arXiv:2109.12661v4 [math.OC] 30 Sep 2023

Stability Analysis and Stabilization of Linear Symmetric Matrix-Valued Continuous, Discrete, and Impulsive Dynamical Systems

–

A Unified Approach for the Stability Analysis and the Stabilization of Linear Systems

Corentin Briat[1]
Independent Researcher
Basel, Switzerland

Abstract

Symmetric matrix-valued dynamical systems are an important class of systems that can describe important processes such as covariance/second-order moment processes, or processes on manifolds and Lie Groups. We address here the case of processes that leave the cone of positive semidefinite matrices invariant, thereby including covariance and second-order moment processes. Both the continuous-time and the discrete-time cases are first considered. In the LTV case, the obtained stability and stabilization conditions are expressed as differential and difference Lyapunov conditions which are equivalent, in the LTI case, to some spectral conditions for the generators of the processes. Convex stabilization conditions are also obtained in both the continuous-time and the discrete-time setting. It is proven that systems with constant delays are stable provided that the systems with zero-delays are stable – which mirrors existing results for linear positive systems. The results are then extended and unified into a impulsive formulation for which similar results are obtained. The proposed framework is very general and can recover and/or extend almost all the results on the literature of linear systems related to (mean-square) exponential (uniform) stability. Several examples are discussed to illustrate this claim by deriving stability conditions for stochastic systems driven by Brownian motion and Poissonian jumps, Markov jump systems, (stochastic) switched systems, (stochastic) impulsive systems, (stochastic) sampled-data systems, and all their possible combinations.

1. Introduction

Matrix-valued dynamical systems form an important class of systems that can be used to represent several processes such as the evolution of covariances or second-order moments [70], the dynamics of systems on manifolds such as SO(3) [1, 25] or Lie groups [51]. In particular, the class of matrix-valued dynamical systems that leave the cone of positive semidefinite matrices invariant is of special interest because it can represent the dynamics of covariance or seconder-order moment matrices associated with stochastic dynamical systems. The consideration of the so-called second-order information is not new and has been considered in the past in [70]. More recent works such as [43, 77] also consider second-order information methods for providing new ways to solve existing problems related to H_∞ analysis. Finally, this approach is also widely used in the analysis and the control of stochastic systems; see e.g. [9, 28–38].

The objective of this paper is to provide a clear analysis of a very general class of matrix-valued linear dynamical systems evolving on the cone of positive semidefinite matrices as a unifying way for analyzing the stability of linear systems, including deterministic or stochastic, continuous, discrete or hybrid systems,

[1]email: corentin@briat.info; url: http://www.briat.info; ORCID Number: 0000-0003-1822-2683

without requiring any deep knowledge in stochastic processes or stochastic calculus. Indeed, the analysis of all those classes of systems can be brought back to the analysis of an associated matrix-valued differential or difference equations, or a combination of them in the hybrid case, which describe the evolution of the second-order moment associated with the state of the system. In fact, a very simple procedure can be applied to build those matrix-valued dynamical systems from the original system.

Another interesting point is that cone-preserving systems have been shown to admit simpler characterizations for their properties [26, 27, 72]. The simplest class of cone preserving systems is that of linear positive systems [40] and are known to admit linear programming conditions for their stability using linear copositive Lyapunov functions and for the characterization of the L_1- and L_∞-gains which both coincide with the 1- and ∞-norm of the DC-matrix of the system, which is obtained by evaluating the transfer function of the system at $s = 0$; see e.g. [13, 15, 39]. Analogously, the H_∞-norm of such systems coincides with the 2-norm of the DC-matrix [61]. Those results notably had simplifying implications in the analysis of stability of power control in wireless networks in [59, 60] but also in the analysis and the scalable control of compartmental systems [63], or the analysis and the control of biological systems [21–23, 47], etc. The design of constrained or structured controllers is also convex for those systems [3]. Linear positive systems with delays are stable provided that their zero-delay counterparts are also stable [2, 15, 18, 48, 67–69]. Many extensions of those results as well as new ones have been provided; see e.g. [54, 62]. As the systems considered in this paper can be seen as matrix analogues of linear positive systems, or more generally, cone preserving systems, there is hope that such systems share similar and simpler conditions characterizing some of their properties such as stability and performance. It is notably shown in this paper, that this is the case for systems with discrete delays as also discussed in [72]. In fact, many of the obtained results for linear positive systems with delays can be extended to the current class systems by suitably adapting the systems themselves and considering the correct Lyapunov-Krasovskii functionals. This will not be considered here as this is not the main topic of the paper but will be addressed in future works focusing on the analysis of delay systems and on the development of a dissipativity theory for such systems.

The first step towards a possible full answer to whether matrix-valued cone preserving systems also admit simple characterization of their properties is the development of a suitable and well-rounded stability theory for them. In this paper, we use the fact that the stability analysis of linear symmetric matrix-valued continuous- and discrete-time systems can be analyzed using linear copositive Lyapunov functions that take nonnegative values for all state values in the cone of positive semidefinite matrices; we refer those functions as linear $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$-copositive Lyapunov functions to clearly state on which cone the Lyapunov function is positive definite. In fact, those Lyapunov functions can be all characterized in terms of the interior of the dual cone, the latter coinciding with the cone of positive semidefinite matrices as this cone is self-dual. The main tools are the inner-product of matrices and the concepts of operators adjoint to those describing the dynamics of the matrix-valued dynamical systems. This general formulation allows for very simple and natural proofs for all the main results of the paper.

In the continuous-time case, both LTV and LTI systems are considered and their stability is characterized in terms of a Lyapunov differential equation and a Lyapunov equation, respectively. In the LTI case, the stability conditions are also equivalent to a condition on the eigenvalues of the operator describing the dynamics of the system. A stabilization result is also derived and takes the form of a convex differential linear matrix inequality problem. An extension of the results pertaining to a certain class of time-delay systems is also considered and extends the results in [72], while at the same time providing a new proof for it. We then show how those results can be used to retrieve some results important of the literature. The first example is that of an LTV system driven by both Brownian motions and Poissonian jumps and can be seen as a particular case of the systems considered in [8]. The second example, which extends [72], pertains to the analysis of a class of diffusion processes with delays and the main result here is that this system is exponentially stable if and only if the system with zero delays is exponentially stable. The third example addresses the stability of linear time-varying continuous-time Markov jump systems considered e.g. in [29, 53, 55] in the LTI case. We can recover those results in only few lines of calculations using the results of the paper. The last example is that of sampled-data system with Poissonian sampling that addresses, in a slightly different way, the problem considered in [75].



Figure 1: Structure of the paper and types of systems that can be considered within the considered framework.

We obtain then analogous results in the discrete-time case where both the cases of LTV and LTI systems are addressed. In this context, the stability conditions are rather expressed in terms of Lyapunov-Stein difference equations and Lyapunov-Stein equations, respectively. A spectral condition is also obtained in the LTI case. Stabilization conditions are formulated in terms of a difference linear matrix inequality. A result on delay systems is also obtained, with the same conclusions as in the continuous-time case. However, this result does not seem to have been previously obtained in the literature. Again, some examples are considered in order to demonstrate the usefulness of the approach. The first example is that of stochastic LTV systems involving two different classes of stochastically varying parameters. The first class is that of identically distributed independent parameters with zero mean and unit variance whereas the second one is that of independent non-identically distributed Bernoulli random variables. The second example pertains to the analysis of a class of linear stochastic discrete-time system with delays, whereas the last one considers time-varying Markov jump linear systems for which we recover some of the results in [28].

The two previously considered frameworks are then combined to give rise to matrix-valued impulsive systems which are described as coupled matrix-valued differential and difference equations. As a result, the stability conditions are expressed in terms of coupled differential-/difference equations in both the LTV and LTI cases. Following the ideas in [45], those stability conditions are relaxed giving rise to persistent flowing and persistent jumping stability conditions which only assume a strict decrease of the Lyapunov function along the flow and at the jumps, respectively. Stabilization conditions are also obtained and stated in terms

of coupled convex differential and difference linear matrix inequalities. As an illustration of the main result, the first example addresses a class of stochastic LTV systems driven by Brownian motions and subject to deterministic impulses and it is shown that we can easily recover and extend the results obtained in [17]. The second example pertains to a class of stochastic LTV switched systems that generalizes the classes considered in [16, 66] and for which we retrieve those results as special cases of those obtained in the current framework. The next example considers the case of stochastic LTV sampled-data systems which we reformulate as a stochastic hybrid system. In the case when the sampling times are deterministic, we obtain a generalization of the results in [14, 17, 45]. Finally, the last example addresses the analysis of a certain class of stochastic LTV impulsive systems with stochastic impulses and switching first considered in [71] and for which we can recover and generalize the existing results to the LTV case.

Outline. Preliminary definitions are given in Section 2. Continuous-time matrix-valued differential equations are considered in Section 3 whereas their discrete-time counterparts in Section 4. The results are unified in a hybrid formulation in Section 5. Application examples are considered in the related sections.

Notations. The set of positive and nonnegative integers are denoted by $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, respectively. The set of positive and nonnegative real numbers are denoted by $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, respectively. Similarly, the cone of symmetric positive definite and symmetric positive semidefinite matrices of dimension n are denoted by $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ and $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$, respectively. The set of symmetric matrices of dimension n is simply denoted by $\mathbb{S}^n$. The left open right-half plane of the complex plane is denoted by $\mathbb{C}_{<0}$. The natural basis for the Euclidian space is denoted by $\{e_1, \ldots\}$. For a square real matrix A, we denote $\mathrm{Sym}[A] := A + A^{\mathrm{T}}$. For a matrix A with columns $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$, the vectorization operator $\mathrm{vec}(\cdot)$ stacks the columns of a matrix on the top of each other; i.e. $\mathrm{vec}(A) = \begin{bmatrix} a_1^{\mathrm{T}} & \ldots & a_n^{\mathrm{T}} \end{bmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}}$. For a square matrix A, the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of A are denoted by $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$, respectively. The Hadamard product is denoted by $\odot$ whereas the Kronecker product and sum are denoted by $\otimes$ and $\oplus$, respectively. Finally, $\star$ stands for symmetric entries in symmetric matrices.

2. Preliminaries

We state in this section the essential definitions and results that will be key for deriving the main results of the paper.

Definition 2.1 (Nuclear norm [12]). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, then its nuclear-norm $||A||_*$ is defined as*

$$||A||_* := \sum_{i=1}^{\min\{m,n\}} \sigma_i(A) \tag{1}$$

where $\sigma_i(A)$ is the i-th singular values of A. When $A \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$, then we have that

$$||A||_* = \mathrm{trace}(A). \tag{2}$$

The following inner-product, also called Frobenius inner product, extends the concept of scalar product to matrices:

Definition 2.2 (Inner product on $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$). *The inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is defined as*

$$\langle A, B \rangle := \mathrm{trace}\, AB^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{3}$$

for any $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$.

The following result will prove to be instrumental in proving the main stability results of the paper and is proven here for the sake of completeness:

Proposition 2.3. *Let us consider matrices $P \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $Q \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ and $R \in \mathbb{S}^n$. Then, the following statement holds:*

(a) Let $P \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ and $Q \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$, then we have that $\langle P, Q\rangle = 0$ if and only if $Q = 0$.

(b) Let $R \in \mathbb{S}^n$, then we have that $\langle R, Q\rangle < 0$ (resp. $\langle R, Q\rangle \leq 0$) for all $Q \succeq 0$, $Q \neq 0$, if and only if $R \prec 0$ (resp. $R \preceq 0$).

(c) Let $P \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, then we have that $\lambda_{\min}(P)||Q||_* \leq \langle P, Q\rangle \leq \lambda_{\max}(P)||Q||_*$ for all $Q \succeq 0$.

Proof : Throughout this proof, we denote by $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ the set of orthonormal eigenvectors of the matrix P associated with the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n\}$. Observe also that the matrix $V = [v_1 \ \ldots \ v_n]$ forms an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof of statement (a)**.** Clearly if $Q = 0$, then $\langle P, Q\rangle = 0$. Assume on the other hand that $\langle P, Q\rangle = 0$. This is equivalent to saying that

$$\sum_i \lambda_i v_i^{\mathrm{T}} Q v_i = 0 \tag{4}$$

and we necessarily have that $v_i^{\mathrm{T}} Q v_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$ since $\lambda_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Since V is a basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$, then $V^{\mathrm{T}} Q V$ is similar to Q and the diagonal elements of $V^{\mathrm{T}} Q V$ are all zero. Since the trace of a matrix is the sum of its eigenvalues and since Q is positive semidefinite, then this implies that Q must be the zero matrix. This proves statement (a).

Proof of statement (b)**.** Assume first that $R \prec 0$. Then, we have that $\langle R, Q\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i w_i^{\mathrm{T}} Q w_i$ where μ_i and w_i are the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of the matrix R. This implies that $\langle R, Q\rangle < 0$ for all $Q \succeq 0$, $Q \neq 0$.

We show now the reverse implication. Assume that $\langle R, Q\rangle < 0$ for all $Q \succeq 0$, $Q \neq 0$. Then, this must hold for all $Q = Q_i = w_i w_i^{\mathrm{T}} \succeq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. This implies that we must have that $\langle R, Q_i\rangle = \mu_i < 0$. This proves the necessity and the statement (b).

Proof of statement (c)**.** Since Q is symmetric, then it can be written as $Q = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i z_i z_i^{\mathrm{T}}$ where θ_i and z_i are its eigenvalues and eigenvectors. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P, Q\rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i \langle P, z_i z_i^{\mathrm{T}}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i z_i^{\mathrm{T}} P z_i \\ &\leq \lambda_{\max}(P) \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i \\ &= \lambda_{\max}(P)||Q||_*. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The lower bound is proven analogously. This proves statement (c). ♢

We will finally need the following definitions:

Definition 2.4 ($\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$-copositive definiteness). *A continuous function $V : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is said to be uniformly $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$-copositive definite if and only if*

(a) $V(t, 0) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, and

(b) there exists a continuous, strictly increasing function $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\alpha(0) = 0$, such that $V(t, X) \geq \alpha(||X||)$ for all $(t, X) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$, and where $||\cdot||$ denotes any matrix norm; e.g. the nuclear norm.

Moreover, the function V is said to be radially unbounded if $\alpha(\cdot)$ is such that $\alpha(s) \to \infty$ as $s \to \infty$.

Definition 2.5 (Decrescent function [58]). *A continuous function $V : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is said to be decrescent if there exists a continuous, strictly increasing function $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $\alpha(0) = 0$ and $\alpha(s) \to \infty$ as $s \to \infty$ such that $V(t, X) \leq \alpha(||X||)$ for all $(t, X) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$, and where $||\cdot||$ denotes any matrix norm; e.g. the nuclear norm.*

3. Linear Matrix-Valued Symmetric Continuous-Time Systems

This section is devoted to the definition of linear matrix-valued symmetric continuous-time systems that evolves on the cone of positive semidefinite matrices together with their associated generators and state-transition operator. Using those definitions a necessary and sufficient condition for their uniform exponential stability is obtained in Theorem 3.3 in terms of a matrix-differential equation or a matrix-differential inequality. This result is then specialized to the LTI case in Theorem 3.4 where additional spectral conditions are also obtained. Convex stabilizability and stabilization conditions are also obtained in Theorem 3.5 and take the form of differential linear matrix inequalities. For completeness, the case of systems with delays is considered and a necessary and sufficient stability condition, generalizing existing ones, is also obtained in Theorem 3.6. The simplicity and the versatility of the approach as a general tool for the analysis of (stochastic) continuous-time systems is illustrated through several examples, namely on the analysis of linear time-varying stochastic systems subject to Brownian motions and Poissonian jumps, LTI time-delay systems subject to Brownian motions, time-varying Markov jump linear systems, and time-varying sampled-data systems with Poissonian sampling.

3.1. Preliminaries

Let us consider here the following class of matrix-valued continuous-time dynamical systems

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dot{X}(t) & = & \mathrm{Sym}[A_0(t)X(t)] + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(t)X(t)A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \mu(t)X(t), t \geq t_0 \\ X(t_0) & = & X_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0} \end{array} \tag{6}$$

where $A_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, and $\mu : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are piecewise-continuous and bounded. It is immediate to verify that the right-hand side is uniformly Lipschitz in X which implies that there exists a unique global solution which can be written as

$$X(t) = S(t, s)X(s), t \geq s \geq 0 \tag{7}$$

where $S(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the state transition operator verifying

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} S(t, s)X = \mathcal{C}_t(S(t, s)X) \text{ for all } X \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0} \tag{8}$$

where the generator $\mathcal{C}_t$ is given by

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \mathcal{C}_t : & \mathbb{S}^n & \mapsto & \mathbb{S}^n & \\ & X & \mapsto & A_0(t)X + XA_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(t)XA_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \mu(t)X. \end{array} \tag{9}$$

The adjoint operator of $\mathcal{C}_t$, denoted by $\mathcal{C}^*_t$, is given by

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \mathcal{C}^*_t : & \mathbb{S}^n & \mapsto & \mathbb{S}^n & \\ & X & \mapsto & A_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}}X + XA_0(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}XA_i(t) + \mu(t)X. \end{array} \tag{10}$$

The following result shows that the system (6) leaves the cone $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ invariant:

Proposition 3.1. *The matrix-valued differential equation* (6) *leaves the cone of positive semidefinite matrices invariant, that is, for any* $X_0 \succeq 0$*, we have that* $X(t, t_0, X_0) \succeq 0$ *for all* $t \geq 0$*.*

Proof : The solution to (6) can be shown to satisfy the expression

$$X(t) = \Phi(t, t_0) X_0 \Phi(t, t_0)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{t_0}^{t} \Phi(t, s) A_i(s) X(s) A_i(s)^{\mathrm{T}} \Phi(t, s)^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{d}s \tag{11}$$

where $\Phi(t, s)$ is the state-transition matrix associated with the system $\dot{x}(t) = (A_0(t) + \frac{1}{2}\mu(t) I_n) x(t)$. The result can be obtained by the successive approximations procedure; see e.g. Proposition 2.5 from [34]. ♢

Definition 3.2. *The zero solution of the system* (6) *is said to be* ***globally uniformly exponentially stable with rate*** α *if there exist some scalars* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\beta \geq 1$ *such that*

$$||X(t)|| \leq \beta e^{-\alpha(t - t_0)} ||X_0|| \tag{12}$$

for all $t \geq t_0$*, all* $t_0 \geq 0$*, and all* $X_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$*.*

3.2. Stability Analysis

With the previous definitions and results in mind, we are now able to state the following result[2] characterizing the uniform exponential stability of the system (6)

Theorem 3.3. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (6) *is uniformly exponentially stable.*

(b) There exist a differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *and a continuous matrix-valued function* $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P(t) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \beta_1 I & \preceq & Q(t) & \preceq & \beta_2 I, \end{array} \tag{13}$$

and such that ***Lyapunov differential equation***

$$\dot{P}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t^*(P(t)) + Q(t) = 0 \tag{14}$$

hold for all $t \geq 0$ *and for some scalars* $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$*.*

(c) There exists a differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *such that the*

$$\alpha_1 I \preceq P(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I, \tag{15}$$

and such that ***Lyapunov differential inequality***

$$\dot{P}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t^*(P(t)) \preceq -\alpha_3 I \tag{16}$$

hold for all $t \geq 0$ *and for some scalars* $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$*.*

[2] It was brought to the attention of the author after publication of the paper that this result can be seen as a particular case of Theorem 2.4.2 in [38].

Proof : It is immediate to see that the statements (b) and (c) are equivalent.

Proof that statement (b) **implies statement** (a)**.** To this aim, define the function $V(t,X) = \langle P(t), X\rangle$ where $P(\cdot)$ satisfies the conditions of statement (b). Since $P(t)$ is positive definite, uniformly bounded and uniformly bounded away from 0, then, from Proposition 2.3, we have that V is $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$-copositive definite, radially unbounded and decrescent. Evaluating the derivative of the function V along the trajectories of the system (6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(t,X(t)) &= \langle \dot{P}(t), X(t)\rangle + \langle P(t), \mathcal{C}_t(X(t))\rangle \\ &= \langle \dot{P}(t), X(t)\rangle + \langle \mathcal{C}_t^*(P(t)), X(t)\rangle \\ &= -\langle Q(t), X(t)\rangle \\ &\leq -\frac{\beta_1}{\alpha_2}\langle P(t), X(t)\rangle = -\frac{\beta_1}{\alpha_2} V(t,X(t)). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Therefore, V is a global, uniform and exponential Lyapunov function for the system (6), which proves that the system (6) is globally uniformly exponentially stable with rate β_1/α_2.

Proof that statement (a) **implies statement** (b)**.** To this aim, assume that the system (6) is uniformly exponentially stable, then there exist $M, \theta > 0$ such that

$$||S(s,t)X||_* \leq Me^{-\theta(s-t)}||X||_*, s \geq t \geq 0 \tag{18}$$

for all $X \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$. We then define $\bar{P} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ as

$$\langle \bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle = \int_t^\infty \langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s \tag{19}$$

where $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ and such that $\beta_1 I \preceq Q(t) \preceq \beta_2$ for some $\beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$ and for all $t \geq 0$. Note that $\bar{P}$ is uniquely defined since the expression is linear and it must hold for all $X(t) \succeq 0$ and all $t \geq 0$. We need to prove first that there exist positive constant α_1, α_2 such that $\alpha_1 I \preceq \bar{P}(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Clearly, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle &= \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \int_t^\tau \langle Q(s), S(s,t)X(t)\rangle \mathrm{d}s \\ &\leq \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \beta_2 ||X(t)||_* \int_t^\tau e^{-\theta(s-t)}\mathrm{d}s \\ &\leq \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \frac{\beta_2 M(1-e^{-\theta\tau})}{\theta}||X(t)||_* \\ &= \frac{\beta_2 M}{\theta}||X(t)||_* =: \alpha_2||X(t)||_* \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

which implies that $\bar{P}(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$. We need to prove now that there exists an $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that $\bar{P}(t) \succeq \alpha_1 I$. To this aim, assume that Q is differentiable with uniformly bounded derivative (which is a weak assumption as Q can always be chosen to be a constant). We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle &= \langle \dot{Q}(s), X(s)\rangle + \langle Q(s), \mathcal{C}_s(X(s))\rangle \\ &= \langle \dot{Q}(s), X(s)\rangle + \langle \mathcal{C}_s^*(Q(s)), X(s)\rangle \\ &= \langle \dot{Q}(s) + \mathcal{C}_s^*(Q(s)), X(s)\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \dot{Q}(s) + \mathrm{Sym}[Q(s)A_0(s)] + \sum_{i=1}^N A_i(s)^{\mathrm{T}} Q(s) A_i(s), X(s) \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Since both Q and $\dot{Q}$ are uniformly bounded, then there exists a sufficiently large $c > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \geq -c \cdot \langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \tag{22}$$

for all $X(s) \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$. Integrating both sides from t to ∞ yields

$$\int_t^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s \geq -c \cdot \langle \bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle. \tag{23}$$

or, equivalently,

$$-\langle Q(t), X(t)\rangle \geq -c \cdot \langle \bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle \tag{24}$$

where we have used that X is uniformly exponentially stable. Reorganizing the above expression, we get that

$$\langle Q(t) - c\bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle \leq 0. \tag{25}$$

As this inequality holds for all $X(t) \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$, this implies that $\bar{P}(t) \succeq Q(t)/c \succeq \frac{\beta_1}{c} I =: \alpha_1 I$. So, we have proven that there exist positive constant α_1, α_2 such that $\alpha_1 I \preceq \bar{P}(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Computing now the time-derivative of (19) yields

$$\langle \dot{\bar{P}}(t), X(t)\rangle + \langle \bar{P}(t), \mathcal{C}_t(X(t))\rangle = -\langle Q(t), X(t)\rangle \tag{26}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\langle \dot{\bar{P}}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t^*(\bar{P}(t)) + Q(t), X(t)\rangle = 0. \tag{27}$$

As this is true for all $X(t) \succeq 0$, then this implies that the conditions of statement (b) hold with $P = \bar{P}$ and the same Q. This proves the desired result. ♢

The above result demonstrates that the stability of systems of the form (6) can be proven using a specific class of linear $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ -copositive Lyapunov functions in a way that is similar to that of the analysis of linear positive systems using linear $\mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$-copositive Lyapunov functions. The proposed approach leads to stability conditions taking the form differential Lyapunov equations of inequalities.

In the case of LTI systems, however, we can also connect the stability properties of the system (6) to the spectral properties of a matrix and those of a linear operator as shown below:

Theorem 3.4 (LTI case). *Assume that the system* (6) *is time-invariant. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (6) *is exponentially stable.*

(b) The conditions of Theorem 3.3, (b) *and* (c) *hold with constant matrix-valued functions $P(t) \equiv P \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ and $Q(t) \equiv Q \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$.*

(c) The matrix

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}} := F^{\mathrm{T}} \left(I_n \otimes A_0 + A_0 \otimes I_n + \sum_{i=1}^N A_i \otimes A_i + \alpha I_{n^2} \right) F \tag{28}$$

is Hurwitz stable where $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times n(n+1)/2}$, $F^{\mathrm{T}}F = I$ is such that

$$\mathrm{vec}(X) = F\overline{\mathrm{vec}}(X) \tag{29}$$

where $\overline{\mathrm{vec}}(X)$ is given by

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|c|ccc|c|c|c} X_{11} & \sqrt{2}X_{21} & \dots & \sqrt{2}X_{n1} & & X_{22} & \sqrt{2}X_{32} & \dots & \sqrt{2}X_{n2} & \dots & X_{nn}. \end{array}\right] \tag{30}$$

(d) We have that $\mathrm{sp}(\mathcal{C}) \subset \mathbb{C}_{<0}$ where

$$\mathrm{sp}(\mathcal{C}) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \mathcal{C}(X) = \lambda X \text{ for some } X \in \mathbb{S}^n, X \neq 0\} \tag{31}$$

and $\mathcal{C}$ is defined as the time-invariant version of the operator (9)*.*

Proof : The proof of the equivalence between the two first statements follow from Theorem 3.3 specialized to the LTI case.

Proof that statement (a) is equivalent to statement (d). This follows from the fact that the LTI version of the system (6) is globally exponentially stable if and only if the eigenvalues associated with its dynamics have negative real part. Indeed, the solution to that LTI system is given by

$$X(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n(n+1)/2} e^{\lambda_i t} \langle X_0, X_i \rangle \tag{32}$$

where (λ_i, X_i) denotes the i-th pair of eigenvalues and eigenmatrices.

Proof that statement (c) is equivalent to statement (d). Using Kronecker calculus, Statement (d) is equivalent to saying that

$$\left(I_n \otimes A_0 + A_0 \otimes I_n + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i \otimes A_i + \alpha I_{n^2} - \lambda I_{n^2} \right) \mathrm{vec}(X) = 0, \;\; X \neq 0, X \in \mathbb{S}^n \tag{33}$$

implies $\Re(\lambda) < 0$. The eigenvalues depend on the domain of the operator which is not the full space $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ here but the subspace associated with symmetric matrices X. This can be done by restricting the matrix above to that subspace by projection. This can be achieved using the matrix F as

$$\left(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{C}} - \lambda I_{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}} \right) \overline{\mathrm{vec}}(X) = 0, \tag{34}$$

which is equivalent to statement (c). ♢

The above result sheds some light and draws a parallel between standard results for linear systems theory where stability properties are connected to spectral properties of some operators/matrices. The advantage of such a result lies in its reduced computational complexity compared to a solution based on the (reduced) vectorization of the state of the matrix-valued dynamical system, which is of dimension $n(n+1)/2$. In such a case, a Lyapunov stability condition would require finding a Lyapunov function consisting of

$$\frac{n(n+1)}{4} \left(\frac{n(n+1)}{2} + 1 \right) = O(n^4)$$

decision variables. On the other hand, the Lyapunov inequality in Theorem 3.3, (c) reduced to the LTI case only involves

$$\frac{n(n+1)}{2} = O(n^2)$$

decision variables, which is clearly much less. The underlying reason is that when considering the matrix-valued dynamical system, the positive semidefiniteness of the state of the dynamical system can be easily considered unlike in the vectorized case where the positive semidefiniteness does not transfer well to this representation structure. In fact, we would need to consider extra nonlinear semialgebraic constraints to characterize the manifold on which the state evolves. This is much more complicated than the proposed approach, which is very natural to consider for solving the current problem.

3.3. Stabilization

Let us consider the perturbation of the operator $\mathcal{C}_t$ given by

$$\begin{array}{rccl} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t : & \mathbb{S}^n & \mapsto & \mathbb{S}^n \\ & X & \mapsto & (A_0(t) + B_0(t)K_0(t))X + X(A_0(t) + B_0(t)K_0(t))^{\mathrm{T}} \\ & & & \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{N} (A_i(t) + B_i(t)K_i(t))X(A_i(t) + B_i(t)K_i(t))^{\mathrm{T}} + \mu(t)X. \end{array} \tag{35}$$

where the matrix-valued functions $A_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n\times m_i}$, $K_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i\times n}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, are assumed to be piecewise continuous and bounded. The objective is to formulate conditions for the existence of some K_i's such that the above operator generates an uniformly exponentially stable state transition operator; i.e. $\dot{X}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t(X(t))$ is globally uniformly exponentially stable. This is formulated in the following result:

Theorem 3.5. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) There exist matrix-valued functions $K_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i\times n}$, $i = 0, \ldots,$, such that $\dot{X}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_t(X(t))$ is uniformly exponentially stable.

(b) There exists a differentiable matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq Q(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, such that the differential matrix inequality

$$\operatorname*{diag}_{i=0}^{N}[\mathscr{N}_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}] \begin{bmatrix} \dot{P}(t) + A_0(t)Q(t) + Q(t)A_0^{\mathrm{T}} + \mu(t)Q(t) & \operatorname*{row}_{i=1}^{N}[(A_i(t)]Q(t))^{\mathrm{T}} \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(t) \end{bmatrix} \operatorname*{diag}_{i=0}^{N}[\mathscr{N}_i(t)] \preceq -\alpha_3 I \quad (36)$$

holds for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$ and where $\mathscr{N}_i$ is such that $\mathscr{N}_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}$ is a basis for the left null-space of $B_i(t)$; i.e. $\mathscr{N}_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} B_i(t) = 0$ and $\mathscr{N}_i(t)$ is of maximal rank.

(c) There exist a differentiable matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq Q(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, and piecewise continuous matrix-valued functions $U_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i\times n}$ such that the differential matrix inequality

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\dot{Q}(t) + \mathrm{Sym}[A_0(t)Q(t) + B_0(t)U_0(t)] + \mu(t)Q(t) & \operatorname*{row}_{i=1}^{N}[(A_i(t)Q(t) + B_i(t)U_i(t))^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(t) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha_3 I \quad (37)$$

holds for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$. Moreover, suitable K_i's are given by $K_i(t) = U_i(t)Q(t)^{-1}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$.

Proof : The equivalence between the first and the third statements follows from substituting the matrices of the operator (35) into the condition of the statement (b) of Theorem (3.3). Performing then a congruence transformation with respect to $Q(t) := P(t)^{-1}$, making the changes of variables $U_i(t) = K_i(t)Q(t)$, and using a Schur complement leads to the result. The equivalence between the two last statements follows from the fact that the differential matrix inequality in the third statement can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{P}(t) + \mathrm{Sym}[A_0(t)Q(t)] + \mu(t)Q(t) & \operatorname*{row}_{i=1}^{N}[(A_i(t)Q(t))^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(t) \end{bmatrix} + \mathrm{Sym}\left(\operatorname*{diag}_{i=0}^{N} B_i(t) \operatorname*{col}_{i=0}^{N}(U_i(t)) \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0_{n\times nN} \end{bmatrix} \right) \preceq -\alpha_3 I. \quad (38)$$

Invoking the Projection Lemma [42] yields the condition in the second statement. ♢

3.4. Systems with delays

Interestingly, it is possible to extend some of the above results to the case of systems with delays, leading to an extension of the results in [72]. The LTI time-delay system version of the system (6) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}(t) &= \mathrm{Sym}[A_0 X(t)] + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i X(t) A_i^{\mathrm{T}} + \mu X(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} B_i X_t(t-h_i) B_i^{\mathrm{T}}, t \geq 0 \\ X_0(s) &= \Xi(s) \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0},\ s \in [-\bar{h}, 0] \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where the delays h_i's are positive scalars with $\bar{h} := \max_i\{h_i\}$, and $\Xi \in C([-\bar{h}, 0], \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0})$ is the initial condition. As for the system (6), it can be proven that this system leaves the cone of positive semidefinite invariant using exactly the same arguments. Define, moreover, the operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_i : \ \mathbb{S}^n &\mapsto \mathbb{S}^n \\ X &\mapsto B_i X B_i^{\mathrm{T}}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

and their adjoints

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \mathcal{H}_i^* : & \mathbb{S}^n & \mapsto & \mathbb{S}^n \\ & X & \mapsto & B_i^{\mathrm{T}} X B_i. \end{array} \tag{41}$$

The following result demonstrates that the same delay-independent stability property holds for the system (39) as for linear time-invariant positive systems [15, 18, 48, 52]:

Theorem 3.6. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (39) *is exponentially stable for all delay values* $h_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

(b) The system (39) *with zero delays (i.e.* $h_i = 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$*) is exponentially stable.*

(c) There exist matrices $P, Q_i \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, *such that the conditions*

$$\mathcal{C}^*(P) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Q_i \prec 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_i^*(P) - Q_i \preceq 0, \ i = 1, \ldots, N \tag{42}$$

hold.

(d) We have that $\mathrm{sp}\left(\mathcal{C} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{H}_i\right) \subset \mathbb{C}_{<0}$ *where*

$$\mathrm{sp}\left(\mathcal{C} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{H}_i\right) := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \mathcal{C}(X) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{H}_i(X) = \lambda X \text{ for some } X \in \mathbb{S}^n, X \neq 0 \right\}. \tag{43}$$

Proof : We know from Theorem 3.4 that the statements (b) and (d) are equivalent. It is also immediate to see that the statement (a) implies the statement (b). So, we need to prove the two remaining implications.

Proof that the statement (c) **implies the statement** (a)**.** Let us consider the following functional

$$V(X_t) = \langle P, X_t(0) \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{-h_i}^{0} \langle Q_i, X_t(s) \rangle \mathrm{d}s \tag{44}$$

where $X_t(s) = X(t+s), s \in [-\bar{h}, 0]$. for which we have

$$\lambda_{\min}(P) ||X_t(0)||_* \leq V(X_t) \leq (\lambda_{\max}(P) + \lambda_{\max}(Q)) ||X_t||_{c,*} \tag{45}$$

where $||X_t||_{c,*} := \max_{s \in [-\bar{h}, 0]} ||X_t(s)||_*$. Computing the derivative yields

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dot{V}(X_t) & = & \langle P, \dot{X}(t) \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\langle Q_i, X(t) \rangle - \langle Q_i, X(t-h_i) \rangle \right] \\ & = & \langle P, \mathcal{C}(X(t)) \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\langle P, \mathcal{H}_i(X(t-h_i)) \rangle + \langle Q_i, X(t) \rangle - \langle Q_i, X(t-h_i) \rangle \right] \\ & = & \left\langle \mathcal{C}^*(P) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Q_i, X(t) \right\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle \mathcal{H}_i^*(P) - Q_i, X(t-h_i) \rangle \end{array} \tag{46}$$

Under the conditions of the statement (c), there exists a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathcal{C}^*(P) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Q_i \preceq -\varepsilon I$ which implies

$$\dot{V}(X_t) \leq -\varepsilon ||X_t(0)||_* \tag{47}$$

Therefore, the functional (44) is a Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional [46] for the system (39) and the system is exponentially stable regardless the value of the delays as the conditions do not depend on the values of the delays. This proves the implication.

Proof that the statement (b) **implies the statement** (c)**.** Assume that the system (39) with zero delays (i.e. $h_i = 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$) is exponentially stable. This is equivalent to saying that the system

$$\dot{X}(t) = \mathcal{C}(X(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{H}_i(X(t)) \tag{48}$$

is exponentially stable. This implies that there exist a matrix $P \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ and an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{C}^*(P) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{H}_i^*(P) \preceq -2\,\varepsilon\, I. \tag{49}$$

Define now

$$Q_i = \mathcal{H}_i^*(P) + \frac{\varepsilon}{N} I_n \succ 0 \tag{50}$$

and substituting this value in (42) yields

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathcal{C}^*(P) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Q_i & = & \mathcal{C}^*(P) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{H}_i^*(P) \preceq -\,\varepsilon\, I \prec 0, \\ \mathcal{H}_i^*(P) - Q_i & = & -\frac{\varepsilon}{N} I_n \preceq 0, \end{array} \tag{51}$$

which implies that the conditions in the statement (c) hold, thereby proving the desired result. The proof is completed. ♢

The above result is the semidefinite analogue of the results obtained for linear positive systems with discrete delays – see e.g. [48]. The stability properties do not depend on the value of the delays and the system is exponentially stable for all possible values of the delays if and only if the system with zero-delays is exponentially stable. It also admits an extension to the periodic systems case using a periodic Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional under the same assumptions as in [19]. This extension is omitted for brevity.

3.5. Applications

The objective of this section is to demonstrate that many results from the literature can be recovered and extended using the obtained results. To avoid repetitions, in all the sections below, $x, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the state of the system and the initial condition, $t_0 \geq 0$ is the initial time, $W(t) = (W_1(t), \ldots, W_N(t))$ is a vector of N independent Wiener processes which are also independent of the state $x(t)$ and all the other signals possibly involved in the system. To any of the systems, we can associate a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ with natural filtration satisfying the usual conditions.

The first example pertains to the analysis of stochastic LTV systems with Poissonian jumps, the second one to the analysis of diffusion processes with delays, the third one is to the analysis of time-varying Markov jump linear systems, and the last one to the analysis and the control of time-varying sampled-data systems with Poissonian sampling.

3.5.1. Stochastic LTV systems with Poissonian jumps

Let us define the class of stochastic LTV with Poissonian jumps as

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{d}x(t) & = & A_0(t)x(t)\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(t)x(t)\mathrm{d}W_i(t) + \sum_{i=0}^{N} (M_i(t) - I)x(t)\mathrm{d}\eta_i(t), t \geq t_0 \\ x(t_0) & = & x_0 \end{array} \tag{52}$$

where $(\eta_0(t), \eta_1(t), \ldots, \eta_N(t))$ is a vector of $N+1$ independent of Poisson processes with rates $(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N)$ and which are independent of $x(t)$, $W(t)$ and of the matrix-valued functions $A_i, M_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, which are assumed to be piecewise continuous and bounded.

Several stability notions exist for the system above [53] but we will be mostly interested in the uniform exponential mean-square stability defined below:

Definition 3.7. *The system* (52) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable if there exist some scalars* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\beta \geq 1$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[||x(t)||_2^2] \leq \beta e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)}\mathbb{E}[||x_0||_2^2] \tag{53}$$

holds for all $t \geq t_0$*, all* $t_0 \geq 0$*, and all* $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$*.*

One can observe that $\mathbb{E}[||x(t)||_2^2] = \operatorname{trace}\mathbb{E}[x(t)x(t)^{\mathrm{T}}]$ which means that this notion of stability is about the exponential convergence of the sum of the (nonnegative) eigenvalues of the seconder-order moment matrix associated with the system (52) to zero. This remark leads us to the following result:

Theorem 3.8. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (52) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable.*

(b) There exist a differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *and a continuous matrix-valued function* $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P(t) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \beta_1 I & \preceq & Q(t) & \preceq & \beta_2 I, \end{array} \tag{54}$$

and such that Lyapunov differential equation

$$\dot{P}(t) + \operatorname{Sym}[P(t)A_0(t)] + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}P(t)A_i(t) + \sum_{i=0}^{N}\lambda_i\Delta_i^*(t) = -Q(t) \tag{55}$$

where $\Delta_i^*(t) := M_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}P(t)M_i(t) - P(t)$*,* $i = 0, \ldots, N$*, hold for some positive constants* $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ *and for all* $t \geq t_0$ *and all* $t_0 \geq 0$*.*

Proof : The system (52) is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable if and only if the dynamics of the seconder-order moment matrix $X(t) := \mathbb{E}[x(t)x(t)^{\mathrm{T}}]$ given by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dot{X}(t) & = & A_0(t)X(t) + X(t)A_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(t)X(t)A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=0}^{N}\lambda_i\Delta_i(t),\ t \geq t_0 \\ X(t_0) & = & X_0 := \mathbb{E}[x_0x_0^{\mathrm{T}}] \end{array} \tag{56}$$

where $\Delta_i(t) := M_i(t)X(t)M_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} - X(t)$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, is uniformly exponentially stable. Applying then Theorem 3.3 yields the result. ♢

We can extend the system (52) to include control inputs as

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{d}x(t) & = & (A_0(t)x(t) + B_0(t)u_0(t))\mathrm{d}t + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}(A_i(t)x(t) + B_i(t)u_i(t))\mathrm{d}W_i(t) \\ & & \quad + \displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{N}[(M_i(t) - I)x(t) + N_i(t)u_i(t)]\mathrm{d}\eta_i(t), t \geq t_0 \\ x(t_0) & = & x_0 \end{array} \tag{57}$$

where $u_i(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, and the matrix-valued functions $B_i, N_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n\times m_i}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, are assumed to be piecewise constant and bounded. Considering the control laws

$$u_i(t) = K_i(t)x(t),\ i = 0, \ldots, N \tag{58}$$

and making the substitution $A_i \leftarrow A_i + B_i K_i$ and $M_i \leftarrow M_i + N_i K_i$ in (55) yields an operator of the form (35). This leads us to the following result which can be seen as a generalization of the those in [14, 17]:

Theorem 3.9. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (57) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stabilizable.*

(b) There exist a differentiable matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq P(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, *and matrix-valued functions* $U_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, *such that the Lyapunov differential inequality*

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\dot{Q}(t) + \mathrm{Sym}[A_0(t)Q(t) + B_0(t)U_0(t)] - \sum_{i=0}^{N} \lambda_i Q(t) & \operatorname*{row}_{i=1}^{N}[\Psi_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}] & \operatorname*{row}_{i=0}^{N}[\lambda_i \Phi_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(t) & 0 \\ \star & \star & -\operatorname*{diag}_{i=0}^{N}(\lambda_i) \otimes Q(t) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha_3 I \quad (59)$$

holds for some positive constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ *and for all* $t \geq t_0$ *and all* $t_0 \geq 0$ *where* $\Psi_i(t) := A_i(t)Q(t) + B_i(t)U_i(t)$ *and* $\Phi_i(t) := M_i(t)Q(t) + N_i(t)U_i(t)$.

Proof : This is a direct application of Theorem 3.5. ♢

3.5.2. A class of diffusion processes with delays

Let us consider the following class of diffusion systems with delays

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}x(t) &= A_0 x(t)\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i x(t-h_i)\mathrm{d}W_i(t) \\ x(s) &= \phi(s),\ s \in [-\bar{h}, 0] \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where $\phi \in C([-\bar{h}, 0], \mathbb{R}^n)$ is the initial condition. The notion of stability we will be interested here is also the mean square exponential stability which we adapt to systems with delays as

Definition 3.10. *The system* (60) *is mean-square exponentially stable if there exist some scalars* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\beta > 1$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[||x(t)||_2^2] \leq \beta e^{-\alpha t} \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{s \in [-\bar{h}, 0]} ||\phi(s)||_2^2\right] \quad (61)$$

holds for all $t \geq 0$ *and all initial condition* $\phi \in C([-\bar{h}, 0], \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Once again, this is related to the exponential convergence of the eigenvalues of the seconder-order moment matrix, which then leads us to the following result that can be seen as a generalization of Theorem 5 in [72]:

Theorem 3.11. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (60) *is mean-square exponentially stable for all* $h_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

(b) The system (60) *with zero-delays (i.e. with* $h_i = 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$*) is mean-square exponentially stable.*

Proof : Let $X(t) := \mathbb{E}[x(t)x(t)^{\mathrm{T}}]$ to be the seconder-order moment matrix of the system (60). The dynamics of this matrix is described by

$$\dot{X}(t) = A_0 X(t) + X(t)A_0^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i^{\mathrm{T}} X(t-h_i) A_i. \quad (62)$$

Applying now Theorem 3.6 yields the result. ♢

3.5.3. Time-varying Markov jump linear systems

Let us consider the following class of systems described by a linear stochastic differential equation subject to Markovian jumps

$$\begin{array}{rcl} dx(t) & = & A_{\sigma(t)}(t)x(t)\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{i=1}^{N} B_{\sigma(t),i}(t)x(t)\mathrm{d}W_i(t),\ t \geq t_0 \\ x(t_0) & = & x_0, \\ \sigma(t_0) & = & \sigma_0 \end{array} \tag{63}$$

where σ_0 is the initial value of the parameter $\sigma : [t_0, \infty) \mapsto \{1, \ldots, M\}$ which changes value following a finite Markov chain as

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma(t+h) = j | \sigma(t) = i) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \pi_{ij}h + o(h), & i \neq j, \\ 1 + \pi_{ii}h + o(h), & i = j, \end{array} \right. \tag{64}$$

where $\pi_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$ and $\pi_{ii} = -\sum_{j|j\neq i} \pi_{ij}$. The matrix-valued functions $A_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, are assumed to be piecewise continuous and bounded. We consider here the concept of stability called *uniformly exponential mean-square stability in conditioning* as defined in [35, 38]:

Definition 3.12. *The system* (63)(64) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable in conditioning if there exist some scalars* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\beta \geq 1$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[||x(t)||_2^2 | \sigma(t_0)] \leq \beta e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)} \mathbb{E}[||x_0||_2^2] \tag{65}$$

holds for all $t \geq t_0$*, all* $t_0 \geq 0$*, all* $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and all initial probability distribution* $\pi(t_0)$ *of the Markov process defined by* (64)*.*

This leads to the following result[3] which can be seen as a generalization of the results in [29, 50]:

Theorem 3.13. *The system* (63)-(64) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable in conditioning if and only if there exist differentiable matrix-valued functions* $P_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$*,* $i = 1, \ldots, M$*, and continuous matrix-valued functions* $Q_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$*,* $i = 1, \ldots, M$*, such that*

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P_i(t) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \beta_1 I & \preceq & Q_i(t) & \preceq & \beta_2 I, \end{array} \tag{66}$$

and the coupled Lyapunov differential equations

$$\dot{P}_i(t) + A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(t) + P_i(t) A_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} B_{i,j}^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(t) B_{i,j} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j\neq i}}^{M} \pi_{ij} P_j(t) = -Q_i(t) \tag{67}$$

hold for all $i = 1, \ldots, M$ *and some* $\alpha_1.\alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$*.*

Proof : Let $\mathbb{1}_i(\sigma(t))$ be the indicator function of the state i defined as $\mathbb{1}_i(\sigma(t)) = 1$ if $\sigma(t) = i$, and 0 otherwise. Then, defining $X_i(t) = \mathbb{E}[x(t)x(t)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbb{1}_i(\sigma(t))]$, we get that

$$\dot{X}_i(t) = A_i(t)X_i(t) + X_i(t)A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} B_{i,j}(t)X_i(t)B_{i,j}(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \pi_{ji}X_j(t) \tag{68}$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, M$. While it is readily seen that while $\mathbb{E}[x(t)x(t)^{\mathrm{T}}] = \sum_{i=1}^{M} X_i(t)$, there is no closed-form expression for the derivative of the seconder-order moment matrix associated with the system. Let E_i be

[3] It was brought to the attention of the author after publication that this result was previously published in [35, 38].

the matrix composed of the columns $\{e_1, \ldots, e_M\}$ in cyclic ascending order where e_1 is the i-th column and define $\bar{\Pi}$ as $[\bar{\Pi}]_{ij} = \sqrt{\pi_{ji}}$. Then, we have that

$$\operatorname*{diag}_{i=1}^{M} \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{M} \pi_{ji} X_j(t) \right) = \sum_{j=2}^{M} \bar{A}_j X(t) \bar{A}_j^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{69}$$

where $\bar{A}_j = (E_i \odot \bar{\Pi}) \otimes I_n$, $j = 2, \ldots, M$. Using this expression, one can rewrite all the matrix-valued differential equations (68) in compact form as

$$\dot{X}(t) = \bar{A}_0(t) X(t) + X(t) \bar{A}_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \bar{B}_j(t) X(t) \bar{B}_j(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{j=2}^{M} \bar{A}_j X(t) \bar{A}_j^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{70}$$

where $X(t) := \operatorname{diag}_{i=1}^{M}\{X_i(t)\}$,

$$\bar{A}_0(t) \;=\; \operatorname*{diag}_{i=1}^{M} \left\{ A_i(t) + \frac{\pi_{ii}}{2} I \right\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{B}_j(t) \;=\; \operatorname*{diag}_{i=1}^{M} (B_{i,j}(t)), \tag{71}$$

Using Theorem 3.3, we obtain the stability condition

$$\dot{P}(t) + \bar{A}_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P(t) + P(t) \bar{A}_0(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \bar{B}_j(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P(t) \bar{B}_j(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \bar{A}_j^{\mathrm{T}} P(t) \bar{A}_j = -Q(t). \tag{72}$$

As the state of this system has a block-diagonal structure, the state space is actually $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0} \times \ldots \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ (M times) and not the full space $\mathbb{S}^{nM}_{\succeq 0}$. This allows us to also restrict ourselves to block-diagonal matrices $P(t) = \operatorname{diag}_{i=1}^{M}(P_i(t))$ and $Q(t) = \operatorname{diag}_{i=1}^{M}(Q_i(t))$ which all satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.3. Exploiting the block-diagonal structure yields

$$\sum_{j=2}^{M} \bar{A}_j^{\mathrm{T}} P(t) \bar{A}_j = \operatorname*{diag}_{i=1}^{M} \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{M} \pi_{ij} P_j(t) \right). \tag{73}$$

together with the conditions (67) after having expanded the other terms in (72). ♢

3.5.4. Time-varying sampled-data systems with Poissonian sampling

Let us consider here the following LTV stochastic process

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}x(t) \;&=\; (A_0(t)x(t) + B_0(t)u(t))\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{i=1}^{N} (A_i(t)x(t) + B_i(t)u(t))\mathrm{d}W_i(t) \\ x(t^0) \;&=\; x_0 \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where $A_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, are assumed to be piecewise continuous and bounded. We also assume that this system is controlled using the following time-varying sample-data state-feedback control law

$$u(t) = K_1(t_k)x(t_k) + K_2(t_k)u(t_k), \; t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}]. \tag{75}$$

As for the other systems, $x, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the state of the system and the initial condition, and $t^0 \geq 0$ is the initial time. The Wiener processes $W_1(t), \ldots, W_N(t)$ are assumed to be independent of each other and of the state $x(t)$. The matrix-valued functions describing the system are also assumed to be uniformly bounded. Let us now assume that the sampling instants $t_{k+1} - t_k$ is exponentially distributed with rate $\lambda > 0$; i.e. $T_k \sim \mathrm{Exp}(\lambda)$.

Theorem 3.14. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The stochastic LTV sampled-data system (74)-(75) *with Poissonian sampling with rate* $\lambda > 0$ *is uniformly globally exponentially stable.*

(b) There exists a differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq P(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, *such that the differential matrix inequality*

$$\dot{P}(t) + \mathrm{Sym}[P(t)\bar{A}_0(t)] + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{A}_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P(t) \bar{A}_i(t) + \lambda(\bar{J}(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P(t) \bar{J}(t) - P(t)) \preceq -\alpha_3 I \tag{76}$$

holds for some positive constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ *and for all* $t \geq t_0$ *and all* $t_0 \geq 0$ *where*

$$\bar{A}_0(t) := \begin{bmatrix} A_0(t) & B_0(t) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ \bar{A}_i(t) := \begin{bmatrix} A_i(t) & B_i(t) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ \bar{J}(t) := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ K_1(t) & K_2(t) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{77}$$

(c) There exist a differentiable matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq Q(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, *and a matrix-valued function* $U : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n+m)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, *such that the differential matrix inequality*

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\dot{Q}(t) + \mathrm{Sym}[\bar{A}_0(t)Q] - \lambda Q(t) & \lambda \left(\bar{J}_0(t)Q(t) + \bar{J}_b(t)U(t)\right)^{\mathrm{T}} & \underset{i=1}{\overset{N}{\mathrm{row}}}[Q(t)A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -\lambda Q(t) & 0 \\ \star & \star & -I_n \otimes Q(t) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha_3 I \tag{78}$$

holds for some positive constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ *and for all* $t \geq t_0$ *and all* $t_0 \geq 0$ *where*

$$\bar{J}_0(t) := \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ \bar{J}_b(t) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_m \end{bmatrix}. \tag{79}$$

Moreover, suitable gains are given by $\begin{bmatrix} K_1(t) & K_2(t) \end{bmatrix} = U(t)Q(t)^{-1}$.

Proof : The system (74)-(75) can be reformulated as the following impulsive system

$$\mathrm{d}z(t) = \bar{A}_0(t)z(t)\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{A}_i(t)z(t)\mathrm{d}W_i(t) \tag{80}$$

and

$$z(t_k^+) = \bar{J}(t_k)z(t_k) \tag{81}$$

where $\bar{A}_i(t)$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and $\bar{J}(t_k)$ are defined in the result. The seconder-order moment system associated with the above impulsive system is given by

$$\dot{X}(t) = \bar{A}_0(t)X(t) + X(t)\bar{A}_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{A}_i(t)X(t)\bar{A}_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \lambda(\bar{J}(t)X(t)\bar{J}(t)^{\mathrm{T}} - X(t)). \tag{82}$$

Applying then Theorem 3.3 yields the result of the second statement whereas the use of Theorem 3.5 leads to the third statement. ♢

4. Linear Matrix-Valued Symmetric Discrete-Time Systems

This section is devoted to the definition of linear matrix-valued symmetric discrete-time systems that evolves on the cone of positive semidefinite matrices together with their associated generators and state-transition operator. Using those definitions a necessary and sufficient condition for their uniform exponential

stability is obtained in Theorem 4.3 in terms of a matrix-valued difference equation or a matrix-valued difference inequality. This result is then specialized to the LTI case in Theorem 4.4 where additional spectral conditions are also obtained. Convex stabilizability and stabilization conditions are also derived in Theorem 4.5 and take the form of difference linear matrix inequalities. The case of systems with delays is also considered and a necessary and sufficient stability condition, generalizing existing ones, is also obtained in Theorem 4.6. As in the continuous-time case, the simplicity and the versatility of the approach as a general tool for the analysis of (stochastic) discrete-time systems is illustrated through several examples, namely on linear time-varying stochastic systems subject to difference types of stochastic finite-variance parameters, linear time-varying stochastic systems with delays, and time-varying systems with Markov jump parameters.

4.1. Preliminaries

Let us consider here the following class of matrix-valued discrete-time dynamical systems

$$\begin{array}{rcl} X(k+1) & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{N} J_i(k)X(k)J_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}, k \geq k_0 \\ X(k_0) & = & X_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0} \end{array} \tag{83}$$

where the matrix-valued functions $J_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, are bounded. It is clear from the above expression that there is a unique solution to this difference equation, which we denote by $X(k, k_0, X_0)$. This solution can be written as

$$X(k) = \mathcal{D}_{k,\ell}(X_\ell),\ k \geq \ell \geq k_0 \tag{84}$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_{k,\ell}(X) = \begin{cases} X & \text{if } k = \ell \\ \mathcal{D}_\ell(X) & \text{if } k = \ell + 1 \\ \left(\mathcal{D}_{k-1} \circ \ldots \circ \mathcal{D}_\ell\right)(X) & \text{if } k > \ell + 1 \end{cases} \tag{85}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rccl} \mathcal{D}_k : & \mathbb{S}^n & \mapsto & \mathbb{S}^n \\ & X & \mapsto & \displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{N} J_i(k)XJ_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}. \end{array} \tag{86}$$

The adjoint of the operator $\mathcal{D}_k$, denoted by $\mathcal{D}_k^*$, is given by

$$\begin{array}{rccl} \mathcal{D}_k^* : & \mathbb{S}^n & \mapsto & \mathbb{S}^n \\ & X & \mapsto & \displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{N} J_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}XJ_i(k). \end{array} \tag{87}$$

The following result, which is the discrete-time analogue of Proposition 3.1, shows that the system (83) leaves the cone $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ invariant:

Proposition 4.1. *The matrix-valued difference equation* (83) *leaves the cone of positive semidefinite matrices invariant, that is, for any $X_0 \succeq 0$, we have that $X(k, k_0, X_0) \succeq 0$ for all $k \geq k_0$ and all $k_0 \geq 0$.*

Proof : The proof follows from the same lines as the proof of Proposition 3.1 and is thus omitted. ♢

Definition 4.2. *The zero solution of the system* (83) *is* ***globally uniformly exponentially stable with rate*** *ρ if there exist some constants $\beta \geq 1$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$||X(k, k_0, X_0)|| \leq \beta\rho^{k-k_0}||X_0|| \tag{88}$$

for all $k \geq k_0$, all $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and all $X_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$.

4.2. Stability Analysis

With the previous definitions and results in mind, we are now able to state the following result[4] characterizing the uniform exponential stability of the system (83):

Theorem 4.3 (LTV Case). *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (83) *is uniformly exponentially stable.*

(b) There exist some matrix-valued functions $P, Q : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P(k) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \beta_1 I & \preceq & Q(k) & \preceq & \beta_2 I, \end{array} \tag{89}$$

and such that ***Lyapunov difference equation***

$$\mathcal{D}^*_k(P(k+1)) - P(k) + Q(k) = 0 \tag{90}$$

hold for some positive constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ *and for all* $k \geq 0$.

(c) There exists a matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *such that the*

$$\alpha_1 I \preceq P(k) \preceq \alpha_2 I \tag{91}$$

and such that ***Lyapunov difference inequality***

$$\mathcal{D}^*_k(P(k+1)) - P(k) \preceq -\alpha_3 I \tag{92}$$

hold for some positive constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ *and for all* $k \geq 0$.

Proof : It is immediate to see that the statements (b) and (c) are equivalent.

Proof that the statement (b) implies the statement (a). Define the function $V(k, X) = \langle P(k), X \rangle$ where $P(\cdot)$ satisfies the conditions of statement (b). Since $P(k)$ is positive definite, uniformly bounded and uniformly bounded away from 0, then, from Proposition 2.3, we have that V is $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$-copositive definite, radially unbounded and decrescent. Evaluating the successive difference of the function V along the trajectories of the system (83) yields

$$\begin{array}{rcl} V(k+1, X(k+1) - V(k, X(k))) & = & \langle P(k+1), X(k+1) \rangle - \langle P(k), X(k) \rangle \\ & = & \langle P(k+1), \mathcal{D}_k(X(k)) \rangle - \langle P(k), X(k) \rangle \\ & = & \langle \mathcal{D}^*_k(P(k+1)) - P(k), X(k) \rangle \\ & = & -\langle Q(k), X(k) \rangle \\ & \leq & -\dfrac{\beta_1}{\alpha_2} \langle P(k), X(k) \rangle = -\dfrac{\beta_1}{\alpha_2} V(k, X(k)). \end{array} \tag{93}$$

Therefore, V is a global, uniform and exponential Lyapunov function for the system (83), which proves that the system (83) is globally uniformly exponentially stable with rate $1 - \beta_1/\alpha_2$.

Proof that the statement (a) **implies the statement** (b)**.** Assume that the system (83) is uniformly exponentially stable, then by definition there exist some $M \geq 1$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$||\mathcal{D}_{k,k_0}(X)||_* \leq M \rho^{k-k_0} ||X||_* \tag{94}$$

[4] It was brought to the attention of the author after publication of the paper that this result can be seen as a particular case of Theorem 2.4 in [37].

holds for all $k \geq k_0$, all $k_0 \geq 0$, and all $X \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$. Now let $Q : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ be such that $\beta_1 I \preceq Q(k) \preceq \beta_2$ for some $\beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$ and define $\bar{P} : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ such that it verifies

$$\langle \bar{P}(k), X \rangle = \sum_{\tau=k}^{\infty} \langle Q(\tau), \mathcal{D}_{\tau,k}(X) \rangle \tag{95}$$

for all $X \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ and all $k \geq 0$, where $\mathcal{D}_{k,\tau}$ is defined in (84), (85). We need to prove first that there exist scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ such that $\alpha_1 I \preceq P(k) \preceq \alpha_2 I$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Clearly, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \bar{P}(k), X \rangle &= \lim_{K \to \infty} \sum_{\tau=k}^{K} \langle Q(\tau), \mathcal{D}_{\tau,k}(X) \rangle \\
&\leq \beta_2 \lim_{K \to \infty} \sum_{\tau=k}^{K} \langle \mathcal{D}_{\tau,k}(X)) \\
&\leq \beta_2 M \left(\lim_{K \to \infty} \sum_{\tau=k}^{K} \rho^{\tau-k} \right) ||X||_* \\
&= \beta_2 M \left(\lim_{K \to \infty} \frac{1-\rho^{K-k+1}}{1-\rho} \right) ||X||_* \\
&= \frac{\beta_2 M}{1-\rho} ||X||_* =: \alpha_2 ||X||_*.
\end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

Additionally,

$$\langle \bar{P}(k), X \rangle \geq \langle Q(k), X \rangle \geq \beta_1 ||X||_* =: \alpha_1 ||X||_*. \tag{97}$$

So, we have proven the existence of two scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ such that $\alpha_1 I \preceq P(k) \preceq \alpha_2 I$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Observing now that

$$\langle \bar{P}(k+1), \mathcal{D}_k(X) \rangle - \langle \bar{P}(k), X \rangle = -\langle Q(k), X \rangle \tag{98}$$

yields

$$\langle \mathcal{D}_k^*(P(k+1)) - P(k) + Q(k), X \rangle = 0. \tag{99}$$

Since the above expression holds for all $X \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$, then this implies that the Lyapunov equation of statement (b) must hold with $P = \bar{P}$ and the same Q. This proves the result. $\diamondsuit$

The following result is the specialization of the previous one to the LTI case where it is shown that it is possible to connect the stability properties of the system to some spectral properties of a matrix and an operator associated with the LTI version of the system (83):

Theorem 4.4 (LTI case). *Assume that the system* (83) *is time-invariant. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (83) *is exponentially stable.*

(b) The conditions of the Theorem 4.3 in statements (b) *and* (c) *hold with constant matrix-valued functions* $P(t) \equiv P \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *and* $Q(t) \equiv Q \in \mathbb{S}^n$.

(c) The matrix

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} := F^{\mathrm{T}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{N} J_i \otimes J_i \right) F \tag{100}$$

is Schur stable.

(d) We have that $\mathrm{sp}(\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathbb{D}$ *where*

$$\mathrm{sp}(\mathcal{D}) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \mathcal{D}(X) = \lambda X \text{ for some } X \in \mathbb{S}^n, X \neq 0\}. \tag{101}$$

and $\mathcal{D}$ *is defined as the time-invariant version of the operator* (86).

Proof : The proof of the equivalence between the two first statements follow from Theorem 4.3 specialized to the LTI case.

Proof that statement (a) is equivalent to statement (d). This follows from the fact that the LTI version of the system (83) is exponentially stable if and only if the eigenvalues associated with its dynamics are located inside the unit disc. Indeed, the solution to that LTI system is given by

$$X(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n(n+1)/2} \lambda_i^k \langle X_0, X_i \rangle \tag{102}$$

where (λ_i, X_i) denotes the i-th pair of eigenvalues and eigenmatrices. This proves the equivalence.

Proof that statement (c) is equivalent to statement (d). Using Kronecker calculus, Statement (d) is equivalent to saying that

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{N} J_i \otimes J_i - \lambda I_{n^2}\right) \mathrm{vec}(X) = 0, \ X \neq 0, X \in \mathbb{S}^n \tag{103}$$

implies $|\lambda| < 1$. The eigenvalues depend on the domain of the operator which is not the full space $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ here but the subspace associated with symmetric matrices X. This can be done by restricting the matrix above to that subspace by projection. This can be achieved using the matrix F as

$$\left(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} - \lambda I_{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}}\right) \overline{\mathrm{vec}}(X) = 0, \tag{104}$$

which is equivalent to statement (c). ♢

4.3. Stabilization

Let us consider here the perturbation of the operator $\mathcal{D}_k$ given by

$$\begin{array}{rccl} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k : & \mathbb{S}^n & \mapsto & \mathbb{S}^n \\ & X & \mapsto & \displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{N} (J_i(k) + B_i(k)K_i(k)) X (J_i(k) + B_i(k)K_i(k))^{\mathrm{T}} \end{array} \tag{105}$$

where the matrix-valued functions $J_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_i}$, $K_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, are assumed to be bounded. The objective is to formulate conditions for the existence of some K_i's such that the above operator generates an uniformly exponentially stable state transition operator; i.e. $X(k+1) = \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(X(k))$ is globally uniformly exponentially stable. This is formulated in the following result:

Theorem 4.5. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) There exist matrix-valued functions $K_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$, $i = 1, \ldots,$, *such that the system* $X(k+1) = \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_k(X(k))$ *is uniformly exponentially stable.*

(b) There exists a matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq Q(k) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, such that the difference matrix inequality

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q(k) & \operatorname*{row}_{i=0}^{N}[(\mathscr{N}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} J_i(k) Q(k))^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -\operatorname*{diag}_{i=0}^{N}[\mathscr{N}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} Q(k+1) \mathscr{N}_i(k)] \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha_3 I \tag{106}$$

holds for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$ and where $\mathscr{N}_i$ is such that $\mathscr{N}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}$ is a basis for the left null-space of $B_i(k)$; i.e. $\mathscr{N}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} B_i(k) = 0$ and $\mathscr{N}_i(t)$ is of maximal rank.

(c) There exist a differential matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq Q(k) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, and piecewise continuous matrix-valued functions $K_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$ such that the differential matrix inequality

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q(k) & \operatorname*{row}_{i=0}^{N}[(J_i(k) Q(k) + B_i(k) U_i(k))^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(k+1) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha_3 I \tag{107}$$

holds for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$. Moreover, suitable matrix-valued functions K_i's are given by $K_i(k) = U_i(k) Q(k)^{-1}$.

Proof : The equivalence between the first and the third statements follows from substituting the matrices of the operator (105) into the condition of the statement (b) of Theorem (4.3). Performing then a congruence transformation with respect to $Q(k) := P(k)^{-1}$, making the changes of variables $U_i(k) = K_i(k) Q(k)$, and using a Schur complement leads to the result. The equivalence between the two last statements follows from the fact that the differential matrix inequality in the third statement can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q(k) & \operatorname*{row}_{0=1}^{N}[(J_i(k) Q(k))^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(k+1) \end{bmatrix} + \operatorname{Sym}\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \operatorname*{diag}_{i=0}^{N} B_i(k) \end{bmatrix} \operatorname*{col}_{i=0}^{N}(U_i(k)) \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0_{n \times nN} \end{bmatrix} \right) \preceq -\alpha_3 I. \tag{108}$$

Applying then the Projection Lemma [42] yields the condition in the second statement. ♢

4.4. Systems with delays

Interestingly, it is possible to extend some of the above results to the case of systems with delays, leading to an extension of the results in [72] to the discrete-time case with multiple delays. The LTI time-delay system version of the system (83) is given by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} X(k+1) & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{N} J_i X(k) J_i^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} H_i X(k-\tau_i) H_i^{\mathrm{T}},\ k \geq 0 \\ X(k) & = & \Xi(k) \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0},\ k \in \{-\bar{\tau}, \ldots, 0\} \end{array} \tag{109}$$

where $X(k) \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ is the state of the system, $\Xi : \{-\bar{\tau}, \ldots, 0\} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ is the initial condition and the delays are such that $\tau_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, with $\bar{\tau} = \max_i\{\tau_i\}$. It is also convenient to define the operators $\mathcal{T}_i$ as

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \mathcal{T}_i : & \mathbb{S}^n & \mapsto & \mathbb{S}^n \\ & X & \mapsto & H_i X H_i^{\mathrm{T}} \end{array} \tag{110}$$

and their adjoints $\mathcal{T}_i^*$ as

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \mathcal{T}_i^* : & \mathbb{S}^n & \mapsto & \mathbb{S}^n \\ & X & \mapsto & H_i^{\mathrm{T}} X H_i. \end{array} \tag{111}$$

It can also easily be shown that the solution of the system (109) remains confined in the positive semidefinite cone provided that the initial condition take values inside the positive definite cone.

The following result demonstrates that the same delay-independent stability property holds for the system (109) as for linear time-invariant positive discrete-time systems [4]:

Theorem 4.6. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (109) *is exponentially stable for any delay values* $\tau_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

(b) The system (109) *with zero delays (i.e.* $\tau_i = 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$*) is exponentially stable.*

(c) There exist matrices $P, Q_i \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, *such that the conditions*

$$\mathcal{D}^*(P) - P + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Q_i \prec 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{T}_i^*(P) - Q_i \preceq 0, \ i = 1, \ldots, N \tag{112}$$

hold.

(d) We have that $\text{sp}\left(\mathcal{D} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_i\right) \subset \mathbb{D}$ *where*

$$\text{sp}\left(\mathcal{D} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_i\right) := \left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \mathcal{D}(X) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_i(X) = \lambda X \text{ for some } X \in \mathbb{S}^n, X \neq 0\right\}. \tag{113}$$

Proof : We know from Theorem 4.4 that the statements (b) and (d) are equivalent. It is also immediate to see that the statement (a) implies the statement (b). So, we need to prove the two remaining implications.

Proof that the statement (c) **implies the statement** (a)**.** Let us consider the following Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional

$$V(X_k) = \langle P, X_k(0)\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=-\tau_i}^{-1} \langle Q_i, X_k(j)\rangle \tag{114}$$

where $X_k(s) = X(k+s)$, $s \in \{-\bar{\tau}, \ldots, 0\}$. Clearly, we have that

$$V(X_k) \geq \lambda_{\min}(P)||X_k(0)||_* \tag{115}$$

and

$$V(X_k) \leq (\lambda_{\max}(P) + \lambda_{\max}(Q))||X_k||_{d,*} \tag{116}$$

where $||X_k||_{d,*} := \max_{s\in\{-\bar{\tau},\ldots,0\}} ||X(k+s)||_*$.

The discrete-time derivative of the functional (114) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V(X_{k+1}) - V(X_k) &= \langle P, X(k+1) - X(k)\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle Q_i, X(k)\rangle - \langle Q_i, X(k-\tau_i)\rangle \\ &= \left\langle P, \mathcal{D}(X(k)) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_i(X(k-\tau_i)) - X(k)\right\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle Q_i, X(k)\rangle - \langle Q_i, X(k-\tau_i)\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \mathcal{D}^*(P) - P + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Q_i, X(k)\right\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle \mathcal{T}_i^*(P) - Q_i, X(k-\tau))\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

Under the conditions of the statement (c), there exists a small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathcal{C}^*(P) - P + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Q_i \preceq -\varepsilon\, I$ which implies

$$V(X_{k+1}) - V(X_k) \leq -\varepsilon\, ||X_k(0)||_* \tag{118}$$

Therefore, the functional (114) is a discrete-time Lyapunov-Krasovskii functional [41] for the system (109) and the system is exponentially stable regardless the value of the delays as the conditions do not depend on

the values of the delays. This proves the implication.

Proof that the statement (b) **implies the statement** (c)**.** Assume that the system (109) with zero delays is exponentially stable, then the system

$$X(k+1) = \mathcal{D}(X(k)) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_i(X(k)) \tag{119}$$

is exponentially stable. This implies that there exists a matrix $P \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ and an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{D}^*(P) - P + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_i^*(P) \preceq -2\,\varepsilon\, I. \tag{120}$$

Define now

$$Q_i = \mathcal{T}_i^*(P) + \frac{\varepsilon}{N} I_n \succ 0 \tag{121}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Substituting that in (112) yields

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathcal{D}^*(P) - P + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Q_i & = & \mathcal{D}^*(P) - P + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{T}_i^*(P) \preceq -\varepsilon\, I, \\ \mathcal{T}_i^*(P) - Q_i & = & -\frac{\varepsilon}{N} I_n \preceq 0, \end{array} \tag{122}$$

which implies that the conditions in statement (c) hold, thereby proving the desired result. The proof is completed. ♢

4.5. Applications

As in the continuous-time case, the simplicity and the versatility of the approach as a general tool for the analysis of (stochastic) discrete-time systems is illustrated through several examples, namely on the analysis of linear time-varying stochastic systems subject to difference types of stochastic finite-variance parameters, linear time-varying stochastic systems with delays, and time-varying systems with Markov jump parameters.

4.5.1. Stochastic LTV systems

We consider here the following stochastic discrete-time varying system

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x(k+1) & = & A_0(k)x(k) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \nu_i(k) A_i(k) x(k) \\ x(k_0) & = & x_0 \end{array} \tag{123}$$

where $x(k), x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the state of the system and the initial condition, k_0 is the initial time. The random signals $\nu_1(k), \ldots, \nu_N(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ are assumed to be independent of each other and from the state $x(k)$, and they are also assumed to be stationary. The matrix-valued functions A_i, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, are assumed to be bounded for all k's.

We consider here the following notion of stability for the system (123):

Definition 4.7. *The system* (123) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable if there exist some scalars* $\rho \in [0, 1)$ *and* $\beta > 1$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[||x(k)||_2^2] \leq \beta \rho^{k-k_0} \mathbb{E}[||x_0||_2^2] \tag{124}$$

holds for all $k \geq k_0$*, all* $k_0 \geq 0$*, and all* $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$*.*

As in the continuous-time case, this notion of stability is directly connected to the dynamics of the seconder-order moment matrix associated with the system (123). This remark yields the following result:

Theorem 4.8. *Assume that the random signals $\nu_1(k), \ldots, \nu_N(k)$ have zero mean and unit variance. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (123) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable.*

(b) There exist some matrix-valued functions $P, Q : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P(k) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \beta_1 I & \preceq & Q(k) & \preceq & \beta_2 I, \end{array} \tag{125}$$

and such that Lyapunov difference equation

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N} A_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} P(k+1) A_i(k) - P(k) = -Q(k) \tag{126}$$

hold for some positive constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ and for all $k \geq 0$.

Proof : Since the ν_i's have zero mean and unit variance, then the seconder-order moment matrix associated with the system (123) is described by the matrix difference equation

$$X(k+1) = \sum_{i=0}^{N} A_i(k) X(k) A_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{127}$$

together with $X(k_0) = \mathbb{E}[x(k_0)x(k_0)^{\mathrm{T}}]$. Applying then Theorem 4.3 yields the result. ♢

Theorem 4.9. *Assume that the random signals $\nu_1(k), \ldots, \nu_N(k)$ follow a Bernoulli distribution with $\mathbb{P}(\nu_i(k) = 1) = p_i$ and $\mathbb{P}(\nu_i(k) = 1) = 1 - p_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (123) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable.*

(b) There exist some matrix-valued functions $P, Q : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P(k) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \beta_1 I & \preceq & Q(k) & \preceq & \beta_2 I, \end{array} \tag{128}$$

and such that Lyapunov difference equation

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N} \bar{A}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} P(k+1) \bar{A}_i(k) - P(k) + Q(k) = 0 \tag{129}$$

hold for some positive constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ and for all $k \geq 0$ where

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \bar{A}_0(k) & = & A_0(k) + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i A_i(k), \\ \bar{A}_i(k) & = & (p_i(1-p_i))^{1/2} A_i(k), \ i = 1, \ldots, N. \end{array} \tag{130}$$

Proof : First note that we have $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i] = p_i$, $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i^2] = p_i$, $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i \nu_j] = p_i p_j$, and $\mathrm{Var}(\nu_i) = p_i(1-p_i)$. The seconder-order moment associated with the system (123) is given by

$$X(k+1) = \bar{A}_0(k) X(k) \bar{A}_0(k)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{A}_i(k) X(k) \bar{A}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{131}$$

where the matrices are defined in the result. Applying then Theorem 4.3 yields the result. ♢

4.5.2. A class of stochastic linear system with delays

We consider here the following stochastic discrete-time varying system

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x(k+1) & = & A_0 x(k) + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} \nu_i(k) A_i x(k-\tau_i) \\ x(s) & = & \phi(s),\ s \in \{-\bar{\tau}, \ldots, 0\} \end{array} \tag{132}$$

where $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state of the system, $\phi : \{-\bar{\tau}, \ldots, 0\} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ is the initial condition and the delays τ_i are such that $\tau_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ with $\bar{\tau} := \max_i\{\tau_i\}$. The zero mean and unit variance random signals $\nu_1(k), \ldots, \nu_N(k)$ are assumed to be independent of each other and from the state $x(k)$.

Since the system now involves some time-delays, we need to adapt the notion of mean-square exponential stability to this setup as follows:

Definition 4.10. *The system* (132) *is mean-square exponentially stable if there exist some scalars* $\rho \in (0,1)$ *and* $\beta > 1$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[||x(k)||_2^2] \leq \beta \rho^k \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{s \in \{-\bar{\tau}, \ldots, 0\}} ||\phi(s)||_2^2\right] \tag{133}$$

holds for all $k \geq 0$ *and all initial condition* $\phi \in C(\{-\bar{\tau}, \ldots, , 0\}, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

We have the following result:

Theorem 4.11. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (132) *is mean-square exponentially stable for all* $\tau_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

(b) The system (132) *with zero-delays (i.e. with* $\tau_i = 0$ *for all* $i = 1, \ldots, N$*) is mean-square exponentially stable.*

Proof : The seconder-order moment matrix $X(k)$ associated with the system (132) is governed by

$$X(k+1) = A_0(k) X(k) A_0(k)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(k) X(k-\tau_i) A_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{134}$$

and $X(0) = \mathbb{E}[x(0)x(0)^{\mathrm{T}}]$. Applying now Theorem 4.6 yields the result. ♢

4.5.3. Time-varying Markov jump linear systems

We consider here the following class of systems subject to Markovian jumps

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x(k+1) & = & A_{\sigma(k)}(k) x(k) + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} B_{\sigma(k),i}(t) x(k) \nu_i(k),\ k \geq k_0 \\ x(k_0) & = & x_0, \\ \sigma(k_0) & = & \sigma_0 \end{array} \tag{135}$$

where $x(k), x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the state of the system and the initial condition, k_0 is the initial time. The random signals $\nu_1(k), \ldots, \nu_N(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ are assumed to be independent of each other and from the state $x(k)$ and the switching signal $\sigma(k)$, and are also assumed to be stationary. The switching signal $\sigma : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq t_0} \mapsto \{1, \ldots, M\}$, with initial value σ_0, evolves according to the finite Markov chain defined by

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma(k+1) = j | \sigma(k) = i) = \pi_{ij} \tag{136}$$

where $\pi_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, M$, we have that $\sum_{j=1}^{M} \pi_{ij} = 1$. The matrix-valued functions A_i, $i = 0, \ldots, M$, and $B_{i,j}$, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, $j = 1, \ldots, N$, are assumed to be bounded for all k's.

We consider here the concept of stability called *uniformly exponential mean-square stability in conditioning* as defined in [35, 38]:

Definition 4.12. *The system* (135)(136) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable in conditioning if there exist some scalars* $\rho \in [0,1)$ *and* $\beta \geq 1$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[||x(k)||_2^2|\sigma(k_0)] \leq \beta\rho^{k-k_0}\mathbb{E}[||x_0||_2^2] \tag{137}$$

holds for all $k \geq k_0$*, all* $k_0 \geq 0$*, and all* $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and all initial probability distribution* $\pi(t_0)$ *of the Markov process defined by* (136)*.*

This leads to the following result[5] which can be seen as a generalization of the results in[28]:

Theorem 4.13. *Assume that the matrix* $\Pi = [\pi_{ij}]$ *has no zero column. Then, the system* (135)-(136) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable in conditioning if and only if there exist matrix-valued functions* $P_i, Q_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$*,* $i = 1, \ldots, M$*, such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P_i(k) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \beta_1 I & \preceq & Q_i(k) & \preceq & \beta_2 I, \end{array} \tag{138}$$

and the difference equations

$$A_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M}\pi_{ij}P_j(k+1)\right)A_i(k) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{N}B_{i,\ell}(k)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M}\pi_{ij}P_j(k+1)\right)B_{i,\ell}(k) - P_i(k) = -Q_i(k) \tag{139}$$

hold for all $i = 1, \ldots, M$*.*

Proof : Let $\mathbb{1}_i(\sigma(k))$ be the indicator function of the state i defined as $\mathbb{1}_i(\sigma(k)) = 1$ if $\sigma(k) = i$, and 0 otherwise. Then, defining $X_i(k) = \mathbb{E}[x(k)x(k)^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbb{1}_i(\sigma(k))]$, we get that

$$X_i(k+1) = \sum_{j=1}^{M}\pi_{ji}\left(A_j(k)X_j(k)A_j(k)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{N}B_{j,\ell}(k)X_j(k)B_{j,\ell}(k)^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \tag{140}$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, M$. Let E_i be the matrix composed of the columns $\{e_1, \ldots, e_M\}$ in cyclic ascending order where e_1 is the i-th column and define the matrices $A^\pi(k)$ and $B^\pi_\ell(k)$ as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [A^\pi(k)]_{ij} & = & \sqrt{\pi_{ji}}A_j(k), \\ [B^\pi_\ell(k)]_{ij} & = & \sqrt{\pi_{ji}}B_{j,\ell}(k). \end{array} \tag{141}$$

Then, we have that

$$\operatorname*{diag}_{i=1}^{M}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M}\pi_{ji}A_j(k)X_j(k)A_j(k)^{\mathrm{T}}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{M}\bar{A}_i(k)X(k)\bar{A}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{142}$$

and

$$\operatorname*{diag}_{i=1}^{M}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M}\pi_{ji}B_{j,\ell}(k)X_j(k)B_{j,\ell}(k)^{\mathrm{T}}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{M}\bar{B}_{i,\ell}(k)X(k)\bar{B}_{i,\ell}(k)^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{143}$$

where $X(t) := \operatorname{diag}_{i=1}^{M}\{X_i(t)\}$, $\bar{A}_i(k) = A^\pi(k) \odot E_i$ and $\bar{B}_{i,\ell} = B^\pi_\ell \odot E_i$. Then, one can rewrite the above M coupled matrix-valued differential equations as

$$X(k+1) = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\bar{A}_i(k)X(k)\bar{A}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{N}\bar{B}_{i,\ell}(k)X(k)\bar{B}_{i,\ell}(k)^{\mathrm{T}}\right). \tag{144}$$

[5]It was brought to the attention of the author after publication that this result was previously published in [36, 37].

Using Theorem 4.3, we obtain the following stability condition for the above dynamical system

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(\bar{A}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}P(k+1)\bar{A}_i(k)+\sum_{\ell=1}^{N}\bar{B}_{i,\ell}(k)^{\mathrm{T}}P(k+1)\bar{B}_{i,\ell}(k)\right)-P(k)=-Q(k) \tag{145}$$

for some matrix-valued functions P, Q satisfying the conditions in Theorem 4.3. As the state of this system has a block-diagonal structure, the state space is actually $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}\times\ldots\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ (M times), and not the full space $\mathbb{S}^{nM}_{\succeq 0}$. Therefore, we can consider, without introducing any conservatism, block-diagonal matrix-valued functions of the form $P(k)=\mathrm{diag}_{i=1}^{M}(P_i(k))$ and $Q(k)=\mathrm{diag}_{i=1}^{M}(Q_i(k))$ where $P_i(k), Q_i(k)\in\mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $i=1,\ldots,M$, all satisfy the boundedness conditions of Theorem 4.3. Using this structure, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M}\bar{A}_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}P(k+1)\bar{A}_i(k)=\operatorname*{diag}_{i=1}^{M}\left(A_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M}\pi_{ij}P_j(k+1)\right)A_i(k)\right) \tag{146}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M}\bar{B}_{i,\ell}(k)^{\mathrm{T}}P(k+1)\bar{B}_{i,\ell}(k)=\operatorname*{diag}_{i=1}^{M}\left(B_{i,\ell}(k)^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M}\pi_{ij}P_j(k+1)\right)B_{i,\ell}(k)\right). \tag{147}$$

Considering, finally, the above expressions and expanding the other terms in (145) yields the conditions (139). The proof is now completed. ♢

5. Linear Matrix-Valued Symmetric Impulsive Systems

The objective of this section is to merge the results obtained in the case of continuous-time and discrete-time all together to obtain analogous stability conditions in the hybrid setting. Linear matrix-valued symmetric impulsive systems that evolves on the cone of positive semidefinite matrices are first introduced. A necessary and sufficient condition for their uniform exponential stability is then obtained in Theorem 5.2 in terms of a matrix-differential equation or a matrix-differential inequality. Relaxed stability conditions, analogous to those considered in [20, 45] are then obtained in Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 5.4. Convex stabilization conditions are obtained in Theorem 5.5 and take the form of differential-different linear matrix inequalities. The simplicity and the versatility of the approach as a general tool for the analysis of (stochastic) continuous-time systems is illustrated through several examples, namely on the analysis of stochastic LTV systems with deterministic impulses times [17, 45, 57], stochastic LTV switched systems with deterministic switchings [16, 17, 45, 57, 66], sampled-data stochastic LTV systems [17, 45, 57], and stochastic LTV impulsive systems with stochastic impulses and switchings [71].

5.1. Preliminaries

We consider here the following class of matrix-valued impulsive dynamical systems

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{X}(t) &= A_0(t)X(t)+X(t)A_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}}+\sum_{i=1}^{N}A_i(t)X(t)A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}+\mu X(t), t\neq t_k, t\geq t^0\\ X(t^+) &= \sum_{i=0}^{N}J_i(k)X(t)J_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}},\ t=t_k, t\geq t^0\\ X(t^0) &= X_0\in\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}\end{aligned} \tag{148}$$

where $X(t), X_0\in\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ is the state of the system and the initial condition, and $t^0\geq 0$ is the initial time. The matrix-valued functions $A_i:\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mapsto\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $i=1,\ldots,N$, are assumed to be piecewise continuous and uniformly bounded whereas the matrix-valued functions $J:\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\mapsto\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ are assumed to be uniformly bounded.

The sequence of impulse instants $\{t_k\}_{\geq 1}$ is assumed to be strictly increasing and to grow unboundedly; i.e. $t_{k+1} > t_k$, $k \geq 1$ and $t_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Under those assumptions on the data of the system, the impulse sequence and the linearity of the system, we know that there exists a unique complete (i.e. defined for all times $t \geq t^0$) solution, which we denote by $X(t, t^0, X_0)$. This solution can expressed in terms of a state-transition operator corresponding to the generators $\mathcal{C}_t$ and $\mathcal{D}_k$ defined in the previous sections, that is we have that

$$X(t) = S(t,s)X(s),\ t \geq s \geq t^0 \tag{149}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}S(t,s)X = \mathcal{C}_t(S(t,s)X),\ S(s,s) = I,\ t_{k+1} \geq t \geq s > t_k,\ k \geq 1 \tag{150}$$

and

$$S(t,t_k)X = S(t,t_k^+) \circ \mathcal{D}_k(X),\ t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}],\ k \geq 1. \tag{151}$$

We will consider in this section the following notion of stability for the system (148):

Definition 5.1. *The zero solution of the hybrid system* (148) *is* ***globally uniformly exponentially stable with hybrid rate*** (α, ρ) *if there exist some constants* $\beta \geq 1$, $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\rho \in (0,1)$ *such that*

$$||X(t, t^0, X_0)|| \leq \beta \rho^{\kappa(t,t^0)} e^{-\alpha(t-t^0)} ||X_0|| \tag{152}$$

for all $t \geq t^0$, *all* $t^0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, *and all* $X_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$ *where* $\kappa(t, t^0)$ *denotes the number of jumps in the interval* $[t^0, t]$.

It is interesting to note that this stability notion may be relaxed to the cases $\alpha > 0$, $\rho = 1$, and $\alpha = 0$, $\rho \in (0,1)$ which consists to the case of persistent flowing and persistent jumping, respectively (see e.g. [45]) under some additional conditions on the impulse time sequences. Indeed, persistent flowing requires that the time spent by the system flowing is infinite while persistent jumping requires that all the impulses arrive in finite time; i.e. $t_{k+1} - t_k$ is finite for all $k \geq 0$, $t_0 = t^0$. This will be further discussed in the next section.

5.2. Main stability result

We have the following result:

Theorem 5.2. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The matrix-valued linear dynamical system (148) *is globally uniformly exponentially stable with hybrid rate* (α, ρ) *for some* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\rho \in (0,1)$.

(b) There exist a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, *a piecewise continuous matrix-valued function* $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, *and a matrix-valued function* $R : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P(t) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \beta_1 I & \preceq & Q(t) & \preceq & \beta_2 I, \\ \gamma_1 I & \preceq & R(k) & \preceq & \gamma_2 I, \end{array} \tag{153}$$

such that

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \dot{P}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t(P(t)) & = & -Q(t), & t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ \mathcal{D}_k(P(t_k^+)) - P(t_k) & = & -R(k), & t_k > t^0,\ k \geq 1 \end{array} \tag{154}$$

hold for some scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$.

(c) There exists a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *such that*

$$\alpha_1 I \preceq P(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I, \tag{155}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \dot{P}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t(P(t)) & \preceq & -\alpha_3 I, & t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ \mathcal{D}_k(P(t_k^+)) - P(t_k) & \preceq & -\alpha_4 I, & t_k > t^0,\ k \geq 1 \end{array} \tag{156}$$

hold for some scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$.

Proof : The statements (b) and (c) are readily seen to be equivalent. Therefore, we need to focus on the connection with the statement (a).

Proof that the statement (b) implies the statement (a). Assume that the condition of the statement (b) hold and define the function $V(t,X) = \langle P(t), X\rangle$. From the conditions in statement (b), this function is $\mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$-copositive definite, radially unbounded and decrescent. Computing now its derivative along the flow of the system (148) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(t,X(t)) &= \langle \dot{P}(t), X(t)\rangle + \langle P(t), \mathcal{C}_t(X(t))\rangle \\ &= \langle \dot{P}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t^*(P(t)), X(t)\rangle \\ &= -\langle Q(t), X(t)\rangle \\ &\leq -\frac{\beta_1}{\alpha_2} V(t,X(t)). \end{aligned} \tag{157}$$

Similarly, evaluating the discrete-time derivatives at jump times yields

$$\begin{aligned} V(t_k^+, X(t_k^+)) - V(t_k, X(t_k)) &= \langle P(t_k^+), \mathcal{D}_k(X(t_k))\rangle - \langle P(t_k), X(t_k)\rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{D}_k^*(P(t_k^+)) - P(t_k), X(t_k)\rangle \\ &= -\langle R(k), X(t_k)\rangle \\ &\leq -\frac{\gamma_1}{\alpha_2} V(t_k, X(t_k)). \end{aligned} \tag{158}$$

Letting $\alpha := \dfrac{\beta_1}{\alpha_2} > 0$ and $\rho = 1 - \dfrac{\gamma_1}{\alpha_2} \in (0,1)$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(t,X(t)) &\leq -\alpha V(t,X(t)),\ t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ V(t_k^+, X(t_k^+)) &\leq \rho V(t_k, X(t_k)),\ t_k > t^0,\ k \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{159}$$

Integrating this expression yields

$$V(t,X(t)) \leq V(0,X_0) e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)} \rho^{\kappa(t,t_0)} \tag{160}$$

which implies

$$||X(t,t_0,X_0)|| \leq \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} e^{-\alpha(t-t_0)} \rho^{\kappa(t,t_0)} ||X_0|| \tag{161}$$

which proves the uniform hybrid exponential convergence. This proves the desired implication.

Proof that the statement (a) implies the statement (c). Assume that the conditions of statement (a) hold and define $\bar{P}(t)$ as

$$\langle \bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle = \int_t^\infty \langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s + \sum_{t \leq t_i} \langle R(i), X(t_i)\rangle \tag{162}$$

We need to show first that $||P(t)||$ is uniformly bounded and bounded away from zero. From the definition of uniform hybrid exponential stability, i.e. Definition 5.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle &= \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \left[\int_t^\tau \langle Q(s), S(s,t)X(t)\rangle \mathrm{d}s + \sum_{\tau > t_i \geq t} \langle R(i), S(t_i,t)X(t)\rangle \right] \\ &\leq M||X(t)||_* \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \left(\beta_{X,2} \int_t^\tau e^{-\alpha(s-t)} \rho^{\kappa(s,t)} \mathrm{d}s + \beta_{Y,2} \sum_{\tau > t_i \geq t} \rho^{\kappa(t_i,t)} e^{-\alpha(t_i - t)} \right) \\ &\leq M||X(t)||_* \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \left(\beta_{X,2} \int_t^\tau e^{-\alpha(s-t)} \mathrm{d}s + \beta_{Y,2} \sum_{\tau > t_i \geq t} \rho^{\kappa(t_i,t)} \right) \\ &= M||X(t)||_* \left(\frac{\beta_{X,2}}{\alpha} + \frac{\beta_{Y,2}}{1-\rho} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{163}$$

Hence, there exists an $\alpha_2 > 0$ such that $\bar{P}(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$.

Let us now prove that there exists an $\alpha_1 > 0$ such that $\bar{P}(t) \succeq \alpha_1 I$. To this aim, we consider

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle & = & \langle \dot{Q}(s), X(s)\rangle + \langle Q(s), \mathcal{C}_s(X(s))\rangle \\ & = & \langle \dot{Q}(s), X(s)\rangle + \langle \mathcal{C}_s^*(Q(s)), X(s)\rangle \\ & = & \langle \dot{Q}(s) + \mathcal{C}_s^*(Q(s)), X(s)\rangle \end{array} \tag{164}$$

where we have assumed that $Q(s)$ is piecewise differentiable with bounded derivative. This is not a restrictive assumption as it can be chosen as a constant without loss of generality. Now, using the fact that $Q(s)$ is bounded with bounded derivative, then there exists a large enough $c > 0$ such that

$$\langle \dot{Q}(s) + \mathcal{C}_s^*(Q(s)), X(s)\rangle \geq -c\langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle. \tag{165}$$

This implies that for some sufficiently large $c > 0$, we have that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \geq -c\langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \tag{166}$$

for all $X(s) \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\geq 0}$ and for all $t_k < s \leq t \leq t_{k+1}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Now assume that $t_{k-1} < t \leq t_k$ and observe that

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \displaystyle\int_t^{t_k} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s & = & \langle Q(t_k), X(t_k)\rangle - \langle Q(t), X(t)\rangle & \geq & -c\displaystyle\int_t^{t_k} \langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s \\ \displaystyle\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s & = & \langle Q(t_{i+1}), X(t_{i+1})\rangle - \langle Q(t_i^+), X(t_i^+)\rangle & \geq & -c\displaystyle\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s. \end{array} \tag{167}$$

Summing all the above terms gives

$$-\langle Q(t), X(t)\rangle + \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \big(\langle Q(t_i), X(t_i)\rangle - \langle Q(t_i^+), X(t_i^+)\rangle\big) \geq -c\int_t^{\infty} \langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s. \tag{168}$$

Adding $-c\displaystyle\sum_{t_i \geq t} \langle R(i), X(t_i)\rangle = -c\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \langle R(i), X(t_i)\rangle$ on both sides yields

$$-\langle Q(t), X(t)\rangle + \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \big(\langle Q(t_i), X(t_i)\rangle - \langle Q(t_i^+), X(t_i^+)\rangle\big) - c\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \langle R(i), X(t_i)\rangle \geq -c\langle \bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle. \tag{169}$$

where we have used the fact that $t_{k-1} < t \leq t_k$. Noting that $X(t_i^+) = \mathcal{D}_i(X(t_i))$, then we get that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \displaystyle\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \big(\langle Q(t_i), X(t_i)\rangle - \langle Q(t_i^+), X(t_i^+)\rangle - c\langle R(i), X(t_i)\rangle\big) & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \big(\langle Q(t_i) - cR(i), X(t_i)\rangle - \langle Q(t_i^+), \mathcal{D}_i(X(t_i))\rangle\big) \\ & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \langle Q(t_i) - cR(i) - \mathcal{D}_i^*(Q(t_i^+)), X(t_i)\rangle \end{array} \tag{170}$$

Therefore, and since the matrix-valued functions J_j are uniformly bounded, then there exists a large enough $c > 0$ (which stays compatible with out previous choice for c) such that $Q(t_i) - cR(i) - \mathcal{D}_i^*(Q(t_i^+)) \prec 0$. Therefore, with such a $c > 0$, we get that

$$-\langle Q(t), X(t) \geq -c\langle \bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle \tag{171}$$

and, as a result, $\bar{P}(t) \succeq Q(t)/c \succeq \beta_1 I/c =: \alpha_1 I$. This proves the second inequality for $\bar{P}(t)$.

We now prove that $\bar{P}(t)$ in (162) verifies the equalities in (154). Computing the derivative of $\bar{P}(t)$ with respect to time yields

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\langle \bar{P}(t), X(t)\rangle & = & \langle \dot{\bar{P}}(t), X(t)\rangle + \langle \bar{P}(t), \dot{X}(t)\rangle \\ & = & \langle \dot{\bar{P}}(t), X(t)\rangle + \langle \bar{P}(t), \mathcal{C}_t(X(t))\rangle \\ & = & \langle \dot{\bar{P}}(t), X(t)\rangle + \langle \mathcal{C}_t^*(\bar{P}(t)), X(t)\rangle \\ & = & -\langle Q(t), X(t)\rangle. \end{array} \tag{172}$$

Therefore, $\langle \dot{\bar{P}}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t^*(\bar{P}(t)) + Q(t), X(t)\rangle = 0$ and (162) verifies the first inequality in (154) with $P = \bar{P}$. Similarly, evaluating $\bar{P}(t)$ at t_k and t_k^+ yields

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \langle \bar{P}(t_k^+), X(t_k^+)\rangle & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \langle R(i), X(t_i)\rangle + \int_{t_k}^{\infty} \langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s \\ \langle \bar{P}(t_k), X(t_k)\rangle & = & \langle \bar{P}(t_k), X(t_k)\rangle \\ & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \langle R(i), X(t_i)\rangle + \int_{t_k}^{\infty} \langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s \\ & = & \langle R(k), X(t_k)\rangle + \displaystyle\sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \langle R(i), X(t_i)\rangle + \int_{t_k}^{\infty} \langle Q(s), X(s)\rangle \mathrm{d}s \\ & = & \langle R(k), X(t_k)\rangle + V(t_k^+, X(t_k^+)). \end{array} \tag{173}$$

This implies that $\langle \bar{P}(t_k^+), X(t_k^+)\rangle - \langle \bar{P}(t_k), X(t_k)\rangle + \langle R(k), X(t_k)\rangle = 0$. However, we also have that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \langle \bar{P}(t_k^+), X(t_k^+)\rangle - \langle \bar{P}(t_k), X(t_k)\rangle + \langle R(k), X(t_k)\rangle & = & \langle \bar{P}(t_k^+), \mathcal{D}_k(X(t_k))\rangle - \langle \bar{P}(t_k), X(t_k)\rangle + \langle R(k), X(t_k)\rangle \\ & = & \langle \mathcal{D}_k^*(\bar{P}(t_k^+)), X(t_k)\rangle + \langle -\bar{P}(t_k) + R(k), X(t_k)\rangle \\ & = & \langle \mathcal{D}_k^*(\bar{P}(t_k^+)) - \bar{P}(t_k) + R(k), X(t_k)\rangle \\ & = & 0, \end{array} \tag{174}$$

which shows that $\bar{P}$ in (162) also verifies the second inequality in (154) with $P = \bar{P}$. This proves the desired result. ♢

5.3. Relaxed stability results

The above results can be relaxed in two possible ways. The first one, called persistent flowing relaxation, relaxes the strict decrease of the Lyapunov function at jumps:

Theorem 5.3 (Persistent flowing). *Assume that $\mathcal{D}_k(X) \preceq X$ for all $k \geq 0$ and all $X \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The matrix-valued linear dynamical system (148) *is globally uniformly exponentially stable hybrid rate $(\alpha, 1)$ for some $\alpha > 0$.*

(b) There exist a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ and a continuous matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P(t) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \beta_1 I & \preceq & Q(t) & \preceq & \beta_2 I, \end{array} \tag{175}$$

such that

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \dot{P}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t(P(t)) & = & -Q(t), & t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ \mathcal{D}_k(P(t_k^+)) - P(t_k) & = & 0, & t_k > t^0,\ k \geq 1 \end{array} \tag{176}$$

hold for some scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$.

(c) There exists a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ such that

$$\alpha_1 I \preceq P(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I \tag{177}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \dot{P}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t(P(t)) & \preceq & -\alpha_3 I, & t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ \mathcal{D}_k(P(t_k^+)) - P(t_k) & \preceq & 0, & t_k > t^0,\ k \geq 1 \end{array} \tag{178}$$

hold for some scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$.

Proof : The proof follows from the same lines as the proof of Theorem 5.2. The only difference is in the proof of the implication that the statement (a) implies the statement (c). In the current proof, we consider a continuous matrix-valued function Q and define the matrix-valued function $\bar{P}(t)$ as

$$\langle \bar{P}(t), X(t) \rangle := \int_t^\infty \langle Q(s), X(s) \rangle \mathrm{d}s. \tag{179}$$

As a result, the expression (168) becomes

$$-\langle Q(t), X(t) \rangle + \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} \langle Q(t_i), X(t_i) - X(t_i^+) \rangle \geq -c \langle \bar{P}(t), X(t) \rangle. \tag{180}$$

Under the assumption that $\mathcal{D}_i(X) \preceq X$, we then get that

$$-\langle Q(t), X(t) \rangle \geq -c \langle \bar{P}(t), X(t) \rangle \tag{181}$$

which shows, in turn, that $\bar{P}(t) \succeq \beta_1 / c I$. The rest of the proof follows from the same lines. $\diamondsuit$

The second one, called persistent jumping relaxation, relaxes the strict decrease of the Lyapunov function along the flow of the system:

Theorem 5.4 (Persistent jumping). *Assume that $\mathcal{C}_t(X) \preceq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and all $X \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0}$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The matrix-valued linear dynamical system (148) *is globally uniformly exponentially stable with hybrid rate $(0, \rho)$ for some $\rho \in (0, 1)$.*

(b) There exist a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ and a matrix-valued function $R : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \alpha_1 I & \preceq & P(t) & \preceq & \alpha_2 I, \\ \gamma_1 I & \preceq & R(k) & \preceq & \gamma_2 I, \end{array} \tag{182}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \dot{P}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t(P(t)) & = & 0, & t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ \mathcal{D}_k(P(t_k^+)) - P(t_k) & = & -R(k), & t_k > t^0,\ k \geq 1 \end{array} \tag{183}$$

hold for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$.

(c) There exists a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ such that

$$\alpha_1 I \preceq P(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I \tag{184}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \dot{P}(t) + \mathcal{C}_t(P(t)) & \preceq & 0, & t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ \mathcal{D}_k(P(t_k^+)) - P(t_k) & \preceq & -\alpha_3 I, & t = t_k, t \geq t^0 \end{array} \tag{185}$$

hold for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$.

Proof : The proof follows from the same lines as the proof of Theorem 5.2. The only difference is in the proof of the implication that the statement (a) implies the statement (c). In the current proof, we define the matrix-valued function $\bar{P}(t)$ as

$$\langle \bar{P}(t), X(t) \rangle := \sum_{t \leq t_i} \langle R(i), X(t_i) \rangle \tag{186}$$

Clearly, we have that $\langle \bar{P}(t), X(t) \rangle \geq \langle R(s_t), X(s_t) \rangle$ where $s_t := \min\{i : t \leq t_i\}$. Using now the assumption that $\mathcal{C}_t(X) \preceq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, we get that $X(s_t) \preceq X(t)$, which implies that

$$\langle \bar{P}(t), X(t) \rangle \geq \langle R(s_t), X(t) \rangle \tag{187}$$

and that $\bar{P}(t) \succeq \gamma_1 I$. This proves the lower bound for $\bar{P}$(t). The rest of the proof follows from the same lines as the proof of Theorem 5.2. $\diamondsuit$

5.4. Stabilization

Let us consider here the perturbation of the system (148) given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}(t) &= (A_0(t) + B_0(t)K_0(t))X(t) + X(t)(A_0(t) + B_0(t)K_0(t))^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{N} (A_i(t) + B_i(t)K_i(t))X(t)(A_i(t) + B_i(t)K_i(t))^{\mathrm{T}} + \mu X(t), t \neq t_k, t \geq t^0 \\ X(t^+) &= \sum_{i=0}^{N} (J_i(k) + E_i(k)G_i(k))X(t)(J_i(k) + E_i(k)G_i(k))^{\mathrm{T}},\ t = t_k, t \geq t^0 \\ X(t^0) &= X_0 \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succeq 0} \end{aligned} \tag{188}$$

where the matrix-valued functions $A_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_i}$, $K_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, are assumed to be piecewise continuous and bounded, and $J_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $E_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_i}$, $G_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, are bounded. We then have the following result:

Theorem 5.5. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The matrix-valued linear dynamical system (188) *is globally uniformly exponentially stabilizable with hybrid rate* (α, ρ) *for some* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\rho \in (0, 1)$.

(b) There exist a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq P(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{N}(t)^{\mathrm{T}} \begin{bmatrix} -\dot{Q}(t) + \mathrm{Sym}[A_0(t)Q(t)] + \mu(t)Q(t) & \underset{i=1}{\overset{N}{\mathrm{row}}}[Q(t)A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(t) \end{bmatrix} \mathscr{N}(t) &\preceq -\alpha_3 I,\ t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \mathscr{M}(k)^{\mathrm{T}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -Q(t_k) & \underset{i=0}{\overset{N}{\mathrm{row}}}[Q(t_k)J_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(t_k^+) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \mathscr{M}(k) \end{bmatrix} &\preceq -\alpha_4 I,\ t_k > t^0,\ k \geq 1 \end{aligned} \tag{189}$$

hold for some scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4 > 0$ *where* $\mathscr{N}(t)^{\mathrm{T}}$ *is a basis of the left null-space of* $\mathrm{diag}_{i=0}^{N}(B_i(t))$ *and* $\mathscr{M}(k)^{\mathrm{T}}$ *is a basis of the left null-space of* $\mathrm{diag}_{i=0}^{N}(E_i(k))$.

(c) There exist a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq P(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, *matrix valued functions* $U_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$ *and* $V_i : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}$. $i = 0, \ldots, N$, *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} -\dot{Q}(t) + \mathrm{Sym}[\Psi_0(t)] + \mu(t)Q(t) & \underset{i=1}{\overset{N}{\mathrm{row}}}[\Psi_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(t) \end{bmatrix} &\preceq -\alpha_3 I,\ t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ \begin{bmatrix} -Q(t_k) & \underset{i=0}{\overset{N}{\mathrm{row}}}[(\Phi_i(k))^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(t_k^+) \end{bmatrix} &\preceq -\alpha_4 I,\ t_k > t^0,\ k \geq 1 \end{aligned} \tag{190}$$

hold for some scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4 > 0$ *where* $\Psi_i(t) := A_i(t)Q(t) + B_i(t)U_i(t)$ *and* $\Phi_i(k) := J_i(k)Q(t_k) + E_i(k)V_i(k)$.

Proof : The proof consists of a mixture of the proofs of Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 4.5. It is thus omitted for brevity. ♢

5.5. Applications

We illustrate in this section that several results from the literature can be recovered and/or extended using the proposed approach. In particular, we cover the cases of stochastic impulsive systems with deterministic impulse times [17, 45, 57], stochastic switched system with deterministic switching times [16, 17, 45, 57, 66], stochastic sampled-data systems [17, 45, 57], and impulsive Markov jump linear systems [71]. This covers a broad range of systems of the literature.

5.5.1. A class of stochastic LTV systems with deterministic impulses

We consider here the following class of stochastic LTV systems with deterministic jumps as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}x(t) &= A_0(t)x(t)\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(t)x(t)\mathrm{d}W_i(t),\ t \neq t_k,\ k \geq 1 \\ x(t_k^+) &= J_0(k)x(t_k) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} J_i(k)x(t_k)\nu_i(k),\ k \geq 1,\ t_k \geq t^0 \\ x(t^0) &= x_0 \end{aligned} \tag{191}$$

where $x, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state of the system and the initial condition, t^0 is the initial time. The vector $W(t) := (W_1(t), \ldots, W_N(t))$ is a vector of N independent Wiener processes which are also independent of the state $x(t)$ whereas the vector $\nu(k) := (\nu_1(k), \ldots, \nu_N(k))$ contains N independent random processes which are independent of the state $x(t_k)$ and which have zero mean and unit variance. The matrix-valued functions of the system are assumed to satisfy the same assumptions as for the system (148). The sequence of impulse time $t_{k\geq 1}$ is assumed to be increasing and to grow unboundedly. To this system, we can associate a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_{t,k}, \mathbb{P})$ with hybrid filtration [73] which satisfies the usual conditions.

The following notion of stability for the system (191) is considered here:

Definition 5.6. *The system* (191) *is said to be uniformly exponentially mean-square stable with hybrid rate* (α, ρ) *if there exist an* $M > 0$, *a* $\rho \in (0, 1)$ *and an* $\alpha > 0$ *such that we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[||x(t)||_2^2] \leq M\rho^{\kappa(t,t_0)}e^{-\alpha(t-t^0)}\mathbb{E}[||x_0||_2^2] \tag{192}$$

for all $t \geq t^0$ *and all* $t^0 \geq 0$ *where* $\kappa(t, s)$ *denotes the number of jumps in the interval* $[s, t]$.

We then have the following result which is an extension of the results in [17]:

Theorem 5.7. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (191) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable with hybrid rate* (α, ρ) *for some* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\rho \in (0, 1)$.

(b) There exists a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq P(t) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}(t) + P(t)A_0(t) + A_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}}P(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}P(t)A_i(t) &\preceq -\alpha_3 I, \qquad t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{N} J_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}}P(t_k^+)J_i(k) - P(t_k) &= -\alpha_3 I, \qquad t_k > t^0,\ k \geq 1 \end{aligned} \tag{193}$$

hold for some scalars $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$.

Proof : Observing that the seconder-order moment $X(t) = \mathbb{E}[x(t)x(t)^{\mathrm{T}}]$ of the state of the system (191) is governed by the system

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dot{X}(t) & = & A_0(t)X(t) + X(t)A_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i(t)X(t)A_i^{\mathrm{T}},\ t \neq t_k,\ k \geq 1,\ t \geq t^0, \\ X(t_k^+) & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{N} J_i(k)X(t_k)J_i(k)^{\mathrm{T}},\ k \geq 1, t_k \geq t^0, \\ X(t_0^+) & = & X(t_0) = X(0), \end{array} \tag{194}$$

then an immediate application of Theorem 5.2 yields the result. ♢

Using the above very general result, we can retrieve the results obtained in [17]:

Theorem 5.8 (Constant dwell-time). *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The LTI version of the system (191) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable with hybrid rate* (α, ρ) *for some* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\rho \in (0, 1)$ *under constant dwell-time* $\bar{T}$*.*

(b) There exists a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $P : [0, \bar{T}] \mapsto \mathbb{S}_{\succ 0}^n$ *such that*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dot{P}(\tau) + P(\tau)A_0 + A_0^{\mathrm{T}}P(\tau) + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i^{\mathrm{T}}P(\tau)A_i & \preceq & -\alpha I,\ \tau \in [0, \bar{T}] \\ \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} J_i^{\mathrm{T}}P(0)J_i - P(\bar{T}) & \preceq & -\alpha I \end{array} \tag{195}$$

hold for some scalars $\alpha > 0$*.*

Proof : Since the impulses arrive periodically, it is necessary and sufficient to consider a $\bar{T}$-periodic matrix-valued function $P(t_k + \tau) = P(\tau)$ for all $k \geq 0$. Note that we have $P(t_k^+) = P(0)$. The result then follows. ♢

We can also retrieve this result which can be found in [17]:

Theorem 5.9 (Minimum dwell-time). *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The LTI version of the system (191) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable with hybrid rate* (α, ρ) *for some* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\rho \in (0, 1)$ *under minimum dwell-time* $\bar{T}$*.*

(b) There exists a piecewise differentiable matrix-valued function $P : [0, \bar{T}] \mapsto \mathbb{S}_{\succ 0}^n$ *such that*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dot{P}(\tau) + P(\tau)A_0 + A_0^{\mathrm{T}}P(\tau) \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i^{\mathrm{T}}P(\tau)A_i & \preceq & -\alpha I,\ \tau \in [0, \bar{T}] \\ P(\bar{T})A_0 + A_0^{\mathrm{T}}P(\bar{T}) + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_i^{\mathrm{T}}P(\bar{T})A_i & \preceq & -\alpha I,\ \tau \in [0, \bar{T}] \\ \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} J_i^{\mathrm{T}}P(0)J_i - P(\bar{T}) & \preceq & -\alpha I \end{array} \tag{196}$$

hold for some scalars $\alpha > 0$*.*

Proof : In this case, we just need to consider

$$P(t_k + \tau) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} P(\tau) & \text{if } \tau \in [0, \bar{T}] \\ P(\bar{T}) & \text{if } \tau \in [\bar{T}, T_k] \end{array} \right. \tag{197}$$

and the result follows. Note that this matrix may fail to be differentiable at $\tau = \bar{T}$. However, this is not a problem as it has been shown in [49] that if there exists a matrix-valued function P which is differentiable on $(0, \bar{T})$, then there exists a P such that $\dot{P}(\bar{T}) = 0$ that sastifies the conditions of the result. This proves the result. ♢

5.5.2. A class of stochastic LTV switched systems with deterministic switchings

We illustrate in this section that the results obtained in this paper allow to retrieve and extend those developed in [16, 66]. To this aim, let us consider here the following class of LTV stochastic switched systems

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{d}x(t) & = & A_{\sigma(t),0}(t)x(t)\mathrm{d}t + \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} A_{\sigma(t),i}(t)x(t)\mathrm{d}W_i(t) \\ x(t_0) & = & x_0 \\ \sigma(t_0) & = & \sigma_0 \end{array} \tag{198}$$

where $x, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the state of the system and the initial condition, and $t_0 = 0$ is the initial time. The Wiener processes $W_1(t), \ldots, W_N(t)$ are assumed to be independent of each other and of the state $x(t)$ and the switching signal $\sigma(t)$ of the system. The switching signal $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \{1, \ldots, M\}$, with initial value σ_0, is assumed to be deterministic and piecewise constant. The switching signal is assumed to change values at time $t_k \geq 0$, $k \geq 1$, and this sequence is assumed to be increasing and to grow unboundedly. The dwell-time T_k is defined as $T_k := t_{k+1} - t_k$, $k \geq 0$. The notion of mean-square stability in Definition 5.6 can be straightforwardly adapted to the system above. This leads us to the following result:

Theorem 5.10 (Fixed dwell-time). *Assume that there exist differentiable matrix-valued functions $P_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq P_i(\cdot) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, such that*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dot{P}_i(t) + \mathrm{Sym}[P_i(\tau)A_{0,i}(t)] + \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{i,j}(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(t) A_{i,j}(t) & \preceq & -\alpha_3 I,\ i = 1, \ldots, M,\ t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0,\ k \geq 1 \\ P_i(t_k^+) - P_j(t_k) & \preceq & 0,\ i, j = 1, \ldots, M,\ i \neq j,\ k \geq 1 \end{array} \tag{199}$$

hold for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$.

Then, the system (198) *is mean-square exponentially stable under the fixed dwell-time sequence $\{T_k\}_{k \geq 0}$.*

Proof : The dynamics of the seconder-order moment matrix $X(t) = \mathbb{E}[x(t)x(t)^{\mathrm{T}}]$ is given by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \dot{X}(t) & = & A_{\sigma(t),0}(t)X(t) + A_{\sigma(t),0}(t)^{\mathrm{T}} X(t) + \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{\sigma(t),\ell}^{\mathrm{T}} X(t) A_{\sigma(t),\ell} \\ X(t_k^+) & = & X(t_k) \end{array} \tag{200}$$

Since, $\mathcal{D}_k(X) - X \preceq 0$, then we can apply Theorem 5.3 to yield the result. ♢

When the sequence of dwell-times satisfies a certain condition, we can specialize the above result to obtain more tractable stability conditions. The next result applies to the case when the constant dwell-time case, that is, when $T_k = \bar{T}$, $k \geq 0$, for some constant dwell-time value $\bar{T} > 0$ and can be seen as an extension of the results in [5, 16, 66]:

Corollary 5.11 (Constant dwell-time). *Assume that there exist differentiable matrix-valued functions $P_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, such that*

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \dot{P}_i(\tau) + A_{i,0}^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(\tau) + P_i(\tau)\bar{A}_{i,0} + \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{i,j}^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(\tau) A_{i,j} & \preceq & -\alpha I, & \tau \in [0, \bar{T}],\ i = 1, \ldots, M, \\ P_i(0) - P_j(\bar{T}) & \preceq & 0, & i, j = 1, \ldots, M, \end{array} \tag{201}$$

hold for some $\alpha > 0$.

Then, the LTI version of the system (198) *is mean-square exponentially stable under eventual constant dwell-time* $\bar{T}$.

Proof : The proof simply follows from picking $P(t_k + \tau) = P(\tau)$ with $P(0) = P(t_k^+)$. ♢

The following result addresses the case where the dwell-time sequence satisfies $T_k \geq \bar{T}$, $k \geq 1$, for some minimum dwell-time value $\bar{T}$ and can also be seen as a generalization of the results in [5, 16, 66]:

Corollary 5.12 (Minimum dwell-time). *Assume that there exist differentiable matrix-valued functions* $P_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} A_{i,0}^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(\bar{T}) + P_i(\bar{T}) \bar{A}_{i,0} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{i,j}^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(\bar{T}) A_{i,j} &\preceq -\alpha I, \qquad i = 1, \ldots, M, \\ \dot{P}_i(\tau) + A_{i,0}^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(\tau) + P_i(\tau) \bar{A}_{i,0} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{i,j}^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(\tau) A_{i,j} &\preceq -\alpha I, \qquad \tau \in [0, \bar{T}],\ i = 1, \ldots, M, \\ P_i(0) - P_j(\bar{T}) &\preceq 0, \qquad i, j = 1, \ldots, M, \end{aligned} \tag{202}$$

hold for some $\alpha > 0$.

Then, the LTI version of the system (198) *is mean-square exponentially stable under minimum dwell-time* $\bar{T}$.

Proof : The proof follows from considering all the matrix valued functions $P_i(\tau)$ such that $P_i(\tau) = P_i(\bar{T})$ for all $\tau \geq \bar{T}$. Even though those functions are not differentiable at $\tau = \bar{T}$, then it is possible to shown that if the conditions in the result hold, then there exist differentiable functions that satisfy the conditions of the result; see e.g. [49]. ♢

The following result addresses the case where the dwell-time sequence satisfies $T_k \in [T_{\min}^{\sigma(t_k^+)}, T_{\max}^{\sigma(t_k^+)}]$, $k \geq 1$, for some range dwell-time value $[T_{\min}^1, T_{\max}^1] \times \ldots \times [T_{\min}^M, T_{\max}^M]$, and can be seen as an extension of the results in [16]:

Corollary 5.13 (Mode-dependent range dwell-time). *Assume that there exist differentiable matrix-valued functions* $P_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}_i(\tau) + A_{0,i}^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(\tau) + P_i(\tau) A_{0,i} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{i,j}^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(\tau) A_{i,j} &\preceq -\alpha I, \qquad i = 1, \ldots, M,\ \tau \in [0, T_{\max}^i], \\ P_i(0) - P_j(\theta) &\preceq 0, \qquad i, j = 1, \ldots, M,\ i \neq j,\ \theta \in [T_{\min}^j, T_{\max}^j], \end{aligned} \tag{203}$$

hold for some $\alpha > 0$.

Then, the LTI version of the system (198) *is mean-square exponentially stable under the mode-dependent range dwell-time* $[T_{\min}^1, T_{\max}^1] \times \ldots \times [T_{\min}^M, T_{\max}^M]$.

Proof : The proof simply consists of considering T_k^i to lie within the interval $[T_{\min}^i, T_{\max}^i]$, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, in the conditions. ♢

5.5.3. Sampled-data stochastic LTV systems

We illustrate in this section that the results obtained in this paper allow to retrieve and extend those developed in [17]. To this aim, let us consider again the stochastic LTV sampled-data system (74)-(75) and assume now that the sampling times are deterministic. This leads to the following result that can be seen as an extension of the results in [17]:

Theorem 5.14. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The LTV stochastic sampled-data system (74)-(75) *is uniformly mean-square exponentially stable.*

(b) There exist a differentiable matrix-valued function $P : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq P(\cdot) \preceq \alpha_2 I$ *and two matrix-valued functions* $K_1 : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ *and* $K_2 : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ *such that*

$$\dot{P}(t) + \bar{A}_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P(t) + P(t)\bar{A}_0(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{A}_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P(t)\bar{A}_i(t) \preceq -\alpha_3 I,\ t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0 \tag{204}$$

and

$$\bar{J}(k)^{\mathrm{T}} P(t_k^+)\bar{J}(k) - P(t_k) \preceq -\alpha_3 I,\ k \geq 1, t_k > t^0 \tag{205}$$

hold for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$ *where*

$$\bar{A}_i(t) := \begin{bmatrix} A_i(t) & B_i(t) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ \text{and}\ \bar{J}(k) := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ K_1(k) & K_2(k). \end{bmatrix} \tag{206}$$

(c) There exist a differentiable matrix-valued function $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq Q(\cdot) \preceq \alpha_2 I$ *and a matrix-valued function* $U : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{(m+n)\times n}$ *such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\dot{Q}(t) + Q(t)\bar{A}_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \bar{A}_0(t)Q(t) & \underset{i=1}{\overset{N}{\mathrm{row}}}[Q(t)\bar{A}_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(t) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha_3 I,\ t \neq t_k,\ t \geq t^0 \tag{207}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q(t_k) & (\bar{J}_0 Q(t_k) + BU(k))^{\mathrm{T}} \\ \star & -Q(t_k^+) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha_3 I,\ k \geq 1, t_k > t^0 \tag{208}$$

hold for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 > 0$ *and where*

$$\bar{J}_0 := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ \text{and}\ \bar{B} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix}. \tag{209}$$

Moreover, suitable gains are given by $\begin{bmatrix} K_1(k) & K_2(k) \end{bmatrix} = U(k)Q(t_k)^{-1}$.

Proof : The system (74)-(75) can be reformulated as the following impulsive system

$$\mathrm{d}z(t) = \bar{A}_0(t)z(t)\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{A}_i(t)z(t)\mathrm{d}W_i(t) \tag{210}$$

and

$$z(t_k^+) = \bar{J}z(t_k) \tag{211}$$

where A_i, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, and $\bar{J}(k)$ are defined in the result. The seconder-order moment system associated with the above impulsive system is given by

$$\dot{X}(t) = \bar{A}_0(t)X(t) + X(t)\bar{A}_0(t)^{\mathrm{T}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{A}_i(t)X(t)\bar{A}_i(t)^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{212}$$

and

$$X(t_k^+) = \bar{J}X(t_k)\bar{J}^{\mathrm{T}}. \tag{213}$$

Applying then Theorem 5.2 yields the result. ♢

The following results can be seen as generalizations of those in [14, 17]:

Corollary 5.15 (Periodic sampling). *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The LTI version of the sampled-data system (74)-(75) *is mean-square exponentially stable under periodic sampling* $\bar{T}$.

(b) There exist a differentiable matrix-valued function $Q : [0, \bar{T}] \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *and a matrix* $U \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n)\times n}$ *such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\dot{Q}(\tau) + Q(\tau)\bar{A}_0^{\mathrm{T}} + \bar{A}_0 Q(\tau) & \operatorname*{row}_{i=1}^{N}[Q(\tau)\bar{A}_i^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(\tau) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha I,\ \tau \in [0, \bar{T}] \tag{214}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q(\bar{T}) & (\bar{J}_0 Q(\bar{T}) + BU)^{\mathrm{T}} \\ \star & -Q(0) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha I,\ k \geq 1, t_k > t^0 \tag{215}$$

hold for some $\alpha > 0$.*where*

$$\bar{J}_0 := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ \bar{B} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix}. \tag{216}$$

Moreover, suitable gains are given by $\begin{bmatrix} K_1 & K_2 \end{bmatrix} = UQ(\bar{T})^{-1}$.

Proof : Due to periodicity of the impulse times period, we can choose $P(t_k + \tau) = P(\tau)$, $\tau \in (0, \bar{T}]$, in the conditions of Theorem 5.14, which proves the result. ♢

Corollary 5.16 (Aperiodic sampling). *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The LTI version of the sampled-data system (74)-(75) *is mean-square exponentially stable under aperiodic sampling* $[T_{\min}, T_{\max}]$.

(b) There exist a differentiable matrix-valued function $Q : [0, \bar{T}] \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ *and a matrix* $U : [0, T_{\max}] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{(m+n)\times n}$ *such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\dot{Q}(\tau) + Q(\tau)\bar{A}_0^{\mathrm{T}} + \bar{A}_0 Q(\tau) & \operatorname*{row}_{i=1}^{N}[Q(\tau)\bar{A}_i^{\mathrm{T}}] \\ \star & -I_N \otimes Q(\tau) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha I,\ \tau \in [0, T_{\max}] \tag{217}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} -Q(\theta) & (\bar{J}_0 Q(\bar{T}) + BU(\theta))^{\mathrm{T}} \\ \star & -Q(0) \end{bmatrix} \preceq -\alpha I,\ \theta \in [T_{\min}, T_{\max}] \tag{218}$$

hold for some $\alpha > 0$.*where*

$$\bar{J}_0 := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},\ \bar{B} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix}. \tag{219}$$

Moreover, suitable gains are given by $\begin{bmatrix} K_1(T_k) & K_2(T_k) \end{bmatrix} = UQ(T_k)^{-1}$.

Proof : Due to periodicity of the impulse times period, we can choose $P(t_k + \tau) = P(\tau)$, $\tau \in (0, T_{\max}]$, in the conditions of Theorem 5.14, which proves the result. ♢

5.5.4. A class of stochastic LTV impulsive systems with stochastic impulses and switching

We consider here the following class of systems that extends the systems analyzed in [71] to the stochastic and time-varying case:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{d}x(t) & = & A_{0,\sigma(t)}x(t)\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{i=1}^{N} A_{i,\sigma(t)}(t)x(t)\mathrm{d}W_i(t),\ \sigma(t) \in \{1, \ldots, M_c\}, \\ x(t_k^+) & = & J_{0,\sigma(t_k)}(k)x(t_k) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} J_{i,\sigma(t_k)}(k)\nu_i(k)x(t_k),\ \sigma(t_k) \in \{M_c + 1, \ldots, M_c + M_d\} \\ x(t^0) & = & x_0 \\ \sigma(t^0) & = & \sigma_0 \end{array} \tag{220}$$

where M_c is the number of continuous modes and M_d is the number of discrete modes. As for the other systems $x, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the state of the system and the initial condition, and $t^0 \geq 0$ is the initial time. The Wiener processes $W_1(t), \ldots, W_N(t)$ are assumed to be independent of each other, of the state $x(t)$, and the switching signal $\sigma(t)$ of the system. Similarly, the random sequences $\nu_1(k), \ldots, \nu_N(k)$ are independent of each other, of $x(t_k)$, and the switching signal $\sigma(t_k)$. The matrix-valued functions describing the system are also assumed to be uniformly bounded. The switching signal $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \{1, \ldots, M\}$, with initial value σ_0, is assumed to be stochastically varying and piecewise constant. We also have that for $i = 1, \ldots, M_c$:

$$p_{ij}(h) = \mathbb{P}(\sigma(t+h) = j | \sigma(t) = i) = \begin{cases} \lambda_{ij} h + o(h), & i \neq j \\ 1 + \lambda_{ii} h + o(h), & i = j \end{cases} \tag{221}$$

where $\Lambda = [\lambda_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{M_c \times (M_c + M_d)}$, $\lambda_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{M_c+M_d} \lambda_{ij} = 0$ for all i. For $i = M_c + 1, \ldots, M_c + M_d$, we have that

$$p_{ij} = \mathbb{P}(\sigma(t^+) = j | \sigma(t) = i) = \pi_{ij} \tag{222}$$

where $\Pi = [\pi_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{M_d \times (M_c + M_d)}$, $\pi_{ij} \geq 0$ for all i, j, $\sum_{j=1}^{M_c+M_d} \pi_{ij} = 1$ for all i, and $\pi_{ij} = 0$ for all $i, j \in \{M_c + 1, \ldots, M_c + M_d\}$ (i.e. no transition between the discrete modes). We then have the following result that can be seen as an extension or a generalization of [71, Theorem 3.2] to the stochastic and time-varying case:

Theorem 5.17. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) The system (220), (221), (222) *is uniformly exponentially mean-square stable.*

(b) There exist differentiable matrix-valued functions $P_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, $\alpha_1 I \preceq P_i(\cdot) \preceq \alpha_2 I$, $i = 1, \ldots, M_c + M_d$, such that

$$\dot{P}_i(t) + A_{0,i}(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(\tau) + P_i(t) A_{0,i}(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{i,j}(t)^{\mathrm{T}} P_i(t) A_{i,j}(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{M_c+M_d} \lambda_{ij} P_j(t) \preceq -\alpha_3 I \tag{223}$$

holds for all $i = 1, \ldots, M_c$, $t \neq t_k$, and

$$J_\ell(k)^{\mathrm{T}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{M_c} \pi_{\ell j} P_j(t_k^+) \right) J_\ell(k) - P_\ell(t_k) \preceq -\alpha_4 I, \tag{224}$$

holds for all $\ell = M_c + 1, \ldots, M_c + M_d$, $t_k \geq t^0$ and for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4 > 0$.

Proof : The complete proof is omitted but can be seen as a combination of the proofs of Theorem 5.7, Theorem 3.13, and Theorem 4.13. ♢

6. Concluding statements and future works

A unified formulation for the analysis of a broad class of linear systems in terms of the analysis of matrix-valued differential equations has been introduced. The approach is shown to generalize and unify most of the results on the literature on linear systems including continuous-time, discrete-time, impulsive, switched and sampled-data systems, and certain systems with delays. The natural next step is the consideration of systems with inputs and the derivation of a dissipativity theory for such systems [24, 74, 76]. This would lead, for instance, to the derivation of necessary and sufficient conditions characterizing their passivity, L_2-gain, etc.. The generalization of the approach to nonlinear matrix-valued monotone systems [6] would also be of great interest. Possible extensions on the stochastic side would be the consideration of Levy processes [11] and of more general renewal processes along the same lines as [7–10, 56]. While only the stabilization with respect to static state feedback has been considered here, the case of dynamic output feedback is still of great interest; see e.g. [44, 64, 65]. The design of observers for matrix-valued dynamical systems is also of great interest.

References

[1] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, and T. Ratiu. *Manifolds, Tensor Analysis, and Applications*. Springer Science+Business Media New York, 1988.

[2] M. Ait Rami. Stability analysis and synthesis for linear positive systems with time-varying delays. In *Positive systems - Proceedings of the 3rd Multidisciplinary International Symposium on Positive Systems: Theory and Applications (POSTA 2009)*, pages 205–216. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.

[3] M. Ait Rami and F. Tadeo. Controller synthesis for positive linear systems with bounded controls. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems – II. Express Briefs*, 54(2):151–155, 2007.

[4] A. Y. Aleksandrov and O. Mason. Diagonal Lyapunov–Krasovskii functionals for discrete-time positive systems with delay. *Systems & Control Letters*, 63:63–67, 2014.

[5] L. I. Allerhand and U. Shaked. Robust stability and stabilization of linear switched systems with dwell time. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(2):381–386, 2011.

[6] D. Angeli and E. D. Sontag. Monotone control systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(10):1684–1698, 2003.

[7] D. Antunes, J. P. Hespanha, and C. Silvestre. Control of impulsive renewal systems: Application to direct design in networked control. In *Joint 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and 28th Chinese Control Conference*, pages 6882–6887, 2009.

[8] D. Antunes, J. P. Hespanha, and C. Silvestre. Stability of impulsive systems driven by renewal processes. In *28th American Control Conference*, pages 4032–4037, St Louis, MO, USA, 2009.

[9] D. Antunes, J. P. Hespanha, and C. Silvestre. Stochastic hybrid systems with renewal transitions. In *29th American Control Conference*, pages 3124–3129, Baltimore, MD, USA, 2010.

[10] D. Antunes, J. P. Hespanha, and C. Silvestre. Volterra integral approach to impulsive renewal systems: Application to networked control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(3):607–619, 2013.

[11] D. Applebaum. *Lévy Processes and Stochastic Calculus*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[12] R. Bhatia. *Matrix Analysis*. Springer, 1997.

[13] C. Briat. Robust stability analysis of uncertain linear positive systems via integral linear constraints - L_1- and L_∞-gains characterizations. In *50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 3122–3129, Orlando, Florida, USA, 2011.

[14] C. Briat. Convex conditions for robust stability analysis and stabilization of linear aperiodic impulsive and sampled-data systems under dwell-time constraints. *Automatica*, 49(11):3449–3457, 2013.

[15] C. Briat. Robust stability and stabilization of uncertain linear positive systems via integral linear constraints - L_1- and L_∞-gains characterizations. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 23(17):1932–1954, 2013.

[16] C. Briat. Convex conditions for robust stabilization of uncertain switched systems with guaranteed minimum and mode-dependent dwell-time. *Systems & Control Letters*, 78:63–72, 2015.

[17] C. Briat. Stability analysis and stabilization of stochastic linear impulsive, switched and sampled-data systems under dwell-time constraints. *Automatica*, 74:279–287, 2016.

[18] C. Briat. Stability and performance analysis of linear positive systems with delays using input-output methods. *International Journal of Control*, 91(7):1669–1692, 2018.

[19] C. Briat. Stability and $L_1 \times \ell_1$-to-$L_1 \times \ell_1$ performance analysis of uncertain impulsive linear positive systems with applications to the interval observation of impulsive and switched systems with constant delays. *International Journal of Control*, 93(11):2634–265, 2020.

[20] C. Briat. Hybrid $L_\infty \times \ell_\infty$-performance analysis and control of linear time-varying impulsive and switched positive systems. *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, 39:100980, 2021.

[21] C. Briat, A. Gupta, and M. Khammash. Antithetic integral feedback ensures robust perfect adaptation in noisy biomolecular networks. *Cell Systems*, 2(1):15–26, 2016.

[22] C. Briat and M. Khammash. Ergodicity analysis and antithetic integral control of a class of stochastic reaction networks with delays. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 19(3):1575–1608, 2020.

[23] C. Briat and M. Khammash. Ergodicity, output-controllability, and antithetic integral control of uncertain stochastic reaction networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(5):2087–2098, 2020.

[24] B. Brogliato, R. Lozano, B. Maschke, and O. Egeland. *Dissipative Systems Analysis and Control*. Springer-Verlag, 2007.

[25] F. Bullo and A. D. Lewis. *Geometric Control of Mechanical Systems*. Springer Science+Business Media New York, 2005.

[26] S. Bundfuss and M. Dür. Copositive Lyaunov functions for switched systems over cones. *Systems & Control Letters*, 58(5):342–345, 2009.

[27] Y. Chen, P. Bolzern, P. Colaneri, Y. Bo, and B. Du. Stability and stabilization for markov jump linear systems in polyhedral cones. In *57th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 4779–4784, Miami Beach, USA, 2018.

[28] O. L. V. Costa, M. D. Fragoso, and R. P. Marques. *Discrete-Time Markov Jump Linear Systems*. Springer-Verlag, London, UK, 2005.

[29] O. L. V. Costa, M. D. Fragoso, and M. G. Todorov. *Continuous-Time Markov Jump Linear Systems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.

[30] V. Drăgan and S. Aberkane. Exact detectability and exact observability of discrete-time linear stochastic systems with periodic coefficients. *Automatica*, 112:108660, 2020.

[31] V. Drăgan, T. Damm, G. Freiling, and T. Morozan. Differential equations with positive evolutions and some applications. *Results in Mathematics*, 48:206–236, 2005.

[32] V. Drăgan, E. Fontoura Costa, I.-L. Popa, and S. Aberkane. Exact detectability: Application to generalized lyapunov and riccati equations. *Systems & Control Letters*, 157:105032, 2021.

[33] V. Drăgan, E. Fontoura Costa, I.-L. Popa, and S. Aberkane. Exact detectability of discrete-time and continuous-time linear stochastic systems: A unified approach (in press). *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2022.

[34] V. Drăgan, G. Freiling, A. Hochhaus, and T. Morozan. A class of nonlinear differential equations on the space of symmetric matrices. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, 96:1–48, 2004.

[35] V. Drăgan and T. Morozan. Stability and robust stabilization to linear stochastic systems described by differential equations with markovian jumping and multiplicative white noise. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*, 20(1):33–92, 2002.

[36] V. Drăgan and T. Morozan. Mean square exponential stability for some stochastic linear discrete time systems. *European Journal of Control*, 12(4):373–396, 2006.

[37] V. Drăgan, T. Morozan, and A. M. Stoica. *Mathematical Methods in Robust Control of Discrete-time Linear Stochastic Systems*. Springer New York, Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London, 2010.

[38] V. Drăgan, T. Morozan, and A. M. Stoica. *Mathematical Methods in Robust Control of Linear Stochastic Systems*. Springer New York, 2013.

[39] Y. Ebihara, D. Peaucelle, and D. Arzelier. L_1 gain analysis of linear positive systems and its applications. In *50th Conference on Decision and Control, Orlando, Florida, USA*, pages 4029–4034, 2011.

[40] L. Farina and S. Rinaldi. *Positive Linear Systems: Theory and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2000.

[41] E. Fridman. *Introduction to Time-Delay Systems*. Birkhäuser, Springer International Publishing Basel Switzerland, 2014.

[42] P. Gahinet and P. Apkarian. A linear matrix inequality approach to $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ control. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 4:421–448, 1994.

[43] A. Gattami and B. Bamieh. Simple covariance approach to $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(3):789–794, 2016.

[44] J. C. Geromel, P. Colaneri, and P. Bolzern. Differential linear matrix inequality in optimal sampled-data control. *Automatica*, 100:289–298, 2019.

[45] R. Goebel, R. G. Sanfelice, and A. R. Teel. *Hybrid Dynamical Systems. Modeling, Stability, and Robustness*. Princeton University Press, 2012.

[46] K. Gu, V. L. Kharitonov, and J. Chen. *Stability of Time-Delay Systems*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2003.

[47] A. Gupta, C. Briat, and M. Khammash. A scalable computational framework for establishing long-term behavior of stochastic reaction networks. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 10(6):e1003669, 2014.

[48] W. M. Haddad and V. Chellaboina. Stability theory for nonnegative and compartmental dynamical systems with time delay. *Systems & Control Letters*, 51(5):355–361, 2004.

[49] T. Holicki and C. W. Scherer. Stability analysis and output-feedback synthesis of hybrid systems affected by piecewise constant parameters via dynamic resetting scalings. *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, 34:179–208, 2019.

[50] Y Ji and H. J Chizeck. Controllability, stabilizability, and continuous-time markovian jump linear quadratic control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 777-788, 1990.

[51] V. Jurdjevic and H. J. Sussmann. Control systems on Lie groups. *Systems & Control Letters*, 12(2):313–329, 1972.

[52] T. Kaczorek. Stability of positive continuous-time linear systems with delays. *Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Sciences - Technical sciences*, 57(4):395–398, 2009.

[53] R. Khasminskii. *Stability of Stochastic Differential Equations*. Springer, 2012.

[54] S. Z. Khong and A. Rantzer. Diagonal Lyaunov functions for positive linear time-varying systems. In *55th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 5269–5274, Las Vegas, USA, 2016.

[55] H. Kushner. *Stochastic Stability and Control*. Academic Press, New York, 1967.

[56] A. Lampersky and A. Papachristodoulou. Stability and consensus for multi-agent systems with Poisson clock noise. In *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 3023–3028, Los Angeles, USA, 2014.

[57] A. N. Michel, L. Hou, and D. Liu. *Stability of dynamical systems - Continuous, discontinuous and discrete systems*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2008.

[58] R. M. Murray, Z. Li, and S. S. Satry. *A Mathematical Introduction to Robotic Mnipulation*. CRC Press, 1994.

[59] R. Qian, Z. Duan, and Y. Qi. Stability of power control in multiple coexisting wireless networks: An $\mathscr{L}_2$ small-gain perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems - I: Regular Papers*, 64(5):1235–1246, 1017.

[60] R. Qian, Z. Duan, and Y. Qi. Power control in multiple coexisting wireless networks: l_1 and l_∞ gain based stability analysis. In *36th Chinese Control Conference*, pages 3218–3223, Dalian, China, 2017.

[61] A. Rantzer. Optimizing positively dominated systems. In *51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 271–277, Maui, Hawaii, USA, 2012.

[62] A. Rantzer. On the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov lemma for positive systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(5):1346–1349, 2016.

[63] A. Rantzer and M. E. Valcher. Scalable control of positive systems. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 4:8.1–8.23, 2021.

[64] C. W. Scherer. *The Riccati inequality and state-space H_∞-optimal control*. PhD thesis, University of Würzburg, Germany, 1990.

[65] C. W. Scherer, P. Gahinet, and M. Chilali. Multiobjective output-feedback control via LMI optimization. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, 42(7):896–911, 1997.

[66] U. Shaked and E. Gershon. Robust H_∞ control of stochastic linear switched systems with dwell-time. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 24:1664–1676, 2014.

[67] J. Shen and J. Lam. L_∞-gain analysis for positive systems with distributed delays. *Automatica*, 50:175–179, 2014.

[68] J. Shen and J. Lam. ℓ_∞/L_∞-gain analysis for positive linear systems with unbounded time-varying delays. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(3):857–862, 2015.

[69] J. Shen and W. X. Zheng. Positivity and stability of coupled differential–difference equations with time-varying delays. *Automatica*, 57:123–127, 2015.

[70] R. E. Skelton, T. Iwasaki, and K. M. Grigoriadis. *A Unified Algebraic Approach to Linear Control Design*. Taylor & Francis, 1997.

[71] M. Souza, A. R. Fioravanti, and V. S. P. Araujo. Impulsive Markov jump linear systems: Stability analysis and $\mathbb{H}_2$ control. *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, 42:101089, 2021.

[72] T. Tanaka, C. Langbort, and V. Ugrinovskii. DC-dominant property of cone-preserving transfer functions. *Systems & Control Letters*, 62(8):699–707, 2013.

[73] A. R. Teel, A. Subbaraman, and A. Sferlazza. Stability analysis for stochastic hybrid systems: A survey. *Automatica*, 50(10):2435–2456, 2014.

[74] A. van der Schaft. *L_2-Gain and Passivity Techniques in Nonlinear Control*. Springer-Verlag, London, 2000.

[75] E. I. Verriest and W. Michiels. Stability analysis of systems with stochastically varying delays. *Systems & Control Letters*, 58(10-11):783–791, 2009.

[76] J. C. Willems. *The analysis of feedback systems.* MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1971.

[77] S. You, A. Gattami, and J. C. Doyle. Primal robustness and semidefinite cones. In *54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 6227–6232, Osaka, Japan, 2015.