

# Induced Norm Analysis of Linear Systems for Nonnegative Input Signals <sup>★</sup>

Yoshio Ebihara <sup>a</sup> Noboru Sebe <sup>b</sup> Hayato Waki <sup>c</sup> Dimitri Peaucelle <sup>d</sup>  
Sophie Tarbouriech <sup>d</sup> Victor Magron <sup>d</sup> Tomomichi Hagiwara <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Faculty of Information Science and Electrical Engineering, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan.  
(e-mail: ebihara@ees.kyushu-u.ac.jp).*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Intelligent and Control Systems, Kyushu Institute of Technology, Fukuoka 820-8502, Japan.*

<sup>c</sup>*Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan.*

<sup>d</sup>*LAAS-CNRS, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, F-31400, Toulouse, France.*

<sup>e</sup>*Department of Electrical Engineering, Kyoto University, Kyoto 615-8510, Japan.*

---

## Abstract

This paper is concerned with the analysis of the  $L_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) induced norms of continuous-time linear systems where input signals are restricted to be nonnegative. This norm is referred to as the  $L_{p+}$  induced norm in this paper. It has been shown recently that the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm is effective for the stability analysis of nonlinear feedback systems where the nonlinearity returns only nonnegative signals. However, the exact computation of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm is essentially difficult. To get around this difficulty, in the first part of this paper, we provide a copositive-programming-based method for the upper bound computation by capturing the nonnegativity of the input signals by copositive multipliers. In the second part, we consider how far the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm can be smaller than the standard  $L_2$  induced norm, and derive the uniform infimum on the ratio of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm to the  $L_2$  induced norm over all linear systems including infinite-dimensional ones. Then, for each linear system, we finally derive a computation method of the lower bounds of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm that are larger than (or equal to) the value determined by the uniform infimum. The effectiveness of the upper/lower bound computation methods is illustrated by numerical examples.

*Key words:* nonnegative signals;  $L_{p+}$  induced norms; upper bounds; lower bounds; copositive programming

---

## 1 Introduction

The  $L_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) induced norm plays an important role in dynamical system analysis [5,20]. The induced norm is the core in assessing the input-output

stability ( $L_p$  stability) of dynamical systems, and also serves as a reasonable measure for disturbance attenuation. The induced norm is also particularly useful in investigating the stability of interconnected systems via the small-gain theorem [20]. In this study, we introduce the  $L_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) induced norms for continuous-time linear systems where input signals are restricted to be nonnegative. This norm is referred to as the  $L_{p+}$  induced norm in this paper.

Recently, there has been a growing attention on control theoretic approaches for the analysis and synthesis of optimization algorithms [21], static feedforward neural networks (NNs) [26,25,15,14,4,12], dynamical NNs such as recurrent NNs (RNNs) [31,32], and dynamical systems driven by NN controllers [37]. By capturing the input-output behavior of nonlinearities in the algorithms

---

<sup>★</sup> A preliminary version of this paper was presented at ECC 2022 and IFAC WC 2023. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP21H01354 and Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST) as part of Adopting Sustainable Partnerships for Innovative Research Ecosystem (ASPIRE), Grant Number JPMJAP2402. This work was also supported by the AI Interdisciplinary Institute ANITI funding, through the French "Investing for the Future PIA3" program under the Grant agreement n° ANR-19-PI3A-0004 as well as by the National Research Foundation, Prime Minister's Office, Singapore under its Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise (CREATE) programme.

or NNs via quadratic constraints, we can cast the analysis and synthesis problems into numerically tractable semidefinite programming problems (SDPs). Along this stream, in [10,11,24], we dealt with the stability analysis of RNNs with activation functions being rectified linear units (ReLU). In particular, by focusing on the fact that the ReLUs return only nonnegative signals, we derived an  $L_{2+}$ -induced-norm-based small-gain theorem [11,24]. Still, exact (or smaller upper bound) computation of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm of linear systems remained to be an outstanding issue.

This study is also motivated by recent advancement on the study of positive systems ([1,3,35,2,27–29,8,19]). A positive system is a system whose state variables and/or output variables are nonnegative. This property arises naturally in biology, network communications, economics, and probabilistic systems, and representative linear time-invariant (LTI) positive systems include compartmental systems. Moreover, simple LTI systems such as integrators and first-order lags and their series/parallel connections are all positive, and these are often employed as typical models of moving objects. Even though their dynamics are very simple, the behavior of large-scale multi-agent systems constructed from them is complicated and deserves investigation. Still, the system positivity allows us to employ Lyapunov functions that are linear or quadratic and diagonal with respect to the state, and this enables us to derive analysis and synthesis conditions that scale linearly to the system size [3,35,27,28,8]. On the other hand, in [19], we recognized the usefulness of the copositive multipliers and the copositive programming problems (COPs) [6] in capturing the signal nonnegativity in standard quadratic fashion. We thus had a prospect that the COPs can be used even for nonpositive (general) linear system analysis in handling nonnegative signals.

On the basis of the preceding studies, in this paper, we investigate the  $L_{p+}$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) induced norms of continuous-time linear systems from a broad perspective. Since the upper bound of  $L_{2+}$  induced norm is especially important in performance guarantees of dynamical systems, we first consider its upper bound computation problem (Problem 1). By introducing positive filters of increased degree and employing copositive multipliers of increased size (freedom), we derive a sequence of COPs that generates a monotonically non-increasing sequence of upper bounds. Furthermore, by applying an inner approximation to the copositive cone, we derive a numerically tractable sequence of SDPs. Then, we second tackle the analysis of the uniform infimum on the ratio of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm to the  $L_2$  induced norm over all linear systems including infinite-dimensional ones (Problem 2). By definition,  $L_{p+}$  induced norm is smaller than (or equal to) the standard  $L_p$  induced norm, and Problem 2 is motivated to clarify how far the  $L_{p+}$  induced norm can be smaller than the  $L_p$  induced norm. Here we deal with  $L_{p+}$  induced norms for  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $p = \infty$

in a unified fashion, since the underlying methodology is independent of  $p$ . The result of Problem 2 is applicable to any LTI systems to obtain their lower bounds of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm. However, for each linear system, it is expected that we can obtain better (larger) lower bounds than the value determined by the uniform infimum. Such a lower bound for the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm is desirable to evaluate the accuracy of the upper bounds obtained for Problem 1. We therefore finally deal with the lower bound analysis problem of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm for a given linear system (Problem 3). By reducing the lower bound analysis problem into a semi-infinite programming problem [33], we derive a computation method that enables us to obtain lower bounds that are larger than (or equal to) the value determined by the uniform infimum.

A preliminary version of this paper is published in [7,9], where the above three problems have been investigated. The novel aspects of the present paper over [7,9] are thoroughly summarized in Subsection 2.5, after more accurate problem statements in Subsection 2.4.

## 2 Preliminaries, Motivations, and Problem Settings

### 2.1 Notation

We use the following notation in this paper. The set of natural numbers is denoted by  $\mathbb{N}$ . The set of  $n$ -dimensional real vectors (with nonnegative entries) is denoted by  $\mathbb{R}^n$  ( $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ ), and the set of  $n \times m$  real matrices (with nonnegative entries) is denoted by  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  ( $\mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}$ ). For  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , we also write  $M \geq 0$  to denote  $M \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}$ . The set of  $n \times n$  real symmetric (positive definite) matrices is denoted by  $\mathbb{S}^n$  ( $\mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ ). The set of  $n \times n$  Hurwitz and Metzler matrices are denoted by  $\mathbb{H}^n$  and  $\mathbb{M}^n$ , respectively, where a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is said to be Metzler if  $M_{ij} \geq 0$  ( $i \neq j$ ). For  $S \in \mathbb{S}^n$ , we write  $S \succeq 0$  ( $S \preceq 0$ ) to denote that  $S$  is positive (negative) semidefinite. For  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we define  $w_{\max} = \max(w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  by  $w_{\max,i} = \max(w_{1,i}, w_{2,i})$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ).

### 2.2 Preliminaries on Signals, Norms, and Cones

For a vector  $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n_v}$ , we define its  $l_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) norm by

$$|v|_p := \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_v} |v_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \quad (p \in [1, \infty)), \quad |v|_\infty := \max_{i=1, \dots, n_v} |v_i|.$$

For a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ , we define its  $l_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) induced norm by

$$\|M\|_p = \max_{v \in \mathbb{C}^m, |v|_p=1} |Mv|_p \quad (p \in [1, \infty), \quad p = \infty).$$

For a continuous-time signal  $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ , we define its  $L_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) norm by

$$\|w\|_p := \left( \int_0^\infty |w(t)|_p^p dt \right)^{1/p} \quad (p \in [1, \infty)),$$

$$\|w\|_\infty := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{0 \leq t < \infty} |w(t)|_\infty.$$

For  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $p = \infty$ , we also define the (standard)  $L_p$  space and the set of the nonnegative  $L_p$  signals by

$$\begin{aligned} L_p &:= \{w : \|w\|_p < \infty\}, \\ L_{p+} &:= \{w : w \in L_p, w(t) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } t \in [0, \infty)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also define their extended versions

$$\begin{aligned} L_{p,e} &:= \{w : w_\tau \in L_p \forall \tau \in [0, \infty)\}, \\ L_{p,e+} &:= \{w : w \in L_{p,e}, w(t) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } t \in [0, \infty)\}. \end{aligned}$$

where  $w_\tau$  is a truncation of  $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$  defined by

$$w_\tau(t) = \begin{cases} w(t) & 0 \leq t \leq \tau, \\ 0 & \tau < t. \end{cases}$$

For a linear operator

$$G : L_p \ni w \mapsto z \in L_p \quad (p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty), \quad (1)$$

we define its (standard)  $L_p$  induced norm by

$$\|G\|_p := \sup_{w \in L_p, \|w\|_p=1} \|z\|_p.$$

On the other hand, we newly introduce

$$\|G\|_{p+} := \sup_{w \in L_{p+}, \|w\|_p=1} \|z\|_p. \quad (2)$$

This obviously satisfies the axioms of a norm and is referred to as the  $L_{p+}$  induced norm in this paper. Due to the restriction to nonnegative input signals, we can readily see that the very basic property  $\|G\|_{p+} \leq \|G\|_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) holds.

We define the positive semidefinite cone  $\mathcal{PSD}^n \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ , the copositive cone  $\mathcal{COP}^n \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ , and the nonnegative cone  $\mathcal{NN}^n \subset \mathbb{S}^n$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{PSD}^n &:= \{P \in \mathbb{S}^n : x^T P x \geq 0 \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}, \\ \mathcal{COP}^n &:= \{P \in \mathbb{S}^n : x^T P x \geq 0 \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n\}, \\ \mathcal{NN}^n &:= \{P \in \mathbb{S}^n : P \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The semidefinite programming problem (SDP) and the copositive programming problem (COP) are convex optimization problems in which we minimize a linear objective function over the linear matrix inequality (LMI) constraints on  $\mathcal{PSD}$  and  $\mathcal{COP}$ , respectively. As mentioned in [6], the COP is a co-NP complete problem

and hence numerically intractable in general. However, the convex optimization problems on  $\mathcal{PSD} + \mathcal{NN}$  with “+” being the Minkowski sum is essentially an SDP and hence numerically tractable. Since  $\mathcal{PSD} \subset \mathcal{PSD} + \mathcal{NN} \subset \mathcal{COP}$  obviously holds, we can therefore apply an inner approximation to  $\mathcal{COP}$  with  $\mathcal{PSD} + \mathcal{NN}$  and solve a COP in a sufficient fashion. In particular, since  $\mathcal{PSD}^n + \mathcal{NN}^n = \mathcal{COP}^n$  ( $n \leq 4$ ) holds [6], we can solve a COP exactly if  $n \leq 4$ .

### 2.3 Motivations: Relevance of $L_{p+}$ Induced Norm to Dynamical System Analysis and Synthesis

This subsection provides two typical examples that motivate us to focus on  $L_{p+}$  induced norms of dynamical systems.

#### 2.3.1 Evaluation of Difference of Positive Systems

We first recall the definition of positive systems and related results.

**Definition 1 ([13,18])** *Let us consider the continuous-time finite-dimensional LTI system  $G$  given by*

$$G : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bw(t), \\ z(t) = Cx(t) + Dw(t) \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_w}$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n}$ , and  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_w}$ . Then, the system  $G$  given by (3) is said to be externally positive if its output is nonnegative for any nonnegative input under zero initial state. In addition, it is said to be internally positive if its state and output are nonnegative for any nonnegative input and nonnegative initial state.

**Proposition 1 ([13,18])** *The system  $G$  given by (3) is externally positive if and only if its impulse response is nonnegative. In addition, it is internally positive if and only if  $A \in \mathbb{M}^n$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n_w}$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_z \times n}$ , and  $D \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_z \times n_w}$ .*

By definition, it is true that if  $G$  is internally positive then it is externally positive. It is also well known that if  $G$  is externally positive then  $\|G\|_2 = \|G\|_{2+}$  holds [35,28]. This result can readily be generalized in the following way.

**Proposition 2** *Suppose  $G$  is externally positive. Then we have  $\|G\|_p = \|G\|_{p+}$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ).*

The proof of this proposition is given in Appendix A to make the paper self-contained.

On the basis of the above preliminaries, let us now consider two externally positive systems  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  of the same input-output size. Here we want to evaluate the




Fig. 1. Dynamical Systems Driven by NN Controllers (left) and Nonlinear Feedback System Representation (right).

“difference” (or say, error) between them. This issue typically arises in positivity-preserving model reduction for positive systems [30,22,34]. A common and easy-to-compute measure is the  $L_2$  induced norm ( $H_\infty$  norm) of the error system, i.e.,  $\|G_1 - G_2\|_2$ . However, since the input of positive systems are often naturally nonnegative, it is more suitable to evaluate the difference under nonnegative inputs. This leads to the requirement to evaluate  $\|G_1 - G_2\|_{2+}$  (or  $\|G_1 - G_2\|_{p+}$  for broader treatments). It should be noted that the error system  $G_1 - G_2$  is no longer externally positive in general even if  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are. Therefore the computation of  $\|G_1 - G_2\|_{2+}$  is not trivial and becomes a challenging issue.

### 2.3.2 Stability Analysis of Dynamical Systems Driven by Neural Network Controllers

Recently, control theoretic approaches have attracted great attention for the analysis of static feedforward neural networks (NNs) [26,25,15,14,4,12], dynamical NNs such as recurrent NNs [32,31,10,11,24], and dynamical systems driven by NN controllers [37] as shown in Fig. 1 (left). Suppose there are no external signals (such as bias signals) to the nonlinear activation functions in the NNs. Then, the dynamical NNs and linear dynamical systems driven by NNs can be modeled as a nonlinear feedback system shown in Fig. 1 (right), where  $G$  is typically a stable LTI system and  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a static nonlinear operator representing nonlinear activation functions in the NNs. Such modeling is useful if we are interested in the global asymptotic stability of the origin (GAS) of the original systems. In particular, in the case where all the activation functions employed are rectified linear units (ReLUs), we see that  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  satisfies  $\|\Phi\|_2 = 1$  and  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$ , i.e.,  $\Phi$  returns only nonnegative signals. In such a typical case, the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm becomes quite relevant for the stability analysis of the nonlinear feedback system as briefly explicated below.

From the standard  $L_2$ -induced-norm-based small-gain theorem [20], we see that the feedback system shown in Fig. 1 is (well-posed and) GAS if  $\|G\|_2 < 1$ . On the other hand, by actively using the nonnegativity nature of  $\Phi$ , it has been shown recently in [24] that the feedback system is (well-posed and) GAS if  $\|G\|_{2+} < 1$ . As illustrated by this concrete example, the  $L_{2+}$ -induced-norm-based small-gain theorem has potential abilities for the stabil-

ity analysis of feedback systems with nonnegative nonlinearities. However, exact computation of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm is inherently difficult and this strongly motivates the current study on its upper and lower bounds computation. The signal-nonnegativity-based analysis of NNs can also be found at [17].

### 2.4 Problem Settings

This subsection poses three problems to be investigated in this paper. Since the upper bound of  $L_{2+}$  induced norm is important in guaranteeing the system performance as illustrated in Subsection 2.3, we naturally consider the next problem.

#### Problem 1 ( $L_{2+}$ Upper Bound Analysis)

For a given stable LTI system  $G$  of the form (1), find an upper bound of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  that is as small as possible.

On the other hand,  $\|G\|_{p+} \leq \|G\|_p$  does hold for  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $p = \infty$ . On this relationship, we are interested in how far  $\|G\|_{p+}$  can be smaller than  $\|G\|_p$  partly from an applied mathematics point of view. To clarify this point, we investigate the next problem.

#### Problem 2 (Uniform Infimum of $\|G\|_{p+}/\|G\|_p$ )

For each  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $p = \infty$ , find the uniform infimum on the ratio of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm to the  $L_2$  induced norm defined by  $\nu_p^* := \inf_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}} \|G\|_{p+}/\|G\|_p$ , which is alternatively characterized as

$$\nu_p^* = \sup \{ \nu_p \in \mathbb{R} : \|G\|_{p+} \geq \nu_p \|G\|_p \ \forall G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}} \}. \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$  stands for the set of stable and causal LTI systems including infinite dimensional ones.

**Remark 1** We use the terminology “uniform” since  $\nu_p^*$  is valid for any  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$ . From (4), it is clear that  $\nu_p \|G\|_p$  is a lower bound of  $\|G\|_{p+}$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) for any  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$ .

The result of Problem 2 is applicable to any  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$  to obtain a lower bound of  $\|G\|_{2+}$ . However, for each  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$ , it is expected that we can obtain better (larger) lower bounds than the value determined by the uniform infimum. Such a lower bound for the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm is desirable to evaluate the accuracy of the upper bound obtained for Problem 1. Therefore we consider the next problem.

#### Problem 3 ( $L_{2+}$ Lower Bound Analysis)

For a given stable LTI system  $G$  of the form (1), find a lower bound of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  that is as large as possible.

### 2.5 Novel Aspects Over [7,9]

The novel aspects of the present paper over our preceding studies in [7,9] are summarized as follows:

- (i) Problem 1 is dealt with in [7]. However, one of the key results in [7], i.e., the construction of the monotonically non-increasing sequence of the upper bounds (Theorem 2 in this paper), is given without any proof. The explicit proof is now given in Section 3, thereby the proposed upper bound computation method is completed for the first time in this paper.
- (ii) Problem 3 is investigated in [9]. It is nonetheless true that the results there are restricted to be single-input systems due to technical difficulties. In the present paper we succeed in extending the results to multi-input systems (Theorem 6).
- (iii) The effectiveness of the upper bound computation method for Problem 1 and the lower bound computation method for Problem 3 is illustrated for multi-input systems in Subsection 6.5. In particular, we provide an interesting numerical example on the evaluation of the difference of positive systems.

### 3 Main Results for $L_{2+}$ Upper Bound Analysis Problem

#### 3.1 Upper Bound Computation of $L_{2+}$ Induced Norm by Positive Filters

Let us focus on the case where  $G$  in (1) is a finite-dimensional LTI system given by (3) where  $x(0) = 0$ . We assume that the system  $G$  is stable, i.e.,  $A \in \mathbb{H}^n$ . As noted previously, it is very clear that  $\|G\|_{2+} \leq \|G\|_2$ , i.e.,  $\|G\|_2$  is a trivial upper bound of  $\|G\|_{2+}$ .

For better upper bound computation of  $\|G\|_{2+}$ , it is promising to actively use the fact that the input signal  $w$  is restricted to be nonnegative. To this end, let us introduce the positive filter given by

$$G_p : \begin{cases} \dot{x}_p(t) = A_p x_p(t) + B_p w(t), & x_p(0) = 0, \\ z_p(t) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_p} \\ 0_{n_w, n_p} \end{bmatrix} x_p(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n_p, n_w} \\ I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} w(t) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where  $A_p \in \mathbb{H}^{n_p} \cap \mathbb{M}^{n_p}$ ,  $B_p \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_p \times n_w}$ . It is clear that the filter  $G_p$  is internally positive from Proposition 1.

We next consider the vertical stacking of  $G$  above  $G_p$  and construct the augmented system  $G_a$  given by

$$G_a : \begin{cases} \dot{x}_a(t) = A_a x_a(t) + B_a w(t), \\ z(t) = C_a x_a(t) + D_a w(t), \\ z_p(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n_p, n} & I_{n_p} \\ 0_{n_w, n} & 0_{n_w, n_p} \end{bmatrix} x_a(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n_p, n_w} \\ I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} w(t), \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

$$x_a := \begin{bmatrix} x \\ x_p \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_a := \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A_p \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_a := \begin{bmatrix} B \\ B_p \end{bmatrix},$$

$$C_a := \begin{bmatrix} C & 0_{n_z, n_p} \end{bmatrix}, \quad D_a := D.$$

In the above augmented system  $G_a$ , it is very important to note that the output  $z_p$  is nonnegative for any

nonnegative input  $w$ . By focusing on this nonnegativity property, the next result can be obtained. The proof of this theorem is given in Appendix B.

**Theorem 1** For the LTI system  $G$  given by (3) and a given  $\gamma > 0$ , we have  $\|G\|_{2+} \leq \gamma$  if there exist  $P_a \in \mathbb{S}^{n+n_p}$  and  $Q_a \in \mathcal{COP}^{n_p+n_w}$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_a A_a + A_a^T P_a + C_a^T C_a & P_a B_a + C_a^T D_a \\ B_a^T P_a + D_a^T C_a & D_a^T D_a - \gamma^2 I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n, n_p+n_w} \\ I_{n_p+n_w} \end{bmatrix} Q_a \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n, n_p+n_w} \\ I_{n_p+n_w} \end{bmatrix}^T \leq 0. \quad (7)$$

We note that if we do not employ (5) (i.e., if we consider the *filter-free* case), the condition (7) reduces to

$$\begin{bmatrix} PA + A^T P + C^T C & PB + C^T D \\ B^T P + D^T C & D^T D - \gamma^2 I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n, n_w} \\ I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} Q \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n, n_w} \\ I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix}^T \leq 0, \quad P \in \mathbb{S}^n, \quad Q \in \mathcal{COP}^{n_w}. \quad (8)$$

On the basis of Theorem 1, let us consider the following COP and SDP:

$$\bar{\gamma}_a := \inf_{\gamma, P_a, Q_a} \gamma \quad \text{subject to (7),} \quad (9)$$

$$P_a \in \mathbb{S}^{n+n_p}, \quad Q_a \in \mathcal{COP}^{n_p+n_w},$$

$$\bar{\bar{\gamma}}_a := \inf_{\gamma, P_a, Q_a} \gamma \quad \text{subject to (7),} \quad (10)$$

$$P_a \in \mathbb{S}^{n+n_p}, \quad Q_a \in \mathcal{PSD}^{n_p+n_w} + \mathcal{NN}^{n_p+n_w}.$$

Then, we readily obtain  $\|G\|_{2+} \leq \bar{\gamma}_a \leq \bar{\bar{\gamma}}_a$ . Moreover, it is shown in [7] that, for any positive filter  $G_p$ , the corresponding upper bound  $\bar{\gamma}_a$  satisfies  $\bar{\gamma}_a \leq \bar{\gamma} \leq \|G\|_2$ , where  $\bar{\gamma}$  is the COP-based *filter-free* upper bound obtained by replacing (7) in (9) with (8). Similarly, for the SDP-based *filter-free* upper bound  $\bar{\bar{\gamma}}$ , we have  $\bar{\bar{\gamma}}_a \leq \bar{\bar{\gamma}} \leq \|G\|_2$ . Namely, by introducing any positive filter, we can obtain no more conservative upper bounds than the filter-free ones. The matrix  $Q_a$  captures the nonnegativity of the input and filtered signals and is referred to as the copositive multiplier.

#### 3.2 Application to GAS Analysis of ReLU-Feedback Systems and Relationship with IQC Conditions

Let us revisit the GAS analysis of the nonlinear feedback system shown in Fig. 1 (right) where  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{n_w} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$  is the (repeated) ReLU. Then, from the discussion in Subsections 3.1 and 2.3.2, we can conclude that the ReLU-feedback system is GAS if  $\bar{\gamma}_a < 1$  holds for some positive filter. In this way, we can use our results for the GAS analysis of ReLU-feedback systems. A concise illustrative numerical example is included in 6.5.1.

To see the relationship between our results in 3.1 and IQC-based stability conditions [23,36,32] in a concise

fashion, let us consider the strict inequality version of (8) with  $\gamma = 1$  that is rearranged as

$$\begin{bmatrix} PA + A^T P & PB \\ B^T P & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} C & D \\ 0 & I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix}^T \Pi \begin{bmatrix} C & D \\ 0 & I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} \prec 0, \quad (11)$$

$$\Pi = \Pi_{\text{COP}} := \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_w} & 0 \\ 0 & Q - I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix}.$$

On the other hand, the general IQC theory [23,36,32] guarantees the GAS of the ReLU-feedback system if there exist  $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$  and  $\Pi \in \mathbf{\Pi}$  such that (11) holds where  $\mathbf{\Pi} \subset \mathbb{S}^{2n_w}$  is the set of multipliers defined by

$$\mathbf{\Pi} := \left\{ \Pi \in \mathbb{S}^{2n_w} : \begin{bmatrix} \zeta \\ \Phi(\zeta) \end{bmatrix}^T \Pi \begin{bmatrix} \zeta \\ \Phi(\zeta) \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w} \right\}.$$

Here, it is obvious that  $\Pi_{\text{COP}} \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ . Namely, our results can be regarded as a special case of the IQC-based condition by employing  $\Pi_{\text{COP}} \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ . We can interpret that  $\Pi_{\text{COP}} \in \mathbf{\Pi}$  has been obtained by focusing on the  $L_2$ -induced norm property  $\|\Phi\| \leq 1$  and the nonnegativity property  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{n_w} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n_w}$  of the ReLU  $\Phi$ . Here, it is true that we can employ more sophisticated multipliers by closely working on the ReLU-properties, and the latest results on this issue can be found, e.g., in [12].

### 3.3 Concrete Construction of Positive Filters

As for the positive filter  $G_p$  given by (5), we propose to use the specific form given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_p &= A_{p,\alpha,N} := J_{\alpha,N} \otimes I_{n_w} \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn_w \times Nn_w}, \\ B_p &= B_{p,N} := E_N \otimes I_{n_w} \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn_w \times n_w}, \\ J_{\alpha,N} &:= \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & \alpha \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, \quad E_N := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^N \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $\alpha < 0$ . By increasing the degree  $N$  of the positive filter  $G_p$  given by (5) and (12), we can construct a sequence of COPs in the form of (9) and SDPs in the form of (10). In the following, we denote by  $\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N}$  and  $\bar{\bar{\gamma}}_{a,\alpha,N}$  the optimal values of these COPs and SDPs, respectively. In addition, we denote by  $A_{a,\alpha,N}$ ,  $B_{a,N}$ ,  $C_{a,N}$ , and  $D_{a,N}$  ( $= D$ ) the coefficient matrices of the augmented system  $G_a$  given by (6) corresponding to the filter of degree  $N$ . Then, regarding the effectiveness of employing higher-degree positive filters in improving upper bounds, we can obtain the next result.

**Theorem 2** *Let us consider the upper bounds of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  given by  $\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N}$  and  $\bar{\bar{\gamma}}_{a,\alpha,N}$  that are characterized respectively by (9) and (10) with the positive filter  $G_p$  of the form (5) and (12) of degree  $N$ . Then, for  $N_1 \leq N_2$ , we have  $\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N_2} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N_1}$  and  $\bar{\bar{\gamma}}_{a,\alpha,N_2} \leq \bar{\bar{\gamma}}_{a,\alpha,N_1}$ .*

**Proof of Theorem 2:** In the following, we prove  $\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N_2} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N_1}$ . The proof for  $\bar{\bar{\gamma}}_{a,\alpha,N_2} \leq \bar{\bar{\gamma}}_{a,\alpha,N_1}$  follows similarly. To prove  $\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N_2} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N_1}$ , it suffices to show that  $\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N+1} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N}$  holds for any  $N$ . Furthermore, this can be verified by proving that (7) corresponding to the filter of degree  $N+1$  holds with  $\gamma = \bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N} + \varepsilon$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

To this end, we first note from the definition of  $\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N}$  that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist  $P_a = P_{a,\alpha,N} \in \mathbb{S}^{n+(N+1)n_w}$  and  $Q_a = Q_{a,\alpha,N} \in \mathcal{COP}^{(N+1)n_w}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} P_{a,\alpha,N} A_{a,\alpha,N} + A_{a,\alpha,N}^T P_{a,\alpha,N} & P_{a,\alpha,N} B_{a,N} \\ * & -(\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N}^2 + 2\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N}\varepsilon) I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} \\ & + \begin{bmatrix} C_{a,N}^T \\ D_{a,N}^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_{a,N}^T \\ D_{a,N}^T \end{bmatrix}^T + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,(N+1)n_w} \\ I_{(N+1)n_w} \end{bmatrix} Q_{a,\alpha,N} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,(N+1)n_w} \\ I_{(N+1)n_w} \end{bmatrix}^T \preceq 0. \end{aligned}$$

To proceed, define  $F_N := [I_{n_w} \ 0_{n_w,(N-1)n_w}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w \times Nn_w}$ . Then, there exist  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,n} & 0 & 0 \\ * & -\varepsilon_2 I_{Nn_w} - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2\alpha} F_N^T F_N & \varepsilon_2 P_p B_p \\ * & * & -\varepsilon^2 I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0$$

where  $P_p \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{n_p}$  is the unique solution of the Lyapunov equation  $P_p A_p + A_p^T P_p + I_{Nn_w} = 0$ . By summing up the above two inequalities and applying the Schur complement argument by focusing on the term  $-\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2\alpha} F_N^T F_N$ , we obtain (13) given at the top of the next page. For (13),

by multiplying  $\begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0_{n,Nn_w} & 0_{n,n_w} & 0_{n,n_w} \\ 0_{n_w,n} & 0_{n_w,Nn_w} & 0_{n_w,n_w} & I_{n_w} \\ 0_{Nn_w,n} & I_{Nn_w} & 0_{Nn_w,n_w} & 0_{Nn_w,n_w} \\ 0_{n_w,n} & 0_{n_w,Nn_w} & I_{n_w} & 0_{n_w,n_w} \end{bmatrix}$  from left and its transpose from right, we obtain (14) given at the top of the next page. Here,

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} P_{a,\alpha,N}^{11} & P_{a,\alpha,N}^{12} \\ P_{a,\alpha,N}^{12T} & P_{a,\alpha,N}^{22} \end{bmatrix} := P_{a,\alpha,N}, \quad P_{a,\alpha,N}^{11} \in \mathbb{S}^n, \quad P_{a,\alpha,N}^{22} \in \mathbb{S}^{Nn_w}, \\ & \hat{P}_{a,\alpha,N}^{22} := P_{a,\alpha,N}^{22} + \varepsilon_2 P_p. \end{aligned}$$

Then, (14) shows that (7) corresponding to the filter of degree  $N+1$  holds with  $\gamma = \bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N} + \varepsilon$  and

$$\begin{aligned} P_a &= P_{a,\alpha,N+1} = \begin{bmatrix} P_{a,\alpha,N}^{11} & 0 & P_{a,\alpha,N}^{12} \\ 0 & \varepsilon_1 I_{n_w} & 0 \\ P_{a,\alpha,N}^{12T} & 0 & \hat{P}_{a,\alpha,N}^{22} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}^{n+(N+1)n_w}, \\ Q_a &= Q_{a,\alpha,N+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n_w,n_w} & 0 \\ 0 & Q_{a,\alpha,N} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{COP}^{(N+2)n_w}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 2** *The introduction of dynamic positive filters in Subsections 3.1 and 3.3 is motivated by the IQC-based analysis using dynamic multipliers [23,36,32]. Similarly to the dynamic multipliers in the IQC framework, the*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{bmatrix} P_{a,\alpha,N}A_{a,\alpha,N} + A_{a,\alpha,N}^T P_{a,\alpha,N} + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,n} & 0 \\ 0 & -\varepsilon_2 I_{Nw} \end{bmatrix} & P_{a,\alpha,N}B_{a,\alpha,N} + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,n_w} \\ \varepsilon_2 P_p B_p \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,n_w} \\ \varepsilon_1 F_N^T \end{bmatrix} \\ * & -(\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N} + \varepsilon)^2 I_{n_w} & 0 \\ * & * & 2\varepsilon_1 \alpha I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} C_{a,N}^T \\ D_{a,N}^T \\ 0_{n_w,n_z} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_{a,N}^T \\ D_{a,N}^T \\ 0_{n_w,n_z} \end{bmatrix}^T \\
& + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,(N+1)n_w} \\ I_{(N+1)n_w} \\ 0_{n_w,(N+1)n_w} \end{bmatrix} Q_{a,\alpha,N} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,(N+1)n_w} \\ I_{(N+1)n_w} \\ 0_{n_w,(N+1)n_w} \end{bmatrix}^T \preceq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{bmatrix} P_{a,\alpha,N}^{11}A + A^T P_{a,\alpha,N}^{11} & 0 & P_{a,\alpha,N}^{12}A_{p,\alpha,N} + A^T P_{a,\alpha,N}^{12} & P_{a,\alpha,N}^{11}B + P_{a,\alpha,N}^{12}B_p \\ * & 2\varepsilon_1 \alpha I_{n_w} & \varepsilon_1 F_N & 0 \\ * & * & \hat{P}_{a,\alpha,N}^{22}A_{p,\alpha,N} + A_{p,\alpha,N}^T \hat{P}_{a,\alpha,N}^{22} & P_{a,\alpha,N}^{12T}B + \hat{P}_{a,\alpha,N}^{22}B_p \\ * & * & * & -(\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N} + \varepsilon)^2 I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} C_{a,N+1}^T \\ D_{a,N+1}^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_{a,N+1}^T \\ D_{a,N+1}^T \end{bmatrix}^T \\
& + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,(N+2)n_w} \\ I_{(N+2)n_w} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n_w,n_w} & 0 \\ 0 & Q_{a,\alpha,N} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,(N+2)n_w} \\ I_{(N+2)n_w} \end{bmatrix}^T \preceq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

positive filters allow us to increase the size (freedom) of the copositive multipliers as we can see by comparing (7) and (8). The effectiveness of employing positive filters is illustrated in 6.5.1 by numerical examples. It is also true that the pole  $\alpha < 0$  in the positive filter (12) corresponds to the pole of the basis functions of the dynamic multipliers which should be fixed in advance. Since no general recipe is available on its appropriate choice, we usually need to carry out a line search over  $\alpha < 0$ .

**Remark 3** From Theorem 2, we see that we can construct a monotonically non-increasing sequence of upper bounds  $\{\bar{\gamma}_{a,\alpha,N}\}$  of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  by increasing the degree  $N$  and solving the corresponding SDP (10). This is done at the expense of increased computational burden. Since we cannot theoretically prove the convergence of this sequence to the true value of  $\|G\|_{2+}$ , it is quite important to obtain sharp lower bounds of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  to ensure the accuracy of the computed upper bounds.

#### 4 Main Results for Uniform Infimum of $\|G\|_{p+}/\|G\|_p$

The next theorem provides our main results for Problem 2: analysis of the uniform infimum on the ratio of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm to the  $L_2$  induced norm.

**Theorem 3** For  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $p = \infty$ , the uniform infimum  $\nu_p^*$  characterized by (4) are given by

$$\nu_p^* = 2^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \quad (p \in [1, \infty)), \quad \nu_\infty^* = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{15}$$

Moreover, the stable LTI system  $G^*(s) = 1 - e^{-Ls}$  ( $L > 0$ ) attains

$$\|G^*\|_{p+} = \nu_p^* \|G^*\|_p \quad (p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty). \tag{16}$$

The proof of this theorem is given in Appendix C. We emphasize that, since we only rely on the linearity of the underlying systems and the properties of the  $L_p$  norms of signals in the proof, Theorem 3 is valid even if we extend the set  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$  in Problem 2 to the set of linear, stable, *time-varying*, and *noncausal* systems including infinite dimensional ones.

#### 5 Main Results for $L_{2+}$ Lower Bound Analysis Problem: Single-Input Case

From Theorem 3, we see that  $\|G\|_{2+} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2 \forall G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$ . However, for each system  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$ , it is expected that  $\|G\|_{2+}$  can be strictly larger than  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$ . In fact, the main contributions of this section are as follows:

- (i) For any nonzero stable finite-dimensional single-input LTI system  $G$ , we prove  $\|G\|_{2+} > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$ .
- (ii) For a given nonzero stable finite-dimensional single-input LTI system  $G$ , we provide a method to compute a lower bound that is strictly larger than  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$ .

We derive these results by using basics about frequency responses of LTI systems, and reducing the lower bound analysis problem into a semi-infinite programming problem [33]. The treatment of multi-input systems is deferred to the next section. In the following, we denote by  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI,SI}}$  the set of stable and single-input LTI systems including infinite dimensional ones.

##### 5.1 Reduction to Semi-Infinite Programming Problem

We first recall the next very basic result.

**Lemma 1 ([16])** For given  $a_m \in \mathbb{R}$  ( $m = 0, \dots, N$ ),  $\phi_m \in \mathbb{R}$  ( $m = 1, \dots, N$ ),  $\omega > 0$ ,  $T = 2\pi/\omega$ , and  $\mathcal{I} = [-T/2, T/2]$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_{\mathcal{I}} \left( a_0 + \sum_{m=1}^N a_m \cos(m\omega t + \phi_m) \right)^2 dt = a_0^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^N a_m^2.$$

For a given  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI,SI}}$ , let us inject the nonnegative input signal

$$w_{\omega}^{[N]}(t) := a_0 + \cos(\omega t) + \sum_{m=2}^N a_m \cos(m\omega t) \quad (t \geq 0) \quad (17)$$

where we assume that  $a_0, a_m$  ( $m = 2, \dots, N$ ) are chosen such that  $w_{\omega}^{[N]}(t) \geq 0$  ( $t \geq 0$ ). It should be noted that, even though  $w_{\omega}^{[N]}(t) \notin L_{2+}$  and  $w_{\omega}^{[N]}(t) \in L_{2e+}$ , the lower bound analysis in the following on the basis of  $w_{\omega}^{[N]}(t)$  is valid since  $\|G\|_{2+}$  is defined as the supremum over  $w \in L_{2+}$  in (2). If we denote by  $z_{\omega}^{[N]}$  the corresponding steady-state output, we see from the steady-state analysis of the frequency response and Lemma 1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|G\|_{2+} &\geq \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \int_{\mathcal{I}} z_{\omega}^{[N]}(t)^T z_{\omega}^{[N]}(t) dt}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \int_{\mathcal{I}} w_{\omega}^{[N]}(t)^2 dt}} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{a_0^2 |G(0)|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} |G(j\omega)|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=2}^N a_m^2 |G(jm\omega)|_2^2}}{\sqrt{a_0^2 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=2}^N a_m^2}} \quad (18) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2a_0^2 |G(0)|_2^2 + |G(j\omega)|_2^2 + \sum_{m=2}^N a_m^2 |G(jm\omega)|_2^2}}{\sqrt{2a_0^2 + 1 + \sum_{m=2}^N a_m^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By leaving  $|G(j\omega)|_2^2$  only in the numerator and taking the supremum over  $\omega \in [0, \infty)$ , we have

$$\|G\|_{2+} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2a_0^2 + 1 + \sum_{m=2}^N a_m^2}} \|G\|_2. \quad (19)$$

This result motivates us to consider the following semi-infinite programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_N^* &:= \inf_{a_0, a_2, \dots, a_N} 2a_0^2 + 1 + \sum_{m=2}^N a_m^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \\ w^{[N]}(t) &:= a_0 + \cos(t) + \sum_{m=2}^N a_m \cos(mt) \geq 0 \quad (\forall t \in \mathcal{I} := [-\pi, \pi]). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

For each  $\gamma_N^*$ , we see  $\|G\|_{2+} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma_N^*}} \|G\|_2$  ( $\forall G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI,SI}}$ ).

In addition, since  $\gamma_N^*$  is monotonically non-increasing with respect to  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , and since  $\gamma_N^* \geq 1$  ( $\forall N \in \mathbb{N}$ ) holds, the sequence  $\{\gamma_N^*\}$  converges. If we define  $\gamma^* := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_N^*$ , we readily obtain

$$\|G\|_{2+} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma^*}} \|G\|_2 \quad \forall G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI,SI}}. \quad (21)$$

## 5.2 Effective Lower Bound Computation Methods

From Theorem 3, we know that  $\|G^*\|_{2+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|G^*\|_2$  and hence  $\gamma^* \geq 2$  should hold in (21). Therefore, if we are able to construct  $w(t)$  such that

$$w(t) = a_0 + \cos(t) + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m \cos(mt) \geq 0 \quad (\forall t \in \mathcal{I}), \quad (22)$$

$$2a_0^2 + 1 + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m^2 = 2,$$

then this is an optimal solution for the semi-infinite programming problem (20) in the limit case  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . With this fact in mind, let us consider the nonnegative signal

$$w^*(t) := \max(2 \cos(t), 0) \quad (t \geq 0) \quad (23)$$

whose Fourier series expansion is given by

$$w^*(t) = \frac{2}{\pi} + \cos(t) + \frac{4}{\pi} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{p+1}}{(2p+1)(2p-1)} \cos(2pt), \quad (24)$$

see, e.g., [16]. In (20), this corresponds to the case where

$$a_0^* = \frac{2}{\pi}, \quad a_{2p}^* = \frac{4}{\pi} \frac{(-1)^{p+1}}{(2p+1)(2p-1)}, \quad a_{2p+1}^* = 0 \quad (p \in \mathbb{N}). \quad (25)$$

From Parseval's identity, we readily see that

$$2a_0^{*2} + 1 + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m^{*2} = 2 \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathcal{I}} w^*(t)^2 dt = 2. \quad (26)$$

It follows that the signal  $w^*$  given by (23) satisfies the optimality condition (22) and hence is an optimal solution for the semi-infinite programming problem (20) in the limit case  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . From these results, we see that the next result holds for any  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI,SI}}$ :

$$\|G\|_{2+} \geq \sup_{\omega > 0} \frac{\sqrt{2a_0^{*2} |G(0)|_2^2 + |G(j\omega)|_2^2 + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m^{*2} |G(jm\omega)|_2^2}}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (27)$$

This expression leads us to the next results.

**Theorem 4** Suppose  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI,SI}} \setminus \{0\}$  is finite-dimensional where “0” stands for the zero operator. Then, we have  $\|G\|_{2+} > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$ . In particular, if  $\|G\|_2 = |G(0)|_2$  holds, then  $\|G\|_{2+} = \|G\|_2$  holds.

**Proof of Theorem 4:** We consider the following three cases: (i)  $\|G\|_2$  is attained at the angular frequency  $\omega = 0$ , i.e.,  $\|G\|_2 = |G(0)|_2$ ; (ii)  $\|G\|_2$  is given as  $\|G\|_2 = |G(j\infty)|_2$  where  $G(j\infty) := \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} G(j\omega)$ ; (iii)  $\|G\|_2$  is attained at  $\omega = \omega^* \in (0, \infty)$ , i.e.,  $\|G\|_2 = |G(j\omega^*)|_2$ .

(i) Suppose  $\|G\|_2 = |G(0)|_2$ . Then, by letting  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  in (27), we see from (26) that  $\|G\|_{2+} \geq |G(0)|_2 = \|G\|_2$ . Namely,  $\|G\|_{2+} = \|G\|_2$  holds.

(ii) Suppose  $\|G\|_2 = |G(j\infty)|_2$ . Then, we see from (27) and (26) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|G\|_{2+} &\geq \frac{\sqrt{2a_0^{*2}|G(0)|_2^2 + (2-2a_0^{*2})|G(j\infty)|_2^2}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ &\geq \frac{\sqrt{(2-2a_0^{*2})}}{\sqrt{2}}|G(j\infty)|_2 \approx \frac{1.0906}{\sqrt{2}}|G(j\infty)|_2 > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

(iii) Suppose  $\|G\|_2 = |G(j\omega^*)|_2$  ( $\omega^* \in (0, \infty)$ ). Then, for  $\|G\|_{2+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$  to hold, we see from (25) and (27) that the system  $G$  should satisfy the infinitely many interpolation constraints:

$$G(0) = 0, \quad G(j2p\omega^*) = 0 \quad (p \in \mathbb{N}). \quad (29)$$

This is impossible for the finite-dimensional system  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI,SI}} \setminus \{0\}$  and hence  $\|G\|_{2+} > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$ . ■

**Remark 4** In Theorem 3, we have shown that the infinite-dimensional system  $G^*(s) = 1 - e^{-Ls}$  ( $L > 0$ ) satisfies  $\|G^*\|_{2+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G^*\|_2$ . Therefore, from the proof of Theorem 4, the system  $G^*$  should satisfy the infinitely many interpolation constraints (29). Indeed, we see that  $\omega^* = \frac{1}{L}\pi$  for  $G^*$ , and  $G^*$  does satisfy the interpolation constraints (29) since  $G^*(0) = 0$ , and  $G^*(j2p\omega^*) = 0$  ( $p \in \mathbb{N}$ ).

For a given system  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI,SI}}$ , we finally make active use of (27) for the lower bound computation of  $\|G\|_{2+}$ . By truncation of the infinite series, let us define

$$v_N(G) := \sup_{\omega > 0} \frac{\sqrt{2a_0^{*2}|G(0)|_2^2 + |G(j\omega)|_2^2 + \sum_{m=2}^N a_m^{*2}|G(jm\omega)|_2^2}}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (30)$$

Then, it is straightforward from Theorem 4 that the next results hold.

**Theorem 5** Suppose  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI,SI}} \setminus \{0\}$  is finite-dimensional and define  $v_N(G)$  ( $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ) by (30). Then, we have

$$\|G\|_{2+} \geq v_N(G) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2 \quad (\forall N \in \mathbb{N}).$$

In particular,  $v_N(G)$  is monotonically non-decreasing with respect to  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , and for sufficiently large  $N$  we have  $v_N(G) > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$ .

We finally note that  $v_N(G)$  can readily be computed by using (25) in the way that

$$v_N(G) = \|\hat{G}_N\|_2, \quad \hat{G}_N(s) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{2}a_0^*G(0) \\ G(s) \\ a_2^*G(2s) \\ \vdots \\ a_N^*G(Ns) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

## 6 Main Results for $L_{2+}$ Lower Bound Analysis Problem: Multi-Input Case

To see the difference between single-input and multi-input cases, let us consider the “static” multi-input system  $G := [1 \ -1]$ . Then, we can readily see that  $\|G\|_2 = \sqrt{2}$  and  $\|G\|_{2+} = 1$ . Namely,  $\|G\|_{2+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$  holds. This example clearly shows that whole assertions in Theorems 4 and 5 do not hold for multi-input systems in general. With this fact in mind, the goal of this section is as follows:

- (i) For any  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$ , we provide a method to compute a lower bound that is *larger than or equal to*  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$ .
- (ii) By numerical examples on a multi-input system  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$ , we show that the method can yield lower bounds that are strictly larger than  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2$ .

On the size of the input and output signals in (1), we remind  $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$  and  $z(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$ .

### 6.1 The Case $\|G\|_2 = \|G(j\omega^*)\|_2$ ( $\omega^* \in (0, \infty)$ )

We first consider the case where  $\|G\|_2 = \|G(j\omega^*)\|_2$  ( $\omega^* \in (0, \infty)$ ) holds, i.e.,  $\|G\|_2$  is attained at the angular frequency  $\omega = \omega^*$  ( $\omega^* \in (0, \infty)$ ). Suppose  $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n_w}$  is the unit right singular vector corresponding to the maximum singular value of  $G(j\omega^*)$ . In the following, we represent the  $i$ -th element of  $v$  by  $v_i = |v_i|e^{j\theta_i}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n_w$ ).

Under these notations, let us consider the nonnegative input signal  $w^*(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$  defined by

$$w_i^*(t) := |v_i| \times \max(2 \cos(\omega^* t + \theta_i), 0) \quad (i = 1, \dots, n_w). \quad (32)$$

If we define  $v^{[m]} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_w}$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) by

$$v_i^{[m]} = |v_i| e^{jm\theta_i} \quad (i = 1, \dots, n_w), \quad (33)$$

we see from (23), (24), (25) that

$$\begin{aligned} w^*(t) &= \text{Re}(\widehat{w}^*(t)), \\ \widehat{w}^*(t) &= a_0^* v^{[0]} + v^{[1]} e^{j\omega^* t} + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m^* v^{[m]} e^{jm\omega^* t}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Then, if we define single-input transfer functions by

$$G^{[m]}(s) := G(s)v^{[m]} \quad (m = 0, 1, 2, \dots), \quad (35)$$

we see from the basic property of frequency response of LTI systems that the steady state output  $z^*(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$ , corresponding to the input  $w^*(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} z^*(t) &= \text{Re}(\widehat{z}^*(t)), \\ \widehat{z}^*(t) &= a_0^* G^{[0]}(0) + G^{[1]}(j\omega^*) e^{j\omega^* t} + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m^* G^{[m]}(jm\omega^*) e^{jm\omega^* t}. \end{aligned}$$

We also note that  $\|G\|_2 = \|G(j\omega^*)\|_2 = |G^{[1]}(j\omega^*)|_2$ . Then, for  $T = 2\pi/\omega^*$  and  $\mathcal{I} = [-T/2, T/2]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|G\|_{2+} &\geq \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \int_{\mathcal{I}} z^*(t)^T z^*(t) dt}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \int_{\mathcal{I}} w^*(t)^T w^*(t) dt}} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2a_0^{*2} |G^{[0]}(0)|_2^2 + |G^{[1]}(j\omega^*)|_2^2 + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m^{*2} |G^{[m]}(jm\omega^*)|_2^2}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |G^{[1]}(j\omega^*)|_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|G\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Motivated by this fact, let us define

$$v_N(G) := \sup_{\omega > 0} \frac{\sqrt{2a_0^{*2} |G^{[0]}(0)|_2^2 + |G^{[1]}(j\omega)|_2^2 + \sum_{m=2}^N a_m^{*2} |G^{[m]}(jm\omega)|_2^2}}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (37)$$

Then, it is straightforward from (36) that the next results hold.

**Theorem 6** *Suppose  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$  and define  $v_N(G)$  ( $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ) by (37). Then, we have*

$$\|G\|_{2+} \geq v_N(G) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|G\|_2 \quad (\forall N \in \mathbb{N}).$$

*In particular,  $v_N(G)$  is monotonically non-decreasing with respect to  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

**Remark 5** *In the single-input case (i.e., if  $n_w = 1$ ), it is clear that Theorem 6 reduces to Theorem 5. This is because if  $n_w = 1$  then we have  $v^{[m]} = 1$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) and hence  $G^{[m]}(s) = G(s)$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) hold in (35).*

## 6.2 The Case $\|G\|_2 = \|G(0)\|_2$

We next consider the case where  $\|G\|_2 = \|G(0)\|_2$  holds, i.e.,  $\|G\|_2$  is attained at the angular frequency  $\omega = 0$ . We cannot simply apply the method in the preceding subsection to  $\omega^* = 0$ , since our underlying result, Lemma 1, never holds for  $\omega = 0$ . Similarly to the single-input case, such a discussion to take the limit  $\omega^* \rightarrow 0$  might be plausible, but we encounter a difficulty since, as shown in (33), the method in the preceding subsection requires an explicit representation of the unit right singular vector corresponding to the maximum singular value of  $G(j\omega^*)$  (this is not the case for single-input case). On the basis of these observations, here we first blindly follow the discussion in the preceding subsection applied to  $\omega^* = 0$ , and validate the obtained results directly later on.

Suppose  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$  is the unit right singular vector corresponding to the maximum singular value of the matrix  $G(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_w}$ . We define  $v_+ = \max(v, 0)$  and  $v_- = -\max(-v, 0)$ . Then, we see that  $w^*$  defined by (32), corresponding to  $\omega^* = 0$ , becomes  $w^*(t) = 2v_+$  where  $\theta_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n_w$ ) in (32) are 0 or  $\pi$ . We also note that  $w^*$  given above can be rewritten as  $w^*(t) = v + v_{\text{abs}}$  where  $v_{\text{abs},i} = |v_i|$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n_w$ ). On the other hand, we see that  $v^{[m]}$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) defined by (33) become

$$v^{[m]} = \begin{cases} v & m \text{ is odd,} \\ v_{\text{abs}} & m \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

Then, the inequality (36) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \|G\|_{2+} &\geq \frac{\sqrt{2a_0^{*2} |G(0)v^{[0]}|_2^2 + |G(0)v^{[1]}|_2^2 + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_m^{*2} |G(0)v^{[m]}|_2^2}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\|G(0)\|_2^2 + |G(0)v_{\text{abs}}|_2^2} \end{aligned}$$

where we used (25), (26), and (38). Since  $\|G\|_{2+} \geq \|G(0)\|_{2+}$  obviously holds, it follows that if we are able to directly validate

$$\|G(0)\|_{2+} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\|G(0)\|_2^2 + |G(0)v_{\text{abs}}|_2^2}$$

for  $G(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_w}$ , then we arrive at the conclusion that all of the results in the preceding subsection are valid even for  $\omega^* = 0$ . This validation is indeed possible as we see in the next theorem.

**Theorem 7** For a given  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ , suppose  $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the unit right singular vector corresponding to the maximal singular value of  $M$ . Let us define  $v_{\text{abs}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  by  $v_{\text{abs},i} = |v_i|$  ( $i = 1, \dots, m$ ). Then, we have

$$\|M\|_{2+} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\|M\|_2^2 + |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2}. \quad (39)$$

**Proof of Theorem 7:** Without loss of generality, we choose (the sign of)  $v$  such that  $|v_+|_2 \geq |v_-|_2$  where  $v_+ = \max(v, 0)$  and  $v_- = -\max(-v, 0)$ . To prove (39), it suffices to show that

$$\frac{|Mv_+|_2}{|v_+|_2} = \frac{|M(v + v_{\text{abs}})|_2}{|v + v_{\text{abs}}|_2} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\|M\|_2^2 + |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2}$$

or equivalently,

$$|M(v + v_{\text{abs}})|_2 \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |v + v_{\text{abs}}|_2 \sqrt{\|M\|_2^2 + |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2}.$$

Since  $v^T v_{\text{abs}} = |v_+|_2^2 - |v_-|_2^2 (\geq 0)$  holds, we obtain

$$|M(v + v_{\text{abs}})|_2^2 = \|M\|_2^2 (1 + 2(|v_+|^2 - |v_-|^2)) + |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |v + v_{\text{abs}}|_2 \sqrt{\|M\|_2^2 + |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |v + v_{\text{abs}}|_2^2 (\|M\|_2^2 + |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2) \\ &= (1 + |v_+|^2 - |v_-|^2) (\|M\|_2^2 + |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |M(v + v_{\text{abs}})|_2^2 - \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |v + v_{\text{abs}}|_2 \sqrt{\|M\|_2^2 + |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2} \right)^2 \\ &= (|v_+|^2 - |v_-|^2) \|M\|_2^2 - (|v_+|^2 - |v_-|^2) |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2 \\ &= (|v_+|^2 - |v_-|^2) (\|M\|_2^2 - |Mv_{\text{abs}}|_2^2) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 6** From the proof of Theorem 7, we see that

$$\|M\|_{2+} \geq \frac{|Mv_+|_2}{|v_+|_2} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|M\|_2.$$

Therefore, we can obtain a lower bound of  $\|M\|_{2+}$  that is larger (no smaller) than  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|M\|_2$  by computing  $|Mv_+|_2/|v_+|_2$ .

### 6.3 The Case $\|G\|_2 = \|G(\infty)\|_2$

We finally consider the case  $\|G\|_2 = \|G(j\infty)\|_2$  where  $G(j\infty) := \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} G(j\omega)$ . We assume that  $G(j\infty) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_w}$  is well-defined; this is typically the case where  $G$  is a finite-dimensional LTI system of the form (3) and in this case we have  $G(j\infty) = D \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_w}$ .

Suppose  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$  is the unit right singular vector corresponding to the maximum singular value of  $G(j\infty) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_w}$ . We define  $v^{[m]} = v$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) and define  $G^{[m]}(s)$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) by (35). Then, it is not hard to see that all the results in Theorem 6 hold. In particular, similarly to (28), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|G\|_{2+} &\geq \frac{\sqrt{2a_0^{*2}|G(0)v|_2^2 + (2 - 2a_0^{*2})|G(j\infty)v|_2^2}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ &\geq \frac{\sqrt{(2 - 2a_0^{*2})}|G(j\infty)v|_2}}{\sqrt{2}} \approx \frac{1.0906}{\sqrt{2}} |G(j\infty)v|_2 > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|G\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

### 6.4 Summary of the Lower Bound Computation

For a given  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{LTI}}$ , we now summarize the procedure for the lower bound computation of  $\|G\|_{2+}$ .

1. If  $\|G\|_2 = \|G(j\omega^*)\|$  ( $\omega^* \in [0, \infty)$ ), denote by  $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n_w}$  ( $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$  if  $\omega^* = 0$ ) the unit right singular vector corresponding to the maximal singular value of  $G(j\omega^*)$ . Define  $v^{[m]}$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) by (33). If  $\|G\|_2 = \|G(j\infty)\|$ , denote by  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$  the unit right singular vector corresponding to the maximal singular value of  $G(j\infty) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_w}$ . Define  $v^{[m]} = v$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ).
2. Define  $G^{[m]}(s)$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) by (35) and compute  $v_N(G)$  defined by (37).

Then, as stated in Theorem 6, we have

$$\|G\|_{2+} \geq v_N(G) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|G\|_2 \quad (\forall N \in \mathbb{N}).$$

In particular,  $v_N(G)$  is monotonically non-decreasing with respect to  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Remark 7** Since  $v \in \mathbb{C}^{n_w}$  in general, the transfer functions  $G^{[m]}(s)$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) in (35) have complex coefficients. Still, the computation of  $v_N(G)$  in (37) can be done similarly to (31).

## 6.5 Numerical Examples

### 6.5.1 $L_{2+}$ Upper and Lower Bounds Computation

Let us consider the case where the system  $G$  in (1) is given by (3) with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -0.88 & 0.32 & 0.72 & -0.39 & -0.45 & -0.23 \\ 0.00 & -1.75 & -0.75 & -0.91 & 1.00 & 0.64 \\ 0.06 & -0.56 & -1.40 & 0.67 & 0.67 & 0.19 \\ 0.82 & 0.21 & -0.13 & -1.95 & 0.58 & 0.56 \\ 0.16 & -0.63 & 0.23 & 0.32 & -1.38 & 0.98 \\ 0.55 & -0.60 & 0.47 & 0.79 & 0.09 & -1.11 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0.32 & -0.44 & 0.14 \\ -0.01 & 0.30 & -0.23 \\ 0.34 & -0.21 & -0.02 \\ -0.16 & 0.17 & 0.40 \\ -0.27 & 0.27 & -0.23 \\ 0.00 & 0.17 & -0.27 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} -0.23 & 0.10 & -0.19 & 0.43 & -0.45 & 0.33 \\ 0.27 & -0.31 & -0.27 & -0.46 & -0.07 & 0.12 \\ -0.17 & -0.41 & 0.40 & 0.09 & 0.02 & -0.24 \end{bmatrix}, \quad D = \begin{bmatrix} 0.61 & 0.59 & 0.18 \\ 0.39 & -0.20 & -0.62 \\ 0.10 & -0.24 & -0.19 \end{bmatrix}.$$

These matrices were randomly generated. In this case, it turned out that  $\|G\|_2 = \|G(j\omega^*)\|_2 = 1.0178$  where  $\omega^* = 0.6529$ . We first computed upper bounds of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  by following the method in Section 3. The filter-free upper bound turned out to be 1.0150. Then, for the poles of the positive filters, we tested the three cases:  $\alpha \in \{-1.0, -1.5, -2.0\}$ . The results are shown in Fig. 2. The best (least) upper bound with positive filters was 0.9911 ( $\alpha = -2.0$ ,  $N = 15$ ). With these facts in mind, we next computed  $v_N(G)$ , the lower bounds of  $\|G\|_{2+}$ , by following the procedure summarized in the preceding subsection. The results are shown in Fig. 3. The best (largest) lower bound is 0.9698. This is indeed larger than the lower bound  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2 \approx 0.7197$  obtained from the uniform infimum shown in Theorem 3. From these upper/lower bounds together with  $(0.9911 - 0.9698)/0.9911 \approx 0.0215$ , we can conclude that the relative error between the upper bound 0.9911 and the true value of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  is less than 2.2%.

In Fig. 3, the improvement of  $v_N(G)$  over  $N \geq 2$  is not significant. This happens in general due to the following reasons. For  $N \geq 2$ , we have from (37) and (26) that

$$v_N(G)^2 = \sup_{\omega > 0} \frac{2a_0^{*2}|G^{[0]}(0)|_2^2 + |G^{[1]}(j\omega)|_2^2 + \sum_{m=2}^N a_m^{*2}|G^{[m]}(jm\omega)|_2^2}{2}$$

$$\leq \sup_{\omega > 0} \frac{2a_0^{*2}|G^{[0]}(0)|_2^2 + |G^{[1]}(j\omega)|_2^2 + (1 - 2a_0^{*2})\|G\|_2^2}{2}$$

$$= v_1(G)^2 + \frac{(1 - 2a_0^{*2})\|G\|_2^2}{2}.$$

Therefore, for  $N \geq 2$ , we have

$$\frac{v_N(G)^2 - v_1(G)^2}{\|G\|_2^2} \leq \frac{(1 - 2a_0^{*2})}{2} \approx 0.0947.$$

This clearly shows that the improvement of  $v_N(G)$  over  $N \geq 2$  is not significant in general.

Finally, suppose  $G$  in this numerical example is the LTI system of the ReLU-feedback system shown in Fig. 1




Fig. 2. Computed Upper Bounds  $\bar{\gamma}_{\alpha, \alpha, N}$ .




Fig. 3. Computed Lower Bounds  $v_N(G)$ .

(right), and let us illustrate how we can use lower/upper bounds of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  for the GAS analysis. First, since  $\|G\|_2 = 1.0178 > 1$ , we cannot conclude the GAS from the standard  $L_2$ -induced-norm-based small-gain theorem. On the other hand, since an easy-to-compute lower bound of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  from Theorem 3 turns out to be  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2 \approx 0.7197$ , it remains possible to have  $\|G\|_{2+} < 1$  (if  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|G\|_2 > 1$  then we have no need to resort to the upper bound computation of  $\|G\|_{2+}$  since  $\|G\|_{2+} < 1$  never happens). Finally, since it turns out that  $\|G\|_{2+} < 0.9911 < 1$  by the upper bound computation, we can conclude the GAS of the corresponding ReLU-feedback system using the  $L_{2+}$ -induced-norm-based small-gain theorem.

### 6.5.2 Difference of Positive Systems

Let us consider stable and internally (and hence externally) positive systems  $G_1, G_2, G_3$  of the form (3) whose

coefficient matrices are

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} -2.67 & 0.44 & 0.23 & 0.11 & 0.98 & 0.95 \\ 0.94 & -2.93 & 0.64 & 0.53 & 0.95 & 0.11 \\ 0.48 & 0.98 & -2.81 & 0.21 & 0.47 & 0.12 \\ 0.40 & 0.44 & 0.12 & -3.04 & 0.99 & 0.00 \\ 0.19 & 0.80 & 0.41 & 0.99 & -2.22 & 0.30 \\ 0.34 & 0.82 & 0.07 & 0.74 & 0.31 & -2.70 \end{bmatrix}, B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.12 & 0.11 \\ 0.71 & 0.72 \\ 0.96 & 0.88 \\ 0.32 & 0.00 \\ 0.79 & 0.10 \\ 0.67 & 0.37 \end{bmatrix}, \\
C_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.91 & 0.17 & 0.10 & 0.41 & 0.20 & 0.88 \\ 1.00 & 0.17 & 0.61 & 0.26 & 0.19 & 0.63 \end{bmatrix}, D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.62 & 0.18 \\ 0.66 & 0.63 \end{bmatrix}, \\
A_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} -1.43 & 0.70 & 0.04 & 0.70 \\ 0.49 & -1.28 & 0.49 & 0.32 \\ 0.99 & 0.50 & -1.20 & 0.78 \\ 0.39 & 0.06 & 0.06 & -1.31 \end{bmatrix}, B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.02 & 0.25 \\ 0.78 & 0.37 \\ 0.41 & 0.84 \\ 0.48 & 0.88 \end{bmatrix}, \\
C_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.24 & 0.27 & 0.10 & 0.96 \\ 0.70 & 0.44 & 0.30 & 0.42 \end{bmatrix}, D_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.92 & 0.70 \\ 0.63 & 0.55 \end{bmatrix}, \\
A_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} -1.19 & 0.33 & 0.06 & 0.17 \\ 0.92 & -1.57 & 0.90 & 0.42 \\ 0.26 & 0.74 & -1.32 & 0.00 \\ 0.58 & 0.67 & 0.44 & -1.50 \end{bmatrix}, B_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.56 & 0.87 \\ 0.07 & 0.75 \\ 0.39 & 0.75 \\ 0.50 & 0.85 \end{bmatrix}, \\
C_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.24 & 0.96 & 0.10 & 0.12 \\ 0.34 & 0.14 & 0.91 & 0.74 \end{bmatrix}, D_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.72 & 0.98 \\ 0.12 & 0.21 \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

These matrices were randomly generated under positivity constraints. Here, we regard  $G_2$  and  $G_3$  of dimension four as reduced order models of  $G_1$  of dimension six. It turned out that  $\|G_1 - G_2\|_2 = 12.43$  and  $\|G_1 - G_3\|_2 = 15.69$  and hence we could say that  $G_2$  is better than  $G_3$  as a reduced order model in the standard  $L_2$  induced norm sense. However, since  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$ , and  $G_3$  are all positive, it is more appropriate to compare the closeness in terms of  $L_{2+}$  induced norm as stated in Subsection 2.3.1. By the upper bound computation method in Section 3 and the lower bound computation method in Subsection 6.4, we obtained  $12.31 \leq \|G_1 - G_2\|_{2+} \leq 12.37$  and  $11.23 \leq \|G_1 - G_3\|_{2+} \leq 11.89$ . Therefore we are led to the definite conclusion that  $G_3$  is better than  $G_2$  as a reduced order model since  $\|G_1 - G_3\|_{2+} < \|G_1 - G_2\|_{2+}$ . This definite conclusion cannot be obtained unless the proposed upper and lower bounds computation methods.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced  $L_{p+}$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) induced norms for continuous time LTI systems. We first developed an  $L_{2+}$  upper bound computation method (Theorems 1 and 2), we then derived in an explicit fashion the uniform infimum on the ratio of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm to the  $L_2$  induced norm over all linear systems including infinite-dimensional ones (Theorem 3), and finally derived an effective method to compute lower bounds of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm that are better (no smaller) than the value determined by the uniform infimum (Theorems 5 and 6).

Even though we illustrated the effectiveness of the proposed upper/lower bounds computation methods by numerical examples, it is true that there is no theoretical guarantees for the accuracy of these bounds. It is our important future topic to enable the quantitative evaluation of the accuracy of these bounds.

On the other hand, as stated in Subsection 3.2, from the IQC framework [23,36,32], the COP for the upper bound computation of the  $L_{2+}$  induced norm can be regarded as a result that employs copositive multipliers capturing the nonnegativity of the assumed nonlinearities. It is also our future topic to clarify the effectiveness of the copositive multipliers in static and dynamical nonlinear system analysis from a broad perspective.

## References

- [1] F. Blanchini, P. Colaneri, and M. E. Valcher. Copositive Lyapunov functions for the stabilization of positive switched systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(12):3038–3050, 2012.
- [2] F. Blanchini, P. Colaneri, and M. E. Valcher. Switched positive linear systems. *Foundations and Trends in Systems and Control*, 2(2):101–273, 2015.
- [3] C. Briat. Robust stability and stabilization of uncertain linear positive systems via integral linear constraints:  $L_1$ -gain and  $L_\infty$ -gain characterization. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 23(17):1932–1954, 2013.
- [4] T. Chen, J. B. Lasserre, V. Magron, and E. Pauwels. Semialgebraic optimization for Lipschitz constants of ReLU networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:19189–19200, 2020.
- [5] C. A. Desoer and M. Vidyasagar. *Feedback Systems: Input-Output Properties*. Academic Press, New York, 1975.
- [6] M. Dür. Copositive programming - a survey. In M. Diehl, F. Glineur, E. Jarlebring, and W. Michiels, editors, *Recent Advances in Optimization and Its Applications in Engineering*, pages 3–20. Springer, 2010.
- [7] Y. Ebihara, H. Motooka, H. Waki, N. Sebe, V. Magron, D. Peaucelle, and S. Tarbouriech.  $L_{2+}$  induced norm analysis of continuous-time LTI systems using positive filters and copositive programming. In *Proc. of the 20th European Control Conference*, 2022.
- [8] Y. Ebihara, D. Peaucelle, and D. Arzelier. Analysis and synthesis of interconnected positive systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(2):652–667, 2017.
- [9] Y. Ebihara, Noboru Sebe, Hayato Waki, and Tomomichi Hagiwara. Lower bound analysis of  $L_{p+}$  induced norm for LTI systems. In *Proc. the 22th IFAC World Congress*, pages 2736–2741, 2023.
- [10] Y. Ebihara, H. Waki, V. Magron, N. H. A. Mai, D. Peaucelle, and S. Tarbouriech.  $l_2$  induced norm analysis of discrete-time LTI systems for nonnegative input signals and its application to stability analysis of recurrent neural networks. *The 2021 ECC Special Issue of the European Journal of Control*, 62:99–104, 2021.
- [11] Y. Ebihara, H. Waki, V. Magron, N. H. A. Mai, D. Peaucelle, and S. Tarbouriech. Stability analysis of recurrent neural networks by IQC with copositive multipliers. In *Proc. of the 60th Conference on Decision and Control*, 2021.
- [12] Y. Ebihara, D. Xin, V. Magron, D. Peaucelle, and S. Tarbouriech. Local Lipschitz constant computation of ReLU-FNNs: Upper bound computation with exactness verification, submitted. 2024.
- [13] L. Farina and S. Rinaldi. *Positive Linear Systems: Theory and Applications*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2000.

- [14] M. Fazlyab, M. Morari, and G. J. Pappas. Safety verification and robustness analysis of neural networks via quadratic constraints and semidefinite programming. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(1):1–15, 2022.
- [15] M. Fazlyab, A. Robey, H. Hassani, M. Morari, and G. J. Pappas. Efficient and accurate estimation of Lipschitz constants for deep neural networks. In *arxiv:1906.04893v2 [cs.LG]*.
- [16] Gerald B Folland. *Fourier analysis and its applications*, volume 4. American Mathematical Soc., 2009.
- [17] J. Grönqvist and A. Rantzer. Dissipativity in analysis of neural networks. In *Proc. the 25th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, pages 1221–1224, 2022.
- [18] T. Kaczorek. *Positive 1D and 2D Systems*. Springer, London, 2001.
- [19] T. Kato, Y. Ebihara, and T. Hagiwara. Analysis of positive systems using copositive programming. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 4(2):444–449, 2020.
- [20] H. Khalil. *Nonlinear Systems*. Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [21] L. Lessard, B. Recht, and A. Packard. Analysis and design of optimization algorithms via integral quadratic constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(1):57–95, 2016.
- [22] P. Li, J. Lam, Z. Wang, and P. Date. Positivity-preserving  $H_\infty$  model reduction for positive systems. *Automatica*, 47(7):1504–1511, 2011.
- [23] A. Megretski and A. Rantzer. System analysis via integral quadratic constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 42(6):819–830, 1997.
- [24] H. Motooka and Y. Ebihara.  $L_2$  induced norm analysis for nonnegative input signals and its application to stability analysis of recurrent neural networks (in Japanese). *Transactions of the Institute of Systems, Control and Information Engineers*, 35(2):29–37, 2022.
- [25] A. Raghunathan, J. Steinhardt, and P. Liang. Certified defenses against adversarial examples. In *Proc. the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [26] A. Raghunathan, J. Steinhardt, and P. Liang. Semidefinite relaxations for certifying robustness to adversarial examples. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 10900–10910, 2018.
- [27] A. Rantzer. Scalable control of positive systems. *European Journal of Control*, 24(1):72–80, 2015.
- [28] A. Rantzer. On the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov lemma for positive systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(5):1346–1349, 2016.
- [29] A. Rantzer and M. E. Valcher. Scalable control of positive systems with applications. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 4:319–341, 2021.
- [30] T. Reis and E. Virnik. Positivity preserving model reduction. In *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*, pages 131–139. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [31] M. Revay, R. Wang, and I. R. Manchester. A convex parameterization of robust recurrent neural networks. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5(4):1363–1368, 2021.
- [32] C. W. Scherer. Dissipativity and integral quadratic constraints: Tailored computational robustness tests for complex interconnections. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 42(3):115–139, 2022.
- [33] A. Shapiro. Sem infinite programming, duality, discretization and optimality conditions. *Optimization*, 58(2):133–161, 2009.
- [34] A. Sootla and A. Rantzer. Scalable positivity preserving model reduction using linear energy functions. In *Proc. Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 4285–4290, 2012.
- [35] T. Tanaka and C. Langbort. The bounded real lemma for internally positive systems and  $H_\infty$  structured static state feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(9):2218–2223, 2011.
- [36] Joost Veenman, Carsten W. Scherer, and Hakan Köroğlu. Robust stability and performance analysis based on integral quadratic constraints. *European Journal of Control*, 31:1–32, 2016.
- [37] H. Yin, P. Seiler, and M. Arcak. Stability analysis using quadratic constraints for systems with neural network controllers. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(4):1980–1987, 2022.

## A Proof of Proposition 2

**Proof of Proposition 2:** Suppose  $G$  is externally positive. For  $w \in L_p$  with  $\|w\|_p = 1$ , let us define  $w_+, w_- \in L_{p+}$  such that  $w = w_+ - w_-$  by  $w_+(t) = \max(w(t), 0_n)$ ,  $w_-(t) = \max(-w(t), 0_n)$  ( $t \in [0, \infty)$ ). Then, for  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $p = \infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Gw\|_p &= \|G(w_+ - w_-)\|_p \\ &= \|Gw_+ - Gw_-\|_p \\ &\leq \|Gw_+ + Gw_-\|_p \\ &= \|G(w_+ + w_-)\|_p \\ &\leq \|G\|_{p+} \|w_+ + w_-\|_p \\ &= \|G\|_{p+} \end{aligned}$$

where we used the external positivity of  $G$  in deriving the first inequality. The above inequality clearly shows  $\|G\|_p \leq \|G\|_{p+}$ . Then, since  $\|G\|_p \geq \|G\|_{p+}$  trivially holds, we came to the conclusion  $\|G\|_p = \|G\|_{p+}$ . ■

## B Proof of Theorem 1

For the proof of Theorem 1, we need the next lemma.

**Lemma 2** [7] *Suppose  $P_a \in \mathbb{S}^{n+n_p}$  satisfies (7) with  $Q_a \in \mathcal{COP}^{n_p+n_w}$ . Then, we have*

$$P_a \in \left\{ P + \begin{bmatrix} 0_{n,n} & 0_{n,n_p} \\ 0_{n_p,n} & P_p \end{bmatrix} : P \in \mathcal{PSD}^{n+n_p}, P_p \in \mathcal{COP}^{n_p} \right\}.$$

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.

**Proof of Theorem 1:** For the augmented system  $G_a$ , we consider the trajectory of its state  $x_a$  for the input  $w \in L_{2+}$  with  $\|w\|_2 = 1$ . From (7), we readily see

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} x_a(t) \\ w(t) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} P_a A_a + A_a^T P_a + C_a^T C_a & P_a B_a + C_a^T D_a \\ B_a^T P_a + D_a^T C_a & D_a^T D_a - \gamma^2 I_{n_w} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_a(t) \\ w(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} x_p(t) \\ w(t) \end{bmatrix}^T Q_a \begin{bmatrix} x_p(t) \\ w(t) \end{bmatrix} \leq 0 \quad (\forall t \geq 0). \end{aligned}$$

From this inequality and (6), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} (x_a(t)^T P_a x_a(t)) + z(t)^T z(t) - \gamma^2 w(t)^T w(t) + z_p(t)^T Q_a z_p(t) \leq 0 \quad (\forall t \geq 0).$$

By integration over  $[0, T]$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & x_a(T)^T P_a x_a(T) + \int_0^T z(t)^T z(t) dt - \gamma^2 \int_0^T w(t)^T w(t) dt \\ & + \int_0^T z_p(t)^T Q_a z_p(t) dt \leq 0 \quad (\forall T > 0). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Since  $Q_a \in \mathcal{COP}^{n_p+n_w}$  and  $z_p \in L_{2+}$ , we first note that

$$\int_0^T z_p(t)^T Q_a z_p(t) dt \geq 0 \quad (\forall T > 0).$$

On the other hand, since  $x_p$  is nonnegative in  $x_a (= [x^T \ x_p^T]^T)$ , we see from Lemma 2 that

$$x_a(T)^T P_a x_a(T) \geq 0 \quad (\forall T > 0).$$

With these facts in mind, we take the limit  $T \rightarrow \infty$  in (B.1) and obtain

$$\int_0^\infty z(t)^T z(t) dt - \gamma^2 \int_0^\infty w(t)^T w(t) dt \leq 0.$$

This clearly shows  $\|z\|_2^2 \leq \gamma^2 \|w\|_2^2 = \gamma^2$ . To summarize, we arrive at the conclusion that

$$\|G\|_{2+} = \sup_{w \in L_{2+}, \|w\|_2=1} \|z\|_2 \leq \gamma.$$

This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

### C Proof of Theorem 3

We start from showing the next result.

**Lemma 3** *For the uniform infimum  $\nu_p^*$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $p = \infty$ ) characterized by (4), we have*

$$\nu_p^* \geq 2^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \quad (p \in [1, \infty)), \quad \nu_\infty^* \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

For the proof of this lemma, the next result is useful.

**Lemma 4** *For  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , suppose  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfies  $x_1^p + x_2^p = 1$ . Then we have*

$$x_1 + x_2 \leq 2^{\frac{p-1}{p}}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

**Proof of Lemma 4:** The function  $f(x) = x^p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ) is convex for  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Therefore we have

$$\left( \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2} \right)^p \leq \frac{x_1^p + x_2^p}{2} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

It follows that (C.2) holds.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Lemma 3:** For  $w \in L_p$  with  $\|w\|_p = 1$ , let us define  $w_+, w_- \in L_{p+}$  such that  $w = w_+ - w_-$  by  $w_+(t) = \max(w(t), 0_n)$ ,  $w_-(t) = \max(-w(t), 0_n)$  ( $t \in [0, \infty)$ ). Then, for  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Gw\|_p &= \|G(w_+ - w_-)\|_p \\ &= \|Gw_+ - Gw_-\|_p \\ &\leq \|Gw_+\|_p + \|Gw_-\|_p \\ &\leq \|G\|_{p+} \|w_+\|_p + \|G\|_{p+} \|w_-\|_p \\ &= \|G\|_{p+} (\|w_+\|_p + \|w_-\|_p). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Here, from  $\|w_+\|_p^p + \|w_-\|_p^p = \|w\|_p^p = 1$  and Lemma 4, we have

$$\|w_+\|_p + \|w_-\|_p \leq 2^{\frac{p-1}{p}}.$$

From this inequality and (C.3), we obtain

$$\sup_{w \in L_p, \|w\|_p=1} \|Gw\|_p \leq \|G\|_{p+} 2^{\frac{p-1}{p}}.$$

or equivalently,  $\|G\|_p \leq \|G\|_{p+} 2^{\frac{p-1}{p}}$ . This clearly shows that  $\nu_p^* \geq 2^{\frac{1-p}{p}}$  ( $p \in [1, \infty)$ ).

Similarly, for  $w \in L_\infty$  with  $\|w\|_\infty = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Gw\|_\infty &\leq \|Gw_+\|_\infty + \|Gw_-\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|G\|_{\infty+} \|w_+\|_\infty + \|G\|_{\infty+} \|w_-\|_\infty \\ &= \|G\|_{\infty+} (\|w_+\|_\infty + \|w_-\|_\infty) \\ &\leq 2 \|G\|_{\infty+}. \end{aligned}$$

From this inequality, we readily obtain

$$\sup_{w \in L_\infty, \|w\|_\infty=1} \|Gw\|_\infty \leq 2 \|G\|_{\infty+}$$

or equivalently,  $\|G\|_\infty \leq 2 \|G\|_{p+}$ . This clearly shows  $\nu_\infty^* \geq \frac{1}{2}$ .  $\blacksquare$

We next prove that (16) holds. To this end, the next result is useful.

**Lemma 5** *For  $w_1, w_2 \in L_{p+}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_1 - w_2\|_p &\leq (\|w_1\|_p^p + \|w_2\|_p^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (p \in [1, \infty)), \\ \|w_1 - w_2\|_\infty &\leq \max(\|w_1\|_\infty, \|w_2\|_\infty). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

**Proof of Lemma 5:** Let us define  $w_{\max} \in L_{p+}$  by

$$w_{\max}(t) := \max(w_1(t), w_2(t)) \quad (t \in [0, \infty)).$$

Then, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_1 - w_2\|_p &\leq \|w_{\max}\|_p \quad (p \in [1, \infty)), \\ \|w_1 - w_2\|_\infty &\leq \|w_{\max}\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from the definition of the  $L_p$  norm of signals, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{\max}\|_p^p &\leq \|w_1\|_p^p + \|w_2\|_p^p \quad (p \in [1, \infty)), \\ \|w_{\max}\|_\infty &\leq \max(\|w_1\|_\infty, \|w_2\|_\infty). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that (C.4) holds.  $\blacksquare$

We now move on to the proof (16).

**Proof of (16):** We first prove that

$$\|G^*\|_p = 2 \quad (p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty). \quad (\text{C.5})$$

To this end, note that

$$\|G^*\|_p \leq \|1\|_p + \|e^{-Ls}\|_p = 2 \quad (p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty). \quad (\text{C.6})$$

To prove

$$\|G^*\|_p \geq 2 \quad (p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty), \quad (\text{C.7})$$

let us consider the input signal  $w_N^* \in L_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty$ ) defined by

$$w_N^*(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < 0, \\ 1 & 2mL \leq t < (2m+1)L, \\ -1 & (2m+1)L \leq t < 2(m+1)L, \\ 0 & 2NL \leq t. \end{cases}$$

where  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m = 0, \dots, N-1$ . Then, the corresponding output  $z_N^* \in L_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty$ ) of the system  $G^*$  is given by

$$z_N^*(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t < 0, \\ 1 & 0 \leq t < L, \\ 2w_N^* & L \leq t < 2NL, \\ 1 & 2NL \leq t < (2N+1)L, \\ 0 & (2N+1)L \leq t. \end{cases}$$

For the signals  $w_N^*, z_N^* \in L_p$  ( $p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty$ ), we readily see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_N^*\|_p &= (2NL)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \|w_N^*\|_\infty &= 1, \\ \|z_N^*\|_p &= ((2N-1)L2^p + 2L)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \|z_N^*\|_\infty &= 2. \end{aligned}$$

From these results, it is obvious that  $\|G^*\|_\infty \geq 2$ . In addition, by letting  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we see  $\|G^*\|_p \geq 2$  ( $p \in$

$[1, \infty)$ ). It follows that (C.7) holds. From (C.6) and (C.7), we can readily conclude that (C.5) holds.

We are now in a right position to to prove (16). To this end, let us consider any nonnegative input signal  $w \in L_{p+}$  ( $p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty$ ) with  $\|w\|_p = 1$  for  $G^*$ . If we define  $w_L \in L_{p+}$  ( $p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty$ ) with  $\|w_L\|_p = 1$  by

$$w_L(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & 0 \leq t < L, \\ w(t-L) & L \leq t, \end{cases}$$

we see that the output  $z$  corresponding to the input  $w$  is given by  $z = w - w_L$ . By applying Lemma 5, we have

$$\|z\|_p \leq 2^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|z\|_\infty \leq 1.$$

Namely, for any nonnegative signal  $w \in L_{p+}$  ( $p \in [1, \infty), p = \infty$ ) with  $\|w\|_p = 1$ , the above inequalities hold. These results, together with, (C.5) lead us to

$$\begin{aligned} \|G^*\|_{p+} &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{p}} = 2^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \|G\|_p = \nu_p^* \|G\|_p \quad (p \in [1, \infty)), \\ \|G^*\|_{\infty+} &\leq 1 = \frac{1}{2} \|G\|_\infty = \nu_\infty^* \|G\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

It follows from (C.1) and (C.8) that (16) holds.  $\blacksquare$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.

**Proof of Theorem 3:** Since we have verified (C.1) and (16), Theorem 3 has been validated.  $\blacksquare$