

On Explicit Stochastic Differential Algebraic Equations*

Sumit Suthar[†], Soumyendu Raha[‡]

Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru

Abstract

Dynamical systems that are subject to continuous uncertain fluctuations can be modelled using Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs). Controlling such systems results in solving path constrained SDEs. Broadly, these problems fall under the category of Stochastic Differential-Algebraic Equations (SDAEs). In this article, the focus is on combining ideas from the local theory of Differential-Algebraic Equations with that of Stochastic Differential Equations. The question of existence and uniqueness of the solution for SDAEs is addressed by using contraction mapping theorem in an appropriate Banach space to arrive at a sufficient condition. From the geometric point of view, a necessary condition is derived for the existence of the solution. It is observed that there exists a class of high index SDAEs for which there is no solution. Hence, computational methods to find approximate solution of high index equations are presented. The techniques are illustrated in form of algorithms with examples and numerical computations.

Keywords: Stochastic Differential Algebraic Equations (SDAE), high index Stochastic Differential Algebraic Equations, constrained Stochastic Differential Equations, constrained dynamics, dynamical systems.

1 Introduction

Dynamical systems are usually modelled using differential equations. When operational conditions are imposed on the system (e.g. safety or performance related constraints), it often takes the form of algebraic equation. Such constrained equation together with the original differential equation is called Differential - Algebraic Equation (DAE). From the application point of view, DAE is often used in control of physical/engineering systems such as in robotics [4, 11, 12], power engineering [20, 9], aerodynamics [24], satellite applications [7] etc. Other than control, DAE also finds application in areas such as biochemistry [23, 25], ecological sciences [10], astronomy and astrophysics [2], electromagnetism [8] etc. There is abundant literature on both theoretical and numerical aspects of DAEs. [1, 3, 17] are some references for the numerical aspects of DAEs. DAEs of high index or singular (implicit) differential equations have also been studied as analysis of differential equations on manifolds, e.g. in [18, 19].

In most of the applications the system usually suffers from continuous uncertain fluctuations. Systems with such uncertain fluctuations can be modelled using Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs). However, operational constraints cannot be neglected if they exist. This results in finding solution of a constrained SDE. In [22] existence and uniqueness is established for SDEs that are subjected to convex constraint. [14] is a good reference that uses ideas from stochastic stability to solve SDEs constrained to a set. When the constraint is in form of an algebraic equation, the SDE and the constraint equation is together termed as Stochastic Differential-Algebraic Equation (SDAE).

An attempt towards developing a stochastic analogue for the theory of Differential-Algebraic Equations (DAEs) can be found in [26]. Similarly, [27, 5] discuss index 1 DAEs with noise as SDAEs. However, the work is limited to noiseless constraints and SDAEs of index 1. [28, 6] discuss stability analysis of the trivial index 1 system perturbed by noise. There have also been

*This work was partially supported by the grant SERB-EMR/2016/002022-EEC of Science and Engineering Research Board, Government of India.

[†]Email: sutharsumit@iisc.ac.in, sumitsuthar@live.in

[‡]Email: raha@iisc.ac.in

attempts toward numerical simulation of index 1 systems in [21, 16, 27], which essentially reduces to simulation of stiff SDEs.

Despite having enormous potential in application, unlike DAEs, SDAEs do not have a well formed theory and attempts at developing the theory are limited to SDAEs of index 1. In this article we extend the ideas of differential-algebraic equations to the stochastic setting. We also give computational methods for approximately solving SDAEs. The main results obtained in this article includes:

- Sufficient condition for existence and uniqueness of solution of SDAE.
- Conditions for Existence of ill-posed equations for which there is no solution.
- Computational methods to find exact and approximate solution with probability 1 for high index equations.

Basic terminologies and notations used in this article can be found in section 2.2. As SDAE are fundamentally different from deterministic DAEs, before developing computational techniques it is necessary to establish the class of equations that may or may not have a solution. These conditions can be found as necessary and sufficient condition in section 3. Existence of *ill-posed* equations, which do not have a solution, is established in section 3.2. In section 4 an attempt is made to find exact solution for high index equations by reducing it to SDE. It is observed that not all high index equations can be solved using this technique. Moreover, existence of ill-posed equations pose a challenge in developing a general computational technique. Hence, the article also focuses on finding techniques to obtain an approximate solution. Section 5.1 and section 5.2 present algorithms for numerical computation. The algorithms are illustrated with an example problem. The article ends with comparison between the techniques for finding approximate solution (section 5.3) and with some concluding remarks (section 6).

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Motivational example

As an example, let us consider an engineering problem. Suppose there is a body that is initially at temperature T_c . If the ambient temperature is $T_\infty < T_c$ then the body will experience cooling. As the body is constantly cooling, an external heat regulator is required to control the temperature of the body. A simple model for such a system can be given by the following differential equation.

$$C \frac{dT}{dt} = -k(T - T_\infty) + \dot{Q}, \quad (1)$$

where, T is the temp of the body, C is the heat capacity, $k > 0$, and \dot{Q} is the rate at which heat is transferred to the body by the heat regulator. If the aim is to maintain a constant temperature of T_c , the differential equation needs to be constrained to the following algebraic equation.

$$g(T) = T - T_c = 0. \quad (2)$$

This forms a system of Differential-Algebraic Equation (DAE). A solution to this DAE will give $\dot{Q}(t)$ such that $T(t) = T_c$. It can be verified that $\dot{Q}(t) = k(T(t) - T_\infty)$ is a solution of the DAE. With this solution, $T(t) = T_c \forall t$ as the initial temperature was T_c . From the implementation perspective, a feedback control can be designed using the closed form solution just obtained. However, it should be noted that in reality the temperature feedback data will usually come from a thermal sensor which may be noisy. Presence of noise may violate the assumption of the model that $T(t)$ is differential. Moreover, the Chapman-Kolmogorov law on “determinism” will be violated due to the stochastic nature of the noise. However, if the noise is also modelled and included in the differential equation then there is a possibility of solving the noisy problem with probability 1. In the current example, this can be done by tweaking the differential equation (1) to include noise. An example of such a model with additive noise of fixed variance is

$$dT = (-k/C(T - T_\infty) + \dot{Q}/C)dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad (3)$$

where W_t is a one dimensional Wiener process and σ is a constant. Due to the operational constraint of maintaining constant temperature T_c , the Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE) (3) has to be constrained to the algebraic equation (2). Together these equations are called stochastic differential-algebraic equation. However, as discussed before, there is no general theory to solve such systems.

2.2 Definitions and notations

In general a multidimensional SDAE can be given by the following.

$$dx = f(x, u)dt + \sigma(x, u)dW_t, \quad (4a)$$

$$g(x, u) = - \int_0^t \Gamma(x(s), u(s))dW_s; \quad (4b)$$

where W_t is a d-dimensional Wiener process and $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ is filtration generated by W_t , $f : U \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\sigma : U \times V \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^n)$. $x(t, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called **state variable** and $u(t, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is called **algebraic variable**. The second equation is the constraint equation (also called the **algebraic equation**) with $g : U \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\Gamma : U \times V \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$. All the stochastic integrals are Ito integrals. U and V are connected neighbourhoods of the initial condition $x(0)$ and $u(0)$ respectively. Equation (4a) and equation (4b) are together called **explicit Stochastic Differential-Algebraic Equations**, as opposed to implicit SDAEs that are usually represented as singular SDEs discussed in [26] and [27] (Explicit SDAEs will be simply called SDAEs as only explicit SDAEs are considered in this article). U is called the **state space** and V the **algebraic space**. An SDAE is said to be **autonomous (non-autonomous)** if both SDE and the algebraic equation are autonomous (non-autonomous). A non-autonomous system can be converted to an autonomous system by coupling the system with another differential equation $dy = dt$. Therefore, it is enough to consider an autonomous SDAE. The dimension of the algebraic equation is also called **the number of algebraic equations** and the dimension of the algebraic space is also called **the number of algebraic variables**. Apparently, the number of algebraic equations in equation (4) is p and the number of algebraic variables is m .

If there exist continuous stochastic processes $x(\cdot, \omega) : I \rightarrow U$ and $u(\cdot, \omega) : I \rightarrow V$, where $I = [0, a)$ and $0 < a < \infty$, that are adapted to $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ and satisfy the SDE as well as the algebraic equation in the mean square sense (as in case of stochastic differential equations), then the SDAE is said to have a **local solution**.

In this article the term **solution** should be considered as local solution, unless explicitly specified. For convenience, a stochastic process $y(t, \omega)$ will be simply written as $y(t)$.

Suppose there is a solution for equations (4) and the algebraic variable is given by the Ito stochastic differential equation,

$$du = a(x, u)dt + B(x, u)dW_t \quad (5)$$

such that $a : U \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $B : U \times V \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$ are Lipschitz continuous. Assuming that the required differentiability conditions are satisfied, the Ito differentiation of the algebraic equation (4b) gives,

$$0 = \left[\mathcal{D}_x(g)f + \mathcal{D}_u(g)a + \frac{1}{2}Tr(\sigma \mathcal{D}_{x,x}^2(g)\sigma^T + B \mathcal{D}_{u,u}^2(g)B^T + 2\sigma \mathcal{D}_{x,u}^2(g)B^T) \right] dt + [\mathcal{D}_x(g)\sigma + \mathcal{D}_u(g)B + \Gamma] dW_t.$$

With $B = -(\mathcal{D}_u(g))^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_x(g)\sigma + \Gamma)$

and

$$a = -(\mathcal{D}_u(g))^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_x(g)f + 1/2Tr(\sigma \mathcal{D}_{x,x}^2(g)\sigma^T + B \mathcal{D}_{u,u}^2(g)B^T + 2\sigma \mathcal{D}_{x,u}^2(g)B^T))$$

we get a stochastic curve, in the product space $U \times V$, such that the differential evolution of the algebraic equation is 0. This means that if the algebraic equation is satisfied at $t = 0$, then it will be satisfied for all time as long as $\mathcal{D}_u g(x, u)$ is invertible. The following lemma is obtained from this discussion.

Lemma 2.1. For an SDAE in the form of equation (4) with $m=p$, such that $f(x, u)$ and $\sigma(x, u)$ are Lipschitz, and $g(x, u)$ is \mathcal{C}^3 ; if $\mathcal{D}_u(g)(x, u)$ is invertible and has bounded inverse in some neighbourhood of $(x(0), u(0))$, then the local solution is given by the following SDE.

$$dk = (f(k), a(k))dt + (\sigma(k), B(k))dW_t, \quad (6)$$

with $k = (x, u)$, $B = -(\mathcal{D}_u g)^{-1}((\mathcal{D}_x g)\sigma + \Gamma)$, and
 $a = -(\mathcal{D}_u g)^{-1}((\mathcal{D}_x g)f + \frac{1}{2}Tr(\sigma(\mathcal{D}_{x,x}^2 g)\sigma^T + B(\mathcal{D}_{u,u}^2 g)B^T + 2\sigma(\mathcal{D}_{x,u}^2 g)B^T))$.

With this as the motivation, we give the following definitions.

Definition 2.1. An **Index 1 SDAE** is an SDAE in form of equation (4), such that $\mathcal{D}_u g$ is invertible.

Definition 2.2. An SDAE that does not admit algebraic variable in the algebraic equation (i.e. when g and Γ are not function of the algebraic variable) is said to be of **high index**. A generic form for high index SDAEs is given as,

$$dx = f(x, u)dt + \sigma(x, u)dW_t, \quad (7a)$$

$$0 = g(x) + \int_0^t \Gamma(x_s)dW_s; \quad (7b)$$

with $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, W_t as d -dimensional Wiener process, $f : U \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sigma : U \times V \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\Gamma : U \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$.

3 Existence and uniqueness of the solution

Clearly, if $\mathcal{D}_u g$ is not invertible then method of lemma 2.1 is not applicable. In particular, this method cannot be used for high index equations. Therefore, before giving methods for computation, it becomes important to obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for existence of solution. Moreover, as we shall see in section 3.2, there exists a class of high index problems called *ill-posed* equations which has no solution.

3.1 Sufficient condition for existence of unique solution

Proposition 3.1. Let the SDAE be in the form of equation (4) such that $m = p$. Let $f(x, u)$, $\sigma(x, u)$, and $\Gamma(x, u)$ be locally Lipschitz in $B_{\epsilon_x}(x_0) \times B_{\epsilon_u}(u_0)$ for some $u_0 \in V$ and $x_0 \in U$. $g(x, u)$ is \mathcal{C}^1 and $g(x_0, u_0) = 0$. $h(x, u) = (0, u - g(x, u))$ and $M = \sup\{\|\mathcal{D}(h(x, u))\|, (x, u) \in B_{\epsilon_x}(x_0) \times B_{\epsilon_u}(u_0)\} < 1$. Then there exists a unique local solution of the equation, i.e. there exists some $a > 0$ such that the solution exists for all $t \in [0, a)$.

Proof. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathfrak{F}_t\}, P)$ be the filtered probability space and the Brownian motions W_j be adapted to the filtration \mathfrak{F} . Let $\|\cdot\|_c$, $\|\cdot\|_x$ and $\|\cdot\|_u$ be norms in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} , \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m respectively, such that $\|(a, b)\|_c^2 = \|a\|_x^2 + \|b\|_u^2$.

Let $E_x[a, b]$ denote the Banach space $(L_{\mathfrak{F}}^2(\Omega; \mathcal{C}([a, b], \mathbb{R}^n)), (\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \|\cdot\|_x^2)^{1/2})$ i.e. the space of all continuous \mathfrak{F} -adapted processes from $[a, b]$ to \mathbb{R}^n . Similarly, let $E_u[a, b]$ denote the space $(L_{\mathfrak{F}}^2(\Omega; \mathcal{C}([a, b], \mathbb{R}^m)), (\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \|\cdot\|_u^2)^{1/2})$.

Consider a function $\phi : E_x[0, a] \times E_u[0, a] \rightarrow E_x[0, a] \times E_u[0, a]$ such that

$$\phi(x_t, u_t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 + \int_0^t f(x(s), u(s))ds + \int_0^t \sigma(x(s), u(s))dW_s \\ u(t) - g(x(t), u(t)) - \int_0^t \Gamma(x(s), u(s))dW_s \end{bmatrix}.$$

If ϕ is a contraction map then the fixed point of ϕ is the local solution for the SDAE. Hence, the problem has reduced to proving that ϕ is indeed a contraction map.

As f , σ and Γ are locally Lipschitz, we consider $(x(t), u(t)) \in B_{\epsilon_x}(x(0)) \times B_{\epsilon_u}(u(0)) \subset U \times V$ such that f , σ and Γ are Lipschitz with constants k_f , k_σ and k_Γ respectively. It is assumed that $g(x(0), u(0)) = 0$.

Let $y_t(\omega), z_t(\omega) \in E_x[0, a]$, $v_t(\omega), r_t(\omega) \in E_u[0, a]$, and
 $\tau(\omega) = \inf\{t \in I | (x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)) \notin B_{\epsilon_x}(x(0)) \times B_{\epsilon_u}(u(0))\}$.

Now, for some fixed $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\phi(y_t, v_t) - \phi(z_t, r_t)\|_c^2 = \\
& \left\| \left[\int_0^t f(y(s), v(s)) - f(z(s), r(s)) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(y(s), v(s)) - \sigma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t))) + \int_0^t \Gamma(y(s), v(s)) - \Gamma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right] \right\|_c^2 \\
& \leq \left\| \int_0^t f(y(s), v(s)) - f(z(s), r(s)) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(y(s), v(s)) - \sigma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_x^2 \\
& + \left\| v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t))) + \int_0^t \Gamma(y(s), v(s)) - \Gamma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_u^2 \\
& \leq 2 \left\| \int_0^t f(y(s), v(s)) - f(z(s), r(s)) ds \right\|_x^2 \\
& + 2 \left\| \int_0^t \sigma(y(s), v(s)) - \sigma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_x^2 \\
& + 2 \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
& + 2 \left\| \int_0^t \Gamma(y(s), v(s)) - \Gamma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_u^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\phi(y_t, v_t) - \phi(z_t, r_t)\|_c^2 \\
& \leq 2t \int_0^t \|f(y(s), v(s)) - f(z(s), r(s))\|_x^2 ds + 2 \left\| \int_0^t \sigma(y(s), v(s)) - \sigma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_x^2 \\
& + 2 \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
& + 2 \left\| \int_0^t \Gamma(y(s), v(s)) - \Gamma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_u^2 \\
& \leq 2tk_f^2 \int_0^t \|(y(s), v(s)) - (z(s), r(s))\|_c^2 ds + 2 \left\| \int_0^t \sigma(y(s), v(s)) - \sigma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_x^2 \\
& + 2 \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
& + 2 \left\| \int_0^t \Gamma(y(s), v(s)) - \Gamma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_u^2 \\
& \leq 2a^2 k_f^2 \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|(y(t), v(t)) - (z(t), r(t))\|_c^2 \\
& + 2 \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \left\| \int_0^t \sigma(y(s), v(s)) - \sigma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_x^2 \\
& + 2 \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
& + 2 \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \left\| \int_0^t \Gamma(y(s), v(s)) - \Gamma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_u^2. \\
& \implies \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|\phi(y_t, v_t) - \phi(z_t, r_t)\|_c^2 \leq 2a^2 k_f^2 \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|(y(t), v(t)) - (z(t), r(t))\|_c^2 \\
& + 2 \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \left\| \int_0^t \sigma(y(s), v(s)) - \sigma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_x^2 \\
& + 2 \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
& + 2 \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \left\| \int_0^t \Gamma(y(s), v(s)) - \Gamma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_u^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|\phi(y_t, v_t) - \phi(z_t, r_t)\|_c^2 \leq 2a^2 k_f^2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|(y(t), v(t)) - (z(t), r(t))\|_c^2 \\
& + 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \left\| \int_0^t \sigma(y(s), v(s)) - \sigma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_x^2 \\
& + 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
& + 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \left\| \int_0^t \Gamma(y(s), v(s)) - \Gamma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_u^2. \\
& \implies \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|\phi(y_t, v_t) - \phi(z_t, r_t)\|_c^2 \leq 2a^2 k_f^2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|(y(t), v(t)) - (z(t), r(t))\|_c^2 \\
& + 4 \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^a \sigma(y(s), v(s)) - \sigma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_x^2 \\
& + 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
& + 4 \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^a \Gamma(y(s), v(s)) - \Gamma(z(s), r(s)) dW_s \right\|_u^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Itô-isometry property,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|\phi(y_t, v_t) - \phi(z_t, r_t)\|_c^2 \leq 2a^2 k_f^2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|(y(t), v(t)) - (z(t), r(t))\|_c^2 \\
& + 4ndk_\sigma^2 \int_0^a \mathbb{E} \|(y(s), v(s)) - (z(s), r(s))\|_c^2 ds \\
& + 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
& + 4mdk_\Gamma^2 \int_0^a \mathbb{E} \|(y(s), v(s)) - (z(s), r(s))\|_c^2 ds \\
& \leq ((2k_f^2)a^2 + 4d(nk_\sigma^2 + mk_\Gamma^2)a) \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|(y(s), v(s)) - (z(s), r(s))\|_c^2 \\
& + 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2.
\end{aligned}$$

It is known that $M = \sup_{(x, u) \in B_{e_x}(x_0) \times B_{e_u}(u_0)} \left\| \begin{array}{cc} 0 & 0 \\ -\mathcal{D}_x g & I - \mathcal{D}_u g \end{array} \right\| < 1$.

Therefore, by mean value inequality,

$$\|(0, (v - r) - (g(y, v) - g(z, r)))\|_c < M \|(y - z, v - r)\|_c$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&< \sqrt{0.5(M^2 + 1)} \|(y - z, v - r)\|_c. \\
&\implies \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
&< 0.5(M^2 + 1) \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|(y(t), v(t)) - (z(t), r(t))\|_c^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|\phi(y_t, v_t) - \phi(z_t, r_t)\|_c^2 \\
&\leq ((2k_f^2)a^2 + 4d(nk_\sigma^2 + mk_\Gamma^2)a) \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|(y(s), v(s)) - (z(s), r(s))\|_c^2 \\
&+ 2\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|v(t) - r(t) - (g(y(t), v(t)) - g(z(t), r(t)))\|_u^2 \\
&< ((2k_f^2)a^2 + 4d(nk_\sigma^2 + mk_\Gamma^2)a \\
&+ 0.5(M^2 + 1)) \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, a]} \|(y(t), v(t)) - (z(t), r(t))\|_c^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, $\tau_0 = \inf\{\tau(\omega) | \omega \in \Omega\} > 0$ with unit probability.

Therefore,

$$\text{with } a < \min \left\{ \tau_0, \frac{-4d(nk_\sigma^2 + mk_\Gamma^2) + \sqrt{16d^2(nk_\sigma^2 + mk_\Gamma^2)^2 + 4k_f^2(1 - M^2)}}{4k_f^2} \right\}, \phi \text{ becomes contrac-}$$

tion map and the proof is complete. \square

Remark. If the solution does not exist or is not unique then the conditions of the proposition are violated. However, as the proposition is not an “if and only if” statement, the converse may not be true.

It can be seen that if $D_u g = 0$ then the condition in the proposition is violated; i.e. in case of high index SDAEs with equal number of algebraic equation and variables ($m = p$), the condition in proposition 3.1 is always violated. But, as the violation of the condition does not amount to non-existence of unique solution, a solution may or may not exist for high index SDAE. Therefore, proposition 3.1 is of no use in case of high index problems with $m = p$. Hence a necessary condition is required.

Remark. For a given equation, if the sufficient conditions in proposition 3.1 are satisfied then it is possible to construct a computational method based on Picard-type iteration.

3.2 Necessary condition

To find a necessary condition for existence of a solution, we assume that there exists a solution to the SDAE and look at the problem from the geometric prospective. For simplicity, assume that the constraint is noiseless i.e. $\Gamma = 0$.

Lemma 3.1. Consider SDAE of index 1 given in form of equation (4). Let $\Gamma = 0$. Suppose there exists Ito stochastic solutions for all initial conditions that satisfy the constraint. Let the algebraic variable be given by the following SDE

$$du = a(x, u)dt + B(x, u)dW_t.$$

If $g(x, u)$ is \mathcal{C}^3 and all the vector fields are \mathcal{C}^1 , then

$$\bigcup_{k \in S} \text{Img}(\sigma(k), B(k))$$

will be a distribution on S ; where $S = \{g^{-1}(0)\}$ is a submanifold of $U \times V$, and $\text{Img}(\sigma(k), B(k))$ is the column space of $\begin{bmatrix} \sigma(x, u) \\ B(x, u) \end{bmatrix}$.

Proof. Let $k = (x, u)$. This results in

$$dk = \begin{bmatrix} f(k) \\ a(k) \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(k) \\ B(k) \end{bmatrix} dW_t.$$

As the SDAE is of index 1, $\mathcal{D}_u g$ is invertible. This means that the number of algebraic variables is same as that of the algebraic equations i.e. $m = p$. In particular, $\mathcal{D}g(k) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is surjective for almost every $k \in U \times V$.

Using the submersion theorem from differential geometry, if 0 is a regular value of g then the

level set $S = \{g^{-1}(0)\}$ is a submanifold of $U \times V \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ with tangent space given by $T_k S = \ker(Dg(k))$.

From the Ito differentiation formula, it is clear that if $k(t, \omega)$ is the solution of the given SDAE then

$$D_x g(k(t, \omega)) \cdot \sigma_i(k(t, \omega)) + D_u g(k(t, \omega)) \cdot B_i(k(t, \omega)) = 0 \quad \forall \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

Since

$$T_k S = \ker(Dg(k)) = \ker([D_x g(x, u) \quad D_u g(x, u)]),$$

it can be concluded that for a given sample path,

$$(\sigma_i(k(t, \omega)), B_i(k(t, \omega))) \in T_{k(t, \omega)} S \quad \forall \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

But this is true for all sample paths (i.e. $\forall \omega \in \Omega$). So the sample paths for any initial condition $k(0) \in S$ implies that $k(t, \omega) \in S$. Therefore,

$$\text{Img} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(k) \\ B(k) \end{bmatrix} \subset T_k S \quad \forall k \in S$$

and the distribution can be constructed on S. □

This argument can be extended to equations with noisy constraint as well. However, the SDAE needs to be tweaked. Consider SDAE of index 1 given in form of equation (4). An SDAE with noisy constraint (equation (4)) can be expressed as an SDAE with noiseless constraint by substituting

$$z(t) = \int_0^t \Gamma(x(s), u(s)) dW_s.$$

With this,

$$dx = f(x, u)dt + \sigma(x, u)dW_t, \tag{8a}$$

$$dz = 0dt + \Gamma(x, u)dW_t, \tag{8b}$$

$$h(x, z, u) = g(x, u) + z = 0; \tag{8c}$$

and we get a new SDAE with noiseless constraint of higher dimensional state space. This idea is similar in spirit to the method of suspension used in the theory of ordinary differential equations. The new SDAE is also of index 1. The solution of the original SDAE matches that of equation (8) if the initial condition for z is $z(0) = 0$. It should be noted that while there is freedom to choose the initial condition for x and u (as long as the initial condition for x and u satisfies the constraint), the initial condition for z must be 0. Therefore, a geometric result that is similar to lemma 3.1 can not be obtained by directly applying the lemma to equation (8). However, as the solution exists, it satisfies the constraint $h(x, z, u) = 0$. Therefore, following the arguments in proof of the lemma 3.1,

$(\sigma_i(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)), \Gamma_i(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)), B_i(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega))) \in T_{(x(t, \omega), z(t, \omega), u(t, \omega))} S \quad \forall \quad i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, where $S = h^{-1}(0)$ is a submanifold of $U \times \mathbb{R}^m \times V$. In other words,

$$\text{Img} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)) \\ \Gamma(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)) \\ B(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)) \end{bmatrix} \subset T_{(x(t, \omega), z(t, \omega), u(t, \omega))} S.$$

Therefore, the following statement can be made for SDAEs with noisy constraint.

Lemma 3.2. Consider SDAE of index 1 given in form of equation (4). Suppose there exists an Ito stochastic solution such that the algebraic variable is given by the following SDE

$$du = a(x, u)dt + B(x, u)dW_t.$$

If $g(x, u)$ is \mathcal{C}^3 and all the vector fields are \mathcal{C}^1 , then

$$\text{Img} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)) \\ \Gamma(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)) \\ B(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)) \end{bmatrix} \subset T_{(x(t, \omega), z(t, \omega), u(t, \omega))} S.$$

Here $S = h^{-1}(0)$ is a submanifold of $U \times \mathbb{R}^p \times V$, $h(x, z, u) = g(x, u) + z$, and $z(t) = \int_0^t \Gamma(x(s), u(s)) dW_s$.

Corollary 3.1. For high index SDAE given by (7); if $g(x)$ is \mathcal{C}^3 , all the vector fields are \mathcal{C}^1 , and there exists an Ito stochastic solution then

$$\text{Img} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(x(t, \omega), u(t, \omega)) \\ \Gamma(x(t, \omega)) \end{bmatrix} \subset T_{(x(t, \omega), z(t, \omega))} S.$$

Here $S = h^{-1}(0)$ is a submanifold of $U \times \mathbb{R}^p$, $h(x, z) = g(x) + z$ and $z(t) = \int_0^t \Gamma(x(s)) dW_s$.

Definition 3.1. High index SDAEs that do not admit algebraic variable in the noise (σ is not a function of u) are called **Uncontrollable Noise SDAEs (UNSDAEs)**. Following is a generic form of UNSDAE.

$$dx = f(x, u)dt + \sigma(x)dW_t, \quad (9a)$$

$$g(x) = - \int_0^t \Gamma(x(s))dW_s; \quad (9b)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, W_t is a d-dimensional Weiner process, $f : U \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sigma : U \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, and $\Gamma : U \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$.

Corollary 3.2. Consider UNSDAE given by equation (9). Let $h(x, z) = g(x) + z$ and $z(t) = \int_0^t \Gamma(x(s))dW_s$. If $g(x)$ is \mathcal{C}^3 , all the vector fields are \mathcal{C}^1 , and $\text{Img}(\sigma(x), \Gamma(x))$ is not in $\ker(Dh(x, z))$, then there is no Ito stochastic solution for the UNSDAE.

Proof. Apply contrapositive statement of corollary 3.1 to UNSDAE. \square

Definition 3.2. UNSDAEs in which $\text{Img}(\sigma(x), \Gamma(x))$ is not in $\ker[D_x g(x) \quad I_{p \times p}]$ are called **ill-posed** SDAEs. $I_{p \times p}$ is an identity matrix.

From corollary 3.2, it is clear that there is no solution for ill-posed equations. This establishes a class of high index equations for which there is no solution. It is now meaningful to develop computational methods for SDAEs that are solvable.

4 Exact solution and the notion of index

For index 1 SDAEs, in lemma 2.1 the algebraic variables are estimated by equating the differential evolution of the algebraic equation to zero. If a similar approach is also used for high index SDAEs then Ito differentiation of equation (7b) yields,

$$0 = [(\mathcal{D}_x g(x_t))f(x_t, u_t) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma(x_t, u_t)(\mathcal{D}_{x,x}^2 g(x_t))\sigma^T(x_t, u_t))]dt + [(\mathcal{D}_x g(x_t))\sigma(x_t, u_t) + \Gamma(x_t)]dW_t. \quad (10)$$

However the major challenge is that, unlike deterministic differential equation that has only one vector field, in SDE there exists martingale part as well. This results in more than one vector field. Hence, there is no way to find exact solution unless the number of algebraic variables is more than the number of algebraic equations.

Lemma 4.1. Consider a high index SDAE in the form of equation (7) such that $f(x, u)$, $\sigma(x, u)$ and $\Gamma(x)$ are \mathcal{C}^1 , and $g(x)$ is \mathcal{C}^3 . There exists another SDAE such that the solution of the new equation is the same as that of the original equation.

Proof. A new SDAE is constructed with the same SDE and $h(x, u) = 0$ as the algebraic equation, where

$$0 = h(x, u) = \begin{bmatrix} (\mathcal{D}_x(g)(x))f(x, u) + \frac{1}{2}Tr(\sigma(x, u)(\mathcal{D}_{x,x}^2(g)(x))\sigma^T(x, u)) \\ (\mathcal{D}_x(g)(x))\sigma_1(x, u) + \Gamma_1(x) \\ (\mathcal{D}_x(g)(x))\sigma_2(x, u) + \Gamma_2(x) \\ \vdots \\ (\mathcal{D}_x(g)(x))\sigma_d(x, u) + \Gamma_d(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

with $\sigma = [\sigma_1|\sigma_2|\dots|\sigma_d]$ and $\Gamma = [\Gamma_1|\Gamma_2|\dots|\Gamma_d]$.

On Ito differentiating equation the algebraic equation of the original SDAE, we obtain equation (10). It is clear that $h(x, u) = 0$ ensures that the differential evolution of the original algebraic equation is zero. If $g(x(0)) = 0$, then the solutions of both the equations match. \square

If the new SDAE obtained in lemma 4.1 is of index 1, then the Ito stochastic solution can be found using lemma 2.1 (provided the conditions in the lemma are satisfied). However, this comes at a cost of having more algebraic variables. The proposed method requires the number of algebraic variables to be more than the number of algebraic equations. Also the new SDAE must be of Index 1 i.e. $\mathcal{D}_u h$ must be invertible. If an SDAE in form of equation (7) can be reduced to another SDAE of index 1 using the method proposed in lemma 4.1, then the SDAE is said to be of *Index 2*. For, index 2 equations, the relation between the number of algebraic variables (m) and number of algebraic equations (p) is given by $m = p(1 + d)$, where d is the dimension of the Wiener process.

Suppose application of lemma 4.1 does not give an index 1 equation. In such a case, lemma 4.1 can be applied one more time to the new SDAEs. However, even more number of algebraic variable will be required for the purpose.

Definition 4.1. 1 more than number of times Lemma 4.1 needs to be applied to get an index 1 SDAE, is called the *index* of the high index SDAE.

Consider the following examples.

$$dx = f_x(x, z)dt + \sigma_x(x, z)dW_t, \quad (11a)$$

$$dz = f_z(x, z, u)dt + \sigma_z(x, z, u)dW_t, \quad (11b)$$

$$0 = g(x) + \int_0^t \Gamma(x_s)dW_s. \quad (11c)$$

If an SDAE in form of equation (11) can be reduced to another SDAE of Index 2 by application of lemma 4.1, then equation (11) is an example of *Index 3* equation. If an SDAE in form of equation (12) can be reduced to another SDAE of Index 3 by application of lemma 4.1, then the equation is an example of *Index 4* equation.

$$dx = f_x(x, z)dt + \sigma_x(x, z)dW_t, \quad (12a)$$

$$dz = f_z(x, z, r)dt + \sigma_z(x, z, r)dW_t, \quad (12b)$$

$$dr = f_r(x, z, r, u)dt + \sigma_r(x, z, r, u)dW_t, \quad (12c)$$

$$0 = g(x) + \int_0^t \Gamma(x_s)dW_s. \quad (12d)$$

This method comes at a cost of having more and more algebraic variables as the index goes up. In general, the relation between the number of algebraic variables, number of algebraic equations, and the index is given by $m = p(1 + d)^{(J-1)}$, where J is the index of the equation, and d is the dimension of the Wiener process. However, this condition may not be satisfied by the given SDAE, as the dimension of spaces is not available at choice. Moreover, a large class of high index equations satisfy $m = p$.

5 Approximate Ito stochastic solution for high index SDAEs

It is observed that to find a path-wise solution for high index equations, the number of algebraic variables (m) has to be more than the number of algebraic equations (p). Precisely $m = p(1 + d)^{(J-1)}$, where J is the index of the high index SDAE. This condition is very restrictive and may not always be satisfied. When $m = p$, the sufficient condition for existence of unique solution in proposition 3.1 is of no use as it is always violated for high index equations. The necessary condition gives us the condition for non-existence of the solution. But, there exists a class of high index SDAEs, called UNSDAEs, in which there is no control over the noise term i.e. noise term is not a function of the algebraic variable. In this case, corollary 3.2 applies and the solution does not exist except for some special cases. Therefore, when $m \neq p(1 + d)^{(J-1)}$ there is no obvious technique to find the solution for high index SDAEs. Moreover, existence of ill-posed equations poses a challenge to develop a general technique for solving all types of high index SDAE. From an application point of view, it is always desirable to have solution for ill-posed problems as well. In this section, we develop some techniques to find an approximate Ito stochastic solution for all types of high index SDAEs.

5.1 Approximate solution with unit probability

Consider the generic form of high index SDAE given by equation (7) with state space, $U = \mathbb{R}^n$ and algebraic space, $V = \mathbb{R}^m$. As observed in the discussion preceding lemma 3.2, an SDAE with noisy constraint can be expressed as another SDAE with noiseless constraint. For this reason $\Gamma = 0$ can be considered without loss of generality. Therefore the equation under consideration becomes

$$dx = f(x, u)dt + \sigma(x, u)dW_t, \quad (13a)$$

$$0 = g(x); \quad (13b)$$

with $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, W_t as d-dimensional Wiener process, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^n)$, and $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$.

Definition 5.1. Suppose for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an Ito stochastic process given by $du(t, \omega) = a(x, u)dt + B(x, u)dW_t$ such that the solution of the differential equation

$$d \begin{bmatrix} x \\ u \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(x, u) \\ a(x, u) \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(x, u) \\ B(x, u) \end{bmatrix} dW_t,$$

satisfies $\|g(x(t))\| < \epsilon$. Then for given $\epsilon > 0$, the corresponding stochastic process $(x(t), u(t))$ is said to be an **approximate solution with unit probability** for ϵ .

With this definition, the problem of finding approximate solution boils down to finding $a(x, u)$ and $B(x, u)$ for given $\epsilon > 0$.

Suppose there exists a function $y : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$y(t, u(t)) = x(t).$$

If $a(x, u) = 0$ and $B(x, u) = 0$ then $u(t)$ will be constant $u(t) = u_0 = v$. However, as $y(t, v) = x(t)$, $y(t, v)$ is still stochastic. This means that when $a(x, u) \neq 0$ and $B(x, u) \neq 0$, $y(t, u(t)) = x(t)$ is obtained by composition of the stochastic process $u(t)$ into the stochastic process $y(t, \cdot)$. Finding differential evolution of such composition is not a straight forward application of Ito differentiation. However, *extended Ito formula* from [13] can be used. This results in,

$$\begin{aligned} d(y_i(t, u(t))) &= dM_t^i(u(t)) + [\partial_{v_j} y_i(t, u(t)) a_j(y(t, u(t)), u(t))] dt \\ &+ \left[\frac{1}{2} B_{km}(y(t, u(t)), u(t)) (\partial_{v_j v_k}^2 y_i(t, u(t))) B_{jm}(y(t, u(t)), u(t)) \right] dt \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left(d \left(\frac{\partial M_t^i}{\partial v_l} \right) du_l \right) + [\partial_{v_k} y_i(t, u(t)) B_{kj}(y(t, u(t)), u(t))] dW_t^j; \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $M_t(v) = y(t, v)$ and $dM_t(v) = dy(t, v)$ for some constant $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

As $x(t) = y(t, u(t))$, it can be verified that if

$$\begin{aligned}
M_t^i(v) = y_i(t, v) &= y_i(0, v) + \int_0^t f_i(y(s, v), v) - \partial_{v_j} y_i(s, v) a_j(y(s, v), v) ds \\
&\quad - \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} B_{km}(y(s, v), v) (\partial_{v_j v_k}^2 y_i(s, v)) B_{jm}(y(s, v), v) ds \\
&\quad - \int_0^t \partial_{v_l} \Lambda_{ij}(s, v) B_{lj}(y(s, v), v) ds + \int_0^t \Lambda_{ij}(s, v) dW_s^j,
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where

$$\Lambda_{ij}(t, v) = \sigma_{ij}(y(t, v), v) - \partial_{v_k} y_i(t, v) B_{kj}(y(t, v), v),$$

then

$$y(t, u(t)) = x(t) = x(0) + \int_0^t f ds + \int_0^t \sigma dW_s.$$

Extended Ito formula can be interpreted as the stochastic analogue of the method of characteristics, which is used in Partial Differential Equations (PDEs).

On Ito-differentiating the algebraic equation, keeping v constant,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = g(y(t, v)) &= g(y(0, v)) + \int_0^t \left[(\mathcal{D}g)F + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Lambda^T (\mathcal{D}^2 g) \Lambda) \right] ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t [(\mathcal{D}g)\Lambda] dW_s,
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where

$$F_i = f_i - (\partial_{v_j} y_i) a_j - \frac{1}{2} B_{km} (\partial_{v_j v_k}^2 y_i) B_{jm} - (\partial_{v_l} \Lambda_{ij}) B_{lj}$$

and

$$\Lambda = \sigma - \mathcal{D}_v y B.$$

Let $z_t : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that

$$z_t(v) = g(y(t, v)).$$

Then equation (16) is a stochastic PDE representing the dynamics of $z_t(v) = g(y(t, v))$.

Now, if $z_0(v)$ is chosen such that $\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^m} \|z_0(v)\| < \epsilon$, then a and B can be estimated from equation (16) such that $dz_t(v) = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\implies B &= ((\mathcal{D}g)\mathcal{D}_v y)^{-1} ((\mathcal{D}g)\sigma), \text{ and} \\
a &= ((\mathcal{D}g)\mathcal{D}_v y)^{-1} w;
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where

$$w_i = (\partial_{x_u} g_i)(f_u - 0.5 B_{km} (\partial_{v_j v_k}^2 y_u) B_{jm} - (\partial_{v_l} \Lambda_{uj}) B_{lj}) + 0.5 \Lambda_{kj} (\partial_{x_k x_l}^2 g_i) \Lambda_{lj}$$

and

$$\Lambda = \sigma - \mathcal{D}_v y B.$$

With the estimated a and B , the dynamics of $z_t(v)$ is frozen i.e. $z_0(v) = z_t(v) \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, one can simply talk about the function $z_0(v)$ instead of $z_t(v)$. From equation (16) it is clear that estimation of a and B requires $\mathcal{D}z_0(v)$ to be invertible. Therefore, the number of algebraic variables should be equal to number of algebraic equations, i.e. $m = p$. Now, $\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^m} \|z_0(v)\| < \epsilon \implies \|z_0(u(t))\| < \epsilon \forall t \in I$, where I is the interval of existence for $d(x, u) = (f(x, u), a(x, u))dt + (\sigma(x), B(x, u))dW_t$. Hence, if $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, then $\|z_0(u(t))\| \rightarrow 0 \forall t \in I$. But, from corollary 3.2, $u(t)$ will not be an Ito stochastic process when $\|z_0(u(t))\| = 0$. This can be confirmed from the fact that as

$\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\|\mathcal{D}z_0(v)\| \rightarrow 0 \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and hence B does not exist, which makes the SDE non integrable. So, using an Ito stochastic process we can satisfy the constraint as close as we want, but not exactly. In other words, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a stochastic process, $du = a(x, u)dt + B(x, u)dW_t$ with a and B given by equation (17), such that $\|g(x(t))\| < \epsilon$. Based on this discussion, the method for computation is summarized in algorithm 5.1.

Algorithm 5.1. Reducing high index SDAE to an SDE, whose solution satisfies $\|g(x(t))\| < \epsilon$.

- 1: Given $\epsilon > 0$, choose $y : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|g(y(0, u))\| < \epsilon$ and $(\mathcal{D}g\mathcal{D}_v y)$ is invertible.
 - 2: $B = ((\mathcal{D}g)\mathcal{D}_v y)^{-1}((\mathcal{D}g)\sigma)$
 - 3: $\Lambda = \sigma - \mathcal{D}_v y B$
 - 4: $\chi_i = (\partial_{x_w} g_i)(f_w - 0.5B_{km}(\partial_{v_j v_k}^2 y_w)B_{jm} - (\partial_{v_l} \Lambda_{wj})B_{lj})B_{lj}$
 $+ 0.5\Lambda_{km}(\partial_{x_j x_k}^2 g_i)\Lambda_{jm}$
 - 5: $a = ((\mathcal{D}g)\mathcal{D}_v y)^{-1}\chi$
 - 6: Use Newton's iteration to solve for u_0 in $g(y(0, u_0)) = 0$.
 - 7: $d(x, u) = (f, a)dt + (\sigma, B)dW_t$ is the required SDE with the initial condition $(x(0), u_0)$. Solve it.
-

5.1.1 Example

It is clear from the previous discussion that in case of high index equation, this method gives an SDE whose solution is the approximate solution for the SDAE. However, depending on the original SDE of the SDAE and the choice of the function $y(t, v)$, the SDE obtained from the method may or may not satisfy the growth bound condition for the SDE (refer to [15] for details on growth bound condition of an SDE). In this section we illustrate the method by the following SDAE.

$$dx = (x + x^2 + u)dt + 0.2dB_t, \quad (18a)$$

$$g(x, t) = 2x - x^3 - 0.5\sin(4t) = 0, \quad (18b)$$

where, $g(x, t)$ is the algebraic equation, u is the algebraic variable, B_t is a 1-dimensional Wiener process, and $x(0) = 0$ is the initial condition for the SDE. Figure 5.1.1 shows $x(t)$ v/s t plot for the SDE (18a) and the constraint equation.

The SDAE is a non autonomous high index SDAE. This SDAE can be converted into the following equivalent autonomous SDAE.

$$d \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + x_1^2 + u \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} dW_t, \quad (19a)$$

$$g \left(\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) = 2x_1 - x_1^3 - 0.5\sin(4x_2) = 0, \quad (19b)$$

where W_t is a 2-dimensional Wiener process, and $(x_1(0), x_2(0)) = (0, 0)$ is the initial condition for the SDE.

This gives an autonomous high index SDAE, in which the noise does not admit algebraic variable. So, by definition, the SDAE is an UNSDAE. Now, $Dg(x_1, x_2) = [2 - 3x_1^2 \quad -2\cos(4x_2)]$ and $Img \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$. Clearly, $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$ is not in $ker(\mathcal{D}g(x_1, x_2))$. Hence, from corollary 3.2, there is no Ito stochastic solution for the given UNSDAE.

The first step in algorithm 5.1 is to choose the function $y(0, u)$. If $y(0, u) = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\epsilon}{4\pi} \tan^{-1} u \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ then for any $\epsilon < 1$, $\|g \left(\begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\epsilon}{4\pi} \tan^{-1} u \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right)\| < \epsilon$. Therefore, let $\begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\epsilon}{4\pi} \tan^{-1} u \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$. With this, according to algorithm 5.1, $B = \left[0.2 \left(\frac{\partial y_1}{\partial u} \right)^{-1} \quad 0 \right] = \left[\frac{-0.8\pi(1+u^2)}{\epsilon} \quad 0 \right]$, and

$$a = \left(\frac{\partial y_1}{\partial u} \right)^{-1} \left(f - 0.5B^2 \frac{\partial^2 y_1}{\partial u^2} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial u} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_2}$$




Figure 1: $x(t)$ v/s t plot for the SDE (18a). The white dashed line indicates the algebraic equation (18b) and the colored lines show $x(t)$ v/s t plot for different realizations. The numerical integration was performed using Euler-Maruyama method with time stepping of 10^{-4} .

Therefore,

$$d \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ u \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + x_1^2 + u \\ 1 \\ \left(\frac{\partial y_1}{\partial u}\right)^{-1} \left(f - 0.5B^2 \frac{\partial^2 y_1}{\partial u^2} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1} \frac{\partial y_1}{\partial u}\right)^{-1} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_2} \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{0.8\pi}{\epsilon}(1+u^2) & 0 \end{bmatrix} dW_t \quad (20)$$

is the required SDE with initial condition $(x_1(0), x_2(0), u(0)) = (0, 0, 0)$.

Now the resulting SDE (20) can be easily solved with the given initial condition. Figure 5.1.1 shows x_1 v/s x_2 plot for the SDE (20). The numerical integration is performed using Euler-Maruyama method with time stepping of 10^{-6} . However, this may only give a local solution as the growth bound condition is not checked.

Remark. Appropriately choosing of the function $y(0, v)$ allows us to decide the interval of time upto which the solution is numerically trackable.

5.2 Approximate solution with bounded probability

In this section ideas of stable control of stochastic differential equation, given in [14], are adopted to the SDAE setting. The new method proposed in section 5.1 gives an approximate solution




Figure 2: x_1 v/s x_2 plot for the SDE (20). The white dashed line indicates the algebraic constraint, black dashed lines show the bound on the constraint, and the colored lines show x_1 v/s x_2 plot for different realizations.

such that the constraint is bounded with unit probability. In this section, a method based on stochastic stability is discussed to find an approximate solution such that the probability that the approximate solution violates the constraint bounds is bounded. A comparison between both the techniques can be found in section 5.3. Consider equation (7) with $U = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $V = \mathbb{R}^m$.

Definition 5.2. A high index SDAE is said to have an **m-solution** if there exists $(x(t), u(t)) \in U \times V$ such that $\mathbb{E}(g(x(t))) = 0$.

Definition 5.3. Let $\lambda(t) = g(x(t)) + \int_0^t \Gamma(x(s))dW_s$. By **bounded m-solution** it is meant that there exists an m-solution $(x(t), u(t)) \in U \times V$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\|\lambda(t)\| > \epsilon) \leq \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

Proposition 5.1. Consider high index SDAE (7) such that $f(x, u)$, $\sigma(x, u)$ and $\Gamma(x)$ are \mathcal{C}^1 , $g(x)$ is \mathcal{C}^3 . For some $u_0 \in V$ and $x_0 \in U$, $h(x_0, u_0) = 0$ and $\mathcal{D}_u h(x_0, u_0)$ is an isomorphism, where $h : U \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $h(x, u) = (\mathcal{D}_x(g)(x))f(x, u) + 0.5Tr(\sigma^T(x, u)(\mathcal{D}_{x,x}^2(g)(x))\sigma(x, u))$. Then there exists a local m-solution for the SDAE.

Proof. Let $\lambda(t) = g(x(t)) + \int_0^t \Gamma(x_s)dW_s$. Ito differentiation of the algebraic equation gives, $d\lambda = h(x, u)dt + (\mathcal{D}_x g(x)\sigma(x, u) + \Gamma(x))dW_t$. $\|h(x_0, u_0)\| = 0$ and hence locally bounded. Therefore, using Fubini's theorem, $d\mathbb{E}(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}(h(x, u))dt$. Since, $h(x, u)$ is \mathcal{C}^1 , if $h(x_0, u_0) = 0$ and $\mathcal{D}_u h(x_0, u_0)$ is an isomorphism, then implicit function theorem completes the proof. \square

Even if an m-solution can be obtained, it remains to be checked if it is a bounded m-solution.

Proposition 5.2. If there exists an m-solution, there also exist a bounded m-solution.

Proof. The proof is based on the conventional proof for stability of SDEs.

Following the proof of existence of m-solution, as $h(x, u)$ is \mathcal{C}^1 and $\mathcal{D}_u h(x_0, u_0)$ is an isomorphism, by implicit function theorem there exists $k(x, w)$ such that $h(x, k(x, w)) = w$. With $u_t = k(x(t), -b\lambda(t))$, $d\lambda = -b\lambda dt + (\mathcal{D}_x g(x)\sigma(x, u) + \Gamma(x))dW_t$.
 $\implies d(\lambda^T \lambda) = (-2b(\lambda^T \lambda) + \text{Tr}(AA^T))dt + 2\lambda^T A dW_t$, where $A = (\mathcal{D}_x g\sigma + \Gamma)$. By Fubini's theorem, $d\mathbb{E}(\lambda^T \lambda) = (-2b\mathbb{E}(\lambda^T \lambda) + \mathbb{E}(\text{Tr}(AA^T)))dt$. Hence, $\mathbb{E}(\lambda^T(t)\lambda(t)) \leq J(1 - e^{-2bt})/2b$, where $J = \sup_{x \in U} \{\text{Tr}(AA^T)\}$.

By Chebyshev's inequality, for some $\epsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(\|\lambda(t)\| > \epsilon) = \mathbb{P}(\lambda^T(t)\lambda(t) > \epsilon^2) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\lambda^T(t)\lambda(t))}{\epsilon^2} \leq \frac{J(1 - e^{-2bt})}{2b\epsilon^2} \leq J/2b\epsilon^2$. Therefore, if $b = \frac{J}{2\epsilon^2\alpha}$, then $\mathbb{P}(\|\lambda(t)\| > \epsilon) \leq \alpha$ i.e. given $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\epsilon > 0 \exists b > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\|\lambda(t)\| > \epsilon) \leq \alpha$. \square

Remark. As $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, $b \rightarrow \infty$. This indicates that it is not possible to eliminate noise by controlling the drift term. Similarly, if $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ then $b \rightarrow \infty$. This confirms the fact that in case of ill-posed equations, there is no path-wise solution.

Proof of proposition 5.2 relies on implicit function theorem. Hence, numerical computation of bounded m-solution will involve the Newton's method of root finding. However, performing newton's iteration at each time step can be computationally inefficient. If a high index SDAE can be reduced to an SDAE of index 1 such that the solution of the two SDAEs agree approximately, then the method of lemma 2.1 can be used (provided required conditions of the lemma are satisfied). Algorithm 5.2 combines this idea with proposition 5.2, and gives the steps to reduce a given UNSDAE to an index 1 SDAE.

Algorithm 5.2. Computing bounded m-solution.

-
- 1: $A(x) = (\mathcal{D}g(x))\sigma(x)$
 - 2: $J = \sup_{x \in U} \{\text{Tr}(A(x)A^T(x))\}$
 - 3: Choose $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $b > \frac{J}{2\epsilon^2\alpha}$.
 - 4: $h(x, u) = (\mathcal{D}g(x))f(x, u) + \frac{\text{Tr}}{2}(\sigma^T(x)(\mathcal{D}^2g(x))\sigma(x)) + b(g(x))$
 - 5: The given SDE and $h(x, u) = 0$ make a new index 1 SDAE. Solve the new SDAE using Lemma 2.1.
-

5.2.1 Example

Consider the same SDAE (19) from the previous example. The goal is to construct an SDE that has a bounded m-solution such that $\mathbb{P}(\|g(x(t))\| > \epsilon) \leq \alpha$. Suppose $\alpha = 0.8$ and $\epsilon = 0.5$. In step 2 of the algorithm 5.2 $J = \sup_{x \in U} \{\text{Tr}(A(x)A^T(x))\}$, where U is the neighbourhood of the initial condition. In the current example, let $U = (-2, 2) \times (-5, 5)$. Hence, $J = \sup_{x \in U} \{0.04(2 - 3x_1^2)^2\} = 4$, and $b > 10$. Let $b = 11$.

The new index 1 SDAE that gives a bounded m-solution for the given SDAE is

$$d \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + x_1^2 + u \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} dW_t, \quad (21a)$$

$$h(x, u) = (\mathcal{D}g(x))f(x, u) + \frac{\text{Tr}}{2}(\sigma^T(x)(\mathcal{D}^2g(x))\sigma(x)) + b(g(x)) \\ = -2\cos(4x_2) + (2 - 3x_1^2)(x_1 + x_1^2 + u) - 0.12x_1 + 11g(x_1, x_2) = 0 \quad (21b)$$

Now either lemma (2.1) can be used to arrive at an SDE for the SDAE or Newton's iteration can be used at every time step to solve the constraint for u . However, in the current example, u can be trivially obtained from the algebraic equation $h(x, u) = 0$.

$$u = (2\cos(4x_2) - 11g(x) + 0.12x_1 - (2 - 3x_1^2)(x_1 + x_1^2))/(2 - 3x_1^2),$$




Figure 3: x_1 v/s x_2 plot for a bounded m-solution of SDAE 19. The white dashed line indicates the algebraic equation and the colored lines show x_1 v/s x_2 plot for different realizations.

as long as $x_1 \neq \pm\sqrt{2/3}$.

Figure 5.2.1 shows the x_1 v/s x_2 plot for a bounded m-solution of SDAE 19. The numerical integration is performed using Euler-Maruyama method with time stepping of 10^{-4} .

5.3 Comparison of the approximate techniques

The advantage of the first method given in section 5.1 is that the constraint bound is satisfied with probability 1. Qualitatively, the first method works by converting the given SDAE into a stochastic partial differential equation using the method of characteristic. Then the function for the state vector is chosen such that the stochastic partial differential equation for the constraint has a bounded solution. The algebraic variable is found by freezing the dynamics of the constraint stochastic partial differential equation. When the stochastic partial differential equation is converted back to the SDE, it is expected that the constraint bound is still respected. However, this fails to happen when if there is a finite time explosion of the resulting SDE for the algebraic equation. Upto a certain extent, the finite time explosion can be controlled by an appropriate choice of the function $y(0, u)$. Investigation on the choice of the function is a subject of further research.

On the other hand, the second technique given in section 5.2 gives a minimum probability (but not unit probability) with which the constraint bound is satisfied. However, numerical implementation seems simpler due of fewer terms than that in method 1.

Choice between the two techniques should be made on the basis of the criticality of the application.

6 Concluding remarks

In this article we have attempted to generalize the notion of index from the theory of Differential-Algebraic Equations to the stochastic setting. In this process, it was observed that a large class of high index problems can not be solved using the conventional ideas from DAEs. Hence, to address the solvability questions for a given Stochastic Differential equation, we found the sufficient condition for existence of unique solution, and from the geometric picture of the problem necessary condition for existence of a solution was derived. The sufficient condition for existence and uniqueness works for SDAEs that has same number of algebraic equations as that of algebraic variables. Though the proposition does not give any specific method to compute the solution, as the proof is based on contraction mapping theorem, it is possible to use Picard-type iterations to find a unique solution. In particular, when the constraint $g(x, u)$ is only \mathcal{C}^1 then Picard-type iteration can be useful.

It is observed that not all types of high Index SDAEs can be solved. In particular, existence of ill-posed equations pose a challenge. Hence, there can be no general method to solve all types of high index equations. As it is common to encounter ill-posed SDAEs in many applications, techniques to find approximate solution for all high index SDAEs are necessary. Therefore, we proposed two different methods that can be used to solve (approximately) any type of high index equation (including deterministic DAEs, in which the noise terms can be simply considered zero). With this we conclude our work.

Although we have tried to give methods to compute exact/approximate solution for high index equations, it remains a challenge to find an exact solution for all types of high index equations that are not ill-posed. For ill-posed equations, the technique presented in section 5.1 shows some promise.

Acknowledgement

This work was partially supported by the grant SERB-EMR/2016/002022-EEC of Science and Engineering Research Board, Government of India.

References

- [1] Uri M Ascher and Linda R Petzold. *Computer methods for ordinary differential equations and differential-algebraic equations*, volume 61. SIAM, 1998.
- [2] Steven F Ashby, Steven L Lee, Linda R Petzold, Paul E Saylor, and EDWARD Seidel. Computing spacetime curvature via differential algebraic equations. *Applied numerical mathematics*, 20(1-2):221–234, 1996.
- [3] Kathryn Eleda Brenan, Stephen L Campbell, and Linda Ruth Petzold. *Numerical solution of initial-value problems in differential-algebraic equations*. SIAM, 1995.
- [4] Stephen L Campbell and Eberhard Griepentrog. Solvability of general differential algebraic equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 16(2):257–270, 1995.
- [5] Nguyen Dinh Cong and Nguyen Thi The. Stochastic differential-algebraic equations of index. *Vietnam Journal of Mathematics*, 38(1):117–131, 2010.
- [6] Nguyen Dinh Cong and NGUYEN THI THE. Lyapunov spectrum of nonautonomous linear stochastic differential algebraic equations of index-1. *Stochastics and Dynamics*, 12(04):1250002, 2012.
- [7] B Fox, LS Jennings, and AY Zomaya. Numerical computation of differential-algebraic equations for the approximation of artificial satellite trajectories and planetary ephemerides. *J. Appl. Mech.*, 67(3):574–580, 2000.

- [8] Idoia Cortes Garcia, Sebastian Schöps, Herbert De Gersem, and Sascha Baumanns. Systems of differential algebraic equations in computational electromagnetics. In *Applications of Differential-Algebraic Equations: Examples and Benchmarks*, pages 123–169. Springer, 2018.
- [9] Qiao Huang and Debangsu Bhattacharyya. Optimal sensor network design for multi-scale, time-varying differential algebraic equation systems: Application to an entrained-flow gasifier refractory brick. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, 141:106985, 2020.
- [10] Yushan Jiang, Qingling Zhang, and Haiyan Wang. Modeling boyciana–fish–human interaction with partial differential algebraic equations. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 277:141–152, 2016.
- [11] Hariharan Krishnan and N Harris McClamroch. Tracking in nonlinear differential-algebraic control systems with applications to constrained robot systems. *Automatica*, 30(12):1885–1897, 1994.
- [12] Aditya Kumar and Prodromos Daoutidis. Feedback control of nonlinear differential-algebraic-equation systems. *AIChE Journal*, 41(3):619–636, 1995.
- [13] Hiroshi Kunita. Some extensions of ito’s formula. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XV 1979/80*, pages 118–141. Springer, 1981.
- [14] Harold Kushner. *Stochastic Stability and Control*. ISSN. Elsevier Science, 1967.
- [15] Bernt Øksendal. Stochastic differential equations. In *Stochastic differential equations*, pages 65–84. Springer, 2003.
- [16] Christian Penski. Analysis and numerical integration of stochastic differential-algebraic equations and applications in electronic circuit simulation. *Preprint TUM-M9907, Technische Universität, München*, 1999.
- [17] Linda Petzold. Differential/algebraic equations are not ode’s. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 3(3):367–384, 1982.
- [18] Sebastian Reich. On a geometrical interpretation of differential-algebraic equations. *Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, 9(4):367–382, 1990.
- [19] Werner C Rheinboldt. Differential-algebraic systems as differential equations on manifolds. *Mathematics of computation*, 43(168):473–482, 1984.
- [20] Johannes Schiffer and Florian Dörfler. On stability of a distributed averaging pi frequency and active power controlled differential-algebraic power system model. In *2016 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 1487–1492. IEEE, 2016.
- [21] Thorsten Sickenberger and Renate Winkler. Efficient transient noise analysis in circuit simulation. In *PAMM: Proceedings in Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, volume 6, pages 55–58. Wiley Online Library, 2006.
- [22] Andrew Storm. Stochastic differential equations with a convex constraint. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 53(3-4):241–274, 1995.
- [23] Wanda Strychalski, David Adalsteinsson, and Timothy C Elston. Simulating biochemical signaling networks in complex moving geometries. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 32(5):3039–3070, 2010.
- [24] T Uppal, S Raha, and S Srivastava. Trajectory feasibility evaluation using path prescribed control of unmanned aerial vehicle in differential algebraic equations framework. *The Aeronautical Journal*, 121(1240):770, 2017.
- [25] Wolfgang Wiechert, Stephan Noack, and Atya Elsheikh. Modeling languages for biochemical network simulation: Reaction vs equation based approaches. In *Biosystems Engineering II*, pages 109–138. Springer, 2009.

- [26] Renate Winkler. Stochastic differential algebraic equations of index 1 and applications in circuit simulation. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, 157(2):477–505, 2003.
- [27] Renate Winkler. Stochastic differential algebraic equations in transient noise analysis. In *Scientific computing in electrical engineering*, pages 151–156. Springer, 2006.
- [28] Qingling Zhang and Shuangyun Xing. Stability analysis and optimal control of stochastic singular systems. *Optimization letters*, 8(6):1905–1920, 2014.