

Arrow of Time in Estimation and Control

Duality Theory Beyond the Linear Gaussian Model

Jin Won Kim and Prashant G. Mehta

May 9, 2024

The House of Control stands on two pillars: Estimation and Control. The elegant symmetry of these pillars is evident in Kalman's *Principle of Duality* (PoD) [1, pp. 489]:

Principle of Duality (PoD). Considering the class of feedback systems with linear control law, the dual plant [...] is obtained by the following steps:

- (i) Replace [the state transition matrix] by its dual [the transpose],
- (ii) Interchange input and output constraints,
- (iii) Reverse the direction of time.

Duality is coeval with the origin of modern systems and control theory and it underpins much of Kalman's early work. For example, his celebrated paper together with Bucy describing the Kalman-Bucy filter draws extensively on the PoD – between the optimal filter and a certain linear quadratic (LQ) optimal control problem (see word cloud in Fig. S1) [2]. Notably, duality help explains why the Riccati equation is the fundamental equation for *both* optimal filtering and optimal control.

Duality is expressed in two inter-related manners:

- (i) Duality between observability and controllability; and
- (ii) Duality between optimal filtering and optimal control.

The second of these items means expressing one type of problem as another type of problem. In the House of Control, the main interest is to solve an optimal filtering (or estimation) problem by expressing it as an optimal control problem.

Sixty-five years have elapsed since the PoD was first stated. Duality is now the foundation upon which the two pillars of the House of Control stand. As part of most control curricula, controllability and observability are introduced as dual concepts in the first graduate course. Duality permeates every facet of the subject's instruction: (i) **Analysis**: dual nature of rank tests,

Gramians, Lyapunov functions, and their relevance to minimal realization and to Hankel model reduction; and (ii) **Design**: synthesis of stabilizing controller and Luenberger observer are dual problems.

Our objective in this paper is to describe extensions of duality theory for nonlinear stochastic systems (hidden Markov models or HMMs). We argue that, despite six decades of work on this topic, duality theory is incomplete. We discuss both the difficulty in extending duality to HMMs, as well as its recent resolution by our research group at Illinois.

As early as 1977, Hermann and Krener wrote a pioneering paper “Nonlinear controllability and observability” where it is noted that “[nonlinear] duality between “controllability” and “observability” [...] is, mathematically, just the duality between vector fields and differential forms” [3]. In recent decades, detectability of a nonlinear system is understood as an “output-to-state stability (OSS)” property. Its definition was originally motivated by Sontag and Wang as follows: “Given the central role often played in control theory by the duality between input/state and state/output behavior, one may reasonably ask what concept obtains if outputs are used instead of inputs in the [input-to-state stability (ISS)] definition. [...] it would appear that this dual property, which we will call output-to-state stability (OSS), is a natural candidate as a concept of nonlinear (zero-) detectability”[4]. A variant of the OSS, the so called incremental output-to-state stability (i-OSS), is a standard assumption to establish stability of a class of nonlinear estimators known as the moving horizon estimators (MHE). A historical account appears in [5, Sec. 4.7], where Rawlings et al. note “establishing duality [of the optimal estimator] with the optimal regulator is a favorite technique for establishing estimator stability”.

Given all of this history, how can it be that duality is incomplete or not understood for HMMs? The issue is not that the HMMs are stochastic while the OSS definitions and MHE algorithms are for deterministic systems. Even though MHE is often introduced and studied in deterministic settings, the algorithm has its roots in the study of stochastic linear Gaussian systems. Specifically, MHE is based on the so called minimum energy duality which originated in the early work (in 1960s) of Bryson and Frazier, Mortensen, and the important PhD thesis of Hijab (the 1980 PhD thesis was supervised by Krener) [6], [7], [8]. Soon after Hijab’s PhD thesis, Fleming and Mitter wrote an influential paper where they describe the log transformation link between the Zakai equation of nonlinear (stochastic) filtering and the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation of nonlinear stochastic optimal control [9]. One consequence is that the negative log of the conditional probability (posterior) density for the filtering problem is a value function for some stochastic optimal control problem. Even though the log transform link was noted, the dual optimal control problem itself was not clarified in [9] or the studies that followed [10], [11], [12], [13]. The dual optimal control problem was presented for the first time in a 2003

paper from Mitter and Newton [14]. Their construction is based on a variational formulation of the Bayes' formula in terms of the Kullback-Leibler (K-L) divergence. The KL-based variational form of Bayes is actually quite classical (see [15, Sec. 3], [16, Sec. 2.2]) and Mitter-Newton's work may be regarded as a generalization of the minimum energy duality of Mortensen-Hijab. A notable ensuing contribution is the PhD thesis of van Handel where the Fleming-Mitter-Newton duality is used to obtain results on nonlinear filter stability [16].

In this paper, it is argued that the duality between estimation and control is incomplete in part because of the issue of time reversal – step (iii) in Kalman's PoD. That there is a problem in generalizing the classical duality of Kalman to nonlinear settings has previously been noted in literature. For example, in his 2008 paper [17], Todorov writes: *“Kalman's duality has been known for half a century and has attracted a lot of attention. If a straightforward generalization to non-LQG settings was possible it would have been discovered long ago. Indeed we will now show that Kalman's duality, although mathematically sound, is an artifact of the LQG setting.”* Todorov attributes the problem to the lack of linearity, e.g., linear algebraic operations such as the use of matrix transpose are not applicable to nonlinear systems. In this paper, it is shown that the issue is not so much the lack of linearity but time reversal. Some of our own recent work on this topic is described where we have presented a solution to this important gap in literature.

Several comparisons are provided to illustrate the differences with prior work as well as discuss the significance of these differences. Specifically, it is shown that the elementary duality between observability and controllability is an example of Kalman's duality that our work helps generalize. Kalman's duality is shown to be distinct from the minimum energy duality which is implicit in much of the other work including MHE, papers of Mortensen and Hijab, the log transform of Mitter-Fleming, and the dual optimal control problem of Mitter-Newton.

In the present paper, Kalman's duality is referred to as the *minimum variance duality*. The two terms “minimum variance duality” and “minimum energy duality” are borrowed from Bensoussan's writings on the subject (which have inspired our own work including the present article). An impetus comes from a curious dichotomy in his 1992 textbook [18] on partially observed systems: While optimization and optimal control techniques are prominently used for the linear Gaussian model, these are conspicuous by their absence in the derivation and analysis of the nonlinear filter and smoothing equations (see [18, Sec. 4.8.]).

Arrow of time in estimation and control

While duality is introduced as part of the first graduate class in most control curricula, the “step (iii)” *reversing the direction of time* in Kalman’s PoD is rarely stressed. In this section, time reversal is illustrated with a discussion of two elementary concepts related to deterministic and stochastic (linear Gaussian) systems. In the accompanying sidebar “Arrow of time in ordinary and stochastic differential equations”, elementary theory of forward-in-time and backward-in-time differential equations is presented in a self-contained manner. This theory explains why the problem of reversing time is not especially pertinent in deterministic settings but non-trivial in stochastic settings.

Time reversal for elementary duality between observability and controllability

Consider the linear state-output system:

$$\frac{dx_t}{dt} = A^T x_t, \quad x_0 = \xi \quad (1a)$$

$$z_t = H^T x_t \quad (1b)$$

Over a fixed time interval $[0, T]$, the output is denoted by $z = \{z_t \in \mathbb{R}^m : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. The output z is an element of the function space $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$.

The output depends upon the initial condition ξ . This dependence is indicated by using the superscript whereby the output z with initial condition $x_0 = \xi$ is denoted by z^ξ . A basic estimation problem is to determine the initial condition ξ from the output z^ξ . Regarding the solution of this problem, the following definition naturally arises.

Definition 1: The linear system (1) is *observable* if:

$$z^{\xi_1} = z^{\xi_2} \implies \xi_1 = \xi_2, \quad \forall \xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

Consider next the following linear input-state system:

$$-\frac{dy_t}{dt} = Ay_t + Hu_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (2a)$$

$$y_T = 0 \quad (2b)$$

where $u = \{u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is the control input. Because the terminal condition at final time $t = T$ is specified, the system (2) is an example of a backward-in-time control system whose solution at time t is obtained by integrating backward-in-time from T to t as follows:

$$y_t = \int_t^T e^{A(s-t)} H u_s \, ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

The control $u \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$.

Viewed as a control system, a basic control problem is to design an input u that steers the system from a given initial condition $y_0 = \eta$ to $y_T = 0$. Regarding the solution of this problem, the following definition naturally arises.

Definition 2: For the linear system (2), the *controllable subspace* is defined by:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists u \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m) \text{ such that the solution to (2) satisfies } y_0 = \eta \text{ and } y_T = 0\}$$

The linear system (2) is *controllable* if $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}^d$

Now, it is well known that observability of the state-output system (1) and the controllability of the input-state system (2) are dual properties. This nature of this duality is a special case of the abstract duality in linear algebra which is reviewed in the sidebar “Mathematical foundations of duality”. The explicit calculations for (1) and (2) are described next.

The first step is to define the function spaces which are of the following two types:

(i) **For the state (initial condition).** Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d equipped with the inner-product

$$\langle \eta, \xi \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} = \eta^\top \xi, \quad \eta, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

(ii) **For the signal (input and output).** The Hilbert space of square integrable \mathbb{R}^m -valued signals $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ equipped with the inner product

$$\langle u, z \rangle_{L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)} = \int_0^T u_t^\top z_t \, dt, \quad u, z \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$$

Duality: For the state-output system (2), the solution map $u \mapsto y_0$ is used to define a linear operator $\mathcal{L} : L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}u := y_0 = \int_0^T e^{At} H u_t \, dt$$

The controllable subspace $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$, the range space of the operator \mathcal{L} . The operator’s adjoint is given by

$$(\mathcal{L}^\dagger \xi)(t) = H^\top e^{A^\top t} \xi, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

and represents the solution map from initial condition $\xi \mapsto z^\xi$ for the state-output system (1). The null-space of \mathcal{L}^\dagger is precisely the subspace of initial conditions that produce zero output, and as such represent the “unobservable” directions. The duality relationship is given by

$$\langle \xi, \mathcal{L}u \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} = \langle \mathcal{L}^\dagger \xi, u \rangle_{L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)}, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \, u \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$$

Because of this relationship, the input-state system (2) is referred to as the *dual control system* for the state-output system (1). An important implication of duality, obtained as a corollary of the closed range theorem, is that (1) is observable iff the dual control system (2) is controllable. Figure S2 depicts this duality relationship.

We close by noting the application of Kalman's PoD:

- (i) The matrices (A^T, H^T) in the state-output system (1) are replaced by their respective transposes (A, H) in the input-state system (2),
- (ii) The input and the output constraints are interchanged. The constraint here is that these are both elements of the common function space $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$.
- (iii) The direction of time is reversed. While the state-output system (1) is integrated forward-in-time, the input-state system (2) is integrated backward-in-time.

Time reversal for the DRE of optimal filtering and optimal control

In stochastic filtering, a basic model is the noisy counterpart of the state-output system (1). The model is referred to as the *linear Gaussian model* and described by the following Itô stochastic differential equation (SDE):

$$dX_t = A^T X_t dt + \sigma dB_t, \quad X_0 \sim N(m_0, \Sigma_0) \quad (3a)$$

$$dZ_t = H^T X_t dt + dW_t, \quad Z_0 = 0 \quad (3b)$$

where $X := \{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ is the \mathbb{R}^d -valued state process, the prior $N(m_0, \Sigma_0)$ is a Gaussian density with mean $m_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and variance $\Sigma_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $Z := \{Z_t : t \geq 0\}$ is the \mathbb{R}^m -valued observation process, and $B := \{B_t : t \geq 0\}$ and $W := \{W_t : t \geq 0\}$ are Brownian motions (B.M.) of appropriate dimensions. It is assumed that X_0, B, W are mutually independent. Denote $Q := \sigma\sigma^T$ and R is the covariance of the observation noise W . It is clear that $\Sigma_0 \succeq 0$ and $Q \succeq 0$ (i.e., Σ_0 and Q are positive semi-definite). The main assumption – that distinguishes the deterministic model (1) and the stochastic model (3) – is that $R \succ 0$ (i.e., R is strictly positive definite). Specifically, the stochastic filtering theory applies to the model where $\sigma = 0$, in which case the model (3a) for the state process reduces to the deterministic model (1a). However, covariance R of the observation noise W must be strictly positive definite. In particular, the stochastic filtering equations are not applicable to the deterministic model (1b) for the output (such is also the case for more general nonlinear (stochastic) filtering).

The filtration generated by observations up to time t is denoted by $\mathcal{Z}_t := \sigma(\{Z_s : 0 \leq s \leq t\})$. The objective of the linear Gaussian filtering problem is to compute the conditional expectation $E(f^T X_T | \mathcal{Z}_T)$ for a given deterministic $f \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

The Kalman-Bucy filter is a recursive algorithm that solves this problem:

$$dm_t = A^T m_t dt + K_t (dZ_t - H^T m_t dt) \quad (4a)$$

$$\frac{d\Sigma_t}{dt} = A^T \Sigma_t + \Sigma_t A + Q - \Sigma_t H R^{-1} H^T \Sigma_t \quad (4b)$$

where $K_t = \Sigma_t H R^{-1}$ is referred to as the Kalman gain. The filter is initialized with initial condition (m_0, Σ_0) . The random vector $m_t = E(X_t | \mathcal{Z}_t)$ is the conditional mean, and therefore, $E(f^T X_T | \mathcal{Z}_T) = f^T m_T$. The deterministic matrix $\Sigma_t = E((X_t - m_t)(X_t - m_t)^T)$ is the conditional covariance.

Related to the PoD, the following remarks appear in the paper of Kalman and Bucy [2]:

- (i) The equation for the covariance $\{\Sigma_t : t \geq 0\}$ is a differential Riccati equation (DRE). DRE is well known as an optimality equation for the deterministic LQ optimal control problem. In the standard version of the LQ problem, with a forward-in-time linear control system as the constraint, the DRE is integrated backward-in-time.
- (ii) In contrast, the DRE of the Kalman filter is integrated forward-in-time. Therefore, the arrow of time is reversed in going from optimal control to optimal filtering, consistent with the step (iii) of Kalman's PoD.

The appearance of the DRE suggests that the problem of computing $E(f^T X_T | \mathcal{Z}_T)$ may alternatively be expressed as an optimal control problem. Here we recall that the conditional expectation is a solution of an optimization problem:

$$E(f^T X_T | \mathcal{Z}_T) = \arg \min_{S_T \in \mathcal{Z}_T} E(|f^T X_T - S_T|^2)$$

where “ $S_T \in \mathcal{Z}_T$ ” means that the random variable S_T is \mathcal{Z}_T -measurable (i.e., allowed to depend upon observations made up to time T). The random variable S_T is referred to as an *estimator* and $E(|f^T X_T - S_T|^2)$ is the *mean-squared error (m.s.e)* for the estimator. The equality means that the conditional expectation $S_T = f^T m_T$ is the estimator with the minimum m.s.e. Because Σ_T is the conditional covariance, the minimum m.s.e. is given by

$$E(|f^T X_T - f^T m_T|^2) = f^T \Sigma_T f$$

We are now ready to state the dual optimal control problem for the Kalman filter (the problem appears in the classical textbook of Åström [19]). In the following, the control input is denoted by $u := \{u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. The control input u is an element of the function space $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$.

- Minimum variance dual optimal control problem:

$$\underset{u \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)}{\text{Minimize}} : J(u) = |y_0|_{\Sigma_0}^2 + \int_0^T |y_t|_Q^2 + |u_t|_R^2 dt \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{Subject to} : -\frac{dy_t}{dt} = Ay_t + Hu_t, \quad y_T = f \text{ (given)} \quad (5b)$$

The relationship between optimal filtering and optimal control problems is given by the following duality principle (see [20, Sec. 3.4.3] for a proof):

Theorem 1 (Duality principle for the linear-Gaussian model (3)): For a control input $u \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$, consider an estimator

$$S_T := y_0^T m_0 - \int_0^T u_t^T dZ_t \quad (6)$$

Then

$$J_T(u) = \mathbb{E}(|f^T X_T - S_T|^2)$$

Suppose $u^{(\text{opt})} = \{u_t^{(\text{opt})} \in \mathbb{R}^m : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is the optimal control input and $\{y_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is the resulting optimal trajectory. Then

$$y_t^T m_t = y_0^T m_0 - \int_0^t (u_s^{(\text{opt})})^T dZ_s, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (7)$$

and therefore, at the terminal time $t = T$, $f^T m_T = y_0^T m_0 - \int_0^T (u_s^{(\text{opt})})^T dZ_s$ with the optimal value $J_T(u^{(\text{opt})}) = f^T \Sigma_T f$.

The sidebar “Derivation of Kalman-Bucy filter” contains a derivation (following [19, Sec. 7.6]) of the equation of the Kalman filter (4) starting from the solution of the minimum variance optimal control problem (5).

The issue with reversing the arrow of time

We have now reviewed the two manners to express the dual relationship between estimation and control:

- (i) Elementary duality between observability of the state-output system (1) and the controllability of the input-state system (2); and
- (ii) Minimum variance duality that relates the optimal filtering problem for the linear Gaussian model (3) to a deterministic LQ optimal control problem for the control system (5b).

We begin by commenting upon similarities and differences between the elementary duality and the minimum variance duality: An obvious similarity is the appearance of the same backward-in-time dual control system, (2) and (5b), respectively, for the two cases. An important difference

is that while the output z of (1) is a deterministic function of time the observation process Z is a stochastic process. The appropriate function space for deterministic z is $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Because Z is a stochastic process, the appropriate function space is $L^2_{\mathcal{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$: the function space of \mathbb{R}^m -valued stochastic processes on $[0, T]$ that are forward-adapted to the filtration \mathcal{Z} . Formally, an element of this function space is any \mathbb{R}^m -valued stochastic process $U = \{U_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ whose value U_t at time t is completely determined from past observations up to time t . A rigorous definition appears at a later point in this paper (see also [20, Sec. 4.1]). A practical consequence of this difference is that one may then consider more general estimators of the form (compare with (6))

$$S_T := (\text{constant}) - \int_0^T U_t^\top dZ_t \quad (8)$$

where $U \in L^2_{\mathcal{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ (the righthand-side is well defined as an Itô stochastic integral). Because the space of deterministic control inputs is a subspace of this larger function space, it may even be possible to obtain a solution with smaller m.s.e. by considering such estimators (or at least the possibility can not be ruled out a priori)!

A difficulty that now arises is that (5b) is a deterministic ODE. With a stochastic U , its solution will also be a stochastic process. For this reason, let us consider a naive extension of the dual control system as follows:

$$-dY_t = (AY_t + HU_t) dt, \quad Y_T = f \quad (9)$$

where the capital letter $Y = \{Y_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is used to denote the fact that the dual process is now a stochastic process. However, this poses a problem of causality, namely, the righthand-side $AY_t + HU_t$ is a sum of two terms: AY_t which depends upon the future (because of the backward-in-time nature of (9)), and HU_t which depends upon the past (because it is an element of $L^2_{\mathcal{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$).

At this point, an alert reader may ask whether the difficulty owes to the naive choice (9) of the dual control system? After all, the construction of the dual was justified only in the deterministic settings. While this is true – and an aim of this paper is to describe the appropriate dual in stochastic settings – there is a more fundamental problem related to the arrow of time:

- (i) By step (iii) in Kalman's PoD, the arrow of time for integrating the dual control system is backward-in-time.
- (ii) Now, any control system requires a definition of the available information that the control input U_t is allowed to use at any time t . In the filtering context, the *only* natural information structure is the one provided by the observations – the filtration $\{\mathcal{Z}_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. Because the information due to observations accumulates as a function of time (i.e., $\mathcal{Z}_s \subset \mathcal{Z}_t$ for $s < t$), the arrow of time for the filtration is forward-in-time.

Therefore, in any attempt to dual-ize the stochastic filtering problem, one has an apparently contradictory situation where the control system is being integrated backward-in-time but the control is allowed to depend only upon the past observations. This is the key difficulty in extending duality to stochastic systems. The situation is contrasted with classical stochastic control where the arrow of time for integrating the control system and the information structure both have the same forward-in-time direction. The contrast is depicted in Figure S3.

An intuitive explanation for this difficulty, which also suggests a way to its resolution, is that the apparent similarity between the deterministic state-output system (1) and the stochastic linear Gaussian model (3) is deceptive. Because of the time reversal, it is not at all clear that (2) is *also* the appropriate dual control system for the stochastic model (3). As it turns out, for the linear Gaussian model, it suffices to consider deterministic control inputs. Therefore, the issue of time reversal becomes moot and the minimum variance duality was already well understood in 1960s. For the more general HMM, the issue of time reversal needs to be carefully addressed. The resolution appears in the PhD dissertation of the first author [20] and is described in this article.

Before presenting the generalization, it must be said that minimum variance is not the *only* type of duality. The other type of duality, which is also by far the more commonly used one, is the minimum energy duality where the time reversal does not play a role. The minimum energy duality is described next. The sidebar “Simple example to illustrate the two types of duality” is included to explain and relate the two types of duality for the simplest example of estimating a Gaussian random variable.

Minimum energy duality for the linear Gaussian model

Like the minimum variance duality, the classical form of the minimum energy duality too is for the linear Gaussian model (3) over a finite time-horizon $[0, T]$. While the minimum variance duality starts with the consideration of the m.s.e., the objective of interest in the minimum energy duality is the (minus of the) *log-likelihood function* defined as follows:

$$-2 \log \rho_{X|Z}(x | z)$$

where $\rho_{X|Z}$ is the conditional density for the linear Gaussian model (3) and $x = \{x_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ and $z = \{z_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ are the possible state and output trajectories. Based on a calculation in the 1963 paper of Bryson and Frazier and a more widely known (in the duality literature) 1968 paper of Mortensen, the objective is expressed as a quadratic optimal control-type cost [6], [7]. The control input $u := \{u_t \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ now has the dimension n of the process noise. The dual optimal control problem is as follows:

- Minimum energy dual optimal control problem:

$$\text{Minimize : } J(u, x_0; z) = |m_0 - x_0|_{\Sigma_0^{-1}}^2 + \int_0^T |u_t|^2 + |\dot{z}_t - H^T x_t|_{R^{-1}}^2 dt \quad (10a)$$

$u \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n)$
 $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\text{Subject to : } \frac{dx_t}{dt} = A^T x_t + \sigma u_t \quad (10b)$$

where $z = \{z_t \in \mathbb{R}^m : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is a given sample path of observation data.

Concerning the dual optimal control problem (10), Bensoussan writes in [21, p. 180]: “The notation is reminiscent of the probabilistic origin. The function z is a given $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ function. It is reminiscent of the observation process, in fact rather the derivative of the observation process (which, as we know, does not exist). Similarly, u is reminiscent of the noise that perturbs the system (again its derivative), and x_0 is the value of the initial condition, which we do not know. The cost functional (10) contains weights related to the covariance matrices that were part of the initial probabilistic model.”

The optimal solution is given in the following proposition (see [20, Sec. 3.4.5] for a proof):

Proposition 1: Consider the optimal control problem (10). Then for any choice of u and x_0 ,

$$J_T(u, x_0; \dot{z}) \geq \int_0^T |\dot{z}_t - H^T \hat{x}_t|_{R^{-1}}^2 dt$$

where the process $\hat{x} = \{\hat{x}_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is given by

$$\frac{d\hat{x}_t}{dt} = A^T \hat{x}_t + \Sigma_t H R^{-1} (\dot{z}_t - H^T \hat{x}_t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad \hat{x}_0 = m_0 \quad (11a)$$

(Compare with Kalman filter (4a) for the conditional mean $\{m_t : t \geq 0\}$). Assuming Σ_t is invertible for all $0 \leq t \leq T$, the equality holds with the optimal trajectory given by the backward-in-time equation:

$$\frac{dx_t}{dt} = A^T x_t + Q \Sigma_t^{-1} (x_t - \hat{x}_t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad x_T = \hat{x}_T \quad (11b)$$

Comparison of the minimum variance and minimum energy duality

As evident from the construction, the two types of duality correspond to distinct estimation objectives:

- Minimum variance (5) is the appropriate duality for the filtering problem: Formula (7) shows that a portion of the optimal control $\{u_s^{\text{OPT}} : 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ yields the filter at time t . Although not explicitly given as part of Prop. 1, the optimal cost-to-go at time t has the interpretation of the optimal m.s.e..

- Minimum energy (10) is the appropriate duality for the smoothing problem: This is because the optimal trajectory $x_t = E(X_t | \mathcal{Z}_T)$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$ (equality is meant in a pathwise sense for each fixed sample-path $Z_t(\omega) = z_t$). The forward-backward equation (11) is well known (see [22, Eq. (16.5.11)]) as the Rauch-Tung-Streibel (RTS) smoother [23]. Notably, the optimal solution at time t depends upon both the past and future values of the output.

Let us next compare these vis-à-vis Kalman's PoD:

- (i) In the minimum variance duality, the constraint (5b) is the dual control system (with matrix transposes). In contrast, the constraint (10b) in the minimum energy duality is a modified copy of the model (3a).
- (ii) In (5), the control input u has the same dimension as the output process while in (10), the control input u has the dimension of the process noise. Note that in the elementary duality between controllability and observability, the inputs and outputs are the elements of the same function space $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and as such have the same dimension.
- (iii) The constraint (5b) is a backward-in-time ODE while the constraint (10b) is a modified copy of the signal model which proceeds forward-in-time.

All of this shows that the minimum variance duality is consistent with each of the three steps in the Kalman's PoD. In contrast, the minimum energy duality is not consistent with any of the three steps. The practical import of this is as follows: The condition for asymptotic analysis of the minimum variance dual optimal control problem (5) is stabilizability of (5b), and by duality detectability of (A^T, H^T) . The latter is well known to be the appropriate condition for stability of the Kalman filter [24], [25]. In contrast, for minimum energy dual optimal control problem (10), the important condition again is detectability of (A^T, H^T) but that is not at all transparent from the constraint (10b). With $\sigma = 0$, which is a perfectly reasonable choice for the linear Gaussian model (3), the constraint (10b) is not even a control system.

Because of the forward-in-time nature of the constraint (10b), time reversal is not an issue in the minimum energy duality. In part because of this, there have been several extensions of the minimum energy duality to both deterministic and stochastic nonlinear systems. These are reviewed and compared with our original work on the generalization of minimum variance duality described next.

Duality for HMMs with white noise observation model

Hidden Markov model (HMM)

We consider a pair of continuous-time stochastic processes (X, Z) as follows:

- The *state process* $X = \{X_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is a Feller-Markov process taking values in the state-space \mathbb{S} . The time-evolution of a Markov process is modeled through its infinitesimal generator, denoted by \mathcal{A} , and a prior, denoted by μ . The prior μ is an element of the space of probability measures on \mathbb{S} . This space is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$.
- The *observation process* $Z = \{Z_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is \mathbb{R}^m -valued and satisfies the SDE (compare with (3b))

$$dZ_t = h(X_t) dt + dW_t, \quad Z_0 = 0 \quad (12)$$

where $h : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is referred to as the observation function and $W = \{W_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is an m -dimensional B.M. with covariance matrix $R \succ 0$. It is assumed that W is independent of X .

The above is referred to as an HMM with *white noise observations*. The model is denoted by (\mathcal{A}, h) . In applications, the important examples of HMM are as follows:

- (i) HMM on a finite state-space $\mathbb{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ of cardinality d .
- (ii) Nonlinear SDE or an ODE on the state-space $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. A SDE model is referred to as an *Itô diffusion*. The linear Gaussian model (3) is an example of an Itô diffusion on $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}^d$.

The notation for these models is described in a self-contained manner in the accompanying sidebar “Examples of HMM”. When \mathbb{S} is not finite, additional assumptions on (\mathcal{A}, h) are necessary for well-posedness reasons.

In the following two subsections, our goal is as follows:

- (i) Define a dual control system for the HMM (\mathcal{A}, h) .
- (ii) Describe the minimum variance duality and the duality principle for the same.

After these have been described, the classical linear Gaussian duality is shown to arise as the special case in the final subsection.

Dual control system

We begin by revisiting the sidebar “Mathematical foundations of duality”. The first step is to define the function spaces. These should already be familiar to the reader for the state-output

linear system (1). The counterparts of these for the HMM are as follows:

- (i) **Function space for the state (initial condition).** The initial condition for an HMM is the prior μ . The prior is an element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$ which is not a vector space. For functional analytic reasons, one regards $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$ as a subset of a measure space denoted as \mathcal{Y}^\dagger . If \mathbb{S} is finite of cardinality d then $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$ is the probability simplex in \mathbb{R}^d .
- (ii) **Function space for the signal (output).** For an HMM, the observation process Z is a stochastic process. It is an element of the Hilbert space $L^2_{\mathcal{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ whose mathematical definition appears in the sidebar “Duality between BSDE control system and HMM”.

For the dual control system, the function spaces are obtained through duality pairing.

- (i) Because the state for an HMM is a measure on \mathbb{S} , the state for the dual control system is a function on \mathbb{S} . The space of such functions is denoted as \mathcal{Y} with \mathcal{Y}^\dagger as the (dual) space of linear functionals on \mathcal{Y} . If \mathbb{S} is finite of cardinality d then $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^d$.
- (ii) Because $L^2_{\mathcal{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is a Hilbert space, the control inputs for the dual control system are also elements of $L^2_{\mathcal{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m) =: \mathcal{U}$.

The main result of [26] is to introduce the following linear backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE) as the dual control system for the HMM (\mathcal{A}, h) :

$$-dY_t(x) = ((\mathcal{A}Y_t)(x) + h^T(x)(U_t + V_t(x))) dt - V_t^T(x) dZ_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (13a)$$

$$Y_T(x) = c, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{S} \quad (13b)$$

where the control input $U := \{U_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is a deterministic constant. The solution of the BSDE $(Y, V) := \{(Y_t(x), V_t(x)) : 0 \leq t \leq T, x \in \mathbb{S}\}$ is a $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}^m$ -valued stochastic process. The process is forward-adapted to the filtration \mathcal{Z} . In the settings where the state-space $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}^d$, (13) is a backward stochastic partial differential equation (BSPDE). The well-posedness results for finite state-space can be found in [27, Ch. 7] and for the BSPDE in [28] (see also [26, Rem. 7-9]).

In the sidebar “Duality between BSDE control system and HMM”, the mathematical characterization of duality is presented. Based on this characterization, Table S1 provides a side-by-side comparison showing the parallels between the classical duality for deterministic linear systems ((1) and (2)) and the duality for the HMM (\mathcal{A}, h) . Additional details can be found in the journal paper [26].

Our goal now is to use the dual control system to construct the minimum variance optimal control problem.

Minimum variance duality for HMM

Recall that for the linear Gaussian model (3), the filtering objective is to compute the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}(f^\top X_T | \mathcal{Z}_T)$. The function $f^\top x$ is an example of a linear function of the state $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In nonlinear (or stochastic) filtering, the objective is to compute an estimate of $f(X_T)$ where the function $f \in \mathcal{Y}$. The theory allows for consideration of also random functions that are \mathcal{Z}_T measurable. For any such random function F , the nonlinear filter is defined as a conditional expectation as follows:

$$(\text{nonlinear filter}) \quad \pi_T(F) := \mathbb{E}(F(X_T) | \mathcal{Z}_T), \quad F \in \mathcal{Z}_T$$

where “ $F \in \mathcal{Z}_T$ ” means that the function F is allowed to be \mathcal{Z}_T -measurable (i.e., for each $x \in \mathbb{S}$, $F_T(x)$ is allowed to depend upon observations up to time T). As before, the conditional expectation has the following interpretation as the solution of an optimization problem:

$$\pi_T(F) = \operatorname{argmin}_{S_T \in \mathcal{Z}_T} \mathbb{E}(|F(X_T) - S_T|^2)$$

The dual control system is used to express the above as a dual optimal control problem.

- Minimum variance optimal control problem:

$$\text{Minimize: } J_T(U) = \mathbb{E}(|Y_0(X_0) - \mu(Y_0)|^2) + \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^T l(Y_t, V_t, U_t; X_t) dt\right) \quad (14a)$$

Subject to (BSDE constraint):

$$-dY_t(x) = ((\mathcal{A}Y_t)(x) + h^\top(x)(U_t + V_t(x))) dt - V_t^\top(x) dZ_t \quad Y_T(x) = F(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S} \quad (14b)$$

where the running cost

$$l(y, v, u; x) := (\Gamma y)(x) + |u + v(x)|_R^2, \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad v \in \mathcal{Y}^m, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^m, \quad x \in \mathbb{S}$$

Here, Γ is the *carré du champ* operator whose definition and meaning is described in the sidebar “Carré du champ operator”. (14) is an example of a linear quadratic stochastic optimal control problem subject to a BSDE constraint. If the state-space is finite, the problem is finite-dimensional while for $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}^d$, the problem is infinite-dimensional. In either case, its solution based on the maximum principle appears in [29, Thm. 2].

The relationship between optimal filtering and optimal control problems is given by the following duality principle (compare with Thm. 1) which is an original contribution of our work:

Theorem 2 (Duality principle for the HMM (\mathcal{A}, h) [29]): For a control input $U \in \mathcal{U}$, consider an estimator

$$S_T := \mu(Y_0) - \int_0^T U_t^\top dZ_t \quad (15)$$

Then

$$J_T(U) = \mathbb{E}(|F(X_T) - S_T|^2)$$

Suppose $U^{(\text{opt})} = \{U_t^{(\text{opt})} : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is the optimal control input and $\{Y_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is the resulting optimal trajectory. Then

$$\pi_t(Y_t) = \mu(Y_0) - \int_0^t (U_s^{(\text{opt})})^\top dZ_s, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

and therefore, at the terminal time $t = T$,

$$\pi_T(F) = \mu(Y_0) - \int_0^T (U_s^{(\text{opt})})^\top dZ_s$$

with the optimal value $J_T(U^{(\text{opt})}) = \mathbb{E}(|F(X_T) - \pi_T(F)|^2)$.

The duality principle first appeared in our paper [30, Thm. 1 and Prop. 1]. As in the linear Gaussian case, minimum variance optimal control problem (14) is the appropriate duality for the filtering problem. The optimal control input not only yields the filter at the terminal time T but also a portion of the optimal control $\{U_s^{(\text{opt})} : 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ yields the filter at time t .

A special case of (14) based on deterministic control input $U = u$ and terminal condition $F = f$ is considered in the M.S. thesis [31]. With such a choice, $V = 0$ and the analysis is simpler but the estimator is sub-optimal [30, Rem. 1]. An equivalent formulation of (14) expressed as a forward-backward SDE appears in [32].

In the following, the classical minimum variance duality (5) for the linear Gaussian model is shown to be a special case of this more general result.

Linear Gaussian special case

Consider the linear Gaussian model (3). We impose the following restrictions:

- The control input $U = u$ is restricted to be a deterministic function of time. In particular, it does not depend upon the observations. For such a control input, the solution $Y = y$ of the BSPDE is a deterministic function of time, and $V = 0$. The BSPDE becomes a PDE:

$$-\frac{\partial y_t}{\partial t}(x) = (\mathcal{A}y_t)(x) + x^\top H u_t, \quad y_T(x) = c, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (16)$$

where the lower-case notation is used to stress the fact that u and y are now deterministic functions of time.

- Consider a finite (d -) dimensional space of linear functions:

$$\mathcal{S} := \{f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f(x) = \tilde{f}^\top x \text{ where } \tilde{f} \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$$

Then \mathcal{S} is an invariant subspace for the dynamics (16). On \mathcal{S} , expressing $y_t(x) = \tilde{y}_t^\top x$, using the formula (S14), the PDE reduces to an ODE:

$$-\frac{d\tilde{y}_t}{dt} = A\tilde{y}_t + Hu_t, \quad \tilde{y}_T = 0 \quad (17)$$

where the terminal condition is set to 0 because it is the only constant function which is also linear.

In this manner, we have recovered the dual control system first introduced as (2) in the discussion of elementary duality between controllability and observability.

The *only* assumption in going from BSPDE (13) to the ODE (17) is that the control U is deterministic. That a deterministic control suffices for minimum variance duality is because of a standard result in the theory of Gaussian processes that conditional expectation $E(f^\top X_T | \mathcal{Z}_T)$ is evaluated in the form of a linear predictor [33, Cor. 1.10]. For this reason, it suffices to consider an estimator of the form

$$S_T := (\text{constant}) - \int_0^T u_t^\top dZ_t$$

where $u = \{u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is deterministic. Consequently, for linear Gaussian estimation, it suffices to restrict the admissible space of control inputs to $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ which is a subspace of $L^2_{\mathcal{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Using a deterministic control u , and the terminal condition $F(x) = f^\top x$, the solution of the BSPDE (14b) is given by

$$Y_t(x) = y_t^\top x, \quad V_t(x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

where $y = \{y_t \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is a solution of the backward-in-time ODE:

$$-\frac{dy_t}{dt} = Ay_t + Hu_t, \quad y_T = f$$

Using the formula (S20) for the carré du champ, the running cost

$$l(Y_t, V_t, U_t; X_t) = (\Gamma Y_t)(X_t) + |U_t + V_t(X_t)|_R^2 = y_t^\top (\sigma \sigma^\top) y_t + |u_t|_R^2 = |y_t|_Q^2 + |u_t|_R^2$$

With the Gaussian prior, the initial cost $E(|y_0^\top (X_0 - m_0)|^2) = y_0^\top \Sigma_0 y_0$.

Combining all of the above, the minimum variance optimal control problem (14) reduces to its classical counterpart (5).

Discussion

Kalman's PoD and time reversal

Because the proposed duality reduces to the classical minimum variance duality, the relationship between the HMM (\mathcal{A}, h) and the BSDE is consistent with the three steps of the Kalman's PoD. We revisit these as follows:

- (i) The first step about taking transpose of matrices is not applicable to the nonlinear setting. Having said that, both the HMM and the BSDE are parametrized by the model (\mathcal{A}, h) . For the linear system, the model is defined by the matrices (A, H) .
- (ii) The inputs and outputs constraints are interchanged. In the nonlinear case, the constraint is that these are both elements of the common function space \mathcal{U} .
- (iii) The arrow of time is reversed. While the HMM is integrated forward-in-time, the BSDE is integrated backward-in-time.

Comparison with minimum energy duality

Sidebar “Historical survey of minimum energy duality for nonlinear estimation” contains a historical review of minimum energy duality. The review is written to relate the early work of Mortensen and Hijab, the duality implicit in construction of the MHE algorithms, and the duality described by Mitter and Fleming and by Mitter and Newton. Table S2 provides a side-by-side comparison of the two types of duality for nonlinear stochastic systems:

- Minimum energy duality of Mitter and Newton (S23) on the left-hand side; and
- Minimum variance duality (14) proposed by us on the right-hand side.

The two represent generalization of the classical minimum energy duality (10) and the minimum variance duality (5), respectively, for the linear Gaussian model.

The important distinctions between the two types of duality are as follows:

- (i) *Inputs and outputs.* The control input for the BSDE and the output of the HMM are dual processes that have the same dimension. These are both element of the same Hilbert space \mathcal{U} . This is not true for the minimum energy duality.
- (ii) *Stability condition.* On account of the linear quadratic nature of (14), stabilizability of the BSDE is a natural condition for asymptotic analysis. Because BSDE is the dual control system, stabilizability of the BSDE is the dual property to the detectability of the HMM [26, Cor. 2]. The latter is known to be the appropriate condition for stability of the nonlinear filter [34]. There are no analogous conditions known for the minimum energy duality.

(iii) *Arrow of time.* The dual control system is backward-in-time consistent with Kalman’s PoD. However, note that the solution of the BSDE is forward-adapted to the filtration generated by the observations. This is a key point concerning time reversal for the filtering problem. Adaptedness is not an issue in the minimum energy duality.

Future directions

In this paper, we have made the case that Kalman’s PoD underpins both the elementary duality between controllability and observability of linear systems as well as the minimum variance duality. Both of these are fundamental to Control Theory and covered in the first graduate course on the subject. We described an original extension of these to HMMs with white noise observations as well as the relationship of the same with the minimum energy duality.

A natural question that arises now is why do this? In particular, what are the benefits of reformulating the optimal filtering problem as an optimal control problem? Apart from its intrinsic appeal to the aficionados of variational techniques, expressing a dynamical system as an optimal control system is useful for the purposes of asymptotic stability analysis, as the time-horizon $T \rightarrow \infty$. Two important reasons are as follows:

1. An optimal control formulation is useful to clarify the necessary and sufficient conditions (model properties) to obtain asymptotic stability.
2. Assuming these model properties hold, the stationary value function, provided it exists, is a candidate Lyapunov function for the optimal control system, e.g., see [35, Proof of Thm. 23.2].

For the linear quadratic problem, these considerations are entirely classical. In their introduction to a re-print of the Kalman’s foundational paper [36] on the subject, Levine and Willems write “*Kalman actually states (p. 102, fourth paragraph) that he views the introduction of the notions of controllability and observability, and their exploitation in the regulator problem, as the principal contribution of the present [Kalman’s] paper. Controllability and observability are shown in the paper to be of central importance in the analysis of the least squares control problem over an infinite horizon.*”

In this regard, duality theory has already been useful to obtain a definition of observability as a dual property. Its significance to the problem of filter stability is explained in the sidebar “Significance of duality to stability theory for finite-state HMM”. Next, the minimum variance duality has led to novel methods for analysis of filter stability which is a subject of continuing work in our research group at Illinois. Early results on this topic have appeared in [37], [38].

Another direction is to use the minimum variance duality for the purposes of numerical approximation of the nonlinear filter. The nonlinear predictor form (15) of the estimator in Thm. 2 is potentially applicable to a number of application areas involving time-series prediction. Development of algorithms in data-driven or learning type scenarios is of topical interest.

Acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge financial support through the AFOSR award FA9550-23-1-0060 (Mehta) and the DFG grant 318763901/SFB1294 (Kim).

References

- [1] R. E. Kalman, “On the general theory of control systems,” in *Proceedings First International Conference on Automatic Control, Moscow, USSR*, 1960, pp. 481–492.
- [2] R. E. Kalman and R. S. Bucy, “New results in linear filtering and prediction theory,” *Journal of Basic Engineering*, vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 95–108, 1961.
- [3] R. Hermann and A. Krener, “Nonlinear controllability and observability,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 728–740, 1977.
- [4] E. D. Sontag and Y. Wang, “Output-to-state stability and detectability of nonlinear systems,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 279–290, 1997.
- [5] J. B. Rawlings, D. Q. Mayne, and M. Diehl, *Model Predictive Control: Theory, Computation, and Design*. Nob Hill Publishing Madison, WI, 2017, vol. 2.
- [6] A. E. Bryson and M. Frazier, “Smoothing for linear and nonlinear dynamic systems,” in *Proceedings of the optimum system synthesis conference*. DTIC Document Ohio, 1963, pp. 353–364.
- [7] R. E. Mortensen, “Maximum-likelihood recursive nonlinear filtering,” *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 386–394, 1968.
- [8] O. B. Hijab, “Minimum energy estimation,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1980.
- [9] W. H. Fleming and S. K. Mitter, “Optimal control and nonlinear filtering for nondegenerate diffusion processes,” *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 63–77, 1982.
- [10] W. H. Fleming and E. De Giorgi, “Deterministic nonlinear filtering,” *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze-Serie IV*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 435–454, 1997.
- [11] V. E. Beneš and I. Karatzas, “On the relation of Zakai’s and Mortensen’s equations,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 472–489, 1983.
- [12] M. Pavon, “Stochastic control and nonequilibrium thermodynamical systems,” *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, vol. 19, pp. 187–202, 1989.
- [13] M. R. James and J. S. Baras, “Nonlinear filtering and large deviations: A pde-control theoretic approach,” *Stochastics*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 391–412, 1988.
- [14] S. K. Mitter and N. J. Newton, “A variational approach to nonlinear estimation,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 1813–1833, 2003.
- [15] S. K. Mitter and N. Newton, “The duality between estimation and control,” *Published in Festschrift for A. Bennoussan*, 2000.
- [16] R. van Handel, “Filtering, stability, and robustness,” Ph.D. dissertation, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, 12 2006.
- [17] E. Todorov, “General duality between optimal control and estimation,” in *2008 IEEE 47th*

- Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 12 2008, pp. 4286–4292.
- [18] A. Bensoussan, *Stochastic Control of Partially Observable Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
 - [19] K. J. Åström, *Introduction to Stochastic Control Theory*. Academic Press, 1970.
 - [20] J. W. Kim, “Duality for nonlinear filtering,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, 06 2022.
 - [21] A. Bensoussan, *Estimation and Control of Dynamical Systems*. Springer, 2018, vol. 48.
 - [22] T. Kailath, A. H. Sayed, and B. Hassibi, *Linear Estimation*. Prentice Hall, 2000.
 - [23] H. E. Rauch, F. Tung, and C. T. Striebel, “Maximum likelihood estimates of linear dynamic systems,” *AIAA journal*, vol. 3, no. 8, pp. 1445–1450, 1965.
 - [24] H. Kwakernaak and R. Sivan, *Linear Optimal Control Systems*. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1972.
 - [25] D. L. Ocone and E. Pardoux, “Asymptotic stability of the optimal filter with respect to its initial condition,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 226–243, 1996.
 - [26] J. W. Kim and P. G. Mehta, “Duality for nonlinear filtering I: Observability,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 699–711, 2024.
 - [27] J. Yong and X. Y. Zhou, *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999, vol. 43.
 - [28] J. Ma and J. Yong, “Adapted solution of a degenerate backward SPDE, with applications,” *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 59–84, 1997.
 - [29] J. W. Kim and P. G. Mehta, “Duality for nonlinear filtering II: Optimal control,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 712–725, 2024.
 - [30] J. W. Kim, P. G. Mehta, and S. Meyn, “What is the Lagrangian for nonlinear filtering?” in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. Nice, France: IEEE, 12 2019, pp. 1607–1614.
 - [31] J. Szalankiewicz, “Duality in nonlinear filtering,” Master’s thesis, Technische Universität Berlin, Institut für Mathematik, Berlin, 2021.
 - [32] J. W. Kim and S. Reich, “On forward-backward SDE approaches to continuous-time minimum variance estimation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12727*, 2024.
 - [33] J. F. Le Gall, *Brownian Motion, Martingales, and Stochastic Calculus*. Springer, 2016, vol. 274.
 - [34] R. van Handel, “Nonlinear filtering and systems theory,” in *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, 2010.
 - [35] R. W. Brockett, *Finite Dimensional Linear Systems*. SIAM, 2015.
 - [36] W. S. Levine and J. C. Willems, “Contributions to the theory of optimal control,” in *Control Theory: Twenty-Five Seminal Papers (1932-1981)*, T. Basar, Ed. IEEE, 2001, pp. 147–166.

- [37] J. W. Kim, P. G. Mehta, and S. Meyn, “The conditional Poincaré inequality for filter stability,” in *2021 IEEE 60th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 12 2021, pp. 1629–1636.
- [38] J. W. Kim and P. G. Mehta, “A dual characterization of the stability of the Wonham filter,” in *2021 IEEE 60th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 12 2021, pp. 1621–1628.
- [39] D. Nualart and É. Pardoux, “Stochastic calculus with anticipating integrands,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, vol. 78, no. 4, pp. 535–581, 1988.
- [40] B. D. Anderson, “Reverse-time diffusion equation models,” *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 313–326, 1982.
- [41] E. Pardoux, “Non-linear filtering, prediction and smoothing,” in *Stochastic Systems: The Mathematics of Filtering and Identification and Applications*. Springer, 1981, pp. 529–557.
- [42] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole, “Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13456*, 2020.
- [43] D. G. Luenberger, *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, 1997.
- [44] G. Strang, “The fundamental theorem of linear algebra,” *The American Mathematical Monthly*, vol. 100, no. 9, pp. 848–855, 1993.
- [45] B. Øksendal, *Stochastic Differential Equations: an Introduction with Applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [46] J. Xiong, *An Introduction to Stochastic Filtering Theory*. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2008, vol. 18.
- [47] R. van Handel, “Observability and nonlinear filtering,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, vol. 145, no. 1-2, pp. 35–74, 2009.
- [48] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux, *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 348.
- [49] J. W. Kim and P. G. Mehta, “An optimal control derivation of nonlinear smoothing equations,” in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Dynamics, Optimization and Computation held in honor of the 60th birthday of Michael Dellnitz*. Springer, 2020, pp. 295–311.
- [50] E. Seneta, *Non-negative Matrices and Markov Chains*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [51] P. Chigansky, R. Liptser, and R. Van Handel, “Intrinsic methods in filter stability,” in *Handbook of Nonlinear Filtering*, D. Crisan and B. Rozovskii, Eds. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [52] P. Baxendale, P. Chigansky, and R. Liptser, “Asymptotic stability of the Wonham filter: ergodic and nonergodic signals,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 643–669, 2004.

Summary

Duality between estimation and control is a foundational concept in Control Theory. Most students learn about the elementary duality – between observability and controllability – in their first graduate course in linear systems theory. Therefore, it comes as a surprise that for a more general class of nonlinear stochastic systems (hidden Markov models or HMMs), duality is incomplete.

Our objective in writing this article is two-fold: (i) To describe the difficulty in extending duality to HMMs; and (ii) To discuss its recent resolution by the authors. A key message is that the main difficulty in extending duality comes from time reversal in going from estimation to control. The reason for time reversal is explained with the aid of the familiar linear deterministic and linear Gaussian models. The explanation is used to motivate the difference between the linear and the nonlinear models. Once the difference is understood, duality for HMMs is described based on our recent work. The article also includes a comparison and discussion of the different types of duality considered in literature.

Arrow of time in ordinary and stochastic differential equations

Ordinary differential equation

We illustrate the concepts with the aid of the simple ordinary differential equation (ODE) over time horizon $[0, T]$:

$$\frac{dy_t}{dt} = 0, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (\text{S1})$$

Arrow of time refers to the nature of integration. The two types of solutions are as follows:

$$\text{(forward-in-time)} \quad y_t = y_0 + \int_0^t 0 \, ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (\text{S2a})$$

$$\text{(backward-in-time)} \quad y_t = y_T - \int_t^T 0 \, ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (\text{S2b})$$

It is easily verified that either of these solutions satisfy the ODE. The forward-in-time solution is obtained upon specifying the initial condition $y_0 = f$ and integrating forward-in-time. The backward-in-time solution is obtained upon specifying the terminal condition $y_T = f$ and integrating backward-in-time. Upon replacing the right-hand side of (S1) (which is 0) by a suitable function of (t, y_t) , the above is easily extended to the reader's favorite ODE.

Stochastic differential equation

A stochastic differential equation (SDE) is different from an ODE because its solution also depends upon a Brownian motion (B.M.) which is denoted in this sidebar by $Z := \{Z_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. In order to make the nature of this dependence precise, one needs to introduce $\mathcal{Z}_t := \sigma(\{Z_s : 0 \leq s \leq t\})$ as the sigma-algebra of observations of Z up to time t . Formally, \mathcal{Z}_t is the set of all events (subsets of the sample space) that become known based on the knowledge of B.M. up to time t . The collection $\mathcal{Z} := \{\mathcal{Z}_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is referred to as the filtration. A random variable S_T is said to be \mathcal{Z}_T -measurable (written as $S_T \in \mathcal{Z}_T$) if its value is known based on the knowledge of B.M. up to time T . A stochastic process $Y = \{Y_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is said to be forward-adapted to the filtration \mathcal{Z} if $Y_t \in \mathcal{Z}_t$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$.

The simplest SDE, counterpart of the ODE (S1), is given by

$$dY_t = 0, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (\text{S3})$$

Upon specifying the initial condition $Y_0 = f$, at time $t = 0$, the forward-in-time solution is obtained as follows:

$$\text{(forward-in-time)} \quad Y_t = Y_0 + \int_0^t 0 \, ds + \int_0^t 0 \, dZ_s, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

where “ $\int_0^t 0 \, dZ_s$ ” is an example of an Itô-integral. The construction of the Itô-integral ensures that the solution is forward-adapted to \mathcal{Z} .

While the forward-in-time solution of the SDE is a natural generalization of the respective formula (S2a) for the ODE, the backward-in-time solution is not as straightforward. The issue is that at time $t = T$, the terminal condition $Y_T = F$ may in general depend upon B.M. up to time T (i.e., $F \in \mathcal{Z}_T$). With such a terminal condition, a naive extension of the backward-in-time formula (S2b) for the ODE gives

$$Y_t = F - \int_t^T 0 \, ds - \int_t^T 0 \, dZ_s, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (\text{S4})$$

The problem is that such a solution is not adapted to the filtration. In particular, $Y_0 = F$ depends upon future values of B.M. which are not known at time $t = 0$.

Backward stochastic differential equation

The theory of backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE) is designed to define a backward-in-time solution that is forward-adapted. The trick is to define the solution as a pair $(Y, V) = \{(Y_t, V_t) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ as follows:

$$(\text{backward-in-time}) \quad Y_t = F - \int_t^T 0 \, ds - \int_t^T V_s \, dZ_s, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad (\text{S5})$$

A succinct notation for the same is the BSDE

$$-dY_t = -V_t \, dZ_t, \quad Y_T = F$$

where the minus sign in front of dY_t , by convention, indicates that the equation is being integrated backward-in-time. An important point to note is that one solves for the pair (Y, V) given the terminal condition $Y_T = F$ at time T . The well-posedness theory of BSDE shows that a unique forward-adapted solution pair exists for each \mathcal{Z}_T -measurable F [27, Ch. 7].

A word of caution

Although the interpretation is not used in this paper, the formula in (S4) is an example of the so called backward-in-time Itô integral. The integral is denoted as $\int_t^T (\dots) \overleftarrow{d}Z_s$ with a backward arrow [39, Sec. 4.2]. Using the backward-in-time integral, one defines a solution of (S3) that is backward-adapted to the filtration, i.e., solution at time t depends upon randomness from time t to T . The backward-adapted solution is different from the forward-adapted solution of the BSDE. However, such constructions are referred to as “reverse time” or “time reversed” form of SDEs [40], [39].

Historically, in the filtering context, the backward Zakai equation is an example of a SDE with a backward-adapted solution [41], [11]. More recently, SDEs with backward-adapted solutions have become popular for generative AI applications [42].

A reader is cautioned that, for us, “reversing the arrow of time” means a solution of a BSDE. In particular, all the stochastic processes considered in this paper are forward-adapted. For example, in formula (S5), the integral “ $\int_t^T V_s dZ_s$ ” is a standard Itô-integral where the integrand $V_s \in \mathcal{Z}_s$ for $t \leq s \leq T$. The BSDE formalism is *necessary* to generalize the Kalman’s PoD and duality taught in an introductory control systems course.

Mathematical foundations of duality

Dual vector spaces

Let \mathcal{Y} be a Banach space equipped with norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Y}}$. The *dual space*, denoted by \mathcal{Y}^\dagger , is the space of bounded linear functionals on \mathcal{Y} . For $y^\dagger \in \mathcal{Y}^\dagger$, the notation

$$\langle y, y^\dagger \rangle := y^\dagger(y)$$

is used to denote the evaluation at $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. The bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called the *duality pairing*. The dual space \mathcal{Y}^\dagger is also a Banach space [43, Thm. 5.3.1]. An important special case is when the space \mathcal{Y} is a Hilbert space equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. For a Hilbert space, $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger = \mathcal{Y}$ and the duality pairing is the inner product. In case there is more than one function space, the duality pairing is indicated by using a subscript, e.g., $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}$.

Adjoint

Consider another Banach space \mathcal{U} and let $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a bounded linear operator. The adjoint operator $\mathcal{L}^\dagger : \mathcal{Y}^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^\dagger$ is obtained from the defining relation:

$$\langle u, \mathcal{L}^\dagger y^\dagger \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle \mathcal{L}u, y^\dagger \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}}, \quad \forall y^\dagger \in \mathcal{Y}^\dagger, u \in \mathcal{U}$$

A detailed explanation showing that \mathcal{L}^\dagger is well-defined, linear and bounded operator appears in [43, Ch. 6.5].

Closed range theorem

In matrix theory, it is an elementary fact that the range space of a matrix is orthogonal to the null space of its transpose [44]. The following theorem provides a generalization of this fact to the relationship between the range space $R(\mathcal{L})$ of \mathcal{L} and the null-space $N(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$ its adjoint \mathcal{L}^\dagger .

Theorem 3 (Theorem 6.6.1 in [43]): Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{Y} be Banach spaces and $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a bounded linear operator. Then

$$R(\mathcal{L})^\perp = N(\mathcal{L}^\dagger)$$

Relationship to the present paper

In this paper, the classical duality between controllability and observability of deterministic linear systems is reviewed to be a special case of the abstract duality in linear algebra. The review sets the stage to discuss a novel extension of the duality for HMMs.

For both cases – linear system and the HMM – duality entails definition of three objects: (a) function space of admissible control inputs \mathcal{U} ; (b) function space of “dual” state \mathcal{Y} ; and (c)

a linear operator $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. For deterministic linear systems, these definitions are classical and reviewed here. For the HMM, these definitions are intended such that controllability and observability are dual properties based on an application of the closed range theorem.

The operator \mathcal{L} is the solution operator of a input-state system which is referred to as the *dual control system*. A novel contribution of our work is to define the dual control system for an HMM.

Derivation of Kalman-Bucy filter

The optimal solution to a linear-quadratic (LQ) problem (5) is given in a linear feedback form [21, Theorem 3.1]:

$$u_t = -R^{-1}H^T\Sigma_t y_t$$

where Σ_t is the solution to the (forward-in-time) dynamic Riccati equation (DRE):

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Sigma_t = A^T\Sigma_t + \Sigma_t A + Q - \Sigma_t H R^{-1} H^T \Sigma_t, \quad \Sigma_0 \text{ given} \quad (\text{S6})$$

It was noted by Kalman and Bucy that the DRE (S6) for the LQ problem is identical to the DRE (4b) of the Kalman filter [2]. Let $\Phi(T, t)$ be the transition matrix from time T to t of the closed-loop system

$$-\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(T, t) = (A - H R^{-1} H^T \Sigma_t)\Phi(T, t), \quad \Phi(T, T) = I$$

Substituting the optimal control into (6),

$$\begin{aligned} f^T \hat{X}_T &= y_0^T m_0 + \int_0^T y_t^T \Sigma_t H R^{-1} dZ_t \\ &= f^T \Phi^T(T, 0) m_0 + \int_0^T f^T \Phi^T(T, t) \Sigma_t H R^{-1} dZ_t \end{aligned}$$

Since f is arbitrary,

$$\hat{X}_T = \Phi^T(T, 0) m_0 + \int_0^T \Phi^T(T, t) \Sigma_t H R^{-1} dZ_t$$

Because T is arbitrary, denote it as t

$$\hat{X}_t = \Phi^T(t, 0) m_0 + \int_0^t \Phi^T(t, s) \Sigma_s H R^{-1} dZ_s$$

Differentiating both sides with respect to t yields the equation of the Kalman-Bucy filter:

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{X}_t &= (A - H R^{-1} H^T \Sigma_t)^T \left(\Phi^T(t, 0) m_0 + \int_0^t \Phi^T(t, s) \Sigma_s H R^{-1} dZ_s \right) dt + \Sigma_t H R^{-1} dZ_t \\ &= A^T \hat{X}_t dt + \Sigma_t H R^{-1} (dZ_t - H^T \hat{X}_t dt) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S7})$$

Simple example to illustrate the two types of duality

The simple example is adapted from [22, Section 3.5] to illustrate the main ideas. Consider a linear estimation problem defined by the model:

$$Z = H^T X_0 + W$$

where $X_0 \sim N(m_0, \Sigma_0)$, $W \sim N(0, R)$ are independent Gaussian random variables of dimension d and m , respectively. It is assumed that both Σ_0 and R are strictly positive-definite. The goal is to compute the conditional mean $E(X_0 | Z)$.

Minimum variance construction

Fix $f \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The estimation objective is to compute $E(f^T X_0 | Z)$. Since all random variables are Gaussian, it suffices to consider an estimator S of the form

$$S = b - u^T Z \tag{S8}$$

where $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are both deterministic [33, Corollary 1.10].

The minimum variance optimization problem is as follows:

$$\min_{b \in \mathbb{R}, u \in \mathbb{R}^m} E(|f^T X_0 - S|^2) \tag{S9}$$

With the estimator (S8), the optimization objective becomes

$$E(|f^T X_0 - S|^2) = |f + Hu|_{\Sigma_0}^2 + |u|_R^2 + ((f + Hu)^T m_0 - b)^2$$

Set $y = f + Hu$. It then follows that $b = y^T m_0$ is the optimal choice, and the minimum variance optimization problem becomes a quadratic programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m} \quad & |y|_{\Sigma_0}^2 + |u|_R^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y = f + Hu \end{aligned}$$

Its solution is given by

$$u = (H^T \Sigma_0 H + R)^{-1} H^T \Sigma_0 f$$

and the corresponding optimal estimator is

$$S = f^T (m_0 + \Sigma_0 H (H^T \Sigma_0 H + R)^{-1} (Z - H^T m_0))$$

Since f is arbitrary,

$$E(X_0 | Z) = m_0 + \Sigma_0 H (H^T \Sigma_0 H + R)^{-1} (Z - H^T m_0) \tag{S10}$$

Minimum energy/maximum likelihood construction

While the previous problem considers the (minimum variance) property of the conditional expectation, the minimum energy problem begins with the Bayes' formula for conditional density:

$$\rho_{X_0|Z}(x | z) = \frac{\rho_{X_0,Z}(x, z)}{\rho_Z(z)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, z \in \mathbb{R}^m$$

where $\rho_{X_0,Z}$ denotes the joint probability density function, ρ_Z is the marginal and $\rho_{X_0|Z}$ denotes the conditional density. The objective is to compute the maximum-likelihood estimate of X_0 . Since the event $[X_0 = x, Z = z]$ is the same as $[X_0 = x, W = z - Hx]$, we have

$$-2 \log (\rho_{X|Z}(x | z)) = |x - m_0|_{\Sigma_0^{-1}}^2 + |z - H^T x|_{R^{-1}}^2 + c(z)$$

where the constant $c(z)$ only depends on z . Therefore, the maximum likelihood problem is given by

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |x - m_0|_{\Sigma_0^{-1}}^2 + |z - H^T x|_{R^{-1}}^2 \quad (\text{S11})$$

Its optimal solution is obtained as

$$x = (\Sigma_0^{-1} + H R^{-1} H^T)^{-1} (\Sigma_0^{-1} m_0 + H R^{-1} z)$$

By an application of the matrix inversion lemma [22, Appdx. A.1], this formula is identical to (S10) with $Z = z$.

In [22], (S9) is referred to as the stochastic problem and (S11) as the deterministic problem. It is noted that the objectives (S9) and (S11) are not directly related to each other even though they share the same solution [22, p. 100].

Relationship to the present paper

In this paper, the two types of dualities for the linear Gaussian model (3) are reviewed as generalizations of the basic constructions described in this sidebar. The review sets the stage for describing their extensions for HMMs. The minimum variance extension is new based on original work of the authors.

Examples of HMM

Finite state-space HMM

Let $\mathbb{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. The space of functions and measures are both identified with \mathbb{R}^d : a real-valued function f (resp., a measure μ) is identified with a column vector in \mathbb{R}^d where the i^{th} element of the vector represents $f(i)$ (resp., $\mu(i)$), and $\mu(f) = \mu^\top f$. In this manner, the observation function $h : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is also identified with a matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$. $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$ is the probability simplex in \mathbb{R}^d . The generator is a rate matrix, denoted as A , whose (i, j) entry (for $i \neq j$) gives the non-negative rate of transition from state $i \mapsto j$. The diagonal entry (i, i) is chosen such that the sum of the elements in the i -th row is zero. The finite state-space HMM is denoted as (A, H) .

The simplest case is with $d = 2$ and $m = 1$. Figure S4 depicts the state-space, the transitions between the two states, and the probability simplex. The rate matrix and the observation function are as follows:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda_{12} & \lambda_{12} \\ \lambda_{21} & -\lambda_{21} \end{bmatrix}, \quad H = \begin{bmatrix} h(1) \\ h(2) \end{bmatrix}$$

Itô diffusions

An Itô diffusion modeled using a stochastic differential equation (SDE):

$$dX_t = a(X_t) dt + \sigma(X_t) dB_t, \quad X_0 \sim \mu \tag{S12}$$

$$dZ_t = h(X_t) dt + dW_t \tag{S13}$$

where the drifts $a, h \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and the diffusion coefficient $\sigma \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^{d \times n})$ satisfy appropriate technical conditions such that a strong solution exists for $[0, T]$, and B is a standard B.M. and W is a B.M with covariance matrix $R \succ 0$. It is assumed that X_0, B and W are mutually independent. With $\sigma = 0$, the model for X is an ODE.

The infinitesimal generator \mathcal{A} acts on $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ functions in its domain according to [45, Thm. 7.3.3]

$$(\mathcal{A}f)(x) := a^\top(x) \nabla f(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top(x) (D^2 f)(x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

where ∇f is the gradient vector and $D^2 f$ is the Hessian matrix.

Linear Gaussian model

The linear Gaussian model (3) is a special case of an Itô diffusion where the drift terms are linear $a(x) = A^\top x$ and $h(x) = H^\top x$, the diffusion coefficient $\sigma(x) = \sigma$ is a constant matrix, and the prior μ is a Gaussian density.

A real-valued linear function is expressed as

$$f(x) = \tilde{f}^{\text{T}}x, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

where $\tilde{f} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then it is an easy calculation to see that $\mathcal{A}f$ is also a linear function given by

$$(\mathcal{A}f)(x) = (A\tilde{f})^{\text{T}}x, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \tag{S14}$$

Duality between the HMM and BSDE control system

Background on nonlinear filtering

A standard approach is based upon the Girsanov change of measure. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, \mathbb{P})$ be the probability triple and suppose $h \in C_b(\mathbb{S})$. Define a new probability measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ as follows:

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \exp \left(- \int_0^T h^\top(X_t) dW_t - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |h(X_t)|^2 dt \right) =: D_T^{-1}$$

Then it is known that the probability law for X is unchanged but Z is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -B.M. that is independent of X [46, Ch. 5]. The expectation with respect to $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ is denoted by $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\cdot)$. The *un-normalized filter* is a measure-valued process $\sigma = \{\sigma_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ defined by

$$\sigma_t(f) := \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(D_t f(X_t) | \mathcal{Z}_t), \quad f \in C_b(\mathbb{S})$$

Because Z is a $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -B.M., the equation of unnormalized filter is easily obtained and is in fact the celebrated Duncan-Mortensen-Zakai (DMZ) equation of nonlinear filtering [46, Thm. 5.5]:

$$d\sigma_t(f) = \sigma_t(\mathcal{A}f) dt + \sigma_t(hf)^\top dZ_t, \quad \sigma_0 = \mu \tag{S15}$$

The solution is denoted as $\sigma^\mu(f) := \{\sigma_t^\mu(f) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ to stress the dependence upon initial prior $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$.

Function spaces

The function spaces are as follows:

- $\mathcal{Y} = C_b(\mathbb{S})$ and its dual space $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger = \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$, the space of regular, bounded and finitely additive signed measures (rba measures). The duality pairing

$$\langle \mu, f \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} := \mu(f) = \int_{\mathbb{S}} f(x) d\mu(x), \quad f \in C_b(\mathbb{S}), \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$$

- The Hilbert space for \mathbb{R}^m -valued stochastic processes

$$\mathcal{U} = L^2_{\mathcal{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m) := \left\{ U : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m : U \text{ is } \mathcal{Z}\text{-adapted and } \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left(\int_0^T |U_t|^2 dt \right) < \infty \right\}$$

equipped with the inner product

$$\langle U, V \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} := \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left(\int_0^T U_t^\top V_t dt \right), \quad U, V \in \mathcal{U}$$

The two function space \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{U} are counterparts of \mathbb{R}^d and $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ that are useful in the study of deterministic linear systems (1) and (2). Note that for $\mathbb{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, the function space $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^d$. In all cases, $L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is a subspace of \mathcal{U} comprising of deterministic signals.

Linear operator and its adjoint

Consider the BSDE control system (13) with control input $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Its solution operator is used to define a bounded linear operator $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(U, c) = Y_0, \quad U \in \mathcal{U}, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}$$

where $Y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ is the solution at time 0 (Note that Y_0 is deterministic). This operator is the counterpart of the linear operator, also denoted as \mathcal{L} , previously defined for the input-state system (2).

In [26, Thm. 2], it is shown that the adjoint of \mathcal{L} is the linear operator $\mathcal{L}^\dagger : \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow L^2_{\mathbb{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m) \times \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mu = (\{\sigma_t^\mu(h) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}, \mu(1)) =: (\sigma^\mu(h), \mu(1)) \quad (\text{S16})$$

The proof entails showing the following duality relationship:

$$\langle \mu, \mathcal{L}(U, c) \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} = \langle \sigma^\mu(h), U \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} + c\mu(1) = \langle \mathcal{L}^\dagger \mu, (U, c) \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R}}, \quad \forall U \in \mathcal{U}, \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$$

Controllability, observability, duality

Based on $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, controllability is defined in the same way as in the linear systems theory.

Definition 3 (Defn. 3 in [26]): For the BSDE (13), the *controllable subspace* $\mathcal{C}_T := \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$. Explicitly,

$$\mathcal{C}_T = \{y_0 \in \mathcal{Y} : \exists c \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } U \in \mathcal{U} \text{ s.t. } Y_0 = y_0 \text{ and } Y_T = c1\} \quad (\text{S17})$$

The BSDE (13) is said to be *controllable* if \mathcal{C}_T is dense in \mathcal{Y} .

The following definition is adopted for observability of the HMM (see [26, Thm. 1] where this definition is shown to be equivalent to van Handel's definition of stochastic observability [47, Defn. 3]):

Definition 4: The HMM (\mathcal{A}, h) is *observable* if:

$$\sigma_t^\mu(h) = \sigma_t^\nu(h), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \quad \implies \quad \mu = \nu, \quad \forall \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$$

From closed range theorem, controllability and observability are now seen to be dual properties. Specifically, the dual control system is controllable iff HMM is observable. This is the promised generalization of the elementary duality between observability of the state-output system (1) and the controllability of the input-state system (2). Figure S5 depicts the duality relationship (compare with Fig. S2).

Carré du champ operator

For a Markov process with generator \mathcal{A} , the *carré du champ* operator Γ is defined as follows:

$$\Gamma(f, g)(x) := (\mathcal{A}fg)(x) - f(x)(\mathcal{A}g)(x) - g(x)(\mathcal{A}f)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{S}$$

where f, g are elements of a suitable space of test functions (denoted as \mathcal{D}) such that each of the three terms on the righthand-side are meaningfully defined [48, Defn. 3.1.1]. $(\Gamma f)(x) := \Gamma(f, f)(x)$.

For the models introduced in the sidebar “Examples of HMM”, the formulae for the carré du champ are as follows:

- Finite-state HMM (A, H)

$$(\Gamma f)(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{S}} A(x, y)(f(x) - f(y))^2, \quad x \in \mathbb{S} \tag{S18}$$

- For the 2-state example,

$$(\Gamma f) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} (\lambda_{12} + \lambda_{21})(f(1) - f(2))^2$$

- For the Itô diffusion (S12), for a function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$,

$$(\Gamma f)(x) = |\sigma^\top(x) \nabla f(x)|^2, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \tag{S19}$$

- For the linear Gaussian model (3), a real-valued linear function is expressed as $f(x) = \tilde{f}^\top x$ with $\tilde{f} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and Γf is a constant function given by

$$(\Gamma f)(x) = \tilde{f}^\top (\sigma \sigma^\top) \tilde{f}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \tag{S20}$$

Historical survey of minimum energy duality for nonlinear estimation

For the problems of nonlinear filtering and smoothing, solution approaches in literature based on duality include the following:

- Mortensen's maximum likelihood nonlinear filter [7].
- Minimum energy estimator (MEE) such as the full information estimator (FIE) and the moving horizon estimator (MHE) [5, Chapter 4].
- Fleming-Mitter duality relating the Zakai equation of nonlinear filtering to the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation of optimal control [9].
- Mitter-Newton's variational formulation of nonlinear smoothing [14].

A common theme connecting all of these prior works is that they are all variations and generalizations of the minimum energy duality (10) given therein for the linear Gaussian model (3). While there are differences in specification of the optimal control objective, the constraint in all these cases is a modified copy of the signal model. Additional details on each of the four approaches appears in the following subsections.

Mortensen's maximum likelihood nonlinear filter

In a pioneering paper, Mortensen [7] considered the maximum likelihood estimation (smoothing) problem for the following model (compare with (3)):

$$dX_t = a(X_t) dt + \sigma(X_t) dB_t, \quad X_0 \sim \mu \quad (\text{S21a})$$

$$dZ_t = h(X_t) dt + dW_t, \quad Z_0 = 0 \quad (\text{S21b})$$

where modeling for the process noise $B = \{B_t : t \geq 0\}$, the observation noise $W = \{W_t : t \geq 0\}$, and the prior μ is as before, described for the linear Gaussian model (3). Mortensen's objective was to compute the maximum likelihood (ML) trajectory $x = \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ which is defined as the trajectory that maximizes the conditional density

$$\rho_{X|Z}(x | z)$$

given the output $z = \{z_t \in \mathbb{R}^m : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$.

- Maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) problem (compare with (10))

$$\text{Minimize: } J_T(u, x_0; \dot{z}) = |x_0 - m_0|_{\Sigma_0^{-1}}^2 + \int_0^T |u_t|^2 + |\dot{z}_t - h(x_t)|_{R^{-1}}^2 dt \quad (\text{S22a})$$

$$\text{Subject to: } \frac{dx_t}{dt} = a(x_t) + \sigma(x_t)u_t \quad (\text{S22b})$$

Note that the dimension of the control input is the same as the process noise B and that the objective function reduces to (10) for the linear Gaussian model (3). Similarity to (10) comes from the assumed additive Gaussian and independent nature of the noises B and W , and the initial condition X_0 (see [20, Sec. 3.4.4] for a derivation). In Mortensen’s paper, an algorithm to solve the MLE problem (S22) is proposed based on an application of the maximum principle. As in the linear Gaussian case (see Prop. 1), the algorithm requires a forward and backward recursion to obtain the maximum likelihood trajectory.

Since Mortensen’s early work, related optimization-type problem formulation and forward-backward solution approach have appeared for a plethora of filtering and smoothing problems. In different communities, these are referred by different names, e.g., maximum likelihood estimation (MLE), maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation and minimum energy estimation (MEE).

Minimum energy estimator (MEE)

Given the enormous success of model predictive control (MPC), related algorithms have been developed to solve the state estimation problems [5, Chapter 4]. In continuous-time setting, the optimal control problem is precisely the problem (S22). In the MPC community, it is referred to as the minimum energy estimation problem. Broadly, there are two classes of MEE algorithms:

- Full information estimator (FIE) where the entire history of observation is used.
- Moving horizon estimator (MHE) where only a most recent fixed window of observation is used.

We refer the reader to Section 4.7 of [5] where a discussion on history of these approaches is provided. In this section, the authors note that dual constructions are useful for stability analysis. The authors describe certain results, e.g. [5, Theorem 4.10], based on i-IOSS (incremental input/output to state stability) properties of the model.

Fleming-Mitter-Newton duality

In [9], it is shown that the linear Zakai equation of stochastic filtering can be transformed into the nonlinear Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation of stochastic optimal control. The particular transformation is an example of the log transformation whereby the negative log of the posterior density is the value function for a certain optimal control problem. The interpretation of the optimal control problem first appears in the 2003 paper of Mitter and Newton [14]. In this paper, the authors consider a control-modified version of the Markov process X denoted by $\tilde{X} := \{\tilde{X}_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. The control problem is to pick (a) the initial distribution $\tilde{\mu}$ and (b) the state transition, such that the law of \tilde{X} equals the conditional law of X .

The optimization problem is formulated on the space of probability laws. Let P_X denote the law for X , Q denote the law for \tilde{X} , and $P_{X|z}$ denote the law for X given an observation path $z = \{z_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. Assuming $Q \ll P_X$, the objective function is the relative entropy (K-L divergence) between Q and $P_{X|z}$:

$$\min_Q \quad E_Q \left(\log \frac{dQ}{dP_X} \right) - E_Q \left(\log \frac{dP_{X|z}}{dP_X} \right).$$

For the model (S21), this procedure yields the following stochastic optimal control problem:

$$\text{Min}_{\tilde{\mu}, U} : \quad J(\tilde{\mu}, U; z) = E \left(\log \frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{d\mu}(\tilde{X}_0) + \int_0^T \ell(\tilde{X}_t, U_t; z_t) dt \right) \quad (\text{S23a})$$

$$\text{Subj. :} \quad d\tilde{X}_t = a(\tilde{X}_t) dt + \sigma(\tilde{X}_t)(U_t dt + d\tilde{B}_t), \quad \tilde{X}_0 \sim \tilde{\mu} \quad (\text{S23b})$$

where

$$l(x, u; z_t) := \frac{1}{2}|u|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\dot{z}_t - h(x)|_{R^{-1}}^2$$

The formula for cost function helps one see the minimum energy nature of Mitter-Newton duality. Because the derivative is only formally defined, there is also a more rigorous manner to express the cost function with only z_t without the need for \dot{z}_t (see [16, Rem. 2.2.5] for an explanation).

The solution of the optimal control problem (S23) is given in the following proposition which provides an explanation for the log transformation originally noted in [9].

Proposition 2: Consider the optimal control problem (S23). For this problem, the HJB equation for the value function V is as follows:

$$-\frac{\partial V_t}{\partial t}(x) = (\mathcal{A}(V_t + z_t h))(x) + \frac{1}{2}h^2(x) - \frac{1}{2}|\sigma^T(x)\nabla(V_t + z_t h)(x)|^2, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

$$V_T(x) = -z_T h(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

where \mathcal{A} is the generator (see Euclidean state-space example in the sidebar ‘‘Carré du champ operator’’). The optimal control is of the state feedback form given by

$$U_t = -\sigma^T(\tilde{X}_t)\nabla(V_t + z_t h)(\tilde{X}_t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

Log transform and time reversal

Expressing $V_t(x) = -\log(q_t(x)e^{Z_t h(x)})$ it is readily verified that $\{q_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ solves the backward Zakai equation as follows:

$$-dq_t(x) = (\mathcal{A}q_t)(x) dt + h(x)q_t(x) \overleftarrow{dZ}_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

$$q_T(x) = 1, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

This reveals the log transform link between the HJB equation and the Zakai equation first described in [9].

The backward Zakai equation is also an example of a time reversal. The nature of time reversal in a backward Zakai is straightforward compared to a BSDE. The crucial difference is that $\{q_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is a backward-adapted process (That is, its value at time t depends upon randomness for times between t to T). In contrast, the solution of the BSDE is forward-adapted. As explained in the paper, adaptedness of stochastic processes is an important property for the filtering problem.

Additional reading

A tutorial style review of the log transformation, its link to the Zakai equation, specifically its path-wise robust representation, formulations of the optimal control problem and its link to the smoothing problem can be found in our review paper [49]. In addition to the Euclidean case, explicit formulae are also described for the finite state-space and linear Gaussian problem. It is shown in [29, VI-B] that Mitter-Newton's problem (S23) reduces to classical form of minimum energy duality (10) for the linear Gaussian model (3).

Significance of duality to stability theory for finite state HMM

Consider an HMM (A, H) on finite state-space $\mathbb{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. See the sidebar “Examples of HMM” for an explanation of the notation for this model. That sidebar also includes a 2-state example which is used for illustration of concepts here.

Definition 5: The Markov process is *ergodic* if 0 is a simple eigenvalue of the matrix A . A measure $\bar{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an *invariant measure* if $\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$ and $\bar{\mu}(Af) = 0$ for all $f \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Because the row sum of the matrix A is zero, 0 is an eigenvalue with a right eigenvector $[1, 1, \dots, 1]^T =: \mathbf{1}$. Now, it is a property of such rate matrices that there exists at least one left eigenvector, associated with the eigenvalue at 0, whose entries are non-negative [50]. Upon normalization by the sum of these entries, the normalized left eigenvector is an invariant measure. When the Markov process is ergodic, the invariant measure is unique.

In the 2-state example, the two eigenvalues are 0 and $-(\lambda_{12} + \lambda_{21})$. Therefore, the 2-state example is ergodic iff $(\lambda_{12} + \lambda_{21}) > 0$. For the ergodic case, the invariant measure is $\bar{\mu} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\lambda_{21}}{(\lambda_{12} + \lambda_{21})} & \frac{\lambda_{12}}{(\lambda_{12} + \lambda_{21})} \end{bmatrix}^T$.

The ergodic property is related to stability. If the Markov process is ergodic, the expectations converge to their steady-state value as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu(f(X_T)) \xrightarrow{(T \rightarrow \infty)} \bar{\mu}(f), \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$$

Here, the superscript notation $\mathbb{E}^\mu(\cdot)$ is used to denote the fact that the initial condition $X_0 \sim \mu$. A proof is obtained by showing $\mathbb{E}^\mu(f(X_T)) = \mu^T e^{AT} f$ and verifying $\mu^T e^{AT} \rightarrow \bar{\mu}^T$. In effect, for an ergodic Markov process, the expectations asymptotically forget the initial prior μ .

For an HMM (A, H) , a historically important problem is to determine conditions on the matrices A and H such that nonlinear filter (conditional expectation) asymptotically forgets the prior. Denote

$$\pi_T^\mu(f) := \mathbb{E}^\mu(f(X_T) | \mathcal{Z}_T), \quad f \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

Here $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$ has the meaning of the true prior. With an incorrect prior $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$, the filter at time T is denoted as $\pi_T^\nu(f)$. For a given function $f \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the filter is said to be L^2 stable if

$$\mathbb{E}^\mu(|\pi_T^\mu(f) - \pi_T^\nu(f)|^2) \xrightarrow{(T \rightarrow \infty)} 0 \quad \forall \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S})$$

The question of filter stability has a rich history (see [34], [51]). Even in the relatively simple settings of finite state space, the answer proved to be difficult. For example, the situation was still not clear in a 2004 paper when a set of sufficient conditions are stated in [52, Thm. 4.4]. The resolution appeared only in 2009 when a general definition of observability and detectability

properties of an HMM was introduced for the first time in [47]. To define observability, a key notion is the space of observable functions denoted as \mathcal{O} . For the finite state HMM (A, H) , an explicit characterization – in terms of the model parameters – of \mathcal{O} is possible and given in [47, Lemma 9]. In this setting, it is shown that (i) L^2 stability holds for all $f \in \mathcal{O}$, and (ii) detectability is necessary and sufficient for filter stability for all $f \in \mathbb{R}^d$ [47, Theorem 2].

Dual control system

In the settings of finite state-space, the dual processes Y and V are \mathbb{R}^d and $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ -valued, respectively. The dual control system is a finite-dimensional BSDE as follows:

$$-dY_t = \left(AY_t + HU_t + \sum_{j=1}^m \text{diag}(H^j)V_t^j \right) dt - V_t dZ_t, \quad Y_T = c1 \quad (\text{S24})$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}$, H^j and V_t^j are the j -th column of the matrices H and V_t , respectively, and $U \in \mathcal{U}$ is the control input.

(S24) is a finite-dimensional linear control system with the solution operator $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by $\mathcal{L}(U, c) = Y_0$. The controllable space $\mathcal{C}_T = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$ is a subspace of \mathbb{R}^d . An explicit characterization of \mathcal{C}_T is as follows:

Proposition 3: [26, Prop. 1] For each $T > 0$, \mathcal{C}_T equals the smallest subspace $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ that satisfies the following two properties:

- 1) The constant vector $1 \in \mathcal{C}$; and
- 2) If $g \in \mathcal{C}$ then $Ag \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\text{diag}(H^j)g \in \mathcal{C}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

Remarkably, the controllable space \mathcal{C} coincides with the space of observable functions \mathcal{O} [26, Rem. 13]. In this manner, consideration of the dual control system yields a natural definition of observability of the HMM. Discovery of the appropriate definition of observability took substantial effort during the first decade of 2000.

For the 2-state example, the controllable space

$$\mathcal{C} = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} h(1) \\ h(2) \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

irrespective of A , and therefore, the 2-state system is controllable iff $h(1) \neq h(2)$. While we do not define stabilizability for the general model, the 2-state model is *stabilizable* if any one of the two conditions hold:

- 1) (A, H) is controllable (i.e., $h(1) \neq h(2)$); or if it is not then
- 2) A is ergodic (i.e., $\lambda_{12} + \lambda_{21} > 0$).

Table S1: Comparison of the controllability–observability duality for linear and nonlinear systems

	Linear deterministic systems	Nonlinear stochastic systems
Function space for inputs and outputs	$\mathcal{U} = L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ $\langle u, v \rangle = \int_0^T u_t^T v_t dt$	$\mathcal{U} = L_{\mathbb{Z}}^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ $\langle U, V \rangle = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left(\int_0^T U_t^T V_t dt\right)$
Function space for the dual state	$\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^d$ $\langle x, y \rangle = x^T y$	$\mathcal{Y} = C_b(\mathbb{S}), \mathcal{Y}^\dagger = \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ $\langle \mu, y \rangle = \mu(y)$
Linear operators	$\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}, u \mapsto y_0$ by ODE (2) $\mathcal{L}^\dagger : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{U},$ $x_0 \mapsto \{z_t : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ by ODE (1)	$\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}, (U, c) \mapsto Y_0$ by BSDE (13) $\mathcal{L}^\dagger : \mathcal{Y}^\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R},$ $\mu \mapsto (\{\sigma_t(h) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}, \mu(1))$ by the Zakai equation (S15)
Controllability	$\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathbb{R}^d$	$\overline{\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{L})} = \mathcal{Y}$
Observability	$\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{L}^\dagger) = \{0\}$	$\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{L}^\dagger) = \{0\}$
Duality	$\mathbf{R}(\mathcal{L})^\perp = \mathbf{N}(\mathcal{L}^\dagger) \implies$ A state-output system is observable iff the dual control system is controllable.	

Table S2: Comparison of the Mitter-Newton duality and the duality proposed in our work

	Mitter-Newton duality	Duality proposed in our work
Filtering/smoothing obj.	Minimize relative entropy (K-L)	Minimize variance (m.s.e.)
Observation (output) process	Pathwise (z is a sample path)	Z is a stochastic process
Control (input) process	U_t has dimension of the process noise	U, Z are both elem. of $L^2_{\mathcal{Z}}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$
Dual optimal control prob.	Eq. (S23)	Eq. (14)
Arrow of time	Forward-in-time	Backward-in-time
State-space	\mathbb{S} : same as the state-space for X_t	\mathcal{Y} : the space of functions on \mathbb{S}
Constraint	Controlled copy of the state process	Dual control system BSDE (14b)
Running cost (Lagrangian)	$l(x, u; z_t) = \frac{1}{2} u ^2 + \frac{1}{2} \dot{z}_t - h(x) ^2_{R^{-1}}$	$l(y, v, u; x) = (\Gamma y)(x) + u + v(x) ^2_R$
Value function (meaning)	Minus log of posterior density	Expected value of conditional variance
Model property (for analysis of asymptotic stability)	Unclear	Stabilizability of BSDE
Optimal solution gives	Equation of smoothing	Equation of nonlinear filtering
Linear-Gaussian special case	Minimum energy duality (10)	Minimum variance duality (5)



Figure S1: Word cloud of the Kalman-Bucy's paper [2]. The word 'dual' or 'duality' appears a total of 42 times in the paper. The word 'optimal' with 78 appearances is the highest frequency word in the paper. The commonly used English language words such as 'and', 'the' etc., have been excluded from the word cloud.




Figure S2: Kalman's duality between controllability and observability: The two are properties of a linear operator and its adjoint.




Figure S3: Arrow of time: (top) in stochastic optimal control, a control system is integrated forward-in-time from initial condition $X_0 = x$; (middle) dual optimal control system is integrated backward-in-time from terminal condition $Y_T = f$. In either case, the control input U_t at time t is allowed to depend only upon past observations – captured using (bottom) the information structure (filtration) which evolves forward-in-time. This is key difficulty in extending Kalman’s duality to nonlinear non-Gaussian settings.





Figure S4: (a) State transition diagram for a 2-state Markov chain. (b) Probability simplex in the measure space \mathbb{R}^2 .




Figure S5: Duality for HMM: Controllability and observability are properties of a linear operator and its adjoint.