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## 1. Estimation problem

We consider

$$
z^{\prime}=A z+f+\mu, \quad z(0)=z_{0}+\mu_{0}
$$

The data $f$ and $z_{0}$ are assumed to be known, while $\mu$ and $\eta$ are model errors. We would like to estimate $z$ thanks to some measurements

$$
y_{o b s}(t)=H z(t)+\eta(t) \in Y_{o}
$$

Here, $Y_{o}$ is the space of observations, $\eta(t)$ is a measure error and $y_{o b s}(t)$ is the noisy observation.

Without measurements the only estimation of the state is made by solving the equation

$$
z_{e}^{\prime}=A z_{e}+f, \quad z_{e}(0)=z_{0}
$$

The error $e=z-z_{e}$ is

$$
e(t)=e^{t A} \mu_{0}+\int_{0}^{t} e^{(t-s) A} \mu(s) d s
$$

The goal is to use the measure $y_{o b s}(t)$ to improve the estimation of $z$.

## Example - The simplified linearized inverted pendulum

As in lecture 2, we consider the 'theoretical model'

$$
\theta^{\prime \prime}=\theta+u, \quad \theta(0)=\theta_{0}, \quad \theta^{\prime}(0)=\theta_{1},
$$

and the 'noisy model'

$$
\theta^{\prime \prime}=\theta+u+\mu, \quad \theta(0)=\theta_{0}+\mu_{0}, \quad \theta^{\prime}(0)=\theta_{1}+\mu_{1} .
$$

Setting $\rho=\theta^{\prime}$, we rewrite this system in the form

$$
\binom{\theta}{\rho}^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right)\binom{\theta}{\rho}+u\binom{0}{1}+\mu\binom{0}{1} .
$$

Assume that $u$ is given by the feedback law determined in lecture 2

$$
u=-2(\theta+\rho) .
$$

The next step consists in using an estimation $\left(\theta_{e}, \rho_{e}\right)$ of $(\theta, \rho)$ in the feedback law.

We measure $\theta$

$$
H\binom{\theta}{\rho}=\theta .
$$

Case 1. If the measure of $\theta$ is exact, we can evaluate $\theta^{\prime}$ by taking the derivative of the measure, and we do not need the model to estimate the state. We are in the case of a full information coming from the measure.
Case 2. If the model

$$
\theta^{\prime \prime}=\theta+u, \quad \theta(0)=\theta_{0}, \quad \theta^{\prime}(0)=\theta_{1},
$$

is exact, we can use the closed loop system

$$
\theta^{\prime \prime}=\theta-2\left(\theta+\theta^{\prime}\right), \quad \theta(0)=\theta_{0}, \quad \theta^{\prime}(0)=\theta_{1},
$$

to determine the control. In that case we do not use the measure to estimate the state.

Case 3. If the observation is $\theta_{\text {obs }}=\theta+\eta$, where $\eta$ is a noise. We measure $\theta$ but the feedback law depends on $\theta$ and $\rho=\theta^{\prime}$. If we apply the same strategy as in case 1 , we are going to use $\theta_{\text {obs }}$ and $\theta_{\text {obs }}^{\prime}$ in the feedback law. The noise is not necessarily differentiable and this naive approach introduces huge errors.

Another approach consists in using an asymptotic state estimation of the form

$$
z_{e}^{\prime}=A z_{e}+f+L\left(H z_{e}-y_{o b s}\right), \quad z_{e}(0)=z_{0} .
$$

The term $L\left(H z_{e}-y_{o b s}\right)$ is called a filtering gain and $L \in \mathcal{L}\left(Y_{o}, Z\right)$. The filtering gain is a corrector taking into account the measures.

We look for $L \in\left(Y_{o}, Z\right)$ such that

$$
\left(e^{t(A+L H)}\right)_{t \geq 0} \text { is exponentially stable on } Z .
$$

When the semigroup $\left(e^{t(A+L H)}\right)_{t \geq 0}$ is exponentially stable on $Z$, a dynamical system of the form

$$
z_{e}^{\prime}=A z_{e}+f+L\left(H z_{e}-y_{o b s}\right), \quad z_{e}(0)=z_{0}, \quad \text { with } L \in\left(Y_{o}, Z\right),
$$

is called a Luenberger observer.

The equation for the error $e=z-z_{e}$ is

$$
e^{\prime}=(A+L H) e+\mu-L \eta, \quad e(0)=\mu_{0} .
$$

Theorem. Assume that

$$
\left\|e^{t(A+L H)}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(Z)} \leq C e^{-t \omega}, \quad \text { with } \omega>0
$$

If $e^{t \omega} \eta \in L^{2}\left(0, \infty ; Y_{o}\right)$ and $e^{t \omega} \mu \in L^{2}(0, \infty ; Z)$, then

$$
\|e\|_{L^{2}(0, \infty ; Z)} \leq C e^{-t \omega_{1}}\left(\left\|\mu_{0}\right\|_{z}+\left\|e^{t \omega} \eta\right\|_{L^{2}\left(0, \infty ; Y_{o}\right)}+\left\|e^{t \omega} \mu\right\|_{L^{2}(0, \infty ; Z)}\right),
$$

with $0<\omega_{1}<\omega$.
2. Observability and Detectability of finite dimensional systems. Observability.

An initial condition $z_{0} \in Z$ is unobservable for the pair $(A, H)$ when

$$
H e^{t A} z_{0}=0 \quad \text { for all } t \geq 0
$$

For finite dimensional systems, an initial condition $z_{0} \in Z$ is unobservable for the pair $(A, H)$ if and only if it is not reachable for the pair $\left(A^{*}, H^{*}\right)$. Indeed, if $z_{0} \in Z$ is unobservable, then

$$
0=\int_{0}^{T}\left(y(t), H e^{t A} z_{0}\right)_{Y_{0}} d t=\int_{0}^{T}\left(e^{t A^{*}} H^{*} y(t), z_{0}\right)_{Z} d t
$$

for all $y \in L^{2}\left(0, T ; Y_{o}\right)$. The converse is obvious.
A system $(A, H)$ of finite dimension is observable when the set of unobservable state is reduced to $\{0\}$.
The pair $(A, H)$ is observable iff the pair $\left(A^{*}, H^{*}\right)$ is controllable.

## Detectability.

The dual notion of stabilizability is the notion of detectability. We say that the pair $(A, H)$ is detectable iff there exists $L \in\left(Y_{o}, Z\right)$ such that

$$
\left(e^{t(A+L H)}\right)_{t \geq 0} \text { is exponentially stable on } Z \text {. }
$$

The semigroup generated by $A+L H$ is exponentially stable on $Z$ iff the semigroup generated by $A^{*}+H^{*} L^{*}$ is exponentially stable on $Z^{*} \equiv Z$. This means that the pair $(A, H)$ is detectable iff the pair $\left(A^{*}, H^{*}\right)$ is stabilizable. One way to find $L^{*}$ such that $A^{*}+H^{*} L^{*}$ is exponentially stable consists in using a stabilizing feedback control by solving the Riccati equation

$$
P_{e}=P_{e}^{*} \geq 0, \quad P_{e} A^{*}+A P_{e}-P_{e} H^{*} H P_{e}+I=0 .
$$

Taking into account the knowledge of covariance noises, we can solve a Riccati equation of the form

$$
P_{e}=P_{e}^{*} \geq 0, \quad P_{e} A^{*}+A P_{e}-P_{e} H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1} H P_{e}+Q_{\mu}=0
$$

where $R_{\eta} \in \mathcal{L}\left(Y_{o}\right)$ and $Q_{\mu} \in \mathcal{L}(Z)$ are two symmetric and semidefinite positive operators (the covariance operators of the noises).

## Detectability of finite dimensional systems

Example 1

$$
\binom{z_{1}}{z_{2}}^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda & 0 \\
0 & \lambda
\end{array}\right)\binom{z_{1}}{z_{2}}+f+\mu, \quad z(0)=z_{0}+\mu_{0}
$$

Let us take

$$
H_{1} z=z_{1}+z_{2} .
$$

The state $z_{0}=(1,-1)^{T}$ is not observable. But if $\lambda<0$, then $\left(A, H_{1}\right)$ is detectable. If $\lambda>0$, the pair $\left(A, H_{1}\right)$ is not detectable.
If $H_{2} z=\left(z_{1}+z_{2}, z_{1}-z_{2}\right)$, then $\left(A, H_{2}\right)$ is detectable. (We have a full 'noisy' information.)

Example 2

$$
\binom{z_{1}}{z_{2}}^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda_{1} & 0 \\
0 & \lambda_{2}
\end{array}\right)\binom{z_{1}}{z_{2}}+f+\mu, \quad z(0)=z_{0}+\mu_{0} .
$$

Let us take

$$
H_{1} z=z_{1}+z_{2} .
$$

If $\lambda_{1} \neq \lambda_{2}$, the pair $\left(A, H_{1}\right)$ is detectable and observable,

- The pair $(A, H)$ is detectable iff there exists $\alpha>0$ such that

$$
\int_{0}^{\infty}\left\|H \pi_{u} e^{-t A_{u}} z\right\|_{Y_{o}}^{2} d t \geq \alpha\|z\|_{Z}^{2}
$$

- The best constant $\alpha>0$ can be taken as an evaluation of a degree of detectability.
- The pair $(A, H)$ is detectable iff, for each 'unstable' eigenvalue $\lambda_{j}$ of $A$, the corresponding family of eigenvectors (eigenfunctions) $\left(e_{j}^{k}\right)_{1 \leq k \leq \ell_{j}}$ is such that the family

$$
\left(H e_{j}^{1}, H e_{j}^{2}, \cdots, H e_{j}^{\ell_{j}}\right)
$$

is linearly independent.
Example 3

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z^{\prime}=A z+f+\mu, \quad z(0)=z_{0}+\mu_{0}, \quad z(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N}, \quad A=\operatorname{diag}\left(\lambda_{1}, \cdots, \lambda_{N}\right), \\
& H z(t)=\sum_{i=1}^{N} z_{i}(t) \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text { and } \quad y_{o b s}(t)=H z(t)+\eta(t) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We are going to see that if the eigenvalues are two by two distinct, then the measure Hz is enough to estimate $z$.

Assume that all the eigenvalues are unstable and of multiplicity equal to

1. We have

$$
H=(1, \cdots, 1) .
$$

The eigenvectors are the basis vectors $e_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq N$. We have

$$
H e_{i}=1 .
$$

Thus the detectability condition is trivially satisfied. However, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{-t A_{u}^{*}} H^{*} H e^{-t A_{u}}=\operatorname{diag}\left(e^{-\lambda_{1} t}, \cdots, e^{-\lambda_{N} t}\right) H^{*} H \operatorname{diag}\left(e^{-\lambda_{1} t}, \cdots, e^{-\lambda_{N} t}\right), \\
& H^{*} H=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & \cdots & 1 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
1 & \cdots & 1
\end{array}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-t A_{u}^{*}} H^{*} H e^{-t A_{u}} d t= \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
\frac{1}{2 \lambda_{1}} & \cdots & \frac{1}{\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{j}} & \cdots & \frac{1}{\lambda_{1}+\lambda_{N}} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\frac{1}{\lambda_{i}+\lambda_{1}} & \cdots & \frac{1}{2 \lambda_{i}} & \cdots & \frac{1}{\lambda_{i}+\lambda_{N}} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\frac{1}{\lambda_{N}+\lambda_{1}} & \cdots & \frac{1}{\lambda_{N}+\lambda_{j}} & \cdots & \frac{1}{2 \lambda_{N}}
\end{array}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

In the case when $N=2$,

$$
\operatorname{det} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-t A_{u}^{*}} H^{*} H e^{-t A_{u}} d t=\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{1}}-\frac{1}{\lambda_{2}}\right)^{2}
$$

Thus if two eigenvalues are very close, the pair $(A, H)$ is 'weakly' detectable.

Example 4 - The linearized inverted pendulum
We measure $\theta$ and $x$. We have

$$
A=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -\frac{m g}{M} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{g(M+m)}{M \ell} & 0
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad H_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{array}\right) .
$$

The controllability matrix of $\left(A^{*}, H_{1}^{*}\right)$ is

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cccccccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{m g}{M} & \frac{g(M+m)}{M \ell} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{m g}{M} & \frac{g(M+m)}{M \ell}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Thus $\left(A^{*}, H_{1}^{*}\right)$ is stabilizable and $\left(A, H_{1}\right)$ is detectable.

If we choose the measure operator

$$
H_{2}=\left(\begin{array}{llll}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right),
$$

the controllability matrix of $\left(A^{*}, H_{2}^{*}\right)$ is

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -\frac{m g}{M} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{m g}{M}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Thus $\left(A^{*}, H_{2}^{*}\right)$ is also stabilizable and $\left(A, H_{2}\right)$ is detectable.

## 3. Calculation of filtering gains $L$

## The deterministic approach to find $L$

Assume that $\mu_{0}=0$. When $\mu$ is a white Gaussian noise with mean value zero and with covariance $Q_{\mu}\left(Q_{\mu}=Q_{\mu}^{*} \geq 0\right)$, and when $\eta$ is a white Gaussian noise with mean value zero and with covariance $R_{\eta}$ ( $R_{\eta}=R_{\eta}^{*}>0$ ), it can be shown that the best linear estimator of $z$, without bias, knowing $y_{o b s}$, is the solution to the problem

$$
\begin{align*}
& \inf J(z, \mu, \eta), \quad(z, \mu, \eta) \text { obeys } \\
& z^{\prime}=A z+f+\mu, \quad z(0)=z_{0},  \tag{EP}\\
& y_{o b s}(t)=H z(t)+\eta(t) \in Y_{o},
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
J(z, \mu, \eta)=\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty}\left(R_{\eta}^{-1}\left(H z-y_{o b s}\right), H z-y_{o b s}\right)_{Y_{o}}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty}\left(Q_{\mu}^{-1} \mu, \mu\right)_{z}
$$

The weights $R_{\eta}^{-1}$ and $Q_{\mu}^{-1}$ are used to obtain the best ponderation between the model error and the measure error.

When $Q_{\mu}=0$, then $\mu=0$. The model error is equal to zero and the best estimation (which is also the exact one) is given by

$$
z^{\prime}=A z+f, \quad z(0)=z_{0} .
$$

At the opposite, if $R_{\eta}=0$, then $\eta=0$ and we have to use the equations $y_{o b s}(t)=H z(t)$ and $z^{\prime}=A z+f+\mu, z(0)=z_{0}$ to identify $\mu$.

Does $(\mathcal{E P})$ admit a solution ? How to characterize it ?
The existence of solutions to $(\mathcal{E P})$ is related to what is called the detectability of the pair $(A, H)$. Let us explain why.

Let us denote by $z_{z_{0}, f}$ the solution to

$$
z_{z_{0}, f}^{\prime}=A z_{z_{0}, f}+f, \quad z_{z_{0}, f}(0)=z_{0}
$$

set $\zeta=z-z_{z_{0}, f}, \bar{y}_{o b s}=y_{o b s}-H z_{z_{0}, f}$ and
$I(\zeta, \mu, \eta)=\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty}\left(R_{\eta}^{-1}\left(H \zeta-\bar{y}_{o b s}\right), H \zeta-\bar{y}_{o b s}\right)_{Y_{o}}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty}\left(Q_{\mu}^{-1} \mu, \mu\right)_{Z}$.

Problem $(\mathcal{E P})$ is transformed as follows
$(\mathcal{N E P})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \inf I(\zeta, \mu, \eta), \quad(\zeta, \mu, \eta) \text { obeys } \\
& \zeta^{\prime}=A \zeta+\mu, \quad \zeta(0)=0, \\
& \bar{y}_{\text {obs }}(t)=H \zeta(t)+\eta(t) \in Y_{o} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Assume that this problem admits a unique solution and let us write formally the optimality system

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \zeta^{\prime}=A \zeta-Q_{\mu} \phi, \quad \zeta(0)=0 \\
& -\phi^{\prime}=A^{*} \phi+H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1}\left(H \zeta-\bar{y}_{o b s}\right), \quad \phi(\infty)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

In this primal formulation, $\zeta$ is the state variable and $\phi$ the adjoint state. We can look for a dual problem in which $\phi$ will be the state variable and $\zeta$ the adjoint state. For that, we set $\psi=R_{\eta}^{-1 / 2} \boldsymbol{H} \zeta$ and we rewrite the above system as follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \zeta^{\prime}=A \zeta-Q_{\mu}^{1 / 2} Q_{\mu}^{1 / 2} \phi, \quad \zeta(0)=0 \\
& -\phi^{\prime}=A^{*} \phi+H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1 / 2} \psi-H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1} \bar{y}_{o b s}, \quad \phi(\infty)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

We can verify that this system is the O.S. of the dual problem
( $\mathcal{D P}$ )

$$
\inf F(\phi, \psi), \quad(\phi, \psi) \text { obeys }
$$

$$
-\phi^{\prime}=A^{*} \phi+H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1 / 2} \psi-H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1} \bar{y}_{o b s}, \quad \phi(\infty)=0
$$

where

$$
F(\phi, \psi)=\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty}\left(Q_{\mu} \phi, \phi\right)_{Z}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty}\|\psi\|_{Y_{o}}^{2} .
$$

For the well posedness of the state equation of $(\mathcal{D P})$, we need that ( $A^{*}, H^{*}$ ) is stabilizable. This is exactly equivalent to the definition of the detectability of the pair $(A, H)$. The Riccati equation for $(\mathcal{D P})$ is

$$
P_{e}=P_{e}^{*} \geq 0, \quad P_{e} A^{*}+A P_{e}-P_{e} H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1} H P_{e}+Q_{\mu}=0
$$

This Riccati equation enable us to define a Luenberger observer by setting

$$
L=-P_{e} H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1}
$$

Then $A^{*}+H^{*} L^{*}$ and $A+L H$ are exponentially stable.

## The stochastic approach to find $L$

We assume that $\mu$ is a Gaussian stationary white noise with mean value zero and covarinace $Q_{\mu}, \eta$ is a Gaussian stationary white noise with mean value zero and covariance $R_{\eta}$. Moreover we assume that $\mu$ and $\eta$ are independent.

The Kalman filtering consists in choosing the estimation $z_{e}$ of $z$ in such a way that the covariance of the error $e=z-z_{e}$ is minimized. Let us look for an estimation of the form

$$
z_{e}^{\prime}=A z_{e}+f+L\left(H z_{e}-y_{o b s}\right), \quad z_{e}(0)=z_{0} .
$$

Let us look for $L$ which minimzes the covariance of the error. The equation for the error $e$ is

$$
e^{\prime}=(A+L H) e+\mu+L \eta, \quad e(0)=\mu_{0}
$$

The mean value of the error is

$$
E[e(t)]=e^{t(A+L H)} E\left[\mu_{0}\right] .
$$

If $A+L H$ is stable then $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} E[e(t)]=0$.
The covariance of estimation error is

$$
E\left[e(t) e(t)^{T}\right]=P_{e} .
$$

In the case when $E\left[\mu_{0}\right]=0$ (or if we look for the asymptotic regime), the covariance $P_{e}$ satisfies the Lyapunov equation

$$
(A+L H) P_{e}+P_{e}(A+L H)^{T}+Q_{\mu}+L R_{\eta} L^{T}=0 .
$$

As in the calculation of the minimizing feedback control, it can be shown that the filtering gain minimizing the covariance of the error is

$$
L=-P_{e} H^{T} R_{\eta}^{-1} .
$$

The corresponding covariance is the solution to the Riccati equation

$$
P_{e}=P_{e}^{*} \geq 0, \quad P_{e} A^{*}+A P_{e}-P_{e} H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1} H P_{e}+Q_{\mu}=0 .
$$

Thus, we recover the same filtering gain as in the deterministic approach.

The simplified linearized inverted pendulum revisited
We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \binom{\theta}{\rho}^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right)\binom{\theta}{\rho}+u\binom{0}{1}+\mu\binom{0}{1}, \\
& \theta_{o b s}=\theta+\eta .
\end{aligned}
$$

We assume that $a$, the variance of $\eta$, is positive and $b$, the variance of $\mu$ is also positive. We have

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

The pair $\left(A^{*}, H^{*}\right)$ is stabilizable and the pair $(A, H)$ is detectable. The minimization problem giving the best estimator is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \inf \frac{1}{2 a} \int_{0}^{\infty}\left(\theta-\theta_{o b s}\right)^{2} d t+\frac{1}{2 b} \int_{0}^{\infty} \mu^{2} d t, \\
& \theta^{\prime \prime}=\theta+u+\mu, \quad \theta(0)=\theta_{0}, \quad \theta^{\prime}(0)=\theta_{1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The Riccati equation for the filtering operator is

$$
P_{e} A^{*}+A P-\frac{1}{a} P_{e} H^{*} H P_{e}+\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & b
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right) .
$$

We obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p_{12}+p_{21}-\frac{1}{a} p_{11}^{2}=0, \quad p_{11}+p_{22}-\frac{1}{a} p_{11} p_{12}=0, \\
& p_{11}+p_{22}-\frac{1}{a} p_{11} p_{21}=0, \quad p_{21}+p_{12}-\frac{1}{a} p_{21} p_{12}+b=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $p_{12}=p_{21}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2 p_{12}-\frac{1}{a} p_{11}^{2}=0, \quad p_{11}+p_{22}-\frac{1}{a} p_{11} p_{12}=0, \\
& -2 a p_{12}+p_{12}^{2}-a b=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Which gives $p_{12}=a+\sqrt{a^{2}+a b}$ and

$$
p_{11}=\sqrt{2 a^{2}+2 a \sqrt{a^{2}+a b}}, \quad p_{22}=\sqrt{2 a+2 \sqrt{a^{2}+a b}} \sqrt{a^{2}+b} .
$$

## 4. Coupling between control and estimation

The stabilization problem with full information. Consider a noisy control system

$$
z^{\prime}=A z+B u+\mu, \quad z(0)=z_{0}+\mu_{0} .
$$

Assume that $(A, B)$ is stabilizable, we can find $K \in \mathcal{L}(Z, U)$, such that $A+B K$ is exponentially stable on $Z$, by solving an Algebraic Riccati Equation of the form

$$
P=P^{*} \geq 0, \quad A^{*} P+P A-P B R^{-1} B^{*} P+Q=0
$$

with $R=R^{*}>0$ and $Q=Q^{*} \geq 0$, and by choosing

$$
K=-R^{-1} B^{*} P .
$$

The estimation problem. We solve the following A.R.E.

$$
P_{e}=P_{e}^{*} \geq 0, \quad A P_{e}+P_{e} A^{*}-P_{e} H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1} H P_{e}+Q_{\mu}=0
$$

and we choose $L=-P_{e} H^{*} R_{\eta}^{-1}$.

When we compare the Riccati equation for $P_{e}$ and the Riccati equation used to define the control law

$$
P=P^{*} \geq 0, \quad A^{*} P+P A-P B R^{-1} B^{*} P+Q=0,
$$

we notice that the roles of $A$ and $A^{*}$ are interchanged.
Next we use the filtering equation to determine the control by solving

$$
z_{e}^{\prime}=A z_{e}+B K z_{e}+L\left(H z_{e}-y_{o b s}\right), \quad z_{e}(0)=z_{0} .
$$

After that we prove that the original system with the feedback coming from the estimator

$$
z^{\prime}=A z+B K z_{e}+\mu, \quad z(0)=z_{0}+\mu_{0}
$$

is stable. Indeed the system satisfied by $\left(z, z_{e}\right)^{T}$ is

$$
\binom{z}{z_{e}}^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
A & B K \\
-L H & A+B K+L H
\end{array}\right)\binom{z}{z_{e}}+\binom{\mu}{0} .
$$

Theorem. If $\left(e^{t(A+B K)}\right)_{t \geq 0}$ is exponentially stable and if $\left(e^{t(A+L H)}\right)_{t \geq 0}$ is exponentially stable, then the semigroup generated by

$$
\mathcal{A}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
A & B K \\
-L H & A+B K+L H
\end{array}\right]
$$

is also exponentially stable on $Z \times Z$.

Proof. If $e=z-z_{e}$, we have

$$
\binom{z}{e}^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
A+B K & -B K \\
0 & A+L H
\end{array}\right)\binom{z}{e}+\binom{\mu}{L \eta} .
$$

## 5. Local stabilization of nonlinear systems

Let us recall that we want to stabilize the nonlinear system

$$
z^{\prime}=A z+B u+N(z)+R(z) u+\mu, \quad z(0)=z_{0}+\mu_{0}
$$

where $z=\left(x, x^{\prime}, \theta, \theta^{\prime}\right)^{T}$,

$$
A=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -\frac{m g}{M} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{g(M+m)}{M \ell} & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad B=\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
\frac{1}{M} \\
0 \\
-\frac{1}{M \ell}
\end{array}\right)
$$

with the measure

$$
y_{o b s}(t)=H z(t)+\eta(t), \quad H=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

The two nonlinear terms $N$ and $R$ obey $N(0)=0$ and $R(0)=0$.

We use the feedback and the filtering gains $K$ and $L$ determined for the linearized model, and we solve

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z^{\prime}=A z+B u+N(z)+R(z) u+\mu, \quad z(0)=z_{0}+\mu_{0}, \\
& z_{e}^{\prime}=A z_{e}+B K z_{e}+L\left(H z_{e}-y_{o b s}\right), \quad z_{e}(0)=z_{0}, \\
& y_{o b s}(t)=H z(t)+\eta(t) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We show, and we verify numerically, that this system is locally stable.

