

Ex. 2:

(i)  $P = \int_0^{\infty} e^{At} R R^T e^{A^T t} dt$ ,  $Q = \int_0^{\infty} e^{A^T t} C^T C e^{At} dt$

$(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D}) = (T^{-1} A T, T^{-1} B, C T, D)$

recall  $e^{\tilde{A}t} = e^{T^{-1} A T t} = T^{-1} e^{At} T$

$\Rightarrow \tilde{P} = \int_0^{\infty} T^{-1} e^{At} \cancel{T^{-1} B R^T T^{-1} T} \cancel{T} e^{A^T t} T^{-T} dt = T^{-1} P T^{-T}$

analogously  $\tilde{Q} = T^T Q T$

$\Rightarrow \tilde{P} \tilde{Q} = T^{-1} P T^{-T} T^T Q T = T^{-1} P Q T$

diag  $(\delta_{11}, \dots, \delta_{nn})$

(ii) •  $P > 0 \Rightarrow \exists$  Orthogonal,  $\delta_{11}, \dots, \delta_{nn} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ :  $P = V \Delta V^T$

no set  $R = V \Delta^{1/2} \Rightarrow R^T = \Delta^{1/2} V^T \Rightarrow P = R R^T$

("numerical" proof no Cholesky decomposition)

note  $R$  obviously nonsingular

• set  $S = R^T Q R \Rightarrow (Q > 0) S > 0$

$\Rightarrow \text{Spec}(S) \subset \mathbb{R}_+$

claim:  $\text{Spec}(PQ) = \text{Spec}(S)$

proof:

- aside:  $X, Y$  nonsingular real matrices  $\Rightarrow \text{Spec}(XY) = \text{Spec}(YX)$

proof:  $\lambda \in \text{Spec}(XY) \Rightarrow \exists v \neq 0: XYv = \lambda v$

$\Rightarrow (YX)(Yv) = \lambda Yv$  with  $Yv \neq 0 \Rightarrow \lambda \in \text{Spec}(YX)$

converse analogously

-  $\text{Spec}(PQ) = \text{Spec}(R R^T Q) = \text{Spec}(R^T Q R) = \text{Spec}(S)$  •  
(aside)

(iii) •  $S > 0 \Rightarrow \exists U$  orthogonal,  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$  :  $S = U^T \Delta U = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$

note  $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\} = \text{Spec}(PQ)$

no  $T = R U \Delta^{-1/4}$  non-singular

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P} &= T^{-1} P T^{-T} (\Delta^{1/4} U^T R^{-1}) R R^T (R^{-T} U \Delta^{1/4}) = \Delta^{1/2} \\ \tilde{Q} &= T^T Q T = (\Delta^{-1/4} U^T R^T) (R^{-T} S R^{-1}) (R U \Delta^{-1/4}) = \Delta^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

$(U^T S U = \Delta)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \tilde{P} &= \tilde{Q} = \Delta^{1/2} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\lambda_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\lambda_n}) \\ &= \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \end{aligned}$$

• in the new representation

$$\tilde{e}_i^T \tilde{P}^{-1} \tilde{e}_i = \frac{1}{\sigma_i}, \quad \tilde{e}_i^T \tilde{Q} \tilde{e}_i = \sigma_i$$

$\Rightarrow$  the "larger"  $\sigma_i$ , the "better"  $\tilde{e}_i$  for both controllability and observability

note: by previous exercise  $\tilde{x}_0^T Q x_0 = \|L \tilde{x}_0\|_Y^2 = \|\tilde{y}(\cdot)\|_Y^2$   
thus it makes sense to consider this as output energy