

Let u^* be the unique minimizer of problem (23) as stated in item 1 of Lemma 3.1. Because $\tilde{u}^* \in \mathcal{U}(x_0)$, the second item of this lemma yields $\eta(\tilde{u}^*) \geq \eta(u^*) = x_0^\dagger K x_0$. From Lemma 3.2, we have the reverse inequality $\eta(\tilde{u}^*) \leq x_0^\dagger K x_0$. It thus follows that $\eta(\tilde{u}^*) = x_0^\dagger K x_0$. Since the optimal control law that minimizes the cost for the problem (23) is unique by item 1 of Lemma 3.1, we have that

$$u^*(t) = \tilde{u}^*(t) = -C^\dagger \tilde{K} y(t) = -B^\dagger K x(t).$$

Thus, using the optimal control law \tilde{u}^* , we have the closed loop system $\dot{x}(t) = (A - BB^\dagger K)x(t)$. However, by the hypothesis that $x_0 \notin \mathbf{V}_a$, the solution $x(t)$ does not converge to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$, which implies that \tilde{u}^* is not admissible. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3. \square

4. THE CASE OF IMAGINARY EIGENVALUES

We state and prove in this subsection a core result of our proof for Theorem 2.1. Namely, we establish the divergence rate of the controllability Gramian $W(T)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, of a controllable system whose state matrix has only *imaginary* eigenvalues.

Consider the system (J, C) , where J is a matrix with only imaginary eigenvalues and in the Jordan normal form (i.e., with the convention of the previous sections, J_o is now J). To proceed, we decompose J into its Jordan blocks, which we denote by $M_i \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i \times d_i}$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Without loss of generality, we assume that blocks with the same eigenvalue are contiguous in the ordering. We associate to each block M_i the matrices C_i and D_i obtained as follows: we decompose C and write

$$(29) \quad J = \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & M_k \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 \\ \vdots \\ C_k \end{bmatrix},$$

where $C_i \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i \times m}$. We then introduce the diagonal matrix

$$(30) \quad D(T) := \begin{bmatrix} D_1(T) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & D_k(T) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{with } D_i(T) := \begin{bmatrix} T^{d_i-1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & T \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i \times d_i}.$$

We now state the main result of this section:

Theorem 4.1. *Let (J, C) be a controllable pair, where J is in Jordan normal form and with only imaginary eigenvalues. Then, there exists a nonsingular matrix S such that*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} D(T)^{-1} W_{J,C}(T) D(T)^{-1} = S.$$

By Theorem 4.1, it is straightforward that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} W_{J,C}(T)^{-1} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} D(T)^{-1} S^{-1} D(T)^{-1} = 0,$$

which establishes Theorem 2.1 for the case where J has only imaginary eigenvalues (in this case, we have that $n_u = 0$, so the matrix K given in (12) is 0).

4.1. On repeated eigenvalues. In this subsection, we prove Theorem 4.1 for the case where all the eigenvalues of J are the same, and equal to λ .

To prove the result, we first derive a property of the C matrix that follows from the controllability of the system (J, C) . Let $g_i \in \mathbb{C}^m$ be the *last* row of C_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, and gather all such vectors in the matrix G :

$$G := \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_k \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times m}.$$

We have the following result:

Lemma 4.1. *If the pair (J, C) is controllable, then G is of full row rank.*

Proof. Since (J, C) is controllable, so are the pairs (M_i, C_i) for $1 \leq i \leq k$. By the Hautus test, the following matrix has full row rank:

$$[\lambda I - J \quad C] = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I - M_1 & & C_1 \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & \lambda I - M_k \quad C_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, observe that $(\lambda I - M_i)$ are matrices with all zero entries save for the upper-diagonal, which has entries one. Hence, the last rows of $(\lambda I - M_i)$ are all zeros. Thus, for the matrix $[\lambda I - J \quad C]$ to have full row rank, it is necessary that the last rows of the C_i 's be linearly independent, which proves the result. \square

In the following Lemma, we establish the divergence rate of $W_{J,C}(T)$.

Lemma 4.2. *It holds that*

$$(31) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} D(T)^{-1} W_{J,C}(T) D(T)^{-1} = \Delta \Phi \Delta,$$

where Δ and Φ are given by

$$\Delta := \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \Delta_k \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with } \Delta_i := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{(-1)^{d_i-1}}{(d_i-1)!} & & \\ & \frac{(-1)^{d_i-2}}{(d_i-2)!} & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$\Phi := \begin{bmatrix} g_1 g_1^\dagger \Psi_{11} & \cdots & g_1 g_k^\dagger \Psi_{1k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ g_k g_1^\dagger \Psi_{k1} & \cdots & g_k g_k^\dagger \Psi_{kk} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with } \Psi_{ij} := \left[\frac{1}{(d_i + d_j - \alpha - \beta + 1)} \right]_{\alpha\beta}$$

for $1 \leq \alpha \leq d_i$ and $1 \leq \beta \leq d_j$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{J} := J - \lambda I$ and $\tilde{M}_i := M_i - \lambda I$. Then, the controllability Gramian $W_{J,C}(T)$ takes the form

$$W_{J,C}(T) = \int_0^T e^{-\lambda t} e^{-\tilde{J}t} C C^\dagger e^{-\tilde{J}^\top t} e^{\lambda t} dt = \int_0^T \underbrace{e^{-\tilde{J}t} C C^\dagger e^{-\tilde{J}^\top t}}_{R(t)} dt.$$

We decompose the integrand $R(t)$ into blocks according to

$$R(t) = [R_{ij}(t)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}, \quad \text{with } R_{ij}(t) := e^{-\tilde{M}_i t} C_i C_j^\dagger e^{-\tilde{M}_j^\top t} \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i \times d_j}.$$

Recalling that \tilde{M}_i is of dimension $d_i \times d_i$ and that g_i is the last row of C_i , we express the product $e^{-\tilde{M}_i t} C_i$ isolating the terms of *highest* order in t

$$(32) \quad e^{-\tilde{M}_i t} C_i = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -t & \frac{t^2}{2} & \cdots & \frac{(-t)^{d_i-1}}{(d_i-1)!} \\ 0 & 1 & -t & \cdots & \frac{(-t)^{d_i-2}}{(d_i-2)!} \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & & 1 & -t \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} C_i = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{(-t)^{d_i-1}}{(d_i-1)!} g_i + O(t^{d_i-2}) \\ \frac{(-t)^{d_i-2}}{(d_i-2)!} g_i + O(t^{d_i-3}) \\ \vdots \\ g_i \end{bmatrix} \\ = D_i(t) \Delta_i \mathbf{1} g_i + H_i(t),$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the vector of ones, $D_i(t)$ is given in (30), and $H_i(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i \times m}$ is such that

$$(33) \quad H_i(t) = \begin{bmatrix} O(t^{d_i-2}) \\ \vdots \\ O(1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

i.e., $H_i(t)$ is a matrix whose entries in the α th row, for $1 \leq \alpha \leq d_i - 1$, are of order $O(t^{d_i-\alpha-1})$ and whose last row is 0. It follows that

$$(34) \quad R_{ij}(t) = H_i(t) H_j(t)^\dagger.$$

$$(35) \quad + \Delta_i D_i(t) \mathbf{1} g_i H_j(t)^\dagger$$

$$(36) \quad + H_i(t) g_j^\dagger \mathbf{1}^\top D_j(t) \Delta_j$$

$$(37) \quad + \Delta_i D_i(t) \mathbf{1} g_i g_j^\dagger \mathbf{1}^\top D_j(t) \Delta_j.$$

For our purpose, it is sufficient to only describe only terms of the highest order in t . For (34), we use (33) to obtain that

$$\int_0^T H_i(t)H_j(t)^\dagger dt = \begin{bmatrix} O(T^{d_i+d_j-3}) & \dots & O(T^{d_i-1}) & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & 0 \\ O(T^{d_j-1}) & \dots & O(T) & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} =: I_1,$$

For (35), we first use (33) to obtain

$$g_i H_j(t)^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} O(t^{d_j-2}) & O(t^{d_j-1}) & \dots & O(1) & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, using the definition of $D_i(t)$ (see (30)), we have that

$$\Delta_i D_i(t) \mathbf{1} g_i H_j(t)^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} O(T^{d_i+d_j-3}) & \dots & O(T^{d_i-1}) & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O(T^{d_j-2}) & \dots & O(1) & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and hence,

$$\int_0^T \Delta_i D_i(t) \mathbf{1} g_i H_j(t)^\dagger dt = \begin{bmatrix} O(T^{d_i+d_j-2}) & \dots & O(T^{d_i}) & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ O(T^{d_j-1}) & \dots & O(T) & 0 \end{bmatrix} =: I_2.$$

For (36), we similarly have that

$$\int_0^T H_i(t) g_j^\dagger \mathbf{1}^\top D_j(t) \Delta_j dt = \begin{bmatrix} O(T^{d_i+d_j-2}) & \dots & O(T^{d_i-1}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O(T^{d_j}) & \dots & O(T) \\ 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} =: I_3.$$

With the above definitions of I_1 , I_2 , and I_3 , a straightforward computation yields

$$\frac{1}{T} D_i(T)^{-1} [I_1 + I_2 + I_3] D_j(T)^{-1} = O(T^{-2}) + O(T^{-1}) + O(T^{-1}).$$

Finally, for the term (37), note that $g_i g_j^\dagger$ is a scalar and that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T D_i(t) \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^\top D_j(t) dt &= \left[\int_0^T T^{d_i+d_j-\alpha-\beta} dt \right]_{\alpha\beta} = \left[\frac{T^{d_i+d_j-\alpha-\beta+1}}{d_i+d_j-\alpha-\beta+1} \right]_{\alpha\beta} \\ &= T D_i(T) \Psi_{ij} D_j(T), \end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq \alpha \leq d_i$ and $1 \leq \beta \leq d_j$. Thus,

$$(38) \quad \frac{1}{T} D_i(T)^{-1} \left[\int_0^T R_{ij}(t) dt \right] D_j(T)^{-1} = g_i g_j^\dagger \Delta_i \Psi_{ij} \Delta_j + O(T^{-1}).$$

The lemma then follows directly from (38). \square

Note that the diagonal matrix Δ is invertible. Thus, to establish Theorem 4.1, it remains to show that the matrix Φ is invertible as well. Our proof relies on introducing an auxiliary linear time-invariant system, which is controllable and whose controllability Gramian at $T = \infty$ is equal to Φ .

To this end, we define the system pair (Π, Γ) , which has the same dimension as (J, C) , as follows:

$$\Pi := \begin{bmatrix} \Pi_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \Pi_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{with } \Pi_i := \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2d_i - 1 & & \\ & 2d_i - 3 & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}g_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{1}g_k \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\Pi_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times d_i}$ and $\mathbf{1}g_i \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i \times m}$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Lemma 4.3. *The pair (Π, Γ) is controllable and, moreover,*

$$(39) \quad W_{\Pi, \Gamma}(\infty) = \Phi,$$

where Φ is given in Lemma 4.2.

Proof. We first show that (Π, Γ) is controllable and then establish (39).

Proof that (Π, Γ) is controllable. We use the Hautus test to establish controllability. Precisely, we show that for any eigenvalue μ of Π ,

$$(40) \quad \text{rank} [\mu I - \Pi \quad \Gamma] = n.$$

We have that Π is diagonal with each block Π_i having pairwise distinct eigenvalues. Also, it should be clear that the eigenvalues of Π are repeated *at most* k times. Thus, the diagonal matrix $(\mu I - \Pi)$ has at most k zero rows, say $k' \leq k$, with at most one zero row per block $(\mu I - \Pi_i)$. These rows correspond in the matrix given in (40) to rows of the form

$$(41) \quad [0 \quad g_i] \quad \text{for some pairwise distinct } i_1, \dots, i_{k'} \in \{1, \dots, k\}.$$

The other rows in this matrix are clearly linearly independent—since the corresponding rows in $(\mu I - \Pi)$ are linearly independent—and independent of the rows in (41).

It remains to show that the rows in (41) are linearly independent. But this holds because the i_j 's are pairwise distinct and, by Lemma 4.1, the g_i 's are linearly independent. Together, these two facts yield that the row vectors in (41) are also linearly independent. This proves that the matrix in (40) has full row rank and hence, the pair (Π, Γ) is controllable.

Proof that (39) holds. First, note that the controllability Gramian

$$W_{\Pi, \Gamma}(\infty) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\Pi t} \Gamma \Gamma^\dagger e^{-\Pi t} dt$$

exists since $-\Pi$ is Hurwitz. We now evaluate it block by block (the blocks match the decomposition of Φ given above in the statement of Lemma 4.2). To this end, we evaluate the product

$$e^{-\Pi_i t} \mathbf{1}g_i g_j^\dagger \mathbf{1}^\top e^{-\Pi_j t} = g_i g_j^\dagger \left[e^{-(d_i + d_j - \alpha - \beta + 1)t} \right]_{\alpha\beta},$$

for $1 \leq \alpha \leq d_i$ and $1 \leq \beta \leq d_j$. Note that $(d_i + d_j - \alpha - \beta + 1) \geq 1$ for all α and β . Integrating the above yields

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\Pi_i t} \mathbf{1}g_i g_j^\dagger \mathbf{1}^\top e^{-\Pi_j t} = g_i g_j^\dagger \Psi_{ij}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Theorem 4.1 for the case of Jordan blocks with the same eigenvalues is then an immediate consequence of Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3, and the fact that the controllability Gramian $W_{\Pi, \Gamma}(\infty)$ is of full rank. □

4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.1. We now consider the general case where the matrix J has Jordan blocks with imaginary, but not necessarily the same, eigenvalues.

Let $r \leq k$ be the number of *distinct* eigenvalues of J , and let k_1, \dots, k_r be the numbers of blocks M_j with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$, respectively. Let $s_0 := 0$ and $s_p := \sum_{q=1}^p k_q$, for $p = 1, \dots, r$. We let

$$\mathbf{M}_p := \begin{bmatrix} M_{s_{p-1}+1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & M_{s_p} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{C}_p := \begin{bmatrix} C_{s_{p-1}+1} \\ \vdots \\ C_{s_p} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } \mathbf{D}_p := \begin{bmatrix} D_{s_{p-1}+1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & D_{s_p} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In words, \mathbf{M}_p contains all the Jordan blocks M_j 's with eigenvalue λ_p , and \mathbf{C}_p and \mathbf{D}_p contain the corresponding C_j 's and D_j 's, for $1 \leq p \leq r$, respectively, where D_j is as in (30) where we omit the dependence on T .

We next decompose the matrix $W_{J,C}(T)$ according to the grouping of Jordan blocks by eigenvalues introduced above, namely, we set

$$W_{J,C}(T) = \begin{bmatrix} L_{11} & \cdots & L_{1r} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ L_{r1} & \cdots & L_{rr} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$L_{pq} := \int_0^T e^{-\mathbf{M}_p t} \mathbf{C}_p \mathbf{C}_q^\dagger e^{-\mathbf{M}_q^\dagger t} dt.$$

We show that the pq th blocks of S exist and compute them explicitly. We consider two cases, first dealing with the diagonal blocks (in Lemma 4.4) and then the off-diagonal blocks (in Lemma 4.5).

Lemma 4.4. *For every $p = 1, \dots, r$,*

$$S_{pp} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{D}_p(T)^{-1} L_{pp}(T) \mathbf{D}_p(T)^{-1}$$

is nonsingular.

Proof. Note that $L_{pp}(T)$ is the controllability Gramian associated with $(\mathbf{M}_p, \mathbf{C}_p)$, and that by construction, all the eigenvalues of \mathbf{M}_p are the same. The lemma thus follows directly from the result of Subsection 4.1. \square

We now evaluate S_{pq} , for $p \neq q$, and have the following lemma:

Lemma 4.5. *For $p, q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ with $p \neq q$, we have*

$$S_{pq} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{D}_p(T)^{-1} L_{pq}(T) \mathbf{D}_q(T)^{-1} = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_p := \mathbf{M}_p - \lambda_p I$. We have that

$$L_{pq}(T) = \int_0^T e^{-\mathbf{M}_p t} \mathbf{C}_p \mathbf{C}_q^\dagger e^{-\mathbf{M}_q^\dagger t} dt = \int_0^T \underbrace{e^{(\lambda_q - \lambda_p)t} e^{-\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_p t} \mathbf{C}_p \mathbf{C}_q^\dagger e^{-\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_q^\dagger t}}_{R_{pq}(t)} dt.$$

Decompose $R_{pq}(t)$ as

$$R_{pq}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11}(t) & \cdots & Q_{1k_q}(t) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ Q_{k_p 1}(t) & \cdots & Q_{k_p k_q}(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with } Q_{ij}(t) := e^{(\lambda_q - \lambda_p)t} e^{-\widetilde{M}_i t} C_{i'} C_{j'}^\dagger e^{-\widetilde{M}_j^\dagger t},$$

where the subindices i' and j' in the expression of $Q_{ij}(t)$ are given by

$$i' := s_{p-1} + i \quad \text{and} \quad j' := s_{q-1} + j,$$

for $1 \leq i \leq k_p$ and $1 \leq j \leq k_q$.

We have evaluated the product $e^{-\tilde{M}_{i'}t}C_{i'}$ in (32). It follows that the $\alpha\beta$ th entry of $Q_{ij}(t)$, for $1 \leq \alpha \leq d_{i'}$ and $1 \leq \beta \leq d_{j'}$, is given by

$$Q_{ij,\alpha\beta}(t) = e^{(\lambda_q - \lambda_p)t} \sum_{\ell=0}^{d_{i'}+d_{j'}-\alpha-\beta} \gamma_\ell t^\ell,$$

for some coefficients γ_ℓ . Note that $\lambda_q \neq \lambda_p$ since $p \neq q$. Since both λ_p and λ_q are imaginary, we obtain that for any $\ell \geq 0$,

$$\int_0^T e^{(\lambda_q - \lambda_p)t} t^\ell dt = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{(\lambda_q - \lambda_p)T} T^\ell + O(T^{\ell-1})}{\lambda_q - \lambda_p} & \text{if } \ell \geq 1 \\ \frac{e^{(\lambda_q - \lambda_p)T} - 1}{\lambda_q - \lambda_p} & \text{if } \ell = 0, \end{cases}$$

which implies that

$$L_{pq,ij} = \left[\int_0^T Q_{ij,\alpha\beta}(t) dt = O(T^{d_{i'}+d_{j'}-\alpha-\beta}) \right]_{\alpha\beta},$$

for $1 \leq \alpha \leq d_{i'}$ and $1 \leq \beta \leq d_{j'}$. We thus conclude that

$$\frac{1}{T} D_{i'}(T)^{-1} L_{pq,ij}(T) D_{j'}(T)^{-1} = O(T^{-1}),$$

and hence,

$$S_{pq} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{D}_p(T)^{-1} L_{pq}(T) \mathbf{D}_q(T)^{-1} = 0.$$

This establishes the result. \square

Theorem 4.1 is then an immediate consequence of Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5. \square

5. THE CASE OF NON-POSITIVE EIGENVALUES

In this section, we show that Theorem 2.1 holds in the case where the matrix A has only eigenvalues with *non-positive* real parts. Following our convention, since A has no eigenvalues with positive real parts, the matrix J_u is empty and $J = J_s = \text{diag}(J_o, J_a)$, where the real parts of the eigenvalues of $J_o \in \mathbb{C}^{n_o \times n_o}$ and $J_a \in \mathbb{C}^{n_a \times n_a}$ are zero and negative, respectively. Similarly, C_u is empty and we decompose $C = C_s = [C_o; C_a]$.

To proceed, we partition the controllability Gramian $W_{J,C}(T)$ into 4 blocks which agree with the decomposition of J_s in J_o, J_a :

$$(42) \quad W_{J,C}(T) =: V_s(T) = \begin{bmatrix} V_o(T) & V_{oa}(T) \\ V_{oa}(T)^\dagger & V_a(T) \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$(43) \quad \begin{aligned} V_*(T) &:= W_{J_*, C_*}(T) = \int_0^T e^{-J_*t} C_* C_*^\dagger e^{-J_*^\dagger t} dt, \quad \text{for } * = o, a \\ V_{oa}(T) &:= \int_0^T e^{-J_o t} C_o C_a^\dagger e^{-J_a^\dagger t} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Schur complement [2], we obtain from (42) that

$$(44) \quad V_s^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} V_o^{-1} + V_o^{-1}V_{oa}(V_s/V_o)^{-1}V_{oa}^\dagger V_o^{-1} & -V_o^{-1}V_{oa}(V_s/V_o)^{-1} \\ -(V_s/V_o)^{-1}V_{oa}^\dagger V_o^{-1} & (V_s/V_o)^{-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where we have omitted the argument T and V_s/V_o is given by

$$(45) \quad V_s/V_o := V_a - V_{oa}^\dagger V_o^{-1}V_{oa}.$$

The main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 5.1. *Let (J, C) be a controllable pair, where J is in Jordan normal form and has only eigenvalues with non-positive real parts. Let $V_s(T)$ and the blocks V_* , for $* = o, a, oa$, be given as in (42) and (43), respectively. Then, the following items hold:*

- (1) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (V_s/V_o)^{-1} = 0$.
- (2) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (V_s/V_o)^{-1}V_{oa}^\dagger V_o^{-1} = 0$.
- (3) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (V_o^{-1} + V_o^{-1}V_{oa}(V_s/V_o)^{-1}V_{oa}^\dagger V_o^{-1}) = 0$.

The following result is now an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.1:

Corollary 5.2. *If (A, B) is controllable and if A only has eigenvalues with non-positive real parts, then*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} W_{(A,B)}(T)^{-1} = 0.$$

Proof. Using the relation $J = P^{-1}AP$ and $C = P^{-1}B$, Theorem 5.1, together with (44), we have that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} W_{A,B}(T)^{-1} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (P^{-1})^\dagger W_{J,C}(T)^{-1} P^{-1} = 0.$$

□

5.1. Asymptotic convergence of matrix products. A major technical challenge in proving Theorem 5.1 is to deal with the asymptotic behavior of the terms $V_{oa}^\dagger V_o^{-1}$ and $V_{oa}^\dagger V_o^{-1}V_{oa}$. Note that these terms appear *only if* the system has both imaginary eigenvalues and eigenvalues with negative real parts. To elaborate, while one can use Theorem 4.1 to argue that V_o^{-1} vanishes as $T \rightarrow \infty$, the term V_{oa} diverges as $-J_a$ has eigenvalues with positive real parts. Thus, to establish convergence (or divergence) of their product, we cannot rely on the convergence of the individual terms.

Even more, as will be clear to see below, only very specific groupings of the terms are so that each product of them converges asymptotically, and defining these groupings requires us to add “buffer terms” (e.g., terms such as $e^{J_o T}$, $e^{J_o^\dagger T}$, and $e^{J_a^\dagger T}$ in (46) below) between the original terms of product.

This approach to establishing convergence or divergence of matrix products will be used extensively throughout the remainder of the paper.

Proposition 5.3. *The following two items hold:*

- (1) *We have that*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{J_a T} (V_s/V_o) e^{J_a^\dagger T} = \int_0^\infty e^{J_a t} C_a C_a^\dagger e^{J_a^\dagger t} dt = W_{-J_a, C_a}(\infty).$$

(2) We define

$$(46) \quad \tilde{V}_o := e^{J_o T} V_o e^{J_o^\dagger T} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{V}_{oa} := e^{J_o T} V_{oa} e^{J_a^\dagger T}.$$

Then,

$$(47) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{V}_{oa}^\dagger \tilde{V}_o^{-1} e^{J_o T} = 0.$$

Proof. We prove the two items separately.

Proof of item 1. We have that

$$e^{J_a T} (V_s/V_o) e^{J_a^\dagger T} = e^{J_a T} V_a e^{J_a^\dagger T} - e^{J_a T} V_{oa}^\dagger V_o^{-1} V_{oa} e^{J_a^\dagger T}.$$

For the first term in the above equation, we use the fact that $V_a(T) = W_{J_a, C_a}(T)$ and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{J_a T} V_a e^{J_a^\dagger T} &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T e^{J_a(T-t)} C_a C_a^\dagger e^{J_a^\dagger(T-t)} dt \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T e^{J_a t'} C_a C_a^\dagger e^{J_a^\dagger t'} dt' = W_{-J_a, C_a}(\infty), \end{aligned}$$

where we set $t' := T - t$. For the second term, we write that

$$e^{J_a T} V_{oa}^\dagger V_o^{-1} V_{oa} e^{J_a^\dagger T} = \left[e^{J_a T} V_{oa}^\dagger e^{J_o^\dagger T} \right] \left[e^{J_o T} V_o e^{J_o^\dagger T} \right]^{-1} \left[e^{J_o T} V_{oa} e^{J_a^\dagger T} \right] = \tilde{V}_{oa}^\dagger \tilde{V}_o^{-1} \tilde{V}_{oa}.$$

If we show that $\tilde{V}_{oa}^\dagger \tilde{V}_o^{-1} \tilde{V}_{oa}$ vanishes as $T \rightarrow \infty$, then item 1 is established. We do so by showing that

- (i) \tilde{V}_o^{-1} vanishes as $T \rightarrow \infty$; and
- (ii) \tilde{V}_{oa} is bounded as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of (i). For the term \tilde{V}_o , we can use the same change of variable ($t' = T - t$) as above to express it as follows:

$$(48) \quad \tilde{V}_o(T) = \int_0^T e^{J_o(T-t)} C_o C_o^\dagger e^{J_o^\dagger(T-t)} dt = W_{-J_o, C_o}(T).$$

We need to appeal to Theorem 4.1 to evaluate the limit of its inverse. To this end, we decompose J_o into its Jordan blocks similarly to what was done in (29):

$$(49) \quad J_o = \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_k),$$

where each M_i is a Jordan block of dimensions d_i , for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let $D(T) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_o \times n_o}$ be defined in the same way as (30), which we reproduce here:

$$(50) \quad D(T) = \text{diag}(D_1(T), \dots, D_k(T)), \quad \text{with } D_i = \text{diag}(T^{d_i-1}, \dots, 1).$$

Because $(-J_o, C_o)$ is controllable, with the eigenvalues of $-J_o$ being imaginary, Theorem 4.1 states that

$$(51) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} D(T)^{-1} \tilde{V}_o(T) D(T)^{-1} = S,$$

for some nonsingular matrix S . This implies that

$$(52) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{V}_o(T)^{-1} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} D(T)^{-1} S^{-1} D(T)^{-1} = 0.$$

Proof of (ii).: For the term \tilde{V}_{oa} , we have

$$(53) \quad \tilde{V}_{\text{oa}} = \int_0^T e^{J_o(T-t)} C_o C_a^\dagger e^{J_a^\dagger(T-t)} dt = \int_0^T e^{J_o t} C_o C_a^\dagger e^{J_a^\dagger t} dt.$$

It is not too hard to see that \tilde{V}_{oa} remains bounded as $T \rightarrow \infty$; indeed, the entries of $e^{J_a^\dagger t}$ decay exponentially fast while the entries of $e^{J_o t}$ grow at most polynomially.

We conclude that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{V}_{\text{oa}}^\dagger \tilde{V}_o^{-1} \tilde{V}_{\text{oa}} = 0.$$

This completes the proof of the first item.

Proof of item 2. As argued in the proof of (ii) in the first item, \tilde{V}_{oa} is bounded in the limit. It thus suffices to show that

$$(54) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{V}_o^{-1} e^{J_o T} = 0.$$

To this end, recall the decomposition of J_o and the expression of $D(T)$ given in (49) and (50), respectively. Now, we write

$$(55) \quad \tilde{V}_o^{-1} e^{J_o T} = [TD(T)]^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{T} D(T)^{-1} \tilde{V}_o(T) D(T)^{-1} \right]^{-1} \left[D(T)^{-1} e^{J_o T} \right],$$

The first term on the right hand side of (55) converges to 0 as $T \rightarrow \infty$. The second term is bounded by Theorem 4.1 (see also (51)). It is thus enough to show that the last term $D(T)^{-1} e^{J_o T}$ is bounded in the limit to establish (54). But this follows straightforwardly by computation; indeed,

$$D_i(T)^{-1} e^{M_i T} = e^{\lambda_i T} \begin{bmatrix} 1/T^{d_i-1} & 1/T^{d_i-2} & 1/2T^{d_i-3} & \dots & 1/(d_i-1)! \\ 0 & 1/T^{d_i-2} & 1/T^{d_i-3} & \dots & 1/(d_i-2)! \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & & 1/T & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since λ_i is imaginary, we have that every entry of $D_i(T)^{-1} e^{M_i T}$ is absolutely bounded in the limit as $T \rightarrow \infty$. \square

5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.1. We establish the three items of the theorem.

Proof of item 1. Since the pair $(-J_a, C_a)$ is controllable and since J_a is Hurwitz, $W_{-J_a, C_a}(\infty)$ is a bounded matrix of full rank. Thus, there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $W_{-J_a, C_a}(\infty) \geq \alpha I$. By item 1 of Proposition 5.3, we can find a sufficiently large T_α such that

$$e^{J_a T} (V_s/V_o) e^{J_a^\dagger T} \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} I \quad \text{for all } T \geq T_\alpha,$$

and hence,

$$V_s/V_o \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} e^{-J_a T} e^{-J_a^\dagger T} \Rightarrow \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (V_s/V_o)^{-1} \leq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{\alpha} e^{J_a^\dagger T} e^{J_a T} = 0.$$

Proof of item 2. We write

$$(56) \quad (V_s/V_o)^{-1} V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_o^{-1} = e^{J_a^\dagger T} \left[e^{J_a T} (V_s/V_o) e^{J_a^\dagger T} \right]^{-1} \left[e^{J_a T} V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_o^{-1} \right].$$

The first term on the right hand side of (56) is zero in the limit since J_a is Hurwitz. The second term is bounded by item 1 of Proposition 5.3. For the last term, we note that

$$(57) \quad e^{J_a T} V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} = \tilde{V}_{\text{oa}}^\dagger \tilde{V}_{\text{o}}^{-1} e^{J_{\text{o}} T},$$

which vanishes in the limit as $T \rightarrow \infty$ by item 2 of Proposition 5.3.

Proof of item 3. Recall that $V_{\text{o}}(T) = W_{J_{\text{o}}, C_{\text{o}}}(T)$, with all the eigenvalues of J_{o} being imaginary. Thus, using Theorem 4.1 and the arguments given in item 1 of Proposition 5.3 to show (52), we similarly obtain that $V_{\text{o}}(T)^{-1}$ vanishes as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Next, we use (57) to rewrite

$$(58) \quad \begin{aligned} V_{\text{o}}^{-1} V_{\text{oa}} (V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} \\ = \left[V_{\text{o}}^{-1} V_{\text{oa}} e^{J_a^\dagger T} \right] \left[e^{-J_a^\dagger T} (V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} e^{-J_a T} \right] \left[e^{J_a T} V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} \right] \\ = \left[e^{J_{\text{o}}^\dagger T} \tilde{V}_{\text{o}}^{-1} \tilde{V}_{\text{oa}} \right] \left[e^{J_a T} (V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}}) e^{J_a^\dagger T} \right]^{-1} \left[\tilde{V}_{\text{oa}}^\dagger \tilde{V}_{\text{o}}^{-1} e^{J_{\text{o}} T} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first and the last terms on the right hand side of (58) vanish as $T \rightarrow \infty$ by item 2 of Proposition 5.3, and the second term is bounded by item 1 of Proposition 5.3. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

Having dealt with the cases of imaginary and non-positive eigenvalues, we are now ready to prove the general case of Theorem 2.1. Recall that $J = P^{-1}AP$ is in Jordan normal form, $C = P^{-1}B$, and the decompositions $J = \text{diag}(J_{\text{u}}, J_{\text{s}})$ and $C = [C_{\text{u}}; C_{\text{s}}]$, where the eigenvalues of J_{u} (resp. J_{s}) have positive (resp. non-positive) real parts.

Consider the controllability Gramian associated with the pair (J, C) and, for ease of notation, we use $V(T)$ as a shorthand notation:

$$V(T) := W_{J,C}(T) = \int_0^T e^{-Jt} C C^\dagger e^{-J^\dagger t} dt.$$

Similar to what has been done in the previous section, we partition the matrix $V(T)$ into 4 blocks:

$$V(T) = \begin{bmatrix} V_{\text{u}}(T) & V_{\text{us}}(T) \\ V_{\text{us}}(T)^\dagger & V_{\text{s}}(T) \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$(59) \quad \begin{aligned} V_{*}(T) &:= W_{J_{*}, C_{*}}(T) = \int_0^T e^{-J_{*}t} C_{*} C_{*}^\dagger e^{-J_{*}^\dagger t} dt, \quad \text{for } * = \text{u, s}, \\ V_{\text{us}}(T) &:= \int_0^T e^{-J_{\text{u}}t} C_{\text{u}} C_{\text{s}}^\dagger e^{-J_{\text{s}}^\dagger t} dt. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V_{\text{u}}(T) = W_{\text{u}}$, where W_{u} is defined in (10). Since (J, C) is controllable, so are (J_{*}, C_{*}) for $* = \text{u, s}$. Thus, the matrices $V(T)$, $V_{\text{u}}(T)$, and $V_{\text{s}}(T)$ are nonsingular. Now, let

$$V/V_{\text{s}} := V_{\text{u}} - V_{\text{us}} V_{\text{s}}^{-1} V_{\text{us}}^\dagger$$

be the Schur complement of V_{s} in V (we again omit the dependence on T). The inverse of V can be written explicitly as

$$(60) \quad V^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} (V/V_{\text{s}})^{-1} & -(V/V_{\text{s}})^{-1} V_{\text{us}} V_{\text{s}}^{-1} \\ -V_{\text{s}}^{-1} V_{\text{us}}^\dagger (V/V_{\text{s}})^{-1} & V_{\text{s}}^{-1} + V_{\text{s}}^{-1} V_{\text{us}}^\dagger (V/V_{\text{s}})^{-1} V_{\text{us}} V_{\text{s}}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 relies on the following technical result:

Theorem 6.1. *The following items hold for the blocks $V_*(T)$, for $* = \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{us}$, given in (59):*

- (1) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V_{\mathbf{s}}(T)^{-1} = 0$.
- (2) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V_{\mathbf{us}}(T)V_{\mathbf{s}}(T)^{-1} = 0$.
- (3) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V_{\mathbf{us}}(T)V_{\mathbf{s}}(T)^{-1}V_{\mathbf{us}}(T)^\dagger = 0$.

Item 1 of Theorem 6.1 follows directly from Corollary 5.2; indeed, by its definition (59), $V_{\mathbf{s}}(T)$ is the controllability Gramian of the controllable pair $(J_{\mathbf{s}}, C_{\mathbf{s}})$, and $J_{\mathbf{s}}$ has only eigenvalues with non-positive real parts. We establish the last two items of Theorem 6.1 in the following subsections. Before that, we prove Theorem 2.1, which is a corollary of Theorem 6.1:

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We first use (60) to show that

$$(61) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V(T)^{-1} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} W_{J,C}(T)^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} W_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By item 3 of Theorem 6.1, we have that

$$(62) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V/V_{\mathbf{s}} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left(V_{\mathbf{u}} - V_{\mathbf{us}}V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}V_{\mathbf{us}}^\dagger \right) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V_{\mathbf{u}} = W_{\mathbf{u}}.$$

Using (62) and item 2, we have that every term in the following product exists in the limit:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (V/V_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1}V_{\mathbf{us}}V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} = W_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (V_{\mathbf{us}}V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}) = 0.$$

Similarly, using (62) and items 1 and 2, we have that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left(V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} + V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}V_{\mathbf{us}}^\dagger(V/V_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1}V_{\mathbf{us}}V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} \right) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}V_{\mathbf{us}}^\dagger W_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1}V_{\mathbf{us}}V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} = 0.$$

Put together in (60), the above yields (61). Theorem 2.1 then follows from (61) and the fact that $W_{A,B}(T)^{-1} = (P^{-1})^\dagger W_{J,C}(T)^{-1} P^{-1}$. \square

6.1. Proof of item 2 of Theorem 6.1. We express $V_{\mathbf{us}}$ as

$$V_{\mathbf{us}} = \int_0^T e^{-J_{\mathbf{u}}t} C_{\mathbf{u}} C_{\mathbf{s}}^\dagger e^{-J_{\mathbf{s}}^\dagger t} dt = [V_{\mathbf{uo}} \quad V_{\mathbf{ua}}],$$

where $V_{\mathbf{uo}}$ and $V_{\mathbf{ua}}$ are given by (using $C_{\mathbf{s}}^\dagger = [C_{\mathbf{o}}^\dagger \quad C_{\mathbf{a}}^\dagger]$)

$$(63) \quad \begin{aligned} V_{\mathbf{uo}} &:= \int_0^T e^{-J_{\mathbf{u}}t} C_{\mathbf{u}} C_{\mathbf{o}}^\dagger e^{-J_{\mathbf{o}}^\dagger t} dt, \\ V_{\mathbf{ua}} &:= \int_0^T e^{-J_{\mathbf{u}}t} C_{\mathbf{u}} C_{\mathbf{a}}^\dagger e^{-J_{\mathbf{a}}^\dagger t} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using the expression for $V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1}$ given in (44), we have that

$$V_{\mathbf{us}}V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} = [V_{\mathbf{uo}} \quad V_{\mathbf{ua}}] \begin{bmatrix} V_{\mathbf{o}}^{-1} + V_{\mathbf{o}}^{-1}V_{\mathbf{oa}}(V_{\mathbf{s}}/V_{\mathbf{o}})^{-1}V_{\mathbf{oa}}^\dagger V_{\mathbf{o}}^{-1} & -V_{\mathbf{o}}^{-1}V_{\mathbf{oa}}(V_{\mathbf{s}}/V_{\mathbf{o}})^{-1} \\ -(V_{\mathbf{s}}/V_{\mathbf{o}})^{-1}V_{\mathbf{oa}}^\dagger V_{\mathbf{o}}^{-1} & (V_{\mathbf{s}}/V_{\mathbf{o}})^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We then decompose

$$V_{\mathbf{us}}V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1} = [(V_{\mathbf{us}}V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1})_1 \quad (V_{\mathbf{us}}V_{\mathbf{s}}^{-1})_2],$$

where

$$(64) \quad \left(V_{\text{us}} V_{\text{s}}^{-1} \right)_1 := V_{\text{uo}} (V_{\text{o}}^{-1} + V_{\text{o}}^{-1} V_{\text{oa}} (V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1}) - V_{\text{ua}} (V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1},$$

$$(65) \quad \left(V_{\text{us}} V_{\text{s}}^{-1} \right)_2 := -V_{\text{uo}} V_{\text{o}}^{-1} V_{\text{oa}} (V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} + V_{\text{ua}} (V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}.$$

We establish item 2 of Theorem 6.1 by proving the following proposition:

Proposition 6.2. *The following items hold:*

- (1) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (V_{\text{us}} V_{\text{s}}^{-1})_1 = 0.$
- (2) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (V_{\text{us}} V_{\text{s}}^{-1})_2 = 0.$

As mentioned earlier, proving that the limits of the above products vanishes cannot be done by showing that each term in the products has a limit. Instead, we need to consider grouping of terms and introduce one more buffer term. For our purpose here, the following term will be relevant:

$$(66) \quad \tilde{V}_{\text{ua}}(T) := V_{\text{ua}} e^{J_{\text{a}}^\dagger T} = \int_0^T e^{-J_{\text{u}} t} C_{\text{u}} C_{\text{a}}^\dagger e^{J_{\text{a}}^\dagger (T-t)} dt.$$

We have

Lemma 6.1. *It holds that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{V}_{\text{ua}}(T) = 0.$*

Proof. Since $-J_{\text{u}}$ and J_{a} are Hurwitz, there exist positive constants $c_1, c_1, \alpha_1,$ and α_2 such that

$$\|e^{-J_{\text{u}} t} C_{\text{u}}\|_F \leq c_1 e^{-\alpha_1 t} \quad \text{and} \quad \|e^{J_{\text{a}} t} C_{\text{a}}\|_F \leq c_2 e^{-\alpha_2 t},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm. Then, using sub-multiplicativity, we obtain that

$$\|\tilde{V}_{\text{ua}}\|_F \leq \int_0^T \|e^{-J_{\text{u}} t} C_{\text{u}} C_{\text{a}}^\dagger e^{J_{\text{a}}^\dagger (T-t)}\|_F dt \leq c_1 c_2 e^{-\alpha_2 T} \int_0^T e^{(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)t} dt.$$

It then follows that

$$\|\tilde{V}_{\text{ua}}\|_F \leq \begin{cases} \frac{c_1 c_2}{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1} (e^{-\alpha_1 T} - e^{-\alpha_2 T}) & \text{if } \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2, \\ c_1 c_2 e^{-\alpha_2 T} T & \text{if } \alpha_1 = \alpha_2. \end{cases}$$

In either case, the norm converges to zero as $T \rightarrow \infty$ due to $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0.$ □

With the lemma above, we will now establish Proposition 6.2.

Proof of Proposition 6.2. We establish below the two items.

Proof of item 1. For the first term on the right hand side of (64), we first note that V_{uo} , defined in (63), is bounded in the limit as $T \rightarrow \infty$ since $-J_{\text{u}}$ is Hurwitz and J_{o} has imaginary eigenvalues (hence the entries of $e^{-J_{\text{u}} t}$ decay exponentially fast while the entries of $e^{-J_{\text{o}} t}$ grow at most polynomially fast), so

$$(67) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \|V_{\text{uo}}\| < \infty.$$

Then, using item 3 of Theorem 5.1, we conclude that the first term on the right hand side of (64) vanishes as $T \rightarrow \infty$. For the second term, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{\text{ua}}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} &= \left[V_{\text{ua}}e^{J_{\text{a}}^\dagger T} \right] \left[e^{-J_{\text{a}}^\dagger T}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}e^{-J_{\text{a}}T} \right] \left[e^{J_{\text{a}}T}V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} \right] \\
&= \tilde{V}_{\text{ua}} \left[e^{-J_{\text{a}}^\dagger T}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}e^{-J_{\text{a}}T} \right] \left[\tilde{V}_{\text{oa}}\tilde{V}_{\text{o}}^{-1}e^{J_{\text{o}}T} \right] \\
(68) \quad &= \tilde{V}_{\text{ua}} \left[e^{J_{\text{a}}T}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})e^{J_{\text{a}}^\dagger T} \right]^{-1} \left[\tilde{V}_{\text{oa}}\tilde{V}_{\text{o}}^{-1}e^{J_{\text{o}}T} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (66) and (57). By Lemma 6.1, the first term of (68) vanishes as $T \rightarrow \infty$. By items 1 and 2 of Proposition 5.3, the second term is bounded in the limit and the last term of (68) vanishes as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Thus,

$$(69) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V_{\text{ua}}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} = 0.$$

Proof of item 2. For the first term on the right hand side of (65), note that V_{uo} is bounded as shown in (67) and that by item 2 of Theorem 5.1, $V_{\text{o}}^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}$ converges to 0 as $T \rightarrow \infty$, so this entire term vanishes as well. For the second term, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
(70) \quad V_{\text{ua}}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} &= \left[V_{\text{ua}}e^{J_{\text{a}}^\dagger T} \right] \left[e^{-J_{\text{a}}^\dagger T}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}e^{-J_{\text{a}}T} \right] e^{J_{\text{a}}T} \\
&= \tilde{V}_{\text{ua}} \left[e^{J_{\text{a}}T}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})e^{J_{\text{a}}^\dagger T} \right]^{-1} e^{J_{\text{a}}T}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.1, we have that the first term on the right hand side of (70) vanishes. By item 1 of Proposition 5.3, the second term is bounded in the limit. Finally, since J_{a} is Hurwitz, the last term vanishes in the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$. \square

6.2. Proof of item 3 of Theorem 6.1. We show here that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V_{\text{us}}(T)V_{\text{s}}(T)^{-1}V_{\text{us}}(T)^\dagger = 0$. Using again the expression for V_{s}^{-1} in (44) and the decomposition of V_{us} in (63), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{\text{us}}V_{\text{s}}^{-1}V_{\text{us}}^\dagger &= [V_{\text{uo}}, V_{\text{ua}}] \begin{bmatrix} V_{\text{o}}^{-1} + V_{\text{o}}^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} & -V_{\text{o}}^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} \\ -(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} & (V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_{\text{uo}}^\dagger \\ V_{\text{ua}}^\dagger \end{bmatrix} \\
(71) \quad &= V_{\text{uo}} \left[V_{\text{o}}^{-1} + V_{\text{o}}^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} \right] V_{\text{uo}}^\dagger \\
(72) \quad &- V_{\text{uo}} \left[V_{\text{o}}^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} \right] V_{\text{ua}}^\dagger \\
(73) \quad &- V_{\text{ua}} \left[(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1}V_{\text{oa}}^\dagger V_{\text{o}}^{-1} \right] V_{\text{uo}}^\dagger \\
(74) \quad &+ V_{\text{ua}} \left[(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} \right] V_{\text{ua}}^\dagger.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term (71), we note that V_{uo} (and hence, V_{uo}^\dagger) is bounded in the limit as shown in (67) and that the expression in the bracket vanishes in the limit by item 3 of Theorem 5.1. Next, we have that the two terms in (72) and (73) are Hermitian conjugate. We see that (73) vanishes in the limit as $T \rightarrow \infty$ as it is the product of the term in (69) and V_{uo}^\dagger — in the limit the former vanishes while the latter is again bounded. For the last term (74), we have that

$$V_{\text{ua}} \left[(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})^{-1} \right] V_{\text{ua}}^\dagger = \tilde{V}_{\text{ua}} \left[e^{J_{\text{a}}T}(V_{\text{s}}/V_{\text{o}})e^{J_{\text{a}}^\dagger T} \right]^{-1} \tilde{V}_{\text{ua}}^\dagger,$$

where $\tilde{V}_{\mathbf{u}_a}$ and $\tilde{V}_{\mathbf{u}_a}^\dagger$ vanish as $T \rightarrow \infty$ by Lemma 6.1 and the expression in the bracket is bounded by item 1 of Proposition 5.3. \square

REFERENCES

1. Roger W Brockett, *Finite dimensional linear systems*, SIAM, 2015.
2. Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson, *Matrix analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
3. Huibert Kwakernaak and Raphael Sivan, *Linear optimal control systems*, vol. 1, Wiley-interscience New York, 1972.
4. David Luenberger, *Canonical forms for linear multivariable systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control **12** (1967), no. 3, 290–293.
5. Walter Murray Wonham, *Linear multivariable control*, vol. 101, Springer, 1974.