

Covariance Control for a class of Stochastic Discrete-time Linear Systems using the S-Variable Approach^{*}

Kaouther Moussa^{*,**} Dimitri Peaucelle^{***}

^{*} *UPHF, CNRS, UMR 8201 - LAMIH, F-59313 Valenciennes, France*

^{**} *INSA Hauts-de-France, F-59313, Valenciennes, France*

^{***} *LAAS-CNRS, Univ. Toulouse, CNRS, Toulouse, France*

Abstract: This paper deals with the problem of covariance control for a class of linear stochastic discrete-time systems in the Stochastic Model Predictive Control (SMPC) framework. The considered systems are affected by independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) additive and parametric stochastic uncertainties (potentially unbounded), in addition to polytopic deterministic uncertainties bounding the mean of the state and input parameters. The control design conditions presented in this paper are formulated as Linear Matrix Inequalities (LMIs), using the S-variable approach in order to reduce the potential conservatism. These conditions are derived using a deterministic exact characterization of the covariance dynamics, the latter involves bilinear terms in the control gain. A technique to linearize such dynamics is presented, it results in a descriptor representation allowing to derive sufficient conditions for covariance control design. The derived condition is firstly compared to a known necessary and sufficient stability condition for systems without deterministic uncertainties and additive stochastic noise, although more conservative, it turns out to be more numerically tractable. Then, the same condition is used to design controllers that are robust to both deterministic and stochastic uncertainties. Several numerical examples are presented for comparison and illustration.

Keywords: Stochastic linear systems, covariance control, LMI-based design, Stochastic MPC, S-variable approach.

1. INTRODUCTION

Stochastic systems allow to describe dynamical systems that are affected by uncertainties of probabilistic nature. Such a property is inherently present in various systems, for instance those modeling biological phenomena (see Del Vecchio et al. (2018) and references therein).

This paper addresses the problem of controlling the covariance of a class of linear stochastic discrete-time systems in the Stochastic Model Predictive (SMPC) framework. The latter has gained a considerable interest in the last decade because of its ability to reduce the conservatism related to worst-case scenario-based approaches (see Mesbah (2016) and references therein).

One of the main techniques to address uncertainties (both deterministic and stochastic) in MPC methods is the tube-based one Langson et al. (2004), it consists in decomposing the state into a deterministic and an uncertain component, this decomposition allows to rewrite the SMPC problem as a deterministic one, which considerably simplifies the resolution of related optimization problems. In this context, covariance dynamics characterization is useful for tightening time-varying chance constraints using concentration inequalities, such as the Chebyshev's inequality as used for example in Kofman et al. (2012); Hewing and Zeilinger

(2018); Fiacchini and Alamo (2021). Whenever a characterization of covariance dynamics is available, probabilistic constraints can be tightened using analytical formulations instead of sampling-based methods that were proposed, for example, in Cannon et al. (2011); Calafiore and Fagiano (2012); Lorenzen et al. (2016).

As mentioned in Moussa and Fiacchini (2025), the characterization of covariance dynamics in SMPC has so far been limited to linear discrete-time systems affected by an additive noise. In this case, the derivation of the covariance dynamics is trivial and its stability is conditioned by the Schur stability of the closed-loop nominal system $(A + BK)$. In Moussa and Fiacchini (2025), we proposed a new covariance dynamics characterization for systems with stochastic parametric uncertainties in the state matrix. Since this characterization is deterministic, classical LMI-based techniques can be applied to derive synthesis conditions ensuring the covariance stability. The main challenge being the presence of bilinear terms in the control gain, due to a Kronecker product related transformation.

In this paper, we address the class of stochastic discrete-time systems that are affected by parametric and additive stochastic uncertainties, in addition to polytopic deterministic uncertainties bounding the mean of the state and input parameters. Practically, such systems can describe the error that might occur when modeling the parameters with

^{*} This work was partially supported by the Clinical project, funded by the ANR under grant ANR-24-CE45-4255.

probability distributions, and allow to take into account deterministic uncertainties on the mean of the parameters.

Similar problems have been addressed in the stochastic control literature, in particular the random polytopes framework presented for example in Hosoe et al. (2018), where an LMI-based robust stability condition was provided for systems described by random polytopes, whose vertices are random matrices with given fixed distributions. Such conditions involve expectation-based inequalities and need a sample-based evaluation of the associated expectations.

The more recent work Hosoe et al. (2020) suggested a linearization based technique to derive deterministic sufficient conditions for the robust stability of such systems. This work was based on the work in Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019), in which the authors proposed a necessary and sufficient condition for the stability of linear stochastic discrete-time systems, with i.i.d. parametric uncertainties and without the polytopic representation. The latter is closely related to our work and will be described in Section 3.

The class of systems considered in this paper can therefore be seen as a special case of random polytopes, with a simpler representation allowing to derive more tractable LMI conditions. It is worth mentioning that the starting point for deriving such conditions is completely different from the conventional studies such as in Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019), in the sense that we first derive a deterministic characterization of the covariance dynamics and then use LMI-based technique to derive stability conditions. Even though this point of view provides sufficient conditions, it allows to overcome the complexity of expectation-based inequalities and to have lower dimensional conditions.

The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- Deriving an LMI-based condition to design a controller for the covariance dynamics that was previously presented in Moussa and Fiacchini (2025) within the SMPC framework.
- Assessing the conservatism and computational complexity of this condition with respect to known necessary and sufficient conditions for the stability of stochastic linear discrete-time systems satisfying specific assumptions.
- Extending the derived condition to the more general case involving both deterministic polytopic and stochastic uncertainties.

The outline of this paper is the following: Section 2 states the problems that will be addressed in the paper, together with the working assumptions; Section 3 recalls the necessary and sufficient conditions for the stability of a class of stochastic linear discrete-time systems that was presented in Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019); Section 4 presents the covariance characterization in the SMPC framework and extends it to the case of polytopic uncertainties; Section 5 presents the stability conditions in the case of systems without and with deterministic parametric uncertainties; Section 6 assesses the numerical tractability and the conservatism of the derived condition (without polytopic uncertainties) in comparison to the necessary

and sufficient condition presented in Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019), furthermore, it presents a numerical example for the polytopic case. Finally, Section 7 suggests some perspectives for future works.

1.1 Notation

\mathbb{R} and \mathbb{N} stand, respectively, for the sets of real and natural numbers. \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ denote, respectively, the set of n -dimensional real vectors and the set of real matrices of dimension $n \times m$. \mathbb{S}^n and \mathbb{S}_+^n denote, respectively, the sets of n -dimensional symmetric matrices and symmetric positive definite ones. The expectation of a random variable x is denoted by $\mathbb{E}[x]$. Given a random vector v , $\text{cov}(v) = \mathbb{E}[(v - \mathbb{E}[v])(v - \mathbb{E}[v])^T]$ stands for the covariance of v , if the latter has a zero mean ($\mathbb{E}[v] = 0$), then the covariance of v is simply $\text{cov}(v) = \mathbb{E}[vv^T]$. The multivariate normal distribution of mean μ and covariance matrix Σ is denoted $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$. The Kronecker product is denoted by \otimes .

Given a square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, A^{-1} , $\text{tr}(A)$ and $\rho(A)$ stand, respectively, for the inverse of A (if nonsingular), its trace and its spectral radius. The multiset consisting of the eigenvalues of A including their algebraic multiplicity is denoted by $\text{mspec}(A)$. A matrix A is said to be Schur stable if all its eigenvalues lie strictly inside the open unit disk in the complex plane. The zero matrix of appropriate dimensions is denoted 0 and the identity matrix of dimension n is denoted I_n . Given a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $\text{vec}(B)$, and $\text{vec}(B)^{-1}$ stand, respectively, for the vectorization of B and the inverse of the vectorization $\text{vec}(\text{vec}^{-1}(B)) = B$. B^T stands for the transpose of the matrix B , the notation $\{B\}^S$ stands for the symmetric matrix $\{B\}^S = B + B^T$ and $(\star)QB$ stands for the symmetric matrix B^TQB . Given a symmetric matrix $M \in \mathbb{S}^n$, $M \succ 0$ and $M \succeq 0$ mean that M is positive definite and positive semi-definite, respectively. Given two square matrices A and B with the same dimension, $A \prec B$ is the matrix inequality that states that $B - A$ is symmetric positive definite. A matrix inequality of the type $I(\mathbf{X}) \prec 0$ is said to be a Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI), if $I(\mathbf{X})$ is affine in the decision variables \mathbf{X} . In this paper, the decision variables are highlighted in **bold green**.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider the following class of stochastic discrete-time linear systems:

$$x_{k+1} = \tilde{A}(\xi_k, \theta)x_k + B(\theta)u_k + w_k. \quad (1)$$

where $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$, with $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, represent, respectively, the state and the control input. $w = (w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of an n -dimensional additive random vector w_k whose support is \mathbb{R}^n , representing an additive stochastic uncertainty. w_k is considered to have a zero mean and a covariance $W \succ 0$, which is commonly considered in stochastic MPC approaches. The initial state $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is assumed to be deterministic.

The state transition matrix $\tilde{A}(\xi_k, \theta)$ is defined as the sum of a deterministic uncertain matrix and a stochastic one:

$$\tilde{A}(\xi_k, \theta) = A(\theta) + \bar{A}(\xi_k). \quad (2)$$

$A(\theta)$ and $B(\theta)$ are defined as follows:

$$A(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^L \theta^{(i)} A^{(i)}, \quad B(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^L \theta^{(i)} B^{(i)}, \quad (3)$$

where $\theta = (\theta^{(1)}, \dots, \theta^{(L)})^T$ is a deterministic uncertain parameter vector satisfying $\theta \in \mathbf{E}^L$ with

$$\mathbf{E}^L := \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^L : \theta^{(i)} \geq 0 \ (i = 1, \dots, L), \sum_{i=1}^L \theta^{(i)} = 1 \right\}. \quad (4)$$

\mathbf{E}^L is assumed to contain the true unknown parameter θ^{true} . The pair $(A(\theta), B(\theta))$ is assumed to be robustly stabilizable.

$\xi = (\xi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an l -dimensional stochastic process, with $l \in \mathbb{N}$, representing the stochastic parametric uncertainties affecting the state matrix. The support of ξ_k is $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^l$, therefore, the matrix-valued function $\bar{A}(\cdot)$ is defined as $\bar{A} : \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

$\bar{A}(\xi_k)$ is such that $\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(\xi_k)] = 0$, which results in a decomposition of the state transition matrix $\tilde{A}(\xi_k, \theta)$ into two terms, the deterministic part containing the mean of the state transition matrix $A(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}(\xi_k, \theta)]$, and the stochastic matrix $\bar{A}(\xi_k)$.

In practice, the class of systems represented by (1) encompasses systems subject to stochastic uncertainties in the state parameters, whose mean values are themselves uncertain yet bounded within a polytope.

In this paper, we restrict our attention to independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) stochastic processes. Therefore, we consider that w and ξ satisfy the following assumption:

Assumption 1. Given a stochastic process $\nu = (\nu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, ν_k is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) with respect to time $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Furthermore, let $\bar{A}(\xi_k)$ satisfy the following:

Assumption 2. The square elements of $\bar{A}(\xi_k)$ are all Lebesgue integrable, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}_{i,j}(\xi_k)^2] < \infty \quad \forall i, j = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\bar{A}_{i,j}(\xi_k)$ denotes the (i, j) entries of $\bar{A}(\xi_k)$.

As mentioned in Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019), Assumption 2 allows to ensure the well-definedness of the second-order moments of the elements of the random matrix $\bar{A}(\xi_k)$, which is a minimal requirement when studying the stability of the covariance dynamics related to system (1).

Since the sequences of ξ_k and w_k are i.i.d. in time, then $\bar{A}(\xi_k)$ and w_k are independent of the state and the input for the same time $k \in \mathbb{N}$, meaning that $\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(\xi_k)x_k] = \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(\xi_k)] \mathbb{E}[x_k]$, and $\mathbb{E}[x_k w_k^T] = \mathbb{E}[x_k] \mathbb{E}[w_k^T]$.

Furthermore, let w satisfy the following assumption:

Assumption 3. The stochastic process w is independent of ξ , i.e. $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{ik} w_{jk}] = \mathbb{E}[\xi_{ik}] \mathbb{E}[w_{jk}] = 0 \ \forall i = 1, \dots, l$ and $\forall j = 1, \dots, n$, where the notation ξ_{ik} stands for the i^{th} element of ξ_k at time k .

Note that Assumption 3 is not restrictive, it is only considered to simplify the exact characterization of the covariance dynamics related to system (1), and additional

terms resulting from its non-satisfaction (that can be easily considered) do not affect the stability analysis of the covariance dynamics.

Given the assumptions formulated above, the goal is to derive control design conditions for the covariance dynamics corresponding to system (1), in the tube-based S MPC framework. We will firstly address the problem of deriving such conditions in the particular case where θ^{true} is known which reduces to $A(\theta^{\text{true}}) = A$ and $B(\theta^{\text{true}}) = B$ when no ambiguity may raise

$$x_{k+1} = \tilde{A}(\xi_k)x_k + Bu_k + w_k. \quad (5)$$

As the resulting condition is closely related to the Mean-Square asymptotic Stability (MSS) of linear stochastic systems, we provide a numerical comparison with the known necessary and sufficient MSS condition recalled in Section 3. The derived condition for system (5) will subsequently be used to establish a control design condition for the general case of system (1).

3. RELATED BACKGROUND

Consider the following linear stochastic discrete-time system:

$$x_{k+1} = \tilde{A}(\xi_k)x_k + \tilde{B}(\xi_k)u_k, \quad (6)$$

such that the square elements of $\tilde{B}(\xi_k)$ are Lebesgue integrable (similar to Assumption 2).

Stability notions for linear stochastic systems have been introduced in the literature, for example in Kozin (1969). In particular, in Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019), considering stochastic systems that satisfy Assumptions 1 and 2 (for ξ and $\tilde{A}(\xi_k)$, $\tilde{B}(\xi_k)$ respectively), the authors proved the equivalence between asymptotic, exponential and quadratic stability. We recall here the definition of asymptotic (also referred to as mean-square asymptotic), since it is intrinsically linked to the presented work.

Definition 1. Mean-Square asymptotic Stability (MSS) Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019):

Consider the following uncontrolled linear stochastic discrete-time system:

$$x_{k+1} = \tilde{A}(\xi_k)x_k, \quad (7)$$

with a deterministic initial condition x_0 . System (7), where the stochastic process ξ satisfies Assumption 1 and the square elements of $\tilde{A}(\xi_k)$ are Lebesgue integrable, is said to be mean-square asymptotically stable in the second moment if, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\epsilon)$ such that:

$$\|x_0\| \leq \delta(\epsilon) \implies \mathbb{E}[\|x_k\|^2] \leq \epsilon, \forall k \in \mathbb{N},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x_k\|^2] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019), the quadratic stability definition is shown to be equivalent to the following condition (for the uncontrolled system):

$$\exists P \in \mathbb{S}_+^n, \text{ such that, } \mathbb{E}\left[P - \tilde{A}(\xi_0)P\tilde{A}(\xi_0)^T\right] \succ 0.$$

This condition takes the form of an expectation-based inequality, as both $\tilde{A}(\xi_0)$ and the decision variable P appear inside the expectation. Then, considering system (6) and the state feedback $u_k = Fx_k$, by decomposing the following matrix:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\star) \left[\text{vec} \left(\tilde{A}(\xi_0) \right)^T, \text{vec} \left(\tilde{B}(\xi_0) \right)^T \right] \right] \quad (8)$$

the decision variables can be taken outside the expectation, which makes the condition more compatible with the analysis based on Lyapunov inequalities. The derived necessary and sufficient condition for closed-loop stability is presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019) Let ξ satisfy Assumption 1, and assume that the square elements of $\tilde{A}(\xi_k)$ and $\tilde{B}(\xi_k)$ are Lebesgue integrable. There exists a gain F such that the closed-loop system defined by $x_{k+1} = (\tilde{A}(\xi_k) + \tilde{B}(\xi_k)F)x_k$ is quadratically stable if and only if there exist $X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfying:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X & * \\ \bar{G}'_A X + \bar{G}'_B Y & X \otimes I_{\bar{n}} \end{pmatrix} \succ 0, \quad (9)$$

where $\bar{G}'_A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\bar{G}'_B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ result from the expectation-based decomposition of the matrix in (8) as presented in Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019), with $\bar{n} \leq n(n+m)$ as suggested in Hosoe and Peaucelle (2019), and $F = YX^{-1}$ is such a stabilizing gain.

The reader is referred to Hosoe and Hagiwara (2019) for further details on the decomposition and conditions involving a decay rate.

Remark 1. The size of the LMI condition in Theorem 1 is at most $n + n^2(n+m)$. The matrix in (8) can be rank-deficient, in particular when either the state or input matrix is deterministic. In such cases, the size of condition (9) can be reduced by eliminating the redundant part associated with the zero singular values. In Section 6, this reduction is applied in order to ensure a fair comparison with the proposed condition.

4. EXACT COVARIANCE CHARACTERIZATION IN THE SMPC FRAMEWORK

Tube-based decomposition is one of the main approaches to handle uncertainties in robust and stochastic MPC frameworks, see for example Langson et al. (2004) and Arcari et al. (2023). It consists in separating the state into a deterministic and an uncertain component, and designing a pre-stabilizing feedback that allows to cope with the uncertain state. In the framework of stochastic MPC, the tube-based approach allows to obtain a tractable formulation that can handle the presence of chance constraints. Therefore, characterizing the covariance dynamics is crucial in this context.

This section uses our previous work in Moussa and Fiacchini (2025) on the exact characterization of the covariance dynamics related to the class of systems in (5), to extend it to the case of system (1).

As commonly done in tube-based MPC approaches, we consider the following state decomposition:

$$x_k = e_k + z_k, \quad (10)$$

where e_k stands for the uncertain state (also denoted as the error), and z_k for the deterministic part representing the mean of the state x_k that we define as follows:

$$z_{k+1} = A(\theta)z_k + B(\theta)v_k \quad (11)$$

with $z_0 = x_0$ and then $e_0 = 0$. We restrict the class of control policies over the following affine error feedback law:

$$u_k = Ke_k + v_k, \quad (12)$$

with $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Then, the resulting error dynamics related to e_k can be written as follows:

$$e_{k+1} = (\tilde{A}(\xi_k, \theta) + B(\theta)K)e_k + \tilde{A}(\xi_k)z_k + w_k \quad (13)$$

The following standard assumption is functional to the subsequent results and is not restrictive since $(A(\theta), B(\theta))$ is assumed to be robustly stabilizable, as commonly considered in standard robust MPC methods Lorenzen et al. (2019).

Assumption 4. The control input v_k , defined by a state feedback law $v_k = \bar{K}(z_k)$ is designed such that the closed-loop system $z_{k+1} = (A(\theta)z_k + B(\theta)\bar{K}(z_k))$ is asymptotically stable $\forall \theta \in \mathbf{E}^L$.

In the case of control without constraints, this is a classical robust state-feedback problem that can be solved with LMI techniques (see for example in Ebihara et al. (2015)). In the case of a tube-based stochastic MPC implementation, v_k can be designed by a deterministic MPC strategy Arcari et al. (2023).

The following proposition establishes the dynamics of the error covariance related to system (1) which is a direct extension of Theorem 1 in Moussa and Fiacchini (2025). The reader is referred to that work for the detailed proof.

Proposition 1. The dynamics of the error covariance related to system (1) is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}(e_{k+1}) &= (\star) \text{cov}(e_k) (A(\theta) + B(\theta)K)^T + W \\ &\quad + \text{vec}^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E} [\bar{A}(\xi_k) \otimes \bar{A}(\xi_k)] \text{vec} (\text{cov}(e_k) + z_k z_k^T) \right) \end{aligned}$$

which equivalently reads as

$$\epsilon_{k+1} = M(\theta, K)\epsilon_k + C_p^A \zeta_k + \omega \quad (14)$$

where $\epsilon_k = \text{vec}(\text{cov}(e_k))$, $\zeta_k = \text{vec}(z_k z_k^T)$, $\omega = \text{vec}(W)$, $C_p^A = \mathbb{E} [\bar{A}(\xi_k) \otimes \bar{A}(\xi_k)]$ and

$$M(\theta, K) = \left((A(\theta) + B(\theta)K) \otimes (A(\theta) + B(\theta)K) + C_p^A \right).$$

Note that the resulting matrix C_p^A is constant and contains the different second-order moments related to the parameters joint distribution, it can be seen as a transformation of the covariance matrix related to the state parameters. Therefore, this proposition presents a deterministic characterization of the error covariance dynamics for system (1).

The following proposition establishes a sufficient condition for the stability of the covariance dynamics in (14), which is also an extension of the condition presented in Moussa and Fiacchini (2025) without polytopic uncertainties.

Proposition 2. If \bar{K} stabilizes robustly the deterministic system as in Assumption 4 and K robustly stabilizes the deterministic system $\epsilon_{k+1} = M(\theta, K)\epsilon_k$ then the covariance matrix $\text{cov}(e_k)$ converges to

$$\text{vec}^{-1} \left((I - M(\theta^{\text{true}}, K))^{-1} \text{vec}(W) \right). \quad (15)$$

The proof follows directly from considering the steady-state dynamics related to (14), under the satisfaction of Assumption 4.

In the next section, the presented characterization will be used to derive a control design condition for the covariance dynamics related to system (5). The latter is used to design a more general condition related to system (1).

5. LMI-BASED CONTROL DESIGN CONDITIONS

While finding robust state-feedback gains \bar{K} for linear uncertain systems with matrices lying in polytopes is a well established topic, we now consider the more involved problem of finding K such that the bilinear matrix $M(\theta, K)$ is robustly Schur stable. Before moving to the robust case, we assume $\theta = \theta^{\text{true}}$ is known and set $M(\theta^{\text{true}}, K) = M(K)$, $A(\theta^{\text{true}}) = A$, $B(\theta^{\text{true}}) = B$.

The difficulty of $M(K)$ being bilinear is circumvented by descriptor modeling and matrix inequalities are obtained using the S-variable approach.

Theorem 2. Assume there exists $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{S}_+^{n^2}$, $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathbf{N}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{3n^2 \times 2n^2}$ the following holds:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{X} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \prec \{N(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T})\mathbf{N}_0^T\}^{\mathcal{S}} \quad (16)$$

where

$$N(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -\mathbf{S} \otimes I_n & 0 \\ C_p^A(\mathbf{S} \otimes I_n) & I_n \otimes (A\mathbf{S} + B\mathbf{T}) \\ (A\mathbf{S} + B\mathbf{T}) \otimes I_n & -I_n \otimes \mathbf{S} \end{array} \right)$$

then $K = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{S}^{-1}$ is such that $M(K)$ is Schur stable.

Proof Consider the dual system $\alpha_{k+1}^T = \alpha_k^T M(K)$ which is Schur stable if and only if $\epsilon_{k+1} = M(K)\epsilon_k$ is Schur stable. Let $\pi_k^T = \alpha_k^T (I_n \otimes (A + BK))$ and $\eta_k^T = (\alpha_{k+1}^T, \alpha_k^T, \pi_k^T)$. The dual system dynamics also read as the following affine in K descriptor form:

$$\eta_k^T \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -I_{n^2} & 0 \\ C_p^A & I_n \otimes (A + BK) \\ (A + BK) \otimes I_n & -I_{n^2} \end{array} \right) = 0.$$

Post multiplying this equality by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S} \otimes I_n & 0 \\ 0 & I_n \otimes \mathbf{S} \end{pmatrix}$$

together with $\mathbf{T} = K\mathbf{S}$ gives that the following holds along the trajectories $\eta_k^T N(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}) = 0$. Therefore (16) implies that

$$\eta_k^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{X} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \eta_k = \alpha_{k+1}^T \mathbf{X} \alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k^T \mathbf{X} \alpha_k < 0$$

hold for the system. The matrix \mathbf{X} is hence a Lyapunov certificate that proves stability. ■

Remark 2. Note that the dimension of the condition in (16) is $3n^2$ which is, in general, lower than the dimension of the necessary and sufficient condition in (9).

5.1 Comments on the choice of \mathbf{N}_0

The above proof is valid whatever matrix \mathbf{N}_0 as long as (16) holds. Moreover, for a fixed value of \mathbf{N}_0 the conditions are LMIs in the decision variables \mathbf{X} , \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{T} . It is hence of crucial importance to have clues on how to chose the

\mathbf{N}_0 , which can be critical considering the large size of the matrix.

According to results in Ebihara et al. (2015), the following structure is non conservative

$$\mathbf{N}_0 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -I_{n^2} & 0 \\ \mathbf{C}_0 & I_n \otimes \mathbf{A}_0 \\ \mathbf{A}_0 \otimes I_n & -I_{n^2} \end{array} \right)$$

More precisely, using Finsler's lemma one can prove that if there exists K solution to the problem then there necessarily exist $\mathbf{A}_0 = A + BK$ and $\mathbf{C}_0 = C_p^A$ solution to (16).

Moreover, for (16) to hold, it is necessary that the system $\mathbf{A}_0 \otimes \mathbf{A}_0 + \mathbf{C}_0$ is Schur stable. The proof of this property comes readily by noticing that such \mathbf{N}_0 corresponds to a descriptor representation of the system $\alpha_{0,k+1}^T = \alpha_{0,k}^T (\mathbf{A}_0 \otimes \mathbf{A}_0 + \mathbf{C}_0)$ and by following the lines of the proof of Theorem 2, that system is stable if (16) holds.

According to these remarks, one natural *a priori* choice is $\mathbf{A}_0 = 0$ and $\mathbf{C}_0 = 0$, providing a most Schur stable matrix $\mathbf{A}_0 \otimes \mathbf{A}_0 + \mathbf{C}_0 = 0$. Another case is, assuming some initial guess K_0 of K , to choose $\mathbf{A}_0 = A + BK_0$ and $\mathbf{C}_0 = C_p^A$.

5.2 The polytopic case

By enforcing the lifted LMI in (16) at the vertices $A^{(i)}, B^{(i)}, \forall i = 1, \dots, L$, an extension of the result in Theorem 2 is obtained for the case where θ is uncertain. The following corollary presents a sufficient condition for the Schur stability of the matrix $M(\theta, K)$, $\forall \theta \in \mathbf{E}^L$.

Corollary 1. Assume there exists $\mathbf{X}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{S}_+^{n^2}$, with $i = 1, \dots, L$, $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $\mathbf{N}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{3n^2 \times 2n^2}$ such that the following holds for all $i = 1, \dots, L$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}^{(i)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{X}^{(i)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \prec \{N^{(i)}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T})\mathbf{N}_0^T\}^{\mathcal{S}} \quad (17)$$

where $N^{(i)}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}) =$

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} -\mathbf{S} \otimes I_n & 0 \\ C_p^A(\mathbf{S} \otimes I_n) & I_n \otimes (A^{(i)}\mathbf{S} + B^{(i)}\mathbf{T}) \\ (A^{(i)}\mathbf{S} + B^{(i)}\mathbf{T}) \otimes I_n & -I_n \otimes \mathbf{S} \end{array} \right)$$

then $K = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{S}^{-1}$ is such that $M(\theta, K)$ is robustly Schur stable $\forall \theta \in \mathbf{E}^L$.

The proof is classical in the S-variable approach and amounts to notice that the inequalities (17) are affine in the matrices defining vertices of the polytope, hence by convexity of both the polytopes and the matrix inequalities, the conditions hold for all uncertainties.

5.3 Links with Mean-Square Stability (MSS)

Considering system (5) without additive noise ($w_k = 0$), one can easily notice the link between the second-order moment of the state $\mathbb{E}[\|x_k\|^2]$ and the error covariance $\text{cov}(e_k)$ since:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x_k\|^2] &= \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(x_k x_k^T)] = \text{tr}(\mathbb{E}[x_k x_k^T]) \\ &= \text{tr}(\text{cov}(x_k)) + \text{tr}(\mathbb{E}[x_k] \mathbb{E}[x_k]^T). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Furthermore, since both $\text{cov}(x_k)$ and $\mathbb{E}[x_k] \mathbb{E}[x_k]^T$ are positive semi-definite matrices, stabilizing the second-order moment ensures the stability of both the covariance

and the expectation term $\mathbb{E}[x_k] \mathbb{E}[x_k]^T$. Moreover, one can notice that $\text{cov}(x_k) = \text{cov}(e_k)$ since by definition:

$$\text{cov}(x_k) = \mathbb{E} \left[(x_k - \mathbb{E}[x_k]) (x_k - \mathbb{E}[x_k])^T \right],$$

by replacing $x_k = e_k + z_k$ and $\mathbb{E}[x_k] = z_k$, and since $\mathbb{E}[e_k] = 0$, it follows directly that $\text{cov}(x_k) = \text{cov}(e_k)$.

Therefore, condition (9) ensures the stability of the error covariance dynamics. Even though the equivalence between the Schur stability of the matrix M and condition (9) is yet to be assessed, it is clear that both conditions imply the stability of the error covariance dynamics.

5.4 Comments on the state dimension

Note that, since the covariance matrix is symmetric, the vectorized representation in (14) contains $n(n-1)/2$ redundant elements. A more compact formulation could be obtained by employing the half-vectorization operator, which removes these redundant entries and reduces the dimension of the covariance dynamics. However, this alternative representation is not convenient for deriving the subsequent stability conditions, and is therefore omitted here. A detailed treatment of this reformulation is left for future work.

6. NUMERICAL RESULTS

This section presents different numerical comparisons and illustrations, mainly to assess the computational complexity and the conservatism of the derived conditions.

6.1 Computational complexity comparison

We suggest to compare the computational complexity of the conditions in (16) and (9). Since the asymptotic stability notion is only related to systems without additive noise, we consider systems with $w_k = 0$. Furthermore, in order to compare (16) to (9), we consider that only $\tilde{A}(\xi_k)$ is stochastic and the input matrix is deterministic. Note that in this case, the size of condition (9) is further reduced using the singular value decomposition.

The following setting has been considered:

- Random nominal matrices A of size n were generated such that both conditions were feasible and $B = I_n$.
- The entries of $\tilde{A}(\xi_k)$ are assumed to follow normal distributions $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.05)$.
- The average computation time was evaluated using 100 tests, considering only the solver execution step.

Fig. 1 presents the average computation time for conditions (16) and (9). The reported time corresponds only to the solver execution phase and does not include the decomposition step required for condition (9). It can be observed that condition (16), whose size is $3n^2$, has a lower computational time compared to condition (9) with dimension reduction. Moreover, the difference in computation time increases with the increase of n .

6.2 Conservatism assessment

In order to evaluate the conservatism of the derived sufficient condition with respect to the necessary and




Fig. 1. Average computation time over 100 tests

	Condition (16)		Condition (9)	
	σ_{max}^2	K	σ_{max}^2	K
Γ_1	—	—	0.09	$\begin{pmatrix} -4.6594 & -1.6551 \end{pmatrix}$
Γ_2	0.09	$\begin{pmatrix} -0.7888 & -0.2967 \end{pmatrix}$	0.16	$\begin{pmatrix} -1.0372 & -0.7751 \end{pmatrix}$
Γ_3	0.16	$\begin{pmatrix} -0.9040 & -0.3095 \end{pmatrix}$	0.2	$\begin{pmatrix} -1.0093 & -0.5969 \end{pmatrix}$

Table 1. Comparison of conditions (16) and (9) with size reduction

sufficient one, let us consider systems as defined in (6), where the entries of $\tilde{A}(\xi_k)$ follow the normal distribution defined as $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ and $\tilde{B}(\xi_k)$ is considered deterministic that we denote $B = (1, 0)^T$ for simplicity. For each setting, the variance is increased until the conditions are no more feasible, then, this maximal variance is denoted σ_{max}^2 .

Consider the following settings for system (6) with a deterministic input matrix $B = (1, 0)^T$:

$$\Gamma_1 : A = \begin{pmatrix} 3.5 & 0.2 \\ 1.2 & 1.5 \end{pmatrix}, \text{mspec}(A) = \{3.6136, 1.3864\}.$$

$$\Gamma_2 : A = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.1 \\ 0.2 & 0.95 \end{pmatrix}, \text{mspec}(A) = \{0.7814, 1.0686\}.$$

$$\Gamma_3 : A = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.1 \\ 0.2 & 0.9 \end{pmatrix}, \text{mspec}(A) = \{1.0414, 0.7586\}.$$

Table 1 shows the maximal variance σ_{max}^2 for which the conditions in (16) and (9) are feasible, for different systems; in addition to the calculated pre-stabilizing gains K . The boxes with the sign — correspond to cases where the problem was not feasible, even for very low variances. The presented results highlight the fact that the maximal variances for which the condition in (16) remains feasible are lower than those related to condition (9). This difference in the maximal variances seems to increase with the instability of the nominal dynamics, measured by the deviation of the eigenvalues of A from the unit circle. This highlights the fact that the conservatism of the sufficient conditions in (16) depends on the system under study.

6.3 Effects of the choice of A_0 and C_0

In order to assess the effect of the choice of the auxiliary matrices A_0 and C_0 on the conservatism of the condition in (16), we consider the setting denoted as Γ_3 . We choose

$A_0 = A + BK$ with $K = (-1.0093 \quad -0.5969)$ resulting from the necessary and sufficient condition (9), and $C_0 = C_p^A$. With this choice of A_0 and C_0 , the LMI in (16) is feasible up to a variance of 0.2 and the computed gain $K = (-1.0091 \quad -0.5982)$ is approximately the same as the one computed with condition (9). This example is presented only to illustrate that, depending on the choice of the auxiliary matrices, the proposed sufficient condition can closely approximate the solution obtained from the necessary and sufficient one. Of course, it would be meaningless to assume a perfect choice of A_0 and C_0 in practice, but this motivates the use of heuristic approaches to this end.

6.4 The polytopic case

Consider system (1) with the following setting:

$$A^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.2 \\ 0.1 & 0.8 \end{pmatrix}, A^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.6 & 0.2 \\ 0.1 & 0.9 \end{pmatrix}, A^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.2 \\ 0.1 & 0.9 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.6 & 0.2 \\ 0.1 & 0.8 \end{pmatrix}, B^{(1,2,3,4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The entries of $\bar{A}(\xi_k)$ are assumed to follow a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.15)$. We consider A_0 and C_0 as zeros matrices and we solve the LMI conditions in (17), the resulting feedback gain is $K = (-0.7783 \quad -0.2162)$, and the average computational time over 100 solver executions is approximately 0.04 s.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper presented control design conditions for covariance dynamics related to a class of stochastic systems, based on the S-variable approach. The derived conditions turns out to be numerically more tractable than existing necessary and sufficient ones, thanks to their reduced dimension. Future work will focus on extending the class of considered stochastic systems, for instance to include systems with stochastic uncertainties in the input matrix, as well as relaxing the i.i.d. assumption. Other possible directions include, first, comparing the tractability of the proposed conditions with those involving random polytopes, and second, accounting for deterministic uncertainties in the second-order moments of the parameters contained in the matrix C_p^A .

NUMERICAL SETUP

All computations were performed on a MacBook Pro equipped with an Apple M4 Max chip (16-core CPU, 40-core GPU) and 64 GB of unified memory. The codes were implemented in MATLAB and the LMI conditions were solved using YALMIP Lofberg (2004) and the SDPT3 solver Tütüncü et al. (2003).

REFERENCES

Arcari, E., Iannelli, A., Carron, A., and Zeilinger, M.N. (2023). Stochastic MPC with robustness to bounded parametric uncertainty. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(12), 7601–7615.

Calafiore, G.C. and Fagiano, L. (2012). Robust model predictive control via scenario optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(1), 219–224.

Cannon, M., Kouvaritakis, B., Raković, S.V., and Cheng, Q. (2011). Stochastic tubes in model predictive control with probabilistic constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(1), 194–200.

Del Vecchio, D., Qian, Y., Murray, R.M., and Sontag, E.D. (2018). Future systems and control research in synthetic biology. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 45, 5–17.

Ebihara, Y., Peaucelle, D., and Arzelier, D. (2015). *S-variable approach to LMI-based robust control*, volume 5. Springer.

Fiacchini, M. and Alamo, T. (2021). Probabilistic reachable and invariant sets for linear systems with correlated disturbance. *Automatica*, 132, 109808.

Hewing, L. and Zeilinger, M.N. (2018). Stochastic model predictive control for linear systems using probabilistic reachable sets. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 5182–5188. IEEE.

Hosoe, Y. and Hagiwara, T. (2019). Equivalent Stability Notions, Lyapunov Inequality, and Its Application in Discrete-Time Linear Systems With Stochastic Dynamics Determined by an i.i.d. Process. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 64(11), 4764–4771.

Hosoe, Y., Hagiwara, T., and Peaucelle, D. (2018). Robust stability analysis and state feedback synthesis for discrete-time systems characterized by random polytopes. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(2), 556–562.

Hosoe, Y. and Peaucelle, D. (2019). Static output feedback stabilization of discrete-time linear systems with stochastic dynamics determined by an independent identically distributed process. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 3(3), 673–678.

Hosoe, Y., Peaucelle, D., and Hagiwara, T. (2020). Linearization of expectation-based inequality conditions in control for discrete-time linear systems represented with random polytopes. *Automatica*, 122, 109228.

Kofman, E., De Doná, J.A., and Seron, M.M. (2012). Probabilistic set invariance and ultimate boundedness. *Automatica*, 48(10), 2670–2676.

Kozin, F. (1969). A survey of stability of stochastic systems. *Automatica*, 5(1), 95–112.

Langson, W., Chrysoschoos, I., Raković, S.V., and Mayne, D.Q. (2004). Robust model predictive control using tubes. *Automatica*, 40(1), 125–133.

Lofberg, J. (2004). YALMIP : a toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB. In *2004 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (IEEE Cat. No.04CH37508)*, 284–289.

Lorenzen, M., Cannon, M., and Allgöwer, F. (2019). Robust MPC with recursive model update. *Automatica*, 103, 461–471.

Lorenzen, M., Dabbene, F., Tempo, R., and Allgöwer, F. (2016). Constraint-tightening and stability in stochastic model predictive control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(7), 3165–3177.

Mesbah, A. (2016). Stochastic model predictive control: An overview and perspectives for future research. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 36(6), 30–44.

Moussa, K. and Fiacchini, M. (2025). Exact covariance characterization for controlled linear systems subject to stochastic parametric and additive uncertainties. *arXiv*. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.03944>.

Tütüncü, R.H., Toh, K.C., and Todd, M.J. (2003). Solving semidefinite-quadratic-linear programs using SDPT3. *Mathematical programming*, 95, 189–217.