

STOCHASTIC PASSIVITY IN STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS: A PORT-HAMILTONIAN PERSPECTIVE

JULIA ACKERMANN, THOMAS KRUSE, AND STEFAN TAPPE

ABSTRACT. We extend deterministic port-Hamiltonian systems (PHS) to a stochastic framework by means of stochastic differential equations. As the dissipation inequality plays a crucial role for deterministic PHS, we develop several passivity concepts for stochastic input-state-output systems and characterize these in terms of the parameters of the system. Afterwards, we examine properties of a certain class of linear stochastic systems that can be regarded as an extension of linear deterministic PHS to a stochastic passivity framework.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Stochastic input-state-output systems	4
3. Results about passivity and the passive local supermartingale property	6
4. Results about the passive supermartingale property	9
5. Further results about the passive supermartingale property	11
6. Uncontrolled stochastic differential equations	16
7. Stochastic linear time-invariant input-state-output systems	17
8. Stochastic passivity results for linear time-invariant systems	20
9. Linear stochastic port-Hamiltonian systems	26
Appendix A. Semimartingale theory	32
Appendix B. An existence result for SDEs	35
Acknowledgments	36
References	36

1. INTRODUCTION

Port-Hamiltonian systems (PHS) are widely used for the modeling and the control of complex physical systems with energy-storing and energy-dissipating elements. By now, there is a substantial literature about deterministic PHS, and a growing interest in stochastic extensions of PHS. For an introduction to deterministic PHS we refer to, for instance, the survey [45] and the textbooks [46], [24], and [47, Section 6]. In this article we focus on finite-dimensional PHS in an input-state-output formulation. More specifically, the deterministic literature frequently considers PHS to be $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$ -valued input-state-output systems of the form

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= b(x(t), u(t)) \\ y(t) &= f(x(t), u(t)) \\ x(0) &= x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ u &\in \mathcal{A} \end{cases}$$

with certain structural properties. Note that in (1.1), $b : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are appropriate mappings and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{u \mid u : \mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\}$ is a suitable set of controls. In (1.1) we call $x(t)$ the *state vector*, $u(t)$ the *input vector* and $y(t)$ the *output vector* at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Additionally, we also consider a function $H : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is called the *storage function* or *Hamiltonian*. It represents the energy of the system (1.1) and is typically a nonnegative function.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60H10, 60G17, 93E03.

Key words and phrases. Port-Hamiltonian system, stochastic differential equation, passivity property, local supermartingale, linear system.

A basic property of any PHS is that its *energy balance* leads to the *dissipation inequality*

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{d}{dt}H(x(t)) \leq \langle u(t), y(t) \rangle \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

(see, e.g., [46, Section 2.6.1] or [47, Section 6.1]). Note that this inequality is satisfied if and only if the function

$$(1.3) \quad z : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad z(t) := H(x(t)) - \int_0^t \langle u(s), y(s) \rangle ds$$

is decreasing. The inequality (1.2) states that the change of the system's internal energy $\frac{d}{dt}H(x(t))$ is always smaller than or equal to the external energy $\langle u(t), y(t) \rangle$ supplied to the system. This property is also known as the *passivity property* of the system.

Of course, the passivity property (1.2) is not satisfied for every input-state-output system of the form (1.1). It rather requires conditions on the parameters (b, f, H) . In the particular situation of deterministic linear systems, this problem has thoroughly been investigated in the literature (see, e.g., [48]) and it is well-established that, under a minimality assumption, such a system is passive if and only if it possesses a port-Hamiltonian structure (see, e.g., [5, Corollary 4]).

From a practical perspective, it is desirable to take into account random perturbations of the system (1.1). We therefore consider $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$ -valued input-state-output systems

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t &= b(X_t, u_t)dt + \sigma(X_t, u_t)dW_t \\ Y_t &= f(X_t, u_t) \\ X_0 &= x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ u &\in \mathcal{A} \end{cases}$$

driven by an \mathbb{R}^k -valued Wiener process W . In (1.4) we have an additional diffusion coefficient $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, and now the set of controls \mathcal{A} is a suitable set of stochastic processes. The purpose of this paper is to rigorously examine passivity properties of the stochastic system (1.4) and thereby extend PHS to a stochastic framework, in particular leading to a class of stochastic PHS that are automatically passive in a suitable sense.

Stochastic variants of finite-dimensional PHS have been investigated before in, for example, [8], [11], [12], [13], [18], [22], [36], [37], [38] with applications in, for instance, teleoperation ([9], [10]), statistical physics ([15], [30]), or traffic flow modeling ([1], [17], [35]). Most of these references consider stochastic variants of PHS in an input-state-output form that specializes (1.4), whereas [11] takes a geometric approach and [13] studies discrete versions of the stochastic PHS of [11]. The recent article [16] builds on the geometric approach of [11] and proposes a framework that combines PHS with neural networks.

One of the early works on stochastic variants of PHS is [37], where under suitable assumptions stochastic generalized canonical transformations are employed to transform the system to a passive one and to subsequently perform stabilization by output feedback. In [36] an external disturbance term is added and stochastic input-to-output stability of the system is investigated by similar methods. A method for bounded stabilization that does not require the noise to vanish at the origin is studied in [38]. One of the few papers where the input, in addition, appears in the noise term and in the output is [18]; with techniques similar to [37], stabilization results are derived. In [22], a stochastic energy-shaping approach is developed to obtain stabilization results for stochastic variants of PHS. The works [8] and [12] consider stochastic variants of PHS and adopt a weak passivity notion suitable for weak stabilization involving invariant measures (see also [19]). More broadly, there is literature on dissipative stochastic systems that does not specifically deal with PHS. For example, let us mention [29] and their characterization results of what we will call the passive supermartingale property by the infinitesimal generator.

In the sequel, we will introduce the reader to the passivity notions that we consider in this article. Let us recall that the passivity property in the deterministic setting just means that the function z defined in (1.3) is decreasing. Therefore, for a fixed starting point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a fixed control $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we introduce the stochastic process $Z := Z^{(x_0, u)}$ as

$$Z_t := H(X_t) - \int_0^t \langle u_s, Y_s \rangle ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Then we can distinguish the following notions of passivity: i) We can demand that every sample path of Z is decreasing. In this case we say that the system (1.4) is *passive*, or ii) we can relax this condition and merely demand that the expectation decreases; that is $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}[Z_t]$ is a decreasing function. In this case we

say that the system (1.4) is *stochastically passive*. Our goal is to provide necessary and sufficient conditions for these two passivity concepts by means of the parameters (b, σ, f, H) of the system (1.4). For the passivity of the system (1.4) we will provide such a characterization in Theorem 3.9. The characterization of stochastic passivity is more involved, and for this purpose it will be useful to consider further notions of passivity:

- Instead of stochastic passivity, we can demand the slightly stronger property that Z is a supermartingale. In this case we say that the system (1.4) has the *passive supermartingale property*.
- It will be useful to relax this property a bit and to demand that Z is only a local supermartingale. Then we say that the system (1.4) has the *passive local supermartingale property*. The advantage of this concept is that local supermartingales can be characterized in terms of special semimartingales; see Proposition A.8, which may be regarded as a local version of the Doob–Meyer decomposition theorem.

As we will see, the passive local supermartingale property can indeed be characterized by means of the parameters (b, σ, f, H) of the system (1.4); see Theorem 3.13. Moreover, in many situations the passive local supermartingale property even implies the passive supermartingale property, which in turn implies stochastic passivity; see Propositions 4.1, 4.3 and Theorems 5.8, 5.9. A brief, simplified overview of the relations between our passivity notions is given in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. The diagram illustrates the relationship between the different passivity notions for the system (1.4) that we consider in this work. Note that $\mathcal{L}H$ and Σ are defined in (3.1) and (3.2), respectively.

Note that for deterministic homogeneous linear time-invariant systems, the dissipation inequality (1.2) is linked to a certain linear matrix inequality (see, e.g., [48, Theorem 3]). This provides the possibility to check passivity, which is a property of the state trajectories, by an algebraic condition. We thus further investigate our passivity concepts in the case of a stochastic linear system of the form

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t &= (AX_t + Bu_t)dt + \sum_{j=1}^k (\mathfrak{A}(j)X_t + \mathfrak{B}(j)u_t)dW_t^j \\ Y_t &= CX_t + Du_t \\ X_0 &= x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ u &\in \mathcal{A} \end{cases}$$

with matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathfrak{A}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $\mathfrak{B}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. Under suitable assumptions on the set of controls \mathcal{A} , we obtain in Theorem 8.3 for the system (1.5) with the quadratic Hamiltonian $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a symmetric matrix, that

negative semidefiniteness of the matrix \mathfrak{M}_Q defined in (7.4), the passive local supermartingale property, the passive supermartingale property, and stochastic passivity are equivalent. In contrast, the characterization of the passivity of the system (1.5) involves a further algebraic condition, see Theorem 7.10.

To extend linear deterministic PHS to stochastic ones, we propose a definition that preserves the structure of linear deterministic PHS and also ensures that the linear matrix inequality $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$ is satisfied, see Definition 9.1 and Lemma 9.2. In particular, this guarantees that stochastic PHS are stochastically passive (see also Corollary 9.4). Generalizing results from the deterministic literature (see, e.g., [46, Theorem 2.3]), we moreover in Lemma 9.5 provide an algebraic condition that assures that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$ implies that the stochastic linear system (1.5) is a stochastic PHS. Note that already in the deterministic case, without such an additional assumption this implication can be false (see, e.g., [7, Example 2]). To summarize, under the algebraic condition of Lemma 9.5 and suitable assumptions on the set of controls \mathcal{A} , we obtain that the stochastic linear system (1.5) with the quadratic Hamiltonian $H(x) = \frac{1}{2}\langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a positive semidefinite matrix, is a stochastic PHS if and only if it is stochastically passive. In Corollary 9.8 we replace the assumption of a quadratic Hamiltonian and the algebraic condition of Lemma 9.5 by the assumption that the stochastic linear system (1.5) is observable (see Definition 8.7).

A further central property of deterministic PHS is the fact that any energy-conserving interconnection of two such systems again results in a PHS. We verify in Proposition 9.12 that this stability-under-interconnection property also holds for the linear stochastic PHS introduced above. Moreover, we extend simple mechanical and electrical examples to the stochastic setting.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide the stochastic framework and introduce the required concepts. In Section 3 we present results which characterize the passivity and the passive local supermartingale property. In Section 4 we present results about the passive supermartingale property; more precisely, we provide conditions which ensure that the passive local supermartingale property implies the passive supermartingale property. In Section 5 we present further results about the passive supermartingale property; this comes along with an existence and uniqueness result for strong solutions as well as moment estimates. In Section 6 we apply our findings to the particular situation of uncontrolled SDEs. Afterwards, we focus on the linear case. Namely, in Section 7 we use the results from previous sections to obtain some basic results for stochastic, linear, time-invariant input-state-output systems (SLTIS). In Section 8 we examine observability and stochastic passivity of such systems. In Section 9 we introduce and characterize linear stochastic PHS. For convenience of the reader, in Appendix A we provide the required results about semimartingales, including a local version of the Doob–Meyer decomposition theorem, and in Appendix B we provide an existence result for SDEs.

2. STOCHASTIC INPUT-STATE-OUTPUT SYSTEMS

In this section we introduce the stochastic input-state-output system and the relevant concepts. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions. We consider the following $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n$ -valued input-state-output system

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t &= b(X_t, u_t)dt + \sigma(X_t, u_t)dW_t \\ Y_t &= f(X_t, u_t) \\ X_0 &= x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ u &\in \mathcal{A} \end{cases}$$

driven by an \mathbb{R}^k -valued Wiener process W , where the set \mathcal{A} of control processes is a set of \mathbb{R}^n -valued progressively measurable processes. Furthermore, in (2.1) we have measurable mappings $b : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. For each $j = 1, \dots, k$ the mapping $\sigma^j : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the j -th column given by

$$\sigma^j(x, v) := \sigma(x, v)_{\bullet j} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We also fix a measurable mapping $H : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the so-called storage function.

2.1. Remark. *We agree on the following notation:*

(1) For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote by

$$\|x\| := \left(\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

the Euclidean norm of x .

(2) For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ we denote by

$$\|A\| := \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^k |A_{ij}|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

the Frobenius norm of A .

2.2. Definition. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary. We call an adapted continuous process $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ a strong solution to the system (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u if we have \mathbb{P} -almost surely

$$\int_0^t (\|b(X_s, u_s)\| + \|\sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2) ds < \infty \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty)$$

as well as

$$X_t = x_0 + \int_0^t b(X_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

2.3. Remark. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary, and let X be a strong solution to the system (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u . As indicated in (2.1), in this case we define the \mathbb{R}^n -valued process $Y = (Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ as $Y_t := f(X_t, u_t)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and we will also call $(X, Y) = (X^{(x_0, u)}, Y^{(x_0, u)})$ a strong solution to the system (2.1).

2.4. Definition. We say that strong uniqueness for the system (2.1) holds true if for each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, each $u \in \mathcal{A}$, and any two strong solutions X^1 and X^2 to the system (2.1) with $X_0^1 = X_0^2 = x_0$ and control u we have $X^1 = X^2$ up to indistinguishability.

2.5. Definition. We say that existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) holds true if the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (1) For each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and each $u \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a strong solution to the system (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u .
- (2) Strong uniqueness for the system (2.1) holds true.

In what follows, we assume that the following assumption is fulfilled.

2.6. Assumption. We suppose that existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) holds true.

In Section 5 we will provide sufficient conditions which ensure that Assumption 2.6 is satisfied.

2.7. Assumption. We suppose that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and every control $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have \mathbb{P} -almost surely

$$(2.2) \quad \int_0^t |\langle u_s, f(X_s^{(x_0, u)}, u_s) \rangle| ds < \infty \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

2.8. Remark. It is easy to find sufficient conditions such that Assumption 2.7 is fulfilled. Indeed, suppose, for example, that the mapping f is continuous and that each control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$ is continuous. Then the integrability condition (2.2) is satisfied, because for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ the solution $X^{(x_0, u)}$ is continuous.

For $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we introduce the process $Z^{(x_0, u)}$ as

$$(2.3) \quad Z_t^{(x_0, u)} := H(X_t^{(x_0, u)}) - \int_0^t \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x_0, u)} \rangle ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

For the next definition, recall that \mathcal{V}^- denotes the convex cone of all càdlàg, adapted and decreasing processes A with $A_0 = 0$.

2.9. Definition. We say that the system (2.1) is passive with respect to the storage function H if for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $Z - Z_0 \in \mathcal{V}^-$, where $Z := Z^{(x_0, u)}$.

2.10. Definition. We say that the system (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to the storage function H if for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $Z_t^{(x_0, u)} \in L^1$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and the mapping $\mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}[Z_t^{(x_0, u)}]$ is decreasing.

2.11. Definition. We say that the system (2.1) has the passive supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H if for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ the process $Z^{(x_0, u)}$ is a supermartingale.

2.12. Definition. We say that the system (2.1) has the passive local supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H if for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ the process $Z^{(x_0, u)}$ is a local supermartingale.

2.13. Remark. Note the following relations between these passivity concepts:

- (1) If the system (2.1) is passive, then it has the passive local supermartingale property. This is an immediate consequence of Proposition A.8.
- (2) If the system (2.1) is passive, and for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $Z_t^{(x_0, u)} \in L^1$ for each $t \geq 0$, then the system (2.1) has the passive supermartingale property.
- (3) If the system (2.1) has the passive supermartingale property, then it is stochastically passive and has the passive local supermartingale property.

3. RESULTS ABOUT PASSIVITY AND THE PASSIVE LOCAL SUPERMARTINGALE PROPERTY

In this section we present results about passivity and the passive local supermartingale property. We will make the following additional assumption.

3.1. Assumption. We assume that the storage function H is of class C^2 .

3.2. Definition. We define $\mathcal{L}H : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{L}H(x, v) := \langle \nabla H(x), b(x, v) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma(x, v) \sigma(x, v)^\top D^2 H(x)) - \langle v, f(x, v) \rangle.$$

Furthermore, we define $\Sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ as

$$(3.2) \quad \Sigma(x, v) := \nabla H(x)^\top \cdot \sigma(x, v).$$

The following auxiliary result is an immediate consequence of Itô's formula.

3.3. Lemma. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary. Then we have

$$Z_t^{(x_0, u)} = H(x_0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, the following auxiliary result will be useful.

3.4. Lemma. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally integrable function which is continuous in zero. We define $\phi : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\phi(t) := \int_0^t \varphi(s) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Then the following statements are true:

- (1) If $\phi(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, then we have $\varphi(0) = 0$.
- (2) If ϕ is decreasing, then we have $\varphi(0) \leq 0$.

Proof. (1) Suppose that $\varphi(0) \neq 0$. Without loss of continuity, we assume that $\varphi(0) > 0$. Set $c := \frac{\varphi(0)}{2} > 0$. By the continuity of φ in zero there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi(t) \geq c$ for all $t \in [0, \delta]$. Hence we arrive at the contradiction $\Phi(\delta) \geq c\delta > 0$.

(2) Suppose that $\varphi(0) > 0$. Set $c := \frac{\varphi(0)}{2} > 0$. By the continuity of φ in zero there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi(t) \geq c$ for all $t \in [0, \delta]$. Hence we deduce $\Phi(\delta) \geq c\delta > 0 = \Phi(0)$, contradicting the assumption that Φ is decreasing. \square

From now on, let us also make the following assumptions.

3.5. Assumption. The mappings b and σ are continuous.

3.6. Assumption. The mapping f is continuous.

3.7. Remark. Due to Assumptions 3.1, 3.5 and 3.6, the mappings $\mathcal{L}H$ and Σ given by (3.1) and (3.2) are also continuous.

3.8. Assumption. For each $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists a control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$ with $u_0 = v$ that is continuous at zero.

3.9. Theorem. Suppose that Assumptions 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.5, 3.6 and 3.8 are fulfilled. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The system (2.1) is passive with respect to the storage function H .
- (ii) We have

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{L}H(x, v) \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$(3.4) \quad \Sigma(x, v) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. (ii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary, and denote by $(X, Y) = (X^{(x_0, u)}, Y^{(x_0, u)})$ the solution to the system (2.1). Furthermore, we set $Z := Z^{(x_0, u)}$. Taking into account (3.4), by Lemma 3.3 we have

$$Z_t = H(x_0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Therefore, by condition (3.3) we have $Z - Z_0 \in \mathcal{V}^-$.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary. By Assumption 3.8 there exists a control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$ with $u_0 = v$ that is continuous at zero. We denote by $(X, Y) = (X^{(x_0, u)}, Y^{(x_0, u)})$ the solution to the system (2.1), and set $Z := Z^{(x_0, u)}$. By Lemma 3.3 we have

$$Z_t = H(x_0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Hence Z is a special semimartingale with canonical decomposition $Z = Z_0 + M + A$, where $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}^0$ and the predictable process $A \in \mathcal{V}$ are given by

$$M_t = \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0,$$

$$A_t = \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, we have $Z = Z_0 + (Z - Z_0)$ with $Z - Z_0 \in \mathcal{V}^-$. By the uniqueness of the canonical decomposition of Z (see Proposition A.3) we deduce that $M = 0$ and $A = Z - Z_0$. Moreover, we have $\langle M, M \rangle = 0$ and

$$\langle M, M \rangle_t = \int_0^t \|\Sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2 ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

By the continuity of Σ (see Remark 3.7) the sample paths of $s \mapsto \Sigma(X_s, u_s)$ are continuous in zero, and hence by Lemma 3.4 we deduce that $\Sigma(x_0, v) = 0$.

Furthermore, recall that $A \in \mathcal{V}^-$. By the continuity of $\mathcal{L}H$ (see Remark 3.7), the sample paths of $s \mapsto \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s)$ are continuous at zero, and hence, by Lemma 3.4 we deduce that $\mathcal{L}H(x_0, v) \leq 0$. Since $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ were arbitrary, we arrive at (3.3) and (3.4). \square

In view of the upcoming results let us agree on the following notation. If $\sigma(\cdot, u) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ is differentiable for some $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then for any $j = 1, \dots, k$ the derivative of the mapping $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $x \mapsto \sigma^j(x, u)$ is called the partial derivative of σ^j at u , and is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $x \mapsto D_x \sigma^j(x, u)$.

3.10. Lemma. Suppose that $\sigma(\cdot, u) \in C^1$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and that (3.4) is fulfilled. Then we have

$$\text{tr}(\sigma(x, u) \sigma(x, u)^\top D^2 H(x)) = - \left\langle \nabla H, \sum_{j=1}^k (D_x \sigma^j)(x, u) \sigma^j(x, u) \right\rangle.$$

In particular, condition (3.3) is fulfilled if and only if

$$(3.5) \quad \left\langle \nabla H(x), b(x, u) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k (D_x \sigma^j)(x, u) \sigma^j(x, u) \right\rangle - \langle u, f(x, u) \rangle \leq 0.$$

Proof. Note that (3.4) implies for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ that

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \langle \nabla H, \sigma^j \rangle = \sum_{l=1}^d \left((D^2 H)_{li} \sigma_{lj} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_l} \frac{\partial \sigma_{lj}}{\partial x_i} \right).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top D^2 H) &= \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{l=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{ij} \sigma_{lj} (D^2 H)_{li} = - \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{l=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{ij} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_l} \frac{\partial \sigma_{lj}}{\partial x_i} \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{l=1}^d \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_l} \sum_{i=1}^d (D_x \sigma^j)_{li} \sigma_{ij} = - \left\langle \nabla H, \sum_{j=1}^k D_x \sigma^j \cdot \sigma^j \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

3.11. Proposition. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.5, 3.6 and 3.8 are fulfilled, and that $\sigma(\cdot, u) \in C^1$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The system (2.1) is passive with respect to the storage function H .*
- (ii) *We have (3.4) and*

$$\left\langle \nabla H(x), b(x, v) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k (D_x \sigma^j)(x, v) \sigma^j(x, v) \right\rangle - \langle v, f(x, v) \rangle \leq 0$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.9 and Lemma 3.10. \square

3.12. Remark. *Note that the term $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k (D_x \sigma^j) \sigma^j$ in Lemma 3.10 represents the so-called Stratonovich correction term. Its presence is expected, since under the assumption that $\sigma(\cdot, u) \in C^1$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we could have transformed (2.1) into Stratonovich form. Then by applying the Stratonovich chain rule instead of Itô's formula in the proof of Theorem 3.9, we would have directly arrived at (3.5).*

3.13. Theorem. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.5, 3.6 and 3.8 are fulfilled. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The system (2.1) has the passive local supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .*
- (ii) *We have (3.3).*

Proof. (ii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary, and denote by $(X, Y) = (X^{(x_0, u)}, Y^{(x_0, u)})$ the solution to the system (2.1), and set $Z := Z^{(x_0, u)}$. By Lemma 3.3 we have

$$Z_t = H(x_0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Therefore Z is a special semimartingale with canonical decomposition $Z = Z_0 + M + A$, where $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}^0$ and the predictable process $A \in \mathcal{V}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_t &= \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds, \quad t \geq 0, \\ M_t &= \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.3) we have $A \in \mathcal{V}^-$. Therefore, by Proposition A.8 we infer that Z is a local supermartingale.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary. By Assumption 3.8 there exists a control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$ with $u_0 = v$ that is continuous at zero. We denote by $(X, Y) = (X^{(x_0, u)}, Y^{(x_0, u)})$ the solution to the system (2.1), and set $Z := Z^{(x_0, u)}$. By Lemma 3.3 we have

$$Z_t = H(x_0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Hence Z is a special semimartingale with canonical decomposition $Z = Z_0 + M + A$, where $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}^0$ and the predictable process $A \in \mathcal{V}$ are given by

$$M_t = \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0,$$

$$A_t = \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Since Z is a local supermartingale, by Proposition A.8 and the uniqueness of the canonical decomposition of Z (see Proposition A.3) we deduce that $A \in \mathcal{V}^-$. By the continuity of $\mathcal{L}H$ (see Remark 3.7), the sample paths of $s \mapsto \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s)$ are continuous in zero, and hence by Lemma 3.4 we deduce that $\mathcal{L}H(x_0, v) \leq 0$. Since $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ were arbitrary, we arrive at (3.3). \square

3.14. Remark. As a consequence of Theorems 3.9 and 3.13, we see that passivity of the system (2.1) implies the local supermartingale property. This confirms the first statement made in Remark 2.13.

3.15. Remark. Sometimes in the literature the condition (3.3) is used to define stochastic passivity notions. For example, in [20, Definition 4.1] (see also [21, Definition 3.1]) a system is called passive if there exists a positive definite (i.e., $H(0) = 0$ and $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}: H(x) > 0$) storage function H (or Lyapunov function) of class C^2 satisfying (3.3). This definition is particularly suitable for examining stability properties of the system. In particular, in this situation the solution 0 of the uncontrolled stochastic differential equation (6.1) is stable in probability (see, e.g., [28, Theorem 5.3], cf. also [21, Remark 3.3]). Moreover, under the sufficient conditions given in [21, Theorem 3.4] or [21, Theorem 4.5], the system (2.1) is globally asymptotically stabilizable in probability by an output feedback control or by a state feedback control, respectively. For more details on stability and stabilization of possibly nonlinear systems we refer to, for instance, [20, 21, 28]. The linear case and stabilization in mean-square are discussed in Remark 9.10 below.

4. RESULTS ABOUT THE PASSIVE SUPERMARTINGALE PROPERTY

So far, we have derived necessary and sufficient conditions for passivity and for the passive local supermartingale property of the system (2.1). Now, we are interested in the question when the passive local supermartingale property implies the passive supermartingale property. Recall from Remark 2.13 that the passive supermartingale property in particular gives us that the system (2.1) is stochastically passive.

The norms in conditions (4.1)–(4.5) below are Euclidean and Frobenius norms; recall the conventions made in Remark 2.1.

4.1. Proposition. Suppose that Assumptions 2.6 and 3.1 are fulfilled. Moreover, suppose that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have

$$(4.1) \quad \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla H(X_s)\| \cdot \|b(X_s, u_s)\|] ds < \infty,$$

$$(4.2) \quad \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|\sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2 \cdot \|D^2 H(X_s)\|] ds < \infty,$$

$$(4.3) \quad \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\| \cdot \|f(X_s, u_s)\|] ds < \infty,$$

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\nabla H(X_s)\|^2 \right] < \infty,$$

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \|\sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2 ds \right] < \infty,$$

where $X = X^{(x_0, u)}$ denotes the strong solution to the system (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u . We then have the following:

(i) For all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $u \in \mathcal{A}$ and $t \geq 0$ it holds that

$$\int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds \in L^1.$$

(ii) For all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ it holds that $M = (M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined by

$$M_t = \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0,$$

is a martingale.

(iii) If the system (2.1) has the passive local supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H , then it has the passive supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .

4.2. Remark. Note that Assumption 2.7 is automatically fulfilled here, because condition (4.3) implies (2.2).

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary. By Lemma 3.3 the process $Z = Z^{(x_0, u)}$ is given by $Z = Z_0 + M + A$, where

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &= \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s, u_s) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0, \\ A_t &= \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s, u_s) ds, \quad t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary. Then we have

$$|\langle \nabla H(x), b(x, v) \rangle| \leq \|\nabla H(x)\| \cdot \|b(x, v)\|.$$

Furthermore, denoting by $\|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ the operator norm and by $\|\cdot\|_{L_1(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ the nuclear norm, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{tr}(\sigma(x, v) \sigma(x, v)^\top D^2 H(x))| &\leq \|\sigma(x, v) \sigma(x, v)^\top D^2 H(x)\|_{L_1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq \|\sigma(x, v) \sigma(x, v)^\top\|_{L_1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|D^2 H(x)\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq \|\sigma(x, v)\| \|\sigma(x, v)^\top\| \|D^2 H(x)\| \\ &= \|\sigma(x, v)\|^2 \|D^2 H(x)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have the estimate

$$|\langle v, f(x, v) \rangle| \leq \|v\| \cdot \|f(x, v)\|.$$

Therefore, recalling the definition (3.1) of $\mathcal{L}H$, by (4.1)–(4.3) we deduce that $A_t \in L^1$ for all $t \geq 0$. This proves (i). Now, we show that M is a martingale. According to Lemma A.12, a sufficient condition for this is that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ it holds

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |M_s| \right] < \infty.$$

The Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality ensures that there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |M_s| \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\langle M \rangle_t} \right].$$

Moreover, recalling the definition (3.2) of Σ , for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$\|\Sigma(x, v)\| \leq \|\nabla H(x)^\top\| \cdot \|\sigma(x, v)\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\nabla H(x)\| \cdot \|\sigma(x, v)\|.$$

This implies for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |M_s| \right] &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\int_0^t \|\Sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2 ds} \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\int_0^t \|\nabla H(X_s)\|^2 \|\sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2 ds} \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\nabla H(X_s)\| \sqrt{\int_0^t \|\sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2 ds} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and conditions (4.4), (4.5) finally prove that

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |M_s| \right] \right)^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\nabla H(X_s)\|^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \|\sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2 ds \right] < \infty$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. This establishes (ii). The result (iii) is now a consequence of Lemma A.9. \square

4.3. Proposition. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.6 and 3.1 are fulfilled, and that the system (2.1) has the passive local supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H . Moreover, suppose that H is bounded from below and that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ it holds that*

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t |\langle u_s, Y_s \rangle| ds \right] < \infty,$$

where $Y_s = f(X_s, u_s)$, $s \geq 0$ with $X = X^{(x_0, u)}$ denoting the strong solution to the system (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u . Then the system (2.1) has the passive supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .

4.4. Remark. *Note that Assumption 2.7 is automatically fulfilled here, because condition (4.7) implies (2.2).*

Proof. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary. By the definition (2.3) of the local martingale $Z = Z^{(x_0, u)}$ we have $Z = H(X) + A$, where $A \in \mathcal{V}$ is given by

$$A_t := - \int_0^t \langle u_s, Y_s \rangle ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Note that $|A| \leq B$, where $B \in \mathcal{V}^+$ is given by

$$B_t := \int_0^t |\langle u_s, Y_s \rangle| ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

By (4.7) we have $B_t \in L^1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Now, Lemma A.10 applies and gives us that Z is a supermartingale. \square

5. FURTHER RESULTS ABOUT THE PASSIVE SUPERMARTINGALE PROPERTY

In this section we present sufficient conditions for existence and uniqueness of strong solutions as well as further results concerning the passive supermartingale property and stochastic passivity of the system (2.1).

5.1. Assumption. *For each $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is a measurable mapping $L^R : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and every control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have*

$$(5.1) \quad \int_0^t |L^R(u_s(\omega))|^2 ds < \infty,$$

and for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\|, \|y\| \leq R$ we have

$$(5.2) \quad \|b(x, v) - b(y, v)\| + \|\sigma(x, v) - \sigma(y, v)\| \leq L^R(v) \|x - y\|.$$

5.2. Assumption. *There is a measurable mapping $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and every control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have*

$$(5.3) \quad \int_0^t |L(u_s(\omega))|^2 ds < \infty,$$

and for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$(5.4) \quad \|b(x, v)\| + \|\sigma(x, v)\| \leq L(v)(1 + \|x\|).$$

5.3. Proposition. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.5, 5.1 and 5.2 are fulfilled. Then Assumption 2.6 is fulfilled; that is, existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) holds true.*

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary. We define the coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{b} &: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \tilde{\sigma} &: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k} \end{aligned}$$

by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{b}(\omega, t, x) &:= b(x, u_t(\omega)), \\ \tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x) &:= \sigma(x, u_t(\omega)). \end{aligned}$$

Then for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the processes

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, & (\omega, t) &\mapsto \tilde{b}(\omega, t, x), \\ \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}, & (\omega, t) &\mapsto \tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x)\end{aligned}$$

are progressively measurable, because u is progressively measurable and b and σ are continuous. We define the nonnegative processes \tilde{L}^R , $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and \tilde{L} as

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{L}_t^R(\omega) &:= L^R(u_t(\omega)), & (\omega, t) &\in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \tilde{L}_t(\omega) &:= L(u_t(\omega)), & (\omega, t) &\in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+.\end{aligned}$$

Then \tilde{L}^R and \tilde{L} are adapted, because u is adapted and L^R and L are measurable. Let $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be arbitrary. By (5.1) for every $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have

$$\int_0^t |\tilde{L}_s^R(\omega)|^2 ds = \int_0^t |L^R(u_s(\omega))|^2 ds < \infty,$$

showing (B.2), and similarly, by (5.3) we have

$$\int_0^t |\tilde{L}_s(\omega)|^2 ds = \int_0^t |L(u_s(\omega))|^2 ds < \infty,$$

showing (B.4). Furthermore, using (5.2) for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $t, R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\|, \|y\| \leq R$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\tilde{b}(\omega, t, x) - \tilde{b}(\omega, t, y)\| + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x) - \tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, y)\| \\ &= \|b(x, u_t(\omega)) - b(y, u_t(\omega))\| + \|\sigma(x, u_t(\omega)) - \sigma(y, u_t(\omega))\| \\ &\leq L^R(u_t(\omega))\|x - y\| = \tilde{L}_t^R(\omega)\|x - y\|,\end{aligned}$$

showing (B.3). Moreover, using (5.4) for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\tilde{b}(\omega, t, x)\| + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x)\| = \|b(x, u_t(\omega))\| + \|\sigma(x, u_t(\omega))\| \\ &\leq L(u_t(\omega))(1 + \|x\|) = \tilde{L}_t(\omega)(1 + \|x\|),\end{aligned}$$

showing (B.5). Consequently, applying Theorem B.1 proves that existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) holds true. \square

We proceed with the existence of moments of the system (2.1). For this purpose, we require the following auxiliary result.

5.4. Lemma. *For each $p \in [2, \infty)$ and each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is a constant $C_{T,p} > 0$ such that for every $\mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ -valued progressively measurable process Φ , and every bounded stopping time $\tau \leq T$ such that*

$$\int_0^\tau \|\Phi_s\|^2 ds < \infty \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-almost surely}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left\| \int_0^t \Phi_s dW_s \right\|^p \right] \leq C_{T,p} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\tau \|\Phi_s\|^p ds \right].$$

Proof. For each dimension $e \in \mathbb{N}$ there are constants $m_e, M_e > 0$ such that

$$(5.5) \quad m_e \|x\|_p^p \leq \|x\|^p \leq M_e \|x\|_p^p \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^e.$$

In the following calculation, for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ and $i = 1, \dots, d$ we agree to denote by $A^i := (A^{i1}, \dots, A^{ik}) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ the i -th row of A . Then by (5.5), the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality and

Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left\| \int_0^t \Phi_s dW_s \right\|^p \right] &\leq M_d \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \int_0^t \Phi_s^i dW_s \right|^p \right] = M_d \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^t \Phi_s^{ij} dW_s^j \right|^p \right] \\ &\leq M_d c_p \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^\tau |\Phi_s^{ij}|^2 ds \right)^{p/2} \right] \leq M_d c_p T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^\tau |\Phi_s^{ij}|^p ds \right] \\ &\leq M_d c_p T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} m_{dk}^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\tau \|\Phi_s\|^p ds \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $c_p > 0$ stems from the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality. \square

5.5. Assumption. *There are a measurable mapping $\kappa_1 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a constant $\kappa_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and every control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have*

$$(5.6) \quad \int_0^t |\kappa_1(u_s(\omega))|^2 ds < \infty,$$

and for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$(5.7) \quad \|b(x, v)\| + \|\sigma(x, v)\| \leq \kappa_1(v) + \kappa_2 \|x\|.$$

5.6. Remark. *Note that Assumption 5.5 implies Assumption 5.2. To see this, we define the measurable mapping $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as $L(v) := \max\{\kappa_1(v), \kappa_2\}$. Then (5.6) implies (5.3), and (5.7) implies (5.4).*

5.7. Proposition. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.5, 5.1 and 5.5 are fulfilled. Then existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) holds true. Moreover, let $p \in [2, \infty)$ be such that*

$$(5.8) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t |\kappa_1(u_s)|^p ds \right] < \infty \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{A} \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Then for each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is a constant $C_{T,p} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$(5.9) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t\|^p \right] \leq C_{T,p} (1 + \|x_0\|^p),$$

where $X = X^{(x_0, u)}$ denotes the solution to the system (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u .

Proof. Existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) is a consequence of Remark 5.6 and Proposition 5.3. Now, let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary, and denote by X a solution to the system (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u . Furthermore, let $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be arbitrary, and let τ be an arbitrary stopping time. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|X_s^\tau\|^p &= \sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau]} \|X_s\|^p \\ &\leq 3^{p-1} \left(\|x_0\|^p + \sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau]} \left\| \int_0^s b(X_r, u_r) dr \right\|^p + \sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau]} \left\| \int_0^s \sigma(X_r, u_r) dW_r \right\|^p \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality and (5.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau]} \left\| \int_0^s b(X_r, u_r) dr \right\|^p \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau]} s^{p-1} \int_0^s \|b(X_r, u_r)\|^p dr \right] \\ &\leq T^{p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} (\kappa_1(u_r) + \kappa_2 \|X_r\|)^p dr \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.4 and (5.7) there is a constant $C_{T,p} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau]} \left\| \int_0^s \sigma(X_r, u_r) dW_r \right\|^p \right] &\leq C_{T,p} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \|\sigma(X_r, u_r)\|^p ds \right] \\ &\leq C_{T,p} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} (\kappa_1(u_r) + \kappa_2 \|X_r\|)^p dr \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} (\kappa_1(u_r) + \kappa_2 \|X_r\|)^p dr \right] \leq 2^{p-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \kappa_1(u_s)^p ds \right] + \kappa_2^p \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \|X_r\|^p dr \right] \right)$$

as well as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \|X_s\|^p ds \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|X_r\|^p ds \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|X_r^\tau\|^p ds \right] = \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|X_r^\tau\|^p \right] ds.$$

Consequently, taking into account (5.8), by the previous estimates there is a constant $K_{T,p} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for every stopping time τ we have

$$(5.10) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|X_s^\tau\|^p \right] \leq K_{T,p} \left(\|x_0\|^p + 1 + \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|X_r^\tau\|^p \right] ds \right), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Now, we define the localizing sequence of stopping times $(\tau_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as

$$\tau_n := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \|X_t\| \geq n\}.$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > \|x_0\|$ and $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be arbitrary. By (5.10) and Gronwall's lemma there is a constant $C_{T,p} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{\tau_n}\|^p \right] \leq C_{T,p} (1 + \|x_0\|^p).$$

Using Fatou's lemma we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t\|^p \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{\tau_n}\|^p \right] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{\tau_n}\|^p \right] \leq C_T (1 + \|x_0\|^p),$$

completing the proof. \square

5.8. Theorem. Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.5, 3.6, 5.1 and Assumption 5.5 with $\kappa_1(v) = K\|v\|$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for some $K > 0$ are fulfilled. Moreover, suppose there is $p \in [2, \infty)$ such that we have

$$(5.11) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \|u_s\|^p ds \right] < \infty \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{A} \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

and for some constant $C > 0$ we have

$$(5.12) \quad \|f(x, v)\| \leq C(1 + \|x\|^{p-1} + \|v\|^{p-1}) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

$$(5.13) \quad \|\nabla H(x)\| \leq C(1 + \|x\|^{p/2}), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

$$(5.14) \quad \|D^2 H(x)\| \leq C(1 + \|x\|^{p-2}), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) holds true, (4.1)–(4.5) hold true, and for each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is a constant $C_{T,p} > 0$ such that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have the moment estimate (5.9). Moreover, if in addition Assumption 3.8 is fulfilled, then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The system (2.1) has the passive local supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .
- (ii) The system (2.1) has the passive supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .
- (iii) We have (3.3).

If these equivalent conditions are fulfilled, then the system (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to the storage function H .

Proof. According to Proposition 5.7 existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) holds true, and for each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is a constant $C_{T,p} > 0$ such that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have (5.9).

Now, let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary, and denote by $X = X^{(x_0, u)}$ the solution to the system (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u . Moreover, let $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be arbitrary. Note that for all $0 < q \leq r < \infty$ we have

$$(5.15) \quad \xi^q \leq 1 + \xi^r \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

and hence

$$(5.16) \quad 1 + \|x\|^q \leq 2(1 + \|x\|^r) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Since $p \geq 2$, we have $\frac{p}{2} \leq p-1$. Therefore, by (5.13) and (5.16) we have

$$(5.17) \quad \|\nabla H(x)\| \leq 2C(1 + \|x\|^{p-1}), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Moreover, by (5.7) we may assume that

$$(5.18) \quad \|b(x, v)\| + \|\sigma(x, v)\| \leq C(\|x\| + \|v\|) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let $q \in (1, \infty)$ be the unique number such that $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$. By (5.17), (5.18), Hölder's inequality and (5.9), (5.11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla H(X_s)\| \cdot \|b(X_s, u_s)\|] ds &\leq 2C^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[(1 + \|X_s\|^{p-1}) \cdot (\|X_s\| + \|u_s\|)] ds \\ &\leq 2C^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\| + \|u_s\|] ds + 2C^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^p] ds + 2C^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^p]^{1/q} \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\|^p]^{1/p} ds < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we note that by (5.15) we have

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^p]^{1/q} \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\|^p]^{1/p} ds &\leq \int_0^t \left(1 + \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^p]\right) \left(1 + \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\|^p]\right) ds \\ &\leq t + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^p] ds + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\|^p] ds + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|X_s\|^p\right] \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\|^p] ds < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Let $r \in (1, \infty]$ be the unique number such that $(\frac{p}{2})^{-1} + r^{-1} = 1$. Then by (5.18), (5.14) and (5.9), (5.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|\sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2 \cdot \|D^2 H(X_s)\|] ds &\leq 2C^3 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[(\|X_s\|^2 + \|u_s\|^2)(1 + \|X_s\|^{p-2})] ds \\ &\leq 2C^3 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^2 + \|u_s\|^2] ds + 2C^3 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^p] ds + 2C^3 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\|^p]^{2/p} \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^p]^{1/r} ds < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where with the help of (5.15) the last integral is estimated as in (5.19). By (5.13) and (5.9) we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\nabla H(X_s)\|^2\right] \leq C^2 \left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|X_s\|^p\right]\right) < \infty.$$

Moreover, by (5.18) and (5.11) we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \|\sigma(X_s, u_s)\|^2 ds\right] \leq 2C^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^2 + \|u_s\|^2] ds < \infty.$$

By (5.12), Hölder's inequality and (5.9), (5.11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\| \cdot \|f(X_s, u_s)\|] ds &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\| \cdot (\|X_s\|^{p-1} + \|u_s\|^{p-1})] ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|X_s\|^p]^{1/q} \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\|^p]^{1/p} ds + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|u_s\|^p] ds < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where with the help of (5.15) the first integral is estimated as in (5.19). Thus, applying Theorem 3.13, Proposition 4.1 and Remark 2.13 concludes the proof. \square

If the storage function H is bounded from below, then the result simplifies as follows.

5.9. Theorem. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 5.1 and Assumption 5.5 with $\kappa_1(v) = K\|v\|$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for some $K > 0$ are fulfilled, and that H is bounded from below. Moreover, suppose there is $p \in [2, \infty)$ such that (5.11) is satisfied, and for some constant $C > 0$ we have (5.12). Then existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) holds true, and for each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is a constant $C_{T,p} > 0$ such that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have the moment estimate (5.9). Moreover, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The system (2.1) has the passive local supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .*

- (ii) The system (2.1) has the passive supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .
- (iii) We have (3.3).

If these equivalent conditions are fulfilled, then the system (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to the storage function H .

Proof. According to Proposition 5.7 existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the system (2.1) holds true, and for each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is a constant $C_{T,p} > 0$ such that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have (5.9).

Now, let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary, and denote by $X = X^{(x_0, u)}$ the solution to the system (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u . Furthermore, we set $Y := f(X, u)$. Let $q \in (1, \infty)$ be the unique number such that $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$. Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 5.8, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t |\langle u_s, Y_s \rangle| ds \right] \leq \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\|u_s\| \cdot \|f(X_s, u_s)\|] ds < \infty.$$

Thus, applying Theorem 3.13, Proposition 4.3 and Remark 2.13 concludes the proof. \square

6. UNCONTROLLED STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

In this section we apply our findings to the particular situation of uncontrolled stochastic differential equations. More precisely, we consider an \mathbb{R}^d -valued SDE of the form

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t &= b(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t \\ X_0 &= x_0 \end{cases}$$

driven by an \mathbb{R}^k -valued Wiener process W with continuous coefficients $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$. We also fix a mapping $H : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The following assumption is in particular satisfied if the coefficients b and σ are Lipschitz continuous.

6.1. Assumption. We suppose that existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the SDE (6.1) holds true.

In what follows, we will also assume that the storage function H is of class C^2 .

6.2. Definition. We define $\mathcal{L}H : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\mathcal{L}H(x) := \langle \nabla H(x), b(x) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma(x)\sigma(x)^\top D^2 H(x)).$$

Furthermore, we define $\Sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ as

$$\Sigma(x) := \nabla H(x)^\top \cdot \sigma(x).$$

6.3. Corollary. Suppose that Assumption 6.1 is fulfilled, and that H is of class C^2 . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) For each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $H(X) \in \mathcal{V}^-$, where $X = X^{(x_0)}$ denotes the strong solution to the SDE (6.1) with $X_0 = x_0$.
- (ii) We have

$$(6.2) \quad \mathcal{L}H(x) \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

$$(6.3) \quad \Sigma(x) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.9. \square

6.4. Corollary. Suppose that Assumption 6.1 is fulfilled, and that H is of class C^2 . Moreover, we assume that σ is of class C^1 . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) For each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $H(X) \in \mathcal{V}^-$, where $X = X^{(x_0)}$ denotes the strong solution to the SDE (6.1) with $X_0 = x_0$.
- (ii) We have (6.3) and

$$\left\langle \nabla H(x), b(x) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m D\sigma^j(x)\sigma^j(x) \right\rangle \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.11. \square

6.5. Corollary. Suppose that Assumption 6.1 is fulfilled, and that H is of class C^2 . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) For each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ the process $H(X)$ is a local supermartingale, where $X = X^{(x_0)}$ denotes the strong solution to the SDE (6.1) with $X_0 = x_0$.
- (ii) We have (6.2).

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.13. \square

6.6. Corollary. Suppose that b and σ are Lipschitz continuous, and that H is of class C^2 . Moreover, we assume that H is bounded from below or that for some $p \in [2, \infty)$ we have (5.13) and (5.14). Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) For each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ the process $H(X)$ is a local supermartingale, where $X = X^{(x_0)}$ denotes the strong solution to the SDE (6.1) with $X_0 = x_0$.
- (ii) For each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ the process $H(X)$ is a supermartingale, where $X = X^{(x_0)}$ denotes the strong solution to the SDE (6.1) with $X_0 = x_0$.
- (iii) We have (6.2).

If these equivalent conditions are fulfilled, then for each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $H(X_t) \in L^1$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and the mapping $\mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}[H(X_t)]$ is decreasing, where $X = X^{(x_0)}$ denotes the strong solution to the SDE (6.1) with $X_0 = x_0$.

Proof. Since b and σ are Lipschitz continuous, they also satisfy the linear growth condition

$$\|b(x)\| + \|\sigma(x)\| \leq K(1 + \|x\|) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

for some constant $K > 0$. Therefore, the result is an immediate consequence of Theorems 5.8 and 5.9. \square

7. STOCHASTIC LINEAR TIME-INVARIANT INPUT-STATE-OUTPUT SYSTEMS

In this section we consider the case where the system (2.1) is a stochastic, linear, time-invariant input-state-output system (SLTIS).

7.1. Assumption. We suppose that the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (1) There exist $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it holds that $b(x, v) = Ax + Bv$.
- (2) For each $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ there exist $\mathfrak{A}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $\mathfrak{B}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it holds that $\sigma^j(x, v) = \mathfrak{A}(j)x + \mathfrak{B}(j)v$.
- (3) There exist $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it holds that $f(x, v) = Cx + Dv$.

Note that under Assumption 7.1, the system (2.1) takes the form

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t &= (AX_t + Bu_t)dt + \sum_{j=1}^k (\mathfrak{A}(j)X_t + \mathfrak{B}(j)u_t)dW_t^j \\ Y_t &= CX_t + Du_t \\ X_0 &= x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ u &\in \mathcal{A}. \end{cases}$$

We also call $A, B, (\mathfrak{A}(j))_{j=1, \dots, k}, (\mathfrak{B}(j))_{j=1, \dots, k}, C, D$ the system matrices.

7.2. Remark. Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled.

- (1) In the sequel, we will often consider the storage function $H(x) = \frac{1}{2}\langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for some symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Then Assumption 3.1 is satisfied, and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} DH(x)v &= \langle Qx, v \rangle \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ D^2H(x)(v, w) &= \langle Qv, w \rangle \quad \forall v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (5.13) and (5.14) hold true.

- (2) Assumptions 3.5 and 3.6 are fulfilled, and we have

$$\|f(x, v)\| \leq K(\|x\| + \|v\|) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $K := \|C\| + \|D\|$. In particular, (5.12) holds true.

(3) We can write $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ as

$$\sigma(x, v) = \mathfrak{A}x + \mathfrak{B}v \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

with continuous linear operators $\mathfrak{A} \in L(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times k})$ and $\mathfrak{B} \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{d \times k})$. Therefore, Assumption 5.1 is satisfied with

$$L^R(v) := \|A\| + \|\mathfrak{A}\|,$$

independent of $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore, if

$$(7.2) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \|u_s\|^2 ds \right] < \infty \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{A} \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

then Assumption 5.5 is fulfilled with

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_1(v) &:= (\|B\| + \|\mathfrak{B}\|) \|v\| \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \kappa_2 &:= \|A\| + \|\mathfrak{A}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using Proposition 5.7, under the additional condition (7.2) existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the SLTIS (2.1) holds true, and for each $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is a constant $C_T > 0$ such that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ we have the moment estimate

$$(7.3) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t\|^2 \right] \leq C_T (1 + \|x_0\|^2),$$

where $X = X^{(x_0, u)}$ denotes the strong solution to the SLTIS (2.1) with $X_0 = x_0$ and control u .

(4) Note that under the additional condition (7.2) we have that item (2), the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and (7.3) imply for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t |\langle u_s, f(X_s^{(x_0, u)}, u_s) \rangle| ds \right] < \infty \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where $X^{(x_0, u)}$ denotes the strong solution to the SLTIS (2.1) with $X_0^{(x_0, u)} = x_0$ and control u . In particular, Assumption 2.7 is satisfied under the additional condition (7.2).

(5) Consider the storage function $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for some symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and suppose that condition (7.2) is fulfilled. We then have from (7.3) and item (4) that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $u \in \mathcal{A}$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ it holds that $Z_t^{(x_0, u)} \in L^1$.

In the setting of Assumption 7.1 with a quadratic storage function as in item (1) in Remark 7.2, we have the following representations for (3.1) and (3.2).

7.3. Lemma. Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled and assume that there exists a symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that

$$\begin{aligned} (\Sigma(x, v))_j &= \langle x, Q\mathfrak{A}(j)x + Q\mathfrak{B}(j)v \rangle \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k, \\ \mathcal{L}H(x, v) &= \langle x, (QA + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{A}(j))x \rangle + \langle x, (QB - C^\top + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j))v \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle v, (\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) - D)v \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The representation for Σ follows from (3.2), the fact that $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d: \nabla H(x) = Qx$, the symmetry of Q , and item (2) in Assumption 7.1. To obtain the representation for $\mathcal{L}H$, note that (3.1), item (1) in

Remark 7.2, Assumption 7.1, and the fact that Q is symmetric imply for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}H(x, v) &= \langle \nabla H(x), b(x, v) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k D^2 H(x) (\sigma^j(x, v), \sigma^j(x, v)) - \langle v, f(x, v) \rangle \\
&= \langle Qx, b(x, v) \rangle - \langle v, f(x, v) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \langle Q\sigma^j(x, v), \sigma^j(x, v) \rangle \\
&= \langle Qx, Ax + Bv \rangle - \langle v, Cx + Dv \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\langle Q\mathfrak{A}(j)x, \mathfrak{A}(j)x \rangle + \langle Q\mathfrak{A}(j)x, \mathfrak{B}(j)v \rangle + \langle Q\mathfrak{B}(j)v, \mathfrak{A}(j)x \rangle + \langle Q\mathfrak{B}(j)v, \mathfrak{B}(j)v \rangle \right) \\
&= \langle x, QA \rangle + \langle x, QBv \rangle - \langle x, C^\top v \rangle - \langle v, Dv \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\langle x, \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{A}(j)x \rangle + 2\langle x, \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j)v \rangle + \langle v, \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j)v \rangle \right) \\
&= \left\langle x, \left(QA + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{A}(j) \right) x \right\rangle + \left\langle v, \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) - D \right) v \right\rangle \\
&\quad + \left\langle x, \left(QB - C^\top + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) \right) v \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Under Assumption 7.1 we introduce for each symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ the $\mathbb{R}^{(d+n) \times (d+n)}$ -matrix

$$(7.4) \quad \mathfrak{M}_Q := \begin{pmatrix} QA + A^\top Q + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{A}(j) & QB - C^\top + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) \\ B^\top Q - C + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{A}(j) & -(D + D^\top) + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) \end{pmatrix}.$$

7.4. Remark. (1) *It is well known that passivity of deterministic linear systems can be characterized by a linear matrix inequality (LMI) (see, e.g., [48, Section 5]). The condition $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$ with \mathfrak{M}_Q given by (7.4) extends this deterministic LMI to the stochastic case (in the sense that if $\mathfrak{A}(j) = 0$ and $\mathfrak{B}(j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, the inequality $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$ reduces to the inequality from the deterministic theory). Below we will show that, similar to the deterministic case, under suitable conditions the negative semidefiniteness of \mathfrak{M}_Q characterizes stochastic passivity properties of the SLTIS (2.1).*

(2) *Linear matrix inequalities $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$ with \mathfrak{M}_Q of the form in (7.4) arise in infinite-horizon optimal stochastic linear-quadratic control problems (see, e.g., [2]). This connection is also reflected by our proof of Proposition 8.4 (see also Remark 8.5), where we solve the optimal stochastic linear-quadratic control problem of computing the available storage to obtain a quadratic storage function for a passive stochastic system.*

7.5. Lemma. *Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled. Assume that there exists a symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then it holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that*

$$\mathcal{L}H(x, v) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} x^\top & v^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_Q \begin{pmatrix} x \\ v \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. The claim follows from Lemma 7.3. \square

7.6. Corollary. *Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled. Assume that there exists a symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then condition (3.3) is satisfied if and only if $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 7.5. \square

By combining Corollary 7.6 and Theorem 5.8, we obtain a characterization of the passive supermartingale property of an SLTIS with a quadratic storage function in terms of a linear matrix inequality.

7.7. Theorem. Suppose that Assumptions 3.8, 7.1 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled, and that there exists a symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The SLTIS (2.1) has the passive local supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .
- (ii) The SLTIS (2.1) has the passive supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .
- (iii) We have $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$.

If these equivalent conditions are fulfilled, then the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to the storage function H .

Proof. Taking into account Remark 7.2 and Corollary 7.6, this is a consequence of Theorem 5.8. \square

7.8. Remark. Under the (typical) additional condition $Q \geq 0$ the statement of Theorem 7.7 is also a consequence of Theorem 5.9.

We next characterize passivity of SLTIS in Theorem 7.10. To this end, we in Lemma 7.9 first obtain a condition that is equivalent to condition (3.4).

7.9. Lemma. Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled. Assume that there exists a symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then condition (3.4) is satisfied if and only if $Q\mathfrak{A}(j)$ is skew-symmetric and $Q\mathfrak{B}(j) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$.

Proof. Note that two matrices $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\tilde{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ satisfy

$$\langle x, \tilde{A}x + \tilde{B}v \rangle = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

if and only if \tilde{A} is skew-symmetric and $\tilde{B} = 0$. Therefore, the claim follows from the representation in Lemma 7.3. \square

7.10. Theorem. Suppose that Assumptions 3.8, 7.1 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled, and that there exists a symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The SLTIS (2.1) is passive with respect to the storage function H .
- (ii) $Q\mathfrak{A}(j)$ is skew-symmetric and $Q\mathfrak{B}(j) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$, and we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} QA + A^\top Q - Q \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}(j)^2 & QB - C^\top \\ B^\top Q - C & -D - D^\top \end{pmatrix} \leq 0.$$

Proof. Note first that if $Q\mathfrak{A}(j)$ is skew-symmetric and $Q\mathfrak{B}(j) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_Q &= \begin{pmatrix} QA + A^\top Q + \sum_{j=1}^k (Q\mathfrak{A}(j))^\top \mathfrak{A}(j) & QB - C^\top + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j) Q\mathfrak{B}(j) \\ B^\top Q - C + \sum_{j=1}^k (\mathfrak{A}^\top(j) Q\mathfrak{B}(j))^\top & -D - D^\top + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j) Q\mathfrak{B}(j) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} QA + A^\top Q - Q \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}(j)^2 & QB - C^\top \\ B^\top Q - C & -D - D^\top \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

(i) \Rightarrow (ii): Since the SLTIS (2.1) is passive, Theorem 3.9 implies that the conditions (3.3) and (3.4) are satisfied. From (3.3) and Corollary 7.6 we obtain that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$. Combining this, (3.4), and Lemma 7.9 yields (ii).

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Since $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$, we obtain from Corollary 7.6 that (3.3) is satisfied. Lemma 7.9 and the fact that $Q\mathfrak{A}(j)$ is skew-symmetric and $Q\mathfrak{B}(j) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$ show that (3.4) holds. Hence, Theorem 3.9 ensures (i). \square

8. STOCHASTIC PASSIVITY RESULTS FOR LINEAR TIME-INVARIANT SYSTEMS

In this section we consider an SLTIS as in Section 7 and examine stochastic passivity. We first introduce the following assumption, which strengthens Assumption 3.8 by additionally requiring an integrability property of the control for small time horizons.

8.1. Assumption. For each $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exist a control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that u is continuous at zero with $u_0 = v$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} \|u_t\|^2] < \infty$.

Under this assumption we derive that stochastic passivity of an SLTIS with a quadratic storage function as in item (1) in Remark 7.2 implies that the associated matrix defined in (7.4) is negative semidefinite.

8.2. Lemma. *Suppose that Assumptions 7.1, 8.1 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled, that there exists a symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and that for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

$$(8.1) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, \varepsilon]} \mathbb{E}[Z_t^{(x_0, u)}] \leq H(x_0).$$

Then it holds that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary. Due to Assumption 8.1, there exist $u \in \mathcal{A}$ with $u_0 = v$ and $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that u is continuous at zero and satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} \|u_t\|^2] < \infty$. Note that Lemma 3.3 implies for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ that

$$Z_t^{(x_0, u)} - H(x_0) = \int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s^{(x_0, u)}, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s^{(x_0, u)}, u_s) dW_s.$$

Moreover, observe that Remark 7.2, Theorem 5.8, and Proposition 4.1 show that the process M with $M_t = \int_0^t \Sigma(X_s^{(x_0, u)}, u_s) dW_s$, $t \in [0, \infty)$, is a martingale and that for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ we have that $\int_0^t \mathcal{L}H(X_s^{(x_0, u)}, u_s) ds \in L^1$. From Lemma 7.5 we thus obtain for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ that

$$(8.2) \quad \mathbb{E}[Z_t^{(x_0, u)}] - H(x_0) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \begin{pmatrix} (X_s^{(x_0, u)})^\top & u_s^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_Q \begin{pmatrix} X_s^{(x_0, u)} \\ u_s \end{pmatrix} ds \right].$$

It follows from (8.1) for all $h \in [0, \varepsilon]$ that

$$(8.3) \quad 0 \geq \frac{2}{h} (\mathbb{E}[Z_h^{(x_0, u)}] - H(x_0)) = \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^h \begin{pmatrix} (X_s^{(x_0, u)})^\top & u_s^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_Q \begin{pmatrix} X_s^{(x_0, u)} \\ u_s \end{pmatrix} ds \right].$$

Since $X^{(x_0, u)}$ is a continuous process with initial value $X_0^{(x_0, u)} = x_0$ and u is continuous at zero with $u_0 = v$, we can show that \mathbb{P} -a.s. it holds that

$$\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \int_0^h \begin{pmatrix} (X_s^{(x_0, u)})^\top & u_s^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_Q \begin{pmatrix} X_s^{(x_0, u)} \\ u_s \end{pmatrix} ds = \begin{pmatrix} x_0^\top & v^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_Q \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, (7.3) and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} \|u_t\|^2] < \infty$ ensure that

$$\sup_{s \in [0, \delta]} \left| \begin{pmatrix} (X_s^{(x_0, u)})^\top & u_s^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_Q \begin{pmatrix} X_s^{(x_0, u)} \\ u_s \end{pmatrix} \right| \in L^1.$$

Therefore, the dominated convergence theorem implies that

$$\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^h \begin{pmatrix} (X_s^{(x_0, u)})^\top & u_s^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_Q \begin{pmatrix} X_s^{(x_0, u)} \\ u_s \end{pmatrix} ds \right] = \begin{pmatrix} x_0^\top & v^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_Q \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}.$$

It thus follows from (8.3) that

$$0 \geq \begin{pmatrix} x_0^\top & v^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_Q \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}.$$

This proves that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$. □

Under Assumption 8.1 we can now add stochastic passivity as a further equivalent statement in Theorem 7.7.

8.3. Theorem. *Suppose that Assumptions 7.1, 8.1 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled, and that there exists a symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to the storage function H .*
- (ii) *The SLTIS (2.1) has the passive locale supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .*
- (iii) *The SLTIS (2.1) has the passive supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .*
- (iv) *We have $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$.*

Proof. Note that Theorem 7.7 shows that (ii), (iii), and (iv) are equivalent. Moreover, it holds that (iii) implies (i) (see also the third statement in Remark 2.13). It hence remains to show that (i) implies (iv). To this end, let the SLTIS (2.1) be stochastically passive with respect to the storage function H . Then for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, all $u \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ it holds that

$$H(x_0) = \mathbb{E}[Z_0^{(x_0, u)}] \geq \mathbb{E}[Z_t^{(x_0, u)}].$$

Hence, Lemma 8.2 yields that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$. \square

In the next result we provide a sufficient condition under which a stochastically passive SLTIS (with respect to some storage function that is bounded from below) is stochastically passive with respect to a quadratic storage function. For this result we use techniques similar to those in [3, Section 3] established under the assumption that the system is stabilizable (see also Remark 8.5 below).

8.4. Proposition. *Assume that $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the natural filtration of W augmented by all the \mathbb{P} -null sets in \mathcal{F} . For all $T \geq 0$ let \mathcal{A}_T denote the set of all $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -progressively measurable processes $u: \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \|u_s\|^2 ds \right] < \infty.$$

Suppose that Assumption 7.1 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled and that for all $T > 0$ and all $u \in \mathcal{A}_T$ there exists $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\tilde{u}(\omega, t) = u(\omega, t)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $t \in [0, T]$. Assume that the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to a storage function H that is bounded from below. Then there exists a positive semidefinite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to $\mathcal{H}: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $\mathcal{H}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\langle Qx, x \rangle$. Moreover, Q is the minimal solution of $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$ in the set of positive semidefinite matrices.

Proof. For $T \in [0, \infty)$ we consider the finite-horizon stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control problem

$$(8.4) \quad V(T, x) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{A}_T} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x, u)} \rangle ds \right], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The fact that the system is stochastically passive with respect to H , and boundedness of H from below, show for all $T \in [0, \infty)$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$(8.5) \quad V(T, x) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{A}_T} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x, u)} \rangle ds \right] \geq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{A}_T} \left(\mathbb{E}[H(X_T^{(x, u)})] - H(x) \right) \geq \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} H(y) - H(x) > -\infty.$$

In particular, for any $T \in [0, \infty)$, the problem (8.4) is finite at zero (see Definition 2.1 in [40]). Therefore, Proposition 5.1 in [40] implies that for all $T \in [0, \infty)$ there exists a symmetric matrix $K(T) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ it holds

$$(8.6) \quad V(T, x) = \langle x, K(T)x \rangle.$$

Note that V is nonpositive since one can always choose the zero control. Hence, we obtain from (8.6) for all $T \in [0, \infty)$ that $K(T)$ is negative semidefinite.

Furthermore, observe that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the function $(0, \infty) \ni T \mapsto V(T, x) \in \mathbb{R}$ is nonincreasing. Moreover, we have by (8.5) that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the function $[0, \infty) \ni T \mapsto V(T, x) \in \mathbb{R}$ is bounded from below. This implies that there exists a symmetric matrix \bar{K} such that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} K(T) = \bar{K}$. Let $Q = -2\bar{K}$ and $\mathcal{H}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\langle x, Qx \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ it holds that $\langle x, Qx \rangle = -2 \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \langle x, K(T)x \rangle \geq 0$.

Due to item (4) in Remark 7.2, the fact that $0 \in \mathcal{A}_T$ with $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T \langle 0, Y_s^{(x, 0)} \rangle ds] = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $T \in [0, \infty)$, the time-invariance of the system, and (8.6) we can argue similar to the proof of the dynamic programming principle in [43] (see, in particular, item (i) in Theorem 4.1 and items (i) and (ii) in Theorem 2.4 in [43]) to obtain for all $T \in [0, \infty)$, $h \in [0, T]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$(8.7) \quad \langle x, K(T)x \rangle = V(T, x) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{A}_T} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^h \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x, u)} \rangle ds + \langle X_h^{(x, u)}, K(T-h)X_h^{(x, u)} \rangle \right].$$

We take the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$ in (8.7) and apply Fatou's lemma (recall that K is negative semidefinite) to obtain for all $h \in [0, \infty)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, \bar{K}x \rangle &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \langle x, K(T)x \rangle \leq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^h \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x,u)} \rangle ds + \langle X_h^{(x,u)}, K(T-h)X_h^{(x,u)} \rangle \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^h \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x,u)} \rangle ds + \langle X_h^{(x,u)}, \bar{K}X_h^{(x,u)} \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This shows for all $h \in [0, \infty)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $u \in \mathcal{A}$ that

$$\mathcal{H}(x) = -\langle x, \bar{K}x \rangle \geq -\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^h \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x,u)} \rangle ds - \mathcal{H}(X_h^{(x,u)}) \right].$$

Therefore, Lemma 8.2 and Theorem 8.3 imply that the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to \mathcal{H} and that $\mathfrak{M}_{\bar{Q}} \leq 0$. It remains to show minimality of Q . To this end let $\tilde{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be positive semidefinite and satisfy $\mathfrak{M}_{\tilde{Q}} \leq 0$. It follows from (8.5) and an application of Itô's formula (similarly to the derivation of (8.2)) for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \langle x, Qx \rangle &= \mathcal{H}(x) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{u \in \mathcal{A}_T} \mathbb{E} \left[- \int_0^T \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x,u)} \rangle ds \right] \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{u \in \mathcal{A}_T} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle x, \tilde{Q}x \rangle - \langle X_T^{(x,u)}, \tilde{Q}X_T^{(x,u)} \rangle + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} X_s^{(x,u)} \\ u_s \end{pmatrix}, \mathfrak{M}_{\tilde{Q}} \begin{pmatrix} X_s^{(x,u)} \\ u_s \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle ds \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \langle x, \tilde{Q}x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

8.5. Remark. (1) Note that the storage function $\mathcal{H}: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $\mathcal{H}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$ that we construct in Proposition 8.4 equals the so-called available storage, which is defined as $H_a: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty]$,

$$H_a(x) = \sup_{u \in \mathcal{A}, T > 0} \mathbb{E} \left[- \int_0^T \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x,u)} \rangle ds \right].$$

Moreover, (8.5) shows that any storage function H that is bounded from below and with respect to which the system is stochastically passive satisfies for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that $H(x) - \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} H(y) \geq H_a(x) \geq 0$. We further remark that the assumption in Proposition 8.4 that the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to a storage function that is bounded from below can be replaced by the assumption that the available storage is finite, i.e., $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d: H_a(x) < \infty$; the reason is that stochastic passivity is only used to obtain the finiteness of the value function in (8.5). In particular, we conclude that under the assumptions of Proposition 8.4 (with the stochastic passivity assumption removed), we have that $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d: H_a(x) < \infty$ if and only if the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to the available storage H_a .

(2) As an additional tool for analyzing the stochastic passivity of the SLTIS (2.1), one can also consider the associated (generalized) Riccati equation

$$\begin{aligned} (8.8) \quad A^\top Q + QA + \sum_{j=1}^k A^\top(j)QA(j) - \mathcal{S}(Q)(\mathcal{N}(Q))^\dagger(\mathcal{S}(Q))^\top &= 0, \\ \mathcal{N}(Q) &\leq 0, \\ \mathcal{S}(Q)(\text{Id} - \mathcal{N}(Q)(\mathcal{N}(Q))^\dagger) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(8.9) \quad \mathcal{S}(Q) = QB + \sum_{j=1}^k A^\top(j)QB(j) - C^\top, \quad \mathcal{N}(Q) = \sum_{j=1}^k B^\top(j)QB(j) - (D + D^\top),$$

and $(\mathcal{N}(Q))^\dagger$ is the Moore–Penrose inverse of $\mathcal{N}(Q)$. This Riccati equation can informally be derived from the above discussed optimal stochastic linear-quadratic control problem

$$\sup_{u \in \mathcal{A}, T > 0} \mathbb{E} \left[- \int_0^T \langle u_s, Y_s^{(x,u)} \rangle ds \right]$$

(see, e.g., [3], [41] or [42] and the references therein; see also the book [14] for further references and the numerical solution in the regular case). It follows directly from the extended Schur lemma (see, e.g., [4, Theorem 1] or [2, Lemma 3]) that a solution Q to the Riccati equation (8.8) satisfies the LMI $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$.

The next goal is to ensure that the matrix Q constructed in Proposition 8.4 is not only positive semidefinite but positive definite. Note that similar results in the literature, such as [48, Lemma 1], [5, Example 6] and [47, Proposition 3.2.12] for the deterministic case and [29, Theorem 3.2] for the stochastic case, contain an additional observability assumption. For this reason we present the following definition of stochastic observability. This concept allows us to prove in Corollary 8.14 below that stochastic passivity and observability imply that Q is positive definite.

8.6. Definition. Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled and that $0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We call x_0 unobservable if $Y_t^{(x_0,0)} = 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for all $t \in [0, \infty)$.

8.7. Definition. Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled and that $0 \in \mathcal{A}$. We say that the SLTIS (2.1) is observable if $\{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x_0 \text{ unobservable}\} = \{0\}$.

8.8. Remark. Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled and that $0 \in \mathcal{A}$.

- (1) Note that $x_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is unobservable.
- (2) Note that the SLTIS (2.1) is observable if and only if for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have that $Y_t^{(x_0,0)} = 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ implies $x_0 = 0$. We moreover mention that in the literature such a system is sometimes called exactly observable (see, e.g., [49, Definition 5]) to distinguish between different observability notions.

Observability of the SLTIS (2.1) can be verified by a rank criterion that only involves (products of) the system matrices $A, \mathfrak{A}(1), \dots, \mathfrak{A}(k), C$. We present this result in Lemma 8.10 below. For completeness, we also provide its proof. For further reference, see [6, Proof of Lemma 3] and the dissertation [33]. For further discussion of conditions for observability in stochastic linear systems we refer to, for example, [6, 23, 31, 49]. In the proof of Lemma 8.10, we use the following result.

8.9. Lemma. Suppose that Assumption 7.1 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled and that $0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $T \in (0, \infty)$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. Assume that for all $s \in [0, T)$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that $\tilde{C}X_s^{(x_0,0)} = 0$. Then for all $s \in [0, T)$ and all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that $\tilde{C}AX_s^{(x_0,0)} = 0$ and $\tilde{C}\mathfrak{A}(j)X_s^{(x_0,0)} = 0$.

Proof. Let $r \in [0, T)$. Note that the assumption that for all $s \in [0, T)$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that $\tilde{C}X_s^{(x_0,0)} = 0$ implies for all $t \in (r, T)$ that \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$(8.10) \quad 0 = \tilde{C}X_t^{(x_0,0)} - \tilde{C}X_r^{(x_0,0)} = \int_r^t \tilde{C}AX_s^{(x_0,0)} ds + \sum_{j=1}^k \int_r^t \tilde{C}\mathfrak{A}(j)X_s^{(x_0,0)} dW_s^j.$$

This and Proposition A.3 show that for all $t \in (r, T)$ and all $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \int_r^t (\tilde{C}\mathfrak{A}(j)X_s^{(x_0,0)})_l dW_s^j = 0.$$

In particular, also the quadratic variation of this stochastic integral is zero, which yields for all $t \in (r, T)$ and all $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ that \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$(8.11) \quad 0 = \sum_{j=1}^k \int_r^t |(\tilde{C}\mathfrak{A}(j)X_s^{(x_0,0)})_l|^2 ds.$$

Observe that for all $t \in (r, T)$, $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that

$$\frac{1}{t-r} \int_r^t |(\tilde{C}\mathfrak{A}(j)X_s^{(x_0,0)})_l|^2 ds \leq \|\tilde{C}\mathfrak{A}(j)\|^2 \sup_{s \in [r, T]} \|X_s^{(x_0,0)}\|^2.$$

Due to the moment estimate (7.3), the continuity of the state, and (8.11) we can hence apply the dominated convergence theorem to obtain for all $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ that

$$0 = \lim_{t \downarrow r} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{t-r} \int_r^t |(\tilde{C}\mathfrak{A}(j)X_s^{(x_0,0)})_l|^2 ds \right] = \mathbb{E} [|(\tilde{C}\mathfrak{A}(j)X_r^{(x_0,0)})_l|^2].$$

This shows that $\tilde{C}\mathfrak{A}(j)X_r^{(x_0,0)} = 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Moreover, note that this, continuity of the state, and (8.10) imply that \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$0 = \lim_{t \downarrow r} \int_r^t \tilde{C}AX_s^{(x_0,0)} ds = \tilde{C}AX_r^{(x_0,0)}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

8.10. Lemma. *Suppose that Assumption 7.1 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled and that $0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Let*

$$S = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{q \in \{0,1\}^i} \bigcup_{p \in \{0,1\}^{i \times k}} \left\{ \prod_{l=1}^i \left(A^{q_l} \prod_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^{p_{l,j}}(j) \right) \right\}.$$

Let $\{\tilde{A}_1, \dots, \tilde{A}_N\}$ be any finite subset of S and define

$$M = (C^\top, \tilde{A}_1^\top C^\top, \dots, \tilde{A}_N^\top C^\top).$$

- (i) Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It then holds that x_0 is unobservable if and only if for all $\tilde{A} \in S$ it holds that $C\tilde{A}x_0 = 0$.
- (ii) If $\text{rank}(M) = d$, then the SLTIS (2.1) is observable.

Proof. To prove (i), let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume first that x_0 is unobservable. Then it holds by definition that $CX_t^{(x_0,0)} = 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for all $t \in [0, \infty)$. We can thus use an induction argument relying on Lemma 8.9 to demonstrate for all $\tilde{A} \in S$ that $C\tilde{A}x_0 = 0$.

Assume now that for all $\tilde{A} \in S$ it holds that $C\tilde{A}x_0 = 0$. Consider the Picard iterations defined by

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{(x_0,0,0)} &= x_0, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \\ X_t^{(x_0,0,m)} &= x_0 + \int_0^t AX_s^{(x_0,0,m-1)} ds + \sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^t \mathfrak{A}(j)X_s^{(x_0,0,m-1)} dW_s^j, \quad t \in [0, \infty), m \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

We can show by induction that for all $\tilde{A} \in S$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $t \in [0, \infty)$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that $C\tilde{A}X_t^{(x_0,0,m)} = 0$. Since we have for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ that $X_t^{(x_0,0)}$ is the \mathbb{P} -a.s. limit of $(X_t^{(x_0,0,m)})_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ (see, e.g., [27, Section 5.2]), we conclude that for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that $CX_t^{(x_0,0)} = 0$. This shows (i).

To prove (ii), note first that (i) ensures that any unobservable $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $M^\top x_0 = 0$. It thus holds that $\{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x_0 \text{ unobservable}\} \subseteq \ker(M^\top)$. Moreover, note that

$$\text{rank}(M) = \text{rank}(M^\top) = d - \dim \ker(M^\top).$$

If $\text{rank}(M) = d$, this shows that $\ker(M^\top) = \{0\}$, and hence

$$\{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid x_0 \text{ unobservable}\} = \{0\}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

8.11. Remark. *Suppose that Assumption 7.1 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled and that $0 \in \mathcal{A}$.*

- (1) Note that by the Cayley–Hamilton theorem, if $\bar{A} \in \{A, \mathfrak{A}(1), \dots, \mathfrak{A}(k)\}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \geq d$, then \bar{A}^m can be expressed as a linear combination of the matrices $\bar{A}^0, \bar{A}^1, \dots, \bar{A}^{d-1}$. In Lemma 8.10 we therefore, for each of the matrices $A, \mathfrak{A}(1), \dots, \mathfrak{A}(k)$, only need to consider exponents up to $d-1$.
- (2) Observe that in view of item (ii) in Lemma 8.10, a sufficient condition for the SLTIS (2.1) to be observable is that $\text{rank}(C^\top, A^\top C^\top, \dots, (A^{d-1})^\top C^\top) = d$, which is equivalent to the respective deterministic linear time-invariant system (i.e., the SLTIS (2.1) with $\mathfrak{A}(j) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$ and deterministic controls u) being observable (see, e.g., Theorem 24 in Section 6.2 of [39]).

The next result, Lemma 8.13, shows that if an observable SLTIS is stochastically passive with respect to a nonnegative storage function, then this storage function is positive definite. We subsequently combine this result with Proposition 8.4 to show that stochastic passivity with respect to any storage function bounded from below and observability ensure that the SLTIS is stochastically passive with respect to a quadratic storage function represented by a positive definite matrix (see Corollary 8.14).

8.12. Assumption. *The set of admissible controls \mathcal{A} is the set of all \mathbb{R}^n -valued progressively measurable processes u that satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \|u_s\|^2 ds \right] < \infty \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

8.13. Lemma. *Suppose that Assumptions 7.1 and 8.12 are fulfilled. Assume that the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to a nonnegative storage function $H: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. If the SLTIS (2.1) is observable, then it holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ that $H(x) > 0$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $H(x) = 0$. Let $a = (1 + \|D\|)^{-1}$ (recall Remark 2.1). It then holds that $\| -aD \| = (1 + \|D\|)^{-1} \|D\| < 1$. Hence, $\text{Id} + aD = \text{Id} - (-a)D$ is invertible. We can thus consider the \mathbb{R}^d -valued continuous process $\bar{X} = (\bar{X}_s)_{s \in [0, \infty)}$ given by

$$(8.12) \quad \begin{aligned} d\bar{X}_t &= (A - aB(\text{Id} + aD)^{-1}C)\bar{X}_t dt + \sum_{j=1}^k (\mathfrak{A}(j) - a\mathfrak{B}(j)(\text{Id} + aD)^{-1}C)\bar{X}_t dW_t^j, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \\ \bar{X}_0 &= x. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, indeed, there exists a unique strong solution of (8.12) and it moreover holds for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\bar{X}_s\|^2] < \infty$ (cf., e.g., Remark 7.2). Next, define $\bar{u} = -a(\text{Id} + aD)^{-1}C\bar{X}$ and note that $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{A}$. Furthermore, let $\bar{Y}_t = C\bar{X}_t + D\bar{u}_t$, $t \in [0, \infty)$. Observe that \bar{X} satisfies for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{X}_t &= (A\bar{X}_t - Ba(\text{Id} + aD)^{-1}C\bar{X}_t)dt + \sum_{j=1}^k (\mathfrak{A}(j)\bar{X}_t - \mathfrak{B}(j)a(\text{Id} + aD)^{-1}C\bar{X}_t)dW_t^j \\ &= (A\bar{X}_t + B\bar{u}_t)dt + \sum_{j=1}^k (\mathfrak{A}(j)\bar{X}_t + \mathfrak{B}(j)\bar{u}_t)dW_t^j. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) is the unique strong solution (cf. Remark 7.2) to the SLTIS (2.1) in the form of Assumption 7.1 with the initial value x and the control \bar{u} . Moreover, note that for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}_t &= C\bar{X}_t - aD(\text{Id} + aD)^{-1}C\bar{X}_t = (\text{Id} - aD(\text{Id} + aD)^{-1})C\bar{X}_t \\ &= (\text{Id} - (\text{Id} + aD)(\text{Id} + aD)^{-1} + (\text{Id} + aD)^{-1})C\bar{X}_t = (\text{Id} + aD)^{-1}C\bar{X}_t \\ &= -a^{-1}\bar{u}_t. \end{aligned}$$

Stochastic passivity of the SLTIS (2.1) with respect to H and the fact that H is nonnegative hence imply for all $T \in [0, \infty)$ that

$$0 = H(x) \geq \mathbb{E}[H(\bar{X}_T)] - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \langle \bar{u}_s, \bar{Y}_s \rangle ds \right] \geq -\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \langle \bar{u}_s, \bar{Y}_s \rangle ds \right] = a\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \langle \bar{Y}_s, \bar{Y}_s \rangle ds \right] \geq 0.$$

It follows for all $T \in (0, \infty)$ that $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T \|\bar{Y}_s\|^2 ds] = 0$. Since \bar{Y} is continuous, we can show that this implies $\bar{Y}_s = 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for all $s \in [0, \infty)$. It then also holds that $\bar{u}_s = 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for all $s \in [0, \infty)$. Therefore, x is unobservable. Now, the assumption that the SLTIS (2.1) is observable implies that $x = 0$. \square

8.14. Corollary. *Suppose that Assumptions 7.1 and 8.12 are fulfilled and that $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the natural filtration of W augmented by all the \mathbb{P} -null sets in \mathcal{F} . Assume that the SLTIS (2.1) is observable and stochastically passive with respect to a storage function H that is bounded from below. Then there exists a positive definite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to $\mathcal{H}: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $\mathcal{H}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\langle Qx, x \rangle$.*

Proof. This follows from combining Proposition 8.4 and Lemma 8.13. \square

9. LINEAR STOCHASTIC PORT-HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS

In this section we focus on a specific subclass of SLTIS (2.1) which we call stochastic, linear, time-invariant port-Hamiltonian systems. In Corollary 9.8, we show that an observable SLTIS is stochastically passive if and only if it belongs to this subclass. We thereby extend known results from the deterministic setting to the stochastic case (see, e.g., [5, Corollary 4] and [46, Theorem 2.3]).

9.1. Definition. We say that the system (2.1) is a stochastic, linear, time-invariant port-Hamiltonian system (SLTI-PHS), if there exist $J, R, Q, \bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $F, P, \mathfrak{B}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $S, N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that $J = -J^\top$, $R = R^\top$, $Q = Q^\top \geq 0$, $S = S^\top$, $N = -N^\top$,

$$(9.1) \quad \begin{pmatrix} R & P \\ P^\top & S \end{pmatrix} \geq 0,$$

and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ it holds that

$$(9.2) \quad \begin{aligned} b(x, v) &= \left(J - R - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j) Q \bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j) \right) Q x + (F - P) v, \\ \sigma^i(x, v) &= \bar{\mathfrak{A}}(i) Q x + \mathfrak{B}(i) v, \\ f(x, v) &= \left(F + P + \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j) Q \mathfrak{B}(j) \right)^\top Q x + \left(S + N + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j) Q \mathfrak{B}(j) \right) v. \end{aligned}$$

To emphasize the dependence on Q we sometimes also say that (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS with Q .

Note that in Definition 9.1, the system (2.1) takes the form

$$\begin{cases} dX_t &= \left[\left(J - R - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j) Q \bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j) \right) Q X_t + (F - P) u_t \right] dt + \sum_{j=1}^k (\bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j) Q X_t + \mathfrak{B}(j) u_t) dW_t^j \\ Y_t &= \left(F + P + \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j) Q \mathfrak{B}(j) \right)^\top Q X_t + \left(S + N + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j) Q \mathfrak{B}(j) \right) u_t \\ X_0 &= x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ u &\in \mathcal{A}. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that any SLTI-PHS is, in particular, an SLTIS.

9.2. Remark. Let the system (2.1) be an SLTI-PHS. Then Assumption 7.1 is satisfied with

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \left(J - R - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j) Q \bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j) \right) Q, \quad B = F - P, \\ \mathfrak{A}(j) &= \bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j) Q \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{B}(j) = \mathfrak{B}(j), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ C &= \left(F + P + \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j) Q \mathfrak{B}(j) \right)^\top Q, \quad D = S + N + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j) Q \mathfrak{B}(j). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\mathfrak{M}_Q = -2 \begin{pmatrix} QRQ & QP \\ P^\top Q & S \end{pmatrix}.$$

9.3. Lemma. Let $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be positive semidefinite and assume that the system (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS with Q . Then we have that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$.

Proof. Using Remark 9.2, we obtain that

$$(9.3) \quad \mathfrak{M}_Q = -2 \begin{pmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} R & P \\ P^\top & S \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It hence follows from (9.1) that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$. \square

Under appropriate assumptions on the set of admissible controls, we obtain the following passivity properties of SLTI-PHS.

9.4. Corollary. Let $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be positive semidefinite and assume that the system (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS with Q . Suppose that Assumption 3.8 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled. Let $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the following statements hold true:

- (i) If Assumption 8.1 is fulfilled, then the SLTI-PHS is stochastically passive with respect to the storage function H .
- (ii) The SLTI-PHS has the passive locale supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .

(iii) *The SLTI-PHS has the passive supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 9.3, Theorem 7.7, and Theorem 8.3. \square

In the next lemma we provide an algebraic condition under which an SLTIS is an SLTI-PHS. This generalizes results from the deterministic case (see, e.g., [46, Theorem 2.3]) to the stochastic case.

9.5. Lemma. *Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled. Assume that there exists a positive semidefinite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $\ker(Q) \subseteq \ker(A) \cap \ker(C) \cap (\cap_{j=1}^k \ker(\mathfrak{A}(j)))$ and $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$. Then the SLTIS (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS with Q .*

Proof. Observe that $\ker(Q) \subseteq \ker(A) \cap \ker(C) \cap (\cap_{j=1}^k \ker(\mathfrak{A}(j)))$ implies that there exist $\bar{A}, \bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $\bar{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ such that $\bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j)Q = \mathfrak{A}(j)$, $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $\bar{A}Q = A$, and $\bar{C}Q = C$. Denote by $\text{Im}(Q)$ the image of Q . Let $G_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be defined by $G_1x = 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{Im}(Q)$, and $G_1x = \bar{A}x + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j)Q\bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j)x$, $x \in \text{Im}(Q)$. Let $G_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ be defined by $G_3x = -B^\top x$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{Im}(Q)$, and $G_3x = -\bar{C}x + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j)x$, $x \in \text{Im}(Q)$. Moreover, let $G_2 = B$ and $G_4 = -D + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j)$. Now, define

$$(9.4) \quad G = \begin{pmatrix} G_1 & G_2 \\ G_3 & G_4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$, it then holds for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d+n}$ that

$$(9.5) \quad \begin{aligned} z^\top \begin{pmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} (G + G^\top) \begin{pmatrix} Q & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id} \end{pmatrix} z &= z^\top \begin{pmatrix} Q(G_1Q) + (G_1Q)^\top Q & QG_2 + QG_3^\top \\ G_3Q + G_2^\top Q & G_4 + G_4^\top \end{pmatrix} z \\ &= z^\top \begin{pmatrix} QA + A^\top Q + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{A}(j) & QB - C^\top + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) \\ B^\top Q - C + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{A}(j) & -(D + D^\top) + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) \end{pmatrix} z \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$ shows for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \text{Im}(Q)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that

$$(9.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} x^\top & y^\top \end{pmatrix} (G + G^\top) \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} &= y^\top (G_4 + G_4^\top) y \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0^\top & y^\top \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} QA + A^\top Q + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{A}(j) & QB - C^\top + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{A}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) \\ B^\top Q - C + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{A}(j) & -(D + D^\top) + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y \end{pmatrix} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (9.5) and (9.6) that $G + G^\top$ is negative semidefinite. Let

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \frac{1}{2}(G_1 - G_1^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, & R &= -\frac{1}{2}(G_1 + G_1^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \\ P &= -\frac{1}{2}(G_2 + G_3^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}, & F &= \frac{1}{2}(G_2 - G_3^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}, \\ S &= -\frac{1}{2}(G_4 + G_4^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, & N &= -\frac{1}{2}(G_4 - G_4^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $-J^\top = J$, $R^\top = R$, $S^\top = S$, $-N^\top = N$, and

$$(9.7) \quad \begin{pmatrix} R & P \\ P^\top & S \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{2}(G + G^\top) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, note that

$$(9.8) \quad \begin{aligned} A &= \bar{A}Q = G_1Q - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j)Q\bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j)Q = (J - R)Q - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j)Q\bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j)Q, \\ B &= G_2 = F - P, \\ C &= \bar{C}Q = \left(-G_3^\top + \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}^\top(j) \right)^\top Q = \left(F + P + \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}^\top(j) \right)^\top Q, \\ D &= -G_4 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j) = S + N + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{B}^\top(j)Q\mathfrak{B}(j). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS. \square

- 9.6. Remark.** (1) Suppose that Assumption 7.1 is fulfilled. If $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is positive definite and it holds that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$, then all assumptions of Lemma 9.5 are satisfied.
- (2) There exist examples where the linear matrix inequality $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$ admits a positive semidefinite solution $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, but the SLTIS (2.1) is not an SLTI-PHS (see, e.g., the deterministic example [7, Example 2]).
- (3) The converse of Lemma 9.5 is true as well: If the system (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS with Q , then Remark 9.2 shows that the system (2.1) is an SLTIS whose system matrices satisfy $\ker(Q) \subseteq \ker(A) \cap \ker(C) \cap (\cap_{j=1}^k \ker(\mathfrak{A}(j)))$ and Lemma 9.3 shows that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$.

In terms of passivity properties, we obtain the following sufficient conditions for an SLTI-PHS.

9.7. Corollary. Suppose that Assumptions 7.1, 3.8 and condition (7.2) are fulfilled. Assume that there exists a positive semidefinite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and

$$(9.9) \quad \ker(Q) \subseteq \ker(A) \cap \ker(C) \cap (\cap_{j=1}^k \ker(\mathfrak{A}(j))).$$

Moreover, assume that at least one of the following conditions (i)–(iii) is satisfied:

- (i) Assumption 8.1 is fulfilled and the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to the storage function H .
- (ii) The SLTIS (2.1) has the passive locale supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .
- (iii) The SLTIS (2.1) has the passive supermartingale property with respect to the storage function H .

Then the SLTIS (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS with Q .

Proof. The claim follows from Lemma 9.5, Theorem 7.7, and Theorem 8.3. \square

If the SLTIS is observable (recall Definition 8.7), then Corollary 8.14 together with Theorem 8.3 and Lemma 9.5 allows us to start from stochastic passivity with respect to any storage function that is bounded from below. This, combined with Corollary 9.4, yields the following characterization of SLTI-PHS.

9.8. Corollary. Suppose that Assumptions 7.1 and 8.12 are fulfilled and that $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the natural filtration of W augmented by all the \mathbb{P} -null sets in \mathcal{F} . Assume that the SLTIS (2.1) is observable. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to a storage function H that is bounded from below.
- (ii) There exists a positive definite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that the SLTIS (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS with Q .
- (iii) The SLTIS (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Note that Corollary 8.14 shows that there exists a positive definite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that the SLTIS (2.1) is stochastically passive with respect to $\mathcal{H}: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $\mathcal{H}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$. Then Theorem 8.3 implies that $\mathfrak{M}_Q \leq 0$. Since Q is positive definite, (ii) now follows from Lemma 9.5.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): This is clearly true.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Corollary 9.4 ensures that the SLTI-PHS with some $Q \geq 0$ is stochastically passive with respect to the storage function $H: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$. \square

Observe that, in general, it is not guaranteed that an SLTI-PHS admits a representation where the matrix Q in Definition 9.1 is positive definite. At least, for any SLTI-PHS there exists a (possibly non-invertible) transformation into an SLTI-PHS with $Q = \text{Id}$.

9.9. Remark. If the system (2.1) is an SLTI-PHS with $Q \geq 0$, then it can be transformed into an SLTI-PHS with $\tilde{Q} = \text{Id}$. Indeed, set $\tilde{X} = Q^{1/2}X$, where $Q^{1/2}$ is the square root of Q (i.e., $Q^{1/2}$ is positive semidefinite with $Q^{1/2}Q^{1/2} = Q$). Then we obtain for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ that

(9.10)

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{X}_t &= Q^{1/2} \left[\left(J - R - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j) Q \bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j) \right) QX_t + (F - P)u_t \right] dt + \sum_{j=1}^k Q^{1/2} (\bar{\mathfrak{A}}(j) QX_t + \mathfrak{B}(j)u_t) dW_t^j \\ &= \left[\left(\tilde{J} - \tilde{R} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j) \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}(j) \right) \tilde{X}_t + (\tilde{F} - \tilde{P})u_t \right] dt + \sum_{j=1}^k (\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}(j) \tilde{X}_t + \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(j)u_t) dW_t^j \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(9.11) \quad Y_t = \left(\tilde{F} + \tilde{P} + \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}^\top(j) \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(j) \right)^\top \tilde{X}_t + \left(S + N + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}^\top(j) \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(j) \right) u_t,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J} &= Q^{1/2} J Q^{1/2}, \quad \tilde{R} = Q^{1/2} R Q^{1/2}, \quad \tilde{F} = Q^{1/2} F, \quad \tilde{P} = Q^{1/2} P, \\ \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}(j) &= Q^{1/2} \mathfrak{A}(j) Q^{1/2}, \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}(j) = Q^{1/2} \mathfrak{B}(j). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, one directly verifies that \tilde{R} , \tilde{P} and S satisfy (9.1).

We next discuss mean-square stabilization properties for SLTI-PHS.

9.10. Remark. By applying established results from the literature one can derive stability and stabilization properties for SLTI-PHS in the mean-square sense. For instance, if there is no control in the diffusion part (i.e., $\mathfrak{B}(j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$), Q is positive definite, and there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $R + c(F - P)(F - P)^\top$ is positive definite, then it follows from, e.g., [2, Theorem 1] that the SLTI-PHS is asymptotically mean-square stabilizable. In particular, if both Q and R in Definition 9.1 are positive definite, then the uncontrolled stochastic differential equation (6.1) is asymptotically mean-square stable.

In addition to passivity, a crucial feature of deterministic PHS is the fact that any power-conserving interconnection of deterministic PHS yields again a deterministic PHS. We show that this property also holds in the stochastic context for SLTI-PHS.

9.11. Remark. We first explain how we interconnect two SLTIS. Let

$$A(i), B(i), (\mathfrak{A}(j, i))_{j=1, \dots, k}, (\mathfrak{B}(j, i))_{j=1, \dots, k}, C(i), D(i)$$

denote the system matrices of dimensions $d(i)$ (state) and $n(i)$ (control) of the SLTIS (i) , where $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (cf. Assumption 7.1 and (7.1)). Assume for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that the control set $\mathcal{A}(i)$ of the SLTIS (i) satisfies Assumption 8.12 (with n replaced by $n(i)$). To interconnect these two systems, let $\hat{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\hat{n} \leq \min\{n(1), n(2)\}$ and $K \in \mathbb{R}^{2\hat{n} \times 2\hat{n}}$. We take (for simplicity) the first \hat{n} components of the controls for connecting and leave the remaining components as external inputs for the connected system, i.e., for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we split $u(i) \in \mathcal{A}(i)$ into the $\mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}}$ -valued process $u^c(i)$ and the $\mathbb{R}^{n(i)-\hat{n}}$ -valued process $u^e(i)$ such that $u(i) = ((u^c(i))^\top, (u^e(i))^\top)^\top$. We also partition the system matrices accordingly, e.g., $B(i) = (B^c(i), B^e(i))$ with $B^c(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(i) \times \hat{n}}$ and $B^e(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(i) \times (n(i)-\hat{n})}$, and

$$C(i) = \begin{pmatrix} C^c(i) \\ C^e(i) \end{pmatrix}, \quad D(i) = \begin{pmatrix} D^c(i) & D^{ce}(i) \\ D^{ec}(i) & D^e(i) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, initial value $x_0(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(i)}$ and control $u(i) \in \mathcal{A}(i)$ this also splits the output into $Y(i) = ((Y^c(i))^\top, (Y^e(i))^\top)^\top$ with

$$\begin{aligned} Y^c(i) &= C^c(i)X(i) + D^c(i)u^c(i) + D^{ce}(i)u^e(i), \\ Y^e(i) &= C^e(i)X(i) + D^{ec}(i)u^c(i) + D^e(i)u^e(i). \end{aligned}$$

If the matrix

$$(9.12) \quad \mathfrak{D} := \text{Id} - K \begin{pmatrix} D^c(1) & 0 \\ 0 & D^c(2) \end{pmatrix}$$

is invertible, then the interconnection

$$(9.13) \quad \begin{pmatrix} u^c(1) \\ u^c(2) \end{pmatrix} = K \begin{pmatrix} Y^c(1) \\ Y^c(2) \end{pmatrix}$$

yields an SLTIS with the state $X = ((X(1))^\top, (X(2))^\top)^\top$, the input $u = u^e = ((u^e(1))^\top, (u^e(2))^\top)^\top$ and the output $Y = Y^e = ((Y^e(1))^\top, (Y^e(2))^\top)^\top$. This can be shown by noticing that (9.13) is equivalent to

$$\mathfrak{D} \begin{pmatrix} u^c(1) \\ u^c(2) \end{pmatrix} = K \begin{pmatrix} C^c(1) & 0 \\ 0 & C^c(2) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X(1) \\ X(2) \end{pmatrix} + K \begin{pmatrix} D^{ce}(1) & 0 \\ 0 & D^{ce}(2) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u^e(1) \\ u^e(2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the connected SLTIS reads

$$(9.14) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t &= [(A + B^c \mathfrak{D}^{-1} K C^c) X_t + (B^c \mathfrak{D}^{-1} K D^{ce} + B^e) u_t] dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^k [\mathfrak{A}(j) + \mathfrak{B}^c(j) \mathfrak{D}^{-1} K C^c] X_t + (\mathfrak{B}^c(j) \mathfrak{D}^{-1} K D^{ce} + \mathfrak{B}^e(j)) u_t] dW_t^j \\ Y_t &= (C^e + D^{ec} \mathfrak{D}^{-1} K C^c) X_t + (D^{ec} \mathfrak{D}^{-1} K D^{ce} + D^e) u_t \\ X_0 &= x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d(1)+d(2)} \\ u &\in \mathcal{A}, \end{cases}$$

where \mathcal{A} satisfies Assumption 8.12 (with n replaced by $n(1) + n(2) - 2\hat{n}$) and where for any matrices $G(1), G(2)$, we denote

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G(1) & 0 \\ 0 & G(2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, note that if we use all control components of the initial systems for connecting, then the connected system will have no input and no output (but we still refer to it as an SLTIS).

9.12. Proposition. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ consider an SLTI-PHS (i) of dimensions $d(i)$ (state) and $n(i)$ (control) with $N(i) = 0$ in Definition 9.1 and assume that the control set $\mathcal{A}(i)$ satisfies Assumption 8.12. Let $\hat{n} \in \{1, \dots, \min\{n(1), n(2)\}\}$ and let $K \in \mathbb{R}^{2\hat{n} \times 2\hat{n}}$ satisfy $K = -K^\top$. Then the system (9.14) (i.e., the interconnection of the SLTI-PHS (1) and the SLTI-PHS (2) via (9.13)) is an SLTI-PHS.

Proof. We use the notation of Remark 9.11. In particular, note that $\mathfrak{D} = \text{Id} - K D^c$.

Suppose that $v \in \mathbb{R}^{2\hat{n}}$ satisfies $\mathfrak{D}v = 0$. It then holds that $v = K D^c v$. Since K is skew symmetric, it follows that

$$v^\top (D^c)^\top v = v^\top (D^c)^\top K D^c v = \frac{1}{2} v^\top (D^c)^\top K D^c v + \frac{1}{2} v^\top (D^c)^\top K^\top D^c v = 0.$$

For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the fact that we have an SLTI-PHS with $N(i) = 0$ shows that $D(i)$ is positive semidefinite. Hence, D^c is positive semidefinite. We thus obtain that $D^c v = 0$. This and $v = K D^c v$ demonstrate that $v = 0$. Therefore, \mathfrak{D} admits an inverse.

Note that for all $u(i) \in \mathcal{A}(i)$ and $x_0(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(i)}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, it follows from (9.13) and $K = -K^\top$ that

$$\langle u_s^c, Y_s^c \rangle = \langle K Y_s^c, Y_s^c \rangle = 0, \quad s \in [0, \infty).$$

This implies for all $u(i) \in \mathcal{A}(i)$ and $x_0(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(i)}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, that (recall $Y = Y^e$)

$$(9.15) \quad \langle u_s^e, Y_s \rangle = \langle u_s^e, Y_s^e \rangle + \langle u_s^c, Y_s^c \rangle = \langle u_s(1), Y_s(1) \rangle + \langle u_s(2), Y_s(2) \rangle, \quad s \in [0, \infty).$$

From Corollary 9.4 we have for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that the SLTI-PHS (i) is stochastically passive with respect to the storage function $H_i(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Q(i)x, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d(i)}$, where $Q(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(i) \times d(i)}$ comes from Definition 9.1. Let $Q = \text{diag}(Q(1), Q(2))$ and $H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d(1)+d(2)}$. Due to (9.15), it holds for all $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d(1)+d(2)}$, $u^e \in \mathcal{A}$, and $t \in [0, \infty)$ that

$$H(X_t) - \int_0^t \langle u_s^e, Y_s \rangle ds = H_1(X_t(1)) - \int_0^t \langle u_s(1), Y_s(1) \rangle ds + H_2(X_t(2)) - \int_0^t \langle u_s(2), Y_s(2) \rangle ds.$$

Therefore, stochastic passivity of the SLTI-PHS (i) with respect to H_i for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ implies that the system (9.14) is stochastically passive with respect to H .

Suppose that $x = ((x(1))^\top, (x(2))^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d(1)+d(2)}$ such that $Qx = 0$. It then holds for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that $x(i) \in \ker(Q(i))$. This and Remark 9.2 imply for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that $x(i) \in \ker(A(i)) \cap \ker(C(i)) \cap (\cap_{j=1}^k \ker(\mathfrak{A}(j, i)))$. It follows that $x \in \ker(A) \cap \ker(C) \cap (\cap_{j=1}^k \ker(\mathfrak{A}(j)))$. Moreover, we can show that $x \in \ker(C^c)$ and $x \in \ker(C^e)$. We hence obtain that the SLTIS (9.14) satisfies the condition (9.9). The claim then follows from the stochastic passivity of the SLTIS (9.14) and Corollary 9.7. \square

To conclude this section, we provide generalizations of two classic examples of linear PHS to SLTI-PHS and exploit the interconnection property to obtain a third example.

9.13. Example. (1) We consider a stochastic variant of the mass-spring-damper system. To this end, we denote by $m > 0$ the mass of the object, by $c > 0$ the damping constant, and by $\kappa > 0$ the spring constant. Let

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{m} \end{pmatrix}$$

and assume that $\sigma \in [-\sqrt{2mc}, +\sqrt{2mc}]$. Then

$$(9.16) \quad \begin{aligned} dX_t &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -c \end{pmatrix} QX_t + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} u_t \right) dt + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma \end{pmatrix} QX_t dW_t, \\ Y_t &= (0 \quad 1) QX_t, \end{aligned}$$

is an SLTI-PHS. The first component of the state in (9.16) is the displacement of the mass and the second component is the momentum, which here is subject to multiplicative noise. The control u is interpreted as an external force applied to the system while the output gives the velocity of the mass. The Hamiltonian H is the sum of the potential and kinetic energy, namely

$$H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \kappa q^2 + \frac{1}{2} m^{-1} p^2, \quad x = (q, p)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Note that if $\sigma = 0$ and the controls are deterministic, then (9.16) is the classic mass-spring-damper system in port-Hamiltonian formulation. Stochastic mass-spring-damper systems are also called stochastic oscillator in the literature, see, e.g., [34]. We remark that our condition on the size of the noise, $\sigma \in [-\sqrt{2mc}, +\sqrt{2mc}]$, which we require to obtain an SLTI-PHS, appears in [34, Equation (3.7)] as the condition for mean-square stability.

- (2) We next consider a stochastic variant of a series RLC circuit. Let $r > 0$ denote the resistance, $l > 0$ the inductance, and $c > 0$ the capacitance. Define

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{c} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{l} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $2r \geq \frac{1}{c}\sigma_1^2 + \frac{1}{l}\sigma_2^2$. Then

$$(9.17) \quad \begin{aligned} dX_t &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -r \end{pmatrix} QX_t + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} u_t \right) dt + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_1 \\ 0 & \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} QX_t dW_t, \\ Y_t &= (0 \quad 1) QX_t, \end{aligned}$$

is an SLTI-PHS. The first component of the state in (9.17) is the charge on the capacitor and the second component is the magnetic flux through the inductor. The current is given by the output, and as an input one applies a voltage source. The Hamiltonian

$$H(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Qx, x \rangle = \frac{1}{2} c^{-1} q^2 + \frac{1}{2} l^{-1} \phi^2, \quad x = (q, \phi)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

is the sum of the electric and magnetic energy. Observe that by setting $\sigma_1 = 0 = \sigma_2$ and allowing only deterministic controls, we recover the deterministic port-Hamiltonian formulation of an RLC circuit. For further stochastic RLC models, see, for example, [14, Section 1.9.7], [44, Section 1.1], or [12, Section 4].

- (3) Proposition 9.12 demonstrates that we can construct further SLTI-PHS examples by coupling. In particular, we can couple systems which come from different physical domains, such as the mass-spring-damper system (1) and the electrical circuit (2): Since in both (1) and (2) there is no control in the output, we have that Proposition 9.12 shows that interconnecting (1) and (2) via

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

yields an SLTI-PHS with four-dimensional state (and no external inputs and outputs). Note that in the interconnection the output current from (2) acts as an input force for (1), and the velocity of the mass (in opposite direction) plays the role of a voltage source for (2).

APPENDIX A. SEMIMARTINGALE THEORY

In this appendix we provide the required results about semimartingale theory. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}, \mathbb{P})$ be a stochastic basis satisfying the usual conditions, see [26, Def. I.1.3]. Let us recall some notation:

- We denote by \mathcal{M} the space of all uniformly integrable martingales.
- We denote by \mathcal{M}_{loc} the space of all local martingales.
- We denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}^0$ the space of all local martingales M with $M_0 = 0$.
- We denote by \mathcal{V}^+ the convex cone of all càdlàg, adapted and increasing processes A with $A_0 = 0$.
- We denote by \mathcal{V}^- the convex cone of all càdlàg, adapted and decreasing processes A with $A_0 = 0$.

- We denote by \mathcal{V} the space of all càdlàg, adapted processes A with locally finite variation such that $A_0 = 0$.
- We denote by \mathcal{A}^+ the convex cone of all $A \in \mathcal{V}^+$ such that $A_\infty \in L^1$.
- We denote by \mathcal{A}^- the convex cone of all $A \in \mathcal{V}^-$ such that $A_\infty \in L^1$.
- We denote by \mathcal{A} the space of all $A \in \mathcal{V}^-$ such that $\text{Var}(A)_\infty \in L^1$.

A.1. Definition. Every process X of the form $X = X_0 + M + A$ with $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}^0$ and $A \in \mathcal{V}$ is called a semimartingale.

A.2. Definition. Every process X of the form $X = X_0 + M + A$ with $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}^0$ and a predictable process $A \in \mathcal{V}$ is called a special semimartingale.

We denote by \mathcal{S} the space of all semimartingales, and by \mathcal{S}_p the space of all special semimartingales.

A.3. Proposition. [26, Cor. I.3.16] For every special semimartingale X the semimartingale decomposition $X = X_0 + M + A$ with $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}^0$ and a predictable process $A \in \mathcal{V}$ is unique. It is called the canonical decomposition of X .

Let \mathcal{S}^- be the convex cone of all supermartingales.

A.4. Definition. A process X is of class (D) if the set of random variables $\{X_T : T \text{ is a finite stopping time}\}$ is uniformly integrable.

We can now restate the Doob-Meyer decomposition theorem by means of special semimartingales as follows.

A.5. Proposition. For an adapted càdlàg process X the following statements are equivalent:

- X is a supermartingale of class (D).
- X is a special semimartingale with canonical decomposition

$$X = X_0 + M + A$$

such that $X_0 \in L^1$, $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}^-$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): This is a consequence of [26, Thm. I.3.15].

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): By [26, Prop. I.1.47] the martingale M is of class (D). Furthermore, the process A is of class (D) because $|A_T| \leq |A_\infty|$ for every finite stopping time T . Therefore, the semimartingale X is of class (D). Moreover, for all $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ with $s \leq t$ and all $B \in \mathcal{F}_s$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t \mathbb{1}_B] = \mathbb{E}[X_0 \mathbb{1}_B] + \mathbb{E}[M_t \mathbb{1}_B] + \mathbb{E}[A_t \mathbb{1}_B] \leq \mathbb{E}[X_0 \mathbb{1}_B] + \mathbb{E}[M_s \mathbb{1}_B] + \mathbb{E}[A_s \mathbb{1}_B] = \mathbb{E}[X_s \mathbb{1}_B],$$

proving that X is a supermartingale. \square

The next goal is to provide a local version of Proposition A.5. For this purpose, we prepare two auxiliary results.

A.6. Lemma. We have $\mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}}^- \subset \mathcal{S}_p$.

Proof. This is the statement on page 32 in [25] following Prop. 2.18. \square

A.7. Lemma. Every local supermartingale $X \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}}^-$ is locally a supermartingale of class (D).

Proof. By localization we may assume that X is a supermartingale, and then the statement follows from proof of [25, Prop. 2.18]. \square

Now, we can present a local version of the Doob-Meyer decomposition theorem in terms of special semimartingales as follows.

A.8. Proposition. For an adapted càdlàg process X the following statements are equivalent:

- X is a local supermartingale.
- X is a special semimartingale with canonical decomposition

$$X = X_0 + M + A$$

such that $X_0 \in L^1$ and $A \in \mathcal{V}^-$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): By Lemma A.6 we have $X \in \mathcal{S}_p$. Let us denote by $X = X_0 + M + A$ the canonical decomposition of X . Since $X \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}}^-$, we have $X_0 \in L^1$. By Lemma A.7 there exists a localizing sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that X^{T_n} is a supermartingale of class (D) for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Proposition A.5, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the process X^{T_n} is a special semimartingale with canonical decomposition $X^{T_n} = X_0 + M(n) + A(n)$ such that $M(n) \in \mathcal{M}$ and $A(n) \in \mathcal{A}^-$. Since \mathcal{M}_{loc} and the class of all predictable processes from \mathcal{V} are stable under stopping, the canonical decomposition of X^{T_n} can also be expressed as $X^{T_n} = X_0 + M^{T_n} + A^{T_n}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the uniqueness of the canonical decomposition (see Proposition A.3) we deduce that $M^{T_n} = M(n)$ and $A^{T_n} = A(n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, we conclude that $A \in \mathcal{V}^-$.
(ii) \Rightarrow (i): By [26, Lemma I.3.10] we have $A \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{loc}}^-$. Hence, there exists a localizing sequence $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $M^{T_n} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $A^{T_n} \in \mathcal{A}^-$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the canonical decomposition of the special semimartingale X^{T_n} is given by $X^{T_n} = X_0 + M^{T_n} + A^{T_n}$, and thus, by Proposition A.5 it follows that $X^{T_n} \in \mathcal{S}^-$. Consequently, we have $X \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}}^-$. \square

A.9. Lemma. *Let $X = X_0 + M + A$ be a local supermartingale. Suppose that M is a martingale and that $A \in \mathcal{V}^-$ satisfies $A_t \in L^1$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then X is a supermartingale.*

Proof. By assumption we have $X_t \in L^1$ for all $t \geq 0$. Moreover, for all $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ with $s \leq t$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_s] = X_0 + \mathbb{E}[M_t | \mathcal{F}_s] + \mathbb{E}[A_t | \mathcal{F}_s] \leq X_0 + M_s + \mathbb{E}[A_s | \mathcal{F}_s] = X_0 + M_s + A_s = X_s,$$

showing that X is a supermartingale. \square

A.10. Lemma. *Let X be a local supermartingale of the form $X = Y + A$ such that Y is a special semimartingale which is bounded from below, and $A \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfies $|A| \leq B$ for some $B \in \mathcal{V}^+$ with $B_t \in L^1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then X is a supermartingale.*

Proof. Let $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a localizing sequence such that X^{T_n} is a supermartingale for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, let $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ with $s \leq t$ be arbitrary. By Fatou's lemma we have

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_t | \mathcal{F}_s] = \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_s \right] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[Y_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_s].$$

Moreover, dominated convergence ensures that

$$\mathbb{E}[A_t | \mathcal{F}_s] = \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_s \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[A_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_s].$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_s] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_s \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_s \right] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[Y_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_s] + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[A_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_s] \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_s] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_{t \wedge T_n} = X_s, \end{aligned}$$

showing that X is a supermartingale. \square

A.11. Remark. *Note that Lemma A.10 generalizes the well-known result that every local supermartingale which is bounded from below is a supermartingale.*

Recall that for a process X we denote by X^* the running maximum

$$X_t^* := \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |X_s|, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

A.12. Lemma. *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{loc}}$ be a local martingale such that $M_t^* \in L^1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then M is a martingale.*

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be arbitrary. Then we have $M_T^t \leq M_t^*$ for every finite stopping time T , showing that the family

$$\{M_T^t : T \text{ is a finite stopping time}\}$$

is uniformly integrable. Thus the local martingale M^t is a process of class (D), and hence, by [26, Prop. I.1.47.c] we deduce that $M^t \in \mathcal{M}$. Since $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ was arbitrary, it follows that M is a martingale. \square

APPENDIX B. AN EXISTENCE RESULT FOR SDEs

In this appendix we provide an existence result for SDEs, which we require in the paper. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}, \mathbb{P})$ be a stochastic basis satisfying the usual conditions, and consider an \mathbb{R}^d -valued SDE of the form

$$(B.1) \quad \begin{cases} dX_t &= \tilde{b}(t, X_t)dt + \tilde{\sigma}(t, X_t)dW_t \\ X_0 &= x_0 \end{cases}$$

driven by an \mathbb{R}^k -valued Wiener process W with coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{b} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \tilde{\sigma} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}. \end{aligned}$$

B.1. Theorem. *We assume that the following conditions are fulfilled:*

- (1) *For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the processes*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (\omega, t) \mapsto \tilde{b}(\omega, t, x), \\ \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}, \quad (\omega, t) \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x) \end{aligned}$$

are progressively measurable.

- (2) *For each $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is an adapted, nonnegative process $\tilde{L}^R \geq 0$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have*

$$(B.2) \quad \int_0^t |\tilde{L}_s^R(\omega)|^2 ds < \infty,$$

and for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\|, \|y\| \leq R$ we have

$$(B.3) \quad \|\tilde{b}(\omega, t, x) - \tilde{b}(\omega, t, y)\| + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x) - \tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, y)\| \leq \tilde{L}_t^R(\omega)\|x - y\|.$$

- (3) *There is an adapted, nonnegative process $\tilde{L} \geq 0$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have*

$$(B.4) \quad \int_0^t |\tilde{L}_s(\omega)|^2 ds < \infty,$$

and for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$(B.5) \quad \|\tilde{b}(\omega, t, x)\| + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x)\| \leq \tilde{L}_t(\omega)(1 + \|x\|).$$

Then existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for the SDE (B.1) holds true.

Proof. For each $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the mappings

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^d &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad x \mapsto \tilde{b}(\omega, t, x), \\ \mathbb{R}^d &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}, \quad x \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x) \end{aligned}$$

are continuous by virtue of (B.3). We define the adapted, nonnegative process $\tilde{K} \geq 0$ as

$$\tilde{K}_t(\omega) := \tilde{L}_t(\omega) + |\tilde{L}_t(\omega)|^2, \quad (\omega, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Then by (B.4) we have

$$\int_0^t \tilde{K}_s(\omega) ds < \infty, \quad (\omega, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Therefore, by (B.5) for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $T, R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \sup_{\|x\| \leq R} \{ \|\tilde{b}(\omega, t, x)\| + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x)\|^2 \} dt &\leq 2 \int_0^T \sup_{\|x\| \leq R} \tilde{K}_t(\omega)(1 + \|x\|)^2 dt \\ &\leq 2(1 + R)^2 \int_0^T \tilde{K}_t(\omega) dt < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

showing that condition (3.1) from [32] is fulfilled. For each $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we define the adapted, nonnegative process $\tilde{K}^R \geq 0$ as

$$\tilde{K}_t^R(\omega) := 2\tilde{L}_t^R(\omega) + |\tilde{L}_t^R(\omega)|^2 + 4\tilde{L}_t(\omega) + 2|\tilde{L}_t(\omega)|^2, \quad (\omega, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Then by (B.2) and (B.4) we have

$$\int_0^T \tilde{K}_t^R(\omega) dt < \infty.$$

Furthermore, by (B.3) for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $t, R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|x\|, \|y\| \leq R$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\langle x - y, \tilde{b}(\omega, t, x) - \tilde{b}(\omega, t, y) \rangle + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x) - \tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, y)\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\|\tilde{b}(\omega, t, x) - \tilde{b}(\omega, t, y)\| \cdot \|x - y\| + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x) - \tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, y)\|^2 \\ & \leq (2\tilde{L}_t^R(\omega) + |\tilde{L}_t^R(\omega)|^2)\|x - y\|^2 \leq \tilde{K}_t^R(\omega)\|x - y\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (B.5) for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle x, \tilde{b}(\omega, t, x) \rangle + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x)\|^2 & \leq 2\|\tilde{b}(\omega, t, x)\| \cdot \|x\| + \|\tilde{\sigma}(\omega, t, x)\|^2 \\ & \leq 2\tilde{L}_t(\omega)\|x\|(1 + \|x\|) + |\tilde{L}_t(\omega)|^2(1 + \|x\|)^2 \\ & \leq (2\tilde{L}_t(\omega) + |\tilde{L}_t(\omega)|^2)(1 + \|x\|)^2 \\ & \leq \tilde{K}_t^1(\omega)(1 + \|x\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, applying [32, Thm. 3.1.1] concludes the proof. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Julia Ackermann and Thomas Kruse acknowledge funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 531152215 – CRC 1701.

REFERENCES

- [1] Julia Ackermann, Matthias Ehrhardt, Thomas Kruse, and Antoine Tordeux. Stabilisation of stochastic single-file dynamics using port-Hamiltonian systems. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 58(17):145–150, 2024. 26th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems MTNS 2024.
- [2] Mustapha Ait Rami and Xun Yu Zhou. Linear matrix inequalities, Riccati equations, and indefinite stochastic linear quadratic controls. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 45(6):1131–1143, 2000.
- [3] Mustapha Ait Rami, Xun Yu Zhou, and JB Moore. Well-posedness and attainability of indefinite stochastic linear quadratic control in infinite time horizon. *Systems & control letters*, 41(2):123–133, 2000.
- [4] Arthur Albert. Conditions for positive and nonnegative definiteness in terms of pseudoinverses. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 17(2):434–440, 1969.
- [5] Christopher Beattie, Volker Mehrmann, and Hongguo Xu. Port-Hamiltonian realizations of nonminimal linear time invariant systems. *arXiv:2201.05355v3*, 2025.
- [6] Bor-Sen Chen and Weihai Zhang. Stochastic H_2/H_∞ control with state-dependent noise. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 49(1):45–57, 2004.
- [7] Karim Cherifi, Hannes Gernandt, and Dorothea Hinsin. The difference between port-Hamiltonian, passive and positive real descriptor systems. *Math. Control Signals Systems*, 36(2):451–482, 2024.
- [8] Francesco Cordoni, Luca Di Persio, and Riccardo Muradore. A variable stochastic admittance control framework with energy tank. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 53(2):9986–9991, 2020.
- [9] Francesco Cordoni, Luca Di Persio, and Riccardo Muradore. Bilateral teleoperation of stochastic port-Hamiltonian systems using energy tanks. *Int. J. Robust Nonlin. Control*, 31(18):9332–9357, 2021.
- [10] Francesco Cordoni, Luca Di Persio, and Riccardo Muradore. Stabilization of bilateral teleoperators with asymmetric stochastic delay. *Systems Control Lett.*, 147:104828, 2021.
- [11] Francesco Cordoni, Luca Di Persio, and Riccardo Muradore. Stochastic port-Hamiltonian systems. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 32(6):1–53, 2022.
- [12] Francesco Cordoni, Luca Di Persio, and Riccardo Muradore. Weak energy shaping for stochastic controlled port-Hamiltonian systems. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.*, 61(5):2902–2926, 2023.
- [13] Francesco Giuseppe Cordoni, Luca Di Persio, and Riccardo Muradore. Discrete stochastic port-Hamiltonian systems. *Automatica*, 137:110122, 2022.
- [14] Tobias Damm. *Rational Matrix Equations in Stochastic Control*. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, first edition, 2004.
- [15] Jean-Charles Delvenne and Henrik Sandberg. Finite-time thermodynamics of port-Hamiltonian systems. *Physica D: Nonlin. Phenom.*, 267:123–132, 2014. Evolving Dynamical Networks.
- [16] Luca Di Persio, Matthias Ehrhardt, Youness Outaleb, and Sofia Rizzotto. Port-Hamiltonian neural networks: From theory to simulation of interconnected stochastic systems. *arXiv:2509.06674*, 2025.
- [17] Matthias Ehrhardt, Thomas Kruse, and Antoine Tordeux. The collective dynamics of a stochastic port-Hamiltonian self-driven agent model in one dimension. *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 58:515–544, 2024.
- [18] Zhou Fang and Chuanhou Gao. Stabilization of input-disturbed stochastic port-Hamiltonian systems via passivity. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 62(8):4159–4166, 2017.

- [19] Zhou Fang, Chuanhou Gao, and Denis Dochain. Stochastic weak passivity for weakly stabilizing stochastic systems with nonvanishing noise. *Systems Control Lett.*, 180:Paper No. 105606, 10, 2023.
- [20] Patrick Florchinger. A passive system approach to feedback stabilization of nonlinear control stochastic systems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 37(6):1848–1864, 1999.
- [21] Patrick Florchinger. Global asymptotic stabilisation in probability of nonlinear stochastic systems via passivity. *Internat. J. Control*, 89(7):1406–1415, 2016.
- [22] Wassim M Haddad, Tanmay Rajpurohit, and Xu Jin. Energy-based feedback control for stochastic port-controlled Hamiltonian systems. *Automatica*, 97:134–142, 2018.
- [23] Ting Hou, Weihai Zhang, and Hongji Ma. Some properties of exact observability of linear stochastic systems and their applications. *Asian J. Control*, 14(3):868–873, 2012.
- [24] Birgit Jacob and Hans J. Zwart. *Linear port-Hamiltonian systems on infinite-dimensional spaces*, volume 223 of *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*. Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2012. Linear Operators and Linear Systems.
- [25] Jean Jacod. *Calcul stochastique et problèmes de martingales*, volume 714. Springer, 2006.
- [26] Jean Jacod and Albert Shiryaev. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*, volume 288. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [27] Ioannis Karatzas and Steven E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991.
- [28] Rafail Khasminskii. *Stochastic stability of differential equations*, volume 66. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [29] Manuel Lanchares and Wassim M. Haddad. Dissipative stochastic dynamical systems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 172:105451, 2023.
- [30] Manuel Lanchares and Wassim M Haddad. Stochastic thermodynamics: dissipativity, accumulativity, energy storage and entropy production. *Philos. Trans. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 381(2256), 2023.
- [31] Zhao-Yan Li, Yong Wang, Bin Zhou, and Guang-Ren Duan. On unified concepts of detectability and observability for continuous-time stochastic systems. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 217(2):521–536, 2010.
- [32] Wei Liu and Michael Röckner. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: An Introduction*. Springer, 2015.
- [33] Yazeng Liu. Backward stochastic differential equation and stochastic control system. *Shandong University*, 1999.
- [34] Lev B. Ryashko and Henri Schurz. Mean square stability analysis of some linear stochastic systems. *Dynam. Systems Appl.*, 6(2):165–189, 1997.
- [35] Barbara Rüdiger, Antoine Tordeux, and Baris E Ugurcan. Stability analysis of a stochastic port-hamiltonian car-following model. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 57(29):295203, jul 2024.
- [36] Satoshi Satoh. Input-to-state stability of stochastic port-Hamiltonian systems using stochastic generalized canonical transformations. *Int. J. Robust Nonlin. Control*, 27(17):3862–3885, 2017.
- [37] Satoshi Satoh and Kenji Fujimoto. Passivity based control of stochastic port-Hamiltonian systems. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 58(5):1139–1153, 2012.
- [38] Satoshi Satoh and Masami Saeki. Bounded stabilisation of stochastic port-Hamiltonian systems. *Int. J. Contr.*, 87(8):1573–1582, 2014.
- [39] Eduardo D. Sontag. *Mathematical control theory*, volume 6 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998. Deterministic finite-dimensional systems.
- [40] Jingrui Sun, Xun Li, and Jiongmin Yong. Open-loop and closed-loop solvabilities for stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 54(5):2274–2308, 2016.
- [41] Jingrui Sun and Jiongmin Yong. Stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problems in infinite horizon. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 78(1):145–183, 2018.
- [42] Jingrui Sun and Jiongmin Yong. *Stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control theory: Open-loop and closed-loop solutions*. Springer Nature, 2020.
- [43] Shanjian Tang. Dynamic programming for general linear quadratic optimal stochastic control with random coefficients. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 53(2):1082–1106, 2015.
- [44] Valery A. Ugrinovskii and Ian R. Petersen. Absolute stabilization and minimax optimal control of uncertain systems with stochastic uncertainty. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 37(4):1089–1122, 1999.
- [45] Arjan van der Schaft. Port-hamiltonian systems: an introductory survey. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, pages 1339–1365, Madrid, Spain, 2006.
- [46] Arjan Van der Schaft. *Modeling and Control of Complex Physical Systems: The Port-Hamiltonian Approach*, chapter Port-Hamiltonian Systems. Springer, 2009.
- [47] Arjan Van der Schaft. *L₂-gain and passivity techniques in nonlinear control*. Springer, 2016.
- [48] Jan C Willems. Dissipative dynamical systems part ii: Linear systems with quadratic supply rates. *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis*, 45:352–393, 1972.
- [49] Weihai Zhang and Bor-Sen Chen. On stabilizability and exact observability of stochastic systems with their applications. *Automatica J. IFAC*, 40(1):87–94, 2004.

UNIVERSITY OF WUPPERTAL, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCES, GAUSS-STRASSE 20, D-42097
WUPPERTAL, GERMANY

Email address: `jackermann@uni-wuppertal.de`

UNIVERSITY OF WUPPERTAL, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCES, GAUSS-STRASSE 20, D-42097
WUPPERTAL, GERMANY

Email address: `tkruse@uni-wuppertal.de`

UNIVERSITY OF WUPPERTAL, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCES, GAUSS-STRASSE 20, D-42097
WUPPERTAL, GERMANY

Email address: `tappe@uni-wuppertal.de`