

ON THE CONTROLLED EIGENVALUE PROBLEM FOR STOCHASTICALLY PERTURBED MULTI-CHANNEL SYSTEMS *

GETACHEW K. BEFEKADU[†]

Abstract. In this brief paper, we consider the problem of minimizing the asymptotic exit rate of diffusion processes from an open connected bounded set pertaining to a multi-channel system with small random perturbations. Specifically, we establish a connection between: (i) the existence of an invariant set for the unperturbed multi-channel system w.r.t. certain class of state-feedback controllers; and (ii) the asymptotic behavior of the principal eigenvalues and the solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equations corresponding to a family of singularly perturbed elliptic operators. Finally, we provide a sufficient condition for the existence of a Pareto equilibrium (i.e., a set of optimal exit rates w.r.t. each of input channels) for the HJB equations – where the latter correspond to a family of nonlinear controlled eigenvalue problems.

Key words. Diffusion process, HJB equations, multi-channel system, principal eigenvalue, optimal exit time, small random perturbations

AMS subject classifications. 37C75, 37H10, 34D15, 34D05, 34D10, 49L25, 34H05

1. Introduction. Consider the following continuous-time multi-channel system¹

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i u_i(t), \quad x(0) = x_0, \quad (1.1)$$

where $x \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is the state of the system, $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{r_i}$ is the control input to the i th-channel, and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r_i}$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, are constant matrices.

Let $D \subset \mathcal{X}$ be an open connected bounded set with smooth boundary. For the multi-channel system in (1.1), we consider the following class of state-feedback controllers

$$\Gamma \subseteq \left\{ (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{R}^{r_i} \mid \Lambda(D) \neq \emptyset \right\}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\Lambda(D) \subset D \cup \partial D$ is the maximal invariant set (under the action of $S^t \triangleq \exp\{(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i)t\}$, $t \geq 0$) such that

$$S^t \Omega = \Omega \subset \Lambda(D), \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (1.3)$$

for any set Ω .

In what follows, we provide a connection between the existence of an invariant set for the system S^t in $D \cup \partial D$ and the asymptotic behavior of the principal eigenvalue for singularly perturbed elliptic operator which is associated with the following stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$dX^{\epsilon, \gamma}(t) = \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i \right) X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(t) dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sigma(X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(t)) dW(t), \quad X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(0) = x_0, \quad (1.4)$$

where

*Received by the editors January 15, 2015. This research was carried-out while the author was working at the University of Notre Dame. The author acknowledges support from the Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Notre Dame.

[†]NRC/AFRL & Department of Industrial System Engineering, University of Florida - REEF, 1350 N. Poquitor Rd, Shalimar, FL 32579, USA (gbefekadu@ufl.edu).

¹This work is, in some sense, a continuation of our previous paper [3].

- $X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(\cdot)$ is an $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued diffusion process, ϵ is a small parameter lying in an interval $(0, \epsilon^*)$ (which represents the level of random perturbation in the system), and $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n)$ is an n -tuple of state-feedbacks from the class Γ ,
- $\sigma: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is Lipschitz continuous with the least eigenvalue of $\sigma(\cdot)\sigma^T(\cdot)$ uniformly bounded away from zero, i.e.,

$$\sigma(x)\sigma^T(x) \geq \kappa I_{d \times d}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

for some $\kappa > 0$, and

- $W(\cdot)$ (with $W(0) = 0$) is an d -dimensional standard Wiener process.

For any fixed $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon^*)$, let $\tau^{\epsilon, \gamma}$ be the first exit time of the diffusion process $X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(t)$ from the set D , i.e.,

$$\tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} = \inf \left\{ t > 0 \mid X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(t) \notin D \right\}. \quad (1.5)$$

Further, let $P_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \{ \mathcal{A} \}$ and $E_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \{ \xi \}$, as usual, denote the probability of an event $\mathcal{A}$ and the expectation of a random variable ξ , respectively, for the diffusion process $X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(t)$ starting from $x_0 \in D$.

Here, it is worth mentioning that, in system reliability analysis and other studies, one often requires to confine a controlled diffusion process $X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(t)$ to a given open connected bounded set D as long as possible. A standard formulation for such a problem is to maximize the mean exit time $E_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \{ \tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} \}$ from the set D . We also observe that a more suitable objective would be to minimize the asymptotic rate with which the diffusion process $X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(t)$ exits from the set D . Further, this suggests minimizing the principal eigenvalue $\lambda_{\epsilon, 0}^\gamma$

$$\lambda_{\epsilon, 0}^\gamma = - \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > t \right\}, \quad (1.6)$$

with respect to certain class of admissible controls (including the above class of state-feedbacks in (1.2)).² Note that if the domain D contains an equilibrium point for the deterministic multi-channel system in (1.1), when such a system is composed with the n -tuple of state-feedbacks from Γ , then the principal eigenvalue $\lambda_{\epsilon, 0}^\gamma$, which is associated with the singularly perturbed elliptic operator

$$- \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon, 0}^\gamma(\cdot)(x) = \left\langle \nabla(\cdot), \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i \right) x \right\rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \sigma(x) \sigma^T(x) \nabla^2(\cdot) \right\}, \quad (1.7)$$

with zero boundary conditions on ∂D , satisfies (see also Corollary 2.3)

$$- \log \lambda_{\epsilon, 0}^\gamma = \epsilon^{-1} r^\gamma + o(\epsilon^{-1}) \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where r^γ is given by the following

$$r^\gamma = \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\varphi(t) \in \Psi} \frac{1}{T} \left\{ I_T^\gamma(\varphi(t)) \mid \varphi(t) \in D \cup \partial D, \ t \in [0, T] \right\} \quad (1.8)$$

²Recently, the authors in [1] have provided interesting results on controlled equilibrium selection in stochastically perturbed dynamics, but in a slightly different context.

and the action functional $I_T^\gamma(\varphi)$, with $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n) \in \Gamma$, is given by

$$I_T^\gamma(\varphi(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \left[\frac{d\varphi(t)}{dt} - \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i \right) \varphi(t) \right]^T \left(\sigma(\varphi(t)) \sigma^T(\varphi(t)) \right)^{-1} \\ \times \left[\frac{d\varphi(t)}{dt} - \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i \right) \varphi(t) \right] dt, \quad (1.9)$$

where the set Ψ consisting of all absolutely continuous functions $\varphi \in C_T([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$, with $\varphi(0) = x_0$, a compact set in D (e.g., see [12], [13], [8, Chapter 14] or [7] for additional discussions).

On the other hand, if the maximum invariant set $\Lambda(D)$ for the deterministic multi-channel system in (1.1), w.r.t. the state-feedbacks from Γ , is nonempty. Then, the following asymptotic condition also holds true (see Lemma 2.5 in the Appendix section (cf. [10, Theorem 2.1]))

$$-\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\epsilon,0}^{x_0,\gamma} \{ \tau^{\epsilon,\gamma} > t \} < \infty, \quad x_0 \in D. \quad (1.10)$$

Moreover, the principal eigenvalue $\lambda_{\epsilon,0}^\gamma$ turns out to be the boundary value between those $R < r^\gamma$ for which $E_{\epsilon,0}^{x_0,\gamma} \{ \exp(\epsilon^{-1} R \tau^{\epsilon,\gamma}) \} < \infty$ and those $R > r^\gamma$ for which $E_{\epsilon,0}^{x_0,\gamma} \{ \exp(\epsilon^{-1} R \tau^{\epsilon,\gamma}) \} = \infty$ (see also [8, pp. 373–382] for additional discussions). Note that estimating the asymptotic exit rate with which the controlled-diffusion process $X^{\epsilon,\gamma}(t)$ exits from the domain D is also related to a singularly perturbed eigenvalue problem. For example, the asymptotic behavior for the principal eigenvalue corresponding to the following eigenvalue problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,0}^\gamma \psi_{\gamma^*}^*(x) + \lambda_{\epsilon,0}^{\gamma^*} \psi_{\gamma^*}^*(x) &= 0, \quad \forall x \in D \\ \psi_{\gamma^*}^*(x) &= 0, \quad \forall x \in \partial D \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (1.11)$$

where $\psi_{\gamma^*}^* \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(D) \cap C(D \cup \partial D)$, for $p > 2$, with $\psi_{\gamma^*}^* > 0$ on D , has been well studied in the past (e.g., see [5] in the context of an asymptotic behavior for the principal eigenfunction; and see [6] or [4] in the context of an asymptotic behavior for the equilibrium density).

Before concluding this section, let us introduce the following definition for minimal action state-feedbacks, w.r.t. the action functional $I_T^\gamma(\varphi)$, which is useful for the development of our main result.

DEFINITION 1.1. *The n -tuple $(\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, \dots, \gamma_n^*) \in \Gamma$ is said to be minimal action state-feedbacks if*

$$(\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, \dots, \gamma_n^*) \in \arg \min I_T^\gamma(\varphi). \quad (1.12)$$

In the following section, we present our main results – where we establish a connection between the asymptotic exit rate with which the controlled diffusion process (w.r.t. each of the input channels) exits from the set D and the asymptotic behavior of principal eigenvalues for a family of singularly perturbed elliptic operators with zero boundary condition on ∂D . Later, such a formulation allows us to provide a sufficient condition for the existence of a Pareto equilibrium (i.e., a set of optimal exit rates w.r.t. each of the input channels) for the HJB equations – where the latter correspond to a family of nonlinear controlled eigenvalue problems (e.g., see [11] or [9, Chapter 8] for additional discussions on eigenvalue problems).

2. Main Results. In this section, we consider a family of SDEs (w.r.t. each of input channels)

$$dX^{\epsilon,i}(t) = \left(A + \sum_{j \neq i} B_j \gamma_j \right) X^{\epsilon,i}(t) dt + B_i u_i(t) dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sigma(X^{\epsilon,i}(t)) dW(t),$$

$$X^{\epsilon,i}(0) = x_0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (2.1)$$

where $u_i(\cdot)$ is a $\mathcal{U}_i$ -valued measurable control process to the i th-channel (i.e., an admissible control from the set $\mathcal{U}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{r_i}$) such that for all $t > s$, $W(t) - W(s)$ is independent of $u_i(\nu)$ for $\nu \leq s$ (nonanticipativity condition) and

$$E \int_s^t |u_i(\tau)|^2 d\tau < \infty, \quad \forall t \geq s,$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Next, let

$$\lambda_\epsilon^u = (\lambda_{\epsilon,1}^{u_1}, \lambda_{\epsilon,2}^{u_2}, \dots, \lambda_{\epsilon,n}^{u_n}), \quad (2.2)$$

with

$$\lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i} = - \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\epsilon,i}^{x_0, u_i} \{ \tau_i^\epsilon > t \}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where the probability $P_{\epsilon,i}^{x_0, u_i}$ is conditioned on the initial point $x_0 \in D$ and the admissible control $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$. Moreover, τ_i^ϵ is the first exit time for the diffusion process $X^{\epsilon,i}(t)$ from the set D , i.e., $\tau_i^\epsilon = \inf \{ t > 0 \mid X^{\epsilon,i}(t) \notin D \}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Further, let us introduce the following set

$$\Sigma^\epsilon = \left\{ \lambda_\epsilon^u \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \mid (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n) \in \Gamma \right\}. \quad (2.3)$$

REMARK 2.1. Notice that the set Σ^ϵ (w.r.t. the class of state-feedbacks Γ) is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Define the partial ordering $\prec$ on Σ^ϵ by $\lambda_\epsilon^{u'} \prec \lambda_\epsilon^{u''}$, i.e.,

$$(\lambda_{\epsilon,1}^{u'_1}, \lambda_{\epsilon,2}^{u'_2}, \dots, \lambda_{\epsilon,n}^{u'_n}) \prec (\lambda_{\epsilon,1}^{u''_1}, \lambda_{\epsilon,2}^{u''_2}, \dots, \lambda_{\epsilon,n}^{u''_n}), \quad (2.4)$$

if $\lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u'_i} \leq \lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u''_i}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, with strict inequality for at least one $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Further, we say that $\lambda_\epsilon^{u^*} \in \Sigma^\epsilon$ is a Pareto equilibrium (w.r.t. the class of state-feedbacks Γ) if there is no $\lambda_\epsilon^u \in \Sigma^\epsilon$ for which $\lambda_\epsilon^u \prec \lambda_\epsilon^{u^*}$.

Then, we have the following proposition that provides a sufficient condition for the existence of a Pareto equilibrium $\lambda_\epsilon^{u^*} \in \Sigma^\epsilon$ (i.e., a set of optimal exit rates w.r.t. each of input channels).

PROPOSITION 2.2. Suppose that the statement in Definition 1.1 holds true at least for one n -tuple of state-feedbacks $(\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, \dots, \gamma_n^*) \in \Gamma$. Then, there exists a Pareto equilibrium $\lambda_\epsilon^{u^*} \in \Sigma^\epsilon$ (i.e., a set of optimal exit rates w.r.t. each of input channels) such that

$$(\lambda_{\epsilon,1}^{u_1^*}, \lambda_{\epsilon,2}^{u_2^*}, \dots, \lambda_{\epsilon,n}^{u_n^*}) \prec (\lambda_{\epsilon,1}^{u_1}, \lambda_{\epsilon,2}^{u_2}, \dots, \lambda_{\epsilon,n}^{u_n}) \quad \text{on } \Sigma^\epsilon, \quad (2.5)$$

where the principal eigenvalues $\lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*}$ are the unique solutions for the HJB equations corresponding to the following family of nonlinear controlled eigenvalue problems

$$\max_{u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i} \left\{ \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i} \psi_{u_i}^*(x, u_i) + \lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} \psi_{u_i}^*(x) = 0 \right\}, \quad \forall x \in D \quad (2.6)$$

$$\psi_{u_i}^*(x) = 0, \quad \forall x \in \partial D$$

with $\psi_{u_i}^* \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(D) \cap C(D \cup \partial D)$, for $p > 2$, with $\psi_{u_i}^* > 0$ on D , and

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i}(\cdot)(x) = \left\langle \nabla(\cdot), (A + \sum_{j \neq i} B_j \gamma_j^*)x + B_i u_i \right\rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ \sigma(x) \sigma^T(x) \nabla^2(\cdot) \right\}, \quad (2.7)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. Suppose there exists an n -tuple of state-feedbacks $(\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, \dots, \gamma_n^*) \in \Gamma$ that satisfies the statement in Definition 1.1. Then, our first claim for $\psi_{u_i}^* \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(D) \cap C(D \cup \partial D)$, with $p > 2$, follows from Equation (2.6) (cf. [11, Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4]). That is, if u_i^* for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, is a measurable selector of $\arg \max \{ \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i} \psi_{u_i}^*(x) \}$, with $x \in D$. Then, by the uniqueness claim for the eigenvalue problem (cf. Equation (1.11)), we have

$$\lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} = - \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\epsilon,i}^{x_0, u_i^*} \left\{ \tau_i^\epsilon > t \right\}, \quad (2.8)$$

where the probability $P_{\epsilon,i}^{x_0, u_i^*}$ is conditioned on x_0 , u_i^* and $(\gamma_1^*, \dots, \gamma_{i-1}^*, \gamma_{i+1}^*, \dots, \gamma_n^*)$. Moreover, for any other admissible controls $v_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} \psi_{u_i}^*(x, v_i) + \lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} \psi_{u_i}^*(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (2.9)$$

Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth bounded open domain containing $D \cup \partial D$. Let $\hat{\psi}_{v_i}$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{\epsilon,i}^{v_i}$ be the principal eigenfunction-eigenvalue pairs for the eigenvalue problem of $\mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,i}^{v_i}$ on ∂Q . Further, let

$$\hat{\tau}_i^\epsilon = \inf \left\{ t > 0 \mid X^{\epsilon,i}(t) \notin Q \right\}. \quad (2.10)$$

Then, under v_i , for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and for some $\hat{x} \in D$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}_{v_i}(\hat{x}) &\geq E_{\epsilon,i}^{x_0, v_i} \left\{ \exp(\hat{\lambda}_{\epsilon,i}^{v_i} t) \hat{\psi}_{v_i}(x(t)) \mathbf{1} \left\{ \hat{\tau}_i^\epsilon > t \right\} \right\}, \\ &\geq \inf_{x \in D} \left| \hat{\psi}_{v_i}(x(t)) \right| \exp(\hat{\lambda}_{\epsilon,i}^{v_i} t) P_{\epsilon,i}^{x_0, u_i^*} \left\{ \tau_i^\epsilon > t \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Leading to

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\epsilon,i}^{v_i} \geq - \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\epsilon,i}^{x_0, u_i^*} \left\{ \tau_i^\epsilon > t \right\}. \quad (2.12)$$

Letting Q shrink to D and using Proposition 4.10 of [11], then we have $\hat{\lambda}_{\epsilon,i}^{v_i} \rightarrow \lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*}$. Thus, we have

$$\lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} \leq - \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\epsilon,i}^{x_0, u_i^*} \left\{ \tau_i^\epsilon > t \right\}. \quad (2.13)$$

Combining with Equation (2.8), this establishes the optimality of u_i^* and the fact that $\lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*}$ is the optimal exit rate.

Conversely, let v_i^* be an admissible optimal control, then we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} \psi_{v_i^*}^*(x, v_i^*) + \hat{\lambda}_{\epsilon,i}^{v_i^*} \psi_{v_i^*}^*(x) = 0 \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} \psi_{u_i^*}^*(x, v_i^*) + \lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} \psi_{u_i^*}^*(x) \leq 0, \quad \forall t > 0, \quad (2.15)$$

with $\hat{\lambda}_{\epsilon,i}^{v_i^*} = \lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*}$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Further, notice that $\psi_{u_i^*}^*$ is a scalar multiple of $\psi_{v_i^*}^*$ and, at some $\hat{x} \in D$ (cf. [11, Theorem 1.4(a)]). Then, we see that v_i^* is also a maximizing measurable selector in Equation (2.6).

On the other hand, for a fixed small ϵ , define the following continuous functional (i.e., a utility function over a closed set $\Sigma^\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ that can be convexified)

$$\Sigma^\epsilon \ni \lambda_\epsilon^u \mapsto U^\epsilon(\lambda_\epsilon^u) \triangleq \langle \omega, \lambda_\epsilon^u \rangle \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.16)$$

where $\omega_i > 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Note that the utility function U^ϵ satisfies the property $U^\epsilon(\lambda_\epsilon^{u'}) < U^\epsilon(\lambda_\epsilon^{u''})$, whenever $\lambda_\epsilon^{u'} \prec \lambda_\epsilon^{u''}$ on Σ^ϵ w.r.t. the class of state-feedbacks Γ . Then, from the Arrow-Barankin-Blackwell theorem (e.g., see [2]), one can see that the set in

$$\left\{ \lambda_\epsilon^u \in \Sigma^\epsilon \mid \exists \omega_i > 0, \ i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \ \min_{\lambda_\epsilon^u \in \Sigma^\epsilon} \langle \omega, \lambda_\epsilon^u \rangle = \langle \omega, \lambda_\epsilon^{u^*} \rangle \right\} \quad (2.17)$$

is dense in the set of all Pareto equilibria. This further implies that, for any choice of $\omega_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, the minimizer $\langle \omega, \lambda_\epsilon^u \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i \lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i}$ over Σ^ϵ satisfies the Pareto equilibrium condition w.r.t. some minimal action state-feedbacks $(\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, \dots, \gamma_n^*) \in \Gamma$. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.2. $\square$

We conclude this section with the following corollary that gives a lower-bound for r^{γ^*} in (1.8) (w.r.t. some minimal action state-feedbacks $(\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, \dots, \gamma_n^*) \in \Gamma$) (cf. [8, Corollary 11.2, pp. 377])

COROLLARY 2.3. *Suppose that the statement in Proposition 2.2 holds. Then, r^{γ^*} in (1.8), w.r.t. the minimal action state-feedbacks $(\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*, \dots, \gamma_n^*) \in \Gamma$, satisfies³*

$$r^{\gamma^*} \geq \max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} r^{u_i^*}, \quad (2.18)$$

³Notice that

$$r^{\gamma^*} = \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\varphi(t) \in \Psi} \frac{1}{T} \left\{ I_T^{\gamma^*}(\varphi(t)) \mid \varphi(t) \in D \cup \partial D, \ t \in [0, T] \right\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_T^{\gamma^*}(\varphi(t)) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \left[\frac{d\varphi(t)}{dt} - \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i^* \right) \varphi(t) \right]^T \left(\sigma(\varphi(t)) \sigma^T(\varphi(t)) \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{d\varphi(t)}{dt} - \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i^* \right) \varphi(t) \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

where $r^{u_i^*}$ is given by

$$r^{u_i^*} = -\epsilon \log \lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.19)$$

REMARK 2.4. Here, we remark that, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$\lambda_{\epsilon,0}^\gamma - \lambda_{\epsilon,i}^{u_i^*} \geq 0, \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon^*), \quad (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n) \in \Gamma,$$

which suggests that the above corollary is useful for selecting the most appropriate minimal action state-feedbacks from Γ that confine the diffusion process $X^\epsilon(t)$ to the prescribed set D for a longer duration (cf. Equations (1.6) and (2.2)).

Appendix. The following lemma (whose proof is an adaptation of [10, Theorem 2.1]) provides a condition under which the maximal invariant set $\Lambda(D)$ is nonempty.

LEMMA 2.5.

(a) If for some $x_0 \in D$,

$$-\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\epsilon,0}^{x_0,\gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon,\gamma} > t \right\} < \infty, \quad (A.1)$$

then the maximal invariant set $\Lambda(D)$ is nonempty.

(b) If for some $x_0 \in D$,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \log E_{\epsilon,0}^{x_0,\gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon,\gamma} \right\} = \infty, \quad (A.2)$$

then the maximal invariant set $\Lambda(D)$ is nonempty.

Proof. Suppose that the maximum closed invariant set $\Lambda(D)$ is empty (i.e., the invariant set for S^t in $D \cup \partial D$ is empty). Then, there exists an open bounded domain $\tilde{D} \supset D \cup \partial D$ such that the corresponding set $\Lambda(\tilde{D})$ is also empty.

Note that it is easy to check that if $D_2 \subset D_1$, then $\Lambda(D_2) \subset \Lambda(D_1)$. Take the following sequence $\{D_m\}$ of open domains such that

$$D_1 \supset D_2 \supset D_3 \supset \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcap_{m \geq 1} D_m = D \cup \partial D. \quad (A.3)$$

If $\Lambda(D_m) \neq \emptyset$ for all $m \geq 1$, then

$$\Lambda = \bigcap_{m \geq 1} \Lambda(D_m). \quad (A.4)$$

Moreover, since $\Lambda(D_m)$ is closed, we have

$$\Lambda(D_1) \supset \Lambda(D_2) \supset \Lambda(D_3) \supset \dots \quad (A.5)$$

Note that Λ is an invariant closed set for the unperturbed system

$$\dot{x}^\gamma(t) = \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i \right) x^\gamma(t), \quad (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n) \in \Gamma, \quad x_0^\gamma = x_0$$

and $\Lambda \supset D \cup \partial D$. Thus, $\emptyset \neq \Lambda \subset \Lambda(D)$. This contradicts our earlier assumption. Then, for some $m_0 \geq 1$, we have

$$\Lambda(D_{m_0}) = \emptyset. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Let $\tilde{D} = D_{m_0}$, for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon^*)$ and $x_0 \in \tilde{D} \cup \partial \tilde{D}$, introduce the following

$$\tau_{\tilde{D}}^{\epsilon, \gamma} = \inf \left\{ t > 0 \mid \exp \left\{ \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i \right) t \right\} x_0 \notin \tilde{D} \cup \partial \tilde{D} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Then, we can show that $\tau_{\tilde{D}}^{\epsilon, \gamma} < \infty$ for any $x_0 \in \tilde{D} \cup \partial \tilde{D}$.

Notice that, if $\tau_{\tilde{D}}^{\epsilon, \gamma} = \infty$, then $\tilde{D} \cup \partial \tilde{D} \ni \exp \left\{ \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i \right) t \right\} x_0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then, we have the following

$$\left\{ \exp \left\{ \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i \right) t \right\} x_0, t \geq 0 \right\} \subset \Lambda(\tilde{D}) = \emptyset, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

which show that $\tau_{\tilde{D}}^{\epsilon, \gamma}$ is finite.

Note that, from upper-semicontinuity of $\tau_{\tilde{D}}^{\epsilon, \gamma}$, we have

$$T = \sup_{x_0 \in \tilde{D} \cup \partial \tilde{D}} \tau_{\tilde{D}}^{\epsilon, \gamma} < \infty. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Moreover, for any $\delta > 0$, let

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{x_0 \in D} E_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \left\{ \text{dist} \left(X^{\epsilon, \gamma}(t), \exp \left\{ \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n B_i \gamma_i \right) t \right\} x_0 \right) > \delta \right\} = 0, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

From Equations (A.7)–(A.10), we have

$$\sup_{x_0 \in D} P_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > T \right\} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Then, using the Markov property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > \ell T \right\} &= E_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \chi_{\tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > T} E_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \chi_{\tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > T} \cdots E_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \chi_{\tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > T}, \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{x_0 \in D} P_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > T \right\} \right)^\ell, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the indicator for the event $\mathcal{A}$.

Since $P_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > t \right\}$ decreases in t , then we have

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > t \right\} \leq \frac{1}{T} \log \left(\sup_{x_0 \in D} P_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > T \right\} \right). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Taking into account Equation (A.11), then, for any $x_0 \in D$, we have the following

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\epsilon, 0}^{x_0, \gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon, \gamma} > t \right\} \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Hence, our assumption that $\Lambda(D) = \emptyset$ is inconsistent.

To proof part (ii), notice that

$$E_{\epsilon,0}^{x_0,\gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon,\gamma} \right\} \leq T \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} P_{\epsilon,0}^{x_0,\gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon,\gamma} > (\ell-1)T \right\}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Assumption $\Lambda(D) = \emptyset$ gives, in view of Equations (A.11), (A.12) and (A.13) for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and for any $x_0 \in D$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\epsilon,0}^{x_0,\gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon,\gamma} \right\} &\leq T \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \left[\sup_{x_0 \in D} P_{\epsilon,0}^{x_0,\gamma} \left\{ \tau^{\epsilon,\gamma} > T \right\} \right]^{\ell-1} \\ &< \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

which contradicts with Equation (A.2). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.5. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] A. ARAPOSTATHIS, A. BISWAS AND V. S. BORKAR, *Controlled equilibrium selection in stochastically perturbed dynamics*, arXiv:1504.04889v2 [math.CT], August 2016.
- [2] K. J. ARROW, E. W. BARANKIN AND D. BLACKWELL, *Admissible points of convex sets*, in H. W. Kuhn and A. W. Tucker (eds.), *Contributions to the theory of games*, vol. II, Princeton, NJ, (1953), pp. 87–91.
- [3] G. K. BEFEKADU AND P. J. ANTSAKLIS, *On the asymptotic estimates for exit probabilities and minimum exit rates of diffusion processes pertaining to a chain of distributed control systems*, SIAM J. Contr. Optim., 53 (2015), pp. 2297–2318.
- [4] A. BISWAS AND V. S. BORKAR, *Small noise asymptotics for invariant densities for a class of diffusions: a control theoretic view*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 360 (2009), pp. 476–484.
- [5] M. V. DAY, *On the exponential exit law in the small parameter exit problem*, Stochastics, 8 (1983), pp. 297–323.
- [6] M. V. DAY, *Recent progress on the small parameter exit problem*, Stochastics, 20 (1987), pp. 121–150.
- [7] M. I. FREIDLIN AND A. D. WENTZEL, *Random perturbations of dynamical systems*, Springer, Berlin, 1984.
- [8] A. FRIEDMAN, *Stochastic differential equations and applications*, Dover Publisher, Inc., Mineola, New York, 2006.
- [9] D. GILBARG AND N. S. TRUDINGER, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Springer Verlag, 2001.
- [10] Y. KIFER, *The inverse problem for small random perturbations of dynamical systems*, Israel J. Math., 40 (1981), pp. 165–174.
- [11] A. QUAAS AND B. SIRAKOV, *Principal eigenvalue and the Dirichlet problem for fully nonlinear elliptic operators*, Advances in Math. 218 (2008), pp. 105–135.
- [12] A. D. VENTCEL AND M. I. FREIDLIN, *On small random perturbations of dynamical systems*, Russian Math. Surv. 25 (1970), pp. 1–55.
- [13] A. D. VENTCEL, *On the asymptotic behavior of the largest eigenvalue of a second-order elliptic differential operator with smaller parameter in the higher derivatives*, Soviet Math. Dokl., 13 (1972), pp. 13–17.