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ABSTRACT

For a class of linear singular optimal control problems with a nonunique singular arc, the solution of the corresponding nearly singular problem is analyzed and a limit solution based on formal singular perturbations is derived. A rigourous proof of the correctness of the result is given by constructing a convergent power series satisfying the Riccati equation of the nearly singular problem. This paper is an expanded version of Report TW 196.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the class of linear, time-invariant, n-dimensional dynamical systems
(1.1ab) $\quad \dot{x}=A x+B v, \quad x(0)=x_{0}$
with performance index
(1.1c) $J=\int_{0}^{\infty} x^{\prime} Q x+\varepsilon^{2} v^{\prime} R v d t, \quad 0<\varepsilon \ll 1$,
where $Q=$ C'C is a symmetric positive semi-definite matrix and $R$ is symmetric and positive definite. We denote the $n$-dimensional state space by $X$. The control vector takes its values in the linear $n$-dimensional space $U$ and $v(\cdot): \mathbb{R}^{+} \rightarrow U$ is assumed to be a piece-wise continuous mapping. In this paper we analyze the problem of perfect regulation for a class of cheap optimal control problems of the type (1.1). For $\varepsilon=0$ (1.1) reduces to a singular optimal control problem, which, as it is shown in [4], may have a family of solutions. As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the solution of (1.1) will tend to one of these solutions. In order to formulate such a class of singular problems in terms of $A, B$ and $Q$ we introduce some concepts of geometric system theory in section 2. For a more extensive exposition we refer to WONHAM [12]. In section 3 we specify the class of problems (1.1) to which our investigations apply and carry out some transformations in order to bring the system in its most suitable form. In section 4, a formal method for selecting the appropriate singular solution is presented, while in the sections 5 and 6 we prove the correctness of the result by developing the solution of (1.1) with respect to $\varepsilon$. It is remarked that the convergence of $x$ satisfying (1.1) for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ can also be proved by analyzing its Laplace transform see FRANCIS [2,3].
2. SOME CONCEPTS OF GEOMETRIC SYSTEM THEORY

Before giving a definition of controllabity subspaces we introduce
the concept of ( $A, B$ )-invariant subspaces.

DEFINITION 2.1. A subspace $V \subset X$ is called (A,B)-invariant if for any $x_{0} \in V$ there exists a control $u(\cdot): \mathbb{R}^{+} \rightarrow U$ such that $x(t)$ satisfying (1.1ab) remains in $V$ for $t>0$.

Let $B=$ ImB. It can be proved that $(A, B)$-invariant subspaces may be characterized by the property $A V \subset V+B$, or, equivalently, by the existence of a family of feedbacks

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{F}(V)=\{F: X \rightarrow U\}(A+B F) V \subset V\} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that the closed loop system that starts $V$ remains in $V$ for $t>0$. The class of ( $A, B$ ) -invariant subspaces contained in some subspace of $X$ is closed under addition and, thus, has a supremal element, see [12]. In the sequel we denote the supremal ( $A, B$ )-invariant subspace contained in $K=$ KerQ by $V_{K}^{*}$.

DEFINITION 2.2. A subspace $R \subset X$ is called a controllability subspace if for any $x_{0}, x_{1} \in R$ there exists a $T>0$ and $a(\cdot): \mathbb{R}^{+} \rightarrow U$ such that $x(t)$ given by (1.1ab) satisfies $x(T)=x_{1}$ and $x(t) \in R$ for $0<t<T$.

Clearly, a controllability subspace is also (A,B)-invariant. Given a subspace $B_{0} \subset X$ and a mapping $A_{F}: X \rightarrow X$, we define the subspace $R_{0} \subset X$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{0}=\left\langle A_{F} 1 B_{0}\right\rangle \equiv B_{0}+A_{F} B_{0}+\ldots+A_{F}^{n-1} B_{0} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

It can be shown that $R$ is a controllability subspace if and only if
(2.3) $\quad R=\langle A+B F \upharpoonleft B \cap R\rangle$ for $F \in \underline{F}(R)$.

Furthermore, the class of controllabity subspaces contained in some subspace of $X$ is closed under addition and, thus, has a supremal element. The supremal controllability subspace contained in $K=$ KerQ we denote by $R_{K}^{*}$. It can be proved that

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{K}^{*}=\langle A+B F| B \cap V_{K}^{*} \quad \text { for } F \in \underline{F}\left(V_{K}^{*}\right) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 3. THE NEARLY SINGULAR OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEM

For the class of problems (1.1) we assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
X=K+B \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, it is supposed that $R_{K}^{*} \neq 0$ or $B \cap K \neq 0$ as this property characterizes the class of problems we are aiming at, while condition (3.1) is meant as a restriction to focus our attention to a representive subclass for which the limit problem has a non-unique solution. In order to ensure finiteness and positive definiteness of the gain function we make the following hypotheses
(H3.1) the pair (A,B) is stabilizable,
(H3.2) the pair ( $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{A}$ ) is observable.

In addition to this similar type of hypotheses holding on a subsystem of (1.1) will be made later on.

The present study can be seen as the counterpart of the work by O'Malley and Jameson $[8,9]$, where implicitly $R_{K}^{*}=0$. Since $A K \subset X=K+B$, we have that $V_{K}^{*}=K$ (see section 2). Let $\kappa=\operatorname{dim} K$. We assume that the state space $X$ is the span of $n$ orthonormal basis vectors $e_{1}, \ldots, e_{n}$ chosen in such a way that $K$ is the span of last $K$ of them. The control space $U$ is the span of $m$ orthonormal basis vectors $d_{1} \ldots . d_{m}$ chosen in such way that $B^{-1} e_{1}, \ldots, B^{-1} e_{n-k}$ has the same span as the first $n-k$ basis vectors $d_{i}$. Here $B^{-1}$ denotes the functional inverse of $B$, see $[12, p .6]$. By regular mappings $H: X \rightarrow X$ and $G: U \rightarrow U$ any system $(A, B, Q, R)$ can be transformed into a system ( $\mathrm{H}^{-1} \mathrm{AH}, \mathrm{H}^{-1} \mathrm{BG}, \mathrm{H}^{\prime} \mathrm{QH}, \mathrm{G}^{\prime} \mathrm{RG}$ ) of the required form. Note that H'QH and G'RG are symmetric and positive (semi-)definite.

Consequently, we may restrict ourselves to systems (1.1) of the form

$$
\binom{\dot{x}_{s}}{\dot{x}_{k}}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
A_{s} & A_{s k}  \tag{3.2}\\
A_{k s} & A_{k}
\end{array}\right)\binom{x_{s}}{x_{k}}+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
B_{s} & 0 \\
0 & B_{k}
\end{array}\right)\binom{v_{s}}{v_{k}}
$$

with $x_{s}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-k}\right), x_{k}=\left(x_{n-k}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), v_{s}=\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n-k}\right)$ and
$v_{k}=\left(v_{n-\kappa+1}, \ldots, v_{m}\right)$. For the control vector we write

$$
\binom{v_{s}}{v_{k}}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & -B_{s}^{-1} A_{s k}  \tag{3.3}\\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right)\binom{x_{s}}{x_{k}}+\binom{u_{s}}{u_{k}}
$$

so that (1.1) becomes
(3.4ab) $\quad\binom{\dot{x}_{s}}{\dot{x}_{k}}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}A_{s} & 0 \\ A_{k s} & A_{k}\end{array}\right)\binom{x_{s}}{x_{k}}+\left(\begin{array}{ll}B_{s} & 0 \\ 0 & B_{k}\end{array}\right)\binom{u_{s}}{u_{k}},\binom{x_{s}(0)}{x_{k}(0)}=\binom{x_{s 0}}{x_{k 0}}$
with performance index
(3.4c) $J=\int_{0}^{\infty}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}, x_{k}^{\prime}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}Q_{s} & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}\right)\binom{x_{s}}{x_{k}}+\varepsilon^{2}\left[\left(x_{s}^{\prime}, x_{k}^{\prime}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & 0 \\ 0 & M_{k}\end{array}\right)\binom{x_{s}}{x_{k}}\right.$,

$$
\left.2\left(x_{s}^{\prime}, x_{k}^{\prime}\right)\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & 0 \\
N_{k s} & N_{k}
\end{array}\right)\binom{u_{s}}{u_{k}}+\left(u_{s}^{\prime}, u_{k}^{\prime}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}
R_{s} & R_{k s}^{\prime} \\
R_{k s} & R_{k}
\end{array}\right)\binom{u_{s}}{u_{k}}\right] d t,
$$

where $M_{k}=D_{k}^{\prime} D_{k}=\left(B_{s}^{-1} A_{s k}\right)^{\prime} R_{s} B_{s}^{-1} A_{s k}^{\prime} N_{k}=-\left(B_{s}^{-1} A_{s k}\right)^{\prime} R_{k s}^{\prime}$ and $N_{k s}=\left(B_{s}^{-1} A_{s k}\right)^{\prime} R_{s}$. In the sequel we denote by $A, B, Q, M, N$ and $R$ the mappings of (3.4). We make the following additional hypotheses.
(H3.3)
the pair ( $A_{k}, B_{k}$ ) is stabilizable
(H3.4) the pair ( $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}, \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{k}}$ ) is observable.

It is known that under the assumptions (H3.1) and (H3.2), (1.1), and thus (3.4), has an optimal solution with

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=-\varepsilon^{-2} R^{-1}\left(B^{\prime} P+\varepsilon^{2} N^{\prime}\right) x \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P$ is a uniquely determined symmetric positive definite matrix satisfying the algebraic Riccati equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left(A-B R^{-1} N^{\prime}\right)+\left(A-B R^{-1} N^{\prime}\right)^{\prime} P-\varepsilon^{-2} P B R^{-1} B^{\prime} P+Q+\varepsilon^{2}\left(M-N R^{-1} N^{\prime}\right)=0 \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is noted that in general this equation will have more than one solution.

The above statement is based on the work of WONHAM [11]. To be complete, we give this result in the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.1. The class of symmetric, positive definite matrices contains a unique element that satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{\prime} P+P A-P B R^{-1} B^{\prime} P+C^{\prime} C=0 \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

provided that ( $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ ) is stabilizable and ( $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{A}$ ) is observable.

## 4. THE FORMAL LIMIT SOLUTION

Since the cost of control is small, it is expected that by some appropriately chosen initial pulse the solution will tend rapidly to the subspace K. In order to analyze this behaviour we carry out the following transformations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{u}=\hat{\mathrm{u}} / \varepsilon, \quad \mathrm{t}=\tau \varepsilon \quad \text { and } \mathrm{J}=\hat{\mathrm{J}} \varepsilon . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting (4.1) into (3.4) and formally letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain
(4.2a) $\quad d \hat{x} / d \tau=B \hat{u}$
(4.2b) $\quad \hat{J}=\int_{0}^{\infty} \hat{x}^{\prime} 2 \hat{x}+\hat{u}^{\prime} R \hat{u} d \tau$.

We consider the feedback
(4.3a) $\quad \hat{u}=-E^{-1} B^{\prime} \hat{P \hat{x}}$
with $\hat{P}$ satisfying
(4.3b) $\quad \hat{P B R R}^{-1} B^{\prime} \hat{P}=Q$.

Partitioning the inverse of $R$ as

$$
R^{-1}=T=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
T_{s} & T_{k s}^{\prime}  \tag{4.4}\\
T_{k s} & T_{k}
\end{array}\right)
$$

we write the unique positive semi-definite solution of (4.3b) as
(4.5a) $\quad P=\left(\begin{array}{ll}P & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}\right)$
with $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{s} 0}>0$ satisfying
(4.5b) $\quad P_{s 0} B_{s} T S_{s} S_{s}^{\prime P}{ }_{s 0}=Q_{s}$.

The corresponding closed loop system reads

$$
\binom{d \hat{x}_{s} / d \tau}{d \hat{x}_{k} / d \tau}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
-B_{s} T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 0} & 0  \tag{4.6}\\
-B_{k} T_{k s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 0} & 0
\end{array}\right)\binom{\hat{x}_{s}}{\hat{x}_{k}}
$$

Integration yields
(4.7a) $\quad \hat{x}_{s}(\tau)=e^{-B_{S} T S_{S}^{\prime} P_{S O}}{ }^{\tau} x_{S O^{\prime}}$
(4.7b) $\quad \hat{x}_{k}(\tau)=x_{k 0}-\int_{0}^{\tau} B_{k} T T_{k s} B_{s}^{\prime} P{ }_{s 0} \hat{x}_{s}(\bar{\tau}) d \bar{\tau}$.

It is noted that $B_{s} S^{T} S^{\prime} S_{s}{ }_{s 0}=P_{s 0^{-1}} Q_{s}$ is positive definite. Consequently, as $\tau \rightarrow \infty \hat{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{s}} \rightarrow 0$ and $\hat{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{s}} \rightarrow \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{kO}}-\xi_{\mathrm{kO}}$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xi_{\mathrm{k} 0}=\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{ks}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{s}}^{-1} \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{s}}^{-1} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{s} 0} \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we observe that at the initial point the solution jumps from ( $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{s} 0}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{kO}}$ ) to $\left(0, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{kO}}{ }^{-\xi_{\mathrm{k}}}\right.$ ). Once the solution is in the subspace $K$ it remains there as $K$ is a invariant for (3.4). The performance index will be zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for any feedback $u_{k}=F_{k} x_{k}$. For the purpose of selecting the appropriate feedback we consider the optimal control problem for $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k}}$ given by (3.4ac) with $x_{s}=0$ for $t>0$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{\bar{x}}_{\mathrm{k}}=\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{k}} \overline{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{k}}+\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{k}} \overline{\mathrm{u}}_{\mathrm{k}^{\prime}} \quad \overline{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{k}}(0)=\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k} 0}-\xi_{\mathrm{k} 0} \tag{4.9ab}
\end{equation*}
$$

(4.9c) $\bar{J}=\int_{0}^{\infty} \bar{x}_{k}^{\prime} M_{k} \bar{x}_{k}+2 \bar{x}_{k}^{\prime} N_{k} \bar{u}_{k}+\bar{u}_{k}^{\prime} R_{k} \bar{u}_{k} d t$.

From (H3.2) and (H3.3) it follows that an optimal solution exists with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{u}_{k}=-R_{k}^{-1}\left(B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k}+N_{k}^{\prime}\right) \bar{x}_{k^{\prime}} \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\bar{P}_{k}$ is the unique positive definite solution of the algebraic Riccati equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{P}_{k}\left(A_{k}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} N_{k}^{\prime}\right)+\left(A_{k}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} N_{k}^{\prime}\right) ' \bar{P}_{k}-\bar{P}_{k} B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} B_{k}^{\prime} \bar{P}_{k}+\left(M_{k}-N_{k} R_{k}^{-1} N_{k}^{\prime}\right)=0 \tag{4.10b}
\end{equation*}
$$

see theorem 3.1. Thus, the optimal solution reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{x}_{k}(t)=e^{\left(A_{k}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} B_{k}^{\prime} \bar{P}_{k}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} N_{k}^{\prime}\right) t}\left(x_{k 0}-\xi_{k 0}\right) \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

REMARK. It is not obvious that $x_{k}(t, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \bar{x}_{k}(t)$ for $t \geq \delta>0$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, as $\bar{x}_{k}$ follows from the order $0\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right)$ terms of the performance index. Since $x_{s}=O(\varepsilon), X_{s}$ is also present with terms of order $O\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right)$, so before hand it is not clear that the system can be decomposed in the above way.


Fig. 4.1. Limit behaviour of the optimal solution

## 5. CONVERGENCE OF THE FORMAL POWER SERIES SATISFYING THE RICCATI EQUATION

The correctness of the formal result of section 4 will be proved in three steps. First we construct a formal power series satisfying (3.6). Then its convergence is proved by using a theorem of HAUTUS [5]. In this way we obtain a representation of an analytic solution of (3.6) for which we are able to prove positive definiteness. Finally, in section 6 we substitute this convergent series in the closed loop system and prove that the solution has the limit behaviour as stated in section 4.

Let us consider the formal power series

$$
P_{\varepsilon}=\varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P^{(j)} \varepsilon^{j}, \quad P^{(j)}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
P_{s j} & P_{k s j}^{\prime}  \tag{5.1}\\
P_{k s j} & P_{k j}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Susbtitution of (5.1) into (3.6) yields, by setting $\varepsilon=0, \mathrm{P}^{(0)}=\hat{\mathrm{P}}$ with $\hat{P}$ given by (4.5). Equating the coefficients of the terms to $\varepsilon$ we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{s 0} A_{s}+A_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 0}-P_{s 1} B_{s} T s_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 0}-P_{s 0} B_{s} T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 1}=0 \tag{5.2a}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
-P_{s 0} B_{s} T{ }_{s} N_{k s}^{\prime}-P_{s 0} B_{s} T_{s k} N_{k}^{\prime}-P_{s 0} B_{s} T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{k s 1}^{\prime}-P_{s 0} B_{s} T k_{k} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k 1}=0 . \tag{5.2b}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{s 1}=\left(B_{s} T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime}\right)^{-1} A_{s} \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{s} N_{k s}^{\prime}+T_{s k} N_{k}^{\prime}+T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{k s 1}^{\prime}+T_{s k} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k 1}=0 . \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equating the terms of $O\left(\varepsilon^{2}\right)$ we obtain the equation

$$
\begin{align*}
& -P_{k s 1} B_{s} T{ }_{s} N_{k s}^{\prime}-P_{k s 1} B_{s} T_{s k} N_{k}^{\prime}+P_{k 1} A_{k}-P_{k 1} B_{k} T_{k s} N_{k s}^{\prime}-P_{k 1} B_{k} T_{k} N_{k}^{\prime}  \tag{5.5}\\
& -N_{k s} T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{k s 1}-N_{k} T_{k s}^{\prime} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{k s 1}^{\prime}+A_{k}^{\prime} P_{k 1}-N_{k s} T_{k s}^{\prime} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k 1}-N_{k} T_{k} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k 1}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -P_{k s 1} B_{s} T S_{s}^{\prime} P_{k s 1}^{\prime}-P_{k s 1} B_{s}^{T} T_{s k} B_{k} P_{k 1}-P_{k 1} B_{k} T_{k s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{k s 1}^{\prime}-P_{k 1} B_{k} T_{k} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k 1} \\
& +M_{k}-N_{k s} T_{s} N_{k s}^{\prime}-N_{k s} T{ }_{s k} N_{k}^{\prime}-N_{k} T_{k s} N_{k s}^{\prime}-N_{k} T_{k} N_{k}^{\prime}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

From (4.4) we derive that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{k}}^{-1}=\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{k}}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ks}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{s}}^{-1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{ks}}^{\prime} \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (5.4) and (5.6) we reduce equation (5.5) to

$$
\begin{align*}
P_{k 1}\left[A_{k}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} N_{k}^{\prime}\right] & +\left[A_{k}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} N_{k}^{\prime}\right]^{\prime} P_{k 1}+  \tag{5.7}\\
& -P_{k 1} B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k 1}+M_{k}-N_{k} R_{k}^{-1} N_{k}^{\prime}=0,
\end{align*}
$$

which has a unique positive semi-definite solution $P_{k 1}=\bar{P}_{k}$ see (4.10b). The equations for the higher order coefficients take the form
(5.8a)

$$
P_{s j} V_{s}+V_{S}^{\prime} P_{s j}=F_{s}^{(j)}
$$

(5.8b)

$$
P_{k j} V_{k}+V_{k}^{\prime} P_{k j}=F_{k}^{(j)}
$$

(5.8c)

$$
P_{k s j} V_{s}+P_{k j} V_{k s}=F_{k s}^{(j)}
$$

with
(5.9ab)

$$
V_{s}=-B_{s} T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 0^{\prime}} \quad V_{k s}=-B_{k} T_{k s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 0^{\prime}}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{k}=A_{k}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} N_{k}^{\prime}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k 1} \tag{5.9c}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
F^{(j)}=F^{(j)}\left(P^{(0)}, \ldots, P^{(j-1)}\right) \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

As $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{s}}$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}$ have eigenvalues with strictly negative real parts the above equations constitute an iteration process yielding uniquely determined coefficients $P^{(j)}, j=2,3, \ldots$ :
(5.11a) $\quad P_{p j}=\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{t V_{p}^{\prime}}{ }_{F_{p}}^{(j)} e^{t V_{p}} d t, \quad p=s, k$,
(5.11b) $\quad P_{k s j}=-P_{k j} B_{k} T_{k s} T_{s}^{-1} B_{s}^{-1}+F_{k s}^{(j)}$.

In order to prove that (5.1) is the unique symmetric, positive definite solution of (3.6) we need the following lemma of HAUTUS [5, p.222] on the convergence of the formal power series (5.1). Furthermore, in a second lemma it is proved that (5.1) is positive definite indeed.

LEMMA 5.1. Let the functions $F_{i j}(Z ; \varepsilon), i, j=1, \ldots, n$ with $z=\left\{z_{i j}\right\}_{i, j=1, \ldots, n}$ be analytic in a neighbourhood $D$ of $(Z, \varepsilon)=(0,0)$ and let $Z=\hat{Z}(\varepsilon)$ be a formal power series solution of the equation $F(Z ; \varepsilon)=0$. If $\operatorname{det} F_{Z}(\hat{Z}(\varepsilon) ; \varepsilon) \neq 0$ in a neighbourhood of $\varepsilon=0$ then $\hat{Z}(\varepsilon)$ is convergent.

LEMMA 5.2. If the formal power series (5.1) is convergent with radius of convergence $\varepsilon_{r}$, then there exists an $\varepsilon_{0}$ such that for $0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_{0}$ this series is positive definite.

PROOF. The matrix $P(\varepsilon)$ is positive definite if for any $x \neq 0$ the quadratic form $x^{\prime} P(\varepsilon) x$ is positive. Since
(5.12a)

$$
x^{\prime} P(\varepsilon) x=\varepsilon Q_{1}(x ; \varepsilon)+O\left(\varepsilon^{3}|x|^{2}\right)
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{1}(x ; \varepsilon)=x_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 0} x_{s}+\varepsilon x_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 1} x_{s}+2 \varepsilon x_{s}^{\prime} P_{k s 1}^{\prime} x_{k}+\varepsilon x_{k}^{\prime} P_{k 1} x_{k} \tag{5.12b}
\end{equation*}
$$

it suffices to prove that

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{1}(x ; \varepsilon)>\delta \varepsilon|x|^{2} \tag{5.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\delta$ is some arbitrary small positive number independent of $\varepsilon$. As $P_{s 0}$ and $P_{k 1}$ are positive definite we estimate the quadratic form as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{1}(x ; \varepsilon)>\left(k^{2}+\varepsilon \eta\right)\left|x_{s}\right|^{2}+\varepsilon \eta\left|x_{k}\right|^{2}-2 \varepsilon M\left|x_{s}\right|\left|x_{k}\right| \tag{5.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\kappa, \eta$ and $1 / M$ are sufficiently small positive numbers. After subtracting a term $\varepsilon^{2} M\left|x_{s}\right|^{2} / K^{2}$ from the right-hand side of this inequality we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{1}(x ; \varepsilon)>\left(\kappa\left|x_{s}\right|-\varepsilon M\left|x_{k}\right| / K\right)^{2}-\varepsilon^{2} M^{2}|x|^{2} / \kappa^{2}+\varepsilon n|x|^{2} \tag{5.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that inequality (5.13) holds for $\delta<\eta-\varepsilon M / K^{2}$. Clearly, we have to choose $\varepsilon_{0}=\min \left\{\varepsilon_{r}, \eta K^{2} / M\right\}$.

Now we are in the position to prove the main theorem of this section.
THEOREM 5.1. The formal power series (5.1) has a positive radius of convergence and hence represents an analytic solution, defined in a neighbourhood of $\varepsilon=0$, being the unique symmetric, positive definite solution of (3.6).

PROOF. Substitution of

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=\varepsilon P_{0}+\varepsilon^{2} P_{1}+\varepsilon^{2} Z \tag{5.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

in (3.6) yields after multiplication of the equation with $\varepsilon^{-1}$
(5.17a)

$$
F(Z ; \varepsilon) \equiv Z H(\varepsilon)+H(\varepsilon)^{\prime} Z-\varepsilon Z^{-1} B^{\prime} Z+\varepsilon G=0
$$

with
(5.17b) $H(\varepsilon)=\varepsilon\left(A-B R^{-1} N^{\prime}\right)-B R^{-1} B^{\prime}\left(P_{0}+\varepsilon P_{1}\right)$,
(5.17c) $\quad G=P_{1}\left(A-B R^{-1} N^{\prime}\right)+\left(A-B R^{-1} N^{\prime}\right)^{\prime} P_{1}-P_{1} B R^{-1} B^{\prime} P_{1}+\left(M-N R^{-1} N^{\prime}\right)$.

Using (5.3) and (5.4) we find that

$$
H(\varepsilon)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{S}}(\varepsilon) & 0 \\
\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ks}}(\varepsilon) & \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{k}}(\varepsilon)
\end{array}\right)
$$

with

$$
H_{s}(\varepsilon)=-B_{s} T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 0}-\varepsilon B_{s} T_{k s}^{\prime} B_{k s}^{\prime} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k s 1}, \quad H_{k}(\varepsilon)=\varepsilon V_{k}
$$

$$
H_{k s}(\varepsilon)=-B_{k} T_{k s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 0}+\varepsilon A_{k s}-\varepsilon B_{k} T_{k s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s 1}-\varepsilon B_{k} T_{k} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k s} 1^{\prime}
$$

and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}$ given by (5.9c). Consequently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{det}(H)=\operatorname{det}\left(H_{S}\right) \operatorname{det}\left(H_{k}\right) . \tag{5.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because of hypotheses (H3.3) and (H3.4) the eigenvalues of $H_{k}$ have strictly negative real parts and so $\operatorname{det}\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{k}}\right) \neq 0$. Since according to (4.5b)

$$
B_{S} T_{s} B_{S}^{\prime} P_{s O}=P_{s 0^{-1} Q_{S}}
$$

the determinant of $H_{s}$ does not vanish either for $\varepsilon$ sufficiently small, so that $\operatorname{det}(H) \neq 0$. This result is equivalent with $\operatorname{det}(\partial F / \partial Z) \neq 0$ at $z=0$. Then from lemma 5.1 and lemma 5.2 we conclude that (5.1) is convergent and positive definite. Hypotheses (H3.1) and (H3.2) guarantee that (3.6) has a unique symmetric, positive definite solution, see theorem 3.1. Since (5.1) converges, the series is a representation of this unique solution.

## 6. THE SINGULARLY PERTURBED CLOSED LOOP SYSTEM

Substitution of (3.5) and (5.1) into (3.4ab) gives the closed loop system
(6.1ab) $\quad\binom{\dot{x}_{s}}{\dot{x}_{k}}=\left(\begin{array}{l}\varepsilon^{-1} C_{s s}(\varepsilon) \\ c_{s k}(\varepsilon) \\ \varepsilon^{-1} C_{k s}(\varepsilon) \\ C_{k k}(\varepsilon)\end{array}\right)\binom{x_{s}}{x_{k}},\binom{x_{s}(0)}{x_{k}(0)}=\binom{x_{s 0}}{x_{k 0}}$
with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^{-1} C_{S S}(\varepsilon) & =A_{s}-\varepsilon^{-2} B_{s} T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s}(\varepsilon)-\varepsilon^{-2} B_{s} T T_{s k} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k s}(\varepsilon ; \\
\varepsilon^{-1} C_{k s}(\varepsilon) & =A_{k s}-\varepsilon^{-2} B_{k} T_{k s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{s}(\varepsilon)-\varepsilon^{-2} B_{k} T_{k} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k s}(\varepsilon), \\
C_{s k}(\varepsilon) & =-\varepsilon^{-2} B_{s} T_{s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{k s}(\varepsilon)-B_{s} T_{s} N_{k s}^{\prime}-\varepsilon^{-2} B_{s} T_{s k} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k}(\varepsilon)-B_{s} T_{s k} N_{k}^{\prime} \\
C_{k k}(\varepsilon) & =A_{k}-\varepsilon^{-2} B_{k} T_{k s} B_{s}^{\prime} P_{k s}^{\prime}(\varepsilon)-B_{k} T_{k s} N_{k s}^{\prime}-\varepsilon^{-2} B_{k} T_{k} B_{k}^{\prime} P_{k}(\varepsilon)-B_{k} T_{k} N_{k}^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

THEOREM 6.1. Let $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{t}), \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k}}(\mathrm{t})\right)$ be the solution of (6.1ab), then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\binom{x_{s}(t)}{x_{k}(t)}-\binom{\hat{x}_{s}(t / \varepsilon)}{\hat{x}_{k}(t / \varepsilon)}-\binom{0}{\bar{x}_{k}(t)}+\binom{0}{x_{k 0}-\xi_{k 0}}\right|=0(\varepsilon) \tag{6.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\mathrm{t}>0$ with $\hat{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{s}}, \hat{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{k}}, \overline{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{k}}$ and $\xi_{\mathrm{k} 0}$ given by (4.7)-(4.11).

PROOF. Since all eigenvalues of (6.1a) have negative real parts, see KWAKERNAAK and SIVAN [6, p.233], $\left|x_{s}\right|$ and $\left|x_{k}\right|$ have upperbounds of order $0(1)$. Integration of the equation for $x_{s}$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{s}(t)=e^{\varepsilon^{-1} \cdot C_{S S}(\varepsilon) t} x_{s 0}+\int_{0}^{t} e^{-1} C_{S S}(\varepsilon)(t-\tau) \quad C_{s k}(\varepsilon) x_{k}(\tau) d \tau \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

or
(6.4) $\quad x_{s}(t)=e^{\varepsilon^{-1} C_{s S}(0) t} x_{s O}+O(\varepsilon)$.

We now introduce the dependent variable

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{r}=x_{k}-c_{k s}(\varepsilon) C_{s s}^{-1}(\varepsilon) x_{s} \tag{6.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (6.1a) we derive the corresponding differential equation

$$
\dot{x}_{r}=\left[C_{k k}(\varepsilon)-C_{k s}(\varepsilon)-C_{s s}^{-1}(\varepsilon) C_{s k}(\varepsilon)\right]\left\{x_{r}+C_{k s}(\varepsilon) C_{s s}^{-1}(\varepsilon) x_{s}\right\} .
$$

From (6.3) it follows that $X_{s}$ is of the order $O(\varepsilon)$ in the $L_{1}$ norm, so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{r}(t)=e^{\left[C_{k k}(\varepsilon)-C_{k s}(\varepsilon) C_{s s}^{-1}(\varepsilon) C_{s k}(\varepsilon)\right] t}\left\{x_{k 0}-C_{k s}(\varepsilon) C_{s s}^{-1}(\varepsilon) x_{s 0}\right\}+0(\varepsilon) . \tag{6.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substitution of (6.3) and (6.6) into (6.5) yields

$$
\begin{align*}
x_{k}(t) & =e^{\left[C_{k k}(0)-C_{k s}(0) C_{s s}^{-1}(0) c_{s k}(0)\right] t}\left\{x_{k 0}-c_{k s}(0) c_{s s}^{-1}(0) x_{s 0}\right\}+  \tag{6.7}\\
& -c_{k s}(0) C_{s s}^{-1}(0) e^{\varepsilon^{-1} C_{s s}(0) t} x_{s 0}+0(\varepsilon) .
\end{align*}
$$

It is noted that
(6.8)

$$
C_{k s}(0) C_{s s}^{-1}(0)=B_{k} T_{k s} T_{s}^{-1} B_{s}^{-1}
$$

so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{k k}(0)-C_{k s}(0) C_{s s}^{-1}(0) C_{s k}(0)=A_{k}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} B_{k}^{\prime} \bar{P}_{k}-B_{k} R_{k}^{-1} N_{k}^{\prime} \tag{6.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

According to (6.4) and (6.7) $x_{s}$ and $x_{k}$ satisfy (6.2), which completes the proof.

Thus, we have found that the expression
(6.10) $\quad\binom{\tilde{x}_{s}(t ; \varepsilon)}{\tilde{x}_{k}(t ; \varepsilon)}=\binom{0}{\bar{x}_{k}(t)}+\binom{\hat{X}_{s}(t / \varepsilon)}{\hat{X}_{k}(t / \varepsilon)}-\binom{0}{x_{k 0}-\xi_{k 0}}$
is a uniformly valid asymptotic approximation up to $O(\varepsilon)$ of the optimal solution of (3.4) for $\varepsilon>0$.

## 7. AN EXAMPLE

As an illustration of the method of approximating the solution of a nearly singular system we present the following example
(7.1a) $\dot{x}=A x+B v, \quad x(0)=x_{0}^{\prime}$
(7.1b) $J=\int_{0}^{\infty} x^{\prime} Q x+\varepsilon^{2} v^{\prime} R v d t$
with
(7.1c)

$$
A=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad B=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right), \quad Q=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad R=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Putting (7.1) in the required form (3.5) we obtain
(7.2a) $\quad \dot{x}_{1}=u_{1}, \quad x_{1}(0)=x_{10}$,
(7.2b)

$$
\dot{x}_{2}=x_{1}+u_{2}, \quad x_{2}(0)=x_{20}
$$

(7.3c) $J=\int_{0}^{\infty} x_{1}^{2}+\varepsilon^{2}\left(x_{2}^{2}-2 x_{2} u_{1}+u_{1}^{2}+u_{2}^{2}\right) d t$.

In the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the system jumps initially from ( $x_{10}, x_{20}$ ) to ( $0, x_{20}$ ), see (4.7) and (4.8). In order to analyze the limit solution in the subspace $x_{1}=0$ for $t>0$, we consider the optimal control problem (4.9) for the system (7.2), so
(7.4a) $\quad \dot{\bar{x}}_{2}=\overline{\mathrm{u}}_{2}, \quad \overline{\mathrm{x}}_{2}(0)=\mathrm{x}_{20}$,
(7.4b) $J=\int_{0}^{\infty} \bar{x}_{2}^{2}+\bar{u}_{2}^{2} d t$.

The optimal solution satisfies $\bar{u}_{2}=-\bar{x}_{2}$, see (4.10).
We are able to verify the result as the exact solution of the problem (7.1) can be computed; the algebraic Riccati equation reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q+P_{\varepsilon} A^{\prime}+A_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} P_{\varepsilon}-\varepsilon^{-2} P_{\varepsilon} B R^{-1} B^{\prime} P_{\varepsilon}=0 \tag{7.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which has the positive definite solution

$$
P_{\varepsilon}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\varepsilon \sqrt{1+\varepsilon^{2}} & \varepsilon^{2}  \tag{7.6}\\
\varepsilon^{2} & \varepsilon^{2}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Since $u_{\varepsilon}=-\varepsilon^{-2} R^{-1} B^{\prime} P_{\varepsilon} x_{\varepsilon}$, the closed loop system reads
(7.7a) $\quad \dot{x}_{\varepsilon 1}=-\varepsilon^{-1} \sqrt{1+\varepsilon^{2}} \mathrm{x}_{\varepsilon 1^{\prime}}$
(7.7b)

$$
\dot{x}_{\varepsilon 2}=-x_{\varepsilon 2}
$$

Consequently the exact solution converges to the given limit solution as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

## 8. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The main result of this paper concerns the limit behaviour of solutions of nearly singular optimal control problems (1.1) with a nontrivial controllability subspace contained in the kernel of o. For this class of problems the corresponding simgular optimal control problems, that is (1.1) with $\varepsilon=0$, has a family of solutions, each of them composed of an initial pulse and a singular arc. In section 4 we presented a method for selecting the correct limit solution. Since this procedure is far from straightforward, a rigourous proof of the correctness of the result is in its place. It is remarked that this analysis based on a theorem by HAUTUS [5] also applies to singular perturbation solutions of problems, for which the singular optimal control problem has a unique solution, see [8] and [9]. Then it suffices to compute the first order asymptotic approximation of the positive definite solution of the Riccati equation.

The present study was motivated by Wonham's geometric approach of multivariate systems. Analyzing cheap control problems in this way we arrived at the problem formulated in [4]. It is along these lines that we expect that the concept of almost invariant subspaces, introduced by WILLEMS [10], may reveal new geometrical aspects of cheap control, which in turn can be of great help if one tries to solve other problems in this field. As open problems under investigation we mention the class (1.1) with condition (3.1) replaced by

$$
x=V_{K}^{*}+B+A B+\ldots+A^{k} B
$$

or by

$$
X \supset K+B
$$

In the last case the optimal solution is not necessarily almost cost free.
The class of control systems we analyzed has various applications in technology. As an example we mention the use in solar energy, see [1]. Actually in a study of OBERLE [7, p.302], a model of optimal heating and cooling to solar energy is proposed, which belongs to the class of singular optimal controls with a nonunique singular arc. This fact may for a great
deal explain the observed sensitivity of the singular arc on the physical parameters.
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