

Stochastic controllability of systems with variable delay in control

J. KLAMKA*

Institute of Control Engineering, Silesian University of Technology, 16 Akademicka St., 44-100 Gliwice, Poland

Abstract. In the paper finite-dimensional time-variable dynamical control systems described by linear stochastic ordinary differential state equations with single time-variable point delay in the control are considered. Using notations, theorems and methods taken directly from deterministic controllability problems necessary and sufficient conditions for different kinds of stochastic relative controllability in a given time interval are formulated and proved. It will be proved that under suitable assumptions relative controllability of a deterministic linear associated dynamical system is equivalent to stochastic relative exact controllability and stochastic relative approximate controllability of the original linear stochastic dynamical system. Some remarks and comments on the existing results for stochastic controllability of linear dynamical systems are also presented.

Key words: controllability, linear control systems, stochastic control systems, delayed controls.

1. Introduction

Controllability is one of the fundamental concept in mathematical control theory and plays an important role both in deterministic and stochastic control theory [1–4]. Controllability is a qualitative property of dynamical control systems and is of particular importance in control theory. Systematic study of controllability was started at the beginning of sixties, when the theory of controllability based on the description in the form of state space for both time-invariant and time-varying linear control systems was worked out. Roughly speaking, controllability generally means, that it is possible to steer dynamical control system from an arbitrary initial state to an arbitrary final state using the set of admissible controls. In the literature there are many different definitions of controllability, both for linear [1, 2, 4, 5] and nonlinear dynamical systems [6–9], which strongly depend on class of dynamical control systems and the set of admissible controls [1, 10]. Therefore, for deterministic dynamical systems linear and nonlinear there exist many different necessary and sufficient conditions for global and local controllability [1, 2, 6, 10].

In recent years various controllability problems for different types of linear dynamical systems have been considered in many publications and monographs. The extensive list of these publications can be found for example in the monograph [1] or in the survey papers [2, 6, 10]. However, it should be stressed, that the most literature in this direction has been mainly concerned with deterministic controllability problems for finite-dimensional linear dynamical systems with unconstrained controls and without delays.

For stochastic control systems both linear and nonlinear the situation is less satisfactory. In recent years the extensions of the deterministic controllability concepts to stochastic control systems have been recently discussed only in a rather few number of publications. In the papers [5, 4, 11–14] different kinds of stochastic controllability were discussed for

linear finite dimensional stationary and time-variable control systems. The papers [3, 15–17] are devoted to a systematic study of approximate and exact stochastic controllability for linear infinite dimensional control systems defined in Hilbert spaces. Stochastic controllability for finite dimensional nonlinear stochastic systems has been discussed in the following papers [9, 18–21]. Using theory of nonlinear bounded operators and linear semigroups different types of stochastic controllability for nonlinear infinite dimensional control systems defined in Hilbert spaces have been considered in [7, 8]. In the papers [22, 23] Lyapunov techniques were used to formulate and prove sufficient conditions for stochastic controllability of nonlinear finite dimensional stochastic systems with point delays in the state variable. Moreover, it should be pointed out, that the functional analysis approach to stochastic controllability problems is also extensively discussed both for linear and nonlinear stochastic control systems in the following papers [3, 7, 15–17, 24].

In the present paper we shall study stochastic controllability problems for linear finite-dimensional dynamical systems, which are natural generalizations of controllability concepts well known in the theory of infinite dimensional control systems [1, 2]. More precisely, we shall consider stochastic relative exact and approximate controllability problems for finite-dimensional linear stationary dynamical systems with single time-variable point delay in the control described by stochastic ordinary differential state equations. Using techniques similar to those presented in the papers [4, 5, 17] we shall formulate and prove necessary and sufficient conditions for stochastic relative exact controllability in a prescribed time interval for linear stationary stochastic dynamical systems with one time-variable point delay in the control.

Roughly speaking, it will be proved that under suitable assumptions relative controllability of a deterministic linear associated dynamical system is equivalent to stochastic relative exact controllability and stochastic relative approximate

*e-mail: jerzy.klamka@polsl.pl

controllability of the original linear stochastic dynamical system. This is a generalization to control delayed case some previous results concerning stochastic controllability of linear dynamical systems without delays in the control [4, 5, 17].

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 contains mathematical model of linear, time-variable stochastic dynamical system with single time-variable point delay in the control. Moreover, in this section basic notations and definitions of stochastic relative exact and stochastic approximate controllability are presented. Moreover, some preliminary results are also included. In Section 3 using results and methods taken directly from deterministic controllability problems, necessary and sufficient conditions for exact and approximate stochastic relative controllability are formulated and proved. Finally, Section 4 contains concluding remarks and states some open controllability problems for more general stochastic dynamical systems.

2. System description

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specified, we use the following standard notations. Let (Ω, F, P) be a complete probability space with probability measure P on Ω and a filtration $\{F_t | t \in [t_0, T]\}$ generated by n -dimensional Wiener process $\{w(s) : t_0 \leq s \leq t\}$ defined on the probability space (Ω, F, P) .

Let $L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$ denotes the Hilbert space of all F_T -measurable square integrable random variables with values in R^n . Moreover, let $L_2^F([t_0, T], R^n)$ denotes the Hilbert space of all square integrable and F_t -measurable processes with values in R^n .

In the theory of linear, finite-dimensional, time-variable stochastic dynamical control systems we frequently use mathematical model given by the following stochastic ordinary differential state equation with single time-variable point delay in the control

$$dx(t) = (A(t)x(t) + B_0(t)u(t) + B_1(t)u(v(t)))dt + \sigma(t)dw(t) \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0, T], \quad (1)$$

with given initial conditions:

$$x(t_0) = x_0 \in L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n) \quad \text{and} \quad u(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [v(t_0), t_0] \quad (2)$$

where the state $x(t) \in R^n = X$ and the control $u(t) \in R^m = U$, $A(t) \in L^2([t_0, T], R^{n \times n})$ is $n \times n$ dimensional matrix with square integrable elements, $B_0(t) \in L^2([t_0, T], R^{n \times m})$ and $B_1(t) \in L^2([t_0, T], R^{n \times m})$ are $n \times m$ dimensional matrices with square integrable elements, $\sigma(t) \in L^1([t_0, T], R^{n \times n})$ is $n \times n$ dimensional matrix with integrable elements, $v(t) = t - h(t)$ is continuously differentiable and strictly increasing function, and $h(t) > 0$ is a time-variable point delay [1]. Moreover, since for $[t_0, v(T)]$ dynamical system (1) is in fact a system without delay, then we generally assume that the final time $v(T) > t_0$.

In the sequel for simplicity of considerations we introduce the so called leading function $r(t) = t + h(t)$, which is the inverse function for $v(t)$. Therefore, the leading function

$r(t) : [v(t_0), v(T)] \rightarrow [t_0, T]$ satisfies the following relation $r(v(t)) = t$.

Moreover, it is assumed, that the set of admissible controls $U_{ad} = L_2^F([t_0, T], R^m)$.

It is well known (see e.g. [4, 5, 9, 17]) that for a given initial conditions (2) and any admissible control $u \in U_{ad}$, for $t \in [v(t_0), t]$ there exist unique solution $x(t; x_0, u) \in L_2(\Omega, F_t, R^n)$ of the linear stochastic differential state equation (1) which can be represented in the following integral form

$$x(t; x_0, u) = F(t, t_0)x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t F(t, s)(B_0(s)u(s) + B_1(s)u(v(s)))ds + \int_{t_0}^t F(t, s)\sigma(s)dw(s)$$

where $F(t, s)$ is $n \times n$ dimensional well-known so called state transition matrix, generated by the matrix $A(t)$, (see e.g. [1] for properties of $F(t, s)$ and more details).

Thus, taking into account zero initial control for $t \in [v(t_0), t_0]$, the solution for $t \in [t_0, v(T)]$ has the following form [1]

$$x(t; x_0, u) = F(t, t_0)x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t F(t, s)B_0(s)u(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^t F(t, s)\sigma(s)dw(s).$$

Moreover, for $t > v(T)$ we have

$$x(t; x_0, u) = F(t, t_0)x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t F(t, s)B_0(s)u(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^{v(t)} F(t, r(s))B_1(r(s))r'(s)u(s)ds + \int_0^t F(t, s)\sigma(s)dw(s)$$

or changing the order of integration equivalently

$$x(t; x_0, u) = F(t, t_0)x_0 + \int_{t_0}^{v(t)} (F(t, s)B_0(s) + F(t, r(s))B_1(r(s))r'(s))u(s)ds + \int_{v(t)}^t F(t, s)B_0(s)u(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^t F(t, s)\sigma(s)dw(s).$$

Now, for a fixed given final time T , taking into account the form of the integral solution $x(t; x_0, u)$ let us introduce the following operators and sets [1].

The linear bounded control operator $L_T \in L(L_2^F([0, T], R^m), L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n))$ defined by

$$L_T u = \int_{t_0}^{v(T)} (F(t, s)B_0(s) + F(t, r(s))B_1(r(s))r'(s))u(s)ds + \int_{v(T)}^T F(t, s)B_0(s)u(s)ds$$

and its adjoint linear bounded operator $L_T^* \in L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n) \rightarrow L_2^F([0, T], R^m)$

$$L_T^* z = (B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t) + B_1^*(r(t))F^*(T, r(t))r'(t))E\{z | F_t\}$$

for $t \in [t_0, v(T)]$

$$L_T^* z = B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t)E\{z | F_t\}$$

for $t \in (v(T), T]$

and the set of all states reachable from initial state $x(t_0) = x_0 \in L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$ in final time T , using admissible controls

$$R_T(U_{ad}) = \{x(T; x_0, u) \in L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n) : u \in U_{ad}\} = F(T, t_0)x_0 + ImL_T + \int_0^T F(T, s)\sigma(s)dw(s).$$

Moreover, we introduce the concept of the linear controllability operator [1, 2, 4, 5] $C_T \in L(L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n), L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n))$ which is strongly associated with the control operator L_T and is defined by the following equality

$$C_T = L_T L_T^* = \int_{t_0}^{v(T)} (F(T, t)B_0(t)B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t) + r'(t)F(T, r(t))B_1(r(t))B_1^*(r(t))F^*(T, r(t))r'(t))E\{\cdot | F_t\}dt + \int_{v(T)}^T F(T, t)B_0(t)B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t)E\{\cdot | F_t\}dt.$$

Finally, let us recall $n \times n$ – dimensional deterministic controllability matrix [1]

$$G_T = \int_{t_0}^{v(T)} (F(T, t)B_0(t)B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t) + r'(t)F(T, r(t))B_1(r(t))B_1^*(r(t))F^*(T, r(t))r'(t))dt + \int_{v(T)}^T F(T, t)B_0(t)B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t)dt.$$

In the proofs of the main results we shall use also controllability operators $C_T(s)$ and controllability matrices $G_T(s)$

depending on time $s \in [t_0, v(T)]$, and defining as follows,

$$C_T(s) = L_T(s)L_T^*(s) = \int_s^{v(T)} (F(T, t)B_0(t)B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t) + r'(t)F(T, r(t))B_1(r(t))B_1^*(r(t))F^*(T, r(t))r'(t))E\{\cdot | F_t\}dt + \int_{v(T)}^T F(T, t)B_0(t)B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t)E\{\cdot | F_t\}dt$$

$$G_T(s) = \int_s^{v(T)} (F(T, t)B_0(t)B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t) + r'(t)F(T, r(t))B_1(r(t))B_1^*(r(t))F^*(T, r(t))r'(t))dt + \int_{v(T)}^T F(T, t)B_0(t)B_0^*(t)F^*(T, t)dt.$$

In the theory of dynamical systems with delays in control or in the state variables, it is necessary to distinguish between two fundamental concepts of controllability, namely: relative controllability and absolute controllability (see e.g. [1, 2, 6] for more details). In this paper we shall concentrate on the weaker concept of relative controllability. On the other hand, since for the stochastic dynamical system (1) the state space $L_2(\Omega, F_t, R^n)$ is in fact infinite-dimensional space, we distinguish exact or strong controllability and approximate or weak controllability. Using the notations given above for the stochastic dynamical system (1) we define the following stochastic relative exact and approximate controllability concepts.

Definition 1. The stochastic dynamical system (1) is said to be stochastically relatively exactly controllable on $[t_0, T]$ if $R_T(U_{ad}) = L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$ that is, if all the points in $L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$ can be exactly reached from arbitrary initial condition $x_0 \in L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$ at time T .

Definition 2. The stochastic dynamical system (1) is said to be stochastically relatively approximately controllable on $[t_0, T]$ if

$$\overline{R_T(U_{ad})} = L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$$

that is, if all the points in $L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$ can be approximately reached from arbitrary initial condition $x_0 \in L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$ at time T .

Remark 1. From the definitions 1 and 2 directly follows, that stochastic relative exact controllability is generally a stronger concept than stochastic relative approximate controllability.

However, there are many cases when these two concepts coincide.

Remark 2. Since the stochastic dynamical system (1) is linear, then without loss of generality in the above two definitions it is enough to take zero initial condition $x_0 = 0 \in L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$.

Remark 3. It should be pointed out, that in the case of delayed controls the above controllability concepts essentially depend on the length of the time interval $[t_0, T]$.

Remark 4. Let us recall once again, that, since for the final time T such that $v(T) \leq t_0$ stochastic dynamical system (1) is in fact a system without delay in the control therefore, in the sequel we generally assumed that $v(T) > t_0$.

Remark 5. Since the dynamical system (3) is stationary, therefore in fact controllability matrix $G_T(s)$ has the same rank at least for all $s \in [t_0, v(T)]$, [1].

Remark 6. From the form of the controllability operator C_T immediately follows, that this operator is selfadjoint.

In the sequel we study the relationship between the controllability concepts for the stochastic dynamical system (1) and controllability of the associated deterministic time-variable finite-dimensional dynamical system with single time-varying point delay in the control of the following form

$$y'(t) = A(t)y(t) + B_0(t)w(t) + B_1(t)w(v(t)) \quad (3)$$

$$t \in [t_0, T]$$

where the admissible controls $w \in L_2([t_0, T], R^m)$.

Therefore, let us recall without proof, the well-known necessary and sufficient condition for relative controllability of deterministic dynamical control system (3).

Lemma 1. [1]. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) deterministic system (3) is relatively controllable on $[t_0, T]$,
- (ii) relative controllability matrix G_T is nonsingular.

Now, let us formulate auxiliary lemma taken directly from the theory of stochastic processes, which will be used in the sequel in the proofs of the main results.

Lemma 2. [4, 5, 9]. For every $z \in L_2(\Omega, F_T, R^n)$, there exists a process $q \in L_2^F([t_0, T], R^{n \times n})$ such that

$$C_T z = G_T E z + \int_{t_0}^T G_T(s) q(s) dw(s).$$

Taking into account the above notations, definitions and lemmas in the next section we shall formulate and prove conditions for stochastic relative exact and stochastic relative approximate controllability for stochastic dynamical system (1).

3. Stochastic relative controllability

In this section, using lemmas given in Section 2 we shall formulate and prove the main result of the paper, which says that stochastic relative exact and in consequence also approximate controllability of stochastic system (1) is in fact equivalent to relative controllability of associated linear deterministic system (3).

Theorem 1. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) Deterministic system (3) is relatively controllable on $[t_0, T]$,
- (ii) Stochastic system (1) is stochastically relatively exactly controllable on $[t_0, T]$
- (iii) Stochastic system (1) is stochastically relatively approximately controllable on $[t_0, T]$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let us assume that the deterministic system (3) is relatively controllable on $[t_0, T]$. Then, it is well known (see e.g. [1, 2, 22]) that the relative deterministic controllability matrix $G_T(s)$ is invertible and strictly positive definite at least for all $s \in [t_0, v(T)]$, [1]. Hence, for some $\gamma > 0$ we have

$$\langle G_T(s)x, x \rangle \geq \gamma \|x\|^2$$

for all $s \in [t_0, v(T)]$ and for all $x \in R^n$. In order to prove stochastic relative exact controllability on $[t_0, v(T)]$ for the stochastic system (1) we use the relationship between controllability operator C_T and controllability matrix G_T given in Lemma 2, to express $E \langle C_T z, z \rangle$ in terms of $\langle G_T E z, E z \rangle$. First of all using formulas for relative controllability operator C_T and relative controllability matrix G_T we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E \langle C_T z, z \rangle &= \\ &= E \left\langle G_T E z + \int_{t_0}^T G_T(s) q(s) dw(s), E z + \int_{t_0}^T q(s) dw(s) \right\rangle \\ &= \langle G_T E z, E z \rangle + E \int_{t_0}^T \langle G_T(s) q(s), q(s) \rangle ds \\ &\geq \gamma \left(\|E z\|^2 + E \int_{t_0}^T \|q(s)\|^2 ds \right) = \gamma E \|z\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in the operator sense we have the following inequality $C_T \geq \gamma I$, which means that the operator C_T is strictly positive definite and thus, that the inverse linear operator C_T^{-1} is bounded. Therefore, stochastic relative exact controllability on $[t_0, T]$ of the stochastic dynamical system (1) directly follows from the results given in [1].

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) This implication is obvious (see e.g. [1, 3, 7, 17]).

(iii) \Rightarrow (i) Assume that the stochastic dynamical system (1) is stochastically relatively approximately controllable on $[t_0, T]$, and hence its controllability operator is positive definite i.e., $C_T > 0$ [1]. Then, using the resolvent operator $R(\lambda, C_T)$ and following directly the functional analysis method given in [4, 5, 9] for stochastic dynamical systems without delays, we obtain that deterministic system (3) is approximately relatively controllable on $[t_0, T]$. However, taking into account

that the state space for deterministic dynamical system (3) is finite dimensional, i.e. exact and approximate controllability coincide [1], we conclude that deterministic dynamical system (3) is relatively controllable on $[t_0, T]$.

Remark 7. Let us observe, that for a special case when the final time is such that $v(T) \leq t_0$, stochastic relative exact or approximate controllability problems in $[t_0, T]$ for stochastic dynamical system with delay in the control (1) are reduced to the standard stochastic exact or stochastic approximate controllability problems for the stochastic dynamical system without delays in the control [1].

Finally, we shall consider stationary dynamical system with constant matrices A , B_0 , B_1 and single point constant delay $h > 0$ in the control. In this very special case, without loss of generality we can take the initial time $t_0 = 0$. Then, taking into account Theorem 1 and relative controllability conditions for stationary deterministic dynamical systems with single constant point delay given in [1] we can formulate the following two simple corollaries.

Corollary 1. Suppose that $h < T$. Then stationary stochastic dynamical control system (1) is stochastically relatively exactly controllable in $[0, T]$ if and only if

$$\text{rank}[B_0, B_1, AB_0, AB_1, A^2B_0, A^2B_1, \dots, A^{n-1}B_0, A^{n-1}B_1] = n.$$

Corollary 2. [4, 5]. Suppose that $T \leq h$. Then stationary stochastic dynamical control system (1) is stochastically relatively exactly controllable in $[0, T]$ if and only if

$$\text{rank}[B_0, AB_0, A^2B_0, \dots, A^{n-1}B_0] = n.$$

Remark 8. Finally, it should be pointed out, that using very general method given in the monograph [1], it is possible to formulate for stochastically relatively approximately controllable dynamical systems the analytic formula for the admissible controls $u(t)$, defined for $t \in [t_0, T]$ and transferring given initial state x_0 to the desired final state x_T at time T .

4. Concluding remarks

In the paper sufficient conditions for stochastic relative exact controllability for linear nonstationary finite-dimensional stochastic control systems with single time-variable point delay in the control have been formulated and proved. These conditions extend to the case of one time-variable point delay in control, known stochastic exact controllability conditions for dynamical control systems without delays recently published in the papers [4, 5, 7]. Finally, it should be pointed out, that using the standard techniques presented in the monograph [1] it is possible to extend the results presented in this paper for more general nonstationary linear stochastic control systems with many time variable delays in the control. Moreover, the extension for stochastic absolute exact controllability and stochastic absolute approximate controllability in a given time interval is also possible.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education under Grant no. N514 415831.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Klamka, *Controllability of Dynamical Systems*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1991.
- [2] J. Klamka, "Controllability of dynamical systems – a survey", *Arch. Control Sciences* 2 (3/4), 281–307 (1993).
- [3] N.I. Mahmudov, "Controllability and observability of linear stochastic systems in Hilbert spaces", *Progress in Probability* 53, (2003).
- [4] N.I. Mahmudov, and A. Denker, "On controllability of linear stochastic systems", *Int. J. Control* 73 (2), 144–151 (2000).
- [5] N.I. Mahmudov, "Controllability of linear stochastic systems", *IEEE Trans. Aut. Control*, AC-46, 724–731 (2001).
- [6] J. Klamka, "Schauder's fixed point theorem in nonlinear controllability problems", *Control and Cybernetics* 29 (3), 377–393 (2000).
- [7] N.I. Mahmudov, "On controllability of semilinear stochastic systems in Hilbert spaces", *IMA J. Math. Cont. Inf.* 19, 363–376 (2002).
- [8] N. I. Mahmudov, "Approximate controllability of semilinear deterministic and stochastic evolution equations in abstract spaces", *SIAM J. Cont. Opt.* 42 (5), 1604–1622 (2003).
- [9] N.I. Mahmudov, and S. Zorlu, "Controllability of nonlinear stochastic systems", *Int. J. Control* 76 (2), 95–104 (2003).
- [10] J. Klamka, "Constrained controllability of nonlinear systems", *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 201 (2), 365–374 (1996).
- [11] [11] A.E. Bashirov, and K.R. Kerimov, "On controllability conception for stochastic systems", *SIAM J. Cont. Opt.* 35, 348–398 (1997).
- [12] A.E. Bashirov, and N.I. Mahmudov, "On concepts of controllability for deterministic and stochastic systems", *SIAM J. Cont. Opt.* 37, 1808–1821 (1999).
- [13] M. Ehrhard, and W. Kliemann, "Controllability of stochastic linear systems", *Systems and Control Letters* 2, 145–153 (1982).
- [14] J. Zabczyk, "Controllability of stochastic linear systems", *Systems and Control Letters* 1 (1), 25–31 (1991).
- [15] E. Fernandez-Cara, M.J. Garrido-Atienza, and J. Real, "On the approximate controllability of a stochastic parabolic equation with multiplicative noise", *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, serie 1*, 328, 675–680 (1999).
- [16] Kim Jong Uhn, "Approximate controllability of a stochastic wave equation", *Appl. Math. Opt.* 49, 81–98 (2004).
- [17] N.I. Mahmudov, "Controllability of linear stochastic systems in Hilbert spaces", *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 259 (1), 64–82 (2001).
- [18] A. Arapostathis, R.K. George, and M.K. Ghosh, "On the controllability of a class of nonlinear stochastic systems", *Systems and Control Letters* 44 (1), 25–34 (2001).
- [19] P. Balasubramaniam, and J.P. Dauer, "Controllability of semilinear stochastic evolution equations in Hilbert spaces", *J. Appl. Math. Stoch. Analysis* 14 (4), 329–339 (2001).
- [20] Y. Sunahara, T. Kabeuchi, S. Asada, S. Aihara, and K. Kishino, "On stochastic controllability for nonlinear systems", *IEEE Trans. Aut. Control* AC-19 (1), 49–54 (1974).
- [21] Y. Sunahara, S. Aihara, and K. Kishino, "On the stochastic observability and controllability for nonlinear systems", *Int. J. Control* 22 (1), 65–82 (1975).

J. Klamka

- [22] J. Klamka, and L. Socha, "Some remarks about stochastic controllability", *IEEE Trans. Aut. Control* AC-22, 880–881 (1977).
- [23] J. Klamka, and L. Socha, "Some remarks about stochastic controllability for delayed linear systems", *Int. J. Control* 32, 561–566 (1980).
- [24] R. Subramaniam, and K. Balachandran, "Controllability of stochastic Volterra integrodifferential systems", *Korean J. Comp. Appl. Math.* 9 (2), 583–589 (2002).