

Counterexample Guided Synthesis of Switched Controllers for Reach-While-Stay Properties

Hadi Ravanbakhsh and Sriram Sankaranarayanan

Abstract—We introduce a counter-example guided inductive synthesis (CEGIS) framework for synthesizing continuous-time switching controllers that guarantee reach while stay (RWS) properties of the closed loop system. The solution is based on synthesizing control Lyapunov functions (CLFs) for switched systems, that yield switching controllers with a guaranteed minimum dwell time in each mode. Next, we use a CEGIS-based approach to iteratively solve the resulting quantified exists-forall constraints, and find a CLF. We introduce refinements to the CEGIS procedure to guarantee termination, as well as heuristics to increase convergence speed. Finally, we evaluate our approach on a set of benchmarks ranging from two to six state variables, providing a preliminary comparison with related tools. Our approach shows significant speedups, thus demonstrating the promise of nonlinear SMT solvers for synthesizing provably correct switching control laws.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study the problem of automatically synthesizing continuous-time switching controllers for ensuring *Reach-While-Stay* (RWS) properties of polynomial systems. RWS properties specify a set of *goal states* G and a set of safe states S . The controller synthesis consists of synthesizing a winning region $W \subseteq S$ and W such that the system initialized inside W is guaranteed to stay inside W until a goal state in G is eventually reached. Additionally, to ensure that the winning region is large enough, we specify an initial set I and require that $I \subseteq W$. Such properties commonly arise in many situations such as stabilizing the output of a system to a goal region, while ensuring that the intermediate “transients” stay within safe bounds, or enable an autonomous vehicle to reach a target while staying away from obstacles. Our approach considers switched system plant models with finitely many control modes and continuous state variables whose dynamics in each mode are described by ODEs. The goal of the controller synthesis is to find a switching controller that chooses a control mode, given the current mode and continuous state.

Our approach synthesizes a control Lyapunov function (CLF), which can be made to decrease along the traces of the closed loop system, guaranteeing that the traces reach a designated, desirable region while staying in the safe region. As such, finding a CLF yields a switching function that simply chooses an appropriate control mode that ensures its decrease. However, for continuous-time switching, we are faced with the problem of *zenoness* caused by the controller switching infinitely often in a finite time interval, and thus, preventing time from diverging. Therefore, we provide sufficient conditions on the switching strategy that ensure that the resulting

switching function respects a minimum dwell time for each control mode.

The synthesis procedure iteratively searches for a CLF using Satisfiability Modulo Theory (SMT) solvers through a well-known procedure for program synthesis called *counter-example guided inductive synthesis* (CEGIS) [1–3]. Whereas CEGIS was originally proposed for synthesizing unknown parameters for programs (called *sketches*) so that assertions (safety properties) in the program are satisfied by all executions, we propose to reuse the basic insights for synthesizing controllers. Since the search space is infinite (and continuous), there is no guarantee that the process terminates. We show an adaptation of CEGIS to our setting that ensures eventual termination of the CEGIS algorithm.

We provide an implementation of the CEGIS approach for synthesizing controllers using the SMT solvers Z3 for linear arithmetic [4] and the dReal δ -satisfiability solver for nonlinear arithmetic constraints [5]. The evaluation shows the ability of our approach to effectively synthesize switching controllers with guaranteed minimal dwell time for 20 benchmark systems drawn from the related literature. On the other hand, the high complexity of nonlinear arithmetic decision procedures cause our approach to fail on 2 out of the 20 benchmarks attempted. Nevertheless, we provide a preliminary comparison that suggests that our approach is quite competitive with other state-of-the-art approach for the synthesis of controllers to guarantee temporal logic objectives. However, we are exploring relaxations for the non-linear constraints using well-known schemes such as SOS programming [6]. An important technical limitation of these relaxations that prevents their direct use in this paper lies in the lack of useful witnesses in case a given constraint is satisfiable. The contributions of this paper are summarized below: (A) We synthesize minimum dwell-time enforcing controllers that guarantee RWS from CLFs. (B) We adapt the well-known CEGIS algorithm to discover CLFs for polynomial switched systems [1–3]. (C) We show how the CEGIS search for candidate CLFs can be modified to guarantee finite termination. (D) We employ a heuristic to find better witness points that significantly improve the proposed approach. (E) We provide an experimental evaluation on a number of interesting benchmarks that demonstrates the promise of our approach, as well as its limitations.

A. Related Work

Verification: The stability of hybrid systems has been studied widely. Lyapunov functions remain a simple, yet powerful, approach for proving various forms of stability. The problem

of synthesizing Lyapunov functions has been approached using ideas such as SOS programming that reduces the conditions for a Lyapunov function for a given system to a semi-definite optimization problem [6–8]. Lyapunov function approach naturally extends to liveness properties (such as RWS).

Synthesis: Beyond verification, much work has focused on designing correct-by-construction controllers for various liveness properties, especially stability. The problem for synthesis is generally much harder than verification. A common approach to synthesizes *control Lyapunov functions* (CLFs) whose values can be decreased at each time instant through an appropriate control input [9]. For continuous-time plants, CLFs can yield an associated static feedback law that guarantees stability under some necessary conditions originally proposed by Artstein [9]. The problem formulation for synthesizing CLFs yields NP-hard, bilinear matrix inequalities (BMI). The BMI problem is solved directly using gradient descent [10] or using a heuristic such as V-K iteration [11] (or elsewhere called policy iteration [12]), which is often susceptible to failures due to local minima. Tan et. al. [13] formulate these conditions as a BMI and use off-the-shelf approaches to tackle the resulting BMIs. Rifford [14] discusses the converse results on control Lyapunov functions, i.e. if a system is globally asymptotically controllable, then there exists a locally Lipschitz control Lyapunov function. This justifies the use of Lyapunov function based methods.

Switched Controllers: In this article, the problem is to find a switching logic such that the closed loop system satisfies a RWS property. A large volume of work on switched system has focused on linear switched systems and the use of linear matrix inequalities to find controllers. Details are available from the textbook by Liberzon [15], and the survey articles by Lin and Ansaklis [16, 17]. Our approach here considers the continuous-time switched systems of more general polynomial dynamical systems. Furthermore, our focus is on synthesis to guarantee a minimum dwell time in each switching mode, and the use of CEGIS to find CLFs. These aspects are, to the best of our knowledge, unique to this work.

Another approach to controller synthesis is proposed by Taly et al. [18]. They consider the problem of synthesizing switching conditions for hybrid systems, so that the resulting system guarantees safety and liveness properties. The proposed method proves reachability by finding some progress certificates similar to Lyapunov functions. They reduce their synthesis to solving a system of nonlinear constraints. Our work here differs in the certificates used to prove desired property (these certificates are much simpler in our method) and the process of finding such certificate.

Dimitrova and Majumdar investigate proof systems for solving general parity games on continuous state-spaces using Lyapunov-like functions [19]. Their approach subsumes RWS properties. However, they do not provide an approach to synthesize these functions. The CEGIS approach presented here is a good candidate for such a mechanization, and the combination will be investigated as part of future work.

Another paradigm for synthesizing controllers is to define an abstract system and find a simulation (or approximate bisimulation) relation between the abstract system and the original system. These approaches are able to handle more general specifications (usually a sub-class of LTL) and they are not restricted to liveness properties, per se. The PESSOA tool [20] uses finite abstraction to discretize a continuous-time system, and solves a completely discrete problem. One problem with this approach is the number of the abstract states, which can grow very large if we want them to be precise. Recently, Cámara et. al. [21] proposed multi-scale abstraction to keep the number of states small and subsequently, Nilsson et. al. [22] proposed a CEGAR-based approach to refine the abstraction, whenever it is needed to avoid large number of abstract states. Our approach does not directly partition the state-space. On the other hand, the nonlinear SMT solvers such as dReal that are used in the CEGIS approach implicitly partition the state-space during the search for a CLF. However, such a partitioning is adaptive and is guided by the formula whose satisfiability is being decided. The preliminary evaluation provided shows that our approach can potentially be much faster in terms of time.

Fast Switches Most of aforementioned works consider discrete-time feedback for switched systems. When the feedback is continuous, extra care should be taken for infinitely fast switches. This phenomenon is common in many types of control, including sliding mode control [23, 24]. Asarin et. al. [25] propose another method for enforcing min-dwell time property for finite-abstraction based synthesis. Taly et. al. [18] use “Progress Invariants” to prove min-dwell time properties (for each switch the value of Lyapunov function should decrease at least $\epsilon > 0$ unit). Here, we develop a simpler strategy to guarantee a minimum dwell time.

CEGIS: The CEGIS framework has been used widely for solving $\exists\forall$ formulae in synthesis problems [3]. The idea here is to find a candidate solution based on some finite number of examples. Although CEGIS was first proposed in the computer science literature by Solar-Lezama et al. [1], variants of this approach are not unknown to the hybrid systems community. This strategy has been mainly used to find a solution for $\exists\forall$ formulae to solve parameter synthesis problems in programming languages ([1–3] to mention few) and hybrid systems [26, 27]. Topcu et al. consider a simulation-based approach for finding maximal region of attraction for continuous systems [28]. They employ a CEGIS-like approach that avoids solving a BMI through sampling finitely many witness points that are likely to belong to the region of attraction. A LMI is used to search for a Lyapunov function that includes these witness points. Also Kapinski et. al. [29] employ a CEGIS approach for synthesizing Lyapunov functions based on simulation results (initiated from witness points). In contrast, our approach considers switched systems and focuses on synthesizing CLFs. We also do not perform any sort of simulations for the witness points in our approach.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Let \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^+ denote the set of natural, real and nonnegative real numbers respectively. Let $\mathbf{0}$ be the zero vector of proper size. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and real number $\delta > 0$, let $\mathcal{B}_\delta(\mathbf{x}_c)$ be a ball with radius δ and \mathbf{x}_c as its center ($\mathcal{B}_\delta(\mathbf{x}_c) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_c\| \leq \delta\}$). For a set S , let ∂S and $\text{int}(S)$ be boundary and interior of S , respectively. Let $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ denote the set of all polynomials involving variables in \mathbf{x} , wherein each polynomial is written as a finite sum $p : \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} c_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$, where the multi-index α is used to denote a monomial \mathbf{x}^α and $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is a coefficient. A *template polynomial* over coefficients C is a polynomial $F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) : \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} c_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$ whose coefficients are parameterized by a set of template variables $c_\alpha \in C$. Given a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $f^-(t)$ denotes the left limit: $\lim_{s \rightarrow t} f(s)$ and $f^+(t)$ denotes the right limit: $\lim_{t \leftarrow s} f(s)$. As a convention, let $\dot{f}(t)$ denote the *right derivative* of the function: $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(t+h) - f(t)}{h}$ at $x = t$. If f is differentiable then \dot{f} coincides with its derivative.

System Model: We first discuss the system model for our controller synthesis problem. The system has a *plant model* which describes the physical environment with continuous dynamics. Also, the system has a controller which provides a mode for the plant (Figure 1).




Fig. 1. The closed loop model of the plant and the controller.

The plant has continuous state variables $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The controller continuously chooses a mode from a finite set of possible *control modes* $q \in Q$, wherein the dynamics of the continuous state variables may depend on the chosen control mode q . We now define our plant models.

Definition 1 (Switched Polynomial System): A *switched polynomial system* is a tuple $\Psi : (Q, X, f)$, consisting of (A) *Continuous state-space*: $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ (n is the number of continuous state variables); (B) A finite set Q of (control) modes; and (C) A map from each mode $q \in Q$ to a polynomial vector field $f_q \in \mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]^n$, specifying its dynamics.

The controller is modeled as a memoryless state feedback switched controller.

Definition 2 (Switching Controller): Given a plant $\Psi : (Q, X, f)$, a switching controller switch is specified by a function $\text{switch}(q, \mathbf{x})$ that maps each current mode $q \in Q$ and plant state $\mathbf{x} \in X$ to a next mode $\hat{q} \in Q$.

A control implementation conforms to this specification by choosing the next mode specified in $\text{switch}(q, \mathbf{x})$.

Definition 3 (Closed Loop System): The composition of the plant Ψ and a controller switch yields a *deterministic switched system* $\Phi(X, Q, f, G)$ with continuous variable \mathbf{x} , modes Q , dynamics given by f_q in each mode $q \in Q$. The transition from mode q to \hat{q} has the guard set $G_{q, \hat{q}} : \{\mathbf{x} \mid \text{switch}(q, \mathbf{x}) = \hat{q}\}$

The set of traces of the closed-loop switched system represents all executions of the switched system that respects the plant dynamics and switches according to the controller

specification. Formally, a *trace* $\text{tr} : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow Q \times X$ is a function mapping time $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ to the mode and state of the plant at that time. Let tr_X (tr_Q) denote the projections of the trace tr onto the sets X (and Q). For a trace to be valid, it must satisfy the following conditions:

- The switching times $\text{SwitchTimes}(\text{tr}) : \{t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \mid \text{tr}_Q^+(t) \neq \text{tr}_Q^-(t)\}$ form a finite, or countably infinite set.
- For all *non-switching times* $t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \text{SwitchTimes}(\text{tr})$, writing $q : \text{tr}_Q(t)$, we have tr_X is differentiable at t and $\frac{d\text{tr}_X}{dt} = f_q(\text{tr}_X(t))$.
- For all *switching times* $t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cap \text{SwitchTimes}(\text{tr})$, writing $q : \text{tr}_Q^-(t)$ and $\hat{q} : \text{tr}_Q^+(t)$, we have $\hat{q} = \text{switch}(q, \text{tr}_X(t))$ and the right derivative $\text{tr}_X^+(t) = f_{\hat{q}}(\text{tr}_X(t))$.

A trace is *time divergent* if for all $\Delta > 0$, $\text{SwitchTimes}(\text{tr}) \cap [0, \Delta]$ is a finite set.

Specification: We want the continuous state \mathbf{x} to reach from initial (compact) set $I \subset X$ to goal (compact) set $G \subset X$, while staying in safe (compact) sets $S \subset X$.

Definition 4 (Reach While Stay): The closed loop switched system Φ satisfies RWS w.r.t (I, G, S) iff for all traces tr , $(\text{tr}_X \in I) \implies (\text{tr}_X \in S) \cup (\text{tr}_X \in G)$.

To eliminate some technical arguments we assume $I \subseteq \text{int}(S)$. The problem we study in this paper is synthesizing a controller that guarantees RWS w.r.t (I, G, S) for the closed loop system. Also we are interested in finding a big region $W \supseteq I$ s.t. the system satisfies RWS w.r.t (W, G, S) .

Problem 1: Given S, G and $I \subseteq \text{int}(S)$ and a plant Ψ , find a switch function and a region $W \supseteq I$ s.t. the closed loop switched system Φ satisfies RWS w.r.t (W, G, S) .

III. LYAPUNOV FUNCTION FOR SWITCHED SYSTEMS

We recall Lyapunov and control Lyapunov functions for RWS properties of switched systems.

Definition 5: A Lyapunov function for RWS w.r.t (I, G, S) is a continuous function $V : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ iff there exists a constant β s.t.

- 1) $(\forall \mathbf{x} \in \partial S \setminus G) V(\mathbf{x}) > \beta$
- 2) $(\forall \mathbf{x} \in I \setminus G) V(\mathbf{x}) < \beta$
- 3) $(\forall \text{tr}, t'' > t' \geq 0) (\text{tr}_X(t') \notin \text{int}(G) \wedge V(\text{tr}_X(t')) < \beta) \implies V(\text{tr}_X(t'')) < V(\text{tr}_X(t'))$

For a given trace tr , let $\text{tr}_V(t) = V(\text{tr}_X(t))$. Because of the continuity of tr_X and V , the third condition is equivalent to

$$\exists \epsilon_Q, \forall \text{tr}, (\forall t \geq 0) (\text{tr}_X(t) \notin G \wedge V(\text{tr}_X(t)) < \beta) \implies \text{tr}_V(t) = \frac{dV}{dx} \text{tr}_X(t) < -\epsilon_Q \quad (1)$$

This condition simply implies that the value of Lyapunov function decreases through time.

Definition 6 (Region for Lyapunov Function): Given a Lyapunov function V , let β be the constant in Def. 5. The associated region is defined as $W : \{\mathbf{x} \in X \mid V(\mathbf{x}) \leq \beta\} \cap S$.

It is easy to show that (a) W is a compact set, (b) $\mathbf{x} \in \partial W \implies V(\mathbf{x}) = \beta$, (c) $I \setminus G \subseteq \text{int}(W)$ and (d) $W \setminus G \subseteq \text{int}(S)$. Ultimately we want to show $(\text{tr}_X \in W) \implies (\text{tr}_X \in W) \cup (\text{tr}_X \in G)$ and since

$W \subseteq \text{int}(S)$, the system satisfies RWS w.r.t (W, G, S) . Our overall strategy for controller synthesis is to synthesize a (control) Lyapunov function. Such function can provide a control strategy as well as region W such that the closed loop system satisfies the specification. However, while Lyapunov functions extend to proving stability for switched/hybrid systems [15], care must be taken to ensure that these techniques are not applied to systems with *time-convergent* traces. Defining the asymptotic behavior of such traces as $t \rightarrow \infty$ is clearly not meaningful, when the time t never diverges. It is possible for such trajectories to “converge” to a non-target state, even when a Lyapunov function decreases.

Secondly, since our goal is to synthesize controllers, time convergent behaviors represent physically unrealizable control strategies, and must be avoided in our closed loop systems. Therefore, it is quite essential that our controller synthesis technique guarantee that the traces of the resulting closed loop system are all time divergent.

A. Control Lyapunov Function

We focus, in this work, on finding polynomial control Lyapunov functions for guaranteeing RWS.

Definition 7 (Control Lyapunov Function): A control Lyapunov function (CLF) w.r.t. (I, G, S) and a plant Ψ is a polynomial function $V(\mathbf{x})$ iff there exist a β and ϵ_Q s.t.

$$\begin{aligned} & (\forall \mathbf{x} \in \partial S \setminus G) V(\mathbf{x}) > \beta \wedge \\ & (\forall \mathbf{x} \in I \setminus G) V(\mathbf{x}) < \beta \wedge \\ & (\forall \mathbf{x} \in S \setminus G) (\exists q \in Q) \dot{V}_q(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{dV}{d\mathbf{x}} f_q(\mathbf{x}) < -\epsilon_Q \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Given a control Lyapunov function V w.r.t (I, G, S) , we define an associated set of switching functions that define controllers, as follows.

Definition 8 (Switching Function for CLF): Given a CLF V and a function $\text{switch} : Q \times X \mapsto Q$, we say that switch is compatible with V iff for every state $\mathbf{x} \in S \setminus G$ and mode q , the mode $\hat{q} : \text{switch}(q, \mathbf{x})$ is such that $\dot{V}_{\hat{q}}(\mathbf{x}) < 0$.

In other words, the controller at any state and any mode chooses an input $q \in Q$ that makes the control Lyapunov function decrease “instantaneously”. Given a CLF, we wish to synthesize a controller that establishes RWS w.r.t (W, G, S) . However, we cannot yet guarantee that the trajectories of the closed loop system will all be time divergent. As a result, we first tackle the problem of finding a switching function that yields a minimum dwell time for each mode $q \in Q$. In other words, whenever the controller switches into a mode $q \in Q$, it must stay in that mode for at least some time $\delta_m > 0$ before transitioning to a different mode \hat{q} .

Non-Zeno Switching Strategy: As usual, the goal of the controller is to ensure that the CLF $V(\mathbf{x})$ decreases along any trace. Suppose the current control mode is given by $q \in Q$. Choosing a fixed constant $\lambda > 1$, we define a switching

function as follows:

$$\text{switch}(q, \mathbf{x}) := \begin{cases} \hat{q} & \text{if } \left(\begin{array}{l} \dot{V}_q(\mathbf{x}) \geq -\frac{\epsilon_Q}{\lambda} \wedge \mathbf{x} \in S \setminus G \\ \wedge \dot{V}_{\hat{q}}(\mathbf{x}) < -\epsilon_Q \end{array} \right) \\ q & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The switching function above changes mode from q to a new mode \hat{q} whenever the derivative of the CLF \dot{V}_q is above a threshold $-\frac{\epsilon_Q}{\lambda}$. The new mode it switches to satisfies $\dot{V}_{\hat{q}} < -\epsilon_Q$. Such a mode is always guaranteed to exist for $\mathbf{x} \in S \setminus G$. Otherwise, the current mode is retained. The main result shows that using the switching function above, whenever the controller switches to mode q , there is a fixed lower bound ($\delta_{m,q} > 0$) on the time before the controller switches to another mode \hat{q} .

Theorem 1: For each $q \in Q$, there exists a minimum dwell time $\delta_{m,q} > 0$ such that for any time $T > 0$ with $\text{tr}_q(T) = q$, if (a) $\text{tr}_X(T) \in S \setminus G$, (b) $\dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(T)) < -\epsilon_Q$ and (c) $\text{tr}_X(t) \in S \setminus G$ for all $t \in [T, T + \delta_{m,q}]$, then $(\forall t \in [T, T + \delta_{m,q}]) \dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(t)) \leq -\frac{\epsilon_Q}{\lambda}$.

As a corollary, the control mode does not change in time $[T, T + \delta_{m,q}]$: $\text{switch}(\text{tr}_q(t), \text{tr}_X(t)) = \text{tr}_q(T)$ for all $t \in [T, T + \delta_{m,q}]$.

A closed form expression bound for $\delta_{m,q}$ is obtained in the proof of Theorem 1 as $\delta_{m,q} = \frac{(\lambda-1)\epsilon_Q}{\epsilon_1 \lambda}$, wherein ϵ_1 is a positive constant s.t. $\epsilon_1 \geq \min_{\mathbf{x} \in S \setminus G} \dot{V}_q$. This is computed by minimizing the polynomial second Lie derivative of V w.r.t the dynamics over the mode q in the set $S \setminus G$. It can be solved conservatively for instance through SOS programming [6].

Theorem 2: Given compact sets $S, G, I \subseteq \text{int}(S)$, a plant Ψ and a CLF $V(\mathbf{x})$ w.r.t (I, G, S) with associated region W , and a controller function switch that conforms to Equation 3, the closed loop Φ satisfies the following properties.

- 1) System satisfies RWS w.r.t (W, G, S) .
- 2) All the traces of the closed loop system starting from W are time divergent before reaching G .

Discrete Controller: Given δ_m , a time-triggered discrete controller computes the $\text{switch}(q, \mathbf{x})$ function every δ_m time units. At the start of each cycle (time T), the controller calculates $\dot{V}_q(\mathbf{x})$ and computes a mode it can safely switch to. Often many possible next modes may exist, and the controller can use other performance criteria to choose the next mode. Once chosen, this mode remains fixed until the beginning of next cycle ($[T + \tau]$). Theorem 1 guarantees that value of CLF decreases during each cycle and therefore, we make progress towards our goal G .

IV. SYNTHESIZING CLFS

The described solution in previous section reduces Problem 1 to finding a CLF. In this section, we focus on the problem of searching a CLF. First, we introduce a general CEGIS framework for solving $\exists \forall$ formula for real arithmetics.

The general problem we wish to solve has the following form:

$$(\exists \mathbf{c} \in C) \begin{cases} \bigvee_j \bigwedge_k G_{j,k}(\mathbf{c}) < 0 \\ (\forall \mathbf{x} \in R_1) \bigvee_k F_{1,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) < 0 \\ (\forall \mathbf{x} \in R_2) \bigvee_k F_{2,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) < 0 \\ \dots \\ (\forall \mathbf{x} \in R_m) \bigvee_k F_{m,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where R_j is a fixed compact region and $F_{j,k}$ are functions polynomial in \mathbf{x} and linear in \mathbf{c} . Also $G_{j,k}$ are functions linear in \mathbf{c} . The CEGIS algorithm was first introduced to tackle $\exists \forall$ constraints such as (4) by Solar-Lezama et al. [1, 2]. The basic idea is to maintain two sets:

- 1) A finite set of *witnesses*: $X_i : \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{n_i}\} \subseteq X$, namely, the X -space.
- 2) A subset $C_i \subseteq C$, namely, the C -space.

The C -space represents the set of candidates which are to be examined by our procedure while the X -space represents *test points* over which a candidate is tested. The i^{th} iteration involves the following steps:

- Step 1) Choose an arbitrary $\mathbf{c}_i \in C_i$ to get candidate solution for Eq. (4).
- Step 2) Check if Eq. (4) holds for \mathbf{c}_i .
 - (a) If Eq. (4) holds, procedure terminates immediately.
 - (b) Otherwise, a point \mathbf{x}_i is obtained at which Eq. (4) fails. \mathbf{x}_i is added to the set of test points ($X_{i+1} : X_i \cup \{\mathbf{x}_i\}$).
- Step 3) C -Space is refined by removing all candidates which fail at \mathbf{x}_i by not satisfying (4)

The procedure terminates successfully if a solution is found. Alternatively, if $C_j = \emptyset$ then it terminates without finding a solution. Finally, the procedure may run forever.

Representing the C -space: Each set C_i is represented using a linear arithmetic formula $\psi_i[\mathbf{c}]$ such that $C_i : \{\mathbf{c} \mid \psi_i[\mathbf{c}] \text{ holds}\}$. The initial formula C_0 is simply $\psi_0 : \bigvee_j \bigwedge_k G_{j,k}(\mathbf{c}) < 0$. Step 1 is implemented using a SMT solver to check if ψ_i is satisfiable and obtain a candidate \mathbf{c}_i as a solution to ψ_i [4]. Likewise, step 3 is implemented by augmenting ψ_i to yield a formula

$$\psi_{i+1} : \psi_i \wedge \bigwedge_j \psi_{i,j} \quad (5)$$

where $\psi_{i,j}$ is *True* if $\mathbf{x}_i \notin R_j$ and $\bigvee_k F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{c}) < 0$ otherwise.

Finding Witnesses: On the other hand, finding witnesses requires us to check the satisfiability of a non-linear constraints obtained by negating (4):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} \in R_1 \wedge \bigwedge_k F_{1,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_i) \geq 0 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x} \in R_m \wedge \bigwedge_k F_{m,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_i) \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

If yes, a witness \mathbf{x}_i is obtained at which the current candidate \mathbf{c}_i fails to satisfy Eq. 4. Otherwise, we conclude problem is solved. However, solving this constraint requires a nonlinear

arithmetic solver that is capable of finding witnesses. Relaxations such as SOS programming can be used to check whether the formula (6) is unsatisfiable [6], but failing this, they do not provide useful witnesses to generate future candidates. Therefore, we resort to a promising approach for checking (6) implemented in the tool dReal [5]. dReal checks if the formula is unsatisfiable, and if it reports UNSAT, we conclude that the constraints (6) are indeed unsat. Otherwise, it reports that a δ -perturbation is satisfiable, and provides us a witness. Therefore, using dReal, we run the risk of obtaining additional possibly spurious witnesses, and not recognizing if a solution has already been found. However, the resulting procedure will not yield a wrong solution.

A. Searching for CLF

Given a plant Ψ , and regions S , G and I , We fix a *template* polynomial form $V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a})$ parameterized by variables in $\mathbf{a} \in A$ as the desired CLF. The space A is a compact set chosen as a hyper-rectangle limiting each $a_i \in [L_i, U_i]$. Formally, we wish to find $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{a}, \epsilon_Q, \beta) \in C : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies the conditions in Def. 7:

$$(\exists \mathbf{c} \in C) \begin{cases} (\epsilon_Q > 0 \wedge \bigwedge_k a_k > L_k \wedge a_k < U_k) \\ (\forall \mathbf{x} \in \partial S \setminus G) V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) > \beta \wedge \\ (\forall \mathbf{x} \in I \setminus G) V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) < \beta \wedge \\ (\forall \mathbf{x} \in S \setminus G) \left(\bigvee_{q \in Q} \dot{V}_q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) < -\epsilon_Q \right) \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Since the form $V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a})$ is linear over the parameters in \mathbf{a} , the above Equation is a typical case that can be solved by the CEGIS framework described above.

B. Adopting CEGIS to Real Arithmetics

We now briefly discuss the termination of the CEGIS procedure. We noted that termination is possible if a solution of the desired form in (4) exists, or alternatively, the C -space is exhausted. However, neither situation may result and the algorithm may run forever. In this section, we provide a simple strengthening of Eq. (5) that guarantees termination. We strengthen (5) as follows (when $\mathbf{x}_i \in R_j$):

$$\psi_{i,j} : \bigvee_k F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{c}) < -\epsilon_{T_j} \quad (8)$$

wherein $\epsilon_{T_j} > 0$ are positive constants. The two constraints are identical when $\epsilon_{T_j} = 0$. Let \mathbf{c}_i be a candidate examined at the i^{th} iteration of the CEGIS procedure modified to use Eq. (8). Suppose there exists a counter example \mathbf{x}_i corresponding to \mathbf{c}_i . We compute a new refined C -space C_{i+1} . It is easily shown the $\mathbf{c}_i \notin C_{i+1}$. Furthermore, by using (8), we obtain the following result that any candidate in a η -ball around \mathbf{c}_i is also eliminated.

Theorem 3: If the CEGIS procedure were modified using Eq. (8) with a given $\epsilon_{T_j} > 0$, then there exists a constant $\eta > 0$ such that at each iteration i , $\mathcal{B}_\eta(\mathbf{c}_i) \cap C_{i+1} = \emptyset$.

As a result, starting from an initial set C_0 , given C_0 is a compact set, we note that employing the stronger rule (8) guarantees that at each step, an η -ball around the current solution is also removed. Thus, either a CLF is found or the

C -space is empty in finitely many iterations. If we exhaust the C -space for a given values of ϵ_{T_j} it is possible to repeat the search by halving ϵ_{T_j} to alleviate against the loss of possible solutions due to the strengthening of Eq. (5) by (8).

Faster Termination

A first cut application of the CEGIS approach, presented thus far, resulted in a prohibitively large number of witnesses, failing on most of our benchmarks. This happens because the witnesses and candidate functions returned by the SMT solvers are similar (close in term of Euclidean distance). We discuss a heuristic to select witnesses \mathbf{x}_i at each step of the CEGIS procedure, that led to the successful implementation of the overall procedure.

Given a current candidate \mathbf{c}_i , we may split the search for a witness into m parts: find a witness that violates the $\bigvee_k F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_i) < 0$ (for each $1 \leq j \leq m$). We will search for a counterexample that produces the “most-egregious” violation of the constraints possible. Therefore, we wish to maximize $\min_k F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_i)$. However, solvers such as dReal currently lack the ability to optimize. Therefore, we simply fix a constant $\gamma \geq 0$ and search for \mathbf{x}_i satisfying $\bigwedge_k F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_i) - \gamma \geq 0$. A larger γ leads to a more “egregious” violation and a larger set of candidates ruled out in the C -space and it is less likely to find a candidate that is similar to the previously selected candidate. The parameter γ itself is iteratively reduced to find a witness or conclude that no witness exists when $\gamma = 0$.

Also, the method can considerably get improved by seeding with an initial set of points X_0 .

C. Complexity and Incompleteness

There are many sources of incompleteness: (a) The polynomial template on the CLF with a maximum degree; (b) The use of ϵ_{T_j} in Eq. 8; and finally (c) the use of a δ -satisfiability solver for nonlinear constraints. However, it is possible to reduce this incompleteness by making δ smaller.

In terms of complexity, solving linear arithmetic constraints and quantifier free nonlinear constraints are well-known to be NP-hard. In addition, while it is guaranteed that there will be a finite number of iterations in the CEGIS procedure, this number can be really large. Though we provided some heuristics to decrease the number of iterations, the worst case can be in the order of $O(d^m)$, where m is the number of unknown coefficients in the template and d is a function of L_i, U_i and η in Theorem 3.

V. EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION

Our approach was implemented as a Python script that wraps around the Z3 [4] and dReal [5] solvers. The inputs to our procedure include a description of the plant model, the set S (taken to be a box), the sets G, I are provided as balls of radius σ_G and σ_I , respectively. In addition, we assume ϵ_Q is given as input. Our approach requires parameters $\epsilon_{T_1} = \epsilon_{T_2}$ corresponding to the first two inequalities in Eq. (7), and ϵ_{T_3} for third one. The choice of these parameters is currently manual, but we are investigating automatic selection heuristics as part of our ongoing work. Finally, we assume a

quadratic CLF template for all benchmarks, with the template coefficients belonging to a compact set $A : \prod_i [L_i, U_i]$, that can be specified by the user.

Benchmarks We collected 20 benchmark instances that are used in our evaluation. These benchmarks are taken from many sources and adapted to produce problem instances for our evaluation [20, 22, 30–40]. We manually formulated a RWS specification where one was not available. Finally, our approach does not yet consider disturbances — benchmarks with disturbances were modified by setting to nominal values. *A detailed description of each benchmark can be found in the appendix.* The results are summarized in Table I.

On the positive side, our approach finds a CLF for 18 out of the 20 benchmark instances. Our technique was successful on some benchmarks with upto 6 state variables. However, our approach timed out on 2 of the larger instances: the nonlinear solver dReal was responsible for the timeout in each case.

Preliminary Comparison We also considered a *preliminary comparison* with three implementations: the PESSOA tool by Mazo et al. [20], the CoSyMa tool by Camara et al. [21, 35] and the prototype corresponding to the recent work by Nilsson et al. [22]. The implementations for the other related approaches could not be obtained.

Unfortunately, just 8 out of the 20 benchmarks could be successfully compared. Reasons included the lack of support for some required features, implementation issues and the lack of proper documentation. Therefore, the comparisons are restricted to the 8 cases that either (a) ran successfully on our machines, or (b) instances whose results/running time were reported in the corresponding references. Table I shows a comparison between our method and these methods using examples chosen from referenced papers. We found that our technique is *faster* on almost all benchmarks compared, even while allowing for the differences in the implementation platforms. We attribute this to many reasons: (A) Our approach is currently specialized to RWS, whereas other approaches consider generic LTL properties. Nevertheless, all comparisons involved solving RWS problems. (b) Building a finite abstraction is very expensive even for systems with 2 or 3 dimensions, and this takes a majority of the time in these benchmarks. Our approach does not construct abstractions explicitly. Finally, Fig 2 compares the regions W (an ellipsoid) obtained for system with ID 18 against the winning region for the RWS property using the CEGAR-based approach [22].

Simulation: The dynamics of the inverted pendulum on a cart [34] example (ID 7) are given as $\dot{\theta} = \omega$, $\dot{\omega} = \frac{g}{l} \sin(\theta) - \frac{h}{ml^2} \omega + \frac{1}{ml} \cos(\theta) u$, where g, h, l and m are constants. We used Taylor expansion to approximate the trigonometric function, and the input u is discretized to be in set $\{-30, 30\}$. Considering region $S = [-1.5, 1.5] \times [-4, 4]$, $\sigma_I = 0.5$, $\sigma_G = 0.2$, $\epsilon_Q = 0.05$ and parameters $\epsilon_{T_1} = 0.1$, $\epsilon_{T_3} = 0.05$ and $\delta = 10^{-5}$, we find the CLF $V([\theta \ \omega]^T) = 0.65625y^2 + 0.69043xy + 2.2539x^2$. The underapproximate minimal dwell time $\tau = 0.0002s$. Figure 3 shows a simulation with initial state $[\theta, \omega] = [1 \ -2]$.

TABLE I
RESULTS OF RUNNING OUR IMPLEMENTATION ON THE BENCHMARK SUITE

Legend: n : # state variables, $|Q|$: # modes, ϵ : dReal precision, itr : # iterations, time: total computation time, Z3 T: time taken by Z3, dReal T: time taken by dReal, OM: Out of Memory, \checkmark : Proper Radial CLF Found, \times : Failed. All timings are in seconds.

ID	Problem			Parameters			Results				Other tools			
	n	$ Q $	ϵ_Q	ϵ_{T_1}	ϵ_{T_3}	δ	itr	z3 T	dReal T	Tot. Time	Status	Tool	Tool Time	Rem.
1	2	2	0.01	0.1	0.01	10^{-5}	15	0.4	4.6	5.3	\checkmark		- NA -	
2	2	2	0.0001	0.1	0.1	10^{-6}	15	0.5	5.6	6.6	\checkmark		- NA -	
3	2	2	0.001	0.1	0.1	10^{-5}	7	0.0	2.3	2.5	\checkmark		- NA -	
4	2	5	0.0001	0.1	0.0001	10^{-6}	1	0.0	0.8	0.8	\checkmark		- NA -	
5	2	2	0.01	0.1	0.01	10^{-6}	3	0.0	3.4	3.6	\checkmark	PESSOA	42.8	(R1)
6	2	3	0.05	0.1	0.05	10^{-5}	13	0.1	49.2	50.0	\checkmark	PESSOA	6881.1	(R1)
7	2	2	0.001	0.1	0.001	10^{-4}	6	0.1	1.6	2.0	\checkmark		- NA -	
8	2	2	0.1	0.1	0.1	10^{-7}	6	0.1	3.6	4.0	\checkmark	CoSyMA	3.2	(R2)
9	3	4	0.001	0.1	0.001	10^{-4}	1	0.0	2.8	2.8	\checkmark	CoSyMA	1.8	(R1)
10	3	4	0.05	0.2	0.05	10^{-4}	8	4.4	80.8	86.2	\checkmark		- NA -	
11	3	3	0.0001	0.1	0.01	10^{-5}	15	25.3	59.6	86.3	\checkmark		- NA -	
12	3	5	0.0001	0.1	0.1	10^{-5}	8	8.0	41.4	50.4	\checkmark		- NA -	
13	3	2	0.001	0.5	0.5	10^{-5}	17	61.7	116.1	179.8	\checkmark		- NA -	
14	3	2	1.0	0.1	10.0	10^{-5}	36	48.1	57.3	108.4	\checkmark	[22]	5319.5	see Fig. 2
15	4	5	0.001	0.1	0.001	10^{-4}	1	0.0	27.8	27.8	\checkmark	CoSyMA	OM (494.0)	(R3)
16	4	2	0.0001	0.1	0.01	10^{-5}	4		- >1hr -		\times		- NA -	
17	4	2	0.001	0.1	0.1	10^{-6}	4		- >1hr -		\times		- NA -	
18	5	6	0.001	0.1	0.001	10^{-4}	1	0.0	649.7	650.0	\checkmark	CoSyMA	OM (571.0)	(R3)
19	6	4	0.001	0.1	0.001	10^{-4}	2	0.5	2994.0	2995.6	\checkmark	CoSyMA	OM	
20	9	4	0.001	0.1	0.001	10^{-4}	1		- >1hr -		\times	CoSyMA	OM	

(R1): Parameters as reported in the related works [34, 35]. (R2): Parameters: $N = 2$, $\tau = 0.1$, $\eta = 0.008$. Controllability Ratio 47.2% [35] (R3): Couldn't reproduced (OM). Timings as reported in [35].




Fig. 2. Region W (red) is for our method and the winning region after 350 iterations (blue) for the approach of Nilsson et al. [22].

VI. CONCLUSION

We have demonstrated a CEGIS procedure for synthesizing CLFs for switched systems to ensure RWS and satisfy a minimal dwell time requirement. We have demonstrated some preliminary evidence of the applicability of our approach to many examples. Moving forward, we are exploring the use of relaxations such as sum-of-squares (SOS) programming and Bernstein polynomials, while ascribing witnesses when the formula turns out to be satisfiable.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Solar-Lezama, "Program synthesis by sketching," Ph.D. dissertation, 2008.
[2] A. Solar-Lezama, L. Tancau, R. Bodik, S. Seshia, and V. Saraswat, "Combinatorial sketching for finite programs," in *ACM Sigplan Notices*, vol. 41, no. 11. ACM, 2006, pp. 404–415.




Fig. 3. Simulation of execution trace of the Inverted Pendulum example

[3] R. Alur, R. Bodik, G. Juniwal, M. M. Martin, M. Raghothaman, S. A. Seshia, R. Singh, A. Solar-Lezama, E. Torlak, and A. Udupa, "Syntax-guided synthesis," in *FMCAD'13*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–17.
[4] L. de Moura and N. Bjørner, "Z3: An efficient SMT solver," in *TACAS*, ser. LNCS, vol. 4963. Springer, 2008, pp. 337–340.
[5] S. Gao, S. Kong, and E. M. Clarke, "dReal: An SMT solver for nonlinear theories over the reals," in *CADE*, 2013, pp. 208–214.
[6] P. A. Parillo, "Semidefinite programming relaxation for semialgebraic problems," *Mathematical Programming Ser. B*, vol. 96, no. 2, pp. 293–320, 2003.

- [7] A. Papachristodoulou and S. Prajna, "On the construction of lyapunov functions using the sum of squares decomposition," in *Proc. CDC*, vol. 3. IEEE, 2002, pp. 3482–3487.
- [8] B. Tibken, "Estimation of the domain of attraction for polynomial systems via LMIs," in *IEEE CDC*, vol. 4. IEEE Press, 2000, pp. 3860–3864 vol.4.
- [9] Z. Artstein, "Stabilization with relaxed controls," *Non-linear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 1163–1173, 1983.
- [10] D. Henrion, J. Lofberg, M. Kocvara, and M. Stingl, "Solving polynomial static output feedback problems with PENBMI," in *Proc. CDC-ECC*. IEEE, 2005, pp. 7581–7586.
- [11] L. El Ghaoui and V. Balakrishnan, "Synthesis of fixed-structure controllers via numerical optimization," in *Proc. CDC*, vol. 3. IEEE, 1994, pp. 2678–2683.
- [12] S. Gaubert, E. Goubault, A. Taly, and S. Zennou, "Static analysis by policy iteration on relational domains," in *PLAS*. Springer, 2007, pp. 237–252.
- [13] W. Tan and A. Packard, "Searching for control lyapunov functions using sums of squares programming," in *Allerton Conference*, 2004, pp. 210–219.
- [14] L. Rifford, "Existence of lipschitz and semiconcave control-lyapunov functions," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1043–1064, 2000.
- [15] D. Liberzon, *Switching in systems and control*. Springer, 2003.
- [16] H. Lin and P. J. Antsaklis, "Stability and stabilizability of switched linear systems: a survey of recent results," *Trans. Aut. Control*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 308–322, 2009.
- [17] H. Lin and P. Antsaklis, "Hybrid dynamical systems: An introduction to control and verification," *Found. Trends Syst. Control*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–172, 2014.
- [18] A. Taly and A. Tiwari, "Switching logic synthesis for reachability," in *Proc. EMSOFT*. ACM, 2010, pp. 19–28.
- [19] R. Dimitrova and R. Majumdar, "Deductive control synthesis for alternating-time logics," in *Proc. EMSOFT*. ACM, 2014, pp. 14:1–14:10.
- [20] J. Mazo, Manuel, A. Davitian, and P. Tabuada, "PESSOA: a tool for embedded controller synthesis," in *CAV*, ser. LNCS. Springer, 2010, vol. 6174, pp. 566–569.
- [21] J. Cámara, A. Girard, and G. Gössler, "Synthesis of switching controllers using approximately bisimilar multiscale abstractions," in *Proc. HSCC*. ACM, 2011, pp. 191–200.
- [22] P. Nilsson and N. Ozay, "Incremental synthesis of switching protocols via abstraction refinement," in *Proc. CDC*. IEEE, 2014.
- [23] H. Lin and P. J. Antsaklis, "Switching stabilizability for continuous-time uncertain switched linear systems," *Trans. Aut. Control*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 633–646, 2007.
- [24] J. C. Geromel and P. Colaneri, "Stability and stabilization of continuous-time switched linear systems," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 1915–1930, 2006.
- [25] E. Asarin, O. Bournez, T. Dang, O. Maler, and A. Pnueli, "Effective synthesis of switching controllers for linear systems," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 88, no. 7, pp. 1011–1025, 2000.
- [26] G. Frehse, S. K. Jha, and B. H. Krogh, "A counterexample-guided approach to parameter synthesis for linear hybrid automata," in *Proc. HSCC*. Springer, 2008, pp. 187–200.
- [27] B. Yordanov and C. Belta, "Parameter synthesis for piecewise affine systems from temporal logic specifications," in *Proc. HSCC*. Springer, 2008, pp. 542–555.
- [28] U. Topcu, A. Packard, P. Seiler, and T. Wheeler, "Stability region analysis using simulations and sum-of-squares programming," in *Proc. ACC*. IEEE Press, 2007, pp. 6009–6014.
- [29] J. Kapinski, J. V. Deshmukh, S. Sankaranarayanan, and N. Arechiga, "Simulation-guided lyapunov analysis for hybrid dynamical systems," in *Proc. HSCC*. ACM, 2014, pp. 133–142.
- [30] D. Liberzon and A. S. Morse, "Basic problems in stability and design of switched systems," *Control Systems, IEEE*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 59–70, 1999.
- [31] W. Perruquetti, J. Richard, and P. Borne, "Lyapunov analysis of sliding motions: Application to bounded control," *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–25, 1996.
- [32] S. Saat, M. Krug, and S. K. Nguang, "A nonlinear static output controller design for polynomial systems: An iterative sums of squares approach," in *Proc. ICOM*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1–6.
- [33] L. Greco, "Stability and stabilization issues in switched systems," Ph.D. dissertation, 2005.
- [34] UCLA CyPhy Lab., "PESSOA: Toolbox for the synthesis of correct-by-design embedded control software."
- [35] S. Mouelhi, A. Girard, and G. Gössler, "Cosyma: a tool for controller synthesis using multi-scale abstractions," in *Proc. HSCC*. ACM, 2013, pp. 83–88.
- [36] E. A. Gol, X. Ding, M. Lazar, and C. Belta, "Finite bisimulations for switched linear systems," in *Proc. CDC*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 7632–7637.
- [37] ETH Zurich - Automatic Control Laboratory, "Lyapunov based control," Sep 2014. [Online]. Available: tinyurl.com/q9xng3y
- [38] S. Pettersson and B. Lennartson, "Stabilization of hybrid systems using a min-projection strategy," in *Proc. ACC*. IEEE, 2001, pp. 223–228.
- [39] W. Zhang, A. Abate, J. Hu, and M. P. Vitus, "Exponential stabilization of discrete-time switched linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 11, pp. 2526–2536, 2009.
- [40] L. Faubourg and J.-B. Pomet, "Design of control lyapunov functions for homogeneous jurdjevic-quinn systems," 1999.

APPENDIX A
PROOFS

Proof of Theorem 1 For each $q \in Q$, there exists a minimum dwell time $\delta_{m,q} > 0$ such that for any time $T > 0$ with $\text{tr}_q(T) = q$, if (a) $\text{tr}_X(T) \in S \setminus G$, (b) $\dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(T)) < -\epsilon_Q$ and (c) $\text{tr}_X(t) \in S \setminus G$ for all $t \in [T, T + \delta_{m,q}]$, then $(\forall t \in [T, T + \delta_{m,q}]) \dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(t)) \leq -\frac{\epsilon_Q}{\lambda}$.

A constructive proof is provided here. Assume at time T s.t.

$$\dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(T)) < -\epsilon_Q \quad (9)$$

and let $T + \delta$ ($\delta > 0$) be the minimum time where

$$\dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(T + \delta)) \geq -\frac{\epsilon_Q}{\lambda}$$

if

$$(\forall t \in [T, T + \delta]) \text{tr}_Q(t) = q \wedge \text{tr}_X(t) \in S \setminus G$$

Let $\ddot{V}_q : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be

$$\ddot{V}_q = \frac{d\dot{V}_q}{dx} f_q(\mathbf{x})$$

Since $S \setminus G$ is a bounded set and \ddot{V}_q is a polynomial, there exist $\epsilon_1 > 0$ s.t.

$$(\forall \mathbf{x} \in S \setminus G) \ddot{V}_q(\mathbf{x}) \leq \epsilon_1 \quad (10)$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(T + \delta)) &= \dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(T)) + \int_T^{T+\delta} \ddot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(t)) dt \\ &\stackrel{\text{Equation } 10}{\implies} \leq \dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(T)) + \epsilon_1 \delta \end{aligned}$$

Then, we can conclude

$$-\frac{\epsilon_Q}{\lambda} < -\epsilon_Q + \epsilon_1 \delta \implies \frac{(\lambda - 1)\epsilon_Q}{\epsilon_1 \lambda} \leq \delta$$

The above arguments suggest that if $\dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(T)) < -\epsilon_Q$ for a mode q , then without switching there exists $\delta_{m,q} > 0$ (δ in above argument) s.t.

$$(\forall t \in [T, T + \delta_{m,q}]) \dot{V}_q(\text{tr}_X(t)) \leq -\frac{\epsilon_Q}{\lambda}$$

Proof of Theorem 2 Given compact sets $S, G, I \subseteq \text{int}(S)$, a plant Ψ and a CLF $V(\mathbf{x})$ w.r.t (I, G, S) with associated region W , and a controller function switch that conforms to Equation 3, the closed loop Φ satisfies the following properties.

- 1) System satisfies RWS w.r.t (W, G, S) .
- 2) All the traces of the closed loop system starting from W are time divergent before reaching G .

First, we show that $I \setminus G \subseteq \text{int}(W)$ and $W \setminus G \subseteq \text{int}(S)$. Remember $W : \{\mathbf{x} | V(\mathbf{x}) \leq \beta\} \cap S$. By definition $W \setminus G \subseteq S$ and $(\forall \mathbf{x} \in \partial S) V(\mathbf{x}) > \beta$. Therefore, $W \subseteq \text{int}(S)$. Also, $(\forall \mathbf{x} \in I \setminus G) V(\mathbf{x}) < \beta$ and consequently $I \setminus G \subseteq \text{int}(W)$.

According to Theorem 1, whenever there is a switch to a mode q , then the output of the controller remains q for at least $\delta_{m,q}$ time unit unless trace reaches G or leaves S .

Now we show that $(\text{tr}_X \in W) \implies (\text{tr}_X \in W) \cup (\text{tr}_X \in G)$.

Assume that $\text{tr}_X(0) \in (W \setminus G)$. tr_X can not leave S before reaching ∂W or G . Let $T \geq 0$ be the first time that $\text{tr}_X(T)$ reaches ∂W before reaching G . Then $\text{tr}_V(T) = \beta$. Since $\text{tr}_V(0) \leq \beta$ and $(\forall 0 \leq t < T) \text{tr}_V(t) < 0$, T has to be zero. At start ($t = 0$), since $\text{tr}_X(0) \in (W \setminus G)$, then the controller choose a mode q such that $\text{tr}_V(0) < 0$ and therefore, the trace leaves the boundary of W and the trace goes to the interior of W ($\text{int}(W)$).

If $(\forall t > 0) \text{tr}_X(t) \in W \setminus G$, by the construction of the controller, we can conclude time diverges. Also since $\text{tr}_V(t) < -\frac{\epsilon_Q}{\lambda}$ for all times, tr_V decreases to infinity. However, the value of V is bounded on bounded set $W \setminus G$. Therefore, tr_X can not remain in $W \setminus G$ and can not reach the boundary of W . The only possible outcome for the trace is to reach G . System satisfies RWS w.r.t (W, G, W) and therefore it satisfies RWS w.r.t (W, G, S) .

Proof of Theorem 3 If the CEGIS procedure were modified using Eq. (8) with a given $\epsilon_{T_j} > 0$, then there exists a constant $\eta > 0$ such that at each iteration i , $\mathcal{B}_\eta(\mathbf{c}_i) \cap C_{i+1} = \emptyset$.

Given a counter example $\mathbf{x}_i \in R_j$ for \mathbf{c}_i , the following is true

$$\wedge_k F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{c}_i) \geq 0 \quad (11)$$

and the added restriction on C -Space for next iteration is

$$\forall_k F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{c}_i) < -\epsilon_{T_j} \quad (12)$$

Let $F'_{j,k}$ be polynomial $F_{j,k}$ without monomials which do not have variables in \mathbf{c} . Since $F'_{j,k}$ is a polynomial in \mathbf{x} and linear in \mathbf{c} , and R_j is a compact set, there exists $M_{j,k} > 0$ s.t. $(\forall \mathbf{c} \in C_0) (\forall \mathbf{x} \in R_j) F'_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) \geq -M_{j,k}$ and as a result, there exists a $\eta > 0$ s.t.

$$(\forall \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{B}_\eta(\mathbf{0})) (\forall \mathbf{x} \in R_j) (\forall k) F'_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) \geq -\epsilon_{T_j} \quad (13)$$

Also,

$$(\forall \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{B}_\eta(\mathbf{c}_i)) (\forall k)$$

$$F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{c}) = F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{c}_i) + F'_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{c}_\eta)$$

where $\mathbf{c}_\eta \in \mathcal{B}_\eta(\mathbf{0})$. Therefore, by Equations 11 and 13

$$(\forall \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{B}_\eta(\mathbf{c}_i)) \wedge_k F_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{c}) \geq -\epsilon_{T_j}$$

and by comparing this to Equation 12 it is easy to see that \mathbf{x}_i is a counter example for $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{B}_\eta(\mathbf{c}_i)$. and $\mathcal{B}_\eta(\mathbf{c}_i) \cap C_{i+1} = \emptyset$.

APPENDIX B
BENCHMARK

The benchmark used in the experiments are examples adopted from literature. We consider each of these systems as a switched system with RWS as the specification.

System 1: This system is adopted from [30]. There are two continuous variables x and y and the dynamics are

$$\dot{x} = y$$

$$\dot{y} = -x + u$$

, where $u \in \{-1, 1\}$. $S = [-1 \ 1]^2$, $\sigma_I = 0.5$ and $\sigma_G = 0.1$.

System 2: This system is adopted from [31]. There are two continuous variables x and y and the dynamics are

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= u \\ \dot{y} &= y^2 x\end{aligned}$$

, where $u \in \{-4, 4\}$. And region $S = [-1 \ 1]^2$, $\sigma_I = 0.5$ and $\sigma_G = 0.1$.

System 3: This system is adopted from [37]. There are two continuous variables x and y and the dynamics are

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= y - x^3 \\ \dot{y} &= u\end{aligned}$$

, where $u \in \{-1, 1\}$. The region of interest is $S = [-1 \ 1]^2$, $\sigma_I = 0.5$ and $\sigma_G = 0.05$.

System 4: This system is a switched system adopted from [33]. There are two continuous variables x and y and 5 modes (q_1, \dots, q_5) the dynamics of each mode is described below

$$\begin{aligned}q_1 &\begin{cases} \dot{x} = 0.0403x + 0.5689y \\ \dot{y} = 0.6771x - 0.2556y \end{cases} \\ q_2 &\begin{cases} \dot{x} = 0.2617x - 0.2747y \\ \dot{y} = 1.2134x - 0.1331y \end{cases} \\ q_3 &\begin{cases} \dot{x} = 1.4725x - 1.2173y \\ \dot{y} = 0.0557x - 0.0412y \end{cases} \\ q_4 &\begin{cases} \dot{x} = -0.5217x + 0.8701y \\ \dot{y} = -1.4320x + 0.8075y \end{cases} \\ q_5 &\begin{cases} \dot{x} = -2.1707x - 1.0106y \\ \dot{y} = -0.0592x + 0.6145y \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

The region S is $[-1 \ 1]^2$, $\sigma_I = 0.5$ and $\sigma_G = 0.05$.

System 5: This system is adopted from [20] is a DC motor system. There are two continuous variables ω and i , and input u is the source voltage.

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\omega} &= -\frac{B}{J}\omega + \frac{k}{J}i \\ \dot{i} &= -\frac{k}{L}\omega - \frac{R}{L}i + \frac{1}{L}u\end{aligned}$$

, where $B = 10^{-4}$, $J = 25 \times 10^{-5}$, $k = 0.05$, $R = 0.5$, $L = 15 \times 10^{-4}$ and $u \in \{-1, 1\}$. The desired point is $[\omega \ i] = [20 \ 0]$ and by change of basis along with scaling, the following system is obtained

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\omega}' &= -\frac{B}{J}(\omega' + 2) + \frac{k}{J}i \\ \dot{i}' &= -\frac{k}{L}(\omega' + 2) - \frac{R}{L}i + 0.1\frac{1}{L}u\end{aligned}$$

Region of interest $S = \{[\omega' \ i']^T | \omega' \in [-1 \ 1], i' \in [-1 \ 1]\}$, $\sigma_I = 0.4$ and $\sigma_G = 0.05$.

System 6: This system is adopted from [34] is a model of inverted pendulum on a cart. There are two continuous

variables θ (angular position) and ω (angular velocity), and input u is the applied force to the cart.

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\theta} &= \omega \\ \dot{\omega} &= \frac{g}{l}\sin(\theta) - \frac{h}{ml^2}\omega + \frac{1}{ml}\cos(\theta)u\end{aligned}$$

, where $g = 9.8$, $h = 2$, $l = 2$, $m = 0.5$ and $u \in \{-30, 30\}$. The region is $S = \{[\theta \ \omega]^T | \theta \in [-1.5 \ 1.5], \omega \in [-4 \ 4]\}$, $\sigma_I = 0.5$ and $\sigma_G = 0.2$.

System 7: This system is a DCDC boost converter adopted from [35] with two discrete mode (q_1, q_2), two continuous variables i and v . By a simple change of bases the state $i = 1.35$ and $v = 5.65$ is set as desired point of activity (origin) and the following dynamics are obtained.

$$\begin{aligned}q_1 &\begin{cases} \dot{i} = 0.0167i + 0.3333 \\ \dot{v} = -0.0142v \end{cases} \\ q_2 &\begin{cases} \dot{i} = -0.0183i - 0.0663v + 0.3333 \\ \dot{v} = 0.0711i - 0.0142v \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Region of interest is $S = \{[i \ v]^T | i \in [-0.7 \ 0.7], v \in [-0.7 \ 0.7]\}$, $\sigma_I = 0.3$ and $\sigma_G = 0.04$. Notice region S is a little different from the one explained in [35].

System 8: This system is adapted from [22]. There are two continuous variables x_1 and x_2 and the controller can choose between three different modes (q_1, q_2). By setting $x_1 = -0.75$ and $x_2 = 1.75$ as the origin, the new dynamics for these modes are

$$\begin{aligned}q_1 &\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = -x_2 - 1.5x_1 - 0.5x_1^3 \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_1 - x_2^2 + 2 \end{cases} \\ q_2 &\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = -x_2 - 1.5x_1 - 0.5x_1^3 \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_1 - x_2 \end{cases} \\ q_3 &\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = -x_2 - 1.5x_1 - 0.5x_1^3 + 2 \\ \dot{x}_2 = x_1 + 10 \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Region S is defined as $S = \{[x_1 \ x_2]^T | x_1 \in [-2.25 \ 2.75], x_2 \in [-3.25 \ 3.25]\}$, $\sigma_I = 1.0$ and $\sigma_G = 0.25$. Notice that this region is a little different from the one introduced in [22]. Also, we scale the problem s.t. $S = \{[x_1 \ x_2]^T | x_1 \in [-0.45 \ 0.45], x_2 \in [-0.65 \ 0.65]\}$.

System 9: The system is a heater for keeping several rooms warm [35]. There are 3 rooms t_1, t_2 and t_3 and heater can be in one of these room or it can be off. Therefore, there are four modes (q_0, \dots, q_3) with the following dynamics. The goal

is to keep t_i around 21 ($i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$).

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0 & \begin{cases} \dot{t}_1 = 0.01(-10.5(t_1 + 21) + 5(t_2 + 21) + 5(t_3 + 21) + 5) \\ \dot{t}_2 = 0.01(5(t_1 + 21) - 10.5(t_2 + 21) + 5(t_3 + 21) + 5) \\ \dot{t}_3 = 0.01(5(t_1 + 21) + 5(t_2 + 21) - 10.5(t_3 + 21) + 5) \end{cases} \\
q_1 & \begin{cases} \dot{t}_1 = 0.01(-11.5(t_1 + 21) + 5(t_2 + 21) + 5(t_3 + 21) + 55) \\ \dot{t}_2 = 0.01(5(t_1 + 21) - 10.5(t_2 + 21) + 5(t_3 + 21) + 5) \\ \dot{t}_3 = 0.01(5(t_1 + 21) + 5(t_2 + 21) - 10.5(t_3 + 21) + 5) \end{cases} \\
q_2 & \begin{cases} \dot{t}_1 = 0.01(-10.5(t_1 + 21) + 5(t_2 + 21) + 5(t_3 + 21) + 5) \\ \dot{t}_2 = 0.01(5(t_1 + 21) - 11.5(t_2 + 21) + 5(t_3 + 21) + 55) \\ \dot{t}_3 = 0.01(5(t_1 + 21) + 5(t_2 + 21) - 10.5(t_3 + 21) + 5) \end{cases} \\
q_3 & \begin{cases} \dot{t}_1 = 0.01(-10.5(t_1 + 21) + 5(t_2 + 21) + 5(t_3 + 21) + 5) \\ \dot{t}_2 = 0.01(5(t_1 + 21) - 10.5(t_2 + 21) + 5(t_3 + 21) + 5) \\ \dot{t}_3 = 0.01(5(t_1 + 21) + 5(t_2 + 21) - 11.5(t_3 + 21) + 55) \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Region $S = [-5 \ 5]^3$, $\sigma_I = 2.5$ and $\sigma_G = 1$.

System 10: This system with 3 continuous variables and 4 modes is adopted from [?]. The dynamics are

$$\begin{aligned}
q_1 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = 4.15x - 1.06y - 6.7z + 1 \\ \dot{y} = 5.74x + 4.78y - 4.68z - 4 \\ \dot{z} = 26.38x - 6.38y - 8.29z + 1 \end{cases} \\
q_2 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = -3.2x - 7.6y - 2z + 4 \\ \dot{y} = 0.9x + 1.2y - z - 2 \\ \dot{z} = x + 6y + 5z - 1 \end{cases} \\
q_3 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = 5.75x - 16.48y - 2.41z - 2 \\ \dot{y} = 9.51x - 9.49y + 19.55z + 1 \\ \dot{z} = 16.19x + 4.64y + 14.05z - 1 \end{cases} \\
q_4 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = -12.38x + 18.42y + 0.54z - 1 \\ \dot{y} = -11.9x + 3.24y - 16.32z + 2 \\ \dot{z} = -26.5x - 8.64y - 16.6z + 1 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Region of interest is $P = [-1 \ 1]^3$, $\sigma_I = 0.5$ and $\sigma_G = 0.1$.

System 11: The system is a linear switched system, adapted from [38]. There are three continuous variables x, y, z in this system and the dynamics for 3 modes (q_1, q_2 and q_3) are

$$\begin{aligned}
q_1 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = 1.8631x - 0.0053y + 0.9129z \\ \dot{y} = 0.2681x - 6.4962y + 0.0370z \\ \dot{z} = 2.2497x - 6.7180y + 1.6428z \end{cases} \\
q_2 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = -2.4311x - 5.1032y + 0.4565z \\ \dot{y} = -0.0869x + 0.0869y + 0.0185z \\ \dot{z} = 0.0369x - 5.9869y + 0.8214z \end{cases} \\
q_3 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = 0.0372x - 0.0821y - 2.7388z \\ \dot{y} = 0.1941x + 0.2904y - 0.1110z \\ \dot{z} = -1.0360x + 3.0486y - 4.9284z \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Region $S = [-1 \ 1]^3$, $\sigma_I = 0.3$ and $\sigma_G = 0.01$.

System 12: This system is a switched system adopted from [33]. There are three continuous variables x, y, z and 5 modes

(q_1, \dots, q_5) the dynamics of each mode is described below

$$\begin{aligned}
q_1 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = 0.1764x + 0.8192y - 0.3179z \\ \dot{y} = -1.8379x - 0.2346y - 0.7963z \\ \dot{z} = -1.5023x - 1.6316y + 0.6908z \end{cases} \\
q_2 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = -0.0420x - 1.0286y + 0.6892z \\ \dot{y} = 0.3240x + 0.0994y + 1.8833z \\ \dot{z} = 0.5065x - 0.1164y + 0.3254z \end{cases} \\
q_3 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = -0.0952x - 1.7313y + 0.3868z \\ \dot{y} = 0.0312x + 0.4788y + 0.0540z \\ \dot{z} = -0.6138x - 0.4478y - 0.4861z \end{cases} \\
q_4 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = 0.2445x + 0.1338y + 1.1991z \\ \dot{y} = 0.7183x - 1.0062y - 2.5773z \\ \dot{z} = 0.1535x + 1.3065y - 2.0863z \end{cases} \\
q_5 & \begin{cases} \dot{x} = -1.4132x - 1.4928y - 0.3459z \\ \dot{y} = -0.5918x - 0.0867y + 0.9863z \\ \dot{z} = 0.5189x - 0.0126y + 0.6433z \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Region $S = [-3 \ 3]^3$, $\sigma_I = 1$ and $\sigma_G = 0.1$.

System 13: This system is adopted from [32]. There are three continuous variables x, y, z and the dynamics are

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x} &= -10x + 10y + u \\
\dot{y} &= 28x - y - xz \\
\dot{z} &= xy - 2.6667z
\end{aligned}$$

, where $u \in \{-100, 100\}$. And region $S = [-5 \ 5]^3$, $\sigma_I = 1.2$ and $\sigma_G = 0.3$.

System 14: This system is a radiant system in building adopted from [22] which is a switched linear system with three continuous variables (T_c, T_1 and T_2) and two modes (q_1, q_2). By setting $T_c = 24$ and $T_1 = T_2 = 23$ as the new origin, the dynamics obtained are

$$\begin{aligned}
q_1 & \begin{cases} \dot{T}_c = 2.25T_1 + 2.25T_2 - 9.26T_c - 14.54 \\ \dot{T}_1 = 2.85T_2 - 7.13T_1 + 4.04T_c + 4.04 \\ \dot{T}_2 = 2.85T_1 - 7.13T_2 + 4.04T_c + 4.04 \end{cases} \\
q_2 & \begin{cases} \dot{T}_c = 2.25T_1 + 2.25T_2 - 4.5T_c + 4.5 \\ \dot{T}_1 = 2.85T_2 - 7.13T_1 + 4.04T_c + 4.04 \\ \dot{T}_2 = 2.85T_1 - 7.13T_2 + 4.04T_c + 4.04 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Region $S = [-6 \ 6]^3$, $\sigma_I = 3$ and $\sigma_G = 1$.

System 15: The system is similar to System 9, except that the number of dimensions is 4. See [35].

System 16: The original system is a switched control system with inputs from [39]. There are 4 variables (w, x, y and z) and 4 original modes. After converting the discrete system into a continuous one, the dynamics are

$$q_1 \begin{cases} \dot{w} = -0.693w - 1.099x + 2.197y + 3.296z - 7.820u \\ \dot{x} = -1.792x + 2.197y + 4.394z - 8.735u \\ \dot{y} = -1.097x + 1.504y + 2.197z - 2.746u \\ \dot{z} = 0.406z + 3.244u \end{cases}$$

$$q_2 \begin{cases} \dot{w} = -1.792w - 1.099x + 2.197y + 1.099z + 6.696u \\ \dot{x} = 0.406x - 2.197y + 4.734u \\ \dot{y} = -0.693y + 2.773u \\ \dot{z} = -2.197w - 1.099x + 2.197y + 1.504z + 4.263u \end{cases}$$

$$q_3 \begin{cases} \dot{w} = 0.406w + 0.811u \\ \dot{x} = 1.099w - 0.144x + 0.549y - 0.549z + 1.910u \\ \dot{y} = 0.549x - 0.144y - 0.549z + 3.871u \\ \dot{z} = 1.099w - 0.693z + 4.970u \end{cases}$$

$$q_4 \begin{cases} \dot{w} = -0.693w + 2.000x + 1.863u \\ \dot{x} = -0.693x + 4.159u \\ \dot{y} = -0.693y + 2.773u \\ \dot{z} = 4.000x - 4.000y - 0.693z - 1.069u \end{cases}$$

, where $u \in \{-1, 1\}$ and Region of interest is $S = [-1, 1]^4$, $\sigma_I = 0.1$ and $\sigma_G = 0.1$.

System 17: This system is a Tora system and the equations are adopted from [40]. There are 4 variables in this system with the following dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} &= x \\ \dot{x} &= -w + 0.1 \sin(y) \\ \dot{y} &= z \\ \dot{z} &= u \end{aligned}$$

, where $u \in [-10, 10]$ and region $S = [-1, 1]^4$, $\sigma_I = 0.1$ and $\sigma_G = 0.02$.

System 18: The system is similar to System 9, except that the number of dimensions is 5. See [35].

System 19: This system is 6 variables version of System 9 and there are 6 rooms and 2 heaters and only consider 4 modes considered. The heater is off for one mode (q_0) and for mode q_i ($1 \leq i \leq 3$), two heaters are on in rooms i and $3+i$.

System 20: This system is 9 variables version of System 9 and there are 9 rooms and 3 heaters and only consider 4 modes considered. The heater is off for one mode (q_0) and for mode q_i ($1 \leq i \leq 3$), three heaters are on in rooms i , $3+i$ and $6+i$.