

Dissipativity, Convexity and Tight O’Shea-Zames-Falb Multipliers for Safety Guarantees

Carsten W. Scherer *

* *Chair for Mathematical Systems Theory, Department of Mathematics, University of Stuttgart, Germany.*

Abstract: We develop a novel convex parametrization of integral quadratic constraints with a terminal cost for subdifferentials of convex functions, involving general O’Shea-Zames-Falb multipliers. We show the benefit of our results for the reduction of conservatism of existing techniques, and sketch applications to the analysis of optimization algorithms or the stability analysis of neural network controllers. The development is prepared by providing a novel link between the convex integrability of a multivariable mapping and dissipativity theory.

Keywords: Dissipativity, Robustness Analysis, Integral quadratic constraints, Absolute Stability, Linear matrix inequalities.

1. INTRODUCTION

The field of systems and control is dominated by understanding complex dynamic interconnections. It has been a highly successful point-of-view to consider such monolithic systems as an interconnection of individual subsystems, and to characterize their global dynamical characteristics by those of the subsystems and properties of their interconnection. Dissipativity theory as developed by Willems (1972a,b) constitutes a cornerstone in system theory. It not only translates this conceptual idea into a concrete mathematical framework, but also lays ground for the tailored construction of related computational tools in a modular fashion. For robustness analysis, this theme has been surveyed, e.g., in the recent contributions by Arcaç et al. (2016) and Scherer (2022), in which one can find many more references to the literature.

The absolute stability analysis of a feedback loop consisting of a linear system and a static nonlinearity, a so-called Lur’e system, has laid ground to this development. As emphasized in Jan Willems’s introduction to the seminal paper by Popov in Basar (2001), the celebrated circle- and Popov-criteria had a substantial impact on the construction of more flexible and less conservative stability results using so-called O’Shea-Zames-Falb (OZF) multipliers (O’Shea (1967); Willems and Brockett (1968) and Zames and Falb (1968)). It is by now well-understood how to generate corresponding computational stability tests based on the main result in Megretski and Rantzer (1997) using integral quadratic constraints (IQCs), which are strongly inspired by the seminal contributions of Yakubovich (1967). For systems described in continuous time, computational aspects are exposed in detail in Chen and Wen (1996) (see also Veenman et al. (2016)), while the discrete-time

counterparts have been proposed by Carrasco et al. (2020) and Fetzer and Scherer (2017a).

Most existing stability proofs based on OZF multipliers are functional analytic in nature. Direct dissipativity-based proofs can be extracted from Seiler (2015) and Veenman and Scherer (2014). The latter has led to the notion of IQCs with a terminal cost, as introduced by Scherer and Veenman (2018) and further developed by Scherer (2022) for continuous time systems. It has been argued that this concept constitutes a seamless link between so-called hard IQCs (which are conservative) and more powerful soft IQCs on the infinite time-horizon. The papers by Fetzer and Scherer (2017a), Fetzer and Scherer (2017b), Iannelli et al. (2019) and Yin et al. (2021) demonstrate the benefit of such IQCs for reducing conservatism with examples.

Discrete-time absolute stability results based on OZF multipliers have recently drawn considerably attention for the analysis of optimization algorithms (Lessard et al. (2016)), the generalization to the design of extremum controllers (Scherer and Ebenbauer (2021)), and for the safety verification of neural network controllers (Yin et al. (2020); Pauli et al. (2021)). However, results about IQCs with a terminal cost for discrete-time systems are missing in the literature, which is partly due to technical challenges concerning the correct formulation of the related algebraic Riccati equations.

To fill this gap, this paper develops a novel convex parametrization of IQCs with a nontrivial terminal cost for subdifferentials of convex functions and involving both causal and anti-causal OZF multipliers. We demonstrate the benefit over existing results by a numerical example. It is conjectured that our construction is tight, in the sense that it constitutes the correct formulation of IQCs in between hard and soft ones; see Fetzer and Scherer (2017b) for a discussion of this issue in continuous-time. We only mention various potential applications to optimization algorithms and stability analysis of neural network con-

* Funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy - EXC 2075 - 390740016. We acknowledge the support by the Stuttgart Center for Simulation Science (SimTech).

trollers, the details of which are left for future research. As a preparation, we reveal a new link between the convex integrability of a multi-valued mapping and dissipativity theory. This is of independent interest on a path towards identifying novel classes of functions for which multiplier-based stability tests can be developed more systematically.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we relate dissipativity theory to convex integration as obtained in a celebrated paper by Rockafellar (1966). After recalling strict dissipativity characterizations for linear systems with quadratic supply rates (Section 3), we formulate a stability result for Lur'e systems based on IQCs with a terminal cost in discrete-time (Section 4). Section 5 proposes novel such IQCs for subdifferentials of convex functions, and Section 6 reveals how to bound the amplitude of an output of a linear system in feedback with any such nonlinearity and in response to initial conditions in the unit ball. A numerical example, a discussion of the exactness of our main results and of potential applications conclude the paper with Section 7.

Notation. If $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $f : X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ denotes a possibly multi-valued mapping with domain X . For $m = 1$, the inequality $f(x) \leq 0$ and $\sup_{x \in X} f(x)$ are then interpreted as $y \leq 0$ for all $y \in f(x)$ and $\sup\{y \mid x \in X, y \in f(x)\}$, respectively. In \mathbb{R}^n , e and e_k are the all-ones and the standard unit vectors for $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. If $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \geq 0$ is understood elementwise and $\|x\|$ is the Euclidean norm. A matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is Schur if its eigenvalues $\text{eig}(A)$ are located in the unit disk $\mathbb{D} := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\lambda| < 1\}$. For $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $A < B$ means that A and B are symmetric and $B - A$ is positive definite. The set of doubly hyperdominant matrices $\mathcal{H}^{n \times n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ (Willems and Brockett (1968)) comprises all $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ whose off-diagonal elements are nonpositive and which satisfy $Ae \geq 0$ and $e^T A \geq 0$. Note that $\mathcal{H}^{n \times n}$ is spectrahedron, the feasible set of some linear matrix inequality (LMI). Moreover, l_{2e}^n is the real vector space of all sequences $x : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, while l_2^n denotes the subspace of $x \in l_{2e}^n$ with $\|x\|_2^2 := \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \|x_t\|^2 < \infty$. Finally, we make use of the fact that a linear discrete-time system

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t, \quad y_t = Cx_t + Du_t \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{N}$$

can be lifted as

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_T \\ y^T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^T & B^T \\ C^T & D^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ u^T \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } T \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1)$$

This involves stacking the components of the input and output signals $u \in l_{2e}^n$ and $y \in l_{2e}^m$, respectively, as

$$u^T := \text{col}(u_0 \ u_1 \ \dots \ u_{T-1}), \quad y^T := \text{col}(y_0 \ y_1 \ \dots \ y_{T-1}),$$

and using the matrices

$$A^T := \underbrace{A \dots A}_{T \text{ factors}}, \quad B^T := (A^{T-1}B \ A^{T-2}B \ \dots \ B),$$

$$C^T := \begin{pmatrix} C \\ CA \\ \vdots \\ CA^{T-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad D^T := \begin{pmatrix} D & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ CB & D & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ CA^{T-2}B & \dots & CB & D \end{pmatrix};$$

for $T = 1$ the latter is interpreted as $D^1 := D$.

2. DISSIPATIVITY AND CONVEXITY

For given subsets $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and possibly multi-valued mappings

$$a : X \times U \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n, \quad c : X \times U \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^k,$$

let us consider the discrete-time dynamical system

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_{t+1} \\ y_t \end{pmatrix} \in \begin{pmatrix} a(x_t, u_t) \\ c(x_t, u_t) \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with the time axis \mathbb{N}_0 . We say that the trajectory $t \mapsto (x_t, u_t, y_t)$ is admissible if $(x_t, u_t, y_t) \in X \times U \times Y$ holds and if the inclusion (2) is satisfied for all $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$. With the left-shift operator $(\sigma x)(t) := x(t+1)$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the system (2) is compactly described as $(\sigma x, y) \in (a(x, u), c(x, u))$.

Definition 1. System (2) is dissipative with respect to the supply rate $S : U \times Y \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ if there exists a storage function $V : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the dissipation inequality (DI)

$$V(x_{t_2}) \leq V(x_{t_1}) + \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-1} S(u_t, y_t). \quad (3)$$

holds for all admissible trajectories and all time instances $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $t_1 \leq t_2$. System (2) is cyclo-dissipative with respect to S in case that

$$0 \leq \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-1} S(u_t, y_t) \quad (4)$$

holds for all $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $t_1 \leq t_2$ and all admissible trajectories satisfying $x_{t_2} = x_{t_1}$. These properties are referred to as passivity or cyclo-passivity for the particular choice $S(u, y) = u^T y$ of the supply-rate.

Note that, in contrast to the original definition in Willems (1972a), it is not required that storage functions are non-negative or bounded from below. Verifying dissipativity requires to come up with a storage function for which the dissipation inequality holds; we also say that storage functions certify dissipativity. Instead, cyclo-dissipativity is characterized directly in terms of system trajectories without the need to have a storage function available. Clearly, dissipative systems are cyclo-dissipative.

The converse implication permits to conclude the existence of a storage function from cyclo-dissipativity. In other words, a mere trajectory-based input-output property of the system guarantees the existence of storage functions which certifies dissipativity. Under a suitable assumption on the richness of state-trajectories, this converse is established by explicitly defining two extremal storage functions through the solution of optimal control problems over admissible system trajectories.

Theorem 2. Suppose there is a ground state $x_* \in X$ such that for every $\xi \in X$ there exists an admissible round trip state trajectory with $x_0 = \xi$, $x_{t_1} = x_*$ and $x_{t_2} = \xi$ for some $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $t_1 \leq t_2$. Then (2) is cyclo-dissipative iff it is dissipative as certified by the available storage function

$$V_*^-(\xi) := \sup_{T \in \mathbb{N}_0, x_0 = \xi, x_T = x_*} \left[- \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} S(u_t, y_t) \right] \quad \text{for } \xi \in X,$$

and the required supply function

$$V_*^+(\xi) := \inf_{T \in \mathbb{N}_0, x_0 = x_*, x_T = \xi} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} S(u_t, y_t) \right] \quad \text{for } \xi \in X.$$

This result is proved in complete analogy to the continuous-time counterparts in Hill and Moylan (1975) and van der Schaft (2021). The same can be said for the well-known fact that dissipativity is equivalent to the validity of the local dissipation inequality

$$V(x_+) - V(x) \leq S(u, y) \quad \text{for all } (x, u) \in X \times U, (x_+, y) \in (a(x, u), c(x, u)).$$

As a first contribution of this paper, let us now establish an interesting relationship of dissipativity with the integration of multi-valued mappings and convexity. Precisely, we wonder under which conditions a mapping $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$ has a convex primitive, i.e., a convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose subdifferential satisfies

$$F(x) \subset \partial f(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5)$$

If $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex, the subdifferential $\partial f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies $f(z+d) - f(z) \geq \partial f(z)^\top d$ for all $z, d \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If (5) is valid, we hence conclude (after the change of variables $z = x + u$ and $d = -u$) that F is linked to f by

$$f(x+u) - f(x) \leq F(x+u)^\top u \text{ for all } x, u \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (6)$$

This just is the local dissipation inequality for the system

$$\sigma x = x + u, \quad y \in F(x + u) \quad (7)$$

and the supply rate $S(u, y) = u^\top y$, with f being a storage function. Hence (7) is passive. Conversely, passivity of (7) implies (6) for some $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. It is then elementary to see that f is convex, and (5) holds by the mere definition of the subdifferential. This proves the following result.

Theorem 3. The mapping $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$ has a convex primitive iff the system $\sigma x = x + u, y \in F(x + u)$ is passive.

Since the linear system $\sigma x = x + u$ is controllable, passivity is equivalent to cyclo-passivity by Theorem 2. Now recall that F is said to be cyclically monotone if

$$\sum_{j=0}^m F(v_j)^\top (v_j - v_{j+1}) \geq 0 \quad (8)$$

holds for any choice of points $v_0, \dots, v_m \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and with $v_{m+1} := v_0$. It is not hard to establish the following link (as shown in Section A.1).

Lemma 4. The system $\sigma x = x + u, y \in F(x + u)$ is cyclo-passive iff F is cyclically monotone.

This leads to Rockafellar's celebrated result that F has a convex primitive iff it is cyclically monotone (Rockafellar (1966)), with a proof based on dissipativity theory.

Instead of exploring these links any further, we rather exploit Theorem 3 for the generation of integral quadratic constraints in robustness analysis. As a first step, we note that (7) is dissipative w.r.t. $(u, y) \mapsto u^\top y$ iff this holds for the system and the supply rate obtained after the pre-compensation $u = -x + v$. This transformation leads to the system $\sigma x = v, y \in F(v)$ with supply rate $(v, y) \mapsto y^\top (v - x)$. Thus, passivity of (7) and dissipativity of

$$\sigma x = u, \quad y = -x + u, \quad S(u, y) = F(u)^\top y \quad (9)$$

are equivalent. Note that the convex integrability of F can as well be expressed by dissipativity of (9).

As a consequence, for some convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\sigma x = u \quad y = -x + u, \quad S(u, y) = \partial f(u)^\top y \quad (10)$$

is dissipative as certified by the storage function f . The linear system or filter in (10) operates on u , and the supply rate is the inner product of the filter's output and $\partial f(u)$. Interestingly, dissipativity is as well guaranteed if the filter operates on $\partial f(u)$ and the supply rate is the inner product of y and u , which means to consider

$$\sigma x = v, \quad y = -x + v, \quad v \in \partial f(u), \quad S(u, y) = y^\top u. \quad (11)$$

A suitable storage function is the Fenchel conjugate of f , which is defined as

$$f^*(x) = \sup_{w \in \mathbb{R}^n} [x^\top w - f(w)] \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Note that f^* takes finite values on the image of the subdifferential mapping ∂f given by

$$X_{\partial f} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in \partial f(u) \text{ for some } u \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

Our findings are summarized as follows and proved in Section A.2.

Theorem 5. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex and $U = Y = \mathbb{R}^n$. Then (10) is dissipative with storage function f on $X = \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, (11) is dissipative with storage function f^* on the state-set $X^* := X_{\partial f}$.

These results extend to longer shifts, if we replace σ by σ^k for $k = 1, \dots, \nu \in \mathbb{N}$ in the dynamics of (10) and (11). First order representation of these dynamics are described with

$$A_\psi := A_\nu \otimes I_n, \quad B_\psi := B_\nu \otimes I_n, \quad C_\psi := C_{k,\nu} \otimes I_n, \quad (12)$$

where $A_\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu \times \nu}$ is the upper Jordan block with eigenvalue zero, $B_\nu := e_\nu \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, $C_{k,\nu} := -e_k^\top \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, I_n is the identity matrix of dimension n , and \otimes is the Kronecker product.

Corollary 6. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex, $k \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$ and $U = Y = \mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$\sigma x = A_\psi x + B_\psi u, \quad y = C_\psi x + u, \quad S(u, y) = \partial f(u)^\top y \quad (13)$$

is dissipative on $X := \times_{j=1}^\nu \mathbb{R}^n$ with the storage function $V_k(x) = \sum_{j=k}^\nu f(x^j)$ for $x = (x^1, \dots, x^\nu) \in X$. Moreover,

$$\sigma x = A_\psi x + B_\psi v, \quad y = C_\psi x + v, \quad v \in \partial f(u) \quad (14)$$

is passive on $X^* := \times_{j=1}^\nu X_{\partial f}$ with the storage function $V_k^*(x) = \sum_{j=k}^\nu f^*(x^j)$ for $x = (x^1, \dots, x^\nu) \in X^*$.

The proof is given in Section A.3. Corollary 6 forms the basis for generating causal and anti-causal OZF multipliers in Section 5. Let us emphasize that the construction of anti-causal multipliers involves Fenchel conjugation.

3. STRICT DISSIPATIVITY AND LINEAR SYSTEMS

We now briefly recap strict dissipativity theory for linear systems. A detailed discussion for continuous-time systems can be found in the recent survey paper by Scherer (2022).

Definition 7. The nonlinear system (2) is strictly dissipative with respect to $S : U \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ if there exists a storage function $V : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and some $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$V(x_{t_2}) \leq V(x_{t_1}) + \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-1} S(u_t, y_t) - \epsilon \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2-1} (\|x_t\|^2 + \|u_t\|^2) \quad (15)$$

holds for all admissible trajectories and all time instances $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $t_1 \leq t_2$.

For a linear system

$$\sigma x = Ax + Bu, \quad y = Cx + Du \quad (16)$$

and a homogeneous quadratic supply rate

$$S_P(u, y) := \begin{pmatrix} y \\ u \end{pmatrix}^\top P \begin{pmatrix} y \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \quad P = P^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+m) \times (k+m)}, \quad (17)$$

strict dissipativity with a general storage function is equivalent to strict dissipativity with a homogeneous quadratic storage function. This leads to the following key result.

Theorem 8. The linear system (16) is strictly dissipative with respect to the quadratic supply rate (17) iff there exists a symmetric solution X of the strict LMI

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & -X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix} < \begin{pmatrix} C & D \\ 0 & I_m \end{pmatrix}^\top P \begin{pmatrix} C & D \\ 0 & I_m \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

If $\text{eig}(A) \cap \partial\mathbb{D} = \emptyset$ and with $G(z) := C(zI - A)^{-1}B + D$, this is equivalent to the frequency-domain inequality

$$0 < \begin{pmatrix} G(\lambda) \\ I_m \end{pmatrix}^* P \begin{pmatrix} G(\lambda) \\ I_m \end{pmatrix} \text{ for all } \lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}. \quad (19)$$

In summary, strict dissipativity can be assured by checking the feasibility of the LMI (18) or, under a mild assumption, through the frequency domain inequality (19).

4. ROBUST STABILITY ANALYSIS

Let us now consider the feedback interconnection of

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bw_t, \quad z_t = Cx_t + Dw_t \quad (20)$$

with the subgradient nonlinearity

$$w_t \in \partial f(z_t) \quad (21)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We assume that $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is Schur and that $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex with $f(0) = 0$ and $0 \in \partial f(0)$. Hence f, f^* satisfy $f(x) \geq 0$ and $f^*(x) \geq f^*(0) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

The current interest in such classical Lur'e system has been emphasized in the introduction, see also Section 7.

The interconnection (20)-(21) is said to be stable if there exists some $L > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (\|x_t\|^2 + \|w_t\|^2) \leq L\|x_0\|^2 \quad (22)$$

holds for all trajectories of (20)-(21). Now note, by (6) for $F = \partial f$, that the static system (21) is dissipative w.r.t. $S(z, w) = z^\top w$, i.e., it is passive. Therefore, the classical passivity theorem guarantees stability of (20)-(21) if the linear system (20) is strictly dissipative with respect to the supply rate $S(w, z) = -w^\top z$ (see, e.g., Brogliato (2004); Brogliato and Tanwani (2020) in continuous-time).

This passivity-based stability test can be substantially improved by imposing dissipativity constraints after passing the input and output signals of (20) or (21) through some dynamic filter

$$\sigma\xi = A_\Psi\xi + B_\Psi \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix}, \quad v = C_\Psi\xi + D_\Psi \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix}, \quad \xi_0 = 0 \quad (23)$$

with ξ of dimension n_Ψ . With the state $\eta = \text{col}(\xi, x)$ of dimension $n_\Psi + n$, the interconnection of (23) with (20) is

$$\sigma\eta = A\eta + Bw, \quad v = C\eta + Dw, \quad \text{where} \quad (24)$$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_\Psi & B_\Psi \begin{pmatrix} C \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} B_\Psi \begin{pmatrix} D \\ I \end{pmatrix} \\ B \end{pmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{pmatrix} C_\Psi & D_\Psi \begin{pmatrix} C \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix}, \quad D = D_\Psi \begin{pmatrix} D \\ I \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us now formulate a discrete-time robust stability result whose continuous-time counterpart has been first presented in Scherer and Veenman (2018).

Theorem 9. Let $P = P^\top$ and suppose the following holds.

- a) All trajectories of (23) under the constraint (21) satisfy the following IQC with a quadratic terminal cost defined by some matrix $Z = Z^\top$:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} v_t^\top P v_t - \xi_T^\top Z \xi_T \geq 0 \text{ for all } T \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (25)$$

- b) The system (24) is strictly dissipative w.r.t. the supply rate $S(w, v) = -v^\top P v$ as certified by $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^\top$.
- c) The certificates $\mathcal{X} = \begin{pmatrix} X_\Psi & W \\ W^\top & X \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_\Psi+n) \times (n_\Psi+n)}$ and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\Psi \times n_\Psi}$ are coupled as

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_\Psi + Z & W \\ W^\top & X \end{pmatrix} > 0. \quad (26)$$

Then there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that all the trajectories of (20)-(21) satisfy

$$x_T^\top Y x_T + \epsilon \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (\|x_t\|^2 + \|w_t\|^2) \leq x_0^\top X x_0 \quad (27)$$

for all $T \in \mathbb{N}$ where $Y := X - W^\top (X_\Psi + Z)^{-1} W$. In particular, the loop (20)-(21) is stable.

The proof is given in Section A.4. Let us contrast Theorem 9 with a stability result based on soft IQCs due to Megretski and Rantzer (1997), which can be proved in discrete-time as in Seiler (2015) and Veenman and Scherer (2014) without relying on homotopy arguments. This requires that (20)-(21) is well-posed in the sense defined in these references. Moreover, f needs to be differentiable with $\|\nabla f(x)\| \leq M\|x\|$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and some $M \geq 0$. Finally, A_Ψ of the filter (23) with the transfer matrix $\Psi(z) = C_\Psi(zI - A_\Psi)^{-1}B_\Psi + D_\Psi$ is assumed to be stable.

Theorem 10. Let $P = P^\top$ and suppose the following holds.

- a) All trajectories of (23) with $z \in l_2^d$ and $w = \nabla f(z)$ satisfy the soft IQC $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} v_t^\top P v_t \geq 0$.
- b) The system (24) is strictly dissipative with respect to the supply rate $S(w, v) = -v^\top P v$.
- c) The left-upper/right-lower $d \times d$ -block of $\Psi(\lambda)^* P \Psi(\lambda)$ is positive/negative semi-definite for all $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$.

Then the loop (20)-(21) is stable.

In both results, it is a misnomer to talk about an integral quadratic constraint in a), since the terminology results from the continuous-time counterparts involving integration instead of summation. Moreover, the transfer matrix $\Psi(1/z)^\top P \Psi(z)$ is referred to as a dynamic multiplier if $\Psi(z)$ is not constant, and it is said to be static otherwise.

Observe that the IQC in Theorem 10 a) is called soft since it is formulated on the infinite time-horizon. Although the conditions in b) are equivalent, Theorem 10 does not involve any sign-constraint on the corresponding certificate. For these reasons, Theorem 10 does not allow to draw conclusions about the transient behaviour of the system state. In contrast, Theorem 9 leads to guaranteed pointwise in time constraints for the future state-trajectory as in (27). In classical dissipation-based stability tests, this is achieved by taking $Z = 0$ in Theorem 9 a), which leads to a so-called hard IQC. Then Theorem 9 c) requires that the certificate \mathcal{X} is positive definite, which involves possibly severe conservatism (see Section 6).

A much more detailed discussion of these links and further consequences are provided in Scherer and Veenman (2018) and Scherer (2022).

5. O'SHEA-ZAMES-FALB MULTIPLIERS

We now establish how to construct IQCs with a nontrivial terminal cost $Z \neq 0$ as appearing in Theorem 9 a). To this end, let $y = \psi_{k,\nu}(u)$ be defined by the filter

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_\nu & B_\nu \\ C_{k,\nu} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ u \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } x_0 = 0.$$

Since f is nonnegative and if $k \in \{1, \dots, \nu\}$, Corollary 6 implies for $z \in l_{2e}^d$ and $y = (\psi_{k,\nu} \circ \mathcal{I}_d)(z)$ with $w \in \partial f(z)$ that the hard IQC $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} w_t^\top y_t \geq 0$ is satisfied for all $T \in \mathbb{N}$.




Fig. 1. Basic causal and non-causal OZF multipliers.

Since $\psi_{k,\nu}$ has the causal transfer function $1 - 1/z^k$, this IQC is formulated for the configuration on the left in Fig. 1 involving a causal filter. Note that $\psi_{0,\nu}(z) = 1$. Since ∂f is passive, we also get a static hard IQC for $k = 0$.

By Corollary 6, the trajectories of $\tilde{y} = (\psi_{k,\nu} \otimes I_d)(w)$ with $w \in \partial f(z)$ satisfy $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} z_t^\top \tilde{y}_t \geq 0$ for all $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, \nu\}$. This can be interpreted as an IQC for the configuration on the right in Fig. 1. This involves a non-causal filter, thus defining a non-causal OZF-multiplier.

Let us now conically combine all these IQCs. To this end, fix possibly different values of $\nu, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and define

$$\psi_\nu(\lambda) := \sum_{k=0}^{\nu} \lambda_k \psi_{k,\nu} \quad \text{for } \lambda := (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_\nu) \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu+1}. \quad (28)$$

Note that ψ_ν admits a state-space realization in terms of $(A_\nu, B_\nu, C_\nu(\lambda), D_\nu(\lambda))$ with $C_\nu(\lambda) := \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} \lambda_k C_{k,\nu}$ and $D_\nu(\lambda) := \sum_{k=0}^{\nu} \lambda_k D_{k,\nu}$. If the vectors $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu+1}$ and $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{\nu}+1}$ are nonnegative, we then obtain for any $z \in l_{2e}^d$, $w \in \partial f(z)$ and $y = (\psi_\nu(\lambda) \otimes I_d)(z)$, $\tilde{y} = (\psi_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{\lambda}) \otimes I_d)(w)$ the hard IQC

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (w_t^\top y_t + z_t^\top \tilde{y}_t) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (29)$$

This is condition a) in Theorem 9 for $Z = 0$. Indeed, with

$$\begin{aligned} A_\Psi &:= \begin{pmatrix} A_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & A_{\tilde{\nu}} \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_d, & B_\Psi &:= \begin{pmatrix} B_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & B_{\tilde{\nu}} \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_d, \\ C_\Psi &:= \begin{pmatrix} I_{\nu+\tilde{\nu}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_d, & D_\Psi &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_2 \end{pmatrix} \otimes I_d, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

and the symmetric matrix

$$P(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) := \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} 0 & 0 & 0 & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & C_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{\lambda})^\top & 0 \\ \hline 0 & C_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{\lambda}) & 0 & \bullet \\ C_\nu(\lambda) & 0 & D_\nu(\lambda) + D_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{\lambda})^\top & 0 \end{array} \right) \otimes I_d, \quad (31)$$

the response of (23) to $z \in l_{2e}^d$ and $w \in \partial f(z)$ satisfies

$$v_t^\top P(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) v_t = (w_t^\top y_t + z_t^\top \tilde{y}_t) + (y_t^\top w_t + \tilde{y}_t^\top z_t) \quad (32)$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By (29), we infer a) in Theorem 9 for $Z = 0$.

To generate IQCs with $Z \neq 0$, let us introduce the lifted state-space representations of the filters $y = \psi_\nu(\lambda)(z)$ and $\tilde{y} = \psi_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{\lambda})(w)$ as in the notation section. Since the filter's initial conditions are zero, this results in

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_T \\ y^T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} B_\nu^T \\ D_\nu^T(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} z^T, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_T \\ \tilde{y}^T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} B_{\tilde{\nu}}^T \\ D_{\tilde{\nu}}^T(\tilde{\lambda}) \end{pmatrix} w^T. \quad (33)$$

We will show that (25) indeed holds with the filter (30) and the matrix $P(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda})$ in (31) for the terminal cost matrix

$$Z(E) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & E^\top \otimes I_d \\ E \otimes I_d & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (34)$$

if the coefficient vectors $\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}$ and the free matrix E render

$$M_T(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}, E) := D_\nu^T(\lambda) + D_{\tilde{\nu}}^T(\tilde{\lambda})^\top - (B_{\tilde{\nu}}^T)^\top E B_\nu^T \quad (35)$$

doubly hyperdominant for $T = \nu + \tilde{\nu} + 1$.




Fig. 2. Computed values of $\gamma_*(0,0)$ (blue), $\gamma_*(1,1)$ (red), $\gamma_*(2,2)$ (yellow), and $\gamma_*(3,3)$ (purple): Full (dotted) lines are obtained with Corollary 12 (setting $E = 0$).

Theorem 11. Suppose that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu+1}$, $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{\nu}+1}$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{\nu} \times \nu}$ are chosen with

$$M_{\nu+\tilde{\nu}+1}(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}, E) \in \mathcal{H}^{(\nu+\tilde{\nu}+1) \times (\nu+\tilde{\nu}+1)}.$$

Then the nonlinearity ∂f satisfies the IQC (25) with the filter defined by (30) for the supply rate matrix $P(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda})$ in (31) and the terminal cost matrix $Z(E)$ in (34).

This is the second main result of this paper, whose proof is found in Section A.5. No analogous result is available in continuous-time.

6. A CONCRETE ALGORITHM

Theorems 9 and 11 form the basis for generating various robust performance results with dynamic IQCs by known dissipativity arguments. A collection of such results can be found, e.g., in Fetzter et al. (2017) and Scherer (2022).

For example, if $e = C_e x$ is an output of the interconnection (20)-(21), we can target at the computation of some tight $\gamma > 0$ such that the amplitude bound $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|e_t\| \leq \gamma$ holds for all initial conditions x_0 in the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^n and all trajectories of (20)-(21).

Corollary 12. The loop (20)-(21) is stable and all its trajectories satisfy

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|C_e x_t\| \leq \gamma_*(\nu, \tilde{\nu}) \|x_0\|$$

if $\gamma_*(\nu, \tilde{\nu})$ is determined as follows:

- Choose the dimensions $\nu, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ to fix the multiplier complexity and set $T_0 := \nu + \tilde{\nu} + 1$.
- With the filter matrices (30) construct (23) and (24).
- With $P(\cdot)$, $Z(\cdot)$, $M_{T_0}(\cdot)$ defined by (31), (34), (35) and the variables $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^\top$, $H = H^\top$, $E \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{\nu} \times \nu}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu+1}$, $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{\nu}+1}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, introduce the LMIs

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{B} \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{X} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{X} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{B} \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \\ & \quad + (\mathcal{C} \ \mathcal{D})^\top P(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) (\mathcal{C} \ \mathcal{D}) < 0, \\ & \begin{pmatrix} H & 0 & C_e \\ 0 & X_\Psi + Z(E) & W \\ C_e^\top & W^\top & X \end{pmatrix} > 0, \quad H < \gamma I, \quad X < \gamma I, \\ & \quad M_{T_0}(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}, E) \in \mathcal{H}^{T_0 \times T_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where \mathcal{X} is partitioned as in Theorem 9.

- Then $\gamma_*(\nu, \tilde{\nu})$ denotes the infimum of all $\gamma > 0$ for which the LMIs (36) are feasible.

It is instrumental to observe that the constraints (36) are indeed affine in all variables. Hence, the computation of $\gamma_*(\nu, \tilde{\nu})$ involves solving a standard semi-definite program.

For a numerical example, take the system matrices

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D_L \\ C_e & 0 \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{ccccc|c} 0.1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.24 & 0.1 & -0.54 & -0.35 & 0.84 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.54 & -0.24 & 0.59 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.54 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -0.56 & 0.54 & 1.04 \\ \hline -0.08 & -0.17 & 0.13 & 0.09 & -0.21 & -1/L \\ 2 & 1.3 & -1 & -1.3 & 1.3 & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

depending on $L \in (0, 3.5]$, and compute $\gamma_*(\nu, \tilde{\nu})$ as in Corollary 12 for $\nu = \tilde{\nu} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ using the LMI-solver of MATLAB (2020) and Yalmip (Lofberg (2004)). The results are plotted over L in Fig. 2 as full lines. They are compared with the values for hard IQCs (dotted curves), which are obtained with $E = 0$ in Corollary 12. The blue curve indicates the severe conservatism of results based on static IQCs ($\nu = \tilde{\nu} = 0$). For dynamic IQCs ($\nu = \tilde{\nu} > 0$), the plots permit to quantify the conservatism of hard IQCs if compared to those with a nontrivial terminal cost as newly developed in this paper. For example, the yellow and purple dots in Fig. 2 indicate a reduction of conservatism by about 20% and 35%, respectively.

7. DISCUSSION AND A CONJECTURE

Due to the modularity of results based on dissipativity, we emphasize that Theorems 9 and 11 can be seamlessly merged with the approaches in, e.g., Yin et al. (2020) and Pauli et al. (2021) to reduce the conservatism in the determination of stability margins of neural network controllers. Our simple numerical example demonstrates the striking potential limitation of static and hard dynamic IQCs, as employed in a whole stream of recent papers revolving around the generation of safety guarantees for static maps or dynamic systems involving neural networks.

In another direction, the analysis of gradient descent algorithms for m -strongly convex and L -smooth functions is addressed by Lessard et al. (2016) based on causal OZF multipliers, while the extension to general OZF multipliers is proposed by Michalowsky et al. (2021). In the latter situation, our results permit to guarantee transient properties of algorithms, next to the typically investigated global exponential stability.

We conclude the paper with the conjecture that robustness analysis based on Theorems 9 and 11 does not involve any more conservatism than robustness analysis based on Theorem 10 with general OZF multipliers.

8. CONCLUSIONS

We have developed a novel discrete-time absolute stability result by dissipation techniques and based on the notion of integral quadratic constraints with a nontrivial terminal cost. The benefit over existing results has been shown by a numerical example, and we conjecture that it is a lossless extension of a known robust stability result relying on O’Shea-Zames-Falb multipliers and soft IQCs. The suggested link of dissipativity theory with convex analysis might offer avenues for systematically developing new classes of multipliers in IQC based stability results.

REFERENCES

- Arcak, M., Meissen, C., and Packard, A. (2016). *Networks of dissipative systems: compositional certification of stability, performance, and safety*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Basar, T. (2001). *Control Theory: Twenty-Five Seminal Papers (1932-1981)*. Wiley-IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ.
- Brogliato, B. (2004). Absolute stability and the Lagrange-Dirichlet theorem with monotone multivalued mappings. *Syst. Contr. Letters*, 51(5), 343–353.
- Brogliato, B. and Tanwani, A. (2020). Dynamical systems coupled with monotone set-valued operators: Formalisms, applications, well-posedness, and stability. *SIAM Review*, 62(1), 3–129.
- Carrasco, J., Heath, W.P., Zhang, J., Ahmad, N.S., and Wang, S. (2020). Convex searches for discrete-time zames-falb multipliers. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 65(11), 4538–4553.
- Chen, X. and Wen, J. (1996). Robustness Analysis for Linear Time Invariant Systems with Structured Incrementally Sector Bounded Feedback Nonlinearities. *J. Appl. Math. Comput.*, 6(4), 625–648.
- Fetzer, M. and Scherer, C.W. (2017a). Absolute stability analysis of discrete time feedback interconnections. In *IFAC-PapersOnline*, 50, 8447–8453.
- Fetzer, M. and Scherer, C.W. (2017b). Zames-Falb Multipliers for Invariance. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 1(2), 412–417.
- Fetzer, M., Scherer, C.W., and Veenman, J. (2017). Invariance with dynamic multipliers. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 63(7), 1929–1942.
- Hill, D.J. and Moylan, P.J. (1975). Cyclo-dissipativeness, dissipativeness, and losslessness for nonlinear dynamical systems. Technical report EE7526, Univ. Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW, Australia.
- Iannelli, A., Seiler, P., and Marcos, A. (2019). Region of attraction analysis with integral quadratic constraints. *Automatica*, 109.
- Lessard, L., Recht, B., and Packard, A. (2016). Analysis and Design of Optimization Algorithms via Integral Quadratic Constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(1), 57–95.
- Lofberg, J. (2004). YALMIP : a toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 284–289.
- Mancera, R. and Safonov, M. (2005). All Stability Multipliers for Repeated MIMO Nonlinearities. *Syst. Contr. Letters*, 54, 389–397.
- MATLAB (2020). *9.9.0.1467703 (R2020b)*. The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts.
- Megretski, A. and Rantzer, A. (1997). System analysis via Integral Quadratic Constraints. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 42, 819–830.
- Michalowsky, S., Scherer, C., and Ebenbauer, C. (2021). Robust and structure exploiting optimisation algorithms: an integral quadratic constraint approach. *International Journal of Control*, 94, 1–24.
- O’Shea, R. (1967). An improved frequency time domain stability criterion for autonomous continuous systems. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 12(6), 725–731.
- Pauli, P., Gramlich, D., Berberich, J., and Allgower, F. (2021). Linear systems with neural network nonlinearities: Improved stability analysis via acausal zames-falb multipliers. In *Proc. 30th IEEE Conf. Dec. and Control*.

- Popov, V. (1962). Absolute stability of nonlinear systems of automatic control. *Automation and Remote Control*, 22, 857–875.
- Rockafellar, R.T. (1966). Characterization of the sub-differentials of convex functions. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 17(3), 497–510.
- Rockafellar, R. and Wets, R.J.B. (2009). *Variational Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Scherer, C. (2022). Dissipativity and integral quadratic constraints, tailored computational robustness tests for complex interconnections. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 42(3), 115–139.
- Scherer, C. and Ebenbauer, C. (2021). Convex synthesis of accelerated gradient algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(6), 4615–4645.
- Scherer, C.W. and Veenman, J. (2018). Stability analysis by dynamic dissipation inequalities: On merging frequency-domain techniques with time-domain conditions. *Syst. Control Lett.*, 121, 7–15.
- Seiler, P. (2015). Stability analysis with dissipation inequalities and Integral Quadratic Constraints. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 60(6), 1704–1709.
- van der Schaft, A. (2021). Cyclo-dissipativity revisited. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 66(6), 2920–2924.
- Veenman, J. and Scherer, C. (2014). A synthesis framework for robust gain-scheduling controllers. *Automatica*, 50(11), 2799–2812.
- Veenman, J., Scherer, C.W., and Koroğlu, H. (2016). Robust stability and performance analysis based on integral quadratic constraints. *Eur. J. Control*, 31, 1–32.
- Willems, J. and Brockett, R. (1968). Some new rearrangement inequalities having application in stability analysis. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 13(5), 539–549.
- Willems, J.C. (1972a). Dissipative Dynamical Systems, Parts I: General Theory. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 45, 321–351.
- Willems, J.C. (1972b). Dissipative Dynamical Systems, Parts II: Linear Systems with Quadratic Supply Rates. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 45, 352–393.
- Yakubovich, V.A. (1967). Frequency conditions for the absolute stability of control systems with several nonlinear or linear nonstationary blocks. *Automation and Remote Control*, 1, 857–880.
- Yin, H., Seiler, P., and Arcak, M. (2021). Backward reachability using integral quadratic constraints for uncertain nonlinear systems. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5, 707–712.
- Yin, H., Seiler, P., and Arcak, M. (2020). Stability analysis using quadratic constraints for systems with neural network controllers. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.*, 67(4), 1980–1987.
- Zames, G. and Falb, P.L. (1968). Stability conditions for systems with monotone and slope-restricted nonlinearities. *SIAM Journal of Control*, 6, 89–109.

Appendix A. PROOFS

A.1 Proof of Lemma 4

Let (7) be cyclo-passive. If we are given $v_0, \dots, v_m, v_{m+1} = v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $w_j \in F(v_j)$, we can take

$x_0 = v_0$ and $u_t = v_{m-t} - v_{m+1-t}$ for $t = 0, \dots, m$ to generate a trajectory of (7) with

$$x_t := v_{m+1-t} \text{ and } x_t + u_t = v_{m-t} \text{ for } t = 0, \dots, m+1.$$

With $y_t := w_{m-t}$ we get $y_t^\top u_t = w_{m-t}^\top (v_{m-t} - v_{m-t+1})$ for $t = 0, \dots, m+1$, and thus

$$\sum_{j=0}^m w_j^\top (v_j - v_{j+1}) = \sum_{t=0}^m y_t^\top u_t. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

If noting $y_t \in F(v_{m-t}) = F(x_t + u_t)$ and $x_0 = v_{m+1} = v_0 = x_{m+1}$, cyclo-passivity of (7) allows us to conclude $\sum_{t=0}^m y_t^\top u_t \geq 0$, which implies (8) due to (A.1).

Conversely, suppose that F is cyclically monotone. Let us pick any trajectory of (7) with $x_0 = x_{m+1}$. If defining

$$v_j := x_{m+1-j} \text{ and } w_j := y_{m-j} \text{ for } j = 0, \dots, m+1,$$

we have $w_j^\top (v_j - v_{j+1}) = y_{m-j}^\top (x_{m-j+1} - x_{m-j}) = y_{m-j}^\top u_{m-j}$ for $j = 0, \dots, m+1$, giving again (A.1). Since $w_j = y_{m-j} \in F(x_{m-j} + u_{m-j}) = F(x_{m-j+1}) = F(v_j)$ and due to (8), we infer that $\sum_{t=0}^m y_t^\top u_t \geq 0$. Since the choice of the round trip trajectory of (7) was arbitrary, (7) is cyclo-passive.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 5

We only need to prove the second statement. Pick any $u \in U$ and $v \in \partial f(u)$. Then 0 is a subgradient of $w \mapsto v^\top w - f(w)$ at $w = u$. By Fermat's principle, $w = u$ is optimal for the maximization in the definition of $f^*(v)$, which implies

$$f^*(v) = v^\top u - f(u) < \infty. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

To show the dissipation inequality, take any $x \in X^*$ and pick $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x \in \partial f(\tilde{u})$. Then the value of $f^*(x)$ is finite, and the definition of $f^*(x)$ implies $-f^*(x) \leq f(u) - x^\top u$. Addition to (A.2) gives $f^*(v) - f^*(x) \leq u^\top (v - x)$. We have proven that

$$f^*(v) - f^*(x) \leq u^\top (v - x) \text{ for all } x \in X^*, u \in U, v \in \partial f(u).$$

This is the local dissipation inequality for (11) on $X^* \times U$.

A.3 Proof of Corollary 6

If $(x, u) \in X \times U$, then $A_\psi x + B_\psi u = \text{col}(x^2, \dots, x^\nu, u)$ and $C_\psi x + u = u - x^k$ just by (12). This shows

$$\begin{aligned} V_k(A_\psi x + B_\psi u) - V_k(x) &= \sum_{j=k+1}^{\nu} f(x^j) + f(u) - \sum_{j=k}^{\nu} f(x^j) \\ &= f(u) - f(x^k) \leq \partial f(u)^\top (u - x^k) = \partial f(u)^\top (C_\psi x + u), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the dissipation inequality for (10) with storage function f . This proves the first claim.

Similarly, $(x, u) \in X^* \times U$ implies that there exist $u_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x \in \text{col}(\partial f(u_1), \partial f(u_2), \dots, \partial f(u_\nu))$. For any $u \in U$ and $v \in \partial f(u)$, we get $A_\psi x + B_\psi v \in \text{col}(x^2, \dots, x^\nu, v)$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} V_k^*(A_\psi x + B_\psi v) - V_k^*(x) &= \sum_{j=k+1}^{\nu} f^*(x^j) + f^*(v) - \sum_{j=k}^{\nu} f^*(x^j) \\ &= f^*(v) - f^*(x^k) \leq u^\top (v - x^k) = u^\top (C_\psi x + v), \end{aligned}$$

by relying on the dissipation inequality for (11) with the storage function f^* . This completes the proof.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 9

Pick any trajectory of the loop (20)-(21). By the dissipativity condition b) and Theorem 8, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$

such that the signals z and w of the loop trajectory filtered by (23) fulfill the dissipation inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} \xi_T \\ x_T \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} X_\Psi & W \\ W^\top & X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_T \\ x_T \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} v_t^\top P v_t + \\ & + \epsilon \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (\|\xi_t\|^2 + \|x_t\|^2 + \|w_t\|^2) \leq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x_0 \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} X_\Psi & W \\ W^\top & X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x_0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

for all $T \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By (21), we can make use of (25) to infer

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_T \\ x_T \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} X_\Psi + Z & W \\ W^\top & X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_T \\ x_T \end{pmatrix} + \epsilon \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x_t \\ w_t \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2 \leq x_0^\top X x_0$$

for all $T \in \mathbb{N}_0$. With c) and the standard fact

$$x_T^\top Y x_T = \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\Psi}} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ x_T \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} X_\Psi + Z & W \\ W^\top & X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ x_T \end{pmatrix},$$

the proof is completed.

A.5 Proof of Theorem 11

We drop the arguments of $P(\cdot)$, $Z(\cdot)$ and $M_T(\cdot)$ in (31), (34) and (35), respectively, to lighten the notation. Let us first show $M_T \in \mathcal{H}^{T \times T}$ for $T \in \mathbb{N}$ different from $T_0 := \nu + \tilde{\nu} + 1$.

Indeed, the cancellation of the first column of $B_\nu^{T_0}/B_{\tilde{\nu}}^{T_0}$ leads to $B_\nu^{T_0-1}/B_{\tilde{\nu}}^{T_0-1}$, while canceling the first row and column of $D_\nu^{T_0}(\lambda)/D_{\tilde{\nu}}^{T_0}(\tilde{\lambda})$ generate $D_\nu^{T_0-1}(\lambda)/D_{\tilde{\nu}}^{T_0-1}(\tilde{\lambda})$, respectively. Since principal sub-matrices of doubly hyperdominant matrices are double hyperdominant and since M_{T_0} is doubly hyperdominant by assumption, we conclude that M_{T_0-1} is doubly hyperdominant as well. This argument can be repeated to prove the claim for $1 \leq T < T_0$.

Let us now show the claim for $T = T_0 + 1$, while the general case follows by induction. By exploiting the particular structure of $(A_\nu, B_\nu, C_\nu(\lambda), D_\nu(\lambda))$, it is elementary to verify that M_{T_0+1} looks with $s = \sum_{k=0}^\nu \lambda + \sum_{k=0}^{\tilde{\nu}} \tilde{\lambda}$ as

$$\begin{pmatrix} s & -\tilde{\lambda}_1 & \cdots & -\tilde{\lambda}_{\tilde{\nu}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -\lambda_1 & s & -\lambda_1 & \cdots & -\lambda_{\tilde{\nu}} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -\lambda_2 & -\lambda_1 & s & -\lambda_1 & \cdots & -\tilde{\lambda}_{\tilde{\nu}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\lambda_\nu & \cdots & -\lambda_2 & -\lambda_1 & s & -\tilde{\lambda}_1 & \cdots & -\tilde{\lambda}_{\tilde{\nu}} & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_\nu & \cdots & -\lambda_2 & -\lambda_1 & s & -\tilde{\lambda}_1 & \cdots & -\tilde{\lambda}_{\tilde{\nu}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & -\lambda_\nu & \cdots & -\lambda_2 & -\lambda_1 & s & -\tilde{\lambda}_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -\lambda_\nu & \cdots & -\lambda_2 & -\lambda_1 & s \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix} E \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

of dimension $(1 + (\nu + 1) + \tilde{\nu}) \times (1 + (\tilde{\nu} + 1) + \nu)$. The dashed lines indicate where to find M_{T_0} as a right-lower block, which is doubly hyperdominant by assumption. As a consequence, M_{T_0+1} has nonpositive off-diagonal elements. Moreover, the sum of the elements in the $(\nu + 2)$ -nd row ($(\tilde{\nu} + 2)$ -nd column) on top of the full horizontal line (left to the full vertical line) is nonnegative. All rows (columns)

on top (to the left) of these are obtained by left (up) shifting this row (column) and filling up the last entries with zeros. This shows that the entries in the i -th row for $i = 1, \dots, \nu + 1$ (j -th column for $j = 1, \dots, \tilde{\nu} + 1$) sum up to nonnegative values as well. For these structural reasons, M_{T_0+1} is double hyperdominant.

Now fix $T \in \mathbb{N}$. Due to (33), the lifted representations of $y = (\psi_\nu(\lambda) \otimes I_d)(z)$ and $\tilde{y} = (\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\nu}}(\tilde{\lambda}) \otimes I_d)(w)$ read as

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_T \\ y^T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} B_\nu^T \otimes I_d \\ D_\nu^T(\lambda) \otimes I_d \end{pmatrix} z^T, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_T \\ \tilde{y}^T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} B_{\tilde{\nu}}^T \otimes I_d \\ D_{\tilde{\nu}}^T(\tilde{\lambda}) \otimes I_d \end{pmatrix} w^T.$$

If $z \in \ell_{2e}^d$ and $w \in \partial f(z)$, we get for these responses that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (w_t^\top y_t + z_t^\top \tilde{y}_t) - \tilde{x}_T^\top (E \otimes I_d) x_T = \\ & = (w^T)^\top (D_\nu^T(\lambda) \otimes I_d) z^T + (z^T)^\top (D_{\tilde{\nu}}^T(\tilde{\lambda}) \otimes I_d) w^T - \\ & \quad - (w^T)^\top (B_\nu^T \otimes I_d)^\top (E \otimes I_d) (B_{\tilde{\nu}}^T \otimes I_d) z^T = \\ & \quad = (w^T)^\top (M_T \otimes I_d) z^T. \quad (\text{A.3}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that this relation motivates the definition of M_T after all. Since M_T is double hyperdominant and since

$$w^T = \text{col}(w_0, \dots, w_{T-1}) \in \text{col}(\partial f(z_0), \dots, \partial f(z_{T-1})),$$

Lemma 2 in Mancera and Safonov (2005) guarantees that (A.3) is nonnegative.

Let us finally recall (32) for the response of the filter (23) to the signals z and w and note that $\xi_T = \text{col}(x_T, \tilde{x}_T)$. For the matrix (34) and together with (A.3) added to its transposed version, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} v_t^\top P(\nu, \tilde{\nu}) v_t - \xi_T^\top Z(E) \xi_T = \\ & = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} v_t^\top P(\nu, \tilde{\nu}) v_t - \tilde{x}_T^\top (E \otimes I_d) x_T - x_T^\top (E^\top \otimes I_d) \tilde{x}_T = \\ & \quad = (w^T)^\top (M_T \otimes I_d) z^T + (z^T)^\top (M_T^\top \otimes I_d) w^T \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $T \in \mathbb{N}$ was arbitrary, the proof is concluded.

A.6 Proof of Corollary 12

Take any $\gamma > \gamma_*(\nu, \tilde{\nu}) \geq 0$. For this value of γ , the LMIs (36) are feasible. Taking Schur complements gives

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} C_e^\top C_e \leq C_e^\top H^{-1} C_e < X - W^\top (X_\Psi + Z(E))^{-1} W \quad (\text{A.4})$$

as a consequence of the second and third LMI. For any trajectory of the loop (20)-(21), the fourth one implies $x_0^\top X x_0 \leq \gamma \|x_0\|^2$. On the one hand, Theorem 9 for $T \rightarrow \infty$ implies $\|x\|_2^2 + \|w\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} \|x_0\|^2$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, which shows stability. On the other hand, Theorem 9 combined with (A.4) also guarantees

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} \|C_e x_T\|^2 \leq \gamma \|x_0\|^2 \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathbb{N},$$

which shows $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|C_e x_t\| \leq \gamma \|x_0\|$. Since $\gamma > \gamma_*(\nu, \tilde{\nu})$ was chosen arbitrarily, the proof is concluded.