

Structure Theory for Ensemble Controllability, Observability, and Duality

Xudong Chen¹

Abstract

Ensemble control deals with the problem of using finitely many control inputs to simultaneously steer a large population (in the limit, a continuum) of control systems. Dual to the ensemble control problem, ensemble estimation deals with the problem of using finitely many measurement outputs to estimate the initial condition of every single system in the ensemble. We introduce in the paper an innovative class of ensemble systems, termed *distinguished ensemble systems*, and establish sufficient conditions for controllability and observability of such systems.

A distinguished ensemble system is comprised of two key components, namely *distinguished control vector fields* and *codistinguished observation functions*. Roughly speaking, a set of vector fields is distinguished if they are closed (up to scaling) under Lie bracket, and moreover, every vector field in the set can be generated (up to scaling) by a Lie bracket of two vector fields in the same set. Similarly, a set of functions is codistinguished to a set of vector fields if the directional derivatives of the functions along the given vector fields yield (up to scaling) the same set of functions. We demonstrate in the paper that the structure of a distinguished ensemble system significantly simplifies the analysis of controllability and observability, and moreover, can serve as a principle for ensemble system design.

Furthermore, we address in the paper the existence of distinguished ensemble systems over Lie groups and their homogeneous spaces. Specifically, we show that *every* connected, semi-simple Lie group admits a set of distinguished vector fields, together with a set of codistinguished functions. The proof is constructive, leveraging the structure theory of semi-simple real Lie algebras and representation theory. Examples will be provided along the presentation illustrating key definitions and main results.

1 Introduction

We address in the paper controllability and observability of a continuum ensemble of control systems. Ensemble controllability is about whether one can use only *finitely many* control inputs to simultaneously steer a large population (in the limit, a continuum) of control systems. These control systems are structurally identical, but show variations in their tuning parameters. Dual to ensemble controllability, ensemble observability is about whether one can estimate the initial condition of every single system in the ensemble from only *finitely many* measurement outputs.

¹X. Chen is with the ECEE Dept., CU Boulder. Email: xudong.chen@colorado.edu.

We introduce in the paper an innovative class of ensemble systems, termed *distinguished ensemble systems*, each of which is equipped with a fine structure on the control vector fields and the observations functions (see below for details). We establish sufficient conditions for controllability and observability of distinguished ensemble systems. We further address the existence of such systems over Lie groups and their homogeneous spaces.

We provide below details of the model considered in the paper, the structure of a distinguished ensemble system, literature review, and contributions.

1.1 Model of ensemble system

Ensemble control model. In its most general form, the control model of an ensemble system can be described by:

$$\dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f(x_\sigma(t), \sigma, u(t)), \quad x_\sigma \in M \text{ for all } \sigma \in \Sigma. \quad (1)$$

where Σ is the parametrization space, and each $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is a tuning parameter. If a single system is indexed by σ , we call it **system- σ** . The state space M is the same for each system- σ . We denote by $x_\sigma(t) \in M$ the state of system- σ at time t , and $u(t) := (u_1(t), \dots, u_m(t))$ the control input which belongs to a finite dimensional vector space \mathbb{R}^m for each t . The vector field f for each system- σ depends on the state $x_\sigma(t)$, the tuning parameter σ , and the control input $u(t)$ shared by all of the systems. We assume that the state space M is analytic and the parametrization space Σ is compact, analytic, and path-connected.

Let $x_\Sigma(t) := \{x_\sigma(t) \mid \sigma \in \Sigma\}$ be the ensemble of the system states. We call $x_\Sigma(t)$ a **profile**. Let $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ be the collection of analytic functions from Σ to M . We assume that each profile x_Σ belongs to $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$. We call $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ the **profile space**. The ensemble controllability problem addressed in the paper is about whether there exists a control law $u(t)$ to steer (1) from an arbitrary initial profile $x_\Sigma(0)$ to a target profile \hat{x}_Σ at a given time T . A precise definition will be provided later in Section §3.

The controllability problem for the general ensemble system (1) is hard. We address the problem within a special class of ensemble systems, namely the system such that the vector field f is separable in state x_σ , parameter σ , and the control input $u(t)$. Specifically, we consider in the paper the following ensemble system:

$$\dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f_0(x_\sigma(t), \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t) \rho_i(\sigma) f_i(x_\sigma(t)), \quad x_\sigma \in M \text{ for all } \sigma \in \Sigma, \quad (2)$$

where f_0 is the drift vector field depending on both $x_\sigma(t)$ and σ , the f_i 's are the **control vector fields** depending only on $x_\sigma(t)$, and the $\rho_i(\sigma)$ are analytic functions defined on Σ . We assume in the paper that all the vector fields and functions are analytic in their variables.

Ensemble estimation model. We next describe the dual ensemble estimation model. We assume in the paper that there are *only finite many* measurement outputs $y^j(t)$'s at our disposal. Each $y^j(t)$ considered in the paper is an average of certain observation function $\phi^j(x_\sigma(t))$ over the parametrization space Σ . Specifically, we let Σ be equipped with a positive Borel measure, and each ϕ^j , for $j = 1, \dots, l$, be a function defined over M . Then,

the measurement outputs $\{y^j(t)\}_{j=1}^l$ are defined by the following integrals:

$$y^j(t) = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_{\sigma}(t)) d\sigma, \quad j = 1, \dots, l. \quad (3)$$

Such type of measurement output arises naturally in physics, e.g., the temperature and pressure in classical thermodynamics, the NMR spectrum in a quantum ensemble of spins, the far-field intensity in Laser beam combination.

The ensemble observability problem is then about whether one is able to use certain control inputs $u_i(t)$'s to excite system (2) and then, estimate $x_{\Sigma}(0)$ from the measurement outputs $y^j(t)$'s. See Section §3 for a precisely definition.

Ensemble system. For convenience, we combine the control model (2) and the observer model (3), and refer following system as an ensemble system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_{\sigma}(t) = f_0(x_{\sigma}(t), \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t) \rho_i(\sigma) f_i(x_{\sigma}(t)), \\ y^j(t) = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_{\sigma}(t)) d\sigma, \quad j = 1, \dots, l. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Examples of the above system will be given along the presentation.

1.2 Distinguished ensemble system

One of the main contributions of the paper is to introduce an innovative structure for system (4), termed as *distinguished ensemble system*, which is comprised of two key components, namely a set of **distinguished vector fields** $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and a set of **codistinguished functions** $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$.

Roughly speaking, a set of vector fields is said to be *distinguished* if the Lie bracket of two vector fields in the set is, up to scaling, another vector field in the same set, i.e., $[f_i, f_j] = \lambda f_k$ for λ a constant, and conversely, any vector field f_k in the set can be generated in this way. Similarly, a set of functions $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is said to be *codistinguished* to the vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ if the directional derivative of any ϕ^j along any f_i is, up to scaling, another function in the same set, i.e., $f_i \phi^j = \lambda \phi^k$ for λ a constant, and conversely, any function ϕ^k in the set can be generated in this way. See Subsection §3.1 for precise definitions. We demonstrate in the paper that distinguished vector fields and codistinguished functions are key components in establishing ensemble controllability and observability of (2).

Examples of distinguished sets of Lie algebras. We note that although the notion of a “distinguished set” of a given Lie algebra appears to be new, such set arises naturally in many places in engineering and physics. For example, when dealing with the rigid motions of a three dimensional object with a fixed center, we have that the infinitesimal motions of rotations around three axes of an orthonormal frame $\Theta \in \text{SO}(3)$ are given by

$$f_1(\Theta) = \Theta \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad f_2(\Theta) := \Theta \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad f_3(\Theta) := \Theta \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the three skew-symmetric matrices belong to $\mathfrak{so}(3)$. One check by computation that $[f_i, f_j] = f_k$ where (i, j, k) is any cyclic rotation of $(1, 2, 3)$. Also, we recall that the standard unicycle model is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \\ \dot{\theta} \end{bmatrix} = u_1 \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + u_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Although the set of the two control vector fields is not closed under Lie bracket:

$$\left[f_1 := \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, f_2 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right] = f_3 := \begin{bmatrix} \sin \theta \\ -\cos \theta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

the above three of them are; indeed, we have $[f_1, f_3] = 0$ and $[f_2, f_3] = f_1$. However, we note that $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^3$ is not distinguished because f_2 cannot be generated by a Lie bracket of any two vector fields in the set.

We further note that in quantum mechanics, the Pauli matrices which represent angular momentum operators satisfy the desired property. Indeed, we have

$$\sigma_1 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \sigma_2 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \sigma_3 := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly, one check by computation that if (i, j, k) is a cyclic rotation of $(1, 2, 3)$, then $[\sigma_i, \sigma_j]_{\text{M}} = 2i\sigma_k$ where $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\text{M}}$ denotes the matrix commutator. Although the constant $2i$ is not real, one can multiple the matrices by the imaginary unit so that the new set $\{i\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^3$ now belongs to $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ and satisfies $[i\sigma_i, i\sigma_j]_{\text{M}} = -2i\sigma_k$. We finally note that the ladder operators represented by the following matrices in $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$:

$$H := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad X := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad Y := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

satisfy the desired property: $[H, X]_{\text{M}} = 2X$, $[H, Y]_{\text{M}} = -2Y$, and $[X, Y]_{\text{M}} = H$. The examples given above can be generalized to a broad class of Lie algebras. In fact, we have recently shown in [1] that every semi-simple *real* Lie algebra admits a distinguished set. We will review such a fact in Subsection §4.1.

1.3 Literature review

Ensemble controllability. Amongst related works about ensemble controllability of nonlinear systems, we first mention [2, 3] by Li and Khaneja in which the authors establishes the controllability of a continuum ensemble of Bloch equations parametrized by a scalar σ in a closed interval $[a, b]$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_1(t) \\ \dot{x}_2(t) \\ \dot{x}_3(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega & u_1(t)\sigma \\ -\omega & 0 & u_2(t)\sigma \\ -u_1(t)\sigma & -u_2(t)\sigma & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1(t) \\ x_2(t) \\ x_3(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that the above model is a typical example of (2). Ensemble control of Bloch equations has also been addressed in [4]. We further note that the controllability problem of a general control-affine ensemble system has been recently addressed in [5]. Specifically, the authors provided an ensemble version of Rachevsky-Chow criterion for ensemble controllability via a Lie algebraic method. We do not intend to reproduce the results established there, but rather our contribution related to ensemble controllability is to demonstrate that if the set of control vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is distinguished, then the ensemble version of Rachevsky-Chow criterion can be easily verified in analysis and fulfilled in system design. For ensemble control of linear systems, we refer the reader to [6, 7], [8, Ch. 12] and references therein. We further refer the reader to [9, 10, 11] for optimal control of probability distributions evolving along linear systems.

Ensemble observability. To the best of author's knowledge, the observability problem of a continuum ensemble system has been mostly addressed within the class of linear systems. We first refer the reader to [8, Ch. 12] where the author considered the following ensemble of linear systems: $\dot{x}_\sigma(t) = A(\sigma)x_\sigma(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y(t) = \int_\Sigma C(\sigma)x_\sigma(t)d\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^l$. The authors addressed the observability of the above ensemble linear system by applying the argument of duality between controllability and observability of (infinite-dimensional) linear systems [12]. However, such type of duality argument does not apply for ensemble system (4); the duality we address in the paper is rather from the structures of distinguished vector fields and of codistinguished functions. We also refer the reader to [13] for a related observability problem about estimating the probability distribution of the initial state. Specifically, the authors there considered a single time-invariant linear system: $\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t)$ and $y(t) = Cx(t)$. An initial probability distribution p_0 of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ induces a distribution \bar{p}_t of $y(t)$ for a given a control input $u(t)$. The observability problem address there is whether one is able to estimate p_0 given the entire distributions \bar{p}_t for all $t \geq 0$. We further refer the reader to [14, 15, 16, 17, 18] for the study of observability of a *single* nonlinear system using the so-called observability codistribution.

1.4 Outline of contribution and organization of the paper

The contributions of the paper is three-fold: (i). We introduce a distinguished ensemble system as a new structure for (4); (ii). We establish a structure theory for controllability and observability of distinguished ensemble systems. (iii). We address the existence problem of distinguished ensemble systems on Lie groups and their homogeneous spaces.

The first item has been addressed in the previous subsection. We provide below more details for the last two items.

(ii). *Structure theory for ensemble controllability and observability.* We illustrate in Section §3 how the structure of a distinguished ensemble system (4) can lead to ensemble controllability and observability. Specifically, we show that having such a structure simplifies the analyses by transposing the controllability (or observability) problem to a problem of finding a separating set of $L^2(\Sigma)$, i.e., the Hilbert space of square-integrable functions on Σ .

The structure theory established in the paper also simplifies the system design problem—i.e., the problem of co-designing the control vector fields f_i 's, the observations functions ϕ^j 's,

and the parametrization functions ρ_i 's so that system (4) is ensemble controllable and/or observable. The simplification is such that it divides the problem into two independent subproblems—one is about finding a set of distinguished vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and a set of codistinguished function $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ over the given manifold M while the other is about finding a set of ρ_i 's so that they form a separating set of $L^2(\Sigma)$. Thus, the structure theory can be viewed as a guiding principle for designing controllable and observable ensemble systems.

(iii). *Existence of distinguished ensemble systems.* We address the problem of whether there exist distinguished vector fields and codistinguished functions over a given manifold M . We provide an affirmative answer for the case where M is an arbitrary connected semi-simple Lie group G . A few commonly seen examples include special unitary group $SU(n)$, special orthogonal group $SO(n)$, special linear group $SL(n)$, symplectic group $Sp(2n, \mathbb{R})$, etc.

The proof of the above existence result is constructive. Specifically, for distinguished vector fields, we leverage the result established in [1] where we have shown how to construct a distinguished set on the Lie algebra level. A sketch of the construction is provided in Subsection §4.1. One then identifies such a distinguished set with the corresponding set of left-invariant (or right-invariant) vector fields over the group G .

For codistinguished functions, we provide a general approach for generating codistinguished functions via Lie group representations. In particular, we show in Subsection §4.2 that a selected set of matrix coefficients associated with a finite dimensional Lie group representation can be made as a set of codistinguished functions (to a finite set of left-invariant vector fields). Then, in Subsection §4.3, we focus on a canonical representation of a Lie group, namely the adjoint representation. We show that, in this case, there always exists a set of codistinguished functions. In particular, if G is matrix Lie group, then these codistinguished functions are simply given by $\phi^{ij}(g) = \text{tr}(gX_i g^{-1}X_j)$ where X_i and X_j are selected matrices belonging to the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G . Further, in Subsection §4.4, we discuss how to extend the results to the homogeneous spaces.

Organization of the paper. In Section §2, we introduce definitions and notations which will be frequently used in the paper. Next, in Section §3, we define distinguished vector fields and codistinguished functions, and establish controllability and observability of distinguished ensemble systems. Then, in Section §4, we address the existence problem of distinguished vector fields and codistinguished functions on Lie groups and their homogeneous spaces. We provide conclusions at the end.

2 Definitions, notations, and preliminaries

We introduce in the section key definitions and notations used in the paper. We also recall a few known facts in differential geometry and Lie groups/algebras.

2.1 Differential geometry

1. *Manifolds, vector fields, and one-forms.* Let M be a real analytic manifold. For a point $x \in M$, let $T_x M$ and $T_x^* M$ be the tangent and cotangent space of M at x , respectively. We further let TM and T^*M be the tangent bundle and cotangent bundle, respectively. Denote

by $C^\omega(M)$ the set of real analytic functions, $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ the set of analytic vector fields, and $\Omega(M)$ the set of analytic one-forms on M . We further denote by $\mathbf{1}_M \in C^\omega(M)$ the constant function whose value is 1 everywhere.

Let $\omega \in \Omega(M)$ and $f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. For a point $x \in M$, let $\omega_x \in T_x^*M$ and $f(x) \in T_xM$. We define $\omega(f) \in C^\omega(M)$ such that $\omega(f)(x) := \omega_x(f(x))$ for all $x \in M$.

Let $\xi : M \rightarrow N$ be a diffeomorphism, and $\xi_* : TM \rightarrow TN$ be the derivative of ξ . For a vector field $f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, let $\xi_*f \in \mathfrak{X}(N)$ be the *pushforward* defined as $(\xi_*f)(y) := \xi_*(f(\xi^{-1}y))$ for all $y \in N$. For a function $\phi \in C^\omega(N)$, let $\xi^*\phi \in C^\omega(M)$ be the *pullback* defined as $(\xi^*\phi)(x) := \phi(\xi(x))$ for all $x \in M$. One can also pull back a one-form $\omega \in \Omega(N)$ and obtain $\xi^*\omega \in \Omega(M)$ defined as $(\xi^*\omega)(f) = \omega(\xi_*f)$ for all $f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$.

2. *Lie derivatives.* Consider an ordinary differential equation $\dot{x} = f(x)$ on M . We denote by $e^{tf}x$ the solution of the differential equation at time t with x the initial condition.

Let $\phi \in C^\omega(M)$ and $f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. Denote by $f\phi \in C^\omega(M)$ the directional derivative (or Lie derivative) of ϕ along f . For two vector fields $f_i, f_j \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, let $[f_i, f_j]$ be the Lie bracket of f_i and f_j , which is defined such that

$$[f_i, f_j]\phi = f_i f_j \phi - f_j f_i \phi, \quad \forall \phi \in C^\omega(M).$$

Let $\omega \in \Omega(M)$ and $f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. The *Lie derivative* of ω along f , denoted by $f\omega$, is a one-form which can be determined by the Cartan's formula:

$$f\omega = \iota_f d\omega + d(\iota_f \omega),$$

where d is the exterior derivative, and ι_f is the contraction with f . A one-form ω is *closed* if $d\omega = 0$, and is *exact* if $\omega = d\phi$ for some $\phi \in C^\omega(M)$. Exact one-forms are always closed since $d^2 = 0$. For any $\phi \in C^\omega(M)$ and any $f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, $(d\phi)(f) = f\phi$, and hence by the Cartan's formula,

$$f(d\phi) = d(f\phi). \quad (5)$$

Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be a set of vector field over M , and $w = w_1 \cdots w_k$ be a *word* over the alphabet $\{1, \dots, m\}$. For a function $\phi \in C^\omega(M)$, we define

$$f_w \phi := f_{w_1} \cdots f_{w_k} \phi.$$

If $w = \emptyset$ (i.e., a word of zero length), then we set $f_w \phi := \phi$. In the same way, we define $f_w \omega$ for any one-form $\omega \in \Omega(M)$.

3. *Whitney topologies.* Let M be equipped with a Riemannian metric. Denote by $d_M(x_1, x_2)$ the distance between two points x_1 and x_2 . Let Σ be a analytic and compact manifold, and $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ be the set of analytic maps from Σ to M . The *Whitney C^0 -topology* on $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ can be defined by a basis of open sets:

$$\{\bar{x}_\Sigma \in C^\omega(\Sigma, M) \mid d_M(x_\sigma, \bar{x}_\sigma) < \epsilon, \quad \forall \sigma \in \Sigma\},$$

where x_Σ varies over $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ and ϵ is any positive real number. Generally, one can also define the Whitney C^k -topology for $1 \leq k \leq \infty$; but for that, one needs to introduce the *jet space*. We omit here the details and refer the reader to [19, Ch. 2-Sec. 2].

4. *Positive measures.* Let μ be a Borel measure on Σ . We say that μ is strictly positive if $\mu(U) > 0$ for any nonempty open set U of Σ .

2.2 Lie groups, Lie algebras, and representations

1. *Lie groups and Lie algebras.* Let G be a Lie group, \mathfrak{g} be its Lie algebra, and $[\cdot, \cdot]$ be the Lie bracket. We identify each element $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ with a left-invariant vector field L_X over G , i.e., $L_X(g) = gX$ for any $g \in G$. Thus, $L_{[X,Y]} = [L_X, L_Y]$. Note that to each $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, there also corresponds the right-invariant vector field R_X . For that, we have $R_{[X,Y]} = -[R_X, R_Y]$.

A *subalgebra* \mathfrak{h} of \mathfrak{g} is a vector subspace closed under Lie bracket, i.e., $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}] \subseteq \mathfrak{h}$. An *ideal* \mathfrak{i} of \mathfrak{g} is a subalgebra such that $[\mathfrak{i}, \mathfrak{g}] \subseteq \mathfrak{i}$. We say that \mathfrak{g} is simple if it is non-abelian, and moreover, the only ideals of \mathfrak{g} are 0 and itself. A *semi-simple* Lie algebra is a direct sum of simple Lie algebras. A *Cartan subalgebra* \mathfrak{h} of \mathfrak{g} is maximal among the abelian subalgebras of \mathfrak{g} such that the adjoint representation $\text{ad}(X) := [\cdot, X]$ are simultaneously diagonalizable (over \mathbb{C}) for all $X \in \mathfrak{h}$.

Simple real Lie algebras have been completely classified (up to isomorphism) by Élie Cartan. One can assign to each simple real Lie algebra a Vogan diagram or a Satake diagram, depending on whether a maximally compact or a maximally non-compact Cartan subalgebra is used for classification. We refer the reader to [20, Ch. VI] for details. A few commonly seen examples include special unitary Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(n)$, special linear Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(n, \mathbb{R})$, special orthogonal Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(n)$, symplectic Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, indefinite special orthogonal Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(p, q)$ (e.g. $\mathfrak{so}(1, 3)$ is the Lie algebra of the Lorentz group $O(1, 3)$). A complete list of (non-complex) simple real Lie algebras can be found in [20, Thm. 6.105]. We will provide more details of the structure theory of semi-simple real Lie algebras along the presentation whenever needed.

2. *Lie group and Lie algebra representation.* Let V be a finite dimensional vector space over \mathbb{R} . Let $\text{Aut}(V)$ and $\text{End}(V)$ be the sets of automorphisms and endomorphisms of V , respectively. A *representation* π of G on V , is a group homomorphism $\pi : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(V)$, i.e., $\pi(e) = \text{Id}$, and $\pi(gh) = \pi(g)\pi(h)$.

Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be an inner-product on V . We say that the representation is C^k (i.e., k -th continuously differentiable) if the map $\pi : (g, v) \in G \times V \mapsto \pi(g)v \in V$ is C^k . A *matrix coefficient* is any C^k -function on G defined as $\langle \pi(g)v_j, v_i \rangle$ where v_i, v_j belong to V . In particular, if the v_i 's form an orthonormal basis of V , then $\langle \pi(g)v_j, v_i \rangle$ is exactly the ij -th entry of $\pi(g)$.

A group representation π induces a Lie algebra homomorphism $\pi_* : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$, where π_* is the derivative of π at the identity $e \in G$. It satisfies the following condition:

$$\pi_*([X, Y]) = \pi_*(Y)\pi_*(X) - \pi_*(X)\pi_*(Y), \quad \forall X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}.$$

We call π_* a *representation* of \mathfrak{g} on V , or simply a Lie algebra representation.

Let $\text{Ad} : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the *adjoint representation*, i.e., each $\text{Ad}(g) : T_e G \rightarrow T_e G$ is the derivative of the conjugation $h \in G \mapsto ghg^{-1} \in G$ at the identity e . The induced Lie algebra representation of Ad is simply ad , i.e., $\text{Ad}_*(X) = \text{ad}(X) = [\cdot, X]$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}$.

If G happens to be a matrix Lie group (which is not always the case) embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, then the *standard representation* of G on \mathbb{R}^n is simply given by $(g, v) \in G \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto gv \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

3. *Philip Hall basis.* Let $X := \{X_1, \dots, X_k\}$ be a set of free generators, and $\mathcal{L}(X)$ be the associated free Lie algebra. For a Lie product $p \in \mathcal{L}(X)$, let $\text{dep}(p)$ be the *depth* of p defined as the number of X_i 's in p , counted with multiplicity. The *P. Hall basis* [21]

of $\mathcal{L}(X)$ is a sequence of Lie products $P := \{p_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ which satisfies the following three conditions: (i). The first k Lie products are the X_i 's, i.e., $p_i = X_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$; (ii). If $\text{dep}(p_i) < \text{dep}(p_j)$, then $i < j$; (iii). Each $[p_i, p_j]$ belongs to P if and only if $p_i, p_j \in P$ with $i < j$, and either $p_j = X_{j'}$ for some j' or $p_j = [p_l, p_r]$ with $p_l, p_r \in P$ and $l \leq i$. For example, if $k = 3$, then the Lie products p in the P. Hall basis with $\text{dep}(p) \leq 3$ are given by

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} X_1 & X_2 & X_3 & [X_1, X_2] & [X_1, X_3] & [X_2, X_3] \\ [X_1, [X_1, X_2]] & [X_1, [X_1, X_3]] & [X_2, [X_1, X_2]] & [X_2, [X_1, X_3]] & & \\ [X_2, [X_2, X_3]] & [X_3, [X_1, X_2]] & [X_3, [X_1, X_3]] & [X_3, [X_2, X_3]] & & \end{array}$$

We further decompose $P = \sqcup_{k \geq 1} P(k)$ where $P(k)$ is comprised of Lie products of depth k . P. Hall basis has been used in motion planning of nonholonomic system via the approach of Lie extension (see, for example, [22, 23]). We review such an approach in Subsection §3.3.

2.3 Miscellaneous

Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n . We denote by $\det(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_n})$ the determinant of a matrix whose j -th column is e_{i_j} for $i_j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

For a vector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\|v\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^n |v_i|$ be the one-norm of v .

Let V be an arbitrary vector space over \mathbb{R} . We denote by V^* the dual vector space, i.e., it is the collection of all linear functionals from V to \mathbb{R} .

Let V' and V'' be two subsets (but not necessarily subspaces) of the vector space V . We say that V' and V'' are **equivalent** if for any $v' \in V'$, there exists $v'' \in V''$ and a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $v' = cv''$, and vice versa. We simply write $V' \equiv V''$ to indicate such equivalence relation.

Let S be an arbitrary set with an operation “ $*$ ” defined so that $s_1 * s_2$ belongs to S for all $s_1, s_2 \in S$. For any two subsets S' and S'' of S , we denote by $S' * S''$ the subset of S comprised of the elements $s' * s''$ for all $s' \in S'$ and $s'' \in S''$. Here are two examples in which such a notation will be used: (i) If S is a vector space and “ $*$ ” is the addition “ $+$ ”, then we write $S' + S''$. (ii) If S is the commutative algebra of analytic functions $C^\omega(\Sigma)$ and “ $*$ ” is the pointwise multiplication, then we write $S'S''$.

However, we note that the above notation does not apply to $[\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_2]$ for \mathfrak{g}_1 and \mathfrak{g}_2 two subsets of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . By convention, $[\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_2]$ is the linear span of all $[X_1, X_2]$ with $X_1 \in \mathfrak{g}_1$ and $X_2 \in \mathfrak{g}_2$. We adopt such a convention in the paper as well.

We denote by $[\cdot, \cdot]$ the Lie bracket of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . If \mathfrak{g} is comprised of matrices, then we denote by $[\cdot, \cdot]_M$ the matrix commutator, which differs from $[\cdot, \cdot]$ by a negative sign, i.e., $[X, Y] = -[X, Y]_M$.

For an arbitrary control system $\dot{x} = f(x, u)$, we denote by $u[0, T]$ the control input $u(t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$, and $x[0, T]$ the trajectory of $x(t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$ generated by the system.

3 Ensemble controllability, observability, and duality

We consider in the section the following ensemble system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{s=1}^r u_{i_s}(t) \rho_{i_s}(\sigma) \right) f_i(x_\sigma(t)), & x_\sigma \in M \text{ and } \sigma \in \Sigma, \\ y^j(t) = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_\sigma(t)) d\sigma, & y^j(t) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, l. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The state space M for each x_σ is analytic, equipped with a Riemannian metric. The parametrization space Σ is analytic, compact, and path-connected with a positive measure. The drift vector field belongs to $C^\omega(M \times \Sigma)$. The parametrization functions $\{\rho_{i_s}\}_{s=1}^r$ and the control vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$'s belong to $C^\omega(\Sigma)$ and $\mathfrak{X}(M)$, respectively. The functions $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ belong to $C^\omega(M)$. Further, the control inputs u_{i_s} 's are independent of each other.

We note here that the numbers of control inputs associated with the control vector fields f_i 's do not need to be the same, i.e., one can replace r in (22) with r_i for each $i = 1, \dots, m$. On the other hand, one can also set $r := \max\{r_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and let ρ_{i_s} be identically zero if $i_s > r_i$. Thus, there is no loss of generality to assume that all the r_i 's are the same.

Recall that $x_\Sigma(t)$ is the profile of system (6) at time t , and $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ is the profile space. We equip with $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ the Whitney C^0 -topology.

We address in the section ensemble controllability and ensemble observability of system (6). Precise definitions are provided below:

Definition 1 (Ensemble controllability). *System (6) is **approximately ensemble controllable** if for (i) any initial profile $x_\Sigma(0)$ and any target profile \hat{x}_Σ , (ii) any time $T > 0$, and (iii) any error tolerance $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a control law $u[0, T]$ such that the solution $x_\Sigma(t)$ of (6) satisfies*

$$d_M(x_\sigma(T), \hat{x}_\sigma) < \epsilon, \quad \forall \sigma \in \Sigma.$$

*Further, system (6) is **approximately ensemble path-controllable** if for any trajectory of profiles $\hat{x}_\Sigma[0, T]$ with $\hat{x}_\sigma(0) = x_\sigma(0)$, there is a control law $u[0, T]$ such that*

$$d_M(x_\sigma(t), \hat{x}_\sigma(t)) < \epsilon, \quad \forall \sigma \in \Sigma \text{ and } t \in [0, T].$$

Similar definitions of approximate ensemble controllability can be also found in [5].

Definition 2 (Ensemble observability). *System (6) is **weakly ensemble observable** if for each profile x_Σ , there exists an open neighborhood U of x_Σ in $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ such that for any $\bar{x}_\Sigma \in C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ intersecting U , there is a time $T > 0$ and a control law $u[0, T]$ so that for some $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ and some $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$\int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_\sigma(t)) d\sigma \neq \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(\bar{x}_\sigma(t)) d\sigma,$$

*where $x_\Sigma(0) = x_\Sigma$ and $\bar{x}_\Sigma(0) = \bar{x}_\Sigma$. Further, system (6) is **ensemble observable** if the open neighborhood U , for any x_Σ , can be chosen to be the entire profile space $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$.*

Organization of the section. The remainder of the section is organized as follows. We provide in Subsection §3.1 two key definitions of the paper, namely *distinguished vector fields* and of *codistinguished functions*. We also provide relevant properties of these vector fields and functions.

To illustrate the roles of distinguished vector fields and codistinguished functions in an ensemble system, we consider in Subsection §3.2 a simplified version of system (6):

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t) \sigma f_i(x_\sigma(t)), & x_\sigma \in M \text{ and } \sigma \in [a, b], \\ y^j(t) = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_\sigma(t)) d\sigma, & y^j(t) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, l, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

i.e., $\Sigma = [a, b]$ is simply a closed interval of \mathbb{R} , $r = 1$, and $\rho(\sigma) = \sigma$ is the standard coordinate function. We then state in the subsection our first main result, Theorem 3.1, about approximate ensemble path-controllability and (weak) ensemble observability of system (7). An illustrating example of such ensemble system defined on $SO(3)$ is given after Theorem 3.1.

We prove Theorem 3.1 in Subsections §3.3 and §3.4, where approximate ensemble path-controllability and (weakly) ensemble observability are established in these two subsections, respectively.

Then, in Subsections §3.5 and §3.6, we extended the results established for (7) to the general system (6), where the parametrization space Σ and the parametrization functions ρ_{i_s} 's can be arbitrary. We introduce *controllability/observability indices* (see Def. 6) to address the ensemble controllability/observability problem.

3.1 Distinguished vector fields and codistinguished functions

We introduce here distinguished vector fields and codistinguished functions (or one-forms). Recall that for a point $x \in M$, we denote by $T_x M$ the tangent space and $T_x^* M$ the cotangent space at x , respectively.

We first have the following definition for distinguished vector fields:

Definition 3 (Distinguished vector fields). *A set of vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ over the manifold M is **distinguished** (or simply **dist.**) if the following hold:*

- (i) *For any $x \in M$, the span of $f_1(x), \dots, f_m(x)$ is $T_x M$.*
- (ii) *For any two vector fields f_i and f_j , there exist another vector field f_k and a real number λ such that*

$$[f_i, f_j] = \lambda f_k; \quad (8)$$

conversely, for any f_k , there exist f_i and f_j and a nonzero λ such that (8) holds.

Recall that $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ is the collection of analytic vector fields over M . One can treat $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ as an infinite dimensional real Lie algebra. If a set of vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m \subseteq \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is **dist.**,

then from the defining conditions, they form a *finite dimensional* Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$. We denote it by

$$F := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m c_i f_i \mid c_i \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Let $\xi : M \rightarrow N$ be an analytic diffeomorphism between two manifolds. Recall that for a vector field f over M , we denote by $\xi_* f$ the pushforward of f as a vector field over N . We have the following fact about topological invariance of dist. vector fields:

Lemma 1. *If $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m \subset \mathfrak{X}(M)$ is dist., then $\{\xi_* f_i\}_{i=1}^m \subset \mathfrak{X}(N)$ is dist. as well.*

Proof. It simply follows from the fact that the pushforward commutes with Lie bracket, i.e., $[\xi_* f_i, \xi_* f_j] = \xi_* [f_i, f_j] = \lambda \xi_* f_k$. ■

We now introduce the other definition for codistinguished functions:

Definition 4 (Codistinguished functions). *A set of functions $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ on M is **codistinguished** (or simply codist.) to a set of vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m \subset \mathfrak{X}(M)$ if the following hold:*

- (i) *For any $x \in M$, the span of $d\phi_x^1, \dots, d\phi_x^l$ is $T_x^* M$.*
- (ii) *For any vector field f_i and any function ϕ^j , there exist a function ϕ^k and a real number λ such that*

$$f_i \phi^j = \lambda \phi^k; \tag{9}$$

conversely, for any ϕ^k , there exist f_i, ϕ^j , and a nonzero λ such that (9) holds.

- (iii) *For $x, y \in M$, if $\phi^j(x) = \phi^j(y)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, l$, then $x = y$.*

*If $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ satisfies only the first two conditions, then it is **weakly codist.** to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$.*

Note that in the above definition, we do *not* require the set of vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ to be distinguished. We also note the following fact:

Remark 1. By the Cartan's formula, we have that $f d\phi = d(f\phi)$ for any $f \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and $\phi \in C^\omega(M)$. In particular, if $f_i \phi^j = \lambda \phi^k$, then

$$f_i d\phi^j = d(f_i \phi^j) = \lambda d\phi^k.$$

Thus, one can say that the set of one-forms $\{d\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is (weakly) *codist.* to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$. ■

Let $\xi : M \rightarrow N$ be an analytic diffeomorphism. Recall that for a function ϕ defined over N , we denote by $\xi^* \phi$ the pullback as a function on M . Note that if $f_i \phi^j = \lambda \phi^k$, then

$$(\xi_*^{-1} f_i)(\xi^* \phi^j) = \xi^*(f_i \phi^j) = \lambda \xi^* \phi^k.$$

Thus, similar to Lemma 1, we have the following property of the topological invariance of codist. functions:

Lemma 2. *If $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, then $\{\xi^* \phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to $\{\xi_*^{-1} f_i\}_{i=1}^m$.*

We further introduce the following definition:

Definition 5. A set of vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and a set of functions $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ are **(weakly) jointly distinguished** if $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is dist. and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is (weakly) codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$.

Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ be (weakly) jointly distinguished. We have shown that the finite dimensional vector space F spanned by the f_i 's is a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$. Now, let Φ be a finite dimensional subspace of $C^\omega(M)$ spanned by the ϕ^j 's, i.e.,

$$\Phi := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^l c_j \phi^j \mid c_j \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Recall that for any $f_i, f_j \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and any function $\phi \in C^\omega(M)$, we have $[f_i, f_j]\phi = f_i f_j \phi - f_j f_i \phi$. It then follows that

Lemma 3. If $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\Phi = \{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ are jointly dist., then the action

$$(f, \phi) \in F \times \Phi \mapsto f\phi \in \Phi$$

is a finite dimensional Lie algebra representation of F on Φ .

We will use this fact later in Section §4 for generating co-dist. functions. Similarly, if we let $d\Phi$ be the vector space spanned by the one-forms $\{d\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$, then

$$(f, d\phi) \in F \times d\Phi \mapsto f d\phi \in d\Phi$$

is again a Lie algebra representation, isomorphic to the one given in the above remark.

3.2 Controllability and observability of distinguished ensemble system

We consider in this subsection a simplified ensemble system (7). For convenience, we reproduce the system below:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t) \sigma f_i(x_\sigma(t)), & x_\sigma \in M \text{ and } \sigma \in \Sigma = [a, b], \\ y^j(t) = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_\sigma(t)) d\sigma, & y^j(t) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, l. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

We assume that the closed interval $[a, b]$ does not contain the origin. Discussions of the case where the closed interval $[a, b]$ is arbitrary are given in Remark 2 at the end of Subsection §3.3.

We make such simplification so as to illustrate how dist. vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and codist. functions $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ can lead to approximate ensemble path-controllability and ensemble observability, respectively. The general ensemble system (6), and its controllability and observability, will be analyzed later in Subsections §3.5 and §3.6. With a few more efforts, the analyses we will carry out for (10) can be applied to the general system (6).

We now state the first main result for system (10):

Theorem 3.1 (Distinguished ensemble system). *The following hold for system (10):*

- (i) *If $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is dist., then (10) is approximately ensemble path-controllable.*
- (ii) *If $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is (weakly) codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, then (10) is (weakly) ensemble observable.*

In particular, if $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ are (weakly) jointly dist., then (10) is approximately ensemble path-controllable and (weakly) ensemble observable.

The proof of the above theorem will be given in the next two subsections. For the remainder of the subsection, we provide an illustrative example on $\text{SO}(3)$ with jointly dist. control vector fields and observation functions. The vector fields and functions constructed in the example will be further generalized in Section §4 so that they exist on *any* semi-simple Lie group.

Example 1. Consider the following left-invariant vector fields over $\text{SO}(3)$, the matrix Lie group of 3×3 special orthogonal matrices:

$$L_{X_1}(g) := gX_1, \quad L_{X_2}(g) := gX_2, \quad L_{X_3}(g) := gX_3. \quad (11)$$

where the X_i 's are skew-symmetric matrices defined by

$$X_i := e_j e_k^\top - e_k e_j^\top, \quad \text{with } \det(e_i, e_j, e_k) = 1,$$

i.e., (i, j, k) is a cyclic rotation of $(1, 2, 3)$.

Let $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ be the Lie algebra of $\text{SO}(3)$, comprised of 3×3 skew symmetric matrices. It should be clear that $\text{Span}\{X_i\}_{i=1}^3 = \mathfrak{so}(3)$, and hence $\text{Span}\{L_{X_i}(g)\}_{i=1}^3 = T_g \text{SO}(3)$. By computation, we have that for any $i \neq j$, the Lie bracket of X_i and X_j is given by

$$[L_{X_i}, L_{X_j}] = \det(e_i, e_j, e_k) L_{X_k}. \quad (12)$$

It follow from (12) that $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^3$ is a dist. set of vector fields.

We next let $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^3$ be analytic functions on $\text{SO}(3)$ defined as follows:

$$\phi^{ij}(g) := \text{tr}(gX_j g^\top X_i^\top), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq 3.$$

We show below that $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{j,k=1}^3$ is codist. to $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^3$. By computation, we have that for any $g \in \text{SO}(3)$ and any $X \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$,

$$d\phi_g^{ij}(gX) = \text{tr}(g[X_j, X]g^\top X_i^\top) = \text{tr}([X_j, X]g^\top X_i^\top g). \quad (13)$$

The above expression has several implications:

- (i) First, using the fact that for any matrices A , B , and C of appropriate dimensions, $\text{tr}([A, B]C) = \text{tr}(A[B, C])$, we have

$$d\phi_g^{ij}(gX) = \text{tr}(X[g^\top X_i^\top g, X_j]).$$

Since $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ is simple, $[\mathfrak{so}(3), \mathfrak{so}(3)] = \mathfrak{so}(3)$. Also, note that both $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^3$ and $\{g^\top X_i^\top g\}_{i=1}^3$ spans $\mathfrak{so}(3)$. It follows that $\{\hat{X}_{ij} := [g^\top X_i^\top g, X_j]\}_{i,j=1}^3$ spans $\mathfrak{so}(3)$. Now, we have

$$d\phi_g^{ij}(gX) = \text{tr}(X\hat{X}_{ij}).$$

By the fact that $\text{tr}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is negative definite on $\mathfrak{so}(3)$, we have that $\{d\phi_g^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^3$ spans $T_g^* \text{SO}(3)$ for all $g \in \text{SO}(3)$. Thus, the first item of Def. 4 is satisfied.

(ii) From (13), we have that for any L_{X_i} and any ϕ^{ij} ,

$$(L_{X_i}\phi^{ij})(g) = d\phi_g^{ij}(gX_i) = \text{tr}(g[X_j, X_i]g^\top X_i^\top).$$

It then follows from (12) that

$$L_{X_i}\phi^{ij} = -\det(e_i, e_j, e_k)\phi^{ik},$$

and hence the second item of Def. 4 is satisfied.

(iii) Let g and g' be such that $\phi^{ij}(g) = \phi^{ij}(g')$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$. Fix an j , we have

$$\text{tr}(gX_jg^\top X_i^\top) = \text{tr}(g'X_jg'^\top X_i^\top), \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Since $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^3$ spans $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ and $\text{tr}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is negative definite on $\mathfrak{so}(3)$, we have $gX_jg^\top = g'X_jg'^\top$, or equivalently, $X_j = g^\top g'X_jg'^\top g$. Since this holds for all $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^3$ spans $\mathfrak{so}(3)$, we have that $g^\top g'$ belongs to the center of $\text{SO}(3)$, which is comprised only of the identity matrix. We thus conclude that $g = g'$, and hence the third item of Def. 4 is satisfied.

We have thus shown that $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^3$ and $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^3$ are jointly dist., and hence by Theorem 3.1 the following ensemble system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{g}_\sigma(t) = L_{X_\sigma}(g_\sigma(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i(t)\sigma L_{X_i}(g_\sigma(t)), \\ y^{ij}(t) = \int_\Sigma \text{tr}(g_\sigma(t)X_jg_\sigma^\top(t)X_i^\top)d\sigma, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq 3. \end{cases}$$

is approximately ensemble path-controllable and ensemble observable. ■

3.3 Proof of approximate ensemble path-controllability

We prove here the first item of Theorem 3.1. To proceed, we first recall that for an arbitrary *single* control-affine system

$$\dot{x} = f_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i f_i(x), \tag{14}$$

the so-called (one-step) *Lie extension* of the system is a new control-affine system with additional control vector fields and corresponding control inputs:

$$\dot{x} = f_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i f_i(x) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} u_{ij} [f_i, f_j](x),$$

where the control inputs u_{ij} 's are independent of the existing u_i 's. Moreover, one can repeatedly apply Lie extensions to generate a family of control-affine systems with more and more control vector fields, each of which is generated by a higher order Lie bracket of the f_i 's. It is known that the original control-affine system is approximately path-controllable if and only if any of its Lie extended system is. In fact, Sussmann and Liu showed in [23, 24] how to construct control inputs $u_i(\cdot)$ using sinusoidal signals to approximate a desired trajectory generated by one of its Lie extended systems. The same technique has also been used in [5] for proving approximate ensemble controllability.

We now apply Lie extensions to system (10). In this case, we have that for any system- σ , the control vector fields are the σf_i 's, and $[\sigma f_i, \sigma f_j] = \sigma^2[f_i, f_j]$. Thus, the one-step Lie extension of (10) is given by

$$\dot{x}_\sigma = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \sigma f_i(x_\sigma) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} u_{ij} \sigma^2[f_i, f_j](x_\sigma). \quad (15)$$

Further, by repeatedly applying Lie extensions, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_\sigma = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \sigma f_i(x_\sigma) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} u_{ij} \sigma^2[f_i, f_j](x_\sigma) \\ + \sum_{i,j,k} u_{ijk} \sigma^3[f_i, [f_j, f_k]](x_\sigma) + \cdots \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the k -th summation in (16) is over all Lie products of depth k in the P. Hall basis generated by the f_i 's (treated as free generators). The u_i 's, u_{ij} 's, and u_{ijk} 's, etc, are all independent control inputs.

Recall that any two sets of vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^l$ and $\{f'_{i'}\}_{i'=1}^{l'}$ over M are equivalent, which we denote by $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^l \equiv \{f'_{i'}\}_{i'=1}^{l'}$, if for any f_i there exist an $f'_{i'}$ and a real number c such that $f_i = c f'_{i'}$, and vice versa.

In the case here, we have that $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a dist. set of vector fields, and hence by the second item of Def. 3,

$$\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m = P(1) \equiv P(2) \equiv P(3) \equiv \cdots$$

In particular, the Lie extended system (16) can be simplified as follows:

$$\dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m \left(u_i^{[1]}(t) \sigma + u_i^{[2]}(t) \sigma^2 + u_i^{[3]}(t) \sigma^3 + \cdots \right) f_i(x_\sigma(t)). \quad (17)$$

The control inputs $u_i^{[k]}$'s in the above system are defined as follows: For $k = 1$, $u_i^{[1]} := u_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. For $k > 1$, we have

$$u_i^{[k]} := \sum_p \lambda_p u_p,$$

where the summation is over any $p \in P(k)$ such that $p = \lambda_p f_i$. Note that all the control inputs $u_i^{[k]}$'s are independent of each other.

Let $\hat{x}_\Sigma[0, T] \in C^\omega(\Sigma \times [0, T], M)$ be the desired trajectory of profiles. Since $\{f_i(x)\}_{i=1}^m$ spans $T_x M$ for all $x \in M$, there are smooth functions $c_i(t, \sigma)$'s in both t and σ such that

$$\frac{\partial \hat{x}_\sigma(t)}{\partial t} - f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i(t, \sigma) f_i(\hat{x}_\sigma(t)).$$

Note, in particular, that the solution $x_\sigma(t)$ to the following differential equation:

$$\dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m c_i(t, \sigma) f_i(\hat{x}_\sigma(t)), \quad (18)$$

with the initial condition $x_\Sigma(0) = \hat{x}_\Sigma(0)$ is exactly $\hat{x}_\Sigma(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

On the other hand, by the Stone-Weierstrass theorem, we know that each continuous function $c_i(t, \sigma)$ can be approximated by a finite number of monomials $t^p \sigma^q$ within arbitrary error tolerance. Moreover, since 0 does not belong to $\Sigma = [a, b]$, each of the monomials $t^p \sigma^q$ can be chosen such that $q \geq 1$. Thus, for a given but arbitrary $\epsilon' > 0$, there exist a positive integer N and a set of polynomials $u_i^{[k]}(t)$ in t , for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $k = 1, \dots, N$, such that

$$\left| c_i(t, \sigma) - \sum_{k=1}^N u_i^{[k]}(t) \sigma^k \right| < \epsilon', \quad \forall (t, \sigma) \in [0, T] \times \Sigma \text{ and } i = 1, \dots, m.$$

In other words, we can steer system (17), via control inputs $u_i^{[k]}(t)$'s which are polynomial in t , to approximate the solution of system (18) uniformly and arbitrarily well. ■

Remark 2. We see in the above proof that any $\sigma^k f_i$, for $k \geq 1$, can be generated by a Lie product of the σf_i 's. Nevertheless, none of the f_i 's can be generated in this way, which in turn precludes the usage of monomials $\{t^k\}_{k \geq 1}$ in polynomial approximation of the continuous functions $c_i(\sigma, t)$'s. On the other hand, if one modifies system (10) by adding new control inputs \tilde{u}_i 's as follows:

$$\dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m (\tilde{u}_i(t) + u_i(t)\sigma) f_i(x_\sigma(t)), \quad \sigma \in \Sigma \text{ and } x_\sigma \in M,$$

then the vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are now explicitly included, and hence the above system is approximately ensemble path-controllable over any closed interval $\Sigma = [a, b]$. We will generalize the fact later in Subsection §3.5. ■

3.4 Proof of ensemble observability

We now prove the second item of Theorem 3.1. Specifically, let $\bar{x}_\Sigma(0) \in C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ be chosen such that it is indistinguishable from $x_\Sigma(0)$, i.e., for any time $T > 0$ and any control law $u[0, T]$, the two trajectories of profiles $x_\Sigma[0, T]$ and $\bar{x}_\Sigma[0, T]$ give rise to the same measurement outputs:

$$\int_\Sigma \phi^j(x_\sigma(t)) d\sigma \equiv \int_\Sigma \phi^j(\bar{x}_\sigma(t)) d\sigma, \quad j = 1, \dots, l.$$

We show below that if $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is weakly codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, then there is an open neighborhood U of $x_\Sigma(0)$ in $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ such that $\bar{x}_\Sigma(0) = x_\Sigma(0)$ is the only solution within U . Further, if $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, then U can be chosen to be the entire profile space $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$.

For convenience, we will now write x_Σ and \bar{x}_Σ instead of $x_\Sigma(0)$ and $\bar{x}_\Sigma(0)$ by omitting their arguments.

Recall that $\{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ is the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^m . We introduce the following notation for a piecewise constant control input:

$$u(t) := \delta_1 e_{i_1} [t_0, t_1) \delta_2 e_{i_2} [t_1, t_2) \cdots \delta_k e_{i_k} [t_{k-1}, t_k], \quad 0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k < \infty,$$

which is defined such that $u(t) = \delta_j e_{i_j}$ with $\delta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ for $t \in [t_{j-1}, t_j)$. We also let $s_i := t_i - t_{i-1}$.

Consider now a control law $u = \delta_1 e_{i_1} [t_0, t_1]$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Recall that $e^{tf}x$ is the solution of a differential equation $\dot{x} = f(x)$ at time t with x the initial condition. Since x_Σ and \bar{x}_Σ are indistinguishable, we have that for all $t_1 \geq 0$ and for all $\delta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(e^{t_1(\delta_1 \sigma f_i + f_0)} x_\sigma) d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(e^{t_1(\delta_1 \sigma f_i + f_0)} \bar{x}_\sigma) d\sigma, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, l.$$

Taking derivative d/dt_1 on both sides and evaluating at $t_1 = 0$, we obtain that

$$\int_{\Sigma} \left((\delta_1 \sigma f_i + f_0) \phi^j \right) (x_\sigma) d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} \left((\delta_1 \sigma f_i + f_0) \phi^j \right) (\bar{x}_\sigma) d\sigma.$$

Further, taking derivative $d/d\delta_1$ on both side and evaluating at $\delta_1 = 0$, we obtain that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (f_i \phi^j)(x_\sigma) \sigma d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} (f_i \phi^j)(\bar{x}_\sigma) \sigma d\sigma.$$

Since $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, for any $j = 1, \dots, l$, there exist a vector field f_i , a function $\phi^{j'}$, and a *nonzero* λ such that $f_i \phi^{j'} = \lambda \phi^j$. It thus follows that

$$\int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_\sigma) \sigma d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(\bar{x}_\sigma) \sigma d\sigma, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, l.$$

We next consider control laws of type $u = \delta_1 e_{i_1} [t_0, t_1) \delta_2 e_{i_2} [t_1, t_2]$ for $i_1, i_2 = 1, \dots, m$. For convenience, we let

$$\tilde{f}_{i_j} := \delta_j \sigma f_{i_j} + f_0. \quad (19)$$

Since x_Σ and \bar{x}_Σ are indistinguishable, we have that for all $s_1, s_2 \geq 0$ and for all $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(e^{s_2 \tilde{f}_{i_2}} e^{s_1 \tilde{f}_{i_1}} x_\sigma) d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(e^{s_2 \tilde{f}_{i_2}} e^{s_1 \tilde{f}_{i_1}} \bar{x}_\sigma) d\sigma,$$

Taking the second order partial derivative $\partial^2 / \partial s_1 \partial s_2$ on both sides of the above expression and then evaluating at $s_1 = s_2 = 0$, we obtain that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (\tilde{f}_{i_1} \tilde{f}_{i_2} \phi^j)(x_\sigma) d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} (\tilde{f}_{i_1} \tilde{f}_{i_2} \phi^j)(\bar{x}_\sigma) d\sigma.$$

Note that by (19), each \tilde{f}_{i_j} depends on δ_j . Taking the second order partial derivative $\partial^2/\partial\sigma_1\partial\sigma_2$ on both sides of the above expression and evaluating at $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$, we obtain that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (f_{i_1} f_{i_2} \phi^j)(x_{\sigma}) \sigma^2 d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} (f_{i_1} f_{i_2} \phi^j)(\bar{x}_{\sigma}) \sigma^2 d\sigma.$$

Again, using the fact that $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, we have that for any $j = 1, \dots, l$, there exist a word w over the alphabet $\{1, \dots, m\}$ of length 2, a function $\phi^{j'}$, and a *nonzero* λ such that $f_w \phi^{j'} = \lambda \phi^j$. It thus follows that

$$\int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_{\sigma}) \sigma^2 d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(\bar{x}_{\sigma}) \sigma^2 d\sigma, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, l.$$

In general, we consider a control law $u = \delta_1 e_{i_1}[t_0, t_1] \cdots \delta_k e_{i_k}[t_{k-1}, t_k]$. Since x_{Σ} and \bar{x}_{Σ} are indistinguishable, for any nonnegative s_i 's and any real numbers δ_i 's, we have

$$\int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(e^{s_k \tilde{f}_{i_k}} \cdots e^{s_1 \tilde{f}_{i_1}} x_{\sigma}) d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(e^{s_k \tilde{f}_{i_k}} \cdots e^{s_1 \tilde{f}_{i_1}} \bar{x}_{\sigma}) d\sigma.$$

Taking the partial derivative $\partial^{2k}/\partial s_1 \cdots \partial s_k \partial \delta_1 \cdots \partial \delta_k$ of the above expression and then evaluating at $s_i = \delta_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, we obtain that

$$\int_{\Sigma} (f_{i_1} \cdots f_{i_k} \phi^j)(x_{\sigma}) \sigma^k d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} (f_{i_1} \cdots f_{i_k} \phi^j)(\bar{x}_{\sigma}) \sigma^k d\sigma.$$

Since $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, there exist a word w of length k , a function $\phi^{j'}$, and a *nonzero* λ such that $f_w \phi^{j'} = \lambda \phi^j$, and hence

$$\int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_{\sigma}) \sigma^k d\sigma = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(\bar{x}_{\sigma}) \sigma^k d\sigma, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, l. \quad (20)$$

We denote by $L^2(\Sigma)$ the Hilbert space of square-integrable functions on Σ (with respect to the positive measure), i.e., it is the collection of functions ϕ such that $\int_{\Sigma} \phi^2(\sigma) d\sigma < \infty$. The inner-product on $L^2(\Sigma)$ is simply given by

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{L^2} := \int_{\Sigma} \phi(\sigma) \psi(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

It is known that the set of polynomials $\{\sigma^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ form a basis of $L^2(\Sigma)$. Thus, if there is a function $\phi \in L^2(\Sigma)$ such that $\langle \phi, \sigma^k \rangle_{L^2} = 0$ for all $k \geq 0$, then ϕ is zero almost everywhere (more precisely, it differs from 0 over a set of measure zero). In the case here, we have from (20) that

$$\langle \phi^j(x_{\sigma}) - \phi^j(\bar{x}_{\sigma}), \sigma^k \rangle_{L^2} = 0, \quad \forall k \geq 0 \text{ and } \forall j = 1, \dots, l.$$

Moreover, since $x_{\sigma}, \bar{x}_{\sigma}$ are analytic in σ and each $\phi^j(x)$ is analytic in x , we have that

$$\phi^j(x_{\sigma}) = \phi^j(\bar{x}_{\sigma}), \quad \forall \sigma \in \Sigma \text{ and } \forall j = 1, \dots, l. \quad (21)$$

Since $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, by the first item of Def. 4, $\{d\phi_x^j\}_{j=1}^l$ spans the cotangent space T_x^*M for all $x \in M$. It follows that for any $x \in M$, there is an open ball $B_{\epsilon(x)}(x)$ centered at x with radius $\epsilon(x) > 0$ such that if $\bar{x} \in B_{\epsilon(x)}(x)$ and $\phi^j(x) = \phi^j(\bar{x})$ for all $j = 1, \dots, l$, then $\bar{x} = x$. Furthermore, since each ϕ^j is analytic, for a fix point $x \in M$, the radius $\epsilon(x')$ of the open ball $B_{\epsilon(x')}(x')$ can be chosen to be locally continuous around x .

The above arguments then have the following implication: Since x_σ is analytic in σ , for each $\sigma \in \Sigma$, there is an open neighborhood V_σ of σ in Σ and a positive real number ϵ_σ such that for any $\sigma' \in V_\sigma$, if $\bar{x}_{\sigma'}$ belongs to the open ball $B_{\epsilon_\sigma}(x_{\sigma'})$ and $\phi^j(x_{\sigma'}) = \phi^j(\bar{x}_{\sigma'})$ for all $j = 1, \dots, l$, then $\bar{x}_{\sigma'} = x_{\sigma'}$.

The collection of open sets $\{V_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \Sigma}$ is an open cover of Σ . Since Σ is compact, there exists a finite cover $\{V_{\sigma_i}\}_{i=1}^N$ of Σ . We then let $\epsilon := \min_{i=1}^N \epsilon_{\sigma_i}$, and define an open neighborhood U of x_σ in $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$ as follows:

$$U := \{\bar{x}_\Sigma \in C^\omega(\Sigma, M) \mid d_M(x_\sigma, \bar{x}_\sigma) < \epsilon, \quad \forall \sigma \in \Sigma\}.$$

We claim that if \bar{x}_Σ intersects U , then $\bar{x}_\Sigma = x_\Sigma$. To see this, we first let $\sigma \in \Sigma$ be such that $d_M(x_\sigma, \bar{x}_\sigma) < \epsilon$. Then, by the above arguments, $x_\sigma = \bar{x}_\sigma$. Now, let σ' be any other point of Σ . We need to show $\bar{x}_{\sigma'} = x_{\sigma'}$. Because Σ is path-connected, there is a continuous path $p : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ with $p(0) = \sigma$ and $p(1) = \sigma'$. Note that for any $s \in [0, 1]$, either $\bar{x}_{p(s)} = x_{p(s)}$ or $d_M(x_{p(s)}, \bar{x}_{p(s)}) \geq \epsilon$. Also, note that \bar{x}_Σ is analytic in σ and $p(s)$ is continuous in s . Thus, $\bar{x}_{p(s)}$ is continuous in s . But then, since $\bar{x}_{p(0)} = x_{p(0)}$, we conclude that $\bar{x}_{p(s)} = x_{p(s)}$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. In particular, $\bar{x}_{\sigma'} = x_{\sigma'}$. This establishes the claim.

We have shown that if $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is weakly codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, then system (6) is weakly ensemble observable. Further, if the third item of Def. 4 is satisfied, then we conclude from (21) that $x_\sigma = \bar{x}_\sigma$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$. In other words, the open neighborhood U can be chosen as the entire profile space $C^\omega(\Sigma, M)$, and hence system (6) is ensemble observable. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

3.5 On general parametrization spaces

We consider in the subsection the general ensemble system (6), and address controllability and observability of it. For convenience, we reproduce the system below:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{s=1}^r u_{is}(t) \rho_{is}(\sigma) \right) f_i(x_\sigma(t)), & x_\sigma \in M \text{ and } \sigma \in \Sigma, \\ y^j(t) = \int_\Sigma \phi^j(x_\sigma(t)) d\sigma, & y^j(t) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, l. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

We assume in the sequel that $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ are jointly distinguished.

Let P be the P. Hall basis with f_i 's the generators (as if they were free). For a Lie product $p \in P$, we let $\text{ind}(p)$ be the multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$ with each α_i the number of appearances of f_i in p . Similarly, for a word w over the alphabet $\{1, \dots, m\}$, we let $\text{ind}(w)$ be the multi-index $\alpha' = (\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_m)$ with each α'_i being the number of appearances of letter i in w . Since $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ are jointly dist., any Lie product p is proportional to some f_i , and any Lie derivative $f_w \phi^j$ is proportional to some ϕ^j .

We now introduce the following definition:

Definition 6. Let $F := \{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\Phi := \{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ be jointly distinguished. Let P be the P . Hall basis with f_i 's the generators. For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, let

$$\mathcal{A}_i := \{\text{ind}(p) \in \mathbb{N}^m \mid \exists p \in P \text{ s.t. } p = \lambda f_i, \text{ for some } \lambda \neq 0\}.$$

For each $j = 1, \dots, l$, let

$$\mathcal{B}^j := \{\text{ind}(w) \in \mathbb{N}^m \mid \exists \phi^j \in \Phi \text{ s.t. } f_w \phi^j = \lambda \phi^j, \text{ for some } \lambda \neq 0\}.$$

We call $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ the **controllability indices** and $\{\mathcal{B}^j\}_{j=1}^l$ the **observability indices**.

Remark 3. We note here that the controllability/observability indices can be computed by recursion. Specifically, for controllability indices, we decompose $\mathcal{A}_i = \sqcup_{k=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_i(k)$ where $\mathcal{A}_i(k)$ is the collection of the α 's in \mathcal{A}_i with $\|\alpha\|_1 = k$. For the base case $k = 1$, we have that $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_i(1)$ if and only if $\alpha = e_i$. For the inductive step, we assume that $\mathcal{A}_i(1), \dots, \mathcal{A}_i(k-1)$ are known for $k \geq 2$. Then, $\mathcal{A}_i(k)$ is comprised of $\alpha = \alpha' + \alpha''$ where $\alpha' \in \mathcal{A}_{i'}(k')$ and $\alpha'' \in \mathcal{A}_{i''}(k'')$ are such that $[f_{i'}, f_{i''}] = \lambda f_i$ for some $\lambda \neq 0$ and $k' + k'' = k$.

The computation for observability indices is slightly complicated. We first decompose \mathcal{B}^j as $\mathcal{B}^j = \sqcup_{k=0}^\infty \sqcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{B}^j(i, k)$ where $\mathcal{B}^j(i, k)$ is comprised of any $\text{ind}(w)$ such that the first letter of w is i and $\|\text{ind}(w)\|_1 = k$. For the base case where $k = 0$, we simply set $\mathcal{B}^j(i, 0) := \{\mathbf{0}\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. For the inductive step, $\mathcal{B}^j(i, k)$ is comprised of $\alpha = \alpha' + e_i$ where $\alpha' \in \mathcal{B}^{j'}(i', k-1)$ is such that $f_{i'} \phi^{j'} = \lambda \phi^j$ for some nonzero λ .

We also note that since $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is dist., each $\mathcal{A}_i(k)$ is nonempty for $k \geq 1$; since $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, each $\mathcal{B}^j(k) := \sqcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{B}^j(i, k)$ is nonempty for $k \geq 0$. ■

Given the controllability and observability indices and the analytic functions ρ_{i_s} 's in (22), we define a collection of subsets of $C^\omega(\Sigma)$ as follows: For a given $i = 1, \dots, m$, let \mathcal{P}_i be the collection of all the “monomials” $\rho_{i_1}^{k_1} \cdots \rho_{i_r}^{k_r} \in C^\omega(\Sigma)$ with $k_s \geq 0$ for all $s = 1, \dots, r$. We set $\rho^0 := \mathbf{1}_\Sigma$ for any $\rho \in C^\omega(\Sigma)$. The *degree* of the monomial is simply $\sum_{s=1}^r k_s$. We further decompose \mathcal{P}_i such that

$$\mathcal{P}_i = \sqcup_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_i(k),$$

where each $\mathcal{P}_i(k)$ is comprised of monomials of degree k .

Recall that if \mathcal{P}' and \mathcal{P}'' are two subsets of $C^\omega(\Sigma)$, then $\mathcal{P}'\mathcal{P}''$ is the subset comprised of $\rho'\rho''$ for all $\rho' \in \mathcal{P}'$ and $\rho'' \in \mathcal{P}''$. Note that since $C^\omega(\Sigma)$ is commutative and associative, one can write without any ambiguity a multiplication of an arbitrary number of subsets of $C^\omega(\Sigma)$. We now have the following definition:

Definition 7. Let $F := \{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\Phi := \{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ be jointly distinguished, and let $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\mathcal{B}^j\}_{j=1}^l$ be controllability indices and observability indices, respectively. For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, let

$$C_i := \cup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_i} \mathcal{P}_1(\alpha_1) \cdots \mathcal{P}_m(\alpha_m), \quad (23)$$

and for each $j = 1, \dots, l$, let

$$O^j := \cup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}^j} \mathcal{P}_1(\beta_1) \cdots \mathcal{P}_m(\beta_m). \quad (24)$$

We call $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^m$ the **controllability monomials** and $\{O^j\}_{j=1}^l$ the **observability monomials**.

With the above definitions, we now have the following fact:

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ be (weakly) jointly distinguished. If each C_i (resp. O^j) contains a basis of $L^2(\Sigma)$, then (22) is approximately ensemble path-controllable (resp. (weakly) ensemble observable).*

We omit the proof as the analysis is similar to what has been done in the previous subsections. One establishes the result by repeatedly using the fact that $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ are jointly distinguished.

A special case we will address in the remainder of the subsection is that $\rho_{i_s} = \rho_s$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. The ensemble system (22) is thus simplified as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_\sigma(t) = f_0(x_\sigma, \sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^m (\sum_{s=1}^r u_{i_s}(t) \rho_s(\sigma)) f_i(x_\sigma(t)), \\ y^j(t) = \int_{\Sigma} \phi^j(x_\sigma(t)) d\sigma, \quad j = 1, \dots, l. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

In this case, the computation of C_i or O^j is significantly simplified. Let \mathcal{P} be the collection of all the monomials $\rho_1^{k_1} \cdots \rho_r^{k_r}$ with $k_s \geq 0$ for all $s = 1, \dots, r$. Then, $\mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{P}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. Furthermore, we have the following fact:

Lemma 4. *If $\rho_{i_s} = \rho_s$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, then*

$$\begin{cases} C_i = \cup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_i} \mathcal{P}(\|\alpha\|_1) = \cup_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{P}(k), \\ O^j = \cup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}^j} \mathcal{P}(\|\beta\|_1) = \cup_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{P}(k) = \mathcal{P}. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

If the unit 1_Σ belongs to $\{\rho_s\}_{s=1}^r$, then for each $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{P}(k) = \cup_{k'=0}^k \mathcal{P}(k').$$

In particular, each $\mathcal{P}(k)$ contains 1_Σ , and hence $C_i = \mathcal{P}$.

Proof. For (26), one uses the fact that $\mathcal{A}_i(k) \neq \emptyset$ for $k \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{B}^j(k) \neq \emptyset$ for $k \geq 0$, and the fact that $\mathcal{P}(k_1)\mathcal{P}(k_2) = \mathcal{P}(k_1 + k_2)$ for any $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$. The rest of the lemma follows from definition and computation. ■

Recall that a subset of $C^\omega(\Sigma)$ *separate points* if for any $\sigma \in \Sigma$, there exist two functions ρ and ρ' in the subset such that $\rho(\sigma) \neq \rho'(\sigma)$. We call such subset a *separating set*. We now have the following fact as a corollary to Theorem 3.2:

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ be (weakly) jointly distinguished. If $\{\rho_s\}_{s=1}^r$ separates points and contains a nonzero constant function, then system (25) is approximately ensemble path-controllable and (weakly) ensemble observable.*

Proof. It directly follows from the Stone-Weierstrass theorem that if $\{\rho_s\}_{s=1}^r$ separates points and contains a nonzero constant function, then the algebra generated by the ρ_s 's is dense in $C^0(\Sigma)$, and hence in $L^2(\Sigma)$ as well. ■

One of the remaining problems is about how to find separating sets of functions $\{\rho_s\}_{s=1}^r$. The existence of such set is guaranteed; indeed by the Nash embedding theorem [25, 26], the manifold Σ can be isometrically embedded into some Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^N . We write $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N)$ as the coordinate of a point $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Now, let $\rho_s(\sigma) := \sigma_s$, for $s = 1, \dots, N$, be the standard coordinate functions (more precisely, the restrictions of the coordinate functions of \mathbb{R}^N to Σ). We further let $\rho_{N+1} := \mathbf{1}_\Sigma$ be the nonzero constant function. Then, $\{\rho_s\}_{s=1}^{N+1}$ satisfies the assumption of Cor. 3.3. Of course, depending on the type of the parametrization space Σ , there exist other options for the separating set. For example, if we let $\Sigma = T^N$ be the N -torus (i.e., the N -copy of S^1) and represents a point $\sigma \in T^N$ by $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N)$ with $\sigma_k \in [0, 2\pi)$, then it is natural to use the set of trigonometric functions $\{\cos(\sigma_k), \sin(\sigma_k) \mid k = 1, \dots, N\}$, plus the unit $\mathbf{1}_{T^N}$, as a separating set.

3.6 Pre-distinguished ensemble system

We consider here a slightly more general case where $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ (resp. $d\Phi = \{d\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$) does not necessarily span TM (resp. T^*M). To proceed, we first introduce a few notations.

Let $\text{Gen}(F)$ be the subset of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ generated by F , i.e., it is the smallest subset of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ which contains F and is closed under Lie bracket. Further, let \overline{F} be a subset of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$, which is equivalent to $\text{Gen}(F)$ (i.e., $\overline{F} \equiv \text{Gen}(F)$), and is minimal in the sense that removal of any element of \overline{F} will violate the equivalence relation.

Similarly, given the set of vector fields F , we let $\text{Gen}_F(\Phi) \subset C^\omega(M)$ be comprised of $f_w \phi^j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, l$ and for all words w over the alphabet $\{1, \dots, m\}$, and $\overline{\Phi}_F$ be a minimal subset of $C^\omega(M)$ which is equivalent to $\text{Gen}_F(\Phi)$.

We now introduce the following definition:

Definition 8. A set of vector fields $F := \{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ over M is **pre-dist.** if \overline{F} is finite and is dist. A set of functions $\Phi := \{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is **(weakly) pre-codist.** to F if $\overline{\Phi}_F$ is (weakly) codist. to F . The two subsets F and Φ are **(weakly) jointly pre-dist.** if \overline{F} and $\overline{\Phi}_F$ are (weakly) jointly distinguished.

Note that if F is dist. and Φ is codist. to F , then $\overline{F} = F$ and $\overline{\Phi}_F = \Phi$. In this case, it is interesting to know whether there exist a proper subset F' of F and a proper subset Φ' of Φ , with *minimal* cardinalities, such that $\overline{F'} = F$ and $\overline{\Phi'}_{F'} = \Phi$.

Example 2. Let $F = \{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^3$ and $\Phi = \{\phi^{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3}$ be jointly dist. over $\text{SO}(3)$ as defined in Example 1. For each $i = 1, 2, 3$, let $F_i := F - \{L_{X_i}\}$, and for each $j = 1, 2, 3$, let $\Phi^j := \{\phi^{1j}, \phi^{2j}, \phi^{3j}\}$. Since we have

$$[L_{X_i}, L_{X_j}] = \det(e_i, e_j, e_k) L_{X_k} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{X_i} \phi^{i'j} = -\det(e_i, e_j, e_k) \phi^{i'k},$$

it follows that F_i and Φ^j are jointly pre-distinguished for any $i, j = 1, 2, 3$. Moreover, the two sets F_i and Φ^j are minimal in cardinalities. ■

Let $\overline{F} = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^{\overline{m}}$ and $\overline{\Phi}_F = \{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^{\overline{l}}$ with $\overline{m} \geq m$ and $\overline{l} \geq l$. The same definition, Def. 6, can be transposed to the case here so that controllability indices $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i=1}^{\overline{m}}$ and observability

indices $\{\mathcal{B}^j\}_{j=1}^{\bar{l}}$ are defined, respectively. We shall note that the P. Hall basis \mathcal{P} used for defining the controllability indices is still generated by $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ instead of $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{\bar{m}}$. Similarly, the collection of the words used for defining the observability indices is still over the alphabet $\{1, \dots, m\}$ instead of $\{1, \dots, \bar{m}\}$.

Further, we define the set of controllability monomials $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^{\bar{m}}$ and the set of observability monomials $\{O^j\}_{j=1}^{\bar{l}}$ using (23) and (24), respectively. Then, similar to Theorem 3.2, we have the following fact:

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ be (weakly) jointly pre-distinguished. If each C_i (resp. O^j) contains a basis of $L^2(\Sigma)$, then (22) is approximately ensemble path-controllable (resp. (weakly) ensemble observable).*

Now again, we assume that $\rho_{i_s} = \rho_s$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and consider ensemble system (25). Then, similar to the statement of Cor. 3.3, we have the following fact as a corollary to the above theorem:

Corollary 3.5. *Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ be (weakly) jointly pre-distinguished. If $\{\rho_s\}_{s=1}^r$ separates points and contains a nonzero constant function, then system (25) is approximately ensemble path-controllable and (weakly) ensemble observable.*

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that the constant function is the unit 1_Σ . We show that $C_i = O^j = \mathcal{P}$. It suffices to show that each $\mathcal{P}(k)$, for $k \geq 0$, belongs to C_i and O^j . Since $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ are jointly pre-distinguished, for each $k \geq 0$, there exist $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{B}^j$ such that $\|\alpha\|_1 \geq k$ and $\|\beta\|_1 \geq k$. Then, $\mathcal{P}(\|\alpha\|_1)$ belongs to C_i and $\mathcal{P}(\|\beta\|_1)$ belongs to O^j . Further, since $\{\rho_s\}_{s=1}^r$ contains the unit, it follows from Lemma 4 that if $k' \leq k''$, then $\mathcal{P}(k')$ is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(k'')$. So, $\mathcal{P}(k)$ is a subset of both $\mathcal{P}(\|\alpha\|_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\|\beta\|_1)$. This completes the proof. ■

4 Existence of distinguished ensemble systems on Lie groups and their homogeneous spaces

We have shown in the previous section that (weakly) jointly dist. vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and functions $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ are key components for an ensemble system to be approximately ensemble path-controllable and (weakly) ensemble observable. It is then critical to address the following existence problem:

Problem 1. *Given a manifold M , are there (weakly) jointly distinguished vector fields and functions?*

We provide an affirmative answer to the above problem for the case where M is a semi-simple Lie group G , and partially to its homogeneous space. Also, note that by Lemmas 1 and 2, if M admits (weakly) jointly dist. vector fields and functions, then so does a manifold N diffeomorphic to M .

We note here that each Lie group G admits the structure of real analytic manifold in a unique way such that multiplication and the inversion are real analytic. In this case the exponential map is also real analytic (see [20, Prop. 1.117]).

Amongst other things, we establish in the section the following fact:

Theorem 4.1. *For any connected semi-simple Lie group G , there exist weakly jointly dist. vector fields $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and functions $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ on G . Moreover, if G has a trivial center, then $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ are jointly distinguished.*

The proof of the above result is constructive. Specifically, we will show that there exist a set of dist. left-invariant (or right-invariant) vector fields on G and a set of functions, obtained as the matrix coefficients of the adjoint representation, which is codistinguished to the set of left-invariant (or right-invariant) vector fields.

Organization of the section. We address in Subsection §4.1 the existence of dist. left-invariant (or right-invariant) vector fields over G . Since the set of left-invariant vector fields has been identified with the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , the existence problem can be naturally addressed on the Lie algebra level, which has been solved in [1]. We state in the subsection the result established there and provide a sketch of the proof.

We address in Subsections §4.2 and §4.3 the existence of (weakly) codist. functions to left-invariant (or right-invariant) vector fields. Recall that if a set of functions $\Phi := \{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to a set of dist. vector fields $F := \{f_i\}_{i=1}^m$, then $(f, \phi) \in F \times \Phi \mapsto f\phi \in \Phi$ is a finite dimensional Lie algebra representation of F on Φ . We start with this fact and provide in Subsection §4.2 a constructive approach for generating a set of codist. functions via Lie group representations.

Then, in Subsection §4.3, we focus on a special Lie group representation, namely the adjoint representation, and prove that there indeed exists a set of matrix coefficients which is (weakly) codist. to a set of dist. left-invariant (or right-invariant) vector fields on G . In the case where G is a matrix Lie group, then the set of codist. functions obtained by the constructive approach takes the form $\{\text{tr}(gX_i g^{-1} X_j)\}_{i,j=1}^m$, which generalizes the set of functions considered in Example 1.

Finally, in Subsection §4.4, we discuss about how to transpose dist. vector fields and codist. functions on a Lie group G to any of its homogeneous spaces. For dist. vector fields, we show that there is a canonical way of doing this. However, for the codist. functions, the situation is more complicated; we provide a few preliminary results there. At the end of the subsection, we combine the results together and investigate a simple example in which the unit sphere S^2 is considered as a homogeneous space of $\text{SO}(3)$.

4.1 Distinguished sets of semi-simple real Lie algebras

Let G be a semi-simple Lie group, and \mathfrak{g} be its Lie algebra. We address in the subsection the existence of dist. left-invariant (or right-invariant) vector fields over G . Recall that $[L_X, L_Y] = L_{[X,Y]}$ and $[R_X, R_Y] = -R_{[X,Y]}$ for any X and Y of \mathfrak{g} . It thus suffices to investigate the existence of a dist. set on the Lie algebra level. We now have the following definition:

Definition 9 ([1]). Let \mathfrak{g} be a semi-simple real Lie algebra. A finite subset $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ of \mathfrak{g} is **distinguished** (or simply **dist.**) if it spans \mathfrak{g} . Moreover, for any X_i and X_j , there exists an X_k and a real number λ such that

$$[X_i, X_j] = \lambda X_k. \quad (27)$$

conversely, for any X_k , there exist X_i, X_j , and a nonzero λ such that (27) holds.

The existence of a dist. set of a semi-simple real Lie algebra has been investigated in [1]. Specifically, we established the following result:

Proposition 4.2. *Every semi-simple real Lie algebra admits a dist. set, and hence every semi-simple real Lie group admits a set of dist. (left-invariant) vector fields.*

Since the above proposition will be of great use in the paper, we sketch below the procedure for constructing a dist. set of \mathfrak{g} . A complete proof can be found in [1]. The proof leverages the structure theory of semi-simple real Lie algebras. A reader not interested in the constructive approach can skip the remainder of the subsection.

Sketch of proof. Recall that $\text{ad}_X(\cdot) := [\cdot, X]$ is the adjoint representation. Denote by $B(X, Y) := \text{tr}(\text{ad}_X \text{ad}_Y)$ the Killing form. Let \mathfrak{h} be a Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , and $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$) be the complexification of \mathfrak{g} (resp. \mathfrak{h}). We let $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}})$ (or simply Δ) be the set of roots. For each $\alpha \in \Delta$, we let $h_\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}$ be such that $\alpha(H) = B(h_\alpha, H)$ for all $H \in \mathfrak{h}$. Denote by $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle := B(h_\alpha, h_\beta)$, which is an inner-product defined over the \mathbb{R} -span of Δ . We denote by $|\alpha| := \sqrt{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle}$ the length of α . Let $H_\alpha := 2h_\alpha/|\alpha|^2$. For a root $\alpha \in \Delta$, let \mathfrak{g}_α be the corresponding root space.

Suppose, for the moment, that one aims to obtain a dist. set for the semi-simple complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$; then, with slight modification, such a set can be obtained via the Chevalley basis [27, Chapter VII], which we recall below:

Lemma 5. *There are $X_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}}$, for $\alpha \in \Delta$, such that the following hold:*

- (i) *For any $\alpha \in \Delta$, we have $[X_\alpha, X_{-\alpha}] = H_\alpha$, with $B(X_\alpha, X_{-\alpha}) = 2/|\alpha|^2$.*
- (ii) *For any two non-proportional roots α, β , we let $\beta + n\alpha$, with $-q \leq n \leq p$, be the α -string containing β . Then,*

$$[X_\alpha, X_\beta] = \begin{cases} N_{\alpha, \beta} X_{\alpha+\beta} & \text{if } \alpha + \beta \in \Delta, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $N_{\alpha, \beta} \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $N_{\alpha, \beta} = -N_{-\alpha, -\beta}$ and $N_{\alpha, \beta}^2 = (q+1)^2$.

For any $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta$, we have $[H_\alpha, X_\beta] = 2\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle/|\alpha|^2 X_\beta$, with $2\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle/|\alpha|^2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. It thus follows from Lemma 5 that

$$A := \{H_\alpha, X_\alpha, X_{-\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \Delta\}$$

is a dist. set of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. The above arguments have the following implications:

- A semi-simple complex Lie algebra can also be viewed as a Lie algebra over \mathbb{R} . We call any such real Lie algebra *complex*. In particular, if the real Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is complex, then the \mathbb{R} -span of $A \cup iA$, with A defined above is \mathfrak{g} . Moreover, since $2\langle\alpha, \beta\rangle/|\alpha|^2$ and $N_{\alpha, \beta}$ are integers (and hence real), the set $A \cup iA$ is a dist. set of \mathfrak{g} .
- If \mathfrak{g} is the \mathbb{R} -span of A (i.e., a split real form of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$), then A is a dist. set of \mathfrak{g} .

The difficulty of proving Prop. 4.2 thus lies in the case where \mathfrak{g} is neither complex nor a split real form of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. We deal with such a case below.

First, recall that a *Cartan involution* $\theta : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie algebra automorphism, with $\theta^2 = \text{id}$, and moreover, the symmetric bilinear form B_θ , defined as

$$B_\theta(X, Y) := -B(X, \theta Y),$$

is positive definite on \mathfrak{g} . One can extend θ to $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ by $\theta(X + iY) = \theta X + i\theta Y$.

Let the Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} be chosen such that it is θ -stable, i.e., $\theta(\mathfrak{h}) = \mathfrak{h}$. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$, where \mathfrak{k} (resp. \mathfrak{p}) is the $+1$ -eigenspace (resp. -1 -eigenspace) of θ . Their complexifications will, respectively, be denoted by $\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathfrak{p}^{\mathbb{C}}$. We further decompose $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{a}$, where \mathfrak{t} and \mathfrak{a} are subspaces of \mathfrak{k} and \mathfrak{p} , respectively. It is known that the roots in Δ are real on $\mathfrak{a} \oplus i\mathfrak{t}$.

We say that \mathfrak{h} is *maximally compact* when the dimension of \mathfrak{t} is as large as possible. Given any θ -stable Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} , one can obtain a maximally compact Cartan subalgebra by subsequently applying the Cayley transformation [20, Sec. VI-7]. We assume in the sequel that \mathfrak{h} is maximally compact. We say that a root is *imaginary* (resp. *real*) if it takes imaginary (resp. real) value on \mathfrak{h} , and hence vanishes over \mathfrak{a} (resp. \mathfrak{t}). If a root is neither real nor imaginary, then it is said to be *complex*. It is known [20, Proposition 6.70] that if \mathfrak{h} is maximally compact, then there are no real roots and vice versa.

Note that if α is a root, then $\theta\alpha$ is also a root, defined as $(\theta\alpha)(H) := \alpha(\theta H)$ for any $H \in \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$; indeed, if we let $X_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}}$, then

$$[H, \theta X_\alpha] = \theta[\theta H, X_\alpha] = \alpha(\theta H)\theta X_\alpha = (\theta\alpha)(H)\theta X_\alpha.$$

Since θ is Lie algebra automorphism, $B(X, Y) = B(\theta X, \theta Y)$ for all $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. In particular, $\theta\alpha(H) = B(H_\alpha, \theta H) = B(\theta H_\alpha, H)$, which implies that $H_{\theta\alpha} = \theta H_\alpha$. We also note that if α is imaginary, then $\theta\alpha = \alpha$. Thus, $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}}$ is θ -stable. Since $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}}$ is one dimensional (over \mathbb{C}), it must be contained in either $\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ or $\mathfrak{p}^{\mathbb{C}}$. An *imaginary root* α is said to be *compact* (resp. *non-compact*) if $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \subseteq \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}^{\mathbb{C}}$). It follows that if α is compact (resp. non-compact), then $\theta X_\alpha = X_\alpha$ (resp. $\theta X_\alpha = -X_\alpha$). Further, one can rescale the X_α 's so that Lemma 5 still holds and $\theta X_\alpha = X_{\theta\alpha}$ for α a complex root.

For a subset $S \subset \mathfrak{g}$, we let $\text{Gen}(S)$ be the subset of \mathfrak{g} generated by S , i.e., it is the smallest subset of \mathfrak{g} which contains S and is closed under Lie bracket, and let \overline{S} be a minimal subset of \mathfrak{g} , which is equivalent to $\text{Gen}(S)$ (i.e., $\overline{S} \equiv \text{Gen}(S)$). Similarly, we have the following definition:

Definition 10 ([1]). A subset $S \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is **pre-distinguished** if \overline{S} is finite and is distinguished.

We now have the following fact:

Proposition 4.3. *Let \mathfrak{g} be a simple real Lie algebra. Suppose that \mathfrak{g} is neither complex nor a split real form of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$; then, there are $X_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}}$, for $\alpha \in \Delta$, such that the items of Lemma 5 are satisfied and the following set*

$$\{X_\alpha - \theta X_{-\alpha}, \quad i(X_\alpha + \theta X_{-\alpha}) \mid \alpha \in \Delta\}$$

belongs to \mathfrak{g} and is pre-distinguished.

We refer the reader to [1] for a proof. Prop. 4.2 then follows from Prop. 4.3. ■

Note that given a simple Lie algebra, there may exist different dist. subsets of \mathfrak{g} . More precisely, we say that two subsets A and A' are of the same class if there is a Lie algebra automorphism $\kappa : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ such that $\kappa(A) \equiv A'$. We provide below a simple example:

Example 3. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2} \mid \text{tr}(X) = 0\}$. We consider two subsets A and A' as follows:

$$A := \left\{ H := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad X := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

and

$$A' := \left\{ H = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad X' := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y' := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

One verifies that A and A' are dist. subsets of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For } A : \quad & [H, X] = 2X, \quad [H, Y] = -2Y, \quad [X, Y] = H; \\ \text{For } A' : \quad & [H, X'] = 2Y', \quad [H, Y'] = 2X', \quad [X', Y'] = -2H. \end{aligned}$$

The above structure coefficients also imply that the two distinguished sets A and A' do not belong to the same class. ■

A problem we pose here and will pursue in the future is thus the following: Given a simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , classify all the classes of dist. subsets of \mathfrak{g} .

4.2 Matrix coefficients as codistinguished functions

Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be a dist. subset of \mathfrak{g} . We address in the subsection the existence of (weakly) co-dist. functions to either the set of left-invariant vector fields $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$ or the set of right-invariant vector fields $\{R_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$. But because of the symmetry, we focus mostly on the left-invariant vector fields.

To proceed, we first recall that the so-called **right-regular representation** of G on $C^\omega(G)$, denoted by $r : G \times C^\omega(G) \rightarrow C^\omega(G)$, is defined by

$$(x, \phi) \in G \times C^\omega(G) \mapsto (r(x)\phi)(g) := \phi(gx^{-1}).$$

The corresponding Lie algebra representation r_* is the negative of the directional derivative along a left-invariant vector field, i.e.,

$$r_*(X)\phi = -L_X\phi.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3, if $\Phi = \{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is codist. to $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$, then $r_*|_\Phi$ is a finite dimensional representation of \mathfrak{g} on Φ .

Thus, in order to find a set of codist. functions to $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$, our strategy is comprised of two steps: First, we construct a finite dimensional subspace Φ of $C^\omega(G)$ closed under r (so that $r_*|_\Phi$ will be a Lie algebra representation of \mathfrak{g} on Φ). Then, we find a finite subset $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ of Φ which is codist. to $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$.

Our approach for the first step about constructing the subspace Φ is to use Lie group representations. Specifically, let π be an arbitrary analytic representation of G on a finite dimensional inner-product space $(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$. Let $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^p$ be any subset that spans V . We define a set of matrix coefficients as follows:

$$\pi^{ij}(g) := \langle v_i, \pi(g)v_j \rangle \in C^\omega(G), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq p, \quad (28)$$

We then let

$$\Phi_\pi := \text{Span} \{ \pi^{ij}(g) \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq p \}.$$

The following fact is well known; but for completeness, we provide a proof below:

Lemma 6. *For any $x \in G$ and any $\phi \in \Phi_\pi$, we have $r(x)\phi \in \Phi_\pi$, i.e., Φ_π is closed under r . Thus, $r|_{\Phi_\pi}$ (resp. $r_*|_{\Phi_\pi}$) is a representation of G (resp. \mathfrak{g}) on Φ_π .*

Proof. The lemma directly follows from computation. For any $x \in G$ and any $g \in G$, we have

$$(r(x)\pi^{ij})(g) = \pi^{ij}(gx^{-1}) = \langle \pi(gx^{-1})v_j, v_i \rangle = \langle \pi(g)\pi(x^{-1})v_j, v_i \rangle.$$

Since $\{v_1, \dots, v_p\}$ spans V , there exist real coefficients c_k 's such that

$$\pi(x^{-1})v_j = \sum_{k=1}^p c_k \langle \pi(x^{-1})v_j, v_k \rangle v_k = \sum_{k=1}^p c_k \pi^{kj}(x^{-1})v_k.$$

We thus have

$$(r(x)\pi^{ij})(g) = \sum_{k=1}^p \left(c_k \pi^{kj}(x^{-1}) \right) \pi^{ik}(g),$$

which implies that $r(x)\pi^{ij}$ is a linear combination of π^{ik} for $k = 1, \dots, p$. ■

Remark 4. Let G be compact, and the representation π of G on V be irreducible and unitary. Further, let $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^p$ be an orthonormal basis of V . Then, by the Peter-Weyl Theorem [20, Sec. IV], the matrix coefficients $\{\pi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^p$ are linearly independent. ■

To address the second step of our strategy about finding a subset $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ of Φ , we first introduce the following definition as a dual to Def. 9:

Definition 11. *Let π be a finite dimensional representation of G on V , and π_* be the corresponding Lie algebra representation. A subset $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^p$ of V is **codistinguished** (or simply codist.) to a subset $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ of \mathfrak{g} if it spans V , and moreover,*

- (i) *The one-forms $\{d\pi_e^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^p$ spans $T_e^*G \approx \mathfrak{g}^*$.*

(ii) For any X_i and v_j , there is a v_k and a real number λ such that

$$\pi_*(X_i)v_j = \lambda v_k; \quad (29)$$

conversely, for any v_k , there exist X_i , v_j , and a nonzero λ such that (29) holds.

(iii) For any $g, h \in G$, if $\pi^{ij}(g) = \pi^{ij}(h)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq p$, then $g = h$.

If only the first two conditions hold, then $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^p$ is **weakly codist.** to $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$.

Note that the subset $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ in the above definite is not necessarily a distinguished set of \mathfrak{g} . With the definition above, we have the following fact:

Lemma 7. If $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^p$ is codist. to $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$, then the set of matrix coefficients $\{\pi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^p$ is codist. to the left-invariant vector fields $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$.

Proof. We first show that the first item of Def. 4 holds, i.e., for any $g \in G$, the one-forms $\{d\pi_g^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^p$ spans T_g^*G . We identify each $d\pi_g^{ij}$ with an element in \mathfrak{g}^* , i.e.,

$$d\pi_g^{ij}(X) = \langle \pi(g)\pi_*(X)v_j, v_i \rangle, \quad \forall X \in \mathfrak{g}.$$

Then, the two subspaces $\text{Span}\{d\pi_e^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^p$ and $\text{Span}\{d\pi_g^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^p$ of \mathfrak{g}^* are isomorphic; indeed, we have that

$$\sum_{i,j} c_{ij} \langle \pi_*(\cdot)v_j, v_i \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi(g)} \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} \langle \pi(g)\pi_*(\cdot)v_j, v_i \rangle \xrightarrow{\pi(g^{-1})} \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} \langle \pi_*(\cdot)v_j, v_i \rangle$$

is the desired isomorphism.

We next show that the second item of Def. 4 holds. It suffices to show that if $\pi_*(X_i)v_j = \lambda v_k$, then $L_{X_i}\pi^{qj} = -\lambda\pi^{qk}$ for any $q = 1, \dots, p$. This holds because

$$(L_{X_i}\pi^{qj})(g) = -\langle \pi(g)\pi_*(X_i)v_j, v_q \rangle = -\lambda \langle \pi(g)v_k, v_q \rangle = -\lambda\pi^{qk}(g).$$

The third item of Def. 4 directly follows from the third item of Def. 11. ■

We further have the following remark about having a set of codist. functions, but to *right-invariant* vector fields:

Remark 5. To construct a set of codist. functions to the right-invariant vector fields $\{R_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$, we first note that the *left-regular representation* of G is given by

$$(x, \phi) \in G \times C^\omega(G) \mapsto (l(x)\phi)(g) := \phi(xg),$$

and the corresponding Lie algebra representation is given by $l_*(X)\phi = R_X\phi$. We next modify (28) as follows:

$$\tilde{\pi}^{ij}(g) := \langle \pi(g^{-1})v_j, v_i \rangle, \quad \forall 1 \leq i, j \leq p, \quad (30)$$

and let $\tilde{\Phi}_\pi := \text{Span}\{\tilde{\pi}^{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq p}$. Then, $\tilde{\Phi}_\pi$ is closed under left-translation $l(x)$ for all $x \in G$. Similarly, if $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^p$ is codist. to $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$, then $\{\tilde{\pi}^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^p$ is codist. to $\{R_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$. ■

In summary, we have shown in the subsection that an analytic finite dimensional representation π of G gives rise to a Lie algebra representation $r_*|_{\Phi_\pi}$ (resp. $l_*|_{\tilde{\Phi}_\pi}$), where Φ_π (resp. $\tilde{\Phi}_\pi$) is a finite dimensional subspace of $C^\omega(G)$ spanned by the matrix coefficients π^{ij} (resp. $\tilde{\pi}^{ij}$ defined in (30)). We have further shown that if the subset $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^p$ is chosen such that it is codist. to a selected subset $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ of \mathfrak{g} , then the resulting matrix coefficients $\{\pi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^p$ (resp. $\{\tilde{\pi}^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^p$) is codist. to $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$ (resp. $\{R_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$).

4.3 On adjoint representation

We follow the discussions in the previous subsection, and consider here the adjoint representation, i.e., $\pi = \text{Ad}$ and $V = \mathfrak{g}$. Recall that $B(X, Y) = \text{tr}(\text{ad}_X \text{ad}_Y)$ is the Killing form, θ is a Cartan involution of \mathfrak{g} , and $B_\theta(X, Y) = -B(X, \theta Y)$ is an inner-product on \mathfrak{g} . From Prop. 4.2, we can pick a dist. set $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ out of \mathfrak{g} . Following (28), we define the matrix coefficients as follows

$$\phi^{ij}(g) := \text{Ad}^{ij}(g) = B_\theta(\text{Ad}(g)X_j, X_i), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq m. \quad (31)$$

To further illustrate (31), we take the advantage of the following fact [20, Prop. 6.28]:

Lemma 8. *Every semi-simple real Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is isomorphic to a Lie algebra of real matrices that is closed under transpose, with the Cartan involution θ carried to negative transpose, i.e., $\theta X = -X^\top$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}$.*

So, for example, the $+1$ -eigenspace \mathfrak{k} and the -1 -eigenspace \mathfrak{p} of θ (introduced in Subsection §4.1) correspond to the subspace of skew-symmetric matrices and the subspace of symmetric matrices, respectively.

We note that for a given semi-simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of real matrices, the Killing form $B(X, Y)$ is proportional to $\text{tr}(XY)$, i.e., $B(X, Y) = c \text{tr}(XY)$ for a real positive constant c . Now, suppose that G is isomorphic to a matrix Lie group; then, it follows from Lemma 8 that one can re-write (31) as follows:

$$\phi^{ij}(g) = c \text{tr}(gX_j g^{-1} X_i^\top). \quad (32)$$

In particular, it generalizes the functions $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3}$ on $\text{SO}(3)$ considered in Example 1 to functions on an arbitrary matrix semi-simple Lie group. However, we shall note that not every semi-simple Lie group is a matrix Lie group. For example, the metaplectic group is a double cover of the symplectic group, yet is not a matrix Lie group. Thus, one cannot always write (31) in terms of (32).

We now have the following result:

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be a dist. set of \mathfrak{g} . Then, the set of functions $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^m$ defined in (31) is weakly codist. to $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$, and is codist. if and only if G has a trivial center.*

Note that since \mathfrak{g} is semi-simple, the center $Z(G)$ of G is discrete. If, further, G is compact, then $Z(G)$ is finite. Centers of (semi-)simple real Lie groups have been extensively investigated. We first note that for each simple real Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , there corresponds a unique

(up to isomorphism) connected group G whose Lie algebra is \mathfrak{g} and has a trivial center. So, for these Lie groups, $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^m$ are jointly distinguished. We also provide below the centers of a few commonly seen connected matrix Lie groups:

- For $G = \mathrm{SU}(n)$ the special unitary group, $Z(G) = \{zI \mid z^n = 1, z \in \mathbb{C}\}$.
- For $G = \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ the special linear group or $G = \mathrm{SO}(n)$ the special orthogonal group, $Z(G) = \{I\}$ if n is odd and $Z(G) = \{\pm I\}$ if n is even.
- For $G = \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ the symplectic group, $Z(G) = \{\pm I_{2n}\}$.

We further have the following remark:

Remark 6. If one aims to construct a set of functions codist. to the right-invariant vector fields $\{R_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$; then, by Remark 5, one can set

$$\tilde{\phi}^{ij}(g) := B_\theta(\mathrm{Ad}(g^{-1})X_j, X_i), \quad \forall 1 \leq i, j \leq m. \quad (33)$$

If we replace ϕ^{ij} with $\tilde{\phi}^{ij}$ and L_{X_i} with R_{X_i} , then Theorem 4.4 still holds. ■

Proof of Theorem 4.4. By Lemma 7, the theorem will be established if we can show that the subset $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is codist. to itself with respect to the adjoint representation. This will be done via a sequence of lemmas, addressing the three items of Def. 11. We first have the following fact:

Lemma 9. The one-forms $\{d\phi_e^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^m$ span the cotangent space $T_e^*G \approx \mathfrak{g}^*$.

Proof. It follows from computation that for any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$,

$$d\phi_e^{ij}(X) = B_\theta([X_j, X], X_i) = -B([X_j, X], \theta X_i).$$

Recall that the Killing form $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ is adjoint-invariant; specifically, for any $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{g}$,

$$B([X, Y], Z) = B(X, [Y, Z]).$$

It then follows that

$$d\phi_e^{ij}(X) = -B([X_j, X], \theta X_i) = -B(X, [\theta X_i, X_j]) = B_\theta(X, [X_i, \theta X_j]),$$

where the last equality holds because θ is a Lie algebra automorphism with $\theta^2 = \mathrm{id}$.

Since \mathfrak{g} is semi-simple, $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] = \mathfrak{g}$. Thus, if $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{Y_j\}_{j=1}^m$ are two subsets of \mathfrak{g} each of which spans \mathfrak{g} , then the subset $\{[X_i, Y_j]\}_{i,j=1}^m$ spans \mathfrak{g} as well. We also note that the Cartan involution θ is a Lie algebra automorphism, and the dist. subset $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ spans \mathfrak{g} . It thus follows that

$$\mathrm{Span} \{\hat{X}_{ij} := [X_i, \theta X_j]\} = \mathfrak{g}.$$

With the \hat{X}_{ij} defined above, we have $d\phi_e^{ij}(X) = B_\theta(X, \hat{X}_{ij})$. It now remains to show that

$$\mathrm{Span} \{B_\theta(\cdot, \hat{X}_{ij})\} = \mathfrak{g}^*.$$

This holds because B_θ is positive definite on \mathfrak{g} (and is, in particular, nondegenerate), and any nondegenerate bilinear form induces a linear isomorphism between \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}^* . ■

Lemma 9 then implies that the set $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^m$ defined in (31) satisfies item 1 of Def. 11. The second item holds because $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is chosen to be a dist. subset of \mathfrak{g} . In fact, it is a straightforward computation that if $[X_i, X_j] = \lambda X_k$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$L_{X_i}\phi^{i'j} = -\lambda\phi^{i'k}, \quad \forall i' = 1, \dots, m;$$

indeed, we have for any $g \in G$,

$$(L_{X_i}\phi^{i'j})(g) = B_\theta(\text{Ad}(g)[X_j, X_i], X_{i'}) = -\lambda B_\theta(\text{Ad}(g)X_k, X_{i'}) = -\lambda\phi^{i'k}(g).$$

We have thus shown that $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^m$ is weakly codist. to $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$.

Finally, to show that the set $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^m$ is codistinguished, it remains to check the last item of Def. 11. This is done in the following lemma:

Lemma 10. *If $\phi^{ij}(g) = \phi^{ij}(h)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, then $g^{-1}h \in Z(G)$.*

Proof. For the moment, we fix an i and

$$\phi^{ij}(g) - \phi^{ij}(h) = B_\theta(\text{Ad}(g)X_i - \text{Ad}(h)X_i, X_j) = 0, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Since B_θ is positive definite, and $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^m$ spans \mathfrak{g} , it follows that

$$\text{Ad}(g)X_i - \text{Ad}(h)X_i = 0.$$

The above expression then holds for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. Since $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ spans \mathfrak{g} , we have $\text{Ad}(g)X = \text{Ad}(h)X$, and hence

$$\text{Ad}(g^{-1}h)X = X, \quad \forall X \in \mathfrak{g}.$$

Thus, $g^{-1}h$ belongs to the centralizer of the identity component of G . Since G is connected, this holds if and only if $g^{-1}h \in Z(G)$. ■

We have thus established Theorem 4.4. ■

Note that the adjoint representation is not the only one that can give rise to codist. functions to left-invariant (or right-invariant) vector fields. Following Def. 11, we pose here another problem, which generalizes the problem at the end of Subsection §4.1:

- Given a simple Lie group G with \mathfrak{g} the Lie algebra, classify all the quadruples $(\pi, V, \{X_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_j\}_{j=1}^p)$ such that $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^p$ is codist. to $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ with respect to π .

To further illustrate the above problem, we consider below an example where $G = \text{SO}(n)$ is a matrix Lie group, and π is the *standard representation* of G on \mathbb{R}^n . We equip with \mathbb{R}^n the standard inner-product, i.e., $\langle v_i, v_j \rangle = v_i^\top v_j$ for all $v_i, v_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Example 4. Let $G = \text{SO}(n)$ with $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(n) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid X^\top + X = 0\}$. We define

$$X_{ij} := e_i e_j^\top - e_j e_i^\top, \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq n.$$

Then, we claim that the standard basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of \mathbb{R}^n is codist. to $\{X_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$ with respect to the standard representation of $\text{SO}(n)$ on \mathbb{R}^n . To see this, first note that

$$\pi^{ij}(\Theta) = e_i^\top \Theta e_j, \quad \forall \Theta \in \text{SO}(n),$$

which is simply the ij -th entry of Θ . We check below the items of Def. 11:

- (i) For $X \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$, $d\pi_I^{ij}(X) = e_i^\top X e_j$. It should be clear that $\{d\pi_I^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n$ spans \mathfrak{g}^* .
- (ii) Let δ_{ij} be the Kronecker delta. Then, $X_{ij}e_k = \delta_{jk}e_i - \delta_{ik}e_j$.
- (iii) If $e_i^\top \Theta e_j = e_i^\top \Theta' e_j$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, then all of the entries of Θ and Θ' are the same, and hence $\Theta = \Theta'$.

This establishes the claim. ■

We further note that the standard representation also works for many other matrix Lie groups including $SU(n)$, $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$, $Sp(2n, \mathbb{R})$, etc. We defer the discussions to another occasion.

4.4 On homogeneous spaces

Let G act on a manifold M . We say that the group action is **transitive** if for any $x, y \in M$, there exists a $g \in G$ such that $gx = y$. In any such case, we say that M is a **homogeneous space** of G . A homogeneous space can be identified with the space G/H of left cosets gH for H a closed Lie subgroup of G . Specifically, we pick an arbitrary point $x \in M$, and let H be the subgroup of G which leaves x fixed (i.e., H is the stabilizer of $x \in M$). Then, M is diffeomorphic to G/H . The group action can be thus understood by sending a pair $(g, g'H)$ to $gg'H$. We also note that the homogeneous space M can be equipped with a unique analytic structure (see [28, Thm. 4.2]).

We address in the subsection the existence of dist. vector fields and codist. functions.

1. On distinguished vector fields. There is a natural extension of a dist. set in the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} to a dist. set of vector fields over a homogeneous space of G . Precisely, we define a map $\tau : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$ as follows: Let $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$ be the exponential map. For a given $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, we defined a vector field $\tau(X) \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that for any $\phi \in C^\omega(M)$, the following hold:

$$(\tau(X)\phi)(x) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\phi(\exp(tX)x) - \phi(x)}{t}, \quad \forall x \in M. \quad (34)$$

If M is embedded in \mathbb{R}^n , then the above definition can be simplified as follows:

$$(\tau(X)\phi)(x) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\exp(tX)x - x}{t}.$$

Let X_i and X_j be in \mathfrak{g} . It is known (see, for example, Chapter 2.3 of [28]) that

$$[\tau(X_i), \tau(X_j)] = -\tau([X_i, X_j]), \quad (35)$$

which leads to the following result:

Proposition 4.5. *Let G be a semi-simple Lie group with \mathfrak{g} the Lie algebra, and M be a homogeneous space of G . If $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a dist. set of \mathfrak{g} , then $\{\tau(X_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ is a dist. set of vector fields over M .*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\{\tau(X_i)(x)\}_{i=1}^m$ spans the tangent space $T_x M$ for all $x \in M$. Let H be the stabilizer of x , and \mathfrak{h} be the corresponding Lie algebra of H . Since $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ spans \mathfrak{g} , there must exist a subset of $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$, say $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{m'}$, such that if we let $\mathfrak{m} := \text{Span}\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{m'}$, then $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{h}$. Moreover, the following map:

$$(a_1, \dots, a_{m'}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m'} a_i X_i\right) x \in M$$

is locally a diffeomorphism around $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m'}$ to an open neighborhood of $x \in M$. This, in particular, implies that $\{\tau(X_i)(x)\}_{i=1}^{m'}$ is a basis of the tangent space of $T_x M$. ■

We provide below an example for illustration:

Example 5. Let $\text{SO}(n)$ be the special orthogonal group acting on $S^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, which sends a pair (Θ, x) , with $\Theta \in \text{SO}(n)$ and $x \in S^{n-1}$, to Θx . The group action is transitive. The map $\tau : \mathfrak{so}(n) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(S^{n-1})$ defined in (34) sends a skew-symmetric matrix X to the vector field $\tau(X)(x) = Xx$. We choose $\{X_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$ to be a dist. set of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ as defined in Example 4. Then, by computation, one obtains that $\tau(X_{ij})(x) = x_j e_i - x_i e_j$ where x_i 's are the coordinates of x . By Prop. 4.5, $\{\tau(X_{ij})\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq n}$ is a set of dist. vector fields over S^{n-1} . ■

2. *On codistinguished functions.* We now discuss how to transpose a set of codist. functions on a Lie group G to a set of codist. functions on its homogeneous space $M \approx G/H$. We consider below for the case where the closed subgroup H is compact.

We say that a function $\phi \in C^\omega(G)$ is H -invariant if for any $g \in G$ and $h \in H$, we have $\phi(gh) = \phi(g)$. In particular, if ϕ is H -invariant, then one can simply define a function ψ on M by $\psi(gH) := \phi(g)$. This is well defined because if $gH = g'H$, then $g^{-1}g'$ belongs to H , and hence $\phi(g) = \phi(gg^{-1}g') = \phi(g')$. Thus, for simplicity but without causing any ambiguity, we say that ϕ is a function on M as well.

If a function ϕ is *not* H -invariant, then one can construct an H -invariant function by averaging ϕ over the subgroup H . Since H is compact, we equip H with the normalized Haar measure [20, Ch. VIII], i.e., $\int_H 1_H dh = 1$. We then define a function on G as follows:

$$\bar{\phi}(g) := \int_H \phi(gh) dh.$$

It should be clear that $\bar{\phi}$ is H -invariant; indeed for any $h' \in H$,

$$\bar{\phi}(gh') := \int_H \phi(gh'h) dh = \int_H \phi(gh) d(h'^{-1}h) = \int_H \phi(gh) dh = \bar{\phi}(g).$$

Note that if ϕ is H -invariant, then $\bar{\phi} = \phi$. We also note the following fact:

Lemma 11. *If $R_{X_i} \phi^j = \lambda \phi^k$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then $R_{X_i} \bar{\phi}^j = \lambda \bar{\phi}^k$. In particular, if we treat $\bar{\phi}^j$ and $\bar{\phi}^k$ as functions on G/H , then $\tau(X_i) \bar{\phi}^j = \lambda \bar{\phi}^k$.*

Proof. The lemma directly follows from computation:

$$(R_{X_i} \bar{\phi}^j)(g) = \int_H (R_{X_i} \phi^j)(gh) dh = \lambda \int_H \phi^k(gh) dh = \lambda \bar{\phi}^k(g),$$

which holds for all $g \in G$. ■

Thus, if $\{\phi^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is (weakly) codist. to $\{R_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$, then by Lemma 11, the second item of Def. 4 holds for $\{\bar{\phi}^j\}_{j=1}^l$ with respect to the induced vector fields $\{\tau(X_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ on M . Nevertheless, it does mean that $\{\bar{\phi}^j\}_{j=1}^l$ is (weakly) codist. to $\{\tau(X_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ because $\{d\bar{\phi}_x^j\}_{j=1}^l$ may not span T_x^*M . We defer the discussions to another occasion.

We provide at the end of the subsection a concrete example on S^2 as a homogeneous space of $\text{SO}(3)$.

3. *An example on the unit sphere S^2 .* Let $G = \text{SO}(3)$, $H = \text{SO}(2)$, and $M = G/H \approx S^2$. We identify the subgroup $\text{SO}(2)$ as follows:

$$H = \left\{ h(\theta) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\theta) & \sin(\theta) \\ 0 & -\sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{bmatrix} \mid \theta \in [0, 2\pi) \right\}$$

so that H is the stabilizer of $e_1 \in S^2$. Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^3$ and $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3}$ be defined in Example 1, which we reproduce below:

$$\begin{cases} X_i = e_j e_k^\top - e_k e_j^\top, & \det(e_i, e_j, e_k) = 1, \\ \phi^{ij}(g) = \text{tr}(g X_j g^\top X_i^\top), & 1 \leq i, j \leq 3. \end{cases}$$

We note that by (32), $\phi^{ij}(g)$ is, up to scaling, equal to $B_\theta(\text{Ad}(g)X_j, X_i)$. We also note that by (33), we have, up to the same scaling, that

$$\tilde{\phi}^{ij}(g) = B_\theta(\text{Ad}(g^{-1})X_j, X_i) = \text{tr}(g^\top X_j g X_i^\top) = \text{tr}(g X_i g^\top X_j^\top) = \phi^{ji}(g).$$

Thus, $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3} = \{\tilde{\phi}^{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3}$, and hence by Remark 6, $\{\phi^{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3}$ is codist. to both $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^3$ and $\{R_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^3$.

We now compute explicitly the induced vector fields $\{\tau(X_i)\}_{i=1}^3$ and the averaged H -invariant functions $\{\bar{\phi}^{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3}$. For the induced vector fields $\{\tau(X_i)\}_{i=1}^3$, we have

$$\tau(X_1)(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ x_3 \\ -x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tau(X_2)(x) = \begin{bmatrix} -x_3 \\ 0 \\ x_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tau(X_3)(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x_2 \\ -x_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Prop. 4.5, they form a dist. set of vector fields over S^2 :

$$[\tau(X_i), \tau(X_j)] = -\det(e_i, e_j, e_k)\tau(X_k).$$

We next compute the averaged H -invariant functions $\{\bar{\phi}^{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3}$. Note that the subgroup H is isomorphic to S^1 , and the Haar measure is simply given by $dh = d\theta/2\pi$. By computation, we have

$$\int_H \text{Ad}(h)X_i dh = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} h(\theta)X_j h(\theta)^\top d\theta = \begin{cases} X_1 & \text{if } j = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, the nonzero $\bar{\phi}^{ij}$'s are given by

$$\bar{\phi}^i(g) := \bar{\phi}^{i1}(g) = \text{tr}(g X_1 g^\top X_i^\top), \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Now, let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) = ge_1 \in S^2$, which is simply the first column of g . We re-write each $\bar{\phi}^i(g)$ using only the variable x . First, note that by computation,

$$gX_1g^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & c_{31} & c_{21} \\ -c_{31} & 0 & c_{11} \\ -c_{21} & -c_{11} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $[c_{ij}]$ is the cofactor matrix of $g \in \text{SO}(3)$. Since g is an orthogonal matrix, $gg^\top = I$, and hence $g = [c_{ij}]$. In particular, (c_{11}, c_{21}, c_{31}) is simply the first column of g , and hence

$$gX_1g^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x_3 & x_2 \\ -x_3 & 0 & x_1 \\ -x_2 & -x_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

So, the functions $\{\bar{\phi}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ can be simplified as follows:

$$\bar{\phi}^i(x) = 2x_i, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3,$$

i.e., the $\bar{\phi}^i$'s are twice the standard coordinate functions.

The set of functions $\{\bar{\phi}^j\}_{j=1}^3$ is codist. to the set of vector fields $\{\tau(X_i)\}_{i=1}^3$. It should be clear that $\{\bar{\phi}^j\}_{j=1}^3$ satisfies the first item and the third item of Def. 4. For the second item, we have $\tau(X_i)\bar{\phi}^j = \det(e_i, e_j, e_k)\bar{\phi}^k$. ■

5 Conclusions

We introduced in the paper an innovative structure for system (4), namely a dist. ensemble system, which is comprised of two key components—one is a set of dist. vector fields and the other is a set of codist. functions. We established sufficient conditions in Section §3 for approximate ensemble path-controllability and (weakly) ensemble observability for a dist. ensemble system.

We posed in Section §4 the following open problem:

- Given a manifold M , are there (weakly) jointly distinguished vector fields and functions?

We addressed the problem for the case where M is a connected, semi-simple Lie group G . Specifically, we showed that every such Lie group admits a set of dist. left-invariant (right-invariant) vector fields, together with a set of functions (weakly) codist. to these vector fields. For dist. vector fields, we leveraged the result established in [1] where we showed that every semi-simple real Lie algebra admits a dist. set. For codist. functions, we showed that a set of matrix coefficients associated with a group representation can be potentially a valid candidate. In the case of adjoint representation, we constructed explicitly a set of matrix coefficients $\{B_\theta(\text{Ad}(g)X_j, X_i)\}_{i,j=1}^m$ which is codist. to the left-invariant vector fields $\{L_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^m$. Furthermore, along the presentation, we posed another open problem:

- Given a semi-simple Lie group G with \mathfrak{g} the Lie algebra, classify all the quadruples $(\pi, V, \{X_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_j\}_{j=1}^P)$ such that $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^P$ is codist. to $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ with respect to π .

Finally, in Subsection §4.4, we discussed how to transpose dist. vector fields and codist. functions on a Lie group to its homogeneous space. We showed how to induce a set of dist. vector fields on the homogeneous space using a dist. set in the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . We proposed an averaging method to generate H -invariant functions which can form a set of codist. functions on the homogeneous space provided that the exact one-forms $\{d\bar{\phi}^j\}_{j=1}^l$ span the cotangent bundle T^*M .

References

- [1] X. Chen and B. Ghahsifard, “Distinguished sets of semi-simple Lie algebras,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.01719*, 2017.
- [2] J.-S. Li and N. Khaneja, “Control of inhomogeneous quantum ensembles,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 73, no. 3, p. 030302, 2006.
- [3] ———, “Ensemble control of Bloch equations,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 528–536, 2009.
- [4] K. Beauchard, J.-M. Coron, and P. Rouchon, “Controllability issues for continuous-spectrum systems and ensemble controllability of Bloch equations,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 296, no. 2, pp. 525–557, 2010.
- [5] A. Agrachev, Y. Baryshnikov, and A. Sarychev, “Ensemble controllability by lie algebraic methods,” *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 921–938, 2016.
- [6] J.-S. Li, “Ensemble control of finite-dimensional time-varying linear systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 345–357, 2011.
- [7] U. Helmke and M. Schönlein, “Uniform ensemble controllability for one-parameter families of time-invariant linear systems,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 71, pp. 69–77, 2014.
- [8] P. A. Fuhrmann and U. Helmke, *The mathematics of networks of linear systems*. Springer, 2015.
- [9] R. W. Brockett, “Optimal control of the Liouville equation,” *AMS IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, vol. 39, p. 23, 2007.
- [10] Y. Chen, T. T. Georgiou, and M. Pavon, “Optimal steering of a linear stochastic system to a final probability distribution, Part I,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 1158–1169, 2016.

- [11] ———, “Optimal steering of a linear stochastic system to a final probability distribution, Part II,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 1170–1180, 2016.
- [12] R. F. Curtain and H. Zwart, *An introduction to infinite-dimensional linear systems theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 21.
- [13] S. Zeng, S. Waldherr, C. Ebenbauer, and F. Allgöwer, “Ensemble observability of linear systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 1452–1465, 2016.
- [14] R. Hermann and A. Krener, “Nonlinear controllability and observability,” *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 728–740, 1977.
- [15] J. Gauthier and G. Bornard, “Observability for any $u(t)$ of a class of nonlinear systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 922–926, 1981.
- [16] A. Van der Schaft, “Observability and controllability for smooth nonlinear systems,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 338–354, 1982.
- [17] J.-P. Gauthier and I. A. Kupka, “Observability and observers for nonlinear systems,” *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 975–994, 1994.
- [18] C. De Persis and A. Isidori, “On the observability codistributions of a nonlinear system,” *Systems & control letters*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 297–304, 2000.
- [19] M. Golubitsky and V. Guillemin, *Stable Mappings and Their Singularities*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 14.
- [20] A. W. Knap, *Lie Groups Beyond an Introduction*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 140.
- [21] J.-P. Serre, *Lie algebras and Lie groups: 1964 lectures given at Harvard University*. Springer, 2009.
- [22] R. M. Murray and S. S. Sastry, “Steering nonholonomic control systems using sinusoids,” in *Nonholonomic Motion Planning*. Springer, 1993, pp. 23–51.
- [23] H. J. Sussmann and W. Liu, “Lie bracket extensions and averaging: the single-bracket case,” in *Nonholonomic Motion Planning*. Springer, 1993, pp. 109–147.
- [24] W. Liu, “An approximation algorithm for nonholonomic systems,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 1328–1365, 1997.
- [25] J. Nash, “Analyticity of the solutions of implicit function problems with analytic data,” *Annals of Mathematics*, pp. 345–355, 1966.
- [26] R. E. Greene and H. Jacobowitz, “Analytic isometric embeddings,” *Annals of Mathematics*, pp. 189–204, 1971.

- [27] J. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie algebras and Representation Theory*. Springer, 1972, vol. 9.
- [28] S. Helgason, *Differential Geometry, Lie Groups, and Symmetric Spaces*. American Mathematical Soc., 2001, vol. 34.