

CONTROL SETS FOR AFFINE SYSTEMS, SPECTRAL PROPERTIES AND PROJECTIVE SPACES

FRITZ COLONIUS
 INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT AUGSBURG, AUGSBURG, GERMANY
 AND ALEXANDRE J. SANTANA AND JULIANA SETTI
 DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE MARINGÁ
 MARINGÁ, BRAZIL

January 14, 2022

Abstract: For affine control systems with bounded control range the control sets, i.e., the maximal subsets of complete approximate controllability, are studied using spectral properties. For hyperbolic systems there is a unique control set with nonvoid interior and it is bounded. For nonhyperbolic systems, these control sets are unbounded. In an appropriate compactification of the state space there is a unique chain control set and the relations to the homogenous part of the control system are worked out.

Key words. affine control systems, control sets, boundary at infinity

AMS subject classification. 93B05, 34H05

1. Introduction. We study controllability properties for affine control systems of the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t)(B_i x(t) + c_i) + d, \quad u(t) \in \Omega, \quad (1.1)$$

where $A, B_1, \dots, B_m \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and c_1, \dots, c_m, d are vectors in \mathbb{R}^n . The controls $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ have values in a bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. The set of admissible controls is $\mathcal{U} = \{u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m) \mid u(t) \in \Omega \text{ for almost all } t\}$ or the set \mathcal{U}_{pc} of all piecewise constant functions defined on \mathbb{R} with values in Ω . We also write (1.1) as

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(u(t))x(t) + Cu(t) + d, \quad u(t) \in \Omega,$$

with $A(u) := A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i B_i$, $u \in \Omega$, and $C := (c_1, \dots, c_m)$.

Controllability properties of bilinear and affine systems have been studied since more than fifty years. Early contributions are due to Rink and Mohler [21] who took the set of equilibria as a starting point for establishing results on complete controllability. On the other hand, Lie-algebraic methods have yielded important insights. A classical result due to Jurdjevic and Sallet [16, Theorem 2] shows that affine system (1.1) is controllable on \mathbb{R}^n if it has no fixed points and its homogeneous part, the bilinear system

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(u(t))x(t), \quad u(t) \in \Omega, \quad (1.2)$$

is controllable on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Only the first condition is necessary, certainly it is not sufficient. Initially, bilinear control systems were considered as “nearly linear” (cf. Bruni, Di Pillo, and Koch [3] containing also many early references). However it turned out that characterizing controllability of such systems (even with unrestricted controls) is a very difficult problem. As Jurdjevic [15, p.182] emphasizes, the controllability properties of affine systems are substantially richer and may require “entirely different geometrical considerations” (based on Lie-algebraic methods). There is a substantial literature on controllability properties of bilinear and affine control systems. Here we

only refer to the monographs Mohler [18], Elliott [12], and Jurdjevic [15]. Further references are also included in [8] where we analyze controllability properties near equilibria.

The present paper concentrates on control sets, i.e., maximal subsets of approximate controllability; cf. Definition 2.1 (another relaxation of complete controllability is the notion of “near controllability” for discrete-time bilinear control systems studied by Nie [19]). The key to our analysis are properties of the interior of the system semigroup and spectral properties of the homogeneous part (1.2). In the hyperbolic case (cf. Definition 5.1) Theorem 5.4 shows that an affine control system has a unique control set D with nonvoid interior. In the uniformly hyperbolic case (cf. Definition 5.5) Theorems 5.7 and 5.8 show that D is bounded and the closure of D is the unique bounded chain control set (here small jumps in the trajectories are allowed; cf. Definition 2.4). Hence these systems enjoy similar controllability properties as linear control systems of the form $\dot{x} = Ax + Bu$ with hyperbolic matrix A (i.e., A has no eigenvalues on the imaginary axis), controllable pair (A, B) , and compact and convex control range Ω containing 0; cf. Colonius and Kliemann [6, Example 3.2.16]. We remark that, in another direction, control sets of linear control systems on Lie groups have been studied by Da Silva [10] and Ayala and Da Silva [1].

Nonhyperbolic affine systems may possess several control sets with nonvoid interior. By Theorem 7.1 each of them is unbounded. The proof takes up ideas from Rink and Mohler [21], replacing the set of equilibria by the set of periodic solutions. Then we compactify the state space using an embedding into projective space \mathbb{P}^n . This is in line with the study of the behavior at infinity for ordinary differential equations based on the Poincaré sphere; cf. Perko [20, Section 3.10]. Theorems 7.5 and Theorem 7.8 show that for a control set with nonvoid interior the “boundary at infinity” (cf. Definition 6.3) intersects a chain control set of the projectivized homogeneous part. Already the special case of linear control systems discussed in the beginning of Section 7 shows that here chain transitivity (a classical notion in the theory of dynamical systems; cf. Robinson [22]) plays an important role. An example of an affine system is provided where more than one chain control set of the homogeneous part is contained in the boundary at infinity of a control set. We emphasize that the boundary at infinity concerns the *lines* which are obtained in the limit for large states. Hence one may expect that one obtains relations to the chain control sets of the homogeneous part in projective space \mathbb{P}^{n-1} , not primarily in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. The main result on the nonhyperbolic case is Theorem 7.13 showing that there is a single chain control set in \mathbb{P}^n containing the images of all control sets D with nonvoid interior in \mathbb{R}^n . The boundary at infinity of this chain control set contains all chain control sets of the homogeneous part having nonvoid intersection with the boundary at infinity of one of the control sets D . These results cast new light on the relations between affine systems and their homogeneous parts and are intuitively appealing, since one may expect that for unbounded x -values the inhomogeneous part $Cu(t) + d$ becomes less relevant (recall that we assume that Ω is bounded).

The contents of the present paper are as follows. In Section 2 we first recall some notation and general properties of nonlinear control systems and cite results on spectral properties and controllability for homogeneous bilinear control systems. Furthermore, we state some classical properties of periodic solutions for inhomogeneous linear differential equations. Section 3 analyzes the interior of system semigroups, and Section 4 applies this to affine control systems and their homogeneous parts. Section 5 shows that for hyperbolic systems a unique control set exists and it is bounded. Sec-

tion 6 prepares the discussion of nonhyperbolic systems by describing the embedding of affine control systems into homogeneous bilinear systems and associated systems in projective spaces. Finally, Section 7 describes the control sets and their boundaries at infinity for nonhyperbolic affine systems.

Notation. The set of eigenvalues of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is $\text{spec}(A)$ and the real eigenspace for an eigenvalue μ is $\mathbf{E}(A; \mu)$. In a metric space X with distance d the distance of $x \in X$ to a nonvoid subset $A \subset X$ is $d(x, A) = \inf\{d(x, a) \mid a \in A\}$.

2. Preliminaries. In Subsection 2.1 notation and some basic properties of control systems are recalled. Subsection 2.2 cites results on control sets for homogeneous bilinear control systems and Subsection 2.3 characterizes the existence and uniqueness of periodic solutions of inhomogeneous periodic linear differential equations.

2.1. Basic properties of nonlinear control systems. In this subsection we introduce some terminology and notation for control-affine systems including control sets and chain control sets.

We will consider control-affine systems on a smooth (C^∞ -)manifold M of the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = f_0(x(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t) f_i(x(t)), \quad u \in \mathcal{U} \text{ or } u \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}, \quad (2.1)$$

where f_0, f_1, \dots, f_m are smooth vector fields on M and the control range $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is compact with $0 \in \Omega$. We assume that for every initial state $x \in M$ and every control function $u \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists a unique solution $\varphi(t, x, u), t \in \mathbb{R}$, with $\varphi(0, x, u) = x$ of (2.1) depending continuously on x . For the general theory of nonlinear control systems we refer to Sontag [23] and Jurdjevic [15].

The set of points reachable from $x \in M$ and controllable to $x \in M$ up to time $T > 0$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\leq T}^+(x) &:= \{y \in M \mid \text{there are } 0 \leq t \leq T \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{U} \text{ with } y = \varphi(t, x, u)\}, \\ \mathcal{O}_{\leq T}^-(x) &:= \{y \in M \mid \text{there are } 0 \leq t \leq T \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{U} \text{ with } x = \varphi(t, y, u)\}, \end{aligned}$$

resp. Furthermore, the reachable set (or “positive orbit”) from x and the set controllable to x (or “negative orbit” of x) are

$$\mathcal{O}^+(x) = \bigcup_{T>0} \mathcal{O}_{\leq T}^+(x), \quad \mathcal{O}^-(x) = \bigcup_{T>0} \mathcal{O}_{\leq T}^-(x),$$

resp. The system is called locally accessible in x , if $\mathcal{O}_{\leq T}^+(x)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\leq T}^-(x)$ have nonvoid interior for all $T > 0$ and the system is called locally accessible if this holds in every point $x \in M$. This is guaranteed by the following accessibility rank condition

$$\dim \mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}\{f_0, f_1, \dots, f_m\}(x) = \dim M \text{ for all } x \in M; \quad (2.2)$$

here $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}\{f_0, f_1, \dots, f_m\}(x)$ is the subspace of the tangent space $T_x M$ corresponding to the vector fields, evaluated in x , in the Lie algebra generated by f_0, f_1, \dots, f_m . For analytic systems on an analytic manifold this condition is also necessary for local accessibility.

The trajectories for the convex hull of Ω can be uniformly approximated on bounded intervals by the trajectories for Ω . Furthermore, trajectories for controls in \mathcal{U} can be uniformly approximated on bounded intervals by trajectories for piecewise constant controls in \mathcal{U}_{pc} .

The following definition introduces subsets of complete approximate controllability which are of primary interest in the present paper.

DEFINITION 2.1. A nonvoid set $D \subset M$ is called a control set of system (2.1) if it has the following properties: (i) for all $x \in D$ there is a control function $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\varphi(t, x, u) \in D$ for all $t \geq 0$, (ii) for all $x \in D$ one has $D \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)}$, and (iii) D is maximal with these properties, that is, if $D' \supset D$ satisfies conditions (i) and (ii), then $D' = D$.

A control set $D \subset M$ is called an invariant control set if $\overline{D} = \overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)}$ for all $x \in D$. All other control sets are called variant.

If the intersection of two control sets is nonvoid, the maximality property (iii) implies that they coincide. If the system is locally accessible in all $x \in \text{int}(D)$, then $\text{int}(D) \subset \mathcal{O}^+(x)$ for all $x \in D$ and $D = \mathcal{O}^-(x) \cap \overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)}$ for every $x \in \text{int}(D)$, and the control sets with nonvoid interior for controls in \mathcal{U} coincide with those defined analogously for piecewise constant controls in \mathcal{U}_{pc} .

LEMMA 2.2. Suppose that the system is locally accessible, and there is $x \in \text{int}(\mathcal{O}^-(x)) \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{O}^+(x))$. Then $x \in \text{int}(D)$ where $D := \mathcal{O}^-(x) \cap \overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)}$ is a control set.

Proof. By the assumption, there is a neighborhood N of x such that one can steer any point in N to any other point in N . Hence one finds that every point in N satisfies property (ii) of control sets. Using local accessibility, one concludes that also every point in $\mathcal{O}^-(x) \cap \overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)}$ satisfies property (ii), and property (i). The maximality property (iii) obviously holds. \square

Next we introduce a notion of controllability allowing for (small) jumps between pieces of trajectories. Here we fix a metric d on M .

DEFINITION 2.3. Fix $x, y \in M$ and let $\varepsilon, T > 0$. A controlled (ε, T) -chain ζ from x to y is given by $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_0, \dots, x_n \in M$, $u_0, \dots, u_{n-1} \in \mathcal{U}$, and $t_0, \dots, t_{n-1} \geq T$ with $x_0 = x$, $x_n = y$, and

$$d(\varphi(t_j, x_j, u_j), x_{j+1}) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } j = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

If for every $\varepsilon, T > 0$ there is a controlled (ε, T) -chain from x to y , then the point x is chain controllable to y .

The concatenation of two controlled (ε, T) -chains again yields a controlled (ε, T) -chain. In analogy to control sets, chain control sets are defined as maximal regions of chain controllability.

DEFINITION 2.4. A nonvoid set $E \subset M$ is called a chain control set of system (2.1) if (i) for all $x \in E$ there is $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\varphi(t, x, u) \in E$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, (ii) for all $x, y \in E$ and $\varepsilon, T > 0$ there is a controlled (ε, T) -chain from x to y , and (iii) E is maximal (with respect to set inclusion) with these properties.

Obviously, every equilibrium and every periodic trajectory is contained in a chain control set. Chain control sets are closed and for locally accessible systems every control set with nonvoid interior is contained in a chain control set. For the properties of control sets and chain control sets stated above, we refer to Colonius and Kliemann [6, Chapters 3 and 4]. In particular, by [6, Theorem 4.7.5] the “ ρ -inner-pair condition” guarantees that chain control sets coincide with the closures of control sets with nonvoid interior; cf. also Remark 2.8 for the special case of bilinear control systems. Hyperbolicity conditions for the associated control flow yield a similar result based on a shadowing lemma; cf. Colonius and Du [5]. Da Silva and Kawan [11] also exploit hyperbolicity conditions for chain control sets.

A compact subset K of a continuous dynamical system $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times M \rightarrow M$ on a metric space M is called chain transitive, if for all $x, y \in K$ and all $\varepsilon, T > 0$ there

is an (ε, T) -chain from x to y given by $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_0 = x, x_1, \dots, x_n = y \in M$, and $t_0, \dots, t_{n-1} \geq T$ with

$$d(\psi(t_j, x_j), x_{j+1}) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } j = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

For a compact and convex control range Ω , a control system of the form (2.1) defines a continuous dynamical system, the control flow, given by $\Psi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{U} \times M \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \times M$, $(t, u, x) \mapsto (u(t + \cdot), \varphi(t, x, u))$ where $u(t + \cdot)(s) := u(t + s)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{U} \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is considered in a metric for the weak* topology. Then \mathcal{U} is compact and by [6, Theorem 4.3.11] a compact chain control set E gives rise to a maximal chain transitive set \mathcal{E} of the flow Ψ via

$$\mathcal{E} = \{(u, x) \in \mathcal{U} \times E \mid \varphi(t, x, u) \in E \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (2.3)$$

2.2. Control sets for homogeneous bilinear systems. In this subsection we cite several results on control sets and chain control sets for homogeneous bilinear control systems of the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(u(t))x(t), \quad u(t) \in \Omega, \text{ with } A(u) := A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i B_i, u \in \Omega, \quad (2.4)$$

where $A, B_1, \dots, B_m \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and the controls $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ have values in a compact convex neighborhood Ω of the origin in \mathbb{R}^m . The solutions are denoted by $\varphi_{\text{hom}}(t, x, u)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

By homogeneity a system of the form (2.4) induces control systems on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and on projective space \mathbb{P}^{n-1} . The projections to the unit sphere and projective space are denoted by $\pi_{\mathbb{S}}$ and $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}$, resp. Hence, for a trajectory of (2.4) one has $\pi_{\mathbb{S}}(x(t)) = \frac{x(t)}{\|x(t)\|}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The vector fields of the system on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} are obtained by subtracting the radial component and the points on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} are obtained by identifying opposite points on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} .

The following definitions introduce several spectral concepts. The Lyapunov exponent for $(u, x) \in \mathcal{U} \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ is

$$\lambda(u, x) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\varphi_{\text{hom}}(t, x, u)\|.$$

DEFINITION 2.5. (i) *The Floquet spectrum of a control set $_{\mathbb{S}}D$ on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} is*

$$\Sigma_{Fl}({}_{\mathbb{S}}D) = \{\lambda(u, x) \mid \pi_{\mathbb{S}}x \in \text{int}({}_{\mathbb{S}}D), u \in \mathcal{U}_{pc} \text{ } \tau\text{-periodic with } \pi_{\mathbb{S}}\varphi_{\text{hom}}(\tau, x, u) = \pi_{\mathbb{S}}x\}.$$

(ii) *The Floquet spectrum of a control set $_{\mathbb{P}}D$ on projective space \mathbb{P}^{n-1} is*

$$\Sigma_{Fl}({}_{\mathbb{P}}D) = \{\lambda(u, x) \mid \pi_{\mathbb{P}}x \in \text{int}({}_{\mathbb{P}}D), u \in \mathcal{U}_{pc} \text{ } \tau\text{-periodic with } \pi_{\mathbb{P}}\varphi_{\text{hom}}(\tau, x, u) = \pi_{\mathbb{P}}x\}.$$

(iii) *The Lyapunov spectrum of a control set $_{\mathbb{P}}D$ on projective space \mathbb{P}^{n-1} is*

$$\Sigma_{Ly}({}_{\mathbb{P}}D) = \{\lambda(u, x) \mid \pi_{\mathbb{P}}\varphi(t, x, u) \in \overline{{}_{\mathbb{P}}D} \text{ for all } t \geq 0\}.$$

REMARK 2.6. *The Floquet spectrum can be characterized using the system semigroups $_{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{S}^{\text{hom}}$ and $_{\mathbb{P}}\mathcal{S}^{\text{hom}}$ of the systems on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} , resp. (cf. Section 4 for the definition of system semigroups). Suppose that the accessibility rank condition*

in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} holds. Colonius and Kliemann [6, Corollary 7.3.18] implies that the Floquet spectrum of a control set $\mathbb{P}D$ consists of the numbers $\frac{1}{\tau} \log |\rho|$ where ρ is a real eigenvalue of an element $\Phi_u(\tau, 0) \in \mathbb{R}\mathcal{S}_\tau^{\text{hom}}$ with eigenspace $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); \rho)) \subset \text{int}(\mathbb{P}D)$ and such that $\Phi_u(\tau, 0)$ induces an element of the system semigroup in $\text{int}(\mathbb{P}\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau+1}^{\text{hom}})$.

For the following results on control sets for the homogeneous system (2.4) cf. Colonius and Kliemann [6, Theorem 7.1.1 and Corollary 12.2.6] and Colonius, Santana, and Setti [8, Theorem 3.15].

THEOREM 2.7. *Consider the systems on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and on projective space \mathbb{P}^{n-1} obtained by projection of the homogeneous bilinear control system (2.4). Assume that the accessibility rank condition on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} is satisfied.*

(i) *There are $1 \leq k_0 \leq n$ control sets $\mathbb{P}D_j$ with nonvoid interior in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} and exactly one of these control sets is an invariant control set.*

(ii) *There are $1 \leq k_1 \leq 2k_0$ control sets $\mathbb{S}D_i$ on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . In each case, one or two of the control sets $\mathbb{S}D_i$ on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} project to a single control set $\mathbb{P}D_j$ in projective space and then $\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{S}D_i) = \Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{P}D_j)$.*

(iii) *If 0 is in the interior of the Floquet spectrum $\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{S}D_i)$ the cone*

$$\mathbb{R}D_i = \{\alpha x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \alpha > 0 \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{S}D_i\}$$

generated by $\mathbb{S}D_i$ is a control set with nonvoid interior in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. At most two of the $\mathbb{R}D_i$ are invariant control sets.

REMARK 2.8. *We refer to Colonius and Kliemann [6] for a discussion when the closure of the Floquet spectrum $\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{P}D)$ coincides with the Lyapunov spectrum $\Sigma_{Ly}(\mathbb{P}D)$. For dimension $n = 2$, this is clarified in [6, Theorem 10.1.1]. For general $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let the control range be given by $\rho \cdot \Omega$, $\rho > 0$, and denote the corresponding sets of controls by \mathcal{U}^ρ . Suppose that the following “ ρ -inner-pair condition” holds:*

For all $\rho' > \rho$ and every $(u, x) \in \mathcal{U}^\rho \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ there is $t > 0$ such that $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\varphi(t, x, u)$ is in the reachable set in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} for controls in $\mathcal{U}^{\rho'}$. Then [6, Theorem 7.1.6] shows that, for all $\rho \in (0, \infty)$ except for at most finitely many ρ , all control sets $\mathbb{P}D^\rho$ of the system with control range $\rho \cdot \Omega$ satisfy $\overline{\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{P}D^\rho)} = \Sigma_{Ly}(\mathbb{P}D^\rho)$.

We turn to the chain control sets in projective space. By [6, Theorem 7.1.2] every chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_j$ contains a control set $\mathbb{P}D_i$ with nonvoid interior, hence the number l of chain control sets satisfies $1 \leq l \leq k_0$. Furthermore, [6, Theorem 7.3.16] shows that for every chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_j$ in \mathbb{P}^{n-1}

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \neq 0 \text{ implies } \pi_{\mathbb{P}}\varphi_{\text{hom}}(t, x, u) \in \mathbb{P}E_j \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

is a linear subspace and its dimension is independent of $u \in \mathcal{U}$. Consider, for a chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_j$, the control sets $\mathbb{P}D_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}D_{i_j}$ with nonvoid interior contained in $\mathbb{P}E_j$. By [6, Theorem 7.3.16] one finds, for every $x \in \pi_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}(\mathbb{P}E_j)$, points $x^i \in \pi_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}(\overline{\mathbb{P}D_i})$ and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$x = \alpha_1 x^1 + \dots + \alpha_{i_j} x^{i_j}. \quad (2.5)$$

By (2.3) the chain control sets $\mathbb{P}E_j$ uniquely correspond to the maximal chain transitive subsets $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{E}_j$ of the control flow on $\mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ via

$$\mathbb{P}\mathcal{E}_j := \{(u, \pi_{\mathbb{P}}x) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1} \mid \pi_{\mathbb{P}}\varphi(t, x, u) \in \mathbb{P}E_j \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (2.6)$$

2.3. Periodic solutions. We recall some basic facts on periodic solutions of inhomogeneous periodic differential equations. Consider

$$\dot{x}(t) = P(t)x(t) + z(t), \quad (2.7)$$

where $P(\cdot) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ and $0 \neq z(\cdot) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ are τ -periodic, i.e., $P(t + \tau) = P(t)$ and $z(t + \tau) = z(t)$ for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

The principal fundamental solution $\Phi(t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$, is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(t, s) = P(t)\Phi(t, s) \text{ with } \Phi(s, s) = I.$$

It satisfies $\Phi(t, r) = \Phi(t, s)\Phi(s, r)$ for $t, s, r \in \mathbb{R}$. The homogeneous equation with $z(t) \equiv 0$ has (non-unique) τ -periodic solutions if and only if 1 is an eigenvalue of $\Phi(\tau, 0)$. Denote the solutions of the homogeneous equation by $\psi(t, x^0)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, with $\psi(0, x^0) = x^0$. The numbers

$$\lambda_j := \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\psi(t, x^0)\| \text{ for } x^0 \neq 0, \quad (2.8)$$

are the Floquet exponents. The Floquet multipliers $\rho_j \in \mathbb{C}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, are the eigenvalues of $\Phi(\tau, 0)$ and the Floquet exponents satisfy $\lambda_j = \frac{1}{\tau} \log |\rho_j|$; cf. Chicone [4, Proposition 2.61], Colonius and Kliemann [7, Theorem 7.2.9]. In particular, 0 is a Floquet exponent if 1 is a Floquet multiplier.

We also refer to Chicone [4, Section 2.4] and Teschl [24, Section 3.6] for background on Floquet theory (note that the Floquet exponents defined in (2.8) are the real parts of the Floquet exponents defined in [4] and [24]).

For the inhomogeneous equation, the following results on periodic solutions are classical (we include a proof for the reader's convenience). Note that here uniqueness of a periodic solution means that it is unique up to time shifts.

PROPOSITION 2.9. *Consider the inhomogeneous τ -periodic differential equation (2.7).*

(i) *This differential equation has a unique τ -periodic solution if and only if $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi(\tau, 0))$, i.e., 0 is not a Floquet exponent. The initial value of the unique τ -periodic solution is $x^0 = (I - \Phi(\tau, 0))^{-1} \int_0^\tau \Phi(\tau, s)z(s)ds$.*

(ii) *If there does not exist a τ -periodic solution of the τ -periodic differential equation (2.7), then the principal fundamental solution satisfies $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi(\tau, 0))$ and $\int_0^\tau z(t)dt \notin \text{Im}(I - \Phi(\tau, 0))$.*

(iii) *For $k = 0, 1, \dots$, let $P^k(\cdot)$ and $z^k(\cdot) \neq 0$ be τ_k -periodic with $\tau_k \geq 0$, and assume that the corresponding principal fundamental solutions Φ^k satisfy $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi^k(\tau_k, 0))$. Furthermore, suppose that $\tau_k \rightarrow \tau_0$, $P^k(\cdot) \rightarrow P^0(\cdot)$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$, and $z^k(\cdot) \rightarrow z^0(\cdot)$ in $L^2([0, \tau_0 + 1]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then the initial values x^k of the corresponding unique τ_k -periodic solutions converge for $k \rightarrow \infty$ to the initial value x^0 of the unique τ_0 -periodic solution for $P^0(\cdot)$ and $z^0(\cdot)$.*

Proof. (i) and (ii) A τ -periodic solution $x(\cdot)$ with $x(0) = x^0$ satisfies

$$(I - \Phi(\tau, 0))x^0 = \int_0^\tau \Phi(\tau, s)z(s)ds. \quad (2.9)$$

If $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi(\tau, 0))$ there is a unique solution $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of (2.9). If $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi(\tau, 0))$, i.e., $\ker(I - \Phi(\tau, 0)) \neq \{0\}$, then this inhomogeneous linear equation in \mathbb{R}^n either has no solution or there is a nontrivial affine subspace of solutions and, in particular, the τ -periodic solution is not unique. This also shows (ii).

(iii) Using Gronwall's inequality one shows that for initial values $y^k \rightarrow y^0$ the solutions of $\dot{y}(t) = P^k(t)y(t) + z^k(t)$, $y(0) = y^k$, converge uniformly on bounded

intervals to the solution of $\dot{y}(t) = P^0(t)y(t) + z^0(t)$, $y(0) = y^0$. This also holds for the principal fundamental solutions and hence $x^k \rightarrow x^0$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$x^k := (I - \Phi^k(\tau_k, 0))^{-1} \int_0^{\tau_k} \Phi^k(\tau_k, s) z^k(s) ds, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$

□

3. System semigroups. In this section we consider control-affine systems of the form (2.1) on a real analytic manifold M given by complete real analytic vector fields f_0, \dots, f_m , assume that the accessibility rank condition (2.2) holds, and that the associated family of vector fields

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i f_i(x) \mid u \in \Omega\}$$

generates a finite dimensional Lie subalgebra of the set of real analytic vector fields on M . The corresponding connected and simply connected Lie group $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F})$ is the system group with a set \mathcal{F}_r of right invariant vector fields on \mathcal{G} determined by their values at the identity given by an element of \mathcal{F} . The elements g of \mathcal{G} have the form

$$g = \exp(t_1 X_1) \cdots \exp(t_k X_k) \text{ for some elements } X_i \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } t_i \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.1)$$

The group \mathcal{G} coincides with the orbit of the identity for the vector fields \mathcal{F}_r . Denote by $\mathcal{S}_\tau = \mathcal{S}_\tau(\mathcal{F})$ the set of those elements of \mathcal{G} with $t_i \geq 0$ and $t_1 + \cdots + t_k = \tau$, and let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup_{\tau > 0} \mathcal{S}_\tau$ be the system semigroup. Also denote $\mathcal{S}_{\leq T} = \bigcup_{\tau \in [0, T]} \mathcal{S}_\tau$.

The action of the system group \mathcal{G} on M is determined by the following: for constant control $u \in \Omega$ and vector field $X^u = f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i f_i \in \mathcal{F}$ let

$$\exp(tX^u)x = \varphi(t, x, u), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By Jurdjevic [15, Theorem 3 on p. 44] the set \mathcal{F} of vector fields is transitive on M , i.e., for all $x, y \in M$ there is $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $y = gx$. The trajectories of control system (2.1) are given by the action of the semigroup \mathcal{S} on M : For $g \in \mathcal{S}_\tau$ and $\tau = t_k + \cdots + t_1, t_i > 0$,

$$gx = \exp(t_k X^{u^k}) \cdots \exp(t_1 X^{u^1})x = \varphi(\tau, x, u),$$

where $u^j \in \Omega$, $X^{u^j} = f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i^j f_i \in \mathcal{F}$, and $\varphi(t, x, u), t \in [0, \tau]$, is the solution of (2.1) with control $u \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$ defined, with $t_0 = 0$, by

$$u(t) := u^{j+1} \text{ for } t \in \left[\sum_{i=0}^j t_i, \sum_{i=0}^{j+1} t_i \right), \quad j = 0, \dots, k-1. \quad (3.2)$$

THEOREM 3.1. (i) *The system semigroup $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$ satisfies $\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau} \subset \overline{\text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau})}$ in \mathcal{G} for every $\tau > 0$.*

(ii) *If $g \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau})$ for a $\tau > 0$ then $gx \in \text{int}(\mathcal{O}_{\leq \tau}^+(x))$ for every $x \in M$.*

Proof. (i) The vector fields \mathcal{F}_r on \mathcal{G} are real analytic. Since this implies that they are Lie-determined we can apply Jurdjevic [15, Corollary on p. 67] which shows that for every open set U in an orbit of \mathcal{F}_r , any $y \in U$, and any $\tau > 0$, the reachable set $\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau}(\mathcal{F}_r)(y) \cap U$ contains an open set in the orbit topology. In particular, this applies to the reachable set up to time τ of the identity which coincides with $\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau}$. Furthermore, [15, Corollary 1 on p. 68] implies $\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau} \subset \overline{\text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau})}$.

(ii) The maps $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow M : g \mapsto gx$ are open, hence $g \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau})$ implies $gx \in \text{int}(\mathcal{O}_{\leq \tau}^+(x))$. \square

In the following, we always consider the interior of \mathcal{S} in the system group \mathcal{G} . Theorem 3.1 leads to the following result connecting elements g in the interior of the system semigroup and fixed points in control sets.

PROPOSITION 3.2. (i) *Let $D \subset M$ be a control set with nonvoid interior. Then for every $x \in \text{int}(D)$ there are $\tau > 0$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau+1})$ such that $gx = x$.*

(ii) *Conversely, let $g \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $gx = x$ for some point $x \in M$. Then $x \in \text{int}(D)$ for some control set $D \subset M$.*

Proof. (i) Let $x \in \text{int}(D)$. By continuity of the action the set $H = \{h \in \mathcal{G} \mid hx \in \text{int}(D)\}$ is open in \mathcal{G} . Since D is a control set, there exists for all $t > 0$ small enough an element $h \in \mathcal{S}_t \cap H$. By normal accessibility (cf. Jurdjevic [15, Theorem 1 on p. 66]) there are for $\sigma_k \rightarrow 0^+$ elements $g_k \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \sigma_k})$ converging to the identity in \mathcal{G} , and hence $h_k := g_k h \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq t+\sigma_k}) \rightarrow h$. Since H is open we can fix a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h_k \in H \cap \mathcal{S}_{t+\sigma} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq t+\sigma_k})$ for some $\sigma \in [0, \sigma_k]$, hence $h_k x \in \text{int}(D)$. By exact controllability in $\text{int}(D)$, we find $h_0 \in \mathcal{S}_s, s > 0$, such that $h_0 h_k x = x$. It follows that $g := h_0 h_k \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau+1})$ with $\tau := t + \sigma + s$ and $gx = x$.

(ii) Every $g \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ satisfies $gx \in \text{int}(\mathcal{O}^+(x))$ and $x \in \text{int}(\mathcal{O}^-(gx))$ for all x . Now $gx = x$ implies that

$$x \in \text{int}(\mathcal{O}^+(x)) \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{O}^-(x)),$$

and hence Lemma 2.2 shows that $D = \mathcal{O}^-(x) \cap \overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)}$ is a control set with $x \in \text{int}(D)$. \square

We also observe that $g \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ implies that $g \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau})$ for some $\tau > 0$; cf. Colonius and Kliemann [6, Lemma 4.5.2]. The following lemma shows that the interior of the system semigroup is path-connected.

LEMMA 3.3. *Let $g \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ and $h \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ for some $\sigma, \tau > 0$. Then there is a continuous path $p : [\sigma, 2\sigma + \tau] \rightarrow \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $p(\sigma) = g$ and $p(2\sigma + \tau) = h$ such that $p(\alpha) = g_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ for $\alpha \in [\sigma, \sigma + \tau]$ and $p(\alpha) = g_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{2\sigma+2\tau-\alpha} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ for $\alpha \in (\sigma + \tau, 2\sigma + \tau]$. Furthermore, $p(\alpha)$ depends in a piecewise analytic way on α .*

Proof. We may write

$$g = \exp(s_k X_k) \cdots \exp(s_1 X_1), \quad h = \exp(t_\ell Y_\ell) \cdots \exp(t_1 Y_1), \quad (3.3)$$

where $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}, t_i, s_i > 0$, and $X_i, Y_i \in \mathcal{F}$ for all i . Thus $\sigma = s_k + \cdots + s_1$ and $\tau = t_\ell + \cdots + t_1$. First define a continuous path $p : [\sigma, \sigma + \tau] \rightarrow \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $p(\sigma) = g$ and $p(\sigma + \tau) = hg$ in the following way:

Set $t_0 = 0$. For $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $\alpha \in \left[\sigma + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} t_i, \sigma + \sum_{i=0}^j t_i \right)$ let

$$g_\alpha = \exp \left(\left(\alpha - \sigma - \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} t_i \right) Y_j \right) \exp(t_{j-1} Y_{j-1}) \cdots \exp(t_1 Y_1) g.$$

Then $g_\sigma = g$, $g_{\sigma+\tau} = hg$ and $g_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$, since for any $g' \in \mathcal{S}$ and $g'' \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ it follows that $g'g'', g''g' \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$. Furthermore, $p(\alpha)$ depends analytically on α on the intervals $\left(\sigma + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} t_i, \sigma + \sum_{i=0}^j t_i \right)$.

Analogously, one can connect hg with h implying the assertion. \square

REMARK 3.4. *The elements g_α constructed in the proof above correspond to*

control functions u^α given by the following: Let $g = g(u)$ and $h = h(v)$ with

$$v(t) = v^j \text{ for } t \in \left[\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} t_i, \sum_{i=0}^j t_i \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, \ell,$$

where v^j determines the vector field Y_j . Then for $\alpha \in \left[\sigma + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} t_i, \sigma + \sum_{i=0}^j t_i \right)$, $j = 1, \dots, \ell$, the element g_α is given by $g_\alpha = g(u^\alpha)$ with control

$$u^\alpha(t) = \begin{cases} u(t) & \text{for } t \in [0, \sigma] \\ v^j & \text{for } t \in \left[\sigma + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} t_i, \alpha \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, \ell \end{cases}.$$

The controls $u^\alpha \in L^2([0, \sigma + \tau]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ depend continuously on α . Analogous statements hold for $\alpha \in [\sigma + \tau, 2\sigma + \tau]$.

4. System semigroups of affine systems in \mathbb{R}^n . In this section we analyze system semigroups for affine systems of the form (1.1).

The family of affine vector fields on \mathbb{R}^n associated with (1.1) is given by

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ X^u(x) = \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i B_i \right) x + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i c_i + d \mid u \in \Omega \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

The system group $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F})$ is a subgroup of the semidirect product $\mathbb{R}^n \rtimes GL(\mathbb{R}^n)$; cf. Jurdjevic and Sallet [16]. For an affine vector field $X(x) = A_0 x + a_0$ we write $\exp tX$ for the one parameter group of diffeomorphisms generated by X , hence

$$(\exp tX)x = e^{tA_0}x + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A_0} a_0 ds \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Next we describe the relation between the action of the system semigroup and periodic control functions. For $g \in \mathcal{S}_\tau$ and $\tau = t_k + \dots + t_1$ we may write

$$g = \exp(t_k X^{u^k}) \cdots \exp(t_1 X^{u^1})x = \varphi(\tau, x, u), \quad (4.2)$$

where $u^j \in \Omega$ and X^{u^j} is the affine vector field

$$X^{u^j}(x) = \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i^j B_i \right) x + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i^j c_i + d,$$

and $\varphi(t, x, u)$, $t \in [0, \tau]$, is the solution of (1.1) with control defined by (3.2). We may consider u as a τ -periodic control function when we extend it τ -periodically to \mathbb{R} and we may write $g \in \mathcal{S}_\tau$ as $g(u)$. The principal fundamental solution of $\dot{x}(t) = A(u(t))x(t)$ corresponding to u is $\Phi_u(t, s)$. Any τ -periodic control $u \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$ also determines an element of the system semigroup of this homogeneous bilinear control system given by $\Phi_u(\tau, 0)$.

We note the following simple but important lemma.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $g(u) \in \mathcal{S}_\tau$. Then $g(u)x = x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if the inhomogeneous τ -periodic differential equation*

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t)(B_i x(t) + c_i) + d = A(u(t))x(t) + Cu + d$$

has a τ -periodic solution with initial value $x(0) = x$. This solution is unique if and only if $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0))$.

Proof. The first assertion is clear by the definitions. The second assertion follows from Proposition 2.9(i). \square

Next we use Lemma 3.3 for a result on spectral properties of elements in the interior of the system semigroup.

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $g(u^0) \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ for some $\sigma > 0$ with $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^0}(\sigma, 0))$ and suppose that there is $g(v) \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $\tau > 0$ and $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_v(\tau, 0))$.*

Then there exist $\tau_1 > 0$ and $g(u^1) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_1} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ and a continuous path $p : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $p(0) = g(u^0)$ and $p(1) = g(u^1)$ such that $p(\alpha) = g(u^\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, where the u^α are τ_α -periodic controls with $g(u^\alpha) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_\alpha} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and the following properties hold:

The principal fundamental solutions $\Phi_{u^\alpha}(t, s)$ of $\dot{x}(t) = A(u^\alpha(t))x(t)$ satisfy $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0))$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^1}(\tau_1, 0))$. The matrices $\Phi_{u^\alpha}(t, s)$, the periods τ_α as well as the controls $u^\alpha \in L^2([0, \sigma + \tau_1]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ depend continuously on α . The numbers τ_α as well as the matrices $\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0)$ and the $g(u^\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times GL(\mathbb{R}^n)$ depend in a piecewise analytic way on α .

Proof. By Lemma 3.3 there is a continuous path $p_1 : [\sigma, 2\sigma + \tau] \rightarrow \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $p_1(\sigma) = g(u^0)$ and $p_1(2\sigma + \tau) = g(v)$ such that $p_1(\alpha) = g_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ for $\alpha \in [\sigma, \sigma + \tau]$ and $p_1(\alpha) = g_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{2\sigma + 2\tau - \alpha} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ for $\alpha \in (\sigma + \tau, 2\sigma + \tau]$. Remark 3.4 shows that $g_\alpha = g(u^\alpha)$ with controls u^α depending continuously on α as elements in $L^2([0, \sigma + \tau]; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Hence also

$$A(u^\alpha(\cdot)) = A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i^\alpha(\cdot) B_i \in L^2([0, \sigma + \tau]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$$

depends continuously on α . The fundamental solutions $\Phi_{u^\alpha}(t, s)$ are given by

$$\Phi_{u^\alpha}(t, s) = I + \int_0^t A(u^\alpha(s')) \Phi_{u^\alpha}(t, s') ds'.$$

Gronwall's lemma implies that these matrices also depend continuously on α , uniformly in t and s on bounded intervals. For $\alpha \in (\sigma + \tau, 2\sigma + \tau]$ analogous statements hold. Then one of the following two cases occurs:

(i) There is $\alpha_0 \in [\sigma, \sigma + \tau]$ such that $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^{\alpha_0}}(\alpha_0, 0))$ and $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\alpha, 0))$ for all $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_0)$. It follows that for every $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_0)$ there is a unique α -periodic solution of the corresponding equation in (1.1).

(ii) There is $\alpha_0 \in [\sigma + \tau, 2\sigma + \tau]$ such that $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^{2\sigma + 2\tau - \alpha_0}}(2\sigma + 2\tau - \alpha_0, 0))$ and, furthermore, $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\alpha, 0))$ for all $\alpha \in [0, \sigma + \tau]$ and $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^{2\sigma + 2\tau - \alpha_0}}(2\sigma + 2\tau - \alpha, 0))$ for all $\alpha \in [\sigma + \tau, \alpha_0)$. As in case (i) for every $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_0)$ there is a unique α -periodic solution.

Reparametrizing the path so that $p(1) = g(u^{\alpha_0})$ one obtains the continuous path p . The τ_α and $g(u^\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times GL(\mathbb{R}^n)$ depend in a piecewise analytic way on α by Lemma 3.3. Using Remark 3.4 one deduces that also $\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0)$ depends in a piecewise analytic way on α . \square

LEMMA 4.3. *Consider, for $k = 0, 1, \dots$, the differential equations*

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(u^k(t))x(t) + Cu^k(t) + d$$

and suppose that

(i) u^k is τ_k -periodic with $\tau_k \rightarrow \tau_0 > 0$ and $u^k \rightarrow u^0$ in $L^2([0, \tau_0 + 1]; \mathbb{R}^m)$.

(ii) The principal fundamental solutions $\Phi_{u^k}(t, s)$ of $\dot{x}(t) = A(u^k(t))x(t)$ satisfy $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0))$ and $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^k}(\tau_k, 0))$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$

(iii) $\int_0^{\tau_0} \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, s) (Cu^0(s) + d) ds \notin \text{Im}(I - \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0))$.

Then, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$, the initial values x^k of the unique τ_k -periodic solutions are determined by

$$(I - \Phi_{u^k}(\tau_k, 0))x^k = \int_0^{\tau_k} \Phi_{u^k}(\tau_k, s) (Cu^k(s) + d) ds.$$

They satisfy for $k \rightarrow \infty$

$$\|x^k\| \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } \frac{x^k}{\|x^k\|} \rightarrow \ker(I - \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0)) = \mathbf{E}(\Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0); 1). \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. As in Lemma 4.2, one shows that the principal fundamental solutions $\Phi_{u^k}(t, s)$ of $\dot{x}(t) = A(u^k(t))x(t)$ satisfy $\Phi_{u^k}(\tau_k, 0) \rightarrow \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0)$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$. Assume, by way of contradiction, that x^k remains bounded. Hence we may suppose that there is $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x^k \rightarrow x^0$. Then it follows from $u^k \rightarrow u^0$ in $L^2(0, \tau_0 + 1; \mathbb{R}^m)$ that

$$(I - \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0))x^0 = \int_0^{\tau_0} \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, s) (Cu^0(s) + d) ds$$

contradicting assumption (iii). We have shown that x^k becomes unbounded for $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since $Cu^k(\cdot) + d$ remains bounded in $L^2([0, \tau_0 + 1]; \mathbb{R}^n)$, we get

$$(I - \Phi_{u^k}(\tau_k, 0)) \frac{x^k}{\|x^k\|} = \frac{1}{\|x^k\|} \int_0^{\tau_k} \Phi_{u^k}(\tau_k, s) (Cu^k(s) + d) ds \rightarrow 0,$$

and (4.3) follows. \square

The next lemma describes the case where assumption (iii) above is violated.

LEMMA 4.4. Consider for a τ_0 -periodic control u^0

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(u^0(t))x(t) + Cu^0(t) + d, \quad (4.4)$$

and suppose that the principal fundamental solution of $\dot{x}(t) = A(u^0(t))x(t)$ satisfies $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0))$ and for some $y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\int_0^{\tau_0} \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, s) (Cu^0(s) + d) ds = (I - \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0))y^0.$$

Then the nontrivial affine subspace $Y = y^0 + \ker(I - \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0)) = y^0 + \mathbf{E}(\Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0); 1)$ has the property that there is a τ_0 -periodic solution of (4.4) starting in y if and only if $y \in Y$, and there are $x^k \in Y, k \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfying for $k \rightarrow \infty$ the conditions in (4.3).

Proof. The first assertion is clear by the definitions. The second assertion follows by choosing $x^k := y^0 + kz, k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $0 \neq z \in \mathbf{E}(\Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0); 1)$. \square

5. Control sets for hyperbolic systems. In this section we present definitions of hyperbolicity for affine control systems and show that hyperbolic systems have a unique control set with nonvoid interior and it is bounded. Furthermore, there is a unique bounded chain control set.

Recall the definition of Floquet exponents for homogeneous periodic differential equations in (2.8) determining the exponential growth behavior of the solutions. For any τ -periodic control, the homogeneous part (1.2) of affine system (1.1) is of this

form, hence we can define corresponding Floquet exponents. They are determined by the Floquet multipliers which are the eigenvalues of the principal fundamental solution $\Phi_u(\tau, 0)$. Recall also that the system semigroup \mathcal{S} of the affine system has nonvoid interior in the system group \mathcal{G} .

DEFINITION 5.1. (i) For an affine system of the form (1.1) the Floquet spectrum is the following set Σ_{Fl} of Floquet exponents of the homogeneous part (1.2) for controls $u \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$ corresponding to an element $g(u) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$,

$$\Sigma_{Fl} = \left\{ \lambda = \frac{1}{\tau} \log |\rho| \mid \rho \in \text{spec}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0)) \cap \mathbb{R} \text{ with } g(u) \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S}) \right\}.$$

(ii) The affine system (1.1) is hyperbolic if $0 \notin \Sigma_{Fl}$. Otherwise, the system is called nonhyperbolic.

One immediately see that for a nonhyperbolic control system there is $g(u) \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ such that the spectrum of $\Phi_u(\tau, 0)$ contains 1 or -1 .

REMARK 5.2. For homogeneous bilinear control system we have recalled in Definition 2.5 the Floquet spectrum $\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{P}D)$ of control sets $\mathbb{P}D$ with nonvoid interior in projective space \mathbb{P}^{n-1} . Such control sets exist, in particular, if the accessibility rank condition on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} holds. We will not always need this rank condition, hence Definition 5.1 does not refer to control sets in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} . Furthermore, it will suffice to require the hyperbolicity condition only for elements g in the interior of the system semigroup \mathcal{S} of the affine system. If system (1.1) reduces to a homogeneous bilinear control system (i.e., $C = 0$ and $d = 0$), the system semigroup \mathcal{S} actually is the system semigroup ${}_{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{S}^{\text{hom}}$ of this system on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Under the accessibility rank condition on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} , Remark 2.6 characterizes the Floquet spectrum $\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{P}D)$ using $g \in {}_{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{S}^{\text{hom}}$ with $\mathbb{P}g \in \text{int}(\mathbb{P}\mathcal{S}^{\text{hom}})$, while the Floquet spectrum from Definition 5.1 considers $g \in \text{int}({}_{\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{S}^{\text{hom}})$.

REMARK 5.3. Observe that the hyperbolicity condition $0 \notin \Sigma_{Fl}$ for the affine system (1.1) is almost complementary to our condition for the existence of control sets with nonvoid interior in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ for its homogeneous part: This is guaranteed by Theorem 2.7(iii) if $0 \in \text{int}(\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{S}D_i))$.

The main result of this section shows that, for hyperbolic affine systems, there is a unique control set with nonvoid interior.

THEOREM 5.4. Suppose that the affine system (1.1) satisfies the accessibility rank condition and that it is hyperbolic. Then there is a unique control set D with nonvoid interior. For every $g \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ there is a unique $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x = gx$ and

$$D = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{there is } g \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S}) \text{ with } x = gx\}.$$

Proof. Let $g(u) \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$. By hyperbolicity, 0 is not a Floquet exponent, and hence 1 is not an eigenvalue of the principal fundamental solution $\Phi_u(\tau, 0)$. Proposition 2.9(i) implies that there is a unique τ -periodic solution starting in some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, hence $gx = x$ by Lemma 4.1. By Proposition 3.2(ii) it follows that $x \in \text{int}(D)$ for some control set D . In order to show that D does not depend on g , consider $g, h \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ and the continuous path p constructed in Lemma 4.2. Denote the unique fixed point of $g(u^\alpha)$ by x^α . For every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, there is a control set D^α with $x^\alpha \in \text{int}(D^\alpha)$, again by hyperbolicity. Since $g(u^\alpha)$ and the periods τ_α depend continuously on α , Proposition 2.9(iii) implies that also x^α depends continuously on α . Hence for small $\alpha > 0$ all points x^α are contained in a single control set D showing

$$\alpha^* := \sup \left\{ \alpha \mid x^{\alpha'} \in D \text{ for all } \alpha' \in [\sigma, \alpha] \right\} > 0.$$

Since $x^{\alpha^*} \in \text{int}(D^{\alpha^*})$ it follows that $D^{\alpha^*} = D$ which shows that $x^{\alpha^*} \in \text{int}(D)$. If $\alpha^* < 1$ this implies that $D^\alpha = D$ for all $\alpha \in [\alpha^*, \alpha^* + \varepsilon]$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ contradicting the definition of α^* . It follows that $\alpha^* = 1$ and hence there is a single control set D containing all $x = gx$ for $g \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$. The corresponding periodic controls generate periodic solution which also are contained in D .

It remains to show that D is the unique control set with nonvoid interior. By Proposition 3.2(i), for a point x in the interior of any control set, there are $\tau > 0$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau+1})$ with $gx = x$. Hence it follows that $x \in D$. \square

The question arises if the control set D is bounded. We will give a positive answer provided that the following uniform hyperbolicity condition holds assuming that the control range Ω is a compact and convex neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{R}^m and hence, for system (1.1), the control flow Ψ on $\mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is well defined (cf. Subsection 2.1).

DEFINITION 5.5. *The homogeneous bilinear system (2.4) is uniformly hyperbolic if the vector bundle $\mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ can be decomposed into the Whitney sum of two invariant subbundles \mathcal{V}^1 and \mathcal{V}^2 such that the restrictions Ψ^1 and Ψ^2 of the control flow Ψ to \mathcal{V}^1 and \mathcal{V}^2 , resp., satisfy for constants $\alpha > 0$ and $K \geq 1$ and for all $(u, x_i) \in \mathcal{V}^i$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi(t, x_1, u)\| &= \|\Psi_t^1(u, x_1)\| \leq Ke^{-\alpha t} \|x_1\| \text{ for } t \geq 0, \\ \|\varphi(t, x_2, u)\| &= \|\Psi_t^2(u, x_2)\| \leq Ke^{\alpha t} \|x_2\| \text{ for } t \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for $i = 1, 2$, one obtains that $\mathcal{V}^i(u) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (u, x) \in \mathcal{V}^i\}$ is a subspace of \mathbb{R}^n and its dimension is independent of $u \in \mathcal{U}$. For all $u \in \mathcal{U}$

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \mathcal{V}^1(u) \oplus \mathcal{V}^2(u) \text{ and } \varphi(t, x_i, u) \in \mathcal{V}^i(u(t + \cdot)) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R},$$

hence, for $x = x_1 + x_2$ with $x_i \in \mathcal{V}^i(u)$ and $\Phi_u^i(t, s) := \Phi_u(t, s)|_{\mathcal{V}^i(u(s+\cdot))}$ for $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\varphi(t, x, u) = \varphi(t, x_1, u) + \varphi(t, x_2, u) \text{ and } \Phi_u(t, s) = \Phi_u^1(t, s) + \Phi_u^2(t, s).$$

The uniform hyperbolicity condition above implies that system (1.1) is hyperbolic in the sense of Definition 5.1. This follows since the τ -periodic controls yield for corresponding trajectories $\varphi(\cdot, x, u)$ with $(u, x) \in \mathcal{V}^1$ Floquet exponents which are equal to or less than $-\alpha$, and for those with $(u, x) \in \mathcal{V}^2$ Floquet exponents which are equal to or greater than α .

LEMMA 5.6. *Suppose that the uniform hyperbolicity assumption holds. Then there is $c > 0$ such that for $(u, x_1) \in \mathcal{V}^1$ and $(u, x_2) \in \mathcal{V}^2$*

$$\|\varphi(t, x_1, u)\| \leq K \|x_1\| + \frac{Kc}{\alpha} \text{ for } t \geq 0, \quad \|\varphi(t, x_2, u)\| \leq K \|x_2\| + \frac{Kc}{\alpha} \text{ for } t \leq 0.$$

Proof. Denote the projections of \mathbb{R}^n to $\mathcal{V}^1(u)$ by P_u and choose $c > 0$ such that $\|P_u\| \|Cv + d\| \leq c$ for all $u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \Omega$. By invariance of \mathcal{V}^1 ,

$$P_{u(t+\cdot)} \Phi_u(t, s) = \Phi_u(t, s) P_{u(s+\cdot)},$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(t, x_1, u) &= P_{u(t+\cdot)} \varphi(t, x_1, u) = P_{u(t+\cdot)} \Phi_u(t, 0) x_1 + \int_0^t P_{u(t+\cdot)} \Phi_u(t, s) [Cu(s) + d] ds \\ &= \Phi_u^1(t, 0) x_1 + \int_0^\tau \Phi_u^1(t, s) P_{u(s+\cdot)} [Cu(s) + d] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and $t \geq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi(t, x_1, u)\| &\leq \|\Phi_u^1(t, 0)x_1\| + \int_0^t \|\Phi_u^1(t, s)P_{u(s+\cdot)}[Cu(s) + d]\| ds \\ &\leq Ke^{-\alpha t} \|x_1\| + Kc \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-s)} ds \leq K \|x_1\| + \frac{Kc}{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

The second assertion follows analogously. \square

The next theorem establishes as claimed that the control set is bounded under the uniform hyperbolicity assumption.

THEOREM 5.7. *Suppose that the accessibility rank condition holds for the affine system (1.1) and that the homogeneous part satisfies the uniform hyperbolicity condition in Definition 5.5. Then the unique control set D with nonvoid interior is bounded.*

Proof. We show that $\text{int}(D)$ is bounded. This will yield the assertion, since the accessibility rank condition implies that $D \subset \text{int}(D)$. Fix $x \in \text{int}(D)$ and consider an arbitrary point $y \in \text{int}(D) = \mathcal{O}^+(x) \cap \mathcal{O}^-(x)$. Thus there are controls $u^1, u^2 \in \mathcal{U}$ and times $t_1, t_2 > 0$ with $y = \varphi(t_1, x, u^1)$ and $y = \varphi(-t_2, x, u^2)$. Define

$$u(t) = \begin{cases} u^1(t) & \text{for } t \in [0, t_1] \\ u^2(t) & \text{for } t \in (-t_2, 0) \end{cases}$$

and extend u to a $t_1 + t_2$ -periodic function on \mathbb{R} . Thus $y = \varphi(t_1, x, u) = \varphi(-t_2, x, u)$ and $u(t_1 + t_2 + t) = u(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This shows $u(t_1 + \cdot) = u(-t_2 + \cdot)$ in \mathcal{U} implying

$$\mathcal{V}^i(u(t_1 + \cdot)) = \mathcal{V}^i(u(-t_2 + \cdot)) \text{ for } i = 1, 2. \quad (5.1)$$

We decompose

$$x = x_1 \oplus x_2 \text{ with } x_i \in \mathcal{V}^i(u) \text{ and } y = y_1 \oplus y_2 \text{ with } y_i \in \mathcal{V}^i(u(t_1 + \cdot)) \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$

The invariance of the complementary subbundles \mathcal{V}^i shows that

$$y_1 = \varphi(t_1, x_1, u) = \varphi(-t_2, x_1, u) \text{ and } y_2 = \varphi(t_1, x_2, u) = \varphi(-t_2, x_2, u),$$

and by (5.1) one gets the decompositions conforming to $\mathcal{V}^1(u(t_1 + \cdot)) \oplus \mathcal{V}^2(u(t_1 + \cdot)) = \mathcal{V}^1(u(-t_2 + \cdot)) \oplus \mathcal{V}^2(u(-t_2 + \cdot))$,

$$y = \varphi(t_1, x_1, u) \oplus \varphi(t_1, x_2, u) = \varphi(-t_2, x_1, u) \oplus \varphi(-t_2, x_2, u) \quad (5.2)$$

where for $i = 1, 2$

$$\varphi(t_1, x_i, u) \in \mathcal{V}^i(u(t_1 + \cdot)), \quad \varphi(-t_2, x_i, u) \in \mathcal{V}^i(u(-t_2 + \cdot)).$$

By (5.1) this implies, in particular, that $\varphi(t_1, x_1, u) = \varphi(-t_2, x_1, u)$ and $\varphi(t_1, x_2, u) = \varphi(-t_2, x_2, u)$. Lemma 5.6 yields the bounds

$$\|\varphi(t_1, x_1, u)\| \leq K \|x_1\| + \frac{Kc}{\alpha} \text{ and } \|\varphi(-t_2, x_2, u)\| \leq K \|x_2\| + \frac{Kc}{\alpha}.$$

Since the bounds are independent of t_1 and t_2 these estimates hold for all $y \in \text{int}(D)$.

\square

Now we analyze the chain control sets. It turns out that under the uniform hyperbolicity condition there is a unique bounded chain control set and it is given

by the closure of the control set with nonvoid interior. This is based on a shadowing lemma established in Colonius and Du [5].

THEOREM 5.8. *Assume that the affine system (1.1) satisfies the accessibility rank condition and the homogeneous part (1.2) satisfies the uniform hyperbolicity condition in Definition 5.5. Then there is a unique bounded chain control set E given by the closure \overline{D} of the control set D with nonvoid interior.*

Proof. **Step 1.** We show that $E := \overline{D}$ is a chain control set. Every control set with nonempty interior is contained in a chain control set, hence there exists a chain control set E' with $D \subset E'$ and also E' has nonvoid interior. By the uniform hyperbolicity assumption and the accessibility rank condition, E' must be the closure of a control set D' according to [5, Theorem 3]. Since $\text{int}(D) \subset E'$ there is $x \in D' \cap D$ implying $D' = D$.

Step 2. For each $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and each bounded chain control set E' , we define the u -fiber of E' by

$$E'(u) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \varphi(\mathbb{R}, x, u) \subset E'\} \text{ and let } \mathcal{U}(E') = \{u \in \mathcal{U} \mid E'(u) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We prove that $\mathcal{U}(E')$ is closed in $\mathcal{U} \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ in the weak* topology. Indeed, assume that $u^k \in \mathcal{U}(E')$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $u^k \rightarrow u \in \mathcal{U}$. Consider points $x^k \in E'(u)$. By compactness of E' , we may assume that $x^k \rightarrow x \in E'$. By continuity of $\varphi(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ it follows that $\varphi(t, x, u) \in E'$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ implying $E'(u) \neq \emptyset$ or, equivalently, $u \in \mathcal{U}(E')$.

Step 3. We prove that $\mathcal{U}(E) = \mathcal{U}$ for the chain control set $E = \overline{D}$. Let $u \in \mathcal{U}$ be an arbitrary control and fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there are piecewise constant $2k$ -periodic controls $u^{k,i} \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$ with $u^{k,i}_{|[-k,k]} \rightarrow u_{|[-k,k]}$ for $i \rightarrow \infty$ in the weak* topology of $L^\infty([-k, k]; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Invoking Theorem 3.1(i) one sees that $\text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq 2k})$ is dense in $\mathcal{S}_{\leq 2k}$ and hence we may choose these controls such that $g(u^{k,i}(-k + \cdot)) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{2k})$. Then 1 is not an eigenvalue of $\Phi_{u^{k,i}}(k, -k)$ since otherwise $0 = \frac{1}{2k} \log 1$ is a Floquet exponent contradicting the uniform hyperbolicity assumption. Thus

$$x(u^{k,i}) = (I - \Phi_{u^{k,i}}(k, -k))^{-1} \int_{-k}^k \Phi_{u^{k,i}}(k, s)[Cu^{k,i}(s) + d]ds$$

is well defined yielding a unique $2k$ -periodic solution. Since $g(u^{k,i}(-k + \cdot)) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ Proposition 3.2(ii) shows that this solution is contained in the interior of a control set, hence, by Theorem 5.4, in the interior of D . In particular, the value at $t = 0$ of this solution, denoted by $y^{k,i}$, is contained in $D \subset E$. Since E is compact, we may assume that $y^{k,i}$ converges for $i \rightarrow \infty$ to an element $y^k \in E$. Thus $\varphi(t, y^{k,i}, u^{k,i}) \in E$ for $t \in [-k, k]$ and continuity of $\varphi(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ implies that $\varphi(t, y^{k,i}, u^{k,i}) \rightarrow \varphi(t, y^k, u^k)$ for $t \in [-k, k]$. The points y^k have a cluster point $y^0 \in E$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$, and continuous dependence on the initial value implies that $\varphi(t, y^0, u) \in E$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Step 4. Assume that E' is a bounded chain control set different from E , hence $E' \cap E = \emptyset$. There are $x \in E'$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\varphi(\mathbb{R}, x, u) \subset E'$. By Step 3 there is $y \in E$ with $\varphi(t, y, u) \in E$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\|\varphi(t, x, u) - \varphi(t, y, u)\| = \|\Phi_u(t, 0)(x - y)\|.$$

Since $\Psi_{-t}^i(u, x_i) = (\Psi_t^i(u, x_i))^{-1}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i = 1, 2$, uniform hyperbolicity implies that this converges to ∞ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ or as $t \rightarrow -\infty$ contradicting the fact that both E and E' are bounded. \square

REMARK 5.9. *The uniform hyperbolicity condition is also used in Kawan [17] and Colonius and Santana [9, Corollary 1 and Theorem 3.1]. It is equivalent to the*

condition that 0 is not in the Sacker-Sell spectrum of the linear flow Ψ_t ; cf., e.g., Colonius and Kliemann [6, Section 5.5].

Next we present a simple example of a hyperbolic affine system.

EXAMPLE 5.10. Consider with control range $\Omega = [-1, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= 2x + u(t)x + 3u(t) + 3 \\ \dot{y} &= -2y + u(t)y + 3u(t),\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, C = \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}, d = \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For the homogeneous part $A(u) = A + uB$ the exponential growth rates of the x - and the y -component are, for all $u \in [-1, 1]$, given by $\lambda_1(u) = 2 + u \geq 1$ and $\lambda_2(u) = -2 + u \leq -1$, resp. Thus the system is uniformly hyperbolic with $\mathcal{V}^1 = \mathcal{U} \times (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{V}^2 = \mathcal{U} \times (\mathbb{R} \times \{0\})$. We claim that the unique control set with nonvoid interior is $D = (-3, 0) \times [-1, 3]$. For the proof, first observe that the equilibria are given by

$$0 = (2 + u)x + 3u + 3, \quad 0 = (-2 + u)y + 3u, \quad \text{hence } x_u = -\frac{3u + 3}{2 + u} \quad \text{and } y_u = \frac{3u}{2 - u}.$$

The maps $u \mapsto x_u$ and $u \mapsto y_u$ are monotonically decreasing and increasing, resp., since

$$\frac{d}{du}x_u = \frac{-3(2 + u) + 3u + 3}{(2 + u)^2} = \frac{-3}{(2 + u)^2} < 0, \quad \frac{d}{du}y_u = \frac{3(2 - u) + 3u}{(2 - u)^2} = \frac{6}{(2 - u)^2} > 0.$$

This implies that the set of equilibria is contained in

$$[x_1, x_{-1}] \times [y_{-1}, y_1] = [-3, 0] \times [-1, 3].$$

Note that the set of equilibria is not contained in a straight line, since $(x_0, y_0) = (-\frac{3}{2}, 0)$ is not on the line $y = -\frac{4}{3}x - 1$ through $(x_{-1}, y_{-1}) = (0, -1)$, $(x_1, y_1) = (-3, 3)$. The solution for constant u and initial value $(x, y)^\top$ has the form

$$\varphi_1(t, x, u) = e^{\lambda_1(u)t}(x - x_u) + x_u, \quad \varphi_2(t, y, u) = e^{\lambda_2(u)t}(y - y_u) + y_u. \quad (5.3)$$

Inspection of the phase portraits for constant u shows that any control set is contained in $[-3, 0] \times [-1, 3]$ and the phase portraits for $u = -1$ and $u = 1$ show that one can approximately reach (with a combination of these controls) from any point $(x, y)^\top \in (-3, 0) \times [-1, 3]$ any other point in this set while this not possible from points $(-3, y)^\top, (0, y)^\top$ with $y \in [-1, 3]$. Hence the unique control set is $D = (-3, 0) \times [-1, 3]$.

Using similar arguments, one can also show that $E = \overline{D}$ is the unique chain control set.

6. Affine control systems and projective spaces. In this section we construct for affine control systems and their homogeneous parts induced systems on projective spaces. In order to distinguish explicitly between control sets and chain control sets referring to the affine system and its homogenous part, we will mark the latter by the suffix ‘‘hom’’ in the rest of this paper.

System (1.1) and (1.2) can be embedded into a homogeneous bilinear control system in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}(t) \\ \dot{z}(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A & d \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x(t) \\ z(t) \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t) \begin{pmatrix} B_i & c_i \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x(t) \\ z(t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6.1)$$

Denote the solutions of (6.1) with initial condition $(x(0), z(0)) = (x^0, z^0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ by $\psi(t, (x^0, z^0), u), t \in \mathbb{R}$. For initial values of the form $(x^0, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ one finds for (6.1)

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t) (B_i x(t) + c_i) + d, \quad \dot{z}(t) = 0,$$

and hence

$$\psi(t, (x^0, 1), u) = (\varphi(t, x^0, u), 1)^\top \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}. \quad (6.2)$$

For initial values of the form $(x^0, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ one finds

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

and hence, recalling that the solutions of the homogeneous part (1.2) of (1.1) are denoted by $\varphi_{\text{hom}}(t, x^0, u)$,

$$\psi(t, (x^0, 0), u) = (\varphi_{\text{hom}}(t, x^0, u), 0)^\top \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}. \quad (6.3)$$

Thus the trajectories (6.2) and (6.3) are copies of the trajectories of (1.1) and of its homogeneous part (1.2), resp., obtained by adding a trivial $(n+1)$ st. component. Note that $\alpha\psi(t, (x^0, 1), u) = (\alpha\varphi(t, x^0, u), \alpha)^\top$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. In general, $\alpha\varphi(t, x^0, u) \neq \varphi(t, \alpha x^0, u)$, and for initial values of the form $(x^0, z^0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $z^0 \neq 0, 1$ the solutions of (6.1) are not related to (1.1) or (1.2).

An immediate consequence of the formulas above is the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 6.1. (i) *A subset $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a control set of (1.1) if and only if the set $D^1 := \{(x, 1) \mid x \in D\}$ is a control set of (6.1) in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$.*

(ii) *A subset $\mathbb{R}D^{\text{hom}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ is a control set of (1.2) if and only if the set $D^0 := \{(x, 0) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}D^{\text{hom}}\}$ is a control set of (6.1) in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$.*

Observe that the control sets D^1 and D^0 of system (6.1) considered in Proposition 6.1 are contained in the invariant affine hyperplanes $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{1\}$ and $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$, resp. In particular, all control sets D^1 and D^0 have void interiors.

Next we discuss associated systems in projective spaces. Recall that $\mathbb{P}^{n-1} = (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) / \sim$, where \sim is the equivalence relation $x \sim y$ if $y = \lambda x$ with some $\lambda \neq 0$. An atlas of \mathbb{P}^{n-1} is given by n charts (U_i, ψ_i) , where U_i is the set of equivalence classes $[x_1 : \dots : x_n]$ with $x_i \neq 0$ (using homogeneous coordinates) and $\psi_i : U_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is defined by

$$\psi_i([x_1 : \dots : x_n]) = \left(\frac{x_1}{x_i}, \dots, \widehat{\frac{x_i}{x_i}}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{x_i} \right);$$

here the hat means that the i -th entry is missing. Denote by $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}$ both projections $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$. A metric on \mathbb{P}^n is given by defining for elements $p_1 = \pi_{\mathbb{P}}x, p_2 = \pi_{\mathbb{P}}y$

$$d(p_1, p_2) = \min \left\{ \left\| \frac{x}{\|x\|} - \frac{y}{\|y\|} \right\|, \left\| \frac{x}{\|x\|} + \frac{y}{\|y\|} \right\| \right\}. \quad (6.4)$$

Homogeneous bilinear control systems induce control systems on projective space which we also call projectivized systems. In particular, one can project system (6.1) in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} to projective space \mathbb{P}^n . In homogeneous coordinates it is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}(t) \\ \dot{z}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} A & d \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t) \begin{pmatrix} B_i & c_i \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.5)$$

Projective space \mathbb{P}^n can be written as the disjoint union $\mathbb{P}^n = \mathbb{P}^{n,1} \dot{\cup} \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$, where, in homogeneous coordinates, the levels $\mathbb{P}^{n,i}$ are given by

$$\mathbb{P}^{n,i} := \{[x_1 : \cdots : x_n : i] \mid (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \text{ for } i = 0, 1.$$

Observe that, by homogeneity,

$$\mathbb{P}^{n,0} = \{[x_1 : \cdots : x_n : 0] \mid \|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\| = 1\}.$$

Any trajectory of system (6.5) is obtained as the projection of a trajectory of (6.1) with initial condition satisfying $z^0 = 0$ or 1, since any initial value $[x_1^0 : \cdots : x_n^0 : z^0]$ with $z^0 \neq 0$ coincides with $[\frac{x_1^0}{z^0} : \cdots : \frac{x_n^0}{z^0} : 1]$.

Loosely speaking, $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ is projective space \mathbb{P}^{n-1} (embedded into \mathbb{P}^n) and $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$ is \mathbb{P}^n without \mathbb{P}^{n-1} . The following observations make this more precise. As noted above, an atlas of \mathbb{P}^n is given by $n+1$ charts (U_i, ψ_i) . A trivial atlas for $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$ is given by $\{(U_{n+1}, \psi_{n+1})\}$ proving that $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$ is a manifold which is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^n . The space $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ is closed in \mathbb{P}^n , and the spaces \mathbb{P}^{n-1} and $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ are diffeomorphic under the map

$$e : \mathbb{P}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n,0} : [x_1 : \cdots : x_n] \mapsto [x_1 : \cdots : x_n : 0]. \quad (6.6)$$

Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n = T_x \mathbb{R}^n$ there is a smooth curve $\alpha(t)$ in \mathbb{R}^n such that $\alpha'(0) = v$ and $\alpha(0) = x$. Hence $\psi_{n+1}^{-1}(\alpha(t)) = [\alpha(t) : 1]$ is a smooth curve in $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$ and $(\psi_{n+1}^{-1} \circ \alpha)'(t) = [\alpha'(t) : 0]$.

Consider, for $u \in \Omega$, the affine vector field on \mathbb{R}^n ,

$$X^u(x) = A(u)x + Cu + d.$$

The vector field in $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$ which is ψ_{n+1}^{-1} -related with X^u is given by

$$(d\psi_{n+1}^{-1})_x X^u(x) = X^u(x).$$

For any trajectory $\psi(t, (x^0, 1), u) = (\varphi_1(t, x^0, u), \dots, \varphi_n(t, x^0, u), 1)^\top$ of system (6.1) in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$, cf. formula (6.2), the projection to $\mathbb{P}^{n,1} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ has homogeneous coordinates

$$[\varphi_1(t, x^0, u) : \cdots : \varphi_n(t, x^0, u) : 1]. \quad (6.7)$$

The ensuing proposition discusses the control sets and chain control sets in projective spaces.

PROPOSITION 6.2. *Consider in \mathbb{R}^n the affine control system (1.1), its homogeneous part (1.2), and in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} the homogeneous bilinear control system (6.1) as well as the system in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} induced by (1.2) and the system (6.5) in \mathbb{P}^n induced by (6.1).*

(i) Every control set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of the affine system (1.1) yields a control set $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1$ of the system (6.5) in \mathbb{P}^n via the map

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n) \longmapsto [x_1 : \dots : x_n : 1] : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n,1} \subset \mathbb{P}^n.$$

Furthermore, D is an invariant control set if and only if $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1$ is an invariant control set. The control set D is unbounded if and only if $\partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0} \neq \emptyset$. More precisely, if $x^k \in D$ with $\|x^k\| \rightarrow \infty$, then every cluster point y of $\frac{x^k}{\|x^k\|}$ satisfies, in homogeneous coordinates,

$$[x_1^{k_i} : \dots : x_n^{k_i} : 1] \rightarrow [y_1 : \dots : y_n : 0] \text{ for a subsequence } k_i \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular, the boundary of $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1$ in \mathbb{P}^n satisfies $\partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0} \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) Every control set ${}_{\mathbb{P}}D^{\text{hom}} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ of the system in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} induced by (1.2) corresponds to a unique control set $e({}_{\mathbb{P}}D^{\text{hom}})$ of the system (6.5) restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ and conversely, via the map (6.6). There are no further control sets in $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$.

(iii) Every chain control set ${}_{\mathbb{P}}E^{\text{hom}} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ of the system in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} induced by (1.2) corresponds to a unique chain control set $e({}_{\mathbb{P}}E^{\text{hom}})$ of the system (6.5) restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ and conversely, via the map (6.6). There are no further chain control sets in $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$.

Proof. (i) For a control set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of (1.1), Proposition 6.1(i) implies that the projection to \mathbb{P}^n of the corresponding control set D^1 in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$ is given in homogeneous coordinates by

$$\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1 = \{[x_1 : \dots : x_n : 1] \mid (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in D\} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n,1}.$$

If $x^k \in D$ with $\|x^k\| \rightarrow \infty$, then $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1$ will contain the sequence with homogeneous coordinates $[x_1^k : \dots : x_n^k : 1]$ satisfying $\|x^{k_i}\| \rightarrow \infty$ for some subsequence $k_i \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\frac{1}{\|x^{k_i}\|} \rightarrow 0$ for $k_i \rightarrow \infty$, one obtains

$$[x_1^{k_i} : \dots : x_n^{k_i} : 1] = \left[\frac{x_1^{k_i}}{\|x^{k_i}\|} : \dots : \frac{x_n^{k_i}}{\|x^{k_i}\|} : \frac{1}{\|x^{k_i}\|} \right] \rightarrow [y_1 : \dots : y_n : 0] \text{ for } k_i \rightarrow \infty.$$

(ii) Consider in homogeneous coordinates an element $[x_1 : \dots : x_n] \in {}_{\mathbb{P}}D^{\text{hom}}$. In local coordinates (U_i, ψ_i) , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, this element is

$$\psi_i([x_1 : \dots : x_n]) = \left(\frac{x_1}{x_i}, \dots, \frac{\widehat{x_i}}{x_i}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{x_i} \right) \text{ if } x_i \neq 0.$$

Then, for any $u \in \mathcal{U}$, the corresponding solution $\varphi_{\text{hom}}(t, x, u)$ of the homogeneous equation (1.2) in \mathbb{R}^n coincides with the first n components of the solution $\psi(t, (x, 0), u)$ of (6.1) with initial state $(x, 0)^\top$. For $x \neq 0$, we project this solution to \mathbb{P}^n and get in homogeneous coordinates

$$[\varphi_{\text{hom},1}(t, x, u) : \dots : \varphi_{\text{hom},n}(t, x, u) : 0] \in \mathbb{P}^{n,0}. \quad (6.8)$$

It follows that any control set ${}_{\mathbb{P}}D^{\text{hom}}$ of the system induced in projective space \mathbb{P}^{n-1} by the homogeneous part (1.2) of (1.1) yields a control set $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^0$ contained in $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ of the system induced in projective space \mathbb{P}^n by (6.1). It coincides with $e({}_{\mathbb{P}}D^{\text{hom}})$.

(iii) follows as (ii) taking into account the metric (6.4) on $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$. \square

We remark that the assertions in Proposition 6.2(ii) and (iii) also hold, if the accessibility rank condition in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} is violated (this is the case in Example 7.9).

The intersection $\partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ will be of relevance below. Hence we give it a suggestive name.

DEFINITION 6.3. *For a control set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with associated control set $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1$ in $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$ the set $\partial_{\infty}(D) := \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ is the boundary at infinity of D .*

Proposition 6.2(i) shows, in particular, that the boundary at infinity $\partial_{\infty}(D)$ of an unbounded control set D is nonvoid.

REMARK 6.4. *The construction of the boundary at infinity in $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ of a control set in $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$ bears some similarity to the ideal boundary used by Firer and do Rocio [13] in the analysis of invariant control sets for sub-semigroups of a semisimple Lie group.*

For hyperbolic systems one easily obtains the following result on the control sets in $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$.

COROLLARY 6.5. *Suppose that the accessibility rank condition holds for the affine system (1.1). If (1.1) is hyperbolic the unique control set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ yields a control set $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1$ in $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$. If the uniform hyperbolicity property in Definition 5.5 holds, the control set D is bounded in \mathbb{R}^n and the closure of $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1$ taken in \mathbb{P}^n satisfies $\overline{\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1} \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. This is a consequence of Theorem 5.4, Theorem 5.7, and Proposition 6.2. \square

Next we clarify the relations between the accessibility rank conditions on the relevant spaces. This is based on the following results in Bacciotti and Vivalda [2, Section 4]. Consider a matrix $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and let $z = (z_1, \dots, \widehat{z}_i, \dots, z_d) \in \psi_i(U_i)$. Then the projection of the linear vector field $\tilde{A}x$ to \mathbb{P}^{d-1} is given in local coordinates on $\psi_i(U_i)$ by

$$\tilde{A}^i z = (a_1(\bar{z}^i), \dots, \widehat{a_i(\bar{z}^i)}, \dots, a_d(\bar{z}^i))^{\top} - a_i(\bar{z}^i)z, \quad (6.9)$$

where $\bar{z}^i = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, 1, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_d)^{\top}$ and $\tilde{A}x = (a_1(x), \dots, a_d(x))^{\top}$. Furthermore, the Lie bracket of the projections of two linear vector fields \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} is equal to the projection of the Lie bracket of two linear vector fields \tilde{A} and \tilde{B} . For a family \mathcal{F}_{lin} of linear vector fields on \mathbb{R}^d , the Lie algebra generated by the projections to \mathbb{P}^{d-1} of the vector fields in \mathcal{F}_{lin} is given by the projection on \mathbb{P}^{d-1} of the Lie algebra generated by \mathcal{F}_{lin} .

THEOREM 6.6. (i) *If the accessibility rank condition holds for affine system (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n , then the accessibility rank condition also holds for the system on the submanifold $\mathbb{P}^{n,1} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ induced by the bilinear system (6.1) on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} .*

(ii) *If the accessibility rank condition holds for the system on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} induced by the homogeneous part of system (1.1), then it holds for the system on the invariant submanifold $\mathbb{P}^{n,0} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ induced by the bilinear system (6.1) on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} .*

(iii) *If the assumptions in (i) and (ii) hold, then the system on \mathbb{P}^n induced by the bilinear system (6.1) on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} has two maximal integral manifolds: The manifold $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$ with dimension n and the manifold $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ with dimension $n-1$.*

Proof. First we compute for the linear vector fields determining control system (6.1) on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} the corresponding vector fields on \mathbb{P}^n in local coordinates. Consider for $u \in \Omega$ the linear vector field on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} given by

$$\check{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A & d \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \begin{pmatrix} B_i & c_i \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i B_i & \sum_{i=1}^m u_i c_i + d \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.10)$$

and evaluate the induced vector field on \mathbb{P}^n in a point with homogeneous coordinates $[x_1 : \dots : x_n : 1] \in U_{n+1} = \mathbb{P}^{n,1}$. For the last component we find that $a_{n+1}(x, z)^\top = 0$, since

$$\check{A}(x, z)^\top = \left(\left(A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i B_i \right) x + \left(\sum_{i=1}^m u_i c_i + d \right) z, 0 \right)^\top.$$

Furthermore, for $i = n + 1$, the vector in (6.9) is given by

$$\check{A}^{n+1}(x, 1)^\top = \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i B_i \right) x + \left(\sum_{i=1}^m u_i c_i + d \right).$$

Then assertion (i) follows since the vector fields for affine system (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n and the local expressions for the vector fields on $\mathbb{P}^{n,1}$ coincide.

(ii) We will compare the local coordinates for the vector fields on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} and on $\mathbb{P}^{n,0} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Consider a linear vector field on \mathbb{R}^n corresponding to the homogeneous part of system (1.1),

$$\tilde{A} = A + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i B_i, \quad u \in \Omega.$$

As described above, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x_i \neq 0$ the projection of the linear vector field $\tilde{A}x = (a_1(x), \dots, a_n(x))^\top$ to a vector field on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} is given in local coordinates on $\psi_i(U_i)$ by

$$\tilde{A}^i z = (a_1(\bar{z}^i), \dots, \widehat{a_i(\bar{z}^i)}, \dots, a_n(\bar{z}^i))^\top - a_i(\bar{z}^i)z,$$

where $\bar{z}^i = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, 1, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n)^\top$. Next consider a vector field (6.10) for the bilinear system (6.1) on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . For the charts of \mathbb{P}^n restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0} = e(\mathbb{P}^{n-1})$ observe

$$\check{\psi}_i(\check{z}) = (\psi_i(x), 0)^\top \text{ for } \check{z} = [x_1 : \dots : x_n : 0] \in \check{U}_i \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0} = U_i \times \{0\} \text{ with } x_i \neq 0.$$

For these vectors $\check{z} \in \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ the projection of the linear vector field $\check{A}\check{z}$ to a vector field on \mathbb{P}^n is given in local coordinates on $\check{\psi}_i(\check{U}_i \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0})$ by

$$\check{A}^i \check{z} = (\check{a}_1(\check{z}^i), \dots, \widehat{\check{a}_i(\check{z}^i)}, \dots, \check{a}_n(\check{z}^i), \check{a}_{n+1}(\check{z}^i))^\top - \check{a}_i(\check{z}^i)\check{z},$$

where $\check{z} = (\check{z}_1, \dots, \check{z}_n, 0)^\top$, $\check{z}^i = (\check{z}_1, \dots, \check{z}_{i-1}, 1, \check{z}_{i+1}, \dots, \check{z}_n, 0)^\top$, and

$$\check{A}\check{z} = (\check{a}_1(\check{z}), \dots, \check{a}_n(\check{z}), \check{a}_{n+1}(\check{z}))^\top = (a_1(z), \dots, a_n(z), 0)^\top.$$

Thus we get

$$\check{A}^i z = (a_1(\bar{z}^i), \dots, \widehat{a_i(\bar{z}^i)}, \dots, a_n(\bar{z}^i), 0)^\top - a_i(\bar{z}^i)(z_1, \dots, z_n, 0)^\top = \left(\tilde{A}^i z, 0 \right)^\top.$$

Hence the local coordinates of \check{A}^i and of \tilde{A}^i coincide and assertion (ii) follows.

(iii) This is clear by (i) and (ii). \square

7. Control sets for nonhyperbolic systems. This section shows that all control sets with nonvoid interior are unbounded if the hyperbolicity condition specified in Definition 5.1 is violated. Using the compactification of the state space constructed in the previous section, we analyze in detail when the boundary at infinity of a control set with nonvoid interior intersects in \mathbb{P}^n the image of a control set or a chain control set of the homogeneous part. Finally, it is shown that there is a single chain control set in \mathbb{P}^n containing the images of all control sets D with nonvoid interior in \mathbb{R}^n and the boundary at infinity of this chain control set contains all chain control sets of the homogeneous part having nonvoid intersection with the boundary at infinity of one of the control sets D .

We begin with the following motivation. Consider a linear control system of the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \quad u(t) \in \Omega, \quad (7.1)$$

where the control range $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a compact convex neighborhood of the origin. This is a special case of system (1.1) for $B_1 = \dots = B_m = 0$ and $d = 0$. We assume that the system without control restriction is controllable. By Colonius and Kliemann [6, Example 3.2.16] there is a unique control set D with nonvoid interior. With $\mathbf{GE}(A; \mu)$ denoting the real generalized eigenspace for an eigenvalue μ of A it satisfies

$$\mathbf{E}_0 \subset D \subset K + \mathbf{E}_0 + F, \quad (7.2)$$

where $\mathbf{E}_0 := \bigoplus_{\operatorname{Re} \mu = 0} \mathbf{GE}(A; \mu)$ is the central spectral subspace and the sets $K \subset \bigoplus_{\operatorname{Re} \mu < 0} \mathbf{GE}(A; \mu)$ and $F \subset \bigoplus_{\operatorname{Re} \mu > 0} \mathbf{GE}(A; \mu)$ are compact (cf. Hinrichsen and Pritchard [14, Theorem 6.2.23]; this can also be deduced from Sontag [23, Corollary 3.6.7]). Thus D is bounded if and only if $\mathbf{E}_0 = \{0\}$, i.e., if A is hyperbolic. If A is nonhyperbolic we embed system (7.1) into a homogeneous bilinear control system in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} as explained in Section 6 and, for the corresponding control set $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1$ in \mathbb{P}^n , we find that the boundary at infinity satisfies

$$\partial_{\infty}(D) = \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0} = \{[x_1 : \dots : x_n : 0] \mid [x_1 : \dots : x_n] \in \pi_{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{E}_0\}. \quad (7.3)$$

This follows from (7.2) noting that for $0 \neq x \in \mathbf{E}_0$ and every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ one obtains an element of D given by

$$k_j + jx + f_j \text{ with } k_j \in K, f_j \in F \text{ and } x \in \mathbf{E}_0.$$

Considering the homogeneous coordinates and dividing by j one finds for $j \rightarrow \infty$ that (7.3) holds. The set $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{E}_0$ is a maximal invariant chain transitive set for the flow induced by the homogeneous part $\dot{x} = Ax$ on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} (cf. Colonius and Kliemann [7, Theorem 4.1.3]). Thus the boundary at infinity $\partial_{\infty}(D)$ is a maximal invariant chain transitive set for the induced flow on $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$.

For general affine control systems of the form (1.1) it stands to reason to replace the maximal chain transitive sets $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{E}_0$ by maximal chain transitive sets of the control flow associated with the homogeneous part or, equivalently, by chain control sets in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} (cf. (2.6)) and to replace the spectral property of \mathbf{E}_0 by appropriate generalized spectral properties. However, the situation for general affine control systems will turn out to be more intricate than for linear control systems.

Now we start our discussion of the nonhyperbolic case for (1.1). Here several control sets with nonvoid interior may coexist as illustrated by [8, Example 5.16 and

Example 5.17]. The following theorem shows that in the nonhyperbolic case all control sets with nonvoid interior are unbounded. Recall that 0 is a Floquet exponent for the differential equation in (1.2) with τ -periodic control u if $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0))$.

THEOREM 7.1. *Assume that the affine control system (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n satisfies the accessibility rank condition. If the system is nonhyperbolic every control set D with nonvoid interior is unbounded.*

More precisely, for every control set D with nonvoid interior there are $g(u) \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$, $\tau > 0$, with $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0))$ and points $x^k \in \text{int}(D)$ such that

$$\|x^k\| \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } d\left(\frac{x^k}{\|x^k\|}, \mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.4)$$

Proof. Let D be a control set with nonvoid interior and consider $x \in \text{int}(D)$. By Proposition 3.2(i) there are $\sigma > 0$ and $g \in \mathcal{S}_\sigma \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ such that $gx = x$. Then the σ -periodic control v with $g = g(v)$ yields the σ -periodic trajectory $\varphi(\cdot, x, v) \subset \text{int}(D)$. Thus

$$\int_0^\sigma \Phi_v(\sigma, s) (Cv(s) + d) ds = (I - \Phi_v(\sigma, 0))x.$$

Step 1: If $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_v(\sigma, 0))$ the affine subspace $Y = x + \mathbf{E}(\Phi_v(\sigma, 0); 1) \subset \text{int}(D)$. For the proof, an application of Lemma 4.4 shows that there is a σ -periodic solution of (4.4) starting in y if and only if $y \in Y = x + \mathbf{E}(\Phi_v(\sigma, 0); 1)$. Thus $g(v)y = y$ for all $y \in Y$. Proposition 3.2(ii) implies that every y is in the interior of some control set, hence $Y \subset \text{int}(D)$. Furthermore, Lemma 4.4 also yields points $x^k \in Y$ such that assertion (7.4) holds with $u := v$ and $\tau := \sigma$.

Step 2: Suppose that $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_v(\sigma, 0))$. Since the system is nonhyperbolic there are a τ' -periodic control w and $\rho \in \text{spec}(\Phi_w(\tau', 0)) \cap \mathbb{R}$ with $g(w) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau'} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ and $0 = \frac{1}{\tau'} \log |\rho|$. Thus $\rho = \pm 1$. If $\rho = -1$ we may consider w as a $2\tau'$ -periodic control and find that $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_w(2\tau', 0))$ with $\tilde{g}(w) \in \mathcal{S}_{2\tau'} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$. Hence, without loss of generality, we may assume that $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_w(\tau', 0))$.

Lemma 4.2 shows that there exist $\tau_1 > 0$, $g(u^1) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_1} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$, and a continuous path $p : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $p(0) = g(u^0) = g(v)$, and $p(1) = g(u^1)$ such that $p(\alpha) = g(u^\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and the following properties hold. The u^α are τ_α -periodic controls with $\tau_0 = \sigma$ and $g(u^\alpha) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_\alpha} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. The principal fundamental solutions $\Phi_{u^\alpha}(t, s)$ of $\dot{x}(t) = A(u^\alpha(t))x(t)$ satisfy $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0))$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^1}(\tau_1, 0))$. The times τ_α as well as the controls $u^\alpha \in L^2([0, 2\sigma + \tau_1]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ depend continuously on $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. Hence, for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, there are unique τ_α -periodic trajectories for u^α which by Proposition 3.2(ii) are in the interior of a control set. It follows that all τ_α -periodic trajectories with $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ are contained in the interior of D , in particular, their initial values satisfy $x^\alpha \in \text{int}(D)$.

Now consider a sequence $\alpha_k \rightarrow 1$ with $\alpha_k < 1$. If

$$\int_0^{\tau_1} \Phi_{u^1}(\tau_1, s) (Cu^1(s) + d) ds \in \text{Im}(I - \Phi_{u^1}(\tau_1, 0)), \quad (7.5)$$

let with $\alpha_0 := 1$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$b_k := \int_0^{\tau_{\alpha_k}} \Phi_{u^{\alpha_k}}(\tau_{\alpha_k}, s) (Cu^{\alpha_k}(s) + d) ds, \quad A_k := I - \Phi_{u^{\alpha_k}}(\tau_{\alpha_k}, 0).$$

Then $A_k x^{\alpha_k} = b_k$ and $A_k \rightarrow A_0, b_k \rightarrow b_0$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$, and $\ker A_0 = \mathbf{E}(\Phi_{u^1}(\tau_1, 0); 1)$. If x^{α_k} remains bounded, we may assume that $x^{\alpha_k} \rightarrow x^0$ for some $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and

hence $A_0 x^0 = b_0$. As in Step 1, Lemma 4.4 implies assertion (7.4). If x^{α_k} becomes unbounded then

$$\left\| A_0 \frac{x^{\alpha_k}}{\|x^{\alpha_k}\|} \right\| \leq \|A_0 - A_k\| + \left\| A_k \frac{x^{\alpha_k}}{\|x^{\alpha_k}\|} \right\| \leq \|A_0 - A_k\| + \frac{b_k}{\|x^{\alpha_k}\|} \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

and again (7.4) follows.

If (7.5) does not hold, Lemma 4.3 implies that, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$, the initial values x^k of the τ_{α_k} -periodic solutions satisfy (7.4) with $u := u^1, \tau = \tau_1$. \square

Next we discuss the relation of the boundary at infinity to control sets of the homogeneous part of the affine control system, motivated by the case of linear control systems exposed in the beginning of this section. First observe that every control set $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1$ satisfies $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1 \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0} = \emptyset$ since $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ is invariant, and recall that e defined in (6.6) denotes the diffeomorphism from \mathbb{P}^{n-1} to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$. We note the following lemma.

LEMMA 7.2. *Suppose that $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1$ is an invariant control set in \mathbb{P}^n .*

(i) *If $x \in \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$, then $\overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)} \subset \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$.*

(ii) *If $e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}}) \subset \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ is a control set with $\partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}}) \neq \emptyset$, then $e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}}) \subset \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$.*

(iii) *If $\partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0} \neq \emptyset$ it contains an invariant control set $e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}})$ of the system restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$.*

Proof. (i) Let $y \in \overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)}$. Then $y \in \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$, since $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ is invariant and closed in \mathbb{P}^n . For fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $T > 0$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$ with $d(\varphi(T, x, u), y) < \varepsilon$. Furthermore, there are $x^k \in \pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1$ with $x^k \rightarrow x$. Since $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1$ is an invariant control set it follows that $\varphi(T, x^k, u) \in \pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1$, and continuous dependence on the initial values implies that $d(\varphi(T, x^k, u), y) < \varepsilon$ for k large enough. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we have shown that $y \in \pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1$ and hence $\overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)} \subset \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$.

(ii) Pick $x \in \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}})$. Since $e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}}) \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)}$, the assertion follows from (i).

(iii) By Colonius and Kliemann [6, Theorem 3.2.8], for every point x in the compact space $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ there is an invariant control set $e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}})$ contained in the closure of the reachable set $\mathcal{O}^+(x)$. Assertion (i) shows that every $x \in \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ satisfies $\overline{\mathcal{O}^+(x)} \subset \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ and hence the assertion follows. \square

We obtain the following consequence for invariant control sets.

THEOREM 7.3. *Assume that the affine system (1.1) satisfies the accessibility rank condition and this system is nonhyperbolic. Suppose that D is an invariant control set.*

(i) *Then the interior of D is nonvoid, the set D is unbounded in \mathbb{R}^n , and the boundary at infinity $\partial_{\infty}(D)$ contains an invariant control set $e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}})$ of the system restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$.*

(ii) *If the control range Ω is a compact convex neighborhood of the origin and the system on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} satisfies the accessibility rank condition, then the boundary at infinity $\partial_{\infty}(D)$ contains the unique invariant control set $e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}})$ where $\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}}$ the unique invariant control set on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} .*

Proof. (i) The interior of D is nonvoid, since the interior of the system semigroup is nonvoid by Theorem 3.1(i). Theorem 7.1 shows that the set D is unbounded. It follows that $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1 \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0} \neq \emptyset$, and by Proposition 6.2(i) $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1$ is an invariant control set contained in $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$. Hence the assertion follows from Lemma 7.2(iii).

(ii) The accessibility rank condition entails that the invariant control set $e(\mathbb{P} D^{\text{hom}})$ of the system on $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ is unique since this holds by Theorem 2.7(i) on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} . \square

We proceed to analyze the boundary at infinity of not necessarily invariant control sets. Here the chain control sets $\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}, j = 1, \dots, l$, of the projectivized homogeneous part will play a crucial role. Recall their characterization in Subsection 2.2.

PROPOSITION 7.4. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 7.1 be satisfied and consider a control set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with nonvoid interior of (1.1). Then there is $g(u) \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ such that $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0))$ (hence 0 is a Floquet exponent) and the boundary at infinity of D satisfies*

$$e(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1))) \cap \partial_\infty(D) \neq \emptyset. \quad (7.6)$$

Proof. Theorem 7.1 shows that D is unbounded and that there are $g(u) \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0))$ and $x^k \in \text{int}(D)$ satisfying $\|x^k\| \rightarrow \infty$ and $d(\frac{x^k}{\|x^k\|}, \mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)) \rightarrow 0$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$. Under the projection $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}$ to \mathbb{P}^n one obtains that $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\{(x, 0) | x \in \mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)\} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$. Hence, in homogeneous coordinates, this leads to

$$d([x_1^k : \dots : x_n^k : 1], \pi_{\mathbb{P}}\{(x, 0) | x \in \mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)\}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{P}^n.$$

Proposition 6.2(i) implies that

$$e(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)) = \pi_{\mathbb{P}}\{(x, 0) | x \in \mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)\} \cap \partial_\infty(D) \neq \emptyset.$$

□

We obtain the following result on the relation between the boundary at infinity of a control set in \mathbb{R}^n and the chain control sets of the homogeneous part in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} .

THEOREM 7.5. *Assume that the affine control system (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^n satisfies the accessibility rank condition and that the system is nonhyperbolic. Furthermore, let the control range Ω be a compact convex neighborhood of the origin. Consider a control set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with nonvoid interior of (1.1).*

(i) *There is a chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ such that $\partial_\infty(D) \cap e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \neq \emptyset$. If the projectivized homogeneous part on \mathbb{P}^{n-1} satisfies the accessibility rank condition, the following further assertions hold.*

(ii) *For the control sets $\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}}, \dots, \mathbb{P}D_{i_j}^{\text{hom}} \subset \mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ with nonvoid interior there are points $y^i \in \pi_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}(\overline{\mathbb{P}D_i^{\text{hom}}})$ and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ with*

$$e(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}(\alpha_1 y^1 + \dots + \alpha_{i_j} y^{i_j})) \in \partial_\infty(D). \quad (7.7)$$

(iii) *If a chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} is the closure of a control set $\mathbb{P}D_j^{\text{hom}}$ with nonvoid interior, then $0 \in \overline{\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{P}D_j^{\text{hom}})}$ and the boundary at infinity $\partial_\infty(D)$ has a nonvoid intersection with the closure of the control set $e(\mathbb{P}D_j^{\text{hom}})$.*

Proof. (i) This follows from Proposition 7.4: Since $x = \Phi_u(\tau, 0)x$ for all $x \in \mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)$ the set $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)$ consists of points on τ -periodic solutions for the τ -periodic control u and hence is contained in a chain control set $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$ in $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$.

(ii) By the result in (2.5) there are control sets $\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}}, \dots, \mathbb{P}D_{i_j}^{\text{hom}} \subset \mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ with nonvoid interior such that for $x \in \mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ there are points $y^i \in \pi_{\mathbb{P}}^{-1}(\overline{\mathbb{P}D_i^{\text{hom}}})$ and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ with

$$x = \alpha_1 y^1 + \dots + \alpha_{i_j} y^{i_j}.$$

Under the diffeomorphism e of \mathbb{P}^{n-1} to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ this yields the assertion in (7.7). Assertion (iii) follows from (i) and (ii). \square

REMARK 7.6. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.5(iii), suppose that for the control u with the property in (7.6) the Floquet exponent 0 even satisfies $0 \in \text{int}(\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{P}D_j^{\text{hom}}))$. Then, by Theorem 2.7, the control set $\mathbb{P}D_j^{\text{hom}}$ is the projection of a control set $\mathbb{R}D_j^{\text{hom}}$ of the homogeneous part in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$.*

In order to show a partial converse of Theorem 7.5 we prepare the following lemma.

LEMMA 7.7. *Suppose that $g(u) \in \mathcal{S}_\tau \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0))$ and*

$$\Phi_u(\tau, 0) = \exp(A(u^k)t_k) \cdots \exp(A(u^1)t_1),$$

where, for $i = 1, \dots, k$, $t_i > 0$ and $u^i \in \Omega$, hence $\tau = t_1 + \dots + t_k$ and $u(t) = u^i$ for $t \in [t_0 + \dots + t_{i-1}, t_0 + \dots + t_i]$ with $t_0 = 0$.

Define for $s \in [0, t_k]$ controls u^s by $u^s(t) = u(t)$ for $[0, \tau - s]$. Then $u^0 = u$ and there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$g(u^s) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau-s} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S}) \text{ with } 1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^s}(\tau - s, 0)) \text{ for } s \in (0, \varepsilon).$$

Furthermore, $\Phi_{u^s}(\tau - s, 0) \rightarrow \Phi_u(\tau, 0)$ for $s \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. The matrices

$$\Phi_{u^s}(\tau - s, 0) = \exp(A(u^k)(t_k - s)) \cdots \exp(A(u^1)t_1)$$

depend analytically on s and the same holds for $\det(I - \Phi_{u^s}(\tau - s, 0)) - 1$. Hence there are at most finitely many zeroes in $[0, t_k]$ which implies that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ with

$$1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^s}(\tau - s, 0)) \text{ for } s \in (0, \varepsilon).$$

Taking $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough leads to $g(u^s) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau-s} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$. \square

Next we formulate the announced partial converse of Theorem 7.5. Recall that the elements of the system semigroup $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{S}^{\text{hom}}$ of the homogeneous system on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ can be identified with the principal fundamental solutions $\Phi_u(\tau, 0)$ for τ -periodic $u \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$.

THEOREM 7.8. *Assume for the homogeneous part in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ of system (1.1) that the accessibility rank condition holds and let $\mathbb{R}D_i^{\text{hom}}$ be a control set with nonvoid interior. Then there is a control set D with nonvoid interior of the affine system (1.1) such that its boundary at infinity satisfies, with $\mathbb{P}D_i^{\text{hom}} \supset \pi_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{R}D_i^{\text{hom}})$,*

$$\partial_\infty(D) \cap e(\mathbb{P}D_i^{\text{hom}}) \neq \emptyset. \quad (7.8)$$

Proof. Fix a point $x \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}D_i^{\text{hom}})$. Since $\text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau}) \neq \emptyset$ for all $\tau > 0$ there are $\tau_0 > 0$ small enough and $u^0 \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$ with $g(u^0) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_0} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ and $x^0 := \Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0)x \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}D_i^{\text{hom}})$. Since also $\text{int}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq \tau}^{\text{hom}}) \neq \emptyset$ for all $\tau > 0$ there are $\tau_1 > 0$ small enough and $u^1 \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$ such that the corresponding element $\Phi_{u^1}(\tau_1, 0) \in \mathbb{R}\mathcal{S}_{\tau_1}^{\text{hom}} \cap \text{int}(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{S}^{\text{hom}})$ satisfies

$$x^1 := \Phi_{u^1}(\tau_1, 0)x^0 = \Phi_{u^1}(\tau_1, 0)\Phi_{u^0}(\tau_0, 0)x \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}D_i^{\text{hom}}).$$

By controllability in the interior of $\mathbb{R}D_i^{\text{hom}}$ there are $\tau_2 > 0$ and $u^2 \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$ satisfying $\Phi_{u^2}(\tau_2, 0)x^1 = x$. Define $\tau := \tau_0 + \tau_1 + \tau_2$ and a control $u \in \mathcal{U}_{pc}$ by τ -periodic extension of

$$u(t) := \begin{cases} u^0(t) & \text{for } t \in [0, \tau_0) \\ u^1(t - \tau_0) & \text{for } t \in [\tau_0, \tau_0 + \tau_1) \\ u^2(t - \tau_0 - \tau_1) & \text{for } t \in [\tau_0 + \tau_1, \tau_0 + \tau_1 + \tau_2) \end{cases}.$$

Then $\Phi_u(\tau, 0)x = x$, hence $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0))$, and

$$g(u) = g(u^2)g(u^1)g(u^0) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S}), \quad \Phi_u(\tau, 0) = h(u) = h(u^2)h(u^1)h(u^0) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}\mathcal{S}^{\text{hom}}).$$

By Proposition 3.2(ii) it follows that the eigenspace $\mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)$ of $\Phi_u(\tau, 0)$ for the eigenvalue 1 is contained in the interior of a control set in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Since $x \in \mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)$ this implies that

$$\mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1) \subset \text{int}(\mathbb{R}D_i^{\text{hom}}) \text{ and hence } \pi_{\mathbb{P}}\mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1) \subset \text{int}(\mathbb{P}D_i^{\text{hom}}). \quad (7.9)$$

By Lemma 7.7 there are $g(u^s) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau-s} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^s}(\tau - s, 0))$ and $\Phi_{u^s}(\tau - s, 0) \rightarrow \Phi_u(\tau, 0)$ for $s \rightarrow 0$. Proposition 2.9(i) shows that there are unique $(\tau - s)$ -periodic solutions of the affine equation for the $(\tau - s)$ -periodic extension of u^s denoted by $\varphi(\cdot, x^s, u^s)$. By Proposition 3.2(ii) they are in the interior of a control set D for the affine system (1.1).

Suppose that assumption (iii) in Lemma 4.3 is satisfied. Then it follows that

$$\|x^s\| \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } \frac{x^s}{\|x^s\|} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1) \text{ for } s \rightarrow 0. \quad (7.10)$$

Hence, for $s \rightarrow 0$, the points $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}(x^s, 1) \in \pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1$ converge to $e(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1))$ showing that

$$\overline{\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1} \cap e(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)) \neq \emptyset.$$

Together with (7.9) this implies that the boundary at infinity of D satisfies (7.8). If assumption (iii) in Lemma 4.3 is not satisfied, Lemma 4.4 shows that there are $x^k \in \mathbf{E}(\Phi_u(\tau, 0); 1)$ with (7.10) for $k \rightarrow \infty$. This shows the assertion also in this case. \square

The following example (cf. Mohler [18, Example 2 on page 32] and Colonius, Santana, Setti [8, Example 5.16]) shows that, in general, the boundary at infinity of a control set D may contain more than one control set of the projectivized homogeneous part.

EXAMPLE 7.9. *Consider the inhomogeneous bilinear control system*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2u & 1 \\ 1 & 2u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} u, \quad u \in \Omega = [-1, 1].$$

The eigenvalues of $A(u) = A + uB$ are given by $\lambda_1(u) = 2u + 1 > \lambda_2(u) = 2u - 1$ and $\lambda_1(-1/2) = \lambda_2(1/2) = 0$. For every $u \in \mathbb{R}$, the eigenspaces for $\lambda_1(u)$ and $\lambda_2(u)$ are $\mathbf{E}(A + uB; \lambda_1(u)) = \{(z, z)^{\top} \mid z \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and $\mathbf{E}(A + uB; \lambda_2(u)) = \{(z, -z)^{\top} \mid z \in \mathbb{R}\}$, resp. In the northern part of the unit circle (hence in \mathbb{P}^1) this yields the two one-point control sets given by the equilibria for any $u \in [-1, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}} = \left\{ \left(1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2} \right) \right\} \text{ and } \mathbb{P}D_2^{\text{hom}} = \left\{ \left(-1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2} \right) \right\}.$$

Here the trajectories not starting in one of these equilibria approach $\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}}$ and $\mathbb{P}D_2^{\text{hom}}$ for $t \rightarrow +\infty$ and $t \rightarrow -\infty$, resp. In $\mathbb{P}^{2,0}$ one obtains in homogeneous coordinates

$$e(\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}}) = \left\{ \left[1/\sqrt{2} : 1/\sqrt{2} : 0 \right] \right\} \text{ and } e(\mathbb{P}D_2^{\text{hom}}) = \left\{ \left[-1/\sqrt{2} : 1/\sqrt{2} : 0 \right] \right\}.$$

As shown in [8, Example 4.4/5.16] there is a connected branch of equilibria

$$\mathcal{B}_1 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x_u \\ y_u \end{pmatrix} \mid u \in \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) \right\} \text{ with } \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{B}_1.$$

They become unbounded for $|u| \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$, and there is a single control set D_1 containing the equilibria in \mathcal{B}_1 in the interior.

We embed the control system into a homogeneous bilinear system in \mathbb{R}^3 and project it to \mathbb{P}^2 . Then the control set D yields a control set $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1$ in $\mathbb{P}^{2,1}$ given by

$$\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1 = \{[x : y : 1] \mid (x, y)^\top \in D\}.$$

The equilibria in \mathcal{B}_1 satisfy $\frac{(x_u, y_u)}{\|(x_u, y_u)\|} \rightarrow \left(\mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$ for $u \rightarrow \pm \frac{1}{2}$, and hence in \mathbb{P}^2

$$\left[\frac{x_u}{\|(x_u, y_u)\|} : \frac{y_u}{\|(x_u, y_u)\|} : \frac{1}{\|(x_u, y_u)\|} \right] \rightarrow \left[\mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} : \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} : 0 \right].$$

Consequently, both control sets $e(\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}})$ and $e(\mathbb{P}D_2^{\text{hom}})$ for the homogeneous part are contained in the boundary at infinity of the control set D ,

$$e(\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}}) \cup e(\mathbb{P}D_2^{\text{hom}}) \subset \partial(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1) \cap \mathbb{P}^{2,0} = \partial_\infty(D).$$

The homogeneous part of Example 7.9 violates the accessibility rank condition in \mathbb{P}^1 and the control sets $\mathbb{P}D_1$ and $\mathbb{P}D_2$ in \mathbb{P}^1 have void interiors. We slightly modify this example in order to get control sets in \mathbb{P}^1 with nonvoid interior. Note that here an arbitrarily small perturbation suffices to change the system behavior drastically.

EXAMPLE 7.10. Consider for small $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2u & 1 \\ 1 & (2+\varepsilon)u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} u = (A + uB(\varepsilon)) \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + Cu,$$

with $u(t) \in [-1, 1]$. We will show that there is a control set D in \mathbb{R}^2 such that the boundary at infinity $\partial_\infty(D)$ intersects two control sets with nonvoid interior for the homogeneous part.

Step 1: The eigenvalues of $A + uB(\varepsilon)$ are given by

$$\lambda_{1,2}(u, \varepsilon) = \frac{u}{2}(4 + \varepsilon) \pm \sqrt{1 + u^2 \left[\frac{1}{4}(4 + \varepsilon)^2 - (4 + 2\varepsilon) \right]}.$$

Note that $\lambda_1(u, \varepsilon) > \lambda_2(u, \varepsilon)$ for all $u \in [-1, 1]$. For $\varepsilon = 0$, it is clear that the functions $u \mapsto \lambda_{1,2}(u, 0) = 2u \pm 1$ are strictly increasing, hence this also holds for small $\varepsilon > 0$. Thus there are unique values $u^1(\varepsilon), u^2(\varepsilon) \in (-1, 1)$ with

$$\lambda_1(u^1(\varepsilon), \varepsilon) = 0 \text{ and } \lambda_2(u^2(\varepsilon), \varepsilon) = 0,$$

and $u^1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}$ and $u^2(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The eigenvectors $(x, y)^\top$ satisfy $y = (\lambda_{1,2}(u, \varepsilon) - 2u)x$. For $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and all $u \in [-1, 1]$ the eigenspace $\mathbf{E}(A + uB(\varepsilon); \lambda_i(u, \varepsilon))$ converges to the eigenspace $\mathbf{E}(A + uB(0); \lambda_i(u, 0))$. In the northern part of the unit circle (hence in \mathbb{P}^1) this yields the two equilibria $e_1(u, \varepsilon)$ and $e_2(u, \varepsilon)$, and the other trajectories in \mathbb{P}^1 converge for $t \rightarrow \infty$ to $e_1(u, \varepsilon)$ and for $t \rightarrow -\infty$ to $e_2(u, \varepsilon)$. Hence there are control sets $\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}}$ and $\mathbb{P}D_2^{\text{hom}}$ (depending on ε) with nonvoid interior consisting of the equilibria $e_1(u, \varepsilon)$ and $e_2(u, \varepsilon)$, $u \in [-1, 1]$, resp. The control

set $\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}}$ is invariant. One easily verifies the accessibility rank condition in \mathbb{P}^1 . Since $0 \in \text{int}(\Sigma_{Fl}(\mathbb{P}D_i^{\text{hom}}))$ it follows that $\mathbb{P}D_i^{\text{hom}}$ is the projection to \mathbb{P}^1 of a control set $\mathbb{R}D_i^{\text{hom}}$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$, $i = 1, 2$.

Step 2: For $u \neq u^1(\varepsilon), u^2(\varepsilon)$ the equilibria are given by

$$(A + uB(\varepsilon))(x_u(\varepsilon), y_u(\varepsilon))^\top = -Cu.$$

It follows that the equilibria $(x_u(\varepsilon), y_u(\varepsilon))^\top$ approach $\mathbf{E}(A + u^i(\varepsilon)B(\varepsilon); 0)$ for $u \rightarrow u^i(\varepsilon)$, $i = 1, 2$. In both cases, the equilibria become unbounded. In particular, there is a connected unbounded branch of equilibria

$$\mathcal{B}_1(\varepsilon) = \{(x_u(\varepsilon), y_u(\varepsilon))^\top \mid u \in (u^1(\varepsilon), u^2(\varepsilon))\}$$

and a single control set D (again depending on ε) containing the equilibria in $\mathcal{B}_1(\varepsilon)$.

Step 3: Embedding the control system into a homogeneous bilinear system in \mathbb{R}^3 and projecting it to \mathbb{P}^2 one obtains from the control set D a control set in $\mathbb{P}^{2,1}$ given by $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D^1 = \{[x : y : 1] \mid (x, y)^\top \in D\}$. As the equilibria $(x_u(\varepsilon), y_u(\varepsilon))^\top \in \mathcal{B}_1$ become unbounded for $u \rightarrow u^i(\varepsilon)$ they approach the eigenspace $\mathbf{E}(A + u^i(\varepsilon)B(\varepsilon); 0)$, resp. It follows that

$$e(\mathbb{P}D_1^{\text{hom}}) \cap \partial_\infty(D) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } e(\mathbb{P}D_2^{\text{hom}}) \cap \partial_\infty(D) \neq \emptyset.$$

In the following we consider chain control sets of the affine system in \mathbb{P}^n . First we define a corresponding boundary at infinity.

DEFINITION 7.11. *The boundary at infinity of a chain control set $\mathbb{P}E$ for the affine system (6.5) in \mathbb{P}^n is*

$$\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E) := \partial(\mathbb{P}E) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}.$$

This definition is similar to the boundary at infinity for control sets but it refers to chain control sets in \mathbb{P}^n not requiring that they are obtained from chain control sets in \mathbb{R}^n ; cf. also Example 7.14. Note that $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E) \subset \mathbb{P}E$ since chain control sets are closed.

LEMMA 7.12. *Let $\mathbb{P}E$ be a chain control set in \mathbb{P}^n .*

(i) *If $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E) \cap e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \neq \emptyset$ for a chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} of the homogeneous part, then $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \subset \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E)$.*

(ii) *If $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E)$ is nonvoid, it contains a chain control set $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$ for a chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ of the homogeneous part.*

Proof. (i) Recall from Proposition 6.2(iii) that $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$ is a chain control set of the system restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$. We will show that the set

$$\mathbb{P}E' := \mathbb{P}E \cup e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$$

satisfies the properties (i) and (ii) of a chain control set in \mathbb{P}^n . Then the maximality property (iii) of the chain control set $\mathbb{P}E$ implies that $\mathbb{P}E' = \mathbb{P}E$ showing that $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \subset \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E)$.

It is clear that $\mathbb{P}E'$ satisfies (i), since this holds for $\mathbb{P}E$ and $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$. For property (ii), it suffices to consider $x \in \mathbb{P}E$ and $y \in e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$ and $\varepsilon, T > 0$. Fix $z \in \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E) \cap e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) = \mathbb{P}E \cap e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$. There are controlled (ε, T) -chains ζ_1 and ζ_2 from x to z and from z to x , resp. For the system restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$, there exist controlled (ε, T) -chains ζ_3 and ζ_4 from z to y and from y to z , resp. Then the concatenations

$\zeta_3 \circ \zeta_1$ and $\zeta_3 \circ \zeta_4$ are controlled (ε, T) -chains from x to y and from y to x , resp. This concludes the proof of assertion (i).

(ii) Let $x \in \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E)$. Then there exists a control $u \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\varphi(t, x, u) \in \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E) = \mathbb{P}E \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ for all $t \geq 0$ by property (i) of chain control sets and invariance of $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$. Since $\mathbb{P}E \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0} = \partial(\mathbb{P}E) \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ is compact, it follows that the set of limit points satisfies

$$\emptyset \neq \omega_{\mathbb{P}}(u, x) := \left\{ y = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{\mathbb{P}} \varphi(t_k, x, u) \mid t_k \rightarrow \infty \right\} \subset \mathbb{P}E \cap \mathbb{P}^{n,0}.$$

Hence Colonius and Kliemann [6, Corollary 4.3.12] implies that there exists a chain control set of the system restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{n,0}$ containing $\omega_{\mathbb{P}}(u, x)$. Thus there is a chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} of the homogeneous part with $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E) \cap e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \neq \emptyset$. Now the assertion follows from (i). \square

The next theorem is the main result on the control sets D with nonvoid interior in \mathbb{R}^n in the nonhyperbolic case. In contrast to the hyperbolic case treated in Section 5 they are unbounded and they need not be unique. Using the compactification provided by \mathbb{P}^n we will show that there is a single chain control set $\mathbb{P}E$ in \mathbb{P}^n containing the images of all the control sets D . The boundary at infinity $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E)$ is related to the homogeneous part of the system: it contains all chain control sets $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$ for chain control sets $\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ of the homogeneous part having nonvoid intersection with the boundary at infinity $\partial_\infty(D)$ of one of the control sets D ; by Theorem 7.5 we know that each $\partial_\infty(D)$ has nonvoid intersection with at least one $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$.

THEOREM 7.13. *Assume that the affine control system (1.1) satisfies the accessibility rank condition and that it is nonhyperbolic. Furthermore, let the control range Ω be a compact convex neighborhood of the origin.*

Then there exists a single chain control set $\mathbb{P}E$ in \mathbb{P}^n containing the control sets $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D^1$ for all control sets D with nonvoid interior in \mathbb{R}^n . Furthermore, the boundary at infinity $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E)$ contains all $\partial_\infty(D)$ and all chain control sets $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$ where $\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ are the chain control sets in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} for the homogeneous part with $\partial_\infty(D) \cap e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \neq \emptyset$ for some D .

Proof. Consider control sets D_0 and D_1 in \mathbb{R}^n with nonvoid interior. It suffices to show that there is a chain control set $\mathbb{P}E$ in \mathbb{P}^n containing $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D_0^1$ and $\pi_{\mathbb{P}} D_1^1$ and that its boundary at infinity $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E)$ contains all chain control sets $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$ with $\partial_\infty(D_i) \cap e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 0$ or $i = 1$.

Pick $x^0 \in \text{int}(D_0)$ and $x^1 \in \text{int}(D_1)$. Then, for $i = 0, 1$, Proposition 3.2(i) implies that there are $\tau_i > 0$ and $g_i = g(u^i) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_i} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ with $x^i = g(u^i)x^i$. Using Lemma 3.3 one finds a continuous path $p : [0, 1] \rightarrow \text{int}(\mathcal{S}) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rtimes \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ with $p(0) = g(u^0)$, $p(1) = g(u^1)$, and $p(\alpha) = g(u^\alpha) \in \mathcal{S}_{\tau_\alpha} \cap \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ where $\tau_\alpha > 0$ depends continuously on α . Furthermore, $g(u^\alpha)$ depends in a piecewise analytic way on α . By Remark 3.4 also $u^\alpha \in L^2([0, \tau_0 + \tau_1]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ depends continuously on α . It follows that also $\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0)$ depends continuously and in a piecewise analytic way on α .

If there is a point $x^\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x^\alpha = g(u^\alpha)x^\alpha$, Proposition 3.2(ii) shows that there is a control set D^α with $x^\alpha \in \text{int}(D^\alpha)$. If such a point does not exist, this means that the τ_α -periodic differential equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(u^\alpha(t))x(t) + Cu^\alpha(t) + d$$

has no τ_α -periodic solution. Hence, by Proposition 2.9(ii), $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0))$ and $\int_0^{\tau_\alpha} \Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, s) [Cu^\alpha(s) + d] ds \notin \text{Im}(I - \Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0))$.

Claim 1. Let $\alpha_0 \in [0, 1]$ be a parameter value where $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^{\alpha_0}}(\tau_{\alpha_0}, 0))$ and $g(u^{\alpha_0})x^{\alpha_0} = x^{\alpha_0}$ and $\alpha \mapsto g(u^\alpha)$ is continuously differentiable in α_0 . Then there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ with $|\alpha - \alpha_0| < \varepsilon$ there is x^α with $g(u^\alpha)x^\alpha = x^\alpha$ and $\alpha \mapsto x^\alpha$ is continuously differentiable.

The claim follows by the Implicit Function Theorem: The function $F(\alpha, x) = x - g(u^\alpha)x$ is continuously differentiable as a map $J \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, where J is an open interval containing $[0, 1]$. In fact, by (4.2)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}g(u^\alpha)x = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\varphi(\tau_\alpha, x, u^\alpha) = \Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0),$$

and $\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0)$ depends continuously on α . One has that $F(\alpha_0, x^{\alpha_0}) = 0$ and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}F(\alpha_0, x) = I - \Phi_{u^{\alpha_0}}(\tau_{\alpha_0}, 0)$$

is of full rank in $\alpha = \alpha_0$ since $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^{\alpha_0}}(\tau_{\alpha_0}, 0))$. Thus there is a continuously differentiable function $\alpha \mapsto x^\alpha$ defined on a neighborhood of α_0 with $0 = F(\alpha, x^\alpha) = x^\alpha - g(u^\alpha)x^\alpha$ and Claim 1 follows.

Define

$$A := \{\alpha \in [0, 1] \mid 1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0)) \text{ and } \alpha' \mapsto g(u^{\alpha'}) \text{ cont. differentiable in } \alpha\}.$$

There are at most only finitely many $0 \leq \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_r \leq 1$ with $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0))$ or $\alpha \mapsto g(u^\alpha)$ not being continuously differentiable. This holds, since $\alpha \rightarrow \det(I - \Phi_{u^\alpha}(\tau_\alpha, 0))$ and $\alpha \mapsto g(u^\alpha)$ are piecewise analytic, hence continuously differentiable for all but at most finitely many points in $[0, 1]$. In particular, A consists of $1 \leq r' \leq r + 1$ intervals.

For $\alpha \in A$ there is x^α with $x^\alpha = g(u^\alpha)x^\alpha$ and $x^\alpha \in \text{int}(D^\alpha)$ for some control set D^α with nonvoid interior since $g(u^\alpha) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{S})$. Claim 1 implies that for all $\alpha' \in [0, 1]$ in a neighborhood of $\alpha \in A$ there is a solution of $x^{\alpha'} = g(u^{\alpha'})x^{\alpha'}$, hence $x^{\alpha'} \in \text{int}(D^{\alpha'})$. For each α in an interval contained in A , the x^α depend continuously on α , hence they are contained in the interior of a single control set. Denote these control sets by $D_2, \dots, D_{r'+1}$. Since they are unbounded, $\partial_\infty(D_i)$ is nonvoid for all i . The control sets ${}_{\mathbb{P}}D_i^1$ in \mathbb{P}^n are contained in chain control sets ${}_{\mathbb{P}}E_i$ and it follows that $\partial_\infty({}_{\mathbb{P}}E_i) \supset \partial_\infty(D_i)$ are nonvoid. Thus Lemma 7.12(ii) implies that $\partial_\infty({}_{\mathbb{P}}E_i)$ contains a chain control set $e({}_{\mathbb{P}}E_j^{\text{hom}})$ where ${}_{\mathbb{P}}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ is a chain control set of the homogeneous part in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} . By Lemma 7.12(i), $\partial_\infty({}_{\mathbb{P}}E_i)$ contains every chain control set of the homogeneous part that it intersects. The theorem follows from the next claim.

Claim 2. All chain control sets ${}_{\mathbb{P}}E_i, i = 2, \dots, r' + 1$, in \mathbb{P}^n coincide.

We only prove this for $\alpha_i \in (0, 1)$ (if $\alpha_1 = 0$ or $\alpha_{r'+1} = 1$ the proof is similar). For every point $\alpha_i \notin A$ there are control sets which we denote by D_i and D_{i+1} such that all α in a neighborhood of α_i satisfy $x^\alpha \in \text{int}(D_i)$ for $\alpha < \alpha_i$ and $x^\alpha \in \text{int}(D_{i+1})$ for $\alpha > \alpha_i$.

Suppose $1 \notin \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0))$. Since $u^\alpha \in L^2([0, \tau_{\alpha_i} + 1], \mathbb{R}^m)$ and τ_α are continuous with respect to α , Proposition 2.9(iii) implies that $x^{\alpha_0} \in \overline{D_i} \cap \overline{D_{i+1}}$. It follows that in \mathbb{P}^n the intersection $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D_i^1 \cap \pi_{\mathbb{P}}D_{i+1}^1$ is nonvoid, showing that the chain control sets ${}_{\mathbb{P}}E_i$ and ${}_{\mathbb{P}}E_{i+1}$ containing $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D_i^1$ and $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}D_{i+1}^1$, resp., coincide.

It remains to consider the α_i with $1 \in \text{spec}(\Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0))$. Again we have to show that the chain control sets ${}_{\mathbb{P}}E_i$ for $\alpha < \alpha_i$ and ${}_{\mathbb{P}}E_{i+1}$ for $\alpha > \alpha_i$ coincide. The projected eigenspace $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\mathbf{E}(\Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0); 1)$ consists of points on τ_{α_i} -periodic solutions

for the τ_{α_i} -periodic control u^{α_i} and hence is contained in a chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}$ in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} . We will show that

$$e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \subset \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E_i) \cap \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E_{i+1}),$$

which implies that $\mathbb{P}E_i$ and $\mathbb{P}E_{i+1}$ have nonvoid intersection and hence coincide.

First consider parameters $\beta_k \rightarrow \alpha_i, \beta_k < \alpha_i$. The points x^{β_k} with $x^{\beta_k} = g(u^{\beta_k})x^{\beta_k}$ satisfy $x^{\beta_k} \in \text{int}(D_i)$.

Case 1. $\int_0^{\tau_{\alpha_i}} \Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, s) [Cu^{\alpha_i}(s) + d] ds \notin \text{Im}(I - \Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0))$.

Lemma 4.3 implies that the $x^{\beta_k} \in D_i$ satisfy

$$\|x^{\beta_k}\| \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } \frac{x^{\beta_k}}{\|x^{\beta_k}\|} \rightarrow \ker(I - \Phi^{\alpha_i}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0)) = \mathbf{E}(\Phi^{\alpha_i}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0); 1), \quad (7.11)$$

and it follows that

$$\emptyset \neq \partial_\infty(D_i) \cap e(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\mathbf{E}(\Phi^{\alpha_i}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0); 1)) \subset \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E_i) \cap e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}). \quad (7.12)$$

By Lemma 7.12(i), $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E_i)$ contains $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$.

Case 2. $\int_0^{\tau_{\alpha_i}} \Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, s) [Cu^{\alpha_i}(s) + d] ds \in \text{Im}(I - \Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0))$.

Let, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$

$$A_k := I - \Phi_{u^{\beta_k}}(\tau_{\beta_k}, 0), \quad b_k := \int_0^{\tau_{\beta_k}} \Phi_{u^{\beta_k}}(\tau_{\beta_k}, s) (Cu^{\beta_k}(s) + d) ds.$$

Then $x^{\beta_k} = g(u^{\beta_k})x^{\beta_k}$ implies $A_k x^{\beta_k} = b_k$ and for $k \rightarrow \infty$

$$A_k \rightarrow A_0 := I - \Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0), \quad b_k \rightarrow b_0 := \int_0^{\tau_{\alpha_i}} \Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, s) (Cu^{\alpha_i}(s) + d) ds.$$

If x^{β_k} remains bounded, we may assume that $x^{\beta_k} \rightarrow y^0$ for some $y^0 \in \overline{D_i} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and hence $A_0 y^0 = b_0$. By Lemma 4.4 there are $x^k \in y^0 + \mathbf{E}(\Phi_{u^{\alpha_i}}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0))$ with $\|x^k\| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\frac{x^k}{\|x^k\|} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(\Phi^{\alpha_i}(\tau_{\alpha_i}, 0); 1)$ and again (7.12) follows implying $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \subset \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E_i)$.

If x^{β_k} becomes unbounded, we obtain

$$\left\| A_0 \frac{x^{\beta_k}}{\|x^{\beta_k}\|} \right\| \leq \|A_0 - A_k\| + \left\| A_k \frac{x^{\beta_k}}{\|x^{\beta_k}\|} \right\| = \|A_0 - A_k\| + \frac{\|b_k\|}{\|x^{\beta_k}\|} \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

and (7.11) and hence (7.12) follow implying $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}}) \subset \partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E_i)$.

We have shown this inclusion using $\beta_k \rightarrow \alpha_i, \beta_k < \alpha_i$. The same arguments can be applied to parameters $\beta_k \rightarrow \alpha_i, \beta_k > \alpha_i$, showing that also for the chain control set $\mathbb{P}E_{i+1}$ the boundary at infinity $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{P}E_{i+1})$ contains the chain control set $e(\mathbb{P}E_j^{\text{hom}})$. This proves Claim 2. \square

The following controlled linear oscillator illustrates Theorem 7.13.

EXAMPLE 7.14. Consider the affine control system (cf. [8, Example 5.17])

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1-u & -3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + u(t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ d \end{pmatrix}, \quad u(t) \in [-\rho, \rho],$$

where $\rho \in (1, \frac{5}{4})$ and $d < 1$. The equilibria are, for $u \in [-\rho, -1)$ and $u \in (-1, \rho]$,

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \middle| x \in \left[\frac{d-\rho}{1-\rho}, \infty \right) \right\}, \quad \mathcal{C}_2 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \middle| x \in \left(-\infty, \frac{d+\rho}{1+\rho} \right] \right\},$$

resp. The equilibria in \mathcal{C}_1 are hyperbolic, since here the eigenvalues of $A(u)$ are $\lambda_1(u) < 0 < \lambda_2(u)$. The equilibria in \mathcal{C}_2 are stable nodes since here $\lambda_1(u) < \lambda_2(u) < 0$. For $u^0 = -1$ the matrix $A(-1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -3 \end{pmatrix}$ has the eigenvalue $\lambda_2(-1) = 0$ with eigenspace $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$. There are control sets $D_1 \neq D_2$ containing the equilibria in \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 , resp., in the interior. For $u^k \nearrow u^0 = -1$, the equilibria in D_1 satisfy $(x_{u^k}, 0) \rightarrow (\infty, 0)$ and for $u^k \searrow u^0 = -1$, the equilibria in D_2 satisfy $(x_{u^k}, 0) \rightarrow (-\infty, 0)$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$. There is a single chain control set ${}_{\mathbb{P}}E$ in \mathbb{P}^2 containing the images of D_1 and D_2 since the eigenspace $\mathbf{E}(e^{A(-1)\tau}; 1) = \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$ satisfies

$$e(\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\mathbf{E}(e^{A(-1)\tau}; 1)) \subset \partial_{\infty}(D_1) \cap \partial_{\infty}(D_2) \quad \text{for any } \tau > 0.$$

Concerning the homogeneous part in \mathbb{P}^1 the projectivized eigenspace $\pi_{\mathbb{P}}\mathbf{E}(e^{A(-1)\tau}; 1)$ is contained in the invariant control set ${}_{\mathbb{P}}D_2^{\text{hom}} = \pi_{\mathbb{P}}\{(x, \lambda_2(u)x)^{\top} \mid x \neq 0, u \in [-\rho, \rho]\}$ and ${}_{\mathbb{P}}D_2^{\text{hom}}$ is the projection of a control set ${}_{\mathbb{R}}D^{\text{hom}}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 , since $0 \in \text{int}(\Sigma_{Fl}({}_{\mathbb{P}}D_2^{\text{hom}}))$.

Acknowledgements. The proof of Theorem 5.8 generalizes a strategy used by Christoph Kawan to show that hyperbolic linear control systems have a unique bounded chain control set. We thank him for making his proof available. We would also like to thank Luiz A.B. San Martin for his valuable suggestions and comments concerning projectivization of systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. AYALA, A. DA SILVA, *Controllability of linear control systems on Lie groups with semisimple finite center*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 55(2) (2017), pp. 1332–1343.
- [2] A. BACCIOTTI AND J.-C. VIVALDA, *On radial and directional controllability of bilinear systems*, Systems Control Lett., 62(7) (2013), pp. 575–580.
- [3] C. BRUNI, G. D. PILLO, AND G. KOCH, *Bilinear systems: an appealing class of ‘nearly linear’ systems in theory and applications*, IEEE Trans. Automatic Control, vol. 19, no. 4, (1974), pp. 334–348.
- [4] C. CHICONE, *Ordinary Differential Equations with Applications*, Texts in Applied Mathematics, Vol. 34, Springer -Verlag 1999.
- [5] F. COLONIUS, W. DU, *Hyperbolic control sets and chain control sets*, J. Dynam. Control Systems 7(1) (2001), pp. 49–59.
- [6] F. COLONIUS AND W. KLIEMANN, *The Dynamics of Control*, Birkhäuser 2000.
- [7] F. COLONIUS AND W. KLIEMANN, *Dynamical Systems and Linear Algebra*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 156, Amer. Math. Soc. 2014.
- [8] F. COLONIUS, A.J. SANTANA AND J. SETTI, *Control sets for bilinear and affine systems*, Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems (2021), doi.org/10.1007/s00498-021-00311-0.
- [9] F. COLONIUS AND A.J. SANTANA, *Topological conjugacy for affine-linear flows and control systems*, Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis, 10(3) (2011), pp. 847–857.
- [10] A. DA SILVA, *Controllability of linear systems on solvable Lie groups*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 54(1) (2016), pp. 372–390.
- [11] A. DA SILVA, C. KAWAN, *Invariance entropy of hyperbolic control sets*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 36(1) (2016), pp. 97–136.
- [12] D.L. ELLIOTT, *Bilinear Control Systems, Matrices in Action*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2008.
- [13] M. FIRER AND O.G. DO ROCIO, *Invariant control sets on flag manifolds and ideal boundaries of symmetric spaces*, J. Lie Theory, 13 (2003), pp. 463–477.
- [14] D. HINRICHSSEN AND A.J. PRITCHARD, *Mathematical Systems Theory, Vol. 2*, in preparation, 2022.
- [15] V. JURDJEVIC, *Geometric Control Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [16] V. JURDJEVIC AND G. SALLET, *Controllability properties of affine systems*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 22(3) (1984), pp. 501–508.
- [17] C. KAWAN, *On the structure of uniformly hyperbolic chain control sets*, Systems Control Lett. 90 (2016), pp. 71–75.
- [18] R.R. MOHLER, *Bilinear Control Processes*, Academic Press, New York and London, 1973.

- [19] L. NIE, *Output-controllability and output-near-controllability of driftless discrete-time bilinear systems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 58(4) (2020), pp. 2114-2142.
- [20] L. PERKO, *Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems*, Springer, 3rd ed., 2001.
- [21] R.E. RINK AND R.R. MOHLER, *Completely controllable bilinear systems*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 6(3) (1968), pp. 477- 486.
- [22] C. ROBINSON, *Dynamical Systems: Stability, Symbolic Dynamics, and Chaos*, Taylor & Francis Inc., 2nd ed., 1998.
- [23] E. SONTAG, *Mathematical Control Theory*, Springer-Verlag 1998.
- [24] G. TESCHL, *Ordinary Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems*, Graduate Studies in Math. Vol. 149, Amer. Math. Soc., 2012.