
AD-A078 433 NORTHWESTERN UNIV EVANSTON IL DEPT OF MECHANICAL ENG--ETC F/G 12/1
OPTIMAL CONTROL OF SYSTEMS WITH UNCERTAINTY.(U)
1979 W E SCHMITENDORF AFOSR-76-2923

UNCLASSIFIED AFOSR-TR-79-1257 NL

| OF |
AD-
A 078433



END
DATE
FILMED
1-80
DDC

AFOSR-TR- 79-1257

3

LEVEL

AD A078433

Progress Report on

OPTIMAL CONTROL OF SYSTEMS WITH UNCERTAINTY

The research was supported by

AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

GRANT AFOSR 76-2923

Period Covered By This Report: September 1978 - August 1979

Principal Investigator: Professor W. E. Schmitendorf
Mechanical Engineering Department
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60201

DDC FILE COPY

DDC
RECEIVED
DEC 13 1979
D

79 12 10 107

Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

UNCLASSIFIED Unclassified
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER (19) AFOSR-TR-79-1257	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. / 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) OPTIMAL CONTROL OF SYSTEMS WITH UNCERTAINTY	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED (9) Interim rept. Sep 78 - Aug 79
7. AUTHOR(s) (10) W.E. Schmitendorf	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) (15) AFOSR-76-2923
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Northwestern University Mechanical Engineering Department Evanston, IL 60201	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 61102F 2304/A1 (17) A7
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS (11) Air Force Office of Scientific Research/NM Bolling AFB, Washington, DC 20332	12. REPORT DATE 1979
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 89
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) (12) 92	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

The first problem considered was that of steering a system without distrubances to the origin when the magnitude of the control is constrained. A technique was developed for determining if a system can be steered to the origin and also a method for obtaining such a control when it exists. Next, the controllability problem was generalized by allowing for targets other than the origin. To reduce computational capability, a method was developed which exploits the affine nature of the target and requires the solution of a smaller dimensional optimization problem.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

over

UNCLASSIFIED 410 129
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

20. Abstract continued.

One other area which has been under investigation is that of avoidance control. The controllability problem for systems with disturbances is being investigated. Research is also continuing on controllability of systems without disturbances. Work is also in progress on the avoidance control problem as well as the closely related holding problem.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	
DDC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist.	Avail and/or special
A	

OPTIMAL CONTROL OF SYSTEMS WITH UNCERTAINTY

I. Introduction

In attempting to design a controller which optimally steers a system to a prescribed target, two basic problems arise. The first is to determine if there exists a control which steers the system to the target. Since we are investigating systems with disturbances, the control must steer the system to the target for all possible disturbances. If at least one such control exists, the second problem is to find the optimal one. The research being conducted under AFOSR Grant 76-2923 is concerned with obtaining techniques for solving these problems. It is believed that these techniques will aid in the design of controllers for uncertain systems. In our approach, the only assumption about the disturbance is that it belongs to a compact set. Thus, the application of this research does not require any assumption about the statistics of the disturbance and will offer an alternative design scheme to those schemes which involve stochastic processes.

II. Results Obtained

Before considering the difficult problem of controlling a system with disturbances to a general target, it was deemed necessary to first consider some simpler problems. Most controllability results assume there are no constraints on the magnitude of the controls. This is usually unrealistic, since physical limitations do place constraints on the instantaneous control values.

The first problem considered was that of steering a system without

AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (AFSC)
NOTICE OF TRANSMITTAL TO DDC
This technical report has been reviewed and is
approved for public release IAW AFR 190-12 (7b).
Distribution is unlimited.
A. D. BLOSE
Technical Information Officer

disturbances to the origin when the magnitude of the control is constrained. A technique was developed for determining if a system can be steered to the origin and also a method for obtaining such a control when it exists. These results have been submitted to the S.I.A.M. Journal on Control and Optimization and are contained in Appendix A.

Next, the controllability problem was generalized by allowing for targets other than the origin. Similar results were obtained for this problem. The specific details are reported in Appendix B and a paper has been submitted to IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control. These results were also discussed in two talks at a conference in Montreal. The summaries of these talks, which appeared in the conference proceedings, are included in Appendix C.

In some situations, the target is a linear combination of the state variables (affine target). The results discussed in Appendix B can be applied to these problems and lead to an n dimensional finite optimization problem. To reduce computational complexity, a method was developed which exploits the affine nature of the target and requires the solution of a smaller dimensional optimization problem. The computational benefits of this approach can be significant. These results were presented at the 1979 Joint Automatic Control Conference. Appendix D contains a copy of the paper which appeared in the proceedings of that conference.

With these results now established, we have been able to make some progress on problems where uncertainty is present. More details of this are given in the next section.

One other area which has been under investigation is that of

avoidance control. The problem is to determine if there exists a control, satisfying the constraints, which steer a system so as to avoid a specified target. Some results have been obtained and a manuscript on this problem is being prepared for submission for presentation at the 1980 Joint Automatic Control Conference.

III. Research in Progress

The theory for constrained controllability problems without disturbances is now fairly well developed. Using the results and insights obtained for these problems, we are currently investigating the controllability problem for systems with disturbances. Methods for determining if there exists a control which steers a system, subject to disturbances, to a target have been obtained. This research has been done in conjunction with Bruce Elenbogen, a graduate student in Applied Mathematics who is being supported by the grant. He is now writing up these results as part of his Ph.D. thesis.

Research is also continuing on controllability of systems without disturbances. We are attempting to determine methods for finding the largest set of initial states which can be steered to the target in a specified time interval. If we are successful in this endeavor, the techniques will be extended to systems with disturbances.

Work is also in progress on the avoidance control problem as well as the closely related holding problem. The holding problem is the problem of determining if there exists a control which keeps or holds a system in a prespecified region. We have shown that the results which apply to

the avoidance problem can also be used to solve the holding problem. Methods for obtaining avoidance (and holding controls) are currently under development.

IV. Additional Information

Papers resulting from the research sponsored by AFOSR under Grant AFOSR 76-2923.

1. Static Multicriteria Problems: Necessary Conditions and Sufficient Conditions, Proceedings IFAC Symposium on Large Scale Systems, Udine, Italy, June 16-20, 1976.

2. A Sufficient Condition for Minmax Control of Systems with Uncertainty in the State Equations, IEEE Trans. Auto. Control, Vol. AC-21, No. 4, August 1976. (Also in Proceedings 1976 JACC, Lafayette, Indiana).

3. Necessary Conditions and Sufficient Conditions for Static Minmax Problems, J. Math. Anal. Applic., Vol. 57, No. 2, February 1977.

4. Minmax Control of Systems with Uncertainty in the Initial State and in the State Equations, IEEE Trans. Auto. Control, Vol. AC-22, No. 2, April 1977 (Also in Proceedings 1976 Conference on Decision and Control, Clearwater Beach, Florida).

5. A Note on the Use of the Direct Sufficient Conditions in Optimal Control Problems, J. of Optimization Theory and Applic., Vol. 23, No. 3, Nov. 1977.

6. Profit Maximization Through Advertising: A Nonzero Sum Differential Game Approach (with G. Leitmann), IEEE Trans. Auto. Control, Vol. AC-23, No. 4, August 1978.

7. Optimal Control of the End-Temperature in a Semi-Infinite Rod (with W. E. Olmstead), Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik, Vol. 28, pp. 697-706, 1977.

8. Multicriteria Optimization With Uncertainty in the Dynamics, Proceedings 1977 Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing, Monticello, Illinois, Sept. 28-30, 1977.

9. Optimal Blowing (with W. E. Olmstead), SIAM J. Applied Math, Vol. 35, No. 3, November 1978.

10. A Necessary and Sufficient Condition for Local Constrained Controllability of a Linear System (with B. R. Barmish), Proc. 1978 Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing, Monticello, Illinois, Oct. 4-6, 1978.

11. Optimal Control of Systems with Multiple Criteria When Disturbances are Present, J. of Optimization Theory and Applications, Vol. 27, No. 1, Jan. 1979.

12. Constrained Controllability (with B. R. Barmish), Proc. 17th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, San Diego, Calif., Jan. 10-12, 1979.

13. A General Sufficiency Theorem for Minmax Control, J. of Optimization Theory and Applications, Vol. 27, No. 3, March 1979.

14. A Simple Derivation of Necessary Conditions for Static Minmax Problems, J. Math. Analysis and Applic., Vol. 70, No. 2, August 1979.

15. A Necessary and Sufficient Condition for Local Constrained Controllability of a Linear System (with B. R. Barmish), IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, Vol. AC-25, No. 1, Feb. 1980.

16. Controlling a System to a Target - Part I: Linear Systems with Origin as Target (with B. R. Barmish), Proceedings of Optimization Days 1979,

McGill University, Montreal, Canada, May 1979.

17. Controlling a System to a Target - Part II: Nonlinear Systems with a General Target (with B. R. Barmish), Proceedings of Optimization Days 1979, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, May 1979.

18. A Result on Controlling a Constrained Linear System to a Linear Subspace (with B. R. Barmish), Proceedings 1979 J.A.C.C., Denver, Colorado, June 1979.

19. Null Controllability of Linear Systems with Constrained Controls (with B. R. Barmish), SIAM J. on Control and Optimization (submitted).

20. New Results on Controllability of Systems of the Form $\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + f(t,u(t))$ (with B. R. Barmish), IEEE Transactions in Automatic Control (submitted).

Conferences and Lectures (Sept. 1978 - August 1979)

I presented a paper on local controllability at the 1978 Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing, Monticello, Illinois, Oct. 1978.

I presented an invited lecture on the optimal control of systems with uncertainty at the University of Rochester, November, 1978.

I presented a paper on constrained controllability at the 17th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, San Diego, Calif., Jan. 1979.

I presented two papers on controlling a system to a target at Optimization Days 1979, Montreal, Canada, May 1979.

I presented a paper on controlling a system to a linear subspace at the 1979 J.A.C.C., Denver, Colorado, June 1979.

APPENDIX A

NULL CONTROLLABILITY OF LINEAR SYSTEMS WITH CONSTRAINED CONTROLS

W. E. SCHMITENDORF* and B. R. BARMISH**

Abstract. The paper considers the problem of steering the state of a linear time-varying system to the origin when the control is subject to magnitude constraints. Necessary and sufficient conditions are given for global constrained controllability as well as a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a control (satisfying the constraints) which steers the system to the origin from a specified initial epoch (x_o,t_o). The global result does not require zero to be an interior point of the control set Ω and the theorem for constrained controllability at (x_o,t_o) only requires that Ω be compact, not that it contain zero. The results are compared to those available in the literature. Furthermore, numerical aspects of the problem are discussed as is a technique for determining a steering control.

* Technological Institute, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60201
The research of this author was supported by AFOSR Grant 76-2923.

** Department of Electrical Engineering, The University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627

1. Introduction and Formulation. Consider the problem of steering the state of a linear system

$$\text{(S)} \qquad \dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t);\ t \in [t_o,\infty)$$

to the origin from a specified initial condition

$$x(t_o) = x_o$$

by choice of control function $u(\cdot)$. Here $x(t) \in R^n$, $u(t) \in R^m$ and $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ are continuous matrices† of appropriate dimension. Unlike the usual controllability problem where the control values at each instant of time are unconstrained, we insist here that the control values at each instant of time belong to a prespecified set Ω in R^m.

Let $\mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ denote the set of functions from R into Ω that are measurable on $[t_o,\infty)$. Then any control $u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ is termed admissible. We now define three notions of constrained controllability or, more precisely, Ω-null controllability.

Definition 1.1. The linear system (S) is Ω-null controllable at (x_o,t_o) if, given the initial condition $x(t_o) = x_o$, there exists a control $u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ such that the solution $x(\cdot)$ of (S) satisfies $x(t) = 0$ for some $t \in [t_o,\infty)$.

Definition 1.2. The linear system (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at t_o if (S) is Ω-null controllable at (x_o,t_o) for all $x_o \in R^n$.

Our major result will pertain to the global type of controllability. To compare our results to those of previous researchers, we also need a local controllability concept.

Definition 1.3. The linear system (S) is locally Ω-null controllable at t_o if there exists an open set $V \subset R^n$, containing the origin, such that (S) is null controllable at (x_o,t_o) for all $x_o \in V$.

† This requirement can be weakened to local integrability.

The majority of constrained controllability results are for autonomous systems, i.e., systems where A and B are constant. When $\Omega = R^m$, Kalman [1] showed that a necessary and sufficient condition for global R^m-null controllability is rank(Q) = n where $Q \triangleq [B,AB,\ldots,A^{n-1}B]$. Lee and Markus [2] considered constraint sets $\Omega \subset R^m$ which contain u = 0 and showed that rank(Q) = n is a necessary and sufficient condition for (S) to be locally Ω-null controllable. Furthermore, if each eigenvalue λ of A satisfies $Re(\lambda) < 0$, then (S) is globally Ω-null controllable. This result is typical of the results available when Ω contains the origin.

Saperstone and Yorke [3] were the first to eliminate the assumption that zero is an interior point of Ω when they considered problems with m = 1 and $\Omega = [0,1]$. Their result states that for these problems (S) is locally Ω-null controllable if and only if rank(Q) = n and A has no real eigenvalues. They also extend this result to m > 1 and consider the m-fold product set $\Omega = \Pi_1^m[0,1]$. Problems with more general constraint sets were studied by Brammer [4] who showed that if there exists a $u \in \Omega$ satisfying Bu = 0 and the convex hull of Ω has a nonempty interior, then necessary and sufficient conditions for local Ω-null controllability are rank(Q) = n and the nonexistence of a real eigenvector v of A' satisfying $v'Bu \leq 0$ for all $u \in \Omega$. In addition, if no eigenvalue of A has a positive real part then the theorem becomes one for global Ω-null controllability. A similar result for global controllability when $\Omega = [0,1]$ was obtained by Saperstone [5]. Friedman [6] considers a linear pursuit evasion problem where the target is a closed convex set and gives a sufficient condition for the existence of a pursuer control, based on the evader's control, which drives the system from a specified initial condition to the target.

For nonautonomous systems, the most familiar controllability result is that of Kalman [1] when $\Omega = R^m$. He showed that (S) is R^m-null controllable if and only if $W(t_o,t_1)$ is positive definite for some $t_1 \in [t_o,\infty)$ where

$$W(t_o,t_1) \triangleq \int_{t_o}^{t_1} \phi(t_1,\tau)B(\tau)B'(\tau)\phi'(t_1,\tau)d\tau$$

and $\phi(t,\tau)$ is the state transition matrix for (S). When the control is constrained, the major global results are those by Conti [7] and Pandolfi [8]. In [7], Conti describes a "divergent integral condition" which is necessary and sufficient for global Ω-null controllability when Ω is the closed unit ball. In order to make Conti's result more compatible with existing theory for time-invariant systems, Pandolfi in [8] defines the notion of p-th characteristic exponent for time varying systems. For the special case when the system is time-invariant, the characteristic exponent turns out to be the real part of some eigenvalue of A. Subsequently, controllability criteria are provided in terms of this exponent.

The Ω-null controllability problem is also studied in papers by Dauer [9], [10], Chukwu and Gronski [11] and Chukwu and Silliman [12]. In order to decide on the question of Ω-controllability, one must test a certain growth condition which involves searching a function space. In contrast, the results given here are finite-dimensional in nature.

In [13],, Grantham and Vincent consider the problem of steering a nonlinear system to a target. They present a technique for determining the boundary between the set of states which can be steered to the target and those which cannot. More recently, Murthy and Evans [14] obtained results comparable to [3]-[5] for discrete linear systems and Pachter and Jacobson [15] developed sufficient conditions for controllability for case where $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ are time-invariant and Ω is a closed convex cone containing the origin. A readable account of the state of the art is contained in the book by Jacobson [16, Chapter 5].

In contrast to much of the work of previous authors, this paper concentrates on the case where $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ are time-varying. Our results for global Ω-null controllability are for constraint sets Ω that are compact and contain zero

(but not necessarily as an interior point). One of our main results on global Ω-null controllability is an extension of a theorem of Conti [7] and it degenerates to Conti's theorem when Ω is a unit ball.

Our results for Ω-null controllability at (x_o,t_o) have even wider applicability since they do not require $0 \in \Omega$. Neither do they require the existence of a $u \in \Omega$ such that $Bu = 0$ as in [3]-[5], [7]-[12]. Thus we can analyze controllability of a system with, for example, $m = 1$ and $\Omega = [1,2]$ whereas many of the presently available theorems do not apply. Furthermore, as will be illustrated by examples, there are autonomous systems (S) which are neither globally Ω-null controllable nor locally Ω-null controllable but nevertheless are Ω-null controllable at some (x_o,t_o). Our theorem can be used to decompose the state space into two sets. Initial states in one set can be steered to the origin while those in the other cannot be driven to the origin by an admissible control.

2. Main Results. In order to describe our necessary and sufficient conditions for global Ω-null controllability, we make use of the support function $H_\Omega: R^m \to R \cup \{+\infty\}$ on Ω which for any $\alpha \in R^m$ is given by

$$H_\Omega(\alpha) \triangleq \sup\{w'\alpha : w \in \Omega\} \quad .$$

Using this notation, we have the following theorem, which is proven in Appendix A.

Theorem 2.1. Suppose Ω is a compact set which contains zero†. Then, (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at t_o if and only if

$$\int_{t_o}^{\infty} H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = +\infty \tag{2.1}$$

for all non-zero solutions $z(\cdot)$ of the adjoint system

$$\dot{z}(t) = -A'(t)z(t);\ t \in [t_o,\infty) \quad , \tag{S'}$$

† The theorem is also valid if the requirement "$0 \in \Omega$" is replaced with "there exists a $u \in \Omega$ such that $Bu = 0$". This type of assumption is used by Brammer [4].

or equivalently, if and only if

$$\int_{t_o}^{\infty} \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(t_o,\tau)\lambda : \omega \in \Omega\}d\tau = +\infty$$

for all $\lambda \in R^n$, $\lambda \neq 0$.

We note that $H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau))$ can be viewed as the composition of a non-negative Baire function with a measurable function. Hence, the integral in (2.1) is well defined along all trajectories $z(\cdot)$ of (S).

In the following corollary, we examine the special case of Theorem 2.1 which arises under the strengthened hypothesis "zero is an interior point of Ω." As we might anticipate, for this special case, the structure of the set Ω will not matter other than the requirement that it contains zero in its interior.

Corollary 2.2. (See Appendix A for proof): Suppose there exists a compact set Ω such that

(i) zero is an interior point of Ω;

(ii) (S) is globally Ω-null controllable.

Then (S) is also globally Ω'-null controllable for any other set Ω' (not necessarily compact) which contains zero in its interior.

Our proof of Theorem 2.1 will make use of a more fundamental result (also proven in Appendix A) giving conditions for Ω-null controllability at a fixed initial epoch (x_o,t_o). To meet this end, we define the scalar function $J : R^n \times R \times R^n \to R$ by

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) \triangleq x_o'\Phi'(T,t_o)\lambda + \int_{t_o}^{T} H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)d\tau \tag{2.2}$$

We note that $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ can be viewed as the support function on the so-called attainable set. This fact is used implicitly in the proof of the next theorem.

Theorem 2.3. Let Ω be a compact set. Pick any subset Λ of R^n which contains 0 as an interior point. Then (S) is Ω-null controllable at (x_o,t_o) if and only if

$$\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

for some $T \in [t_o,\infty)$, or equivalently, if and only if,

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \lambda \in \Lambda \tag{2.4}$$

for some $T \in [t_o,\infty)$.

Comment. If Ω is also convex and A and B are constant, the sufficiency portion of this theorem is just a special case of Theorem 7.2.1 of [6]. Naturally, the smallest time T for which (2.3) holds will be the minimum arrival time at the origin.

Theorem 2.3 can also be stated in terms of the adjoint system (S'), i.e., if we take $\Lambda = R^n$ and notice that $z(t) = \Phi'(t_o,t)z(t_o)$ is the response of the adjoint system (S'), then the following theorem is easily proven. (The proof is established by making the change of variables $z(t) \triangleq \Phi'(T,t)\lambda$).

Theorem 2.3'. Let Ω satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 2.3. Then (S) is Ω-null controllable at (x_o,t_o) if and only if there exists some $T \in [t_o,\infty)$ such that

$$x_o'z(t_o) + \int_{t_o}^{T} H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau \geq 0 \tag{2.5}$$

for all solutions $z(\cdot)$ of (S').

This theorem demonstrates that the question of Ω-null controllability at (x_o,t_o) can be answered by solving a finite dimensional optimization problem. Moreover, the question of global Ω-null controllability can also be answered via a finite dimensional optimization problem.

Corollary 2.4. Let Ω and Λ be as in Theorem 2.3. Then (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at t_o if and only if for every $x_o \in R^n$ there is a time $T_{x_o} \in [t_o,\infty)$ such that

$$\min\{J(x_o,T_{x_o},\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} = 0 \quad .$$

The proof of this corollary follows from Theorem 2.3 in conjunction with the definition of global Ω-null controllability.

There is one point worth noting. In using Theorem 2.1 to check for Ω-null controllability at t_o, Ω must be compact and contain 0. If Corollary 2.4 is used, only the compactness assumption must be satisfied.

Next, we present some examples to illustrate how our theorems can be applied and to compare our results to those of [3-5].

Example 1. Let $x(t)$ and $u(t)$ be scalars and suppose (S) is described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = x(t) + u(t) \quad , \quad t \in [0,\infty) \quad .$$

This system is R^1-null controllable if $\Omega = R^1$. But suppose $\Omega = [0,1]$. Then the system is not globally Ω-null controllable at $t_o = 0$. This follows from Theorem 2.1 since, for $z_o < 0$, $H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau)) = 0$ and thus $\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau < +\infty$. Also, using [3] or [4] it can be shown that the system is not locally Ω-null controllable. Nevertheless, there do exist initial states x_o from which it is possible to steer the system to the origin. Such states can be determined via Theorem 2.3.

For the above

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) = x_o e^T\lambda + \int_o^T \sup\{we^{T-\tau}\lambda : w \in [0,1]\}d\tau$$

When $\Lambda = [-1,1]$, this becomes

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) = \begin{cases} x_o e^T\lambda & \lambda \le 0 \\ x_o e^T\lambda + \lambda(e^T - 1) & \lambda > 0 \end{cases}$$

and thus

$$\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda) : \lambda \in [-1,1]\} = 0$$

if and only if $x_o \leq 0$ and $x_o \geq e^{-T} - 1$ for some $T \in [0,\infty)$, or equivalently, if and only if $-1 < x_o \leq 0$. We conclude that even though (S) is not locally Ω-null controllable, it is Ω-null controllable at $(x_o,0)$ whenever $-1 < x_o \leq 0$.

If $\Omega = [1,2]$, neither [3-5] nor Theorem 2.1 apply. However, we can use Theorem 2.3. Since

$$H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda) = \begin{cases} 2\lambda e^{(T-\tau)} & \lambda > 0 \\ \lambda e^{(T-\tau)} & \lambda \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

$J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ becomes

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) = \begin{cases} x_o e^T\lambda + 2\lambda(e^T - 1) & \lambda > 0 \\ x_o e^T\lambda + \lambda(e^T - 1) & \lambda \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda) : \lambda \in [-1,1]\} = 0$$

if and only if $2(e^{-T} - 1) \leq x_o \leq e^{-T} - 1$. Thus (S), with $\Omega = [1,2]$, is Ω-null controllable at $(x_o,0)$ whenever $-2 < x_o \leq 0$.

As a final variation of this problem, suppose $\Omega = [-a,a]$. Then [4] or Theorem 2.1, shows that (S) is not globally Ω-null controllable. Using [4], it can be demonstrated that (S) is locally Ω-null controllable while Theorem 2.3 not only tells us that (S) is locally Ω-null controllable but also that the states x_o which can be steered to the origin are those satisfying $-a < x_o < a$.

Example 2. Our second example illustrates the application of Theorem 2.1 for a nonautonomous system. We consider the time-varying two-dimensional system (S) described by

$$\dot{x}_1(t) = u(t)\sin t$$

$$\dot{x}_2(t) = -\frac{1}{(t+1)^2}\, x_1(t) + u(t)t\sin t, \quad t \in [0,\infty)$$

The control constraint set is taken to be $\Omega = [0,1]$. By a straightforward computation, the state transition matrix for the adjoint system (S') is found to be

$$\Phi_*(t,t_o) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \dfrac{t - t_o}{(t+1)(t_o+1)} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Hence, in accordance with Theorem 2.1, (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at $t_o = 0$ if and only if

$$\int_o^\infty \sup_{\omega\in[0,1]} \omega[\sin\tau \quad \tau\sin\tau] \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{\tau}{\tau+1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z_{01} \\ z_{02} \end{bmatrix} d\tau = +\infty$$

for <u>all</u> non-zero initial conditions $z_0 \triangleq [z_{01}\ z_{02}]'$. Evaluating above, this reduces to the requirmment that

$$(2.6) \qquad \int_o^\infty I(\tau)d\tau \triangleq \int_o^\infty \max\left\{0, z_{01}\sin\tau + z_{02}\,\tau\sin\tau\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau+1}\right)\right\} d\tau = +\infty$$

for all $z_0 \neq 0$. We shall show that this condition is indeed satisfied.

<u>Case 1</u>. $z_{01} \neq 0$, $z_{02} = 0$. For this case, we have

$$\int_o^\infty I(\tau)d\tau = \int_o^\infty \max\{0,\ z_{01}\sin\tau\}d\tau$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{T}_1} z_{01}\sin\tau\, d\tau$$

where $\mathcal{T}_1 \triangleq \{\tau \geq 0:\ z_{01}\sin\tau > 0\}$. Because the range set $\mathcal{T}_1$ of integration is the union of infinitely many intervals of length π, it follows that

$$\int_o^\infty I(\tau)d\tau = +\infty \quad .$$

Case 2. z_{01} = anything, $z_{02} \neq 0$. Let $T^* \triangleq \frac{|z_{01}| + 1}{|z_{02}|}$. Then to verify (2.6), it sufficies to show that

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}_2} I(\tau)d\tau = +\infty$$

where $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{\tau \geq T^* : z_{02} \sin \tau > 0\}$. (Recall that the integrand is non-negative.) Now, for $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2$, we notice that the integrand $I(\tau)$ can be bounded from below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} z_{01}\sin \tau + z_{02}\tau \sin \tau\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau+1}\right) &\geq |z_{02}||\sin \tau|\tau\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau+1}\right) - |z_{01}||\sin \tau| \\ &\geq \left(|z_{02}|\ \tau - |z_{01}|\right)|\sin \tau| \\ &\geq \left(|z_{02}|\ T^* - |z_{01}|\right)|\sin \tau| \\ &= |\sin \tau| \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}_2} I(\tau)d\tau \geq \int_{\mathcal{T}_2} |\sin \tau|d\tau = +\infty$$

because the range of integration is once again the union of infinitely many intervals of length π.

We conclude that (S) is globally Ω-null controllable.

3. Relationship with Other Controllability Results. In this section, we compare our controllability results with those of Conti [7] and Brammer [4]. We also consider, as a limiting case of our theory, the usual controllability problem obtained when magnitude constraints are not present.

Result of Conti. An important special case of Theorem 2.1 occurs when Ω is a closed unit ball in R^m, i.e.,

$$\Omega = \{w \in R^m : \|w\| \leq 1\}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is a prespecified norm on R^m. For this situation we have

$$H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)z(\tau)) = \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)z(\tau) : \|\omega\| \leq 1\} = \|B'(\tau)z(\tau)\|_*$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the norm on R^m which is dual to $\|\cdot\|$. (For example $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the ℓ^1 norm when $\|\cdot\|$ is the ℓ^∞ norm; $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_*$ coincide when $\|\cdot\|$ is the usual ℓ^2 (Euclidean) norm.)

By Theorem 2.1, we conclude that (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at t_o if and only if

$$\int_{t_o}^{\infty} \|B'(\tau)z(\tau)\|_* d\tau = +\infty \tag{3.1}$$

for all non-zero solutions $z(\cdot)$ of (S'). This result is established independently in Conti [7] and also discussed in Pandolfi [8]. This result, in conjunction with Corollary 2.2 leads immediately to the following Proposition.

Proposition 3.1. Let Ω be any set containing zero in its interior. Then (3.1) is a necessary and sufficient condition for global Ω-null controllability.

Thus, Conti's condition is a necessary and sufficient condition for global Ω-null controllability for any set Ω containing zero in its interior, not just when Ω is the closed unit ball.

Result of Brammer. Consider the case when $A(t) \equiv A$ and $B(t) \equiv B$ are time-invariant. For these autonomous problems, the following necessary conditions can be obtained directly from Theorem 2.1. Recall that $Q = [B, AB, \ldots, A^{n-1}B]$.

Theorem 3.2. Assume $A(t) \equiv A$ and $B(t) \equiv B$ are time-invariant and that Ω is a compact set which contains the origin. If (S) is globally Ω-null controllable then

(i) rank $(Q) = n$

(ii) there is no real eigenvector v of A' satisfying $v'B\omega \leq 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$.

(iii) no eigenvalue of A has a positive real part.

The proof of this result is in Appendix B.

In [4], Brammer has obtained the same result using a different method of proof. There, he also shows that the above three conditions are also sufficient for global Ω-null controllability in the time invariant case if it is also assumed that the convex hull of Ω has a non-empty interior. Alternative proofs of the sufficiency result have been given by Heymann and Stern [25] and Hajek. The latter proof is in [5].

We note that the system of Example 1 of Section 2 does not satisfy these three conditions. Nevertheless, it is Ω-null controllable at $(x_o,0)$ for some initial states x_o.

The Case $\Omega=R^m$. When $\Omega=R^m$, it is well known [17, p. 171] that the time-varying system (S) is completely controllable (globally R^m-null controllable at t_o in our notation) if and only if the rows of $\phi(t_o,\cdot)B(\cdot)$ are linearly independent on some bounded interval $[t_o,T]$. Here we show that when $\Omega=R^m$, equation (2.1) is a necessary and sufficient condition for global R^m-null controllability. This is accomplished by showing that (2.1) is equivalent to the rows of $\phi(t_o,\cdot)B(\cdot)$ being linearly independent on some bounded interval $[t_o,T]$.

Proposition 3.3. (S) is globally R^m-null controllable if and only if

$$\int_{t_o}^{\infty} H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = +\infty$$

for all non-zero solutions $z(\cdot)$ of (S').

The proof of this result is in Appendix B.

4. Some Computational Aspects. In a large number of problems, one may have to resort to the computer to check whether or not a system is Ω-null controllable. When using equation (2.3), a solution of the minimization problem $\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda): \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is needed. Direct application of so-called gradient or descent algorithms to compute $\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda): \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is precluded by the fact that $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is in general not differentiable in λ. This fact is a consequence

of the sup operation involved in the definition of $H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)$. Fortunately, however, numerical computation of $\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda): \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is feasible if "generalized steepest descent" schemes are used. These schemes rely on subdifferential† rather than gradient information. The next two lemmas develop a description of the subdifferential of $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$. The proofs are given in Appendix C.

Lemma 4.1. For fixed $(x_o,T) \in R^n \times R$, $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is a lower semicontinuous convex function of λ.

Lemma 4.2. For fixed $(x_o,T) \in R^n \times R$, the subdifferential of $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ at $\lambda \in R^n$ consists of all vectors $\lambda_* \in R^n$ of the form

$$\lambda_* = \Phi(T,t_o)x_o + \int_{t_o}^{T} \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)w_*(\tau)d\tau \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$w_*(\tau) \in \arg\max\{w'B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda : w \in \Omega\} \tag{4.2}$$

$$= \{w \in \Omega : w'B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda \geq \eta\, B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda \ \forall\, \eta \in \Omega\}$$

for almost all $\tau \in [0,T]$.

Remark. Since $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is the support function on the attainable set (see discussion preceding Theorem 2.3), a geometric interpretation of the subdifferential at λ is available: This set consists of all vectors in the normal cone to the attainable set at λ. (See Goodman [24, p. 285]).

Formulae (4.1) and (4.2) hold for arbitrary compact-convex Ω. Often however, more structural information is known about Ω. In such cases, (4.1) and (4.2) may simplify. To illustrate, suppose

† $\lambda_* \in \partial J(x_o,T,\lambda)$, the subdifferential of $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ at λ, if and only if

$$J(x_o,T,z) \geq J(x_o,T,\lambda) + (z - \lambda)'\lambda_* \quad \text{for all } z \in R^n \ .$$

$$\Omega = [-M_1,M_1] \times [-M_2,M_2] \times \ldots \times [-M_m,M_m] \; ; \; (M_i > 0)$$

Then, the maximum in (4.2) is achieved in the i^{th} component by

$$[\omega_*(\tau)]_i \in M_i \; \text{sgn}[B'(\tau)\phi'(T,\tau)\lambda]_i \; ; \; i = 1,2,\ldots,m$$

where sgn $x \triangleq 1$ if $x > 0$; sgn $x \triangleq -1$ if $x < 0$; sgn $0 \triangleq [-1,1]$. Consequently, for this case, we can substitute into (4.1) and show that the subdifferential $\partial J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ consists of all vectors $\lambda_* \in R^n$ of the form

$$\lambda_* = \phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \sum_{i=1}^m M_i h_i(T,\tau)\,\text{sgn}\,\lambda' h_i(T,\tau)\,d\tau \tag{4.3}$$

where $h_i(T,\tau)$ is the i^{th} column of $H(T,\tau) \triangleq \phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)$. This description of the subdifferentials of $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ can be used in conjunction with the generalized steepest descent algorithms to compute $\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda): \lambda \in \Lambda\}$.

We also note that λ_* is uniquely specified by (4.3) if

$$\text{measure}\{\tau : \lambda' h_i(T,\tau) = 0\} = 0 \quad \underline{\text{for}} \quad i = 1,2,\ldots,m \; .$$

For such λ, $\partial J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is precisely $\nabla_\lambda J(x_o,T,\lambda)$, the gradient of $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ at λ.

5. The Steering Control. Using the results of Section 2, we can determine if (S) is Ω-null controllable. However, those results do not give a method for determining a steering control $u_*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)$ which accomplishes this objective.

One method of determining an appropriate $u_*(\cdot)$ is to solve the time optimal control problem, i.e., find $u_*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)$ which steers (S) from given (x_o,t_o) to the origin and does so in minimum time. If there is a control which steers the system to the origin, then there is a time optimal one [2]. Hence, in principle, a steering control can be numerically computed using any of a wide variety of algorithms which are available for solution of the time optimal control problem.

Since the solution of the time optimal problem is determined by solving a two point boundary value problem, it can be quite difficult to obtain the steering control this way. In this section, a "simpler" alternative method for

generating a steering control is presented. This technique does not involve a two point boundary value problem and leads to a control which steers the system arbitrarily close to the origin. Our result is obtained from the following minimum norm problem:† Given initial point (x_o,t_o) and a final time T, find $u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ which leads to the smallest value of $\|x(T)\|$. The solution of this minimum norm problem is characterized in the next theorem.

Theorem 5.1. (See Appendix D for proof). Let (x_o,t_o) and T be given. Suppose that $\lambda_* \in R^n$ achieves the minimum of $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ over the closed unit ball. Then any solution of the minimum norm problem satisfies

$$u_*(\tau) \in \arg\max\{\omega'B'(\tau)\phi'(T,\tau)\lambda_* : \omega \in \Omega\} \tag{5.1}$$

for almost all $\tau \in [t_o,T]$.

We note that condition (5.1) will uniquely determine $u_*(\cdot)$ whenever the minimum of $\omega'B'(\tau)\phi'(T,\tau)\lambda_*$ is uniquely achieved. For example, suppose

$$\Omega = [-M_1,M_1] \times [-M_2,M_2] \times \ldots \times [-M_m,M_m] \quad (M_i > 0) \ .$$

Then (5.1) requires

$$[u_*(\tau)]_i \in M_i \operatorname{sgn}[B'(\tau)\phi'(T,\tau)\lambda_*]_i \ , \quad i = 1,2,\ldots,m. \tag{5.2}$$

For the case when the minimum of $\|x(T)\| = 0$, $\lambda_* = 0$ and (5.1) will not determine a control which steers (S) to the origin. The following heuristic procedure can be used to determine a control which steers (S) arbitrarily close to the origin: Choose a T such that the minimum of $\|x(T)\|$ is nonzero. As T is increased, the minimum of $\|x(T)\|$ approaches zero and the corresponding solution $u_*(\cdot)$, generated via (5.2), of the minimum norm problem results in a control which steers the system progressively closer to the origin.

---

† (S) here is required to be R^m-null controllable.

In our next theorem, we provide another useful characterization of steering controls. For fixed $T \in [0,\infty)$, $x_o \in R^n$, we define the functional V_T: $R^n \times \mathfrak{M}(\Omega) \to R$ by

$$V_T(\lambda,u(\cdot)) = \lambda'\Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_0^T \lambda'\Phi\ (T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau$$

Theorem 5.2. (See Appendix D for proof). Pick any compact convex set Λ containing zero as an interior point. Then $V_T(\lambda,u(\cdot))$ possesses at least one saddle point $(\lambda_*,u_*(\cdot)) \in \Lambda \times \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$. Moreover, $u_*(\cdot)$ steers x_o to zero at time T if and only if $V_T(\lambda_*,u_*(\cdot)) = 0$.

6. Additional Applications. In this section, we use our results to obtain an existence theorem for the time optimal control problem and also apply our results to a pursuit game.

Existence of Time Optimal Controls. Consider the following time optimal control problem: Find $u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ which drives the state $x(\cdot)$ of (S) from an initial position $x(t_o) = x_o$ to the origin and minimizes

$$C(u(\cdot)) = \int_{t_o}^{t_f} dt \quad ; \quad t_f = \text{arrival time at the origin.}$$

The classical theorem for existence of a time optimal control (e.g., Lee and Markus [2]) requires that there is at least one control which transfers the state $x(\cdot)$ of (S) to the origin. Combining the result of [2] with our Theorem 2.3, we obtain the following existence lemma.

Lemma 6.1. There exists a solution to the time optimal control problem if and only if there is some finite $t_f \in [t_o,\infty)$ such that

$$\min\{J(x_o,t_f,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} = 0 \quad .$$

Furthermore, the time optimal cost is given by

$$C^*(u_*(\cdot)) = \min\{t_f : \min[J(x_o,t_f,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda] = 0\} \quad .$$

Pursuit Games. Next, we consider the pursuit game studied by Hajek [18]. The system is described by

$$(6.1) \qquad \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) - p(t) + q(t) \; ; \; p(t) \in P \; , \; q(t) \in Q \quad x(t_o) = x_o$$

where P and Q are compact convex subsets of R^n. The pursuer $p(\cdot)$ seeks a strategy $\sigma : Q \times [t_o,\infty) \to P$ which steers $x(\cdot)$ to the origin for all possible quarry controls $q(\cdot) : [t_o,\infty) \to Q$. A quarry control is admissible if it is measurable and a strategy is admissible if $\sigma(\cdot)$ preserves measurability.

In [18], a solution to this problem is obtained in terms of the associated control system

$$\dot{y}(t) = Ay(t) - u(t) \; ; \; u(t) \in P \overset{*}{-} Q \; ; \; y(t_o) = x_o \tag{6.2}$$

where $P \overset{*}{-} Q$ is the Pontryagin difference. i.e.,

$$P \overset{*}{-} Q \triangleq \{x \in R^n : x + Q \subseteq P\} \quad .$$

Admissible controls $u(\cdot)$ above must be measurable.

Simply put, Hajek's result says that the state $x(\cdot)$ of (6.1) can be forced to the origin, for all admissible $q(\cdot)$, if and only if the state $y(\cdot)$ of (6.2) can be steered to the origin. More precisely, the following theorem is available.

First Reciprocity Theorem [18]. Initial position x_o in (6.1) can be (stroboscopically) forced to the origin at time $T \geq t_o$ by a strategy $\sigma(\cdot)$ if and only if, x_o in (6.2) can be steered to the origin at time T by an admissible control $u(\cdot)$. Furthermore, $\sigma(\cdot)$ and $u(\cdot)$ are related by

$$\sigma(q,t) = u(t) + q \quad . \tag{6.3}$$

By applying Theorem 2.3 to (6.2), we obtain another condition for determining if (6.1) can be forced to the origin.

Lemma 6.2. Assume $P \overset{*}{-} Q$ compact. Pick any subset Λ of R^n containing zero as an interior point. Then x_o in (6.1) can be forced to the origin at time $T \geq t_o$ by a strategy $\sigma(\cdot)$ if and only if

$$\min\{K(x_o,T,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} = 0$$

where

$$K(x_o,T,\lambda) \triangleq x_o' e^{A'(T - t_o)}\lambda + \int_{t_o}^{T} H_{P \overset{*}{-} Q}(e^{A'(T - \tau)}\lambda)d\tau$$

It should be pointed out that in addition to pursuit game interpretation of (6.1), (6.1) can also be viewed as a problem of steering a system with disturbances to the origin if $q(\cdot)$ is thought of as a disturbance. Also, the results apply to systems described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bp(t) + Cq(t) \; ; \; p(t) \in P \quad , \quad q(t) \in Q$$

if one replaces $Bp(t)$ by $p'(t)$, $Cq(t)$ by $-q'(t)$, P by BP and Q by CQ.

APPENDIX A

Proof of Theorems 2.1, 2.3 and Corollary 2.2. Since Theorem 2.3 is used in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we first present the proof of Theorem 2.3. There are many ways to prove Theorem 2.3; our proof exploits the convexity of the attainable set in conjunction with a measurable selection theorem. We note that a proof of the sufficiency part of the theorem is given in [6, Theorem 7.2.1]. To simplify our notation, we henceforth take $t_o = 0$ without loss of generality. This will apply to subsequent appendices as well.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let $A_T(x_o)$ be the set of states which can be attained from x_o at time T, i.e.,

$$(A.1) \qquad A_T(x_o) = \left\{\Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau \; : \; u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{m}(\Omega)\right\} \; .$$

The set $A_T(x_o)$ is convex and compact [2]. From Def. 1.1, it follows that x_o can be steered to 0 at time T if and only if $0 \in A_T(x_o)$ or, equivalently, by the Separating Hyerplane Theorem [21],

$$(A.2) \qquad 0 \leq \sup\left\{\lambda' a \; : \; a \in A_T(x_o)\right\}$$

for all vectors $\lambda \in R^n$. Using (A.1), requirement (A.2) becomes

$$(A.3) \qquad \lambda'\Phi(T,0)x_o + \sup\left\{\int_o^T \lambda'\Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau \; : \; u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{m}(\Omega)\right\} \geq 0$$

for all $\lambda \in R^n$. As a consequence of the measurable selection theory of [19], we can commute the supremum and integral operations in (A.3)†. Thus, $0 \in A_T(x_o)$ if and only if

$$(A.4) \qquad 0 \leq \lambda'\Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)d\tau = J(x_o,T,\lambda)$$

for all $\lambda \in R^n$. Since $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is positively homogeneous in λ, we can restrict λ to Λ in (A.4). Theorem 2.3 now follows. □

† $\Phi(T,\tau)\,B(\tau)$ being a Cartheodory function enables us to apply the results of [19].

Next, we present the proof of Theorem 2.1. In the proof, Theorem 2.3 is used.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 (Necessity): We suppose that (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at $t_o = 0$. Let $z(\cdot)$ be any non-zero solution of (S'); we must prove that

$$\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = +\infty \quad . \tag{A.5}$$

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose there is a non-zero solution $\hat{z}(\cdot)$ such that

$$\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\hat{z}(\tau))d\tau = \alpha \ , \quad \alpha < \infty$$

Then there is a positive constant $\beta < \infty$ such that

$$\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\hat{z}(\tau))d\tau < \beta$$

Define

$$x_o^* \triangleq \frac{-2\beta\hat{z}(0)}{\hat{z}'(0)\hat{z}(0)} \ ; \ x_o^* \neq 0 \quad .$$

We now claim that x_o^* cannot be steered to zero by an admissible control $u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{m}(\Omega)$. To prove our claim, for each $t \in [0,\infty)$, define

$$\lambda_t \triangleq \Phi'(0,t)\hat{z}(0) \ ; \ \lambda_t \neq 0 \quad .$$

Now, given any $t \in [0,\infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} J(x_o^*,t,\lambda_t) &= x_o^{*\prime}\Phi'(t,0)\lambda_t + \int_o^t H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(t,\tau)\lambda_t)d\tau \\ &= x_o^{*\prime}\hat{z}(0) + \int_o^t H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\hat{z}(\tau))d\tau \\ &\leq -2\beta + \beta \\ &< 0 \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\Lambda = R^n$ in Theorem 2.3, it follows that

$$\min\{J(x_o^*,t,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \leq J(x_o^*,t,\lambda_t) < 0$$

for all $t \in [0,\infty)$. By Theorem 2.3, (S) is <u>not</u> Ω-null controllable at $(x_o^*,0)$. □

(Sufficiency): Now, we assume that (A.5) holds. Again, we proceed by contradiction, i.e., suppose (S) is <u>not</u> globally Ω-null controllable at $t_o = 0$. Hence, there exists an initial condition $x_o^* \neq 0$ which cannot be steered to zero. By Theorem 2.3 (with $\Lambda = R^n$), we can find a sequence of times $\langle t_k \rangle_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and a sequence of vectors $\langle \lambda_k \rangle_{k=1}^{\infty}$ having the following properties:

P1. $\lim_{k \to \infty} t_k = +\infty$;

P2. $J(x_o^*,t_k,\lambda_k) < 0$ for $k = 1,2,3...$

We are going to construct an initial condition $\tilde{z}_o \neq 0$ for (S') which makes the integral in (A.5) finite. To meet this end, let

$$z_k = \frac{\phi'(t_k,0)\lambda_k}{\|\phi'(t_k,0)\lambda_k\|} \quad ; \quad k = 1,2,... \quad ;$$

We note that each z_k above is non-zero because $\lambda_k \neq 0$ and $\phi(t_k,0)$ is invertible. Then $\langle z_k \rangle_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence in R^n belonging to the set

$$S \triangleq \{z \in R^n : \|z\| = 1\} \quad .$$

Since S is compact, we can extract a subsequence $\langle z_{k_j} \rangle_{j=1}^{\infty}$ which converges to some vector $\tilde{z}_o \in S$. We will now show that $\tilde{z}_o$ is the initial condition which we seek. Let $\tilde{z}(\cdot)$ be the trajectory of (S') generated by $z(0) \triangleq \tilde{z}_o$; let $\langle t_{k_j} \rangle_{j=1}^{\infty}$

denote the subsequence of times corresponding to $\langle z_{k_j} \rangle_{j=1}^{\infty}$. By P1, we have

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} t_{k_j} = + \infty$$

and by P2, it follows that

$$x_o^{*\prime}\phi'(t_{k_j},0)\lambda_{k_j} + \int_o^{t_{k_j}} H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\phi'(t_{k_j},\tau)\lambda_{k_j})d\tau < 0 \quad \underline{\text{for}} \quad j = 1,2,3,...$$

Dividing by $\|\phi'(t_{k_j},0)\lambda_{k_j}\|$ and noting that H_Ω is positively homogeneous, we obtain

$$\int_o^{t_{k_j}} H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\phi'(0,\tau)z_{k_j})d\tau \le \|x_o^*\| \, \|z_{k_j}\| \quad \underline{\text{for}} \quad j = 1,2,3,...$$

$$\le \|x_o^*\| \quad \underline{\text{for}} \quad j = 1,2,3,...$$

We would like to obtain an inequality involving $\tilde{z}_o$ with an infinite upper limit on this integral. To accomplish this, we define

$$f_{k_j}(\tau) \triangleq H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\phi'(0,\tau)z_{k_j}) \quad \text{if} \quad \tau \in [0,t_{k_j}] ;$$

$$\triangleq 0 \quad \text{otherwise;} \quad j = 1,2,3,...;$$

$$f(\tau) \triangleq H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\phi'(0,\tau)\tilde{z}_o) \; ; \quad \tau \in [0,\infty)$$

and make the following observations:

(i) $\int_o^{\infty} f_{k_j}(\tau)d\tau$ is bounded (by $\|x_o^*\|$) for $j = 1,2,3,...$

(ii) $f_{k_j}(\tau)$ converges pointwise to $f(\tau)$ on $[0,\infty)$. This observation is proven using the facts that $z_{k_j} \to \tilde{z}_o$, $t_{k_j} \to + \infty$ and H_Ω depends continuously on its argument.

Applying Fatou's Lemma [20, p. 83], we have

$$\int_o^\infty f(\tau)d\tau \leq \liminf_{j \to \infty} \int_o^\infty f_{k_j}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\leq \limsup_{j \to \infty} \int_o^\infty f_{k_j}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\leq \|x_o^*\| \quad .$$

Substitution for $f(\tau)$ above gives

$$\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\phi'(0,\tau)\tilde{z}_o)d\tau \leq \|x_o^*\| \quad ,$$

i.e.,

$$\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\tilde{z}(\tau))d\tau \leq \|x_o^*\|$$

$$< \infty$$

which is the contradiction that we seek. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Proof of Corollary 2.2. Suppose Ω and Ω' satisfy the hypotheses of the corollary. We are going to show that (S) is globally Ω'-null controllable. To prove this, it is sufficient to find a subset $\Omega'_\delta \subseteq \Omega'$ such that (S) is globally Ω'_δ-null controllable: Pick $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\Omega'_\delta \triangleq \{\omega: \|\omega\| \leq \delta\} \subseteq \Omega'$$

(This can be accomplished because zero is interior to Ω'.) Now, to prove that Ω'_δ has the desired property, we pick $R > 0$ such that

$$\Omega_R \triangleq \{\omega: \|\omega\| \leq R\} \supseteq \Omega$$

(This can also be done since Ω is compact, hence bounded.) Let $z(\cdot)$ be any

non-zero solution of (S'). Then we have

$$\int_0^\infty H_{\Omega_\delta'}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = \int_0^\infty \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)z(\tau) : \|\omega\| \le \delta\}d\tau$$

$$= \delta \int_0^\infty \|B'(\tau)z(\tau)\| d\tau$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{R} \int_0^\infty R\|B'(\tau)z(\tau)\| d\tau$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{R} \int_0^\infty \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)z(\tau) : \|\omega\| \le R\}d\tau$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{R} \int_0^\infty H_{\Omega_R}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau$$

$$= +\infty$$

since (S) is globally Ω_R-null controllable. (Ω_R-null controllability follows from Ω-null controllability in conjunction with the fact that $\Omega_R \supseteq \Omega$.) By Theorem 2.1, we conclude that (S) must be globally Ω_δ'-null controllable and hence Ω'-null controllable. □

APPENDIX B

Proof of Theorem 3.2. (i): This condition follows immediately from the fact that global R^m-null controllability is necessary for global Ω-null controllability.

It is also possible to prove (i) directly from Theorem 2.1. Suppose (S) is globally Ω-null controllable but rank $(Q) < n$. Then there exists a $v \in R^n$, $v \neq 0$, such that $B'e^{-A't}v = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Let $z(0) = v$. Then $z(\tau) = e^{-A't}v$ and

$$\int_0^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' z(\tau)) d\tau = \int_0^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' e^{-A't} v) d\tau = 0$$

which contradicts Theorem 2.1.

(ii): Suppose (S) is globally Ω-null controllable but there exists a real eigenvector v of A' satisfying $\omega' B' v \leq 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Denoting by λ the real eigenvalue associated with v, we have $e^{-A't}v = e^{-\lambda t}v$. With $z(0) = v, z(\tau) = e^{-A'\tau}v = e^{-\lambda\tau}v$ and

$$\int_0^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' z(\tau) d\tau = \int_0^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' e^{-\lambda\tau} v) d\tau$$

$$= \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda\tau} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' v) d\tau$$

Now this integral is less than or equal to zero since $\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' v) \leq 0$ and $e^{-\lambda t} \geq 0$. This contradicts Theorem 2.1.

(iii): Again the proof is by contradiction. Assume (S) is globally Ω-null controllable but A has an eigenvalue λ with a positive real part. Then λ is also an eigenvalue of A' so that $A'v = \lambda v$ where v is an eigenvector corresponding to A'. Let $\bar{\lambda}$ and $\bar{v}$ denote the complex conjugate of λ and v. They satisfy $A\bar{v} = \bar{\lambda}\bar{v}$. Hence,

$$e^{-A't}v = e^{\lambda t}v \quad \text{and} \quad e^{-A't}\bar{v} = e^{\bar{\lambda} t}\bar{v}$$

Consider the solution of the adjoint equation corresponding to the initial condition $z(0) = v + \bar{v}$. (Note that $z(0)$ is real.) For this $z(0)$

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' z(\tau)) = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' e^{-A'\tau}(v + \bar{v}))$$

$$= \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \left[\omega' B' \left(e^{-\lambda t} v + e^{-\bar{\lambda} t} \bar{v}\right)\right]$$

$$= \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \left\{\omega' B' e^{-at} [2m \cos bt + 2n \sin bt]\right\}$$

where a and b are the real part and imaginary part of λ and n and m are the real part and imaginary part of v. Let $M \triangleq \sup_{t \geq 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \omega' B' [2n \cos bt + 2n \sin bt]$. M is finite since Ω is compact, i.e., $M \leq 2 \max\{|n|, |m|\} \|B\| \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\omega\|$. Thus

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' z(\tau)) \leq M e^{-at}$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' z(\tau)) d\tau \leq M \int_0^\infty e^{-at} dt$$

The integral on the right is finite since $a > 0$ and we have a contradiction to Theorem 2.1. □

Proof of Proposition 3.3. (Necessity): Suppose (S) is globally R^m-null controllable. Then there is a finite interval $[0,T]$ on which the rows of $\phi(0,\cdot)B(\cdot)$ are linearly independent. Thus, for every non-zero vector $z_o \in R^n$, it follows that $B'(t)\phi'(0,t)z_o \neq 0$ for some $t \in [0,T]$. Since, $B'(\cdot)\phi'(0,\cdot)z_o$ is continuous, there must be an interval $I = [t - \delta, t + \delta]$ on which $B'(\tau)\phi'(0,\tau)z_o \neq 0$ for all $\tau \in I$. On this interval, we have

$$\sup\{\omega\ B'(\tau)\phi'(0,\tau)z_o : \omega \in R^m\} = +\infty \quad .$$

Hence, using the non-negativity of $H_{\Omega}(\cdot)$, we conclude that

$$\int_0^\infty H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau \geq \int_I H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)\phi'(0,\tau)z_o)d\tau$$

$$= \int_I \sup\{\omega' B'(\tau)\phi'(0,\tau)z_o : \omega \in R^m\}d\tau$$

$$= +\infty$$

(Sufficiency): Proceeding by contradiction, we suppose that for all non-zero solutions $z(\cdot)$ of (S'), we have

$$\int_0^\infty H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = +\infty$$

but the columns of $B'(\cdot)\Phi'(0,\cdot)$ are linearly dependent on every bounded interval $[0,T]$. Let $\langle T_n\rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be a monotone increasing sequence of times such that $T_n \to \infty$. Then, for each n, we can find a non-zero vector $\tilde{z}_n$ such that $B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\tilde{z}_n \equiv 0$ on $[0,T_n]$. Let

$$z_n \triangleq \frac{\tilde{z}_n}{\|\tilde{z}_n\|} \quad \text{for} \quad n = 1,2,\ldots .$$

Then, $\langle z_n\rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in the (compact) unit ball. Hence, we can extract a subsequence z_{n_j} converging to some $\hat{z}_o$, $\|\hat{z}_o\| = 1$. We notice that the corresponding subsequence of times T_{n_j} still converges to $+\infty$. Furthermore, for each fixed $\tau \in [0,\infty)$, we have

$$B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\hat{z}_o = \lim_{j\to\infty} B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)z_{n_j}$$

$$= 0$$

Consequently, if $\hat{z}(\tau)$ is the trajectory mate of $\hat{z}_o$,

$$\int_0^\infty H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)\hat{z}(\tau))d\tau = \int_0^\infty \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\hat{z}_o : \omega \in R^m\}d\tau = 0$$

which contradicts the assumed hypothesis. □

APPENDIX C

Proof of Lemma 4.1. For (x_o,T) fixed, $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ can be expressed as

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) = \sup\{H_\omega(\lambda) : \omega(\cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(\Omega)\}$$

where

$$H_\omega(\lambda) \triangleq \lambda'\Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \lambda'\Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)\omega(\tau)d\tau \quad .$$

Consequently, $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ is the pointwise supremum over an indexed collection of continuous linear (hence convex) functions. Hence $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ itself must be convex and at least lower semicontinuous (in fact, continuous). □

Proof of Lemma 4.2. We prove this lemma using some of the standard properties of subdifferentials given in Rockafellar [21], [22]. Since both functions in the definition of $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ are finite and convex, $\lambda_* \in \partial J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ if and only if

$$\lambda_* \in \partial(x_o'\Phi'(T,0)\lambda) + \partial\int_o^T H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)d\tau \qquad \text{(by Theorem 23.8 of [22])}$$

$$= \Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \partial H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)d\tau \qquad \text{(by Theorem 23 of [22])}$$

$$= \Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)\cdot\partial H_\Omega(\hat{\omega}(\tau))\Big|_{\hat{\omega}(\tau)=B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda} d\tau$$

(by Theorem 23.9 of [21])

Now, by Corollary 23.5.3 of [21], $\omega_*(\tau) \in \partial H_\Omega(\hat{\omega}(\tau))$ if and only if $\omega_*(\tau) \in \arg\max\{\omega'\hat{\omega}(\tau) : \omega \in \Omega\}$. Substituting the required form for $\hat{\omega}$ above, we obtain our desired representation for λ_*. □

APPENDIX D

Sketch of a Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $f : L^1(0,T;R^m) \to R$, $g : R^n \to R$, $\Lambda_T : L^1(0,T;R^m) \to R^n$ be given by

$$f(u) \triangleq 0 \text{ if } u(\cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(\Omega) \; ; \quad f(u) \triangleq +\infty \text{ otherwise} \; ;$$

$$g(z) \triangleq - \|\Phi(T,0)x_o + z\| \; ; \quad z \in R^n \; ;$$

$$\Lambda_T u \triangleq \int_o^T \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau \quad .$$

Then, using the notation above

$$\inf(MN) \triangleq \inf\{\|x(T)\| \; : \; u(\cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(\Omega)\}$$

$$= \inf\{f(u) - g(\Lambda_T u) \; : \; u \in L^1(0,T;R^m)\} \quad .$$

Written in this way, inf(MN) is in the standard form for application of Rockafellar's extension of Fenchel's Duality Theorem (cf. [23], Theorem 1). The functionals f and g are respectively proper convex and concave functions; it can be easily shown that inf(MN) is "stably set" -- a technical precondition for Rockafellar's Theorem.

By carrying out the computations involved in Theorem 1 of [23], it can be shown that the problem

$$\min(MN)^* \triangleq \min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda) \; : \; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$$

is dual to inf(MN) in the following sense:

$$\inf(MN) + \min(MN)^* = 0 \quad .$$

The "extremality condition" in Rockafellar's theorem provides a necessary condition which must be satisfied by all solution pairs λ_* solving $(MN)^*$ and $u_*(\cdot)$ solving (MN). This extremality condition requires

$$\Lambda_T^* \lambda_* \in \partial f(u_*)$$

where Λ_T^* is the adjoint of Λ_T and $\partial f(u_*)$ is the subdifferential of f at u_*. For our choice of f, this necessary condition particularizes to

$$\lambda_*' \Phi(T,\tau) B(\tau) \in (\text{Normal cone of } \mathbb{m}(\Omega) \text{ at } u_*(\cdot)) \quad .$$

We denote this normal cone at u_* by $N_c(u_*)$. By definition of the normal cone, we have $v(\cdot) \in N_c(u^*)$ if and only if

$$\int_0^T u_*'(\tau) B'(\tau) \Phi'(T,\tau) \lambda_* d\tau = \int_0^T \sup\{\omega' B'(\tau) \Phi'(T,\tau) \lambda_* : \omega \in \Omega\} d\tau \quad .$$

This is possible only if $\omega = u_*(\tau)$ achieves the supremum of $\omega' B'(\tau) \Phi'(T,\tau) \lambda_*$ for almost all $\tau \in [0,T]$. Equivalently, we must have

$$u_*(\tau) \in \arg\max\{\omega' B'(\tau) \Phi'(T,\tau) \lambda_* : \omega \in \Omega\}$$

for almost all $\tau \in [0,T]$.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. As in the proof of Theorem 2.3, let $A_T(x_o)$ be the set of states which can be attained from x_o at time T. We recall that this set is compact and convex. Define $W_T : \Lambda \times A_T(x_o) \to R$ by

$$W_T(\lambda,\xi) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \lambda'\xi \quad . \tag{D.1}$$

In accordance with Proposition 2.3 of [19, p. 171], $W_T(\lambda,\xi)$ will possess a saddle point because the following conditions are satisfied:

(D.2.1) For all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $W(\lambda,\cdot)$ is concave and upper semicontinuous.

(D.2.2) For all $\xi \in \Pi_T(\Omega)$, $W(\cdot,\xi)$ is convex and lower semicontinuous.

Since $W_T(\lambda,\xi)$ possesses a saddle point, we note that

$$\min_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \max_{u(\cdot)\in\mathbb{m}(\Omega)} V_T(\lambda,u(\cdot)) = \min_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \max_{\xi\in A_T(x_o)} W_T(\lambda,\xi)$$

Furthermore,

$$\max_{u(\cdot)\in\mathbb{m}(\Omega)} \min_{\lambda\in\Lambda} V_T(\lambda,u(\cdot)) = \max_{\xi\in A_T(x_o)} \min_{\lambda\in\Lambda} W_T(\lambda,\xi) \quad .$$

These equalities, in conjunction with the fact that W_T possesses a saddle point, imply that V_T also has a saddle point.

To prove the last part of the theorem, we take $(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot))$ to be a given saddle point of $V_T(\lambda, u(\cdot))$. Hence we have

$$(D.3) \qquad V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) = \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \max_{u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)} V_T(\lambda, u(\cdot)) \quad .$$

Using a measurable selection argument, as in the proof of Theorem 2.3, it is also apparent that

$$(D.4) \qquad \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \max_{u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)} V_T(\lambda, u(\cdot)) = \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J(x_o, T, \lambda) \quad .$$

From (D.3) and (D.4) we conclude that

$$(D.5) \qquad V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) = \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J(x_o, T, \lambda) \quad .$$

From Theorem 2.3 and the comments following the theorem, we know that x_o can be steered to zero at time T if and only if

$$0 = \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J(x_o, T, \lambda)$$

$$= V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) \quad \text{(by (D.5))}.$$

To complete the proof, we must show that if $V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) = 0$, then $u^*(\cdot)$ steers x_o to 0. Now

$$0 = V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) \leq V_T(\lambda, u_*(\cdot)) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \Lambda$$

or

$$0 \leq \lambda' \left[\Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u_*(\tau)d\tau \right] \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

Thus

(D.6) $$0 \leq \lambda' \, x(T,x_o,u_*(\cdot)) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \Lambda$$

Since 0 is an interior point of the convex, compact set Λ, (D.6) implies $x(T,x_o,u_*(\cdot)) = 0$ and $u_*(\cdot)$ is a steering control. □

Acknowledgment. The authors wish to thank the reviewers for their thorough reading of the paper. Their comments and suggestions led to many simplifications in the proofs.

REFERENCES

1. R. E. Kalman, Mathematical Description of Linear Dynamical System, This Journal, 1 (1963), pp. 152-192.

2. E. Lee and L. Markus, Foundations of Optimal Control Theory, John Wiley, New York, 1967.

3. S. Saperstone and J. Yorke, Controllability of Linear Oscillatory Systems Using Positive Controls, This Journal, 9 (1971), pp. 253-262.

4. R. Brammer, Controllability in Linear Autonomous Systems with Positive Controllers, This Journal, 10 (1972), pp. 339-353.

5. S. Saperstone, Global Controllability of Linear Systems with Positive Controls, This Journal, 11 (1973), pp. 417-423.

6. A. Friedman, Differential Games, Wiley, 1971.

7. R. Conti, Teoria del Controllo e del Controllo Ottimo, UTET, Torino, Italy, 1974.

8. L. Pandolfi, Linear Control Systems: Controllability with Constrained Controls, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 19 (1976), pp. 577-585.

9. J. Dauer, Controllability of Nonlinear Systems Using a Growth Condition, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 9 (1972), pp. 90-98.

10. J. Dauer, Controllability on Nonlinear Systems with Restrained Controls, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 14 (1974), pp. 251-262.

11. E. Chukwu and J. Gronski, Controllability of Nonlinear Systems with Restrained Controls to Closed Convex Sets, Department of Mathematics Report CSUMD 45, Cleveland State University.

12. E. N. Chuckwu and S. D. Sillman, Complete Controllability to a Closed Target Set, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 21 (1977), pp. 369-383.

13. W. J. Grantham and T. L. Vincent, A Controllability Minimum Principle, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 17 (1975), pp. 93-114.

14. M. E. Evans and D. N. P. Murthy, Controllability of Discrete-Time Systems with Positive Controls, IEEE Automatic Control, AC-22 (1977), pp. 942-945.

15. M. Pachter and D. H. Jacobson, Control with Conic Constraint Set, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications (to appear).

16. D. H. Jacobson, Extension of Linear-Quadratic Control, Optimization and Matrix Theory, Academic Press, New York, 1977.

17. C. T. Chen, Introduction to Linear System Theory, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1970.

18. O. Hájek, Pursuit Games, Academic Press, New York, 1975.

19. I. Ekeland and R. Teman, Convex Analysis and Variational Problems, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1976.

20. H. L. Royden, Real Analysis, MacMillan Co., New York, 1968.

21. R. T. Rockafellar, Convex Analysis, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1972.

22. R. T. Rockafellar, Conjugate Duality and Optimization, monograph, SIAM Publications, Philadelphia, PA, 1974.

23. R. T. Rockafellar, Duality and Stability in Extremum Problems Involving Convex Function, Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 21 (1967), pp. 167-187.

24. G. S. Goodman, Support Functions and the Integration of Set-Valued Mappings, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vol. 2 (1976), pp. 281-296.

25. M. Heymann and R. J. Stern, Controllability of Linear Systems with Positive Controls: Geometric Considerations, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Application, 52 (1975), pp. 36-41.

APPENDIX B

NULL CONTROLLABILITY OF LINEAR SYSTEMS WITH CONSTRAINED CONTROLS

W. E. SCHMITENDORF* and B. R. BARMISH**

Abstract. The paper considers the problem of steering the state of a linear time-varying system to the origin when the control is subject to magnitude constraints. Necessary and sufficient conditions are given for global constrained controllability as well as a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a control (satisfying the constraints) which steers the system to the origin from a specified initial epoch (x_o,t_o). The global result does not require zero to be an interior point of the control set Ω and the theorem for constrained controllability at (x_o,t_o) only requires that Ω be compact, not that it contain zero. The results are compared to those available in the literature. Furthermore, numerical aspects of the problem are discussed as is a technique for determining a steering control.

* Technological Institute, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60201
The research of this author was supported by AFOSR Grant 76-2923.

** Department of Electrical Engineering, The University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627

1. Introduction and Formulation. Consider the problem of steering the state of a linear system

$$(S) \qquad \dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t);\ t \in [t_o,\infty)$$

to the origin from a specified initial condition

$$x(t_o) = x_o$$

by choice of control function $u(\cdot)$. Here $x(t) \in R^n$, $u(t) \in R^m$ and $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ are continuous matrices† of appropriate dimension. Unlike the usual controllability problem where the control values at each instant of time are unconstrained, we insist here that the control values at each instant of time belong to a prespecified set Ω in R^m.

Let $\mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ denote the set of functions from R into Ω that are measurable on $[t_o,\infty)$. Then any control $u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ is termed admissible. We now define three notions of constrained controllability or, more precisely, Ω-null controllability.

Definition 1.1. The linear system (S) is Ω-null controllable at (x_o,t_o) if, given the initial condition $x(t_o) = x_o$, there exists a control $u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ such that the solution $x(\cdot)$ of (S) satisfies $x(t) = 0$ for some $t \in [t_o,\infty)$.

Definition 1.2. The linear system (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at t_o if (S) is Ω-null controllable at (x_o,t_o) for all $x_o \in R^n$.

Our major result will pertain to the global type of controllability. To compare our results to those of previous researchers, we also need a local controllability concept.

Definition 1.3. The linear system (S) is locally Ω-null controllable at t_o if there exists an open set $V \subset R^n$, containing the origin, such that (S) is null controllable at (x_o,t_o) for all $x_o \in V$.

† This requirement can be weakened to local integrability.

The majority of constrained controllability results are for autonomous systems, i.e., systems where A and B are constant. When $\Omega = R^m$, Kalman [1] showed that a necessary and sufficient condition for global R^m-null controllability is rank(Q) = n where $Q \triangleq [B,AB,\ldots,A^{n-1}B]$. Lee and Markus [2] considered constraint sets $\Omega \subset R^m$ which contain u = 0 and showed that rank(Q) = n is a necessary and sufficient condition for (S) to be locally Ω-null controllable. Furthermore, if each eigenvalue λ of A satisfies $Re(\lambda) < 0$, then (S) is globally Ω-null controllable. This result is typical of the results available when Ω contains the origin.

Saperstone and Yorke [3] were the first to eliminate the assumption that zero is an interior point of Ω when they considered problems with m = 1 and $\Omega = [0,1]$. Their result states that for these problems (S) is locally Ω-null controllable if and only if rank(Q) = n and A has no real eigenvalues. They also extend this result to m > 1 and consider the m-fold product set $\Omega = \Pi_1^m[0,1]$. Problems with more general constraint sets were studied by Brammer [4] who showed that if there exists a $u \in \Omega$ satisfying Bu = 0 and the convex hull of Ω has a nonempty interior, then necessary and sufficient conditions for local Ω-null controllability are rank(Q) = n and the nonexistence of a real eigenvector v of A' satisfying $v'Bu \leq 0$ for all $u \in \Omega$. In addition, if no eigenvalue of A has a positive real part then the theorem becomes one for global Ω-null controllability. A similar result for global controllability when $\Omega = [0,1]$ was obtained by Saperstone [5]. Friedman [6] considers a linear pursuit evasion problem where the target is a closed convex set and gives a sufficient condition for the existence of a pursuer control, based on the evader's control, which drives the system from a specified initial condition to the target.

For nonautonomous systems, the most familiar controllability result is that of Kalman [1] when $\Omega = R^m$. He showed that (S) is R^m-null controllable if and only if $W(t_o,t_1)$ is positive definite for some $t_1 \in [t_o,\infty)$ where

$$W(t_o,t_1) \triangleq \int_{t_o}^{t_1} \Phi(t_1,\tau)B(\tau)B'(\tau)\Phi'(t_1,\tau)d\tau$$

and $\Phi(t,\tau)$ is the state transition matrix for (S). When the control is constrained, the major global results are those by Conti [7] and Pandolfi [8]. In [7], Conti describes a "divergent integral condition" which is necessary and sufficient for global Ω-null controllability when Ω is the closed unit ball. In order to make Conti's result more compatible with existing theory for time-invariant systems, Pandolfi in [8] defines the notion of p-th characteristic exponent for time varying systems. For the special case when the system is time-invariant, the characteristic exponent turns out to be the real part of some eigenvalue of A. Subsequently, controllability criteria are provided in terms of this exponent.

The Ω-null controllability problem is also studied in papers by Dauer [9], [10], Chukwu and Gronski [11] and Chukwu and Silliman [12]. In order to decide on the question of Ω-controllability,one must test a certain growth condition which involves searching a function space. In contrast, the results given here are finite-dimensional in nature.

In [13],, Grantham and Vincent consider the problem of steering a nonlinear system to a target. They present a technique for determining the boundary between the set of states which can be steered to the target and those which cannot. More recently, Murthy and Evans [14] obtained results comparable to [3]-[5] for discrete linear systems and Pachter and Jacobson [15] developed sufficient conditions for controllability for case where $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ are time-invariant and Ω is a closed convex cone containing the origin. A readable account of the state of the art is contained in the book by Jacobson [16, Chapter 5].

In contrast to much of the work of previous authors, this paper concentrates on the case where $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ are time-varying. Our results for global Ω-null controllability are for constraint sets Ω that are compact and contain zero

(but not necessarily as an interior point). One of our main results on global Ω-null controllability is an extension of a theorem of Conti [7] and it degenerates to Conti's theorem when Ω is a unit ball.

Our results for Ω-null controllability at (x_o,t_o) have even wider applicability since they do not require $0 \in \Omega$. Neither do they require the existence of a $u \in \Omega$ such that $Bu = 0$ as in [3]-[5], [7]-[12]. Thus we can analyze controllability of a system with, for example, $m = 1$ and $\Omega = [1,2]$ whereas many of the presently available theorems do not apply. Furthermore, as will be illustrated by examples, there are autonomous systems (S) which are neither globally Ω-null controllable nor locally Ω-null controllable but nevertheless are Ω-null controllable at some (x_o,t_o). Our theorem can be used to decompose the state space into two sets. Initial states in one set can be steered to the origin while those in the other cannot be driven to the origin by an admissible control.

2. Main Results. In order to describe our necessary and sufficient conditions for global Ω-null controllability, we make use of the support function $H_\Omega: R^m \to R \cup \{+\infty\}$ on Ω which for any $\alpha \in R^m$ is given by

$$H_\Omega(\alpha) \triangleq \sup\{w'\alpha : w \in \Omega\} \quad .$$

Using this notation, we have the following theorem, which is proven in Appendix A.

Theorem 2.1. Suppose Ω is a compact set which contains zero†. Then, (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at t_o if and only if

$$\int_{t_o}^{\infty} H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = +\infty \tag{2.1}$$

for all non-zero solutions $z(\cdot)$ of the adjoint system

$$\dot{z}(t) = -A'(t)z(t);\ t \in [t_o,\infty) \quad , \tag{S'}$$

† The theorem is also valid if the requirement "$0 \in \Omega$" is replaced with "there exists a $u \in \Omega$ such that $Bu = 0$". This type of assumption is used by Brammer [4].

or equivalently, if and only if

$$\int_{t_o}^{\infty} \sup\{w'B'(\tau)\Phi'(t_o,\tau)\lambda : w \in \Omega\}d\tau = +\infty$$

for all $\lambda \in R^n$, $\lambda \neq 0$.

We note that $H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))$ can be viewed as the composition of a non-negative Baire function with a measurable function. Hence, the integral in (2.1) is well defined along all trajectories $z(\cdot)$ of (S).

In the following corollary, we examine the special case of Theorem 2.1 which arises under the strengthened hypothesis "zero is an interior point of Ω." As we might anticipate, for this special case, the structure of the set Ω will not matter other than the requirement that it contains zero in its interior.

Corollary 2.2. (See Appendix A for proof): Suppose there exists a compact set Ω such that

(i) zero is an interior point of Ω;

(ii) (S) is globally Ω-null controllable.

Then (S) is also globally Ω'-null controllable for any other set Ω' (not necessarily compact) which contains zero in its interior.

Our proof of Theorem 2.1 will make use of a more fundamental result (also proven in Appendix A) giving conditions for Ω-null controllability at a fixed initial epoch (x_o,t_o). To meet this end, we define the scalar function $J : R^n \times R \times R^n \to R$ by

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) \triangleq x_o'\Phi'(T,t_o)\lambda + \int_{t_o}^{T} H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)d\tau \tag{2.2}$$

We note that $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ can be viewed as the support function on the so-called attainable set. This fact is used implicitly in the proof of the next theorem.

Theorem 2.3. Let Ω be a compact set. Pick any subset Λ of R^n which contains 0 as an interior point. Then (S) is Ω-null controllable at (x_o,t_o) if and only if

$$\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

for some $T \in [t_o,\infty)$, or equivalently, if and only if,

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \lambda \in \Lambda \tag{2.4}$$

for some $T \in [t_o,\infty)$.

Comment. If Ω is also convex and A and B are constant, the sufficiency portion of this theorem is just a special case of Theorem 7.2.1 of [6]. Naturally, the smallest time T for which (2.3) holds will be the minimum arrival time at the origin.

Theorem 2.3 can also be stated in terms of the adjoint system (S'), i.e., if we take $\Lambda = R^n$ and notice that $z(t) = \Phi'(t_o,t)z(t_o)$ is the response of the adjoint system (S'), then the following theorem is easily proven. (The proof is established by making the change of variables $z(t) \triangleq \Phi'(T,t)\lambda$).

Theorem 2.3'. Let Ω satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 2.3. Then (S) is Ω-null controllable at (x_o,t_o) if and only if there exists some $T \in [t_o,\infty)$ such that

$$x_o'z(t_o) + \int_{t_o}^{T} H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau \geq 0 \tag{2.5}$$

for all solutions $z(\cdot)$ of (S').

This theorem demonstrates that the question of Ω-null controllability at (x_o,t_o) can be answered by solving a finite dimensional optimization problem. Moreover, the question of global Ω-null controllability can also be answered via a finite dimensional optimization problem.

Corollary 2.4. Let Ω and Λ be as in Theorem 2.3. Then (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at t_o if and only if for every $x_o \in R^n$ there is a time $T_{x_o} \in [t_o,\infty)$ such that

$$\min\{J(x_o,T_{x_o},\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} = 0 \quad .$$

The proof of this corollary follows from Theorem 2.3 in conjunction with the definition of global Ω-null controllability.

There is one point worth noting. In using Theorem 2.1 to check for Ω-null controllability at t_o, Ω must be compact and contain 0. If Corollary 2.4 is used, only the compactness assumption must be satisfied.

Next, we present some examples to illustrate how our theorems can be applied and to compare our results to those of [3-5].

Example 1. Let $x(t)$ and $u(t)$ be scalars and suppose (S) is described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = x(t) + u(t) \quad , \quad t \in [0,\infty) \quad .$$

This system is R^1-null controllable if $\Omega = R^1$. But suppose $\Omega = [0,1]$. Then the system is not globally Ω-null controllable at $t_o = 0$. This follows from Theorem 2.1 since, for $z_o < 0$, $H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau)) = 0$ and thus $\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau < +\infty$. Also, using [3] or [4] it can be shown that the system is not locally Ω-null controllable. Nevertheless, there do exist initial states x_o from which it is possible to steer the system to the origin. Such states can be determined via Theorem 2.3.

For the above

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) = x_o e^T\lambda + \int_o^T \sup\{ue^{T-\tau}\lambda : u \in [0,1]\}d\tau$$

When $\Lambda = [-1,1]$, this becomes

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) = \begin{cases} x_o e^T\lambda & \lambda \le 0 \\ x_o e^T\lambda + \lambda(e^T - 1) & \lambda > 0 \end{cases}$$

and thus

$$\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda) : \lambda \in [-1,1]\} = 0$$

if and only if $x_o \le 0$ and $x_o \ge e^{-T} - 1$ for some $T \in [0,\infty)$, or equivalently, if and only if $-1 < x_o \le 0$. We conclude that even though (S) is not locally Ω-null controllable, it is Ω-null controllable at $(x_o,0)$ whenever $-1 < x_o \le 0$.

If $\Omega = [1,2]$, neither [3-5] nor Theorem 2.1 apply. However, we can use Theorem 2.3. Since

$$H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda) = \begin{cases} 2\lambda e^{(T-\tau)} & \lambda > 0 \\ \lambda e^{(T-\tau)} & \lambda \le 0 \end{cases}$$

$J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ becomes

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) = \begin{cases} x_o e^T\lambda + 2\lambda(e^T - 1) & \lambda > 0 \\ x_o e^T\lambda + \lambda(e^T - 1) & \lambda \le 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda) : \lambda \in [-1,1]\} = 0$$

if and only if $2(e^{-T} - 1) \le x_o \le e^{-T} - 1$. Thus (S), with $\Omega = [1,2]$, is Ω-null controllable at $(x_o,0)$ whenever $-2 < x_o \le 0$.

As a final variation of this problem, suppose $\Omega = [-a,a]$. Then [4] or Theorem 2.1, shows that (S) is not globally Ω-null controllable. Using [4], it can be demonstrated that (S) is locally Ω-null controllable while Theorem 2.3 not only tells us that (S) is locally Ω-null controllable but also that the states x_o which can be steered to the origin are those satisfying $-a < x_o < a$.

Example 2. Our second example illustrates the application of Theorem 2.1 for a nonautonomous system. We consider the time-varying two-dimensional system (S) described by

$$\dot{x}_1(t) = u(t)\sin t$$

$$\dot{x}_2(t) = -\frac{1}{(t+1)^2}\, x_1(t) + u(t)t\sin t, \quad t \in [0,\infty)$$

The control constraint set is taken to be $\Omega = [0,1]$. By a straightforward computation, the state transition matrix for the adjoint system (S') is found to be

$$\Phi_*(t,t_o) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \dfrac{t - t_o}{(t+1)(t_o+1)} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Hence, in accordance with Theorem 2.1, (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at $t_o = 0$ if and only if

$$\int_o^\infty \sup_{w\in[0,1]} w\begin{bmatrix}\sin\tau & \tau\sin\tau\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \dfrac{\tau}{\tau+1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} z_{01} \\ z_{02} \end{bmatrix} d\tau = +\infty$$

for <u>all</u> non-zero initial conditions $z_0 \triangleq [z_{01}\ z_{02}]'$. Evaluating above, this reduces to the requirement that

$$(2.6) \qquad \int_o^\infty I(\tau)d\tau \triangleq \int_o^\infty \max\left\{0, z_{01}\sin\tau + z_{02}\,\tau\sin\tau\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau+1}\right)\right\} d\tau = +\infty$$

for all $z_0 \neq 0$. We shall show that this condition is indeed satisfied.

<u>Case 1</u>. $z_{01} \neq 0$, $z_{02} = 0$. For this case, we have

$$\int_o^\infty I(\tau)d\tau = \int_o^\infty \max\{0,\ z_{01}\sin\tau\}d\tau$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{T}_1} z_{01}\sin\tau\, d\tau$$

where $\mathcal{T}_1 \triangleq \{\tau \geq 0:\ z_{01}\sin\tau > 0\}$. Because the range set $\mathcal{T}_1$ of integration is the union of infinitely many intervals of length π, it follows that

$$\int_o^\infty I(\tau)d\tau = +\infty \quad .$$

Case 2. z_{01} = anything, $z_{02} \neq 0$. Let $T^* \triangleq \frac{|z_{01}| + 1}{|z_{02}|}$. Then to verify (2.6), it sufficies to show that

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}_2} I(\tau)d\tau = +\infty$$

where $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{\tau \geq T^*: z_{02} \sin \tau > 0\}$. (Recall that the integrand is non-negative.) Now, for $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2$, we notice that the integrand $I(\tau)$ can be bounded from below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} z_{01}\sin \tau + z_{02}\tau \sin \tau\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau+1}\right) &\geq |z_{02}||\sin \tau|\tau\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau+1}\right) - |z_{01}||\sin \tau| \\ &\geq \left(|z_{02}|\ \tau - |z_{01}|\right)|\sin \tau| \\ &\geq \left(|z_{02}|\ T^* - |z_{01}|\right)|\sin \tau| \\ &= |\sin \tau| \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}_2} I(\tau)d\tau \geq \int_{\mathcal{T}_2} |\sin \tau|d\tau = +\infty$$

because the range of integration is once again the union of infinitely many intervals of length π.

We conclude that (S) is globally Ω-null controllable.

3. Relationship with Other Controllability Results. In this section, we compare our controllability results with those of Conti [7] and Brammer [4]. We also consider, as a limiting case of our theory, the usual controllability problem obtained when magnitude constraints are not present.

Result of Conti. An important special case of Theorem 2.1 occurs when Ω is a closed unit ball in R^m, i.e.,

$$\Omega = \{w \in R^m : \|w\| \leq 1\}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is a prespecified norm on R^m. For this situation we have

$$H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)z(\tau)) = \sup\{w'B'(\tau)z(\tau) : \|w\| \leq 1\} = \|B'(\tau)z(\tau)\|_*$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the norm on R^m which is dual to $\|\cdot\|$. (For example $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the $\mathcal{L}^1$ norm when $\|\cdot\|$ is the $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ norm; $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_*$ coincide when $\|\cdot\|$ is the usual $\mathcal{L}^2$ (Euclidean) norm.)

By Theorem 2.1, we conclude that (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at t_o if and only if

$$\int_{t_o}^{\infty} \|B'(\tau)z(\tau)\|_* d\tau = +\infty \tag{3.1}$$

for all non-zero solutions $z(\cdot)$ of (S'). This result is established independently in Conti [7] and also discussed in Pandolfi [8]. This result, in conjunction with Corollary 2.2 leads immediately to the following Proposition.

Proposition 3.1. Let Ω be any set containing zero in its interior. Then (3.1) is a necessary and sufficient condition for global Ω-null controllability.

Thus, Conti's condition is a necessary and sufficient condition for global Ω-null controllability for any set Ω containing zero in its interior, not just when Ω is the closed unit ball.

Result of Brammer. Consider the case when $A(t) \equiv A$ and $B(t) \equiv B$ are time-invariant. For these autonomous problems, the following necessary conditions can be obtained directly from Theorem 2.1. Recall that $Q = [B, AB, \ldots, A^{n-1}B]$.

Theorem 3.2. Assume $A(t) \equiv A$ and $B(t) \equiv B$ are time-invariant and that Ω is a compact set which contains the origin. If (S) is globally Ω-null controllable then

(i) rank $(Q) = n$

(ii) there is no real eigenvector v of A' satisfying $v'Bw \leq 0$ for all $w \in \Omega$.

(iii) no eigenvalue of A has a positive real part.

The proof of this result is in Appendix B.

In [4], Brammer has obtained the same result using a different method of proof. There, he also shows that the above three conditions are also sufficient for global Ω-null controllability in the time invariant case if it is also assumed that the convex hull of Ω has a non-empty interior. Alternative proofs of the sufficiency result have been given by Heymann and Stern [25] and Hajek. The latter proof is in [5].

We note that the system of Example 1 of Section 2 does not satisfy these three conditions. Nevertheless, it is Ω-null controllable at $(x_o,0)$ for some initial states x_o.

The Case $\Omega=R^m$. When $\Omega=R^m$, it is well known [17, p. 171] that the time-varying system (S) is completely controllable (globally R^m-null controllable at t_o in our notation) if and only if the rows of $\Phi(t_o,\cdot)B(\cdot)$ are linearly independent on some bounded interval $[t_o,T]$. Here we show that when $\Omega=R^m$, equation (2.1) is a necessary and sufficient condition for global R^m-null controllability. This is accomplished by showing that (2.1) is equivalent to the rows of $\Phi(t_o,\cdot)B(\cdot)$ being linearly independent on some bounded interval $[t_o,T]$.

Proposition 3.3. (S) is globally R^m-null controllable if and only if

$$\int_{t_o}^{\infty} H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = +\infty$$

for all non-zero solutions $z(\cdot)$ of (S').

The proof of this result is in Appendix B.

4. Some Computational Aspects. In a large number of problems, one may have to resort to the computer to check whether or not a system is Ω-null controllable. When using equation (2.3), a solution of the minimization problem $\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda): \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is needed. Direct application of so-called gradient or descent algorithms to compute $\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda): \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is precluded by the fact that $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is in general not differentiable in λ. This fact is a consequence

of the sup operation involved in the definition of $H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)$. Fortunately, however, numerical computation of $\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda): \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is feasible if "generalized steepest descent" schemes are used. These schemes rely on subdifferential† rather than gradient information. The next two lemmas develop a description of the subdifferential of $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$. The proofs are given in Appendix C.

Lemma 4.1. For fixed $(x_o,T) \in R^n \times R$, $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is a lower semicontinuous convex function of λ.

Lemma 4.2. For fixed $(x_o,T) \in R^n \times R$, the subdifferential of $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ at $\lambda \in R^n$ consists of all vectors $\lambda_* \in R^n$ of the form

$$\lambda_* = \Phi(T,t_o)x_o + \int_{t_o}^{T} \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)\omega_*(\tau)d\tau \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$\omega_*(\tau) \in \arg\max\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda : \omega \in \Omega\}$$
$$= \{\omega \in \Omega : \omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda \geq \eta\, B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda \ \forall\ \eta \in \Omega\} \tag{4.2}$$

for almost all $\tau \in [0,T]$.

Remark. Since $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is the support function on the attainable set (see discussion preceding Theorem 2.3), a geometric interpretation of the subdifferential at λ is available: This set consists of all vectors in the normal cone to the attainable set at λ. (See Goodman [24, p. 285]).

Formulae (4.1) and (4.2) hold for arbitrary compact-convex Ω. Often however, more structural information is known about Ω. In such cases, (4.1) and (4.2) may simplify. To illustrate, suppose

† $\lambda_* \in \partial J(x_o,T,\lambda)$, the subdifferential of $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ at λ, if and only if

$$J(x_o,T,z) \geq J(x_o,T,\lambda) + (z-\lambda)'\lambda_* \quad \text{for all } z \in R^n \ .$$

$$\Omega = [-M_1,M_1] \times [-M_2,M_2] \times \ldots \times [-M_m,M_m] \; ; \; (M_i > 0)$$

Then, the maximum in (4.2) is achieved in the i^{th} component by

$$[\omega_*(\tau)]_i \in M_i \, \text{sgn}[B'(\tau)\phi'(T,\tau)\lambda]_i \; ; \; i = 1,2,\ldots,m$$

where sgn $x \triangleq 1$ if $x > 0$; sgn $x \triangleq -1$ if $x < 0$; sgn $0 \triangleq [-1,1]$. Consequently, for this case, we can substitute into (4.1) and show that the subdifferential $\partial J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ consists of all vectors $\lambda_* \in R^n$ of the form

$$\lambda_* = \phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \sum_{i=1}^m M_i h_i(T,\tau)\,\text{sgn}\,\lambda' h_i(T,\tau)\,d\tau \tag{4.3}$$

where $h_i(T,\tau)$ is the i^{th} column of $H(T,\tau) \triangleq \phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)$. This description of the subdifferentials of $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ can be used in conjunction with the generalized steepest descent algorithms to compute $\min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda): \lambda \in \Lambda\}$.

We also note that λ_* is uniquely specified by (4.3) if

$$\text{measure}\{\tau : \lambda' h_i(T,\tau) = 0\} = 0 \quad \underline{\text{for}} \quad i = 1,2,\ldots,m \; .$$

For such λ, $\partial J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is precisely $\nabla_\lambda J(x_o,T,\lambda)$, the gradient of $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ at λ.

5. The Steering Control. Using the results of Section 2, we can determine if (S) is Ω-null controllable. However, those results do not give a method for determining a steering control $u_*(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ which accomplishes this objective.

One method of determining an appropriate $u_*(\cdot)$ is to solve the time optimal control problem, i.e., find $u_*(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ which steers (S) from given (x_o,t_o) to the origin and does so in minimum time. If there is a control which steers the system to the origin, then there is a time optimal one [2]. Hence, in principle, a steering control can be numerically computed using any of a wide variety of algorithms which are available for solution of the time optimal control problem.

Since the solution of the time optimal problem is determined by solving a two point boundary value problem, it can be quite difficult to obtain the steering control this way. In this section, a "simpler" alternative method for

generating a steering control is presented. This technique does not involve a two point boundary value problem and leads to a control which steers the system arbitrarily close to the origin. Our result is obtained from the following minimum norm problem:† Given initial point (x_o,t_o) and a final time T, find $u(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$ which leads to the smallest value of $\|x(T)\|$. The solution of this minimum norm problem is characterized in the next theorem.

Theorem 5.1. (See Appendix D for proof). Let (x_o,t_o) and T be given. Suppose that $\lambda_* \in R^n$ achieves the minimum of $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ over the closed unit ball. Then any solution of the minimum norm problem satisfies

$$u_*(\tau) \in \arg\max\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda_* : \omega \in \Omega\} \tag{5.1}$$

for almost all $\tau \in [t_o,T]$.

We note that condition (5.1) will uniquely determine $u_*(\cdot)$ whenever the minimum of $\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda_*$ is uniquely achieved. For example, suppose

$$\Omega = [-M_1,M_1] \times [-M_2,M_2] \times \ldots \times [-M_m,M_m] \quad (M_i > 0) \ .$$

Then (5.1) requires

$$[u_*(\tau)]_i \in M_i \operatorname{sgn}[B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda_*]_i \ , \quad i = 1,2,\ldots,m. \tag{5.2}$$

For the case when the minimum of $\|x(T)\| = 0$, $\lambda_* = 0$ and (5.1) will not determine a control which steers (S) to the origin. The following heuristic procedure can be used to determine a control which steers (S) arbitrarily close to the origin: Choose a T such that the minimum of $\|x(T)\|$ is nonzero. As T is increased, the minimum of $\|x(T)\|$ approaches zero and the corresponding solution $u_*(\cdot)$, generated via (5.2), of the minimum norm problem results in a control which steers the system progressively closer to the origin.

---

† (S) here is required to be R^m-null controllable.

In our next theorem, we provide another useful characterization of steering controls. For fixed $T \in [0,\infty)$, $x_o \in R^n$, we define the functional V_T: $R^n \times \mathfrak{M}(\Omega) \to R$ by

$$V_T(\lambda,u(\cdot)) = \lambda'\Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_0^T \lambda'\Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau$$

Theorem 5.2. (See Appendix D for proof). Pick any compact convex set Λ containing zero as an interior point. Then $V_T(\lambda,u(\cdot))$ possesses at least one saddle point $(\lambda_*,u_*(\cdot)) \in \Lambda \times \mathfrak{M}(\Omega)$. Moreover, $u_*(\cdot)$ steers x_o to zero at time T if and only if $V_T(\lambda_*,u_*(\cdot)) = 0$.

6. Additional Applications. In this section, we use our results to obtain an existence theorem for the time optimal control problem and also apply our results to a pursuit game.

Existence of Time Optimal Controls. Consider the following time optimal control problem: Find $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ which drives the state $x(\cdot)$ of (S) from an initial position $x(t_o) = x_o$ to the origin and minimizes

$$C(u(\cdot)) = \int_{t_o}^{t_f} dt \quad ; \quad t_f = \text{arrival time at the origin.}$$

The classical theorem for existence of a time optimal control (e.g., Lee and Markus [2]) requires that there is at least one control which transfers the state $x(\cdot)$ of (S) to the origin. Combining the result of [2] with our Theorem 2.3, we obtain the following existence lemma.

Lemma 6.1. There exists a solution to the time optimal control problem if and only if there is some finite $t_f \in [t_o,\infty)$ such that

$$\min\{J(x_o,t_f,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} = 0 \quad .$$

Furthermore, the time optimal cost is given by

$$C^*(u_*(\cdot)) = \min\{t_f : \min[J(x_o,t_f,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda] = 0\} \quad .$$

Pursuit Games. Next, we consider the pursuit game studied by Hajek [18]. The system is described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) - p(t) + q(t) \; ; \; p(t) \in P \; , \; q(t) \in Q \quad x(t_o) = x_o \tag{6.1}$$

where P and Q are compact convex subsets of R^n. The pursuer $p(\cdot)$ seeks a strategy $\sigma : Q \times [t_o,\infty) \to P$ which steers $x(\cdot)$ to the origin for all possible quarry controls $q(\cdot) : [t_o,\infty) \to Q$. A quarry control is admissible if it is measurable and a strategy is admissible if $\sigma(\cdot)$ preserves measurability.

In [18], a solution to this problem is obtained in terms of the associated control system

$$\dot{y}(t) = Ay(t) - u(t) \; ; \; u(t) \in P \overset{*}{-} Q \; ; \; y(t_o) = x_o \tag{6.2}$$

where $P \overset{*}{-} Q$ is the Pontryagin difference. i.e.,

$$P \overset{*}{-} Q \triangleq \{x \in R^n : x + Q \subseteq P\} \; .$$

Admissible controls $u(\cdot)$ above must be measurable.

Simply put, Hajek's result says that the state $x(\cdot)$ of (6.1) can be forced to the origin, for all admissible $q(\cdot)$, if and only if the state $y(\cdot)$ of (6.2) can be steered to the origin. More precisely, the following theorem is available.

First Reciprocity Theorem [18]. Initial position x_o in (6.1) can be (stroboscopically) forced to the origin at time $T \geq t_o$ by a strategy $\sigma(\cdot)$ if and only if, x_o in (6.2) can be steered to the origin at time T by an admissible control $u(\cdot)$. Furthermore, $\sigma(\cdot)$ and $u(\cdot)$ are related by

$$\sigma(q,t) = u(t) + q \; . \tag{6.3}$$

By applying Theorem 2.3 to (6.2), we obtain another condition for determining if (6.1) can be forced to the origin.

Lemma 6.2. Assume $P \overset{*}{-} Q$ compact. Pick any subset Λ of R^n containing zero as an interior point. Then x_o in (6.1) can be forced to the origin at time $T \geq t_o$ by a strategy $\sigma(\cdot)$ if and only if

$$\min\{K(x_o,T,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} = 0$$

where

$$K(x_o,T,\lambda) \triangleq x_o' e^{A'(T - t_o)}\lambda + \int_{t_o}^{T} H_{P \overset{*}{-} Q}(e^{A'(T - \tau)}\lambda)d\tau$$

It should be pointed out that in addition to pursuit game interpretation of (6.1), (6.1) can also be viewed as a problem of steering a system with disturbances to the origin if $q(\cdot)$ is thought of as a disturbance. Also, the results apply to systems described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bp(t) + Cq(t) \; ; \; p(t) \in P \quad , \quad q(t) \in Q$$

if one replaces $Bp(t)$ by $p'(t)$, $Cq(t)$ by $-q'(t)$, P by BP and Q by CQ.

APPENDIX A

Proof of Theorems 2.1, 2.3 and Corollary 2.2. Since Theorem 2.3 is used in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we first present the proof of Theorem 2.3. There are many ways to prove Theorem 2.3; our proof exploits the convexity of the attainable set in conjunction with a measurable selection theorem. We note that a proof of the sufficiency part of the theorem is given in [6, Theorem 7.2.1]. To simplify our notation, we henceforth take $t_o = 0$ without loss of generality. This will apply to subsequent appendices as well.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let $A_T(x_o)$ be the set of states which can be attained from x_o at time T, i.e.,

$$(A.1) \qquad A_T(x_o) = \left\{ \Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau \; : \; u(\cdot) \in \Omega \right\} .$$

The set $A_T(x_o)$ is convex and compact [2]. From Def. 1.1, it follows that x_o can be steered to 0 at time T if and only if $0 \in A_T(x_o)$ or, equivalently, by the Separating Hyerplane Theorem [21],

$$(A.2) \qquad 0 \leq \sup\left\{ \lambda' a \; : \; a \in A_T(x_o) \right\}$$

for all vectors $\lambda \in R^n$. Using (A.1), requirement (A.2) becomes

$$(A.3) \qquad \lambda'\Phi(T,0)x_o + \sup\left\{ \int_o^T \lambda'\Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau \; : \; u(\cdot) \in \Omega \right\} \geq 0$$

for all $\lambda \in R^n$. As a consequence of the measurable selection theory of [19], we can commute the supremum and integral operations in (A.3)†. Thus, $0 \in A_T(x_o)$ if and only if

$$(A.4) \qquad 0 \leq \lambda'\Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)d\tau = J(x_o,T,\lambda)$$

for all $\lambda \in R^n$. Since $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ is positively homogeneous in λ, we can restrict λ to Λ in (A.4). Theorem 2.3 now follows. □

† $\Phi(T,\tau)\,B(\tau)$ being a Cartheodory function enables us to apply the results of [19].

Next, we present the proof of Theorem 2.1. In the proof, Theorem 2.3 is used.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 (Necessity): We suppose that (S) is globally Ω-null controllable at $t_o = 0$. Let $z(\cdot)$ be any non-zero solution of (S'); we must prove that

$$\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = +\infty \quad . \tag{A.5}$$

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose there is a non-zero solution $\hat{z}(\cdot)$ such that

$$\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\hat{z}(\tau))d\tau = \alpha \ , \quad \alpha < \infty$$

Then there is a positive constant $\beta < \infty$ such that

$$\int_o^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\hat{z}(\tau))d\tau < \beta$$

Define

$$x_o^* \triangleq \frac{-2\alpha\hat{z}(0)}{\hat{z}'(0)\hat{z}(0)} \ ; \ x_o^* \neq 0 \quad .$$

We now claim that x_o^* cannot be steered to zero by an admissible control $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)$. To prove our claim, for each $t \in [0,\infty)$, define

$$\lambda_t \triangleq \phi'(0,t)\hat{z}(0) \ ; \ \lambda_t \neq 0 \quad .$$

Now, given any $t \in [0,\infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} J(x_o^*,t,\lambda_t) &= x_o^{*\prime}\phi'(t,0)\lambda_t + \int_o^t H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\phi'(t,\tau)\lambda_t)d\tau \\ &= x_o^{*\prime}\hat{z}(0) + \int_o^t H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\hat{z}(\tau))d\tau \\ &\leq -2\alpha + \beta \\ &< 0 \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\Lambda = R^n$ in Theorem 2.3, it follows that

$$\min\{J(x_o^*,t,\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \leq J(x_o^*,t,\lambda_t) < 0$$

for all $t \in [0,\infty)$. By Theorem 2.3, (S) is <u>not</u> Ω-null controllable at $(x_o^*,0)$. □

(Sufficiency): Now, we assume that (A.5) holds. Again, we proceed by contradiction, i.e., suppose (S) is <u>not</u> globally Ω-null controllable at $t_o = 0$. Hence, there exists an initial condition $x_o^* \neq 0$ which cannot be steered to zero. By Theorem 2.3 (with $\Lambda = R^n$), we can find a sequence of times $\langle t_k \rangle_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and a sequence of vectors $\langle \lambda_k \rangle_{k=1}^{\infty}$ having the following properties:

P1. $\lim_{k \to \infty} t_k = +\infty$;

P2. $J(x_o^*,t_k,\lambda_k) < 0$ for $k = 1,2,3...$

We are going to construct an initial condition $\tilde{z}_o \neq 0$ for (S') which makes the integral in (A.5) finite. To meet this end, let

$$z_k = \frac{\phi'(t_k,0)\lambda_k}{\|\phi'(t_k,0)\lambda_k\|} \quad ; \quad k = 1,2,... \quad ;$$

We note that each z_k above is non-zero because $\lambda_k \neq 0$ and $\phi(t_k,0)$ is invertible. Then $\langle z_k \rangle_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence in R^n belonging to the set

$$S \triangleq \{z \in R^n : \|z\| = 1\} \quad .$$

Since S is compact, we can extract a subsequence $\langle z_{k_j} \rangle_{j=1}^{\infty}$ which converges to some vector $\tilde{z}_o \in S$. We will now show that $\tilde{z}_o$ is the initial condition which we seek. Let $\tilde{z}(\cdot)$ be the trajectory of (S') generated by $z(0) \triangleq \tilde{z}_o$; let $\langle t_{k_j} \rangle_{j=1}^{\infty}$

denote the subsequence of times corresponding to $\langle z_{k_j} \rangle_{j=1}^{\infty}$. By P1, we have

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} t_{k_j} = +\infty$$

and by P2, it follows that

$$x_o^{*\prime}\Phi'(t_{k_j},0)\lambda_{k_j} + \int_o^{t_{k_j}} H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)\Phi'(t_{k_j},\tau)\lambda_{k_j})d\tau < 0 \quad \underline{\text{for}} \quad j = 1,2,3,\ldots$$

Dividing by $\|\Phi'(t_{k_j},0)\lambda_{k_j}\|$ and noting that H_{Ω} is positively homogeneous, we obtain

$$\int_o^{t_{k_j}} H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)z_{k_j})d\tau \leq \|x_o^*\| \, \|z_{k_j}\| \quad \underline{\text{for}} \quad j = 1,2,3,\ldots$$

$$\leq \|x_o^*\| \quad \underline{\text{for}} \quad j = 1,2,3,\ldots$$

We would like to obtain an inequality involving $\tilde{z}_o$ with an infinite upper limit on this integral. To accomplish this, we define

$$f_{k_j}(\tau) \triangleq H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)z_{k_j}) \quad \text{if} \quad \tau \in [0,t_{k_j}] ;$$

$$\triangleq 0 \quad \text{otherwise;} \quad j = 1,2,3,\ldots;$$

$$f(\tau) \triangleq H_{\Omega}(B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\tilde{z}_o) \; ; \quad \tau \in [0,\infty)$$

and make the following observations:

(i) $\int_o^{\infty} f_{k_j}(\tau)d\tau$ is bounded (by $\|x_o^*\|$) for $j = 1,2,3,\ldots$

(ii) $f_{k_j}(\tau)$ converges pointwise to $f(\tau)$ on $[0,\infty)$. This observation is proven using the facts that $z_{k_j} \to \tilde{z}_o$, $t_{k_j} \to +\infty$ and H_{Ω} depends continuously on its argument.

Applying Fatou's Lemma [20, p. 83], we have

$$\int_0^\infty f(\tau)d\tau \le \liminf_{j\to\infty} \int_0^\infty f_{k_j}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\le \limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_0^\infty f_{k_j}(\tau)d\tau$$

$$\le \|x_o^*\| \quad .$$

Substitution for $f(\tau)$ above gives

$$\int_0^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\tilde{z}_o)d\tau \le \|x_o^*\| \quad ,$$

i.e.,

$$\int_0^\infty H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\tilde{z}(\tau))d\tau \le \|x_o^*\|$$

$$< \infty$$

which is the contradiction that we seek. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Proof of Corollary 2.2. Suppose Ω and Ω' satisfy the hypotheses of the corollary. We are going to show that (S) is globally Ω'-null controllable. To prove this, it is sufficient to find a subset $\Omega'_\delta \subseteq \Omega'$ such that (S) is globally Ω'_δ-null controllable: Pick $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\Omega'_\delta \triangleq \{\omega: \|\omega\| \le \delta\} \subseteq \Omega'$$

(This can be accomplished because zero is interior to Ω'.) Now, to prove that Ω'_δ has the desired property, we pick $R > 0$ such that

$$\Omega_R \triangleq \{\omega: \|\omega\| \le R\} \supseteq \Omega$$

(This can also be done since Ω is compact, hence bounded.) Let $z(\cdot)$ be any

non-zero solution of (S'). Then we have

$$\int_0^\infty H_{\Omega'_\delta}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = \int_0^\infty \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)z(\tau) : \|\omega\| \le \delta\}d\tau$$

$$= \delta \int_0^\infty \|B'(\tau)z(\tau)\| d\tau$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{R} \int_0^\infty R\|B'(\tau)z(\tau)\| d\tau$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{R} \int_0^\infty \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)z(\tau): \|\omega\| \le R\}d\tau$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{R} \int_0^\infty H_{\Omega_R}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau$$

$$= +\infty$$

since (S) is globally Ω_R-null controllable. (Ω_R-null controllability follows from Ω-null controllability in conjunction with the fact that $\Omega_R \supseteq \Omega$.) By Theorem 2.1, we conclude that (S) must be globally Ω'_δ-null controllable and hence Ω'-null controllable. □

APPENDIX B

Proof of Theorem 3.2. (i): This condition follows immediately from the fact that global R^m-null controllability is necessary for global Ω-null controllability.

It is also possible to prove (i) directly from Theorem 2.1. Suppose (S) is globally Ω-null controllable but rank $(Q) < n$. Then there exists a $v \in R^n$, $v \neq 0$, such that $B'e^{-A't}v = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Let $z(0) = v$. Then $z(\tau) = e^{-A'\tau}v$ and

$$\int_0^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega'B'z(\tau))d\tau = \int_0^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega'B'e^{-A'\tau}v)d\tau = 0$$

which contradicts Theorem 2.1.

(ii): Suppose (S) is globally Ω-null controllable but there exists a real eigenvector v of A' satisfying $\omega'B'v \leq 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Denoting by λ the real eigenvalue associated with v, we have $e^{-A't}v = e^{-\lambda t}v$. With $z(0) = v, z(\tau) = e^{-A'\tau}v = e^{-\lambda\tau}v$ and

$$\int_0^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega'B'z(\tau)d\tau = \int_0^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega'B'e^{-\lambda\tau}v)d\tau$$

$$= \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda\tau} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega'B'v)d\tau$$

Now this integral is less than or equal to zero since $\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega'B'v) \leq 0$ and $e^{-\lambda t} \geq 0$. This contradicts Theorem 2.1.

(iii): Again the proof is by contradiction. Assume (S) is globally Ω-null controllable but A has an eigenvalue λ with a positive real part. Then λ is also an eigenvalue of A' so that $A'v = \lambda v$ where v is an eigenvector corresponding to A'. Let $\bar{\lambda}$ and $\bar{v}$ denote the complex conjugate of λ and v. They satisfy $A\bar{v} = \bar{\lambda}\bar{v}$. Hence,

$$e^{-A't}v = e^{\lambda t}v \quad \text{and} \quad e^{-A't}\bar{v} = e^{\bar{\lambda}t}\bar{v}$$

Consider the solution of the adjoint equation corresponding to the initial condition $z(0) = v + \bar{v}$. (Note that $z(0)$ is real.) For this $z(0)$

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' z(\tau)) = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' e^{-A'\tau}(v + \bar{v}))$$

$$= \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \left[\omega' B' \left(e^{-\lambda t} v + e^{-\bar{\lambda} t} \bar{v}\right)\right]$$

$$= \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \left\{\omega' B' e^{-at} [2m \cos bt + 2n \sin bt]\right\}$$

where a and b are the real part and imaginary part of λ and n and m are the real part and imaginary part of v. Let $M \triangleq \sup_{t \geq 0} \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \omega' B' [2n \cos bt + 2n \sin bt]$. M is finite since Ω is compact, i.e., $M \leq 2 \max\{|n|, |m|\} \|B\| \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\omega\|$. Thus

$$\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' z(\tau)) \leq M e^{-at}$$

and

$$\int_o^\infty \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} (\omega' B' z(\tau)) d\tau \leq M \int_o^\infty e^{-at} dt$$

The integral on the right is finite since $a > 0$ and we have a contradiction to Theorem 2.1. □

Proof of Proposition 3.3. (Necessity): Suppose (S) is globally R^m-null controllable. Then there is a finite interval $[0,T]$ on which the rows of $\Phi(0,\cdot)B(\cdot)$ are linearly independent. Thus, for every non-zero vector $z_o \in R^n$, it follows that $B'(t)\Phi'(0,t)z_o \neq 0$ for some $t \in [0,T]$. Since, $B'(\cdot)\Phi'(0,\cdot)z_o$ is continuous, there must be an interval $I = [t - \delta, t + \delta]$ on which $B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)z_o \neq 0$ for all $\tau \in I$. On this interval, we have

$$\sup\{\omega\ B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)z_o : \omega \in R^m\} = +\infty \quad .$$

Hence, using the non-negativity of $H_{(\cdot)}(\cdot)$, we conclude that

$$\int_o^\infty H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau \geq \int_I H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)z_o)d\tau$$

$$= \int_I \sup\{\omega' B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)z_o : \omega \in R^m\}d\tau$$

$$= +\infty$$

(Sufficiency): Proceeding by contradiction, we suppose that for all non-zero solutions $z(\cdot)$ of (S'), we have

$$\int_0^\infty H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)z(\tau))d\tau = +\infty$$

but the columns of $B'(\cdot)\Phi'(0,\cdot)$ are linearly dependent on every bounded interval $[0,T]$. Let $\langle T_n\rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be a monotone increasing sequence of times such that $T_n \to \infty$. Then, for each n, we can find a non-zero vector $\tilde{z}_n$ such that $B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\tilde{z}_n \equiv 0$ on $[0,T_n]$. Let

$$z_n \triangleq \frac{\tilde{z}_n}{\|\tilde{z}_n\|} \quad \text{for} \quad n = 1,2,\ldots \ .$$

Then, $\langle z_n\rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in the (compact) unit ball. Hence, we can extract a subsequence z_{n_j} converging to some $\hat{z}_o$, $\|\hat{z}_o\| = 1$. We notice that the corresponding subsequence of times T_{n_j} still converges to $+\infty$. Furthermore, for each fixed $\tau \in [0,\infty)$, we have

$$B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\hat{z}_o = \lim_{j\to\infty} B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)z_{n_j}$$

$$= 0$$

Consequently, if $\hat{z}(\tau)$ is the trajectory mate of $\hat{z}_o$,

$$\int_0^\infty H_{R^m}(B'(\tau)\hat{z}(\tau))d\tau = \int_0^\infty \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\hat{z}_o : \omega \in R^m\}d\tau = 0$$

which contradicts the assumed hypothesis. □

APPENDIX C

Proof of Lemma 4.1. For (x_o,T) fixed, $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ can be expressed as

$$J(x_o,T,\lambda) = \sup\{H_\omega(\lambda) : \omega(\cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(\Omega)\}$$

where

$$H_\omega(\lambda) \triangleq \lambda'\Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \lambda'\Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)\omega(\tau)d\tau \quad .$$

Consequently, $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ is the pointwise supremum over an indexed collection of continuous linear (hence convex) functions. Hence $J(x_o,T,\cdot)$ itself must be convex and at least lower semicontinuous (in fact, continuous). □

Proof of Lemma 4.2. We prove this lemma using some of the standard properties of subdifferentials given in Rockafellar [21], [22]. Since both functions in the definition of $J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ are finite and convex, $\lambda_* \in \partial J(x_o,T,\lambda)$ if and only if

$$\lambda_* \in \partial(x_o'\Phi'(T,0)\lambda) + \partial\int_o^T H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)d\tau \qquad \text{(by Theorem 23.8 of [22])}$$

$$= \Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \partial H_\Omega(B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda)d\tau \qquad \text{(by Theorem 23 of [22])}$$

$$= \Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_o^T \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)\cdot\partial H_\Omega(\hat{\omega}(\tau))\big|_{\hat{\omega}(\tau)=B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\lambda} d\tau$$

(by Theorem 23.9 of [21])

Now, by Corollary 23.5.3 of [21], $\omega_*(\tau) \in \partial H_\Omega(\hat{\omega}(\tau))$ if and only if $\omega_*(\tau) \in \arg\max\{\omega'\hat{\omega}(\tau) : \omega \in \Omega\}$. Substituting the required form for $\hat{\omega}$ above, we obtain our desired representation for λ_*. □

APPENDIX D

Sketch of a Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $f : L^1(0,T;R^m) \to R$, $g : R^n \to R$, $\Lambda_T : L^1(0,T;R^m) \to R^n$ be given by

$$f(u) \triangleq 0 \text{ if } u(\cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(\Omega) \; ; \quad f(u) \triangleq +\infty \text{ otherwise} \; ;$$

$$g(z) \triangleq -\|\Phi(T,0)x_o + z\| \; ; \quad z \in R^n \; ;$$

$$\Lambda_T u \triangleq \int_o^T \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau \quad .$$

Then, using the notation above

$$\inf(MN) \triangleq \inf\{\|x(T)\| \; : \; u(\cdot) \in \mathbb{M}(\Omega)\}$$

$$= \inf\{f(u) - g(\Lambda_T u) \; : \; u \in L^1(0,T;R^m)\} \quad .$$

Written in this way, inf(MN) is in the standard form for application of Rockafellar's extension of Fenchel's Duality Theorem (cf. [23], Theorem 1). The functionals f and g are respectively proper convex and concave functions; it can be easily shown that inf(MN) is "stably set" -- a technical precondition for Rockafellar's Theorem.

By carrying out the computations involved in Theorem 1 of [23], it can be shown that the problem

$$\min(MN)^* \triangleq \min\{J(x_o,T,\lambda) \; : \; \lambda \in \Lambda\}$$

is dual to inf(MN) in the following sense:

$$\inf(MN) + \min(MN)^* = 0 \quad .$$

The "extremality condition" in Rockafellar's theorem provides a necessary condition which must be satisfied by all solution pairs λ_* solving $(MN)^*$ and $u_*(\cdot)$ solving (MN). This extremality condition requires

$$\Lambda_T^* \lambda_* \in \partial f(u_*)$$

where Λ_T^* is the adjoint of Λ_T and $\partial f(u_*)$ is the subdifferential of f at u_*. For our choice of f, this necessary condition particularizes to

$$\lambda_*' \Phi(T,\tau) B(\tau) \in (\text{Normal cone of } \mathbb{m}(\Omega) \text{ at } u_*(\cdot)) \quad .$$

We denote this normal cone at u_* by $N_c(u_*)$. By definition of the normal cone, we have $v(\cdot) \in N_c(u^*)$ if and only if

$$\int_0^T u_*'(\tau) B'(\tau) \Phi'(T,\tau) \lambda_* d\tau = \int_0^T \sup\{\omega' B'(\tau) \Phi'(T,\tau) \lambda_* : \omega \in \Omega\} d\tau \quad .$$

This is possible only if $\omega = u_*(\tau)$ achieves the supremum of $\omega' B'(\tau) \Phi'(T,\tau) \lambda_*$ for almost all $\tau \in [0,T]$. Equivalently, we must have

$$u_*(\tau) \in \arg\max\{\omega' B'(\tau) \Phi'(T,\tau) \lambda_* : \omega \in \Omega\}$$

for almost all $\tau \in [0,T]$.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. As in the proof of Theorem 2.3, let $A_T(x_o)$ be the set of states which can be attained from x_o at time T. We recall that this set is compact and convex. Define $W_T : \Lambda \times A_T(x_o) \to R$ by

$$W_T(\lambda,\xi) \triangleq \lambda'\xi \quad . \tag{D.1}$$

In accordance with Proposition 2.3 of [19, p. 171], $W_T(\lambda,\xi)$ will possess a saddle point because the following conditions are satisfied:

(D.2.1) For all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $W(\lambda,\cdot)$ is concave and upper semicontinuous.

(D.2.2) For all $\xi \in \Pi_T(\Omega)$, $W(\cdot,\xi)$ is convex and lower semicontinuous.

Since $W_T(\lambda,\xi)$ possesses a saddle point, we note that

$$\min_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \max_{u(\cdot)\in\mathbb{m}(\Omega)} V_T(\lambda,u(\cdot)) = \min_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \max_{\xi\in A_T(x_o)} W_T(\lambda,\xi)$$

Furthermore,

$$\max_{u(\cdot)\in\mathbb{m}(\Omega)} \min_{\lambda\in\Lambda} V_T(\lambda,u(\cdot)) = \max_{\xi\in A_T(x_o)} \min_{\lambda\in\Lambda} W_T(\lambda,\xi) \quad .$$

These equalities, in conjunction with the fact that W_T possesses a saddle point, imply that V_T also has a saddle point.

To prove the last part of the theorem, we take $(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot))$ to be a given saddle point of $V_T(\lambda, u(\cdot))$. Hence we have

$$V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) = \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \max_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)} V_T(\lambda, u(\cdot)) \quad . \tag{D.3}$$

Using a measurable selection argument, as in the proof of Theorem 2.3, it is also apparent that

$$\min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \max_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)} V_T(\lambda, u(\cdot)) = \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J(x_o, T, \lambda) \quad . \tag{D.4}$$

From (D.3) and (D.4) we conclude that

$$V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) = \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J(x_o, T, \lambda) \quad . \tag{D.5}$$

From Theorem 2.3 and the comments following the theorem, we know that x_o can be steered to zero at time T if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J(x_o, T, \lambda) \\ &= V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) \quad \text{(by (D.5))}. \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof, we must show that if $V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) = 0$, then $u^*(\cdot)$ steers x_o to 0. Now

$$0 = V_T(\lambda_*, u_*(\cdot)) \leq V_T(\lambda, u_*(\cdot)) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \Lambda$$

or

$$0 \leq \lambda' \left[\Phi(T,0)x_o + \int_0^T \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u_*(\tau)d\tau \right] \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

Thus

$$0 \leq \lambda' \, x(T,x_o,u_*(\cdot)) \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \Lambda \tag{D.6}$$

Since 0 is an interior point of the convex, compact set Λ, (D.6) implies $x(T,x_o,u_*(\cdot)) = 0$ and $u_*(\cdot)$ is a steering control. □

Acknowledgment. The authors wish to thank the reviewers for their thorough reading of the paper. Their comments and suggestions led to many simplifications in the proofs.

REFERENCES

1. R. E. Kalman, Mathematical Description of Linear Dynamical System, This Journal, 1 (1963), pp. 152-192.

2. E. Lee and L. Markus, Foundations of Optimal Control Theory, John Wiley, New York, 1967.

3. S. Saperstone and J. Yorke, Controllability of Linear Oscillatory Systems Using Positive Controls, This Journal, 9 (1971), pp. 253-262.

4. R. Brammer, Controllability in Linear Autonomous Systems with Positive Controllers, This Journal, 10 (1972), pp. 339-353.

5. S. Saperstone, Global Controllability of Linear Systems with Positive Controls, This Journal, 11 (1973), pp. 417-423.

6. A. Friedman, Differential Games, Wiley, 1971.

7. R. Conti, Teoria del Controllo e del Controllo Ottimo, UTET, Torino, Italy, 1974.

8. L. Pandolfi, Linear Control Systems: Controllability with Constrained Controls, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 19 (1976), pp. 577-585.

9. J. Dauer, Controllability of Nonlinear Systems Using a Growth Condition, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 9 (1972), pp. 90-98.

10. J. Dauer, Controllability on Nonlinear Systems with Restrained Controls, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 14 (1974), pp. 251-262.

11. E. Chukwu and J. Gronski, Controllability of Nonlinear Systems with Restrained Controls to Closed Convex Sets, Department of Mathematics Report CSUMD 45, Cleveland State University.

12. E. N. Chuckwu and S. D. Sillman, Complete Controllability to a Closed Target Set, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 21 (1977), pp. 369-383.

13. W. J. Grantham and T. L. Vincent, A Controllability Minimum Principle, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 17 (1975), pp. 93-114.

14. M. E. Evans and D. N. P. Murthy, Controllability of Discrete-Time Systems with Positive Controls, IEEE Automatic Control, AC-22 (1977), pp. 942-945.

15. M. Pachter and D. H. Jacobson, Control with Conic Constraint Set, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications (to appear).

16. D. H. Jacobson, Extension of Linear-Quadratic Control, Optimization and Matrix Theory, Academic Press, New York, 1977.

17. C. T. Chen, Introduction to Linear System Theory, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1970.

18. O. Hájek, Pursuit Games, Academic Press, New York, 1975.

19. I. Ekeland and R. Teman, Convex Analysis and Variational Problems, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1976.

20. H. L. Royden, Real Analysis, MacMillan Co., New York, 1968.

21. R. T. Rockafellar, Convex Analysis, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1972.

22. R. T. Rockafellar, Conjugate Duality and Optimization, monograph, SIAM Publications, Philadelphia, PA, 1974.

23. R. T. Rockafellar, Duality and Stability in Extremum Problems Involving Convex Function, Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 21 (1967), pp. 167-187.

24. G. S. Goodman, Support Functions and the Integration of Set-Valued Mappings, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vol. 2 (1976), pp. 281-296.

25. M. Heymann and R. J. Stern, Controllability of Linear Systems with Positive Controls: Geometric Considerations, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Application, 52 (1975), pp. 36-41.

APPENDIX C

CONTROLLING A SYSTEM TO A TARGET - PART 1:

LINEAR SYSTEMS WITH ORIGIN AS TARGET

W. E. Schmitendorf[1]
Mechanical Engineering Department
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201

B. R. Barmish
Electrical Engineering Department
The University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14627

SUMMARY

Consider a system described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(t)\,x(t) + B(t)\,u(t), \quad t \in [0,\infty) \qquad (S)$$

where $x(t) \in R^n$ is the state and $u(t) \in R^m$ is the control. The instantaneous control values are required to belong to a prescribed set Ω in R^m. $M(\Omega)$ will denote the set of functions from R into Ω which are measurable on $[0,\infty)$ and $u(\cdot)$ is admissible if $u(\cdot) \in M(\Omega)$. The target set X is the origin, i.e. $X = \{0\}$.

We say that (S) is Ω- controllable to X from x_o if there exists an admissible control which steers (S) from x_o to X in finite time. If (S) is Ω- controllable to X from every $x_o \in R^n$, then we say that (S) is globally Ω - controllable to X.

Necessary and sufficient conditions are given for global Ω- controllability to $\{0\}$ as well as a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an admissible control which steers the system to the origin from a specified initial state.

The global result does not require zero to be an interior point of Ω while the local result only assumes Ω compact, not that it contains zero. Furthermore, the controllability test involves a search over the finite dimensional set Ω rather than the infinite dimensional set $\mathbb{M}(\Omega)$. Results on determining a steering control are also discussed.

---

[1]The research of this author was supported by AFOSR Grant No. 76-2923.

CONTROLLING A SYSTEM TO A TARGET - PART 2:

NONLINEAR SYSTEMS WITH A GENERAL TARGET

B. R. Barmish
Electrical Engineering Department
The University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14627

W. E. Schmitendorf[1]
Mechanical Engineering Department
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201

SUMMARY

In this part, our results are extended to the class of nonlinear systems described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(t)\,x(t) + f(t,u(t)),\ t\in[0,\infty) \qquad (S')$$

We also allow the target X to be any closed, convex set. A necessary condition and a sufficient condition for Ω controllability to X from x_o are given as well as a necessary condition and sufficient condition for global Ω-controllability to X.

Unlike the work of previous authors, we need not assume uniform boundedness of the state transition matrix $\Phi(o,t)$ or symmetricity and positive invariance of X with respect to $\Phi(o,t)$. Also, the assumptions that $0\in\Omega$ and $f(t,o) \equiv 0$ are not required. For systems where these assumptions are satisfied the necessary condition and sufficient condition reduce to one condition and this single condition is equivalent to those available in the literature. Furthermore, we exhibit systems which can be deemed Ω controllable or uncontrollable via our results but existing theorems cannot be used to determine if the system is Ω-controllable or Ω-uncontrollable.

---

[1]The research of this author was supported by AFOSR Grant No. 76-2923.

APPENDIX D

A RESULT ON CONTROLLING A CONSTRAINED LINEAR SYSTEM TO A LINEAR SUBSPACE[1]

W. E. Schmitendorf
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL

B. R. Barmish
Department of Electrical Engineering
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY

Abstract

We consider the problem of steering the state of a linear system to an affine target when the admissible controls are required to satisfy magnitude constraints. A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an admissible control which steers the system to the target from a specified initial condition is presented as well as a necessary condition and a sufficient condition for global controllability to the target. The output controllability problem and the special case of a point target are also discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Consider the linear system

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t) \qquad (S)$$

where the state $x(t)\in R^n$, the control $u(\cdot)\in R^m$ and $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ are given continuous matrices of appropriate dimension. In this paper, the problem studied is that of determining if there exists an admissible control $u(\cdot)$ which steers the system to a target θ given by

$$\theta = \{x: Lx = a\} .$$

Here L is a known $p \times n$ matrix of rank p and a is a given p vector. A control $u(\cdot)$ is admissible if $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ where Ω is a prespecified compact set in R^m and $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ denotes the set of functions from R into Ω that are measurable on $[t_0,\infty)$.

We now define Ω-controllability to target θ. Without loss of generality, we henceforth take $t_0 = 0$.

Definition 1. The linear system (S) is Ω-controllable to θ from x_0 if, given the initial condition $x(0) = x_0$, there exists a control $u(\cdot)\in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ such that the solution $x(\cdot)$ of (S) satisfies $Lx(T) = a$ for some $T \in [0,\infty)$, i.e. $x(T) \in \theta$. (S) is globally Ω-controllable to θ if it is controllable to θ from every $x_0 \in R^n$.

Extensive work has been done on this problem when the target is the origin ($L = I, a=0$); see, for example [1-7]. Problems with targets other than $\theta = \{0\}$ have been considered in [8-11]. In [10], it is assumed that the target is closed, convex, symmetric about 0 and satisfies the positive invariance condition

$$\Phi(0,\tau)\theta \subset \Phi(0,\tau')\theta \quad \text{for all} \quad \tau' \geq \tau$$

where $\Phi(t,t_0)$ is the state transition matrix. Here our target is not required to satisfy these assumptions. Neither do we need to make the assumption that $\Phi(0,\tau)$ is uniformly bounded, as in [8,9]. Furthermore, we do not require $0 \in \Omega$ as in [8-10]. In [11], a sufficient condition for controllability at x_0 is given, but global controllability is not considered.

In the next section, we present a necessary and sufficient condition for Ω-controllability to θ from x_0, while Sec. III presents global Ω-controllability results. Some special cases and extensions are discussed in Sec. IV. Sec. V contains examples illustrating the results.

II. CONTROLLABILITY FROM A FIXED INITIAL CONDITION

Our condition will be given in terms of the scalar function $K: R^n \times R \times R^p \to R$ defined by

$$K(x_0,T,\sigma) = x_0'\Phi'(T,0)L'\sigma - a'\sigma + \int_0^T \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)L'\sigma: \omega \in \Omega\}d\tau . \qquad (1)$$

In the sequel, only compact Ω will be considered. This guarantees that the integrand is a continuous function of τ and thus the integral in (1) is well defined.

Theorem 1. Pick any subset A of R^p which contains 0 as an interior point. Then (S) is Ω-controllable to θ from (x_0,t_0) if and only if

$$\min\{K(x_0,T,\sigma) : \sigma \in A\} = 0 \qquad (2)$$

for some $T \in [t_0,\infty)$.

Proof. Let $A_T(x_0)$ be the set of states that can be attained from x_0 at time T, i.e.,

$$A_T(x_0) = \left\{\Phi(T,0)x_0 + \int_0^T \Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau : u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)\right\}$$

and define

$$B_T(x_0) = \left\{y \in R^p : y = Lx, x \in A_T(x_0)\right\}$$

Since $A_T(x_0)$ is convex and compact, so is $B_T(x_0)$. Initial state x_0 can be steered to θ at time T if and only if point a and the set $B_T(x_0)$ cannot be strictly separated by a hyperplane or, equivalently, if and only if

$$\sigma'a \leq \sup\left\{\sigma'b: b \in B_T(x_0)\right\} \qquad (3)$$

for all $\sigma \in R^p$. Using the definition of $B_T(x_0)$, (3) becomes

$$\sigma'L\Phi(T,0)x_0 + \sup\left\{\int_0^T \sigma'L\Phi(T,\tau)B(\tau)u(\tau)d\tau : u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)\right\} - \sigma'a \geq 0 \qquad (4)$$

As a consequence of the measurable selection theory of [12], we can commute the supremum and integral operations in (4) and we have that $a \in B_T(x_0)$ if and only if

$$K(x_0,T,\sigma) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \sigma \in R^p . \qquad (5)$$

[1] The research of the first author was supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under Grant 76-2923 and that of the second author by the U.S. Department of Energy.

Since $K(x_0,T,\sigma)$ is positively homogeneous in σ, Theorem 1 follows directly from (5). □

In [13], a similar result is obtained for the more general problem where the describing equations are $\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + f(u(t),t)$ and the target is a closed, convex set. However, a direct application of [13] to the problem considered here leads to a minimization in (1) over R^n rather than R^p. Thus the condition derived here, which exploits the affine structure of the target, is easier to apply.

III. GLOBAL CONTROLLABILITY

Before presenting our global results, we need a preliminary lemma.

Lemma. A necessary and sufficient condition for $\inf\{x'v: x \in \Theta\} > -\infty$ is that $v \in R(L')$ where $R(L')$ denotes the range of L'.

Proof. If $v \in R(L')$, then $v = L'\sigma$ for some $\sigma \in R^p$. Consequently, $\inf\{v'x: x \in \Theta\} = \inf\{v'Lx: x \in \Theta\} = a'\sigma > -\infty$.

Next, suppose $\inf\{x'v: x \in \Theta\} = \beta > -\infty$ but $v \notin R(L')$. Then there is an n vector w in the null space of L satisfying

$$v'w = c \neq 0 \tag{6}$$

$$Lw = 0 \tag{7}$$

Let $x^\circ \in \Theta$, i.e. $Lx^\circ = a$ and define

$$x_n = x^\circ - n(\operatorname{sgn} c)w, \quad n=1,2,3,\ldots \tag{8}$$

From (6) and (7)

$$Lx_n = a \tag{9}$$

$$v'x_n = v'x^\circ - n|c| \tag{10}$$

Then

$$\inf\{v'x: x \in \Theta\} \leq v'x_n = v'x^\circ - n|c| \tag{11}$$

Since the right hand side of (11) tends to $-\infty$ as $n \to \infty$, $\inf\{v'x: x \in \Theta\} = -\infty$ which is the contradiction we seek. □

Our condition for global Ω-controllability will be given in terms of two time functions. For $\eta \in R^n$, define

$$V(\eta,t) \triangleq \int_0^t \max\{w'\Phi'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\eta: w \in \Omega\}d\tau$$

$$-\inf\{x'\Phi'(0,t)\eta: x \in \Theta\} \tag{12}$$

$$W(t) \triangleq \min\{V(\Phi'(t,0)L'\sigma,t): \sigma \in R^p,$$

$$\|\Phi'(t,0)L'\sigma\| = 1\} \tag{13}$$

Theorem 2. A necessary condition for global Ω-controllability to Θ is

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} V(L'\sigma,t) = +\infty \tag{14}$$

for all $\sigma \in R^p$, $\sigma \neq 0$. A sufficient condition for global Ω-controllability to Θ is

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} W(t) = +\infty \tag{15}$$

Proof. (Necessity) Proceeding by contradiction, suppose (5) is globally Ω-controllable to Θ but (14) is not satisfied. Then there exists a constant β, $0 < \beta < \infty$, and an $\bar{\sigma} \in R^p$, $\bar{\sigma} \neq 0$, such that

$$V(L'\bar{\sigma},t) < \beta \quad \text{for all} \quad t \geq 0 .$$

Consequently,

$$\inf\{x'\Phi'(0,t)L'\bar{\sigma}: x \in \Theta\} > -\infty \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0$$

and, from the lemma, there exists at each $t \in [0,\infty)$, a vector $\sigma_t \in R^p$ such that

$$\Phi'(0,t)L'\bar{\sigma} = L'\sigma_t$$

Let,

$$\bar{x}_0 = \frac{-2\beta L'\bar{\sigma}}{\bar{\sigma}'LL'\bar{\sigma}}$$

Then

$$K(\bar{x}_0,t,\sigma_t) = \bar{x}_0'\Phi'(t,0)L'\sigma_t - \sigma_t'a$$

$$+ \int_0^t \sup\{w'B'(\tau)\Phi'(t,\tau)L'\sigma_t: w \in \Omega\}d\tau$$

$$= -2\beta - \inf\{\sigma_t'Lx: x \in \Theta\}$$

$$+ \int_0^t \sup\{w'B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)L'\bar{\sigma}: w \in \Omega\}d\tau$$

$$= -2\beta + V(L'\bar{\sigma},t) = -\beta$$

Hence, $K(\bar{x}_0,t,\sigma_t) < 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and, from Theorem 1, this implies $\bar{x}_0$ is not controllable to Θ which contradicts the assumption of global Ω-controllability to Θ.

(Sufficiency) Again proceeding by contradiction, suppose (15) is satisfied but the system is not globally Ω-controllable to Θ. Then there exists an initial condition $\bar{x}_0$ which cannot be steered to Θ. In accordance with Theorem 1, given any $t \in [0,\infty)$, there is some non-zero vector σ_t such that

$$\bar{x}_0'\Phi'(t,0)L'\sigma_t - \sigma_t'a$$

$$+ \int_0^t \sup\{w'B'(\tau)\Phi'(t,\tau)L'\sigma_t: w \in \Omega\}d\tau < 0 \tag{16}$$

Using the Schwartz inequality, it follows from (16) that

$$\int_0^t \sup\{w'B'(\tau)\Phi'(t,\tau)L'\sigma_t: w \in \Omega\}d\tau$$

$$-\inf\{\sigma_t'Lx: x \in \Theta\} \leq \|\bar{x}_0\| \, \|\Phi'(t,0)L'\sigma_t\| \tag{17}$$

for all $t \in [0,\infty)$. Let

$$\bar{\sigma}_t = \frac{\sigma_t}{\|\Phi'(t,0)L'\sigma_t\|} \tag{18}$$

and observe that $\|\Phi'(t,0)L'\bar{\sigma}_t\| = 1$. Dividing (17) by $\|\Phi'(t,0)L'\sigma_t\|$ and using the fact that $\Phi'(t,\tau) = \Phi'(0,\tau)\Phi'(t,0)$ we obtain

$$\int_0^t \sup\{w'B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\Phi'(t,0)L'\bar{\sigma}_t: w \in \Omega\}d\tau$$

$$-\inf\{x'\Phi'(0,t)\Phi'(t,0)L'\bar{\sigma}_t: x \in \Theta\} \leq \|x_0\|$$

for all $t \geq 0$. This is equivalent to

$$V(\Phi'(t,0)L'\bar{\sigma}_t,t) \leq \|\bar{x}_0\|$$

for all $t \geq 0$. This implies

$$W(t) \leq \|\bar{x}_0\|$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and we have contradicted the hypothesis that $\sup_{t \geq 0} W(t) = +\infty$. □

If the results of [13] for nonlinear systems and general target are applied to (S) with target θ, a similar theorem results. However, it involves an n-vector rather than a p vector σ. Furthermore, the sufficiency portion requires that a linear programming problem be solved at each $t \geq 0$. Consequently, that result is more difficult to apply than Theorem 2 above.

IV. SPECIAL CASES AND EXTENSIONS

In this section, we discuss our results for some special targets and also show how the results can be extended to systems of the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t) + g(t)$$

where $g(\cdot): R \to R^n$ is a continuous function. (This is a special case of the more general system $\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + f(u(t),t)$ studied in [13].) The output controllability problem is also examined.

Ω-Null Controllability: When $L=I$ and $s=0$, we have $\theta = \{0\}$. Then $K(x_0,T,\sigma)$, given in (1), becomes

$$x_0'\Phi'(T,0)\sigma + \int_0^T \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(T,\tau)\sigma: \omega \in \Omega\}d\tau$$

In this case, Theorem 1 states that (S) is Ω-controllable to the origin (Ω-null controllable) at x_0 if and only if there exists a $T \geq 0$ and a set Λ such that the minimum value of the above $K(x_0,T,\sigma)$ over all $\sigma \in \Lambda$ is zero. This is identical to the result in [6]. Furthermore, it can be shown that the global result of Theorem 2 for $\theta = \{0\}$ is equivalent to the global result of [13] for this special case. Finally, under the strengthened hypothesis that Ω contains zero, the necessary condition and sufficient condition of Theorem 2 merge into a single condition which is both necessary and sufficient for global Ω-null controllability,

$$\int_0^\infty \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\sigma: \omega \in \Omega\}d\tau = +\infty ,$$

and this is identical to the global result in [6].

Complete Ω-Controllability: We say that system (S) is completely Ω-controllable if, given any pair $x_0,x_1 \in R^n$, there exists a time $T \geq 0$ and a control $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}(\Omega)$ such that the solution of (S) from x_0 satisfies $x(T) = x_1$. An obvious corollary of Theorem 1 is

Corollary 1. Pick any subset Λ of R^n which contains 0 as an interior point. Then (S) is completely Ω-controllable if and only if for every pair $x_0,x_1 \in R^n$, there is a time T_{x_0,x_1} (which may depend on x_0 and x_1) such that

$$\min\{K(x_0,T_{x_0,x_1},\sigma): \sigma \in \Lambda\} = 0$$

where "x_1" replace "s" and $L=I$ in the definition of K given in (1).

A result on complete Ω-controllability can also be obtained via Theorem 2 and is presented as a second corollary.

Corollary 2. A necessary condition for complete Ω-controllability is that for all $x_1 \in R^n$

$$\sup_{t \geq 0}\left[x_1'\Phi'(0,T)\eta + \int_0^T \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(0,\tau)\eta: \omega \in \Omega\}\right] = +\infty$$

for all $\eta \in R^n$, $\eta \neq 0$. A sufficient condition for complete Ω-controllability is that for all $x_1 \in R^n$

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \min\left\{\int_0^t \sup\{\omega'B'(\tau)\Phi'(t,\tau)\sigma: \omega \in \Omega\}d\tau - x_1'\sigma: \|\Phi'(t,0)L'\sigma\| = 1\right\} = +\infty .$$

Systems With a Forcing Function: Suppose the system is described by

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t) + g(t) \qquad (\hat{S})$$

where $g(\cdot): R \to R^n$ is continuous. For $\lambda \in R^p$, let

$$\hat{K}(x_0,T,\lambda) \triangleq x_0'\Phi'(T,0)L'\lambda - s'\lambda + \int_0^T \sup\left\{[\omega'B'(\tau) + g'(\tau)]\Phi'(T,\tau)L'\lambda: \omega \in \Omega\right\}d\tau$$

Theorem 1 applies to the system $(\hat{S})$ if we replace $K(x_0,T,\lambda)$ by $\hat{K}(x_0,T,\lambda)$ in the theorem. The proof of this result is nearly identical to the proof of Theorem 1 and is omitted.

The global result of Theorem 2 also applies to systems of the form (S) if the integrands in (12) and (13) are replaced by

$$\sup\left\{[\omega'B'(\tau) + g'(\tau)]\Phi'(0,\tau)L'\eta: \omega \in \Omega\right\}$$

and

$$\sup\left\{[\omega'B'(\tau) + g(\tau)]\Phi'(T,\tau)L'\sigma: \omega \in \Omega\right\} ,$$

respectively.

Output Controllability: Suppose that

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t) + g(t)$$

$$y(t) = Cx(t)$$

where $y(\cdot)$ is the output and C is a pxn matrix of rank p. Controlling the output to a specified point $y_1 \in R^p$ is equivalent to steering (S) to the target $\theta = \{x: Cx = y_1\}$. Hence our results apply to the output controllability problem if we replace L by C in our theorem.

V. EXAMPLES

We present two examples. In the first, we apply Theorem 1 and in the second, we investigate global controllability via Theorem 2.

Example 1. Consider the system

$$\dot{x}_1(t) = x_1(t) + u(t) , \quad \dot{x}_2(t) = x_2(t)$$

For every Ω (including $\Omega=R$), the system is not completely controllable. However, it is still possible to steer the system to some targets. Suppose $\Omega = [0,1]$ and $L = [1,0]$, $s = 1$ so that the target is $\theta = \{(x_1,x_2) : x_1 = 1\}$. For this problem

$$K(x_0,T,\sigma) = \begin{cases} \sigma(e^{T}x_{10} - 2 + e^{T}) , & \sigma \geq 0 \\ \sigma(x_{10}e^{T} - 1) , & \sigma \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

and $\min\{K(x_0,T,\sigma) : \sigma \in [-1,1]\} = 0$ if and only if

$$2e^{-T} - 1 \leq x_{10} \leq e^{-T}$$

There is $T \in [0,\infty)$ such that this inequality is satisfied if and only if $-1 < x_{10} \leq 1$. Thus we conclude from Theorem 1 that (x_{10},x_{20}) can be steered to 0 if and only if $-1 < x_{10} \leq 1$ and $-\infty < x_{20} < \infty$.

Now suppose $\theta = \{(x_1,x_2) : x_2 = 1\}$. Then

$$K(x_0,T,\sigma) = \sigma(x_{20}e^{T} - 1)$$

and $\min\{K(x_0,T,\sigma) : \sigma \in [-1,1]\} = 0$ if and only if $x_{20} = e^{-T}$. There is a $T \in [0,\infty)$ such that this equation is satisfied if and only if $0 < x_{20} \leq 1$. Hence, the system can be steered to this target if and only if $-\infty < x_{10} < \infty$ and $0 < x_{20} \leq 1$.

Example 2. We consider the double integrator

$$\dot{x}_1(t) = x_2(t)$$

$$\dot{x}_2(t) = u(t)$$

and the control constraint set is $\Omega = [-1,1]$. Suppose the target is $x_2 = 1 + x_1$ so that $L = [-1,1]$ and $a = 1$. For this problem

$$V(L,\sigma,t) = \int_0^t \sup\{\sigma(\tau+1)\sigma : \sigma\in[-1,1]\}d\tau$$

$$-\inf\{(-x_1 + x_2t + x_2)\sigma : -x_1 + x_2 = 1\}$$

$$= |\sigma|\left(\frac{t^2}{2} + t\right) \quad -\inf\{(x_2t + 1)\sigma : x_2 \in R\}$$

Since $\inf\{(x_2t + 1)\sigma : x_2 \in R\} = -\infty$ for all $\sigma \neq 0$, $V(L,\sigma,t) = +\infty$ for all $\sigma \neq 0$ and the necessary condition for global controllability to 0 is satisfied.

Next, we check the sufficient condition.

$$V(s'(t,0)L,\sigma,t) = |\sigma| \int_0^t |\tau+1-t|d\tau - \sigma$$

$$= \begin{cases} |\sigma|\left(t - \frac{t^2}{2}\right) - \sigma , & 0 \leq t \leq 1 \\ |\sigma|\left(\frac{t^2}{2} + 1 - t\right) - \sigma , & t \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

Then, for $0 \leq t \leq 1$,

$$W(t) = \min\left\{|\sigma|\left(t - \frac{t^2}{2}\right) - \sigma : \sigma^2\left[1 + (1-t)^2\right] = 1\right\}$$

$$= \left[1 + (1-t)^2\right]^{-1/2}\left(t - \frac{t^2}{2} - 1\right)$$

For $t \geq 1$,

$$W(t) = \min\left\{|\sigma|\left(\frac{t^2}{2} + 1 - t\right) - \sigma : \sigma^2\left[1 + (1-t)^2\right] = 1\right\}$$

$$= \left[1 + (1-t)^2\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{t^2}{2} - t\right)$$

Since $\lim_{t\to\infty} W(t) = +\infty$, the sufficient condition is satisfied and this system is globally Ω-controllable to 0.

REFERENCES

1. S. Sapersteone and J. Yorke, "Controllability of Linear Oscillatory Systems Using Positive Controls," SIAM J. on Control, Vol. 9, 1971, pp. 253-262.

2. R. Brammer, "Controllability in Linear Autonomous Systems with Positive Controllers," SIAM J. on Control, Vol. 10, 1972, pp. 339-353.

3. S. Sapersteone, "Global Controllability of Linear Systems with Positive Controls," SIAM J. on Control, Vol. 11, 1973, pp. 417-423.

4. R. Conti, "Teoria del Controllo e del Controllo Ottimo," UTET, Torino, Italy, 1974.

5. L. Pandolfi, "Linear Control Systems: Controllability with Constrained Controls," J. of Optimization Theory and Applications, Vol. 19, 1976, pp. 577-585.

6. W. E. Schmitendorf and B. R. Barmish, "Constrained Controllability of Linear Systems," to appear.

7. B. R. Barmish and W. E. Schmitendorf, "A Necessary and Sufficient Condition for Local Constrained Controllability of a Linear System," Proceedings of Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing, Monticello, Illinois, 1978.

8. J. Dauer, "Controllability of Nonlinear Systems Using a Growth Condition," J. of Optimization Theory and Applications, Vol. 9, 1972, pp. 90-98.

9. J. Dauer, "Controllability of Nonlinear Systems with Restrained Controls," J. of Optimization Theory and Applications, Vol. 14, 1974, pp. 251-262.

10. E. Chukwu and S. D. Silliman, "Complete Controllability to a Closed Target Set," J. of Optimization Theory and Applications, Vol. 21, No. 3, March 1977.

11. A. Friedman, Differential Games, Wiley, 1971.

12. B. R. Barmish, "Measurable Selection Theorems and Their Application to Problems of Guaranteed Performance," IEEE Trans. Automatic Control, Vol. 23, No. 5, October 1978.

13. B. R. Barmish and W. E. Schmitendorf, "New Results on Controllability of Systems of the Form $\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + f(u(t),t)$," to appear.