

# Pointwise Minimum Norm Control Laws for Hybrid Systems

Ricardo G. Sanfelice

## Abstract

Pointwise minimum norm control laws for hybrid dynamical systems are proposed. Hybrid systems are given by differential equations capturing the continuous dynamics or *flows*, and by difference equations capturing the discrete dynamics or *jumps*. The proposed control laws are defined as the pointwise minimum norm selection from the set of inputs guaranteeing a decrease of a control Lyapunov function. The cases of individual and common inputs during flows and jumps, as well as when inputs enter through one of the system dynamics, are considered. Examples illustrate the results.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The construction of asymptotically stabilizing control laws from control Lyapunov functions (CLFs) has enabled the systematic design of feedback laws for nonlinear systems. Building from earlier results in [1], which revealed a key link between the availability of a control Lyapunov function and stabilizability (with relaxed controls), the construction of control laws from Lyapunov inequalities was rendered as a powerful control design methodology (see also, e.g., [2], [3], for the connections between CLFs and asymptotic controllability to the origin). More importantly, design techniques that go beyond the possibility of determining the control law from the expression of the Lyapunov inequalities were proposed and employed in several applications. The control law introduced in [4], known as Sontag's universal formula, provides a generic controller construction for nonlinear systems in affine form that (modulo some extra properties at the origin) only requires the existence of a CLF. (Recent extensions to polynomial

R. G. Sanfelice is with the Department of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Arizona, 1130 N. Mountain Ave, AZ 85721. Email: [sricardo@u.arizona.edu](mailto:sricardo@u.arizona.edu). Research partially supported by NSF CAREER Grant no. ECS-1150306 and by AFOSR YIP Grant no. FA9550-12-1-0366.

systems appeared in [5]). The constructions introduced in [6] have the extra property that their pointwise norm is minimum (for a given CLF). More notably, as shown in [6] by making a link between CLFs and the solution to a differential game, under additional properties, pointwise minimum norm control laws guarantee robustness of the closed-loop system.

In this paper, pointwise minimum norm control laws for hybrid dynamical systems are proposed. Hybrid dynamical systems are given by differential equations capturing the continuous dynamics or *flows*, and by difference equations capturing the discrete dynamics or *jumps*. The conditions determining whether flows or jumps should occur are given in terms of both the state and the inputs. For this class of hybrid systems, control Lyapunov functions are defined by continuously differentiable functions whose change, both along flows and jumps, is upper bounded by a negative definite function of the state. The proposed control law consists of a pointwise minimum norm selection from the set of inputs that guarantees a decrease of the Lyapunov function on each regime. We consider the case when the inputs acting during flows are different than the inputs acting during jumps, the case when the inputs are the same, as well as cases when inputs affect only the flows or the jumps. Conditions guaranteeing continuity and globality of the proposed pointwise minimum norm control laws are also presented. Our results not only recover the results in [7] when specialized to continuous-time systems, but also provide the discrete-time versions, which do not seem available in the literature.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the framework for hybrid systems, the notion of solution, and control Lyapunov functions. Section III presents the results on stabilization by pointwise minimum norm control laws. Examples in Section IV illustrate some of the results.

**Notation:**  $\mathbb{R}^n$  denotes  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space,  $\mathbb{R}$  denotes the real numbers.  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  denotes the nonnegative real numbers, i.e.,  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} = [0, \infty)$ .  $\mathbb{N}$  denotes the natural numbers including 0, i.e.,  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \dots\}$ .  $\mathbb{B}$  denotes the closed unit ball in a Euclidean space. Given a set  $K$ ,  $\overline{K}$  denotes its closure. Given a set  $S$ ,  $\partial S$  denotes its boundary. Given  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|x|$  denotes the Euclidean vector norm. Given a set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|x|_K := \inf_{y \in K} |x - y|$ . Given  $x$  and  $y$ ,  $\langle x, y \rangle$  denotes their inner product. A function  $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is said to belong to class- $\mathcal{K}_\infty$  if it is continuous, zero at zero, strictly increasing, and unbounded. Given a closed set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U}_\star$  with  $\star$  being either  $c$  or  $d$  and  $\mathcal{U}_\star \subset \mathbb{R}^{m_\star}$ , define  $\Pi(K) := \{x : \exists u_\star \in \mathcal{U}_\star \text{ s.t. } (x, u_\star) \in K\}$

and  $\Psi(x, K) := \{u : (x, u) \in K\}$ . That is, given a set  $K$ ,  $\Pi(K)$  denotes the “projection” of  $K$  onto  $\mathbb{R}^n$  while, given  $x$ ,  $\Psi(x, K)$  denotes the set of values  $u$  such that  $(x, u) \in K$ . Then, for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , define the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathcal{U}_c$ ,  $\Psi_d : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathcal{U}_d$  as  $\Psi_c(x) := \Psi(x, C)$  and  $\Psi_d(x) := \Psi(x, D)$ , respectively. Given a map  $f$ , its graph is denoted by  $\text{gph}(f)$ .

## II. PRELIMINARIES ON HYBRID SYSTEMS AND CONTROL LYAPUNOV FUNCTIONS

In this section, we define control Lyapunov functions (CLFs) for hybrid systems  $\mathcal{H}$  with data  $(C, f, D, g)$  and given by

$$\mathcal{H} \begin{cases} \dot{x} &= f(x, u_c) & (x, u_c) \in C \\ x^+ &= g(x, u_d) & (x, u_d) \in D, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where the set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U}_c$  is the *flow set*, the map  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is the *flow map*, the set  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U}_d$  is the *jump set*, and the map  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is the *jump map*. The space for the state is  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and the space for the input  $u = (u_c, u_d)$  is  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_c \times \mathcal{U}_d$ , where  $\mathcal{U}_c \subset \mathbb{R}^{m_c}$  and  $\mathcal{U}_d \subset \mathbb{R}^{m_d}$ . At times, we will require  $\mathcal{H}$  to satisfy the following mild properties.

*Definition 2.1 (hybrid basic conditions):* A hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}$  is said to satisfy the *hybrid basic conditions* if its data  $(C, f, D, g)$  is such that

- (A1)  $C$  and  $D$  are closed subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U}_c$  and  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U}_d$ , respectively;
- (A2)  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is continuous;
- (A3)  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is continuous.

Solutions to hybrid systems  $\mathcal{H}$  are given in terms of hybrid arcs and hybrid inputs on hybrid time domains. Hybrid time domains are subsets  $E$  of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{N}$  that, for each  $(T, J) \in E$ ,  $E \cap ([0, T] \times \{0, 1, \dots, J\})$  can be written as  $\cup_{j=0}^{J-1} ([t_j, t_{j+1}], j)$  for some finite sequence of times  $0 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \dots \leq t_J$ .<sup>1</sup> A hybrid arc  $\phi$  is a function on a hybrid time domain that, for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t \mapsto \phi(t, j)$  is absolutely continuous on the interval  $\{t : (t, j) \in \text{dom } \phi\}$ , while a hybrid input  $u$  is a function on a hybrid time domain that, for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t \mapsto u(t, j)$  is Lebesgue measurable and locally essentially bounded on the interval  $\{t : (t, j) \in \text{dom } u\}$ . Then, a solution to the hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}$  is given by a pair  $(\phi, u)$ ,  $u = (u_c, u_d)$ , with  $\text{dom } \phi = \text{dom } u (= \text{dom}(\phi, u))$  and satisfying the dynamics of  $\mathcal{H}$ , where  $\phi$  is a hybrid arc and  $u$  a hybrid

<sup>1</sup>This property is to hold at each  $(T, J) \in E$ , but  $E$  can be unbounded.

input. A solution pair  $(\phi, u)$  to  $\mathcal{H}$  is said to be *complete* if  $\text{dom}(\phi, u)$  is unbounded and *maximal* if there does not exist another pair  $(\phi, u)'$  such that  $(\phi, u)$  is a truncation of  $(\phi, u)'$  to some proper subset of  $\text{dom}(\phi, u)'$ . For more details about solutions to hybrid systems, see [8].

We introduce the concept of control Lyapunov function for hybrid systems  $\mathcal{H}$ ; see [9] for more details and conditions on  $\mathcal{H}$  guaranteeing its existence.

*Definition 2.2 (control Lyapunov function):* Given a compact set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and sets  $\mathcal{U}_c \subset \mathbb{R}^{m_c}, \mathcal{U}_d \subset \mathbb{R}^{m_d}$ , a continuous function  $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , continuously differentiable on an open set containing  $\overline{\Pi(C)}$  is a *control Lyapunov function with  $\mathcal{U}$  controls for  $\mathcal{H}$*  if there exist  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$  and a positive definite function  $\alpha_3$  such that<sup>2</sup>

$$\alpha_1(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \leq V(x) \leq \alpha_2(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C) \cup \Pi(D) \cup g(D), \quad (2)$$

$$\inf_{u_c \in \Psi_c(x)} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle \leq -\alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C), \quad (3)$$

$$\inf_{u_d \in \Psi_d(x)} V(g(x, u_d)) - V(x) \leq -\alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \forall x \in \Pi(D). \quad (4)$$

### III. MINIMUM NORM STATE-FEEDBACK LAWS FOR HYBRID SYSTEMS

Given a hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfying the hybrid basic conditions, a compact set  $\mathcal{A}$ , and a control Lyapunov function  $V$  satisfying Definition 2.2, define, for each  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , the set

$$\mathcal{I}(r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : V(x) \geq r\}.$$

Moreover, for each  $(x, u_c) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , define the function

$$\Gamma_c(x, u_c, r) := \begin{cases} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) & \text{if } (x, u_c) \in C \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c}), \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and, for each  $(x, u_d) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , the function

$$\Gamma_d(x, u_d, r) := \begin{cases} V(g(x, u_d)) - V(x) + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) & \text{if } (x, u_d) \in D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d}), \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, evaluate the functions  $\Gamma_c$  and  $\Gamma_d$  at points  $(x, u_c, r)$  and  $(x, u_d, r)$  where  $r = V(x)$  to define the functions

$$(x, u_c) \mapsto \Upsilon_c(x, u_c) := \Gamma_c(x, u_c, V(x)), (x, u_d) \mapsto \Upsilon_d(x, u_d) := \Gamma_d(x, u_d, V(x)) \quad (5)$$

<sup>2</sup>Following [7, Definition 4.1], (3) can be replaced by  $\inf_{u_c \in \Psi_c(x)} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle < 0$  for all  $x \in \Pi(C) \setminus \mathcal{A}$ , since, then, [7, Proposition 4.3] guarantees the existence of a continuous positive definite function  $\alpha_3$  satisfying (3) (similarly for (4)).

and the set-valued maps

$$\mathcal{T}_c(x) := \Psi_c(x) \cap \{u_c \in \mathcal{U}_c : \Upsilon_c(x, u_c) \leq 0\}, \mathcal{T}_d(x) := \Psi_d(x) \cap \{u_d \in \mathcal{U}_d : \Upsilon_d(x, u_d) \leq 0\}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, define

$$R_c := \Pi(C) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : V(x) > 0\} \quad (7)$$

and

$$R_d := \Pi(D) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : V(x) > 0\}. \quad (8)$$

When, for each  $x$ , the functions  $u_c \mapsto \Upsilon_c(x, u_c)$  and  $u_d \mapsto \Upsilon_d(x, u_d)$  are convex, and the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  have nonempty closed convex values on  $R_c$  and  $R_d$ , respectively, we have that  $\mathcal{T}_c(x)$  and  $\mathcal{T}_d(x)$  have nonempty convex closed values on (7) and on (8), respectively (this follows from [7, Proposition 4.4]). Then,  $\mathcal{T}_c$  and  $\mathcal{T}_d$  have unique elements of minimum norm on  $R_c$  and  $R_d$ , respectively, and their minimal selections

$$\rho_c : R_c \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c, \quad \rho_d : R_d \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d$$

are given by

$$\rho_c(x) := \arg \min \{|u_c| : u_c \in \mathcal{T}_c(x)\}, \quad (9)$$

$$\rho_d(x) := \arg \min \{|u_d| : u_d \in \mathcal{T}_d(x)\}. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, these selections are continuous under further properties of  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$ .

The hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}$  under the effect of the control pair  $(\rho_c, \rho_d)$  in (9), (10) is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \begin{cases} \dot{x} &= \tilde{f}(x) := f(x, \rho_c(x)) & x \in \tilde{C} \\ x^+ &= \tilde{g}(x) := g(x, \rho_d(x)) & x \in \tilde{D} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

with  $\tilde{C} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : (x, \rho_c(x)) \in C\}$  and  $\tilde{D} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : (x, \rho_d(x)) \in D\}$ . The above arguments and constructions enable the stabilization results in the following sections.

*Remark 3.1:* When bounds (3) and (4) hold for functions  $\alpha_{3,c}$  and  $\alpha_{3,d}$ , then a common function  $\alpha_3$  is given by  $\alpha_3(s) = \min\{\alpha_{3,c}(s), \alpha_{3,d}(s)\}$  for all  $s \geq 0$ . In such a case, the expressions of the pointwise minimum norm control laws (9) and (10) could also be given in terms of  $\alpha_{3,c}$  and  $\alpha_{3,d}$  by defining  $\mathcal{T}_c$  and  $\mathcal{T}_d$  in terms of  $\alpha_{3,c}$  and  $\alpha_{3,d}$ , respectively.

### A. Practical stabilization using min-norm hybrid control

Proposition 3.2 below establishes that the pointwise minimum norm controller in (9)-(10) asymptotically stabilizes the compact set<sup>3</sup>

$$\mathcal{A}_r := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : V(x) \leq r\} \quad (12)$$

for the hybrid system restricted to  $\mathcal{I}(r)$ . More precisely, given  $r > 0$ , we restrict the flow and jump sets of the hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}$  by the set  $\mathcal{I}(r)$ , which leads to

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{I}} \begin{cases} \dot{x} &= f(x, u_c) & (x, u_c) \in C \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c}) \\ x^+ &= g(x, u_d) & (x, u_d) \in D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d}). \end{cases}$$

*Proposition 3.2:* Given a compact set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a hybrid system  $\mathcal{H} = (C, f, D, g)$  satisfying the hybrid basic conditions, suppose there exists a control Lyapunov function  $V$  with  $\mathcal{U}$  controls for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Furthermore, suppose the following conditions hold:

(M1) The set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  are lower semicontinuous<sup>4</sup> with convex values.

(M2) For every  $r > 0$  and every  $x \in \Pi(C) \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$ , the function  $u_c \mapsto \Gamma_c(x, u_c, r)$  is convex on  $\Psi_c(x)$  and, for every  $r > 0$  and every  $x \in \Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$ , the function  $u_d \mapsto \Gamma_c(x, u_d, r)$  is convex on  $\Psi_d(x)$ .

Then, for every  $r > 0$ , the state-feedback law pair

$$\rho_c : R_c \cap \mathcal{I}(r) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c, \quad \rho_d : R_d \cap \mathcal{I}(r) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d$$

defined as

$$\rho_c(x) := \arg \min \{|u_c| : u_c \in \mathcal{T}_c(x)\} \quad \forall x \in R_c \cap \mathcal{I}(r), \quad (13)$$

$$\rho_d(x) := \arg \min \{|u_d| : u_d \in \mathcal{T}_d(x)\} \quad \forall x \in R_d \cap \mathcal{I}(r) \quad (14)$$

renders the compact set  $\mathcal{A}_r$  asymptotically stable for  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{I}}$ . Furthermore, if the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  have closed graph then  $\rho_c$  and  $\rho_d$  are continuous.

<sup>3</sup>A compact set  $\mathcal{A}$  is said to be asymptotically stable for a closed-loop system (e.g.,  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  in (11)) if: • for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that each maximal solution  $\phi$  starting from  $\mathcal{A} + \delta\mathbb{B}$  satisfies  $\phi(t, j) \in \mathcal{A} + \varepsilon\mathbb{B}$  for each  $(t, j) \in \text{dom } \phi$ , and • each maximal solution is bounded and the complete ones satisfy  $\lim_{t+j \rightarrow \infty} |\phi(t, j)|_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$ .

<sup>4</sup>A set-valued map  $S : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  is lower semicontinuous if for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  one has that  $\liminf_{x_i \rightarrow x} S(x_i) \supset S(x)$ , where  $\liminf_{x_i \rightarrow x} S(x_i) = \{z : \forall x_i \rightarrow x, \exists z_i \rightarrow z \text{ s.t. } z_i \in S(x_i)\}$  is the inner limit of  $S$  (see [10, Chapter 5.B]).

*Proof:* Given the CLF  $V$  for  $\mathcal{H}$ , by Definition 2.2, we have (2) and, for every  $r > 0$ ,

$$\inf_{u_c \in \Psi_c(x)} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle \leq -\alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C) \cap \mathcal{I}(r), \quad (15)$$

$$\inf_{u_d \in \Psi_d(x)} V(g(x, u_d)) - V(x) \leq -\alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \forall x \in \Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{I}(r), \quad (16)$$

from where  $\Gamma_c$  and  $\Gamma_d$  are defined. Using the continuity properties of  $f$  and  $g$  obtained from (A2) and (A3) of the hybrid basic conditions, and continuous differentiability of  $V$ , it follows that, for every  $r \geq 0$ ,  $\Gamma_c$  and  $\Gamma_d$  are continuous on  $C \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c})$  and on  $D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d})$ , respectively. Since  $C$  and  $D$  are closed by (A1) of the hybrid basic conditions and  $V$  is continuous, the sets  $C \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c})$  and  $D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d})$  are closed for each  $r$ . By the closedness property of  $C$  and  $D$  along with assumption (M1), the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  have nonempty closed convex values on  $R_c$  and  $R_d$ , respectively. Using (M2), the functions  $u_c \mapsto \Upsilon_c(x, u_c)$  and  $u_d \mapsto \Upsilon_d(x, u_c)$  defined in (5) are convex on  $R_c$  and  $R_d$ , respectively. Then, [7, Proposition 4.4] implies that  $\mathcal{T}_c$  and  $\mathcal{T}_d$  are lower semicontinuous with nonempty closed convex values on  $R_c$  and  $R_d$ , respectively. Moreover,  $\mathcal{T}_c$  and  $\mathcal{T}_d$  have unique elements of minimum norm, and their minimal selections

$$\rho_c : R_c \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c \quad (17)$$

$$\rho_d : R_d \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d \quad (18)$$

on (7) and on (8) (respectively) are, by definition, given by (13) and (14) (respectively). Then, from (13) and (14), we have

$$\rho_c(x) \in \Psi_c(x), \quad \Upsilon_c(x, \rho_c(x)) \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in R_c \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$$

$$\rho_d(x) \in \Psi_d(x), \quad \Upsilon_d(x, \rho_d(x)) \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in R_d \cap \mathcal{I}(r).$$

Using the definitions of  $\Psi_c, \Psi_d$  and  $\Upsilon_c, \Upsilon_d$ , we have

$$\langle \nabla V(x), f(x, \rho_c(x)) \rangle \leq -\alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C) \cap \mathcal{I}(r), \quad (19)$$

$$V(g(x, \rho_d(x))) - V(x) \leq -\alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \forall x \in \Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{I}(r). \quad (20)$$

Then, for every  $r > 0$ , we have a state-feedback pair  $(\rho_c, \rho_d)$  that renders the compact set  $\mathcal{A}_r$  asymptotically stable for  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{I}}$ . This property follows from an application of the Lyapunov stability result in [11, Theorem 3.18].

If  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  have closed graph, then we have that the graph of  $\mathcal{T}_c$  and  $\mathcal{T}_d$  are closed since, for  $\star = c, d$ ,

$$\text{gph}(\mathcal{T}_\star) = \text{gph}(\Psi_\star(x)) \cap \text{gph}(\{u_\star \in \mathcal{U}_\star : \Upsilon_\star(x, u_\star) \leq 0\}),$$

where the first graph is closed by assumption while the second one is closed by the closedness and continuity properties of  $\mathcal{U}_\star$  and  $\Upsilon_\star$ , respectively. Then, using [6, Proposition 2.19], the minimal selections

$$\rho_c : R_c \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c, \quad \rho_d : R_d \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d$$

on (7) and on (8), which are given by (13) and (14), respectively, are continuous.<sup>5</sup> ■

*Remark 3.3:* The state-feedback law (13)-(14) asymptotically stabilizes  $\mathcal{A}_r$  for  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{I}}$  (but not necessarily for  $\mathcal{H}$  as without an appropriate extension of these laws to  $\Pi(C)$  and  $\Pi(D)$ , respectively, there could exist solutions to the closed-loop system that jump out of  $\mathcal{A}_r$ ). This point motivates the following result on stabilization by a control law that has pointwise minimum norm at points in  $\mathcal{I}(r)$ , but not everywhere, and the global stabilization result in the next section. Finally, note that the assumptions placed on  $\mathcal{H}$ , such as the existence of a CLF, can be relaxed by imposing them on  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{I}}$  instead.

*Theorem 3.4:* Under the conditions of Proposition 3.2, for every  $r > 0$  there exists a state-feedback law pair

$$\rho'_c : R_c \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c, \quad \rho'_d : R_d \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d$$

defined on  $R_c \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$  and  $R_d \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$  as

$$\rho'_c(x) := \arg \min \{|u_c| : u_c \in \mathcal{T}_c(x)\} \quad \forall x \in R_c \cap \mathcal{I}(r), \quad (21)$$

$$\rho'_d(x) := \arg \min \{|u_d| : u_d \in \mathcal{T}_d(x)\} \quad \forall x \in R_d \cap \mathcal{I}(r) \quad (22)$$

respectively, that renders the compact set  $\mathcal{A}_r$  asymptotically stable for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Furthermore, if the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  have closed graph then  $\rho'_c$  and  $\rho'_d$  are continuous on  $R_c \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$  and  $R_d \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$ , respectively.

<sup>5</sup>Note that by the hybrid basic conditions of  $\mathcal{H}$ , continuity of  $\rho_c$  and  $\rho_d$ , and closedness of  $\mathcal{I}(r)$ , the hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{I}}$  with the control laws (13) and (14) applied to it satisfies the hybrid basic conditions.



The result follows using Proposition 3.2 and the fact that, from the definition of CLF in Definition 2.2, since the right-hand side of (3) is negative definite with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  (respectively, (4)) the state-feedback  $\rho_c$  (respectively,  $\rho_d$ ) in (9) (respectively, (10)) can be extended – not necessarily as a pointwise minimum norm law – to every point in  $\Pi(C) \cap \mathcal{A}_r$  (respectively,  $\Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{A}_r$ ) and guarantee that  $V$  is nonincreasing. The asymptotic stability of  $\mathcal{A}_r$  for  $\mathcal{H}$  then follows from an application of [11, Theorem 3.18]. Finally, as the definition of  $\mathcal{T}_c$  and  $\mathcal{T}_d$  suggest, the norm-minimality of  $\rho_c$  and  $\rho_d$  are functions of  $V$  and  $\alpha_3$ , and different such choices would give different pointwise minimum norm control laws.

### B. Global stabilization using min-norm hybrid control

The result in the previous section guarantees a practical stability property through the use of a pointwise minimum norm state-feedback control law. Now, we consider the global stabilization of a compact set via continuous state-feedback laws  $(\rho_c, \rho_d)$  with pointwise minimum norm. For such a purpose, extra conditions are required to hold nearby the compact set. For continuous-time systems, such conditions correspond to the so-called *continuous control property* and *small control property* [4], [6], [12]. To that end, given a compact set  $\mathcal{A}$  and a control Lyapunov function  $V$  satisfying Definition 2.2, for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , define

$$\mathcal{T}'_c(x) := \Psi_c(x) \cap S'_c(x, V(x)), \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{T}'_d(x) := \Psi_d(x) \cap S'_d(x, V(x)), \quad (24)$$

where, for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and each  $r \geq 0$ ,

$$S'_c(x, r) := \begin{cases} S^\circ_c(x, r) & \text{if } r > 0, \\ \rho_{c,0}(x) & \text{if } r = 0, \end{cases} \quad S'_d(x, r) := \begin{cases} S^\circ_d(x, r) & \text{if } r > 0, \\ \rho_{d,0}(x) & \text{if } r = 0, \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

$$S^\circ_c(x, r) = \begin{cases} \{u_c \in \mathcal{U}_c : \Gamma_c(x, u_c, r) \leq 0\} & \text{if } x \in \Pi(C) \cap \mathcal{I}(r), \\ \mathbb{R}^{m_c} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$S^\circ_d(x, r) = \begin{cases} \{u_d \in \mathcal{U}_d : \Gamma_d(x, u_d, r) \leq 0\} & \text{if } x \in \Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{I}(r), \\ \mathbb{R}^{m_d} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and the feedback law pair

$$\rho_{c,0} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c, \quad \rho_{d,0} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d$$

induces (strong) forward invariance of  $\mathcal{A}$ , that is,

(M3) Every maximal solution  $t \mapsto \phi(t, 0)$  to  $\dot{x} = f(x, \rho_{c,0}(x))$ ,  $x \in \Pi(C) \cap \mathcal{A}$  satisfies  $|\phi(t, 0)|_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$  for all  $(t, 0) \in \text{dom } \phi$ ;

(M4) Every maximal solution  $j \mapsto \phi(0, j)$  to  $x^+ = g(x, \rho_{d,0}(x))$ ,  $x \in \Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{A}$  satisfies  $|\phi(0, j)|_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$  for all  $(0, j) \in \text{dom } \phi$ .

Under the conditions in Proposition 3.2, the maps in (25) are lower semicontinuous for every  $r > 0$ . To be able to make continuous selections at  $\mathcal{A}$ , these maps are further required to be lower semicontinuous for  $r = 0$ . These conditions resemble those already reported in [6] for continuous-time systems.

*Theorem 3.5:* Given a compact set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a hybrid system  $\mathcal{H} = (C, f, D, g)$  satisfying the hybrid basic conditions, suppose there exists a control Lyapunov function  $V$  with  $\mathcal{U}$  controls for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Moreover, suppose that conditions (M1)-(M2) of Proposition 3.2 hold. If the feedback law pair  $(\rho_{c,0} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c, \rho_{d,0} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d)$  is such that conditions (M3) and (M4) hold, and

(M5) The set-valued map  $\mathcal{T}'_c$  in (23) is lower semicontinuous at each  $x \in \Pi(C) \cap \mathcal{I}(0)$ ,

(M6) The set-valued map  $\mathcal{T}'_d$  in (24) is lower semicontinuous at each  $x \in \Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{I}(0)$

hold, then the state-feedback law pair

$$\rho_c : \Pi(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c, \quad \rho_d : \Pi(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d$$

defined as

$$\rho_c(x) := \arg \min \{|u_c| : u_c \in \mathcal{T}'_c(x)\} \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C) \quad (26)$$

$$\rho_d(x) := \arg \min \{|u_d| : u_d \in \mathcal{T}'_d(x)\} \quad \forall x \in \Pi(D) \quad (27)$$

renders the compact set  $\mathcal{A}$  globally asymptotically stable for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Furthermore, if the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  have closed graph and  $(\rho_{c,0}, \rho_{d,0})(\mathcal{A}) = 0$  then  $\rho_c$  and  $\rho_d$  are continuous.

*Proof:* The proof follows the ideas of the proof of [7, Proposition 7.1]. Proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 3.2, using (M5) and (M6), we have that  $\mathcal{T}'_c$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_d$  are lower semicontinuous with nonempty closed values on  $\Pi(C)$  and  $\Pi(D)$ , respectively. Then,  $\mathcal{T}'_c$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_d$  have unique elements of minimum norm, and their minimal selections

$$\rho_c : \Pi(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c \quad (28)$$

$$\rho_d : \Pi(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d \quad (29)$$

on  $\Pi(C)$  and  $\Pi(D)$  (respectively) are given by (26) and (27) (respectively). Then, from (26) and (27), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_c(x) &\in \Psi_c(x), \quad \Gamma_c(x, \rho_c(x), V(x)) \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C) \\ \rho_d(x) &\in \Psi_d(x), \quad \Gamma_d(x, \rho_d(x), V(x)) \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in \Pi(D).\end{aligned}$$

Using the definitions of  $\Psi_c, \Psi_d$  and  $\Gamma_c, \Gamma_d$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \nabla V(x), f(x, \rho_c(x)) \rangle &\leq -\alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C), \\ V(g(x, \rho_d(x))) - V(x) &\leq -\alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \forall x \in \Pi(D).\end{aligned}$$

Then, the set  $\mathcal{A}$  is globally asymptotically stable for the closed-loop system  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  by an application of the Lyapunov stability theorem for hybrid systems [11, Theorem 3.18].

When the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  have closed graph, from Proposition 3.2 we have that  $\rho_c$  and  $\rho_d$  are continuous on  $\Pi(C) \setminus \mathcal{A}$  and on  $\Pi(D) \setminus \mathcal{A}$ , respectively. Moreover, if  $(\rho_{c,0}, \rho_{d,0})(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ , [9, Theorem 4.5] implies that there exists a continuous feedback pair  $(\kappa_c, \kappa_d)$  – not necessarily of pointwise minimum norm – asymptotically stabilizing the compact set  $\mathcal{A}$  and with the property  $(\kappa_c, \kappa_d)(\mathcal{A}) = 0$  (the pair  $(\kappa_c, \kappa_d)$  vanishes on  $\mathcal{A}$  due to the fact that the only possible selection for  $r = 0$  is the pair  $(\rho_{c,0}, \rho_{d,0})$ , which vanishes at such points). Since  $\rho_c$  and  $\rho_d$  have pointwise minimum norm, we have

$$0 \leq |\rho_c(x)| \leq |\kappa_c(x)| \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C) \quad (30)$$

$$0 \leq |\rho_d(x)| \leq |\kappa_d(x)| \quad \forall x \in \Pi(D). \quad (31)$$

Then, since  $\kappa_c$  and  $\kappa_d$  are continuous and vanish at points in  $\mathcal{A}$ , the laws  $\rho_c$  and  $\rho_d$  are continuous on  $\Pi(C)$  and  $\Pi(D)$ , respectively. ■

### C. The case when the inputs affect only flows or only jumps

The results in the previous sections also hold when inputs only affect either the flows or jumps, but not both. In particular, we consider the special case when  $u_c$  is the only input, in which case  $\mathcal{H}$  becomes

$$\mathcal{H}_c \begin{cases} \dot{x} &= f(x, u_c) & (x, u_c) \in C \\ x^+ &= g(x) & x \in D \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

with  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ . When the only input is  $u_d$ ,  $\mathcal{H}$  becomes

$$\mathcal{H}_d \begin{cases} \dot{x} &= f(x) & x \in C \\ x^+ &= g(x, u_d) & (x, u_d) \in D \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

with, in this case,  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ . The following results follow by combining the earlier results.

*Corollary 3.6: Given a compact set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}_c = (C, f, D, g)$  as in (32) satisfying the hybrid basic conditions, suppose there exists a control Lyapunov function  $V$  with  $\mathcal{U}$  controls for  $\mathcal{H}_c$ . Furthermore, suppose the following conditions hold:*

*(M1c) The set-valued map  $\Psi_c$  is lower semicontinuous with convex values.*

*(M2c) For every  $r > 0$  and every  $x \in \Pi(C) \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$ , the function  $u_c \mapsto \Gamma_c(x, u_c, r)$  is convex on  $\Psi_c(x)$ .*

*Then, for every  $r > 0$ , there exists a state-feedback law*

$$\rho'_c : \Pi(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_c \quad (34)$$

*defined on  $R_c \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$  as in (21) that renders the compact set  $\mathcal{A}_r$  asymptotically stable for  $\mathcal{H}_c$ . Moreover, if the set-valued map  $\Psi_c$  has a closed graph then  $\rho'_c$  is continuous on  $\Pi(C) \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$ . Furthermore, if the zero feedback law  $\rho_{c,0} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{0\} \subset \mathcal{U}_c$  is such that condition (M3) holds and if (M5) holds, then  $\rho_c$  in (26) is globally asymptotically stabilizing. Furthermore, if the set-valued map  $\Psi_c$  has closed graph then  $\rho_c$  is continuous.*

*Corollary 3.7: Given a compact set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}_d = (C, f, D, g)$  as in (33) satisfying the hybrid basic conditions, suppose there exists a control Lyapunov function  $V$  with  $\mathcal{U}$  controls for  $\mathcal{H}_d$ . Furthermore, suppose the following conditions hold:*

*(M1d) The set-valued map  $\Psi_d$  is lower semicontinuous with convex values.*

*(M2d) For every  $r > 0$  and every  $x \in \Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$ , the function  $u_d \mapsto \Gamma_d(x, u_d, r)$  is convex on  $\Psi_d(x)$ .*

*Then, for every  $r > 0$ , there exists a state-feedback law*

$$\rho'_d : \Pi(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_d \quad (35)$$

*defined on  $R_d \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$  as in (22) that renders the compact set  $\mathcal{A}_r$  asymptotically stable for  $\mathcal{H}_d$ . Moreover, if the set-valued map  $\Psi_d$  has a closed graph then  $\rho'_d$  is continuous on  $\Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$ .*

Furthermore, if the zero feedback law  $\rho_{d,0} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{0\} \subset \mathcal{U}_d$  is such that condition (M4) holds and if (M6) holds, then  $\rho_d$  in (27) is globally asymptotically stabilizing. Furthermore, if the set-valued map  $\Psi_d$  has closed graph then  $\rho_d$  is continuous.

#### D. The common input case

When the input for flows and jumps are the same, i.e.,  $u := u_c = u_d$  ( $m := m_c = m_d$ ), the hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}$  becomes

$$\mathcal{H} \begin{cases} \dot{x} &= f(x, u) & (x, u) \in C \\ x^+ &= g(x, u) & (x, u) \in D \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

and a common pointwise minimum norm control law exists when

$$\mathcal{T}'_c(x) \cap \mathcal{T}'_d(x) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C) \cap \Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{I}(r) \quad (37)$$

for each  $r$ . A result paralleling Theorem 3.5 follows using

$$\mathcal{T}'(x) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{T}'_c(x) & \text{if } x \in (\Pi(C) \setminus \Pi(D)) \cap \mathcal{I}(r) \\ \mathcal{T}'_c(x) \cap \mathcal{T}'_d(x) & \text{if } x \in \Pi(C) \cap \Pi(D) \cap \mathcal{I}(r) \\ \mathcal{T}'_d(x) & \text{if } x \in (\Pi(D) \setminus \Pi(C)) \cap \mathcal{I}(r) \\ \mathbb{R}^m & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which, when further assuming (37), is lower semicontinuous and has nonempty, convex values. (The set valued map  $\mathcal{T}$  can be defined similarly.)

*Corollary 3.8:* Given a compact set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a hybrid system  $\mathcal{H} = (C, f, D, g)$  as in (36) satisfying the hybrid basic conditions, suppose there exists a control Lyapunov function  $V$  with  $\mathcal{U}$  controls for  $\mathcal{H}$  with input  $u = u_c = u_d$  ( $m = m_c = m_d$ ). Suppose that conditions (M1)-(M2) of Proposition 3.2 and condition (37) hold. Then, for every  $r > 0$ , there exists a state-feedback law

$$\rho' : \Pi(C) \cup \Pi(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \quad (38)$$

defined on  $(\Pi(C) \cup \Pi(D)) \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$  as

$$\rho'(x) := \arg \min \{|u| : u \in \mathcal{T}(x)\} \quad \forall x \in (\Pi(C) \cup \Pi(D)) \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$$

that renders the compact set  $\mathcal{A}_r$  asymptotically stable for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Moreover, if the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  have closed graph then  $\rho'$  is continuous on  $(\Pi(C) \cup \Pi(D)) \cap \mathcal{I}(r)$ . Furthermore, if

the zero feedback law  $\rho_0 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{0\} \subset \mathcal{U}$  is such that (37) and (M3)-(M6) for  $r = 0$  hold, then the state-feedback law

$$\rho : \Pi(C) \cup \Pi(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \quad (39)$$

defined as

$$\rho(x) := \arg \min \{|u| : u \in \mathcal{T}'(x)\} \quad \forall x \in \Pi(C) \cup \Pi(D) \quad (40)$$

renders the compact set  $\mathcal{A}$  globally asymptotically stable for  $\mathcal{H}$ . Furthermore, if the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  have closed graph then  $\rho$  is continuous.

#### IV. EXAMPLES

Now, we present examples illustrating some of the results in the previous sections. Complete details are presented for the first example.

*Example 4.1 (Rotate and dissipate):* Given  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , let  $\mathcal{W}(v_1, v_2) := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \xi = r(\lambda v_1 + (1 - \lambda)v_2), r \geq 0, \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$  and define  $v_1^1 = [1 \ 1]^\top$ ,  $v_2^1 = [-1 \ 1]^\top$ ,  $v_1^2 = [1 \ -1]^\top$ ,  $v_2^2 = [-1 \ -1]^\top$ . Let  $\omega > 0$  and consider the hybrid system

$$\mathcal{H} \begin{cases} \dot{x} &= f(x, u_c) := u_c \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega \\ -\omega & 0 \end{bmatrix} x & (x, u_c) \in C, \\ x^+ &= g(x, u_d) & (x, u_d) \in D, \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

$$C := \left\{ (x, u_c) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : u_c \in \{-1, 1\}, x \in \widehat{C} \right\},$$

$$\widehat{C} := \overline{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\mathcal{W}(v_1^1, v_2^1) \cup \mathcal{W}(v_1^2, v_2^2))},$$

$$D := \left\{ (x, u_d) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : u_d \geq \gamma|x|, x \in \partial\mathcal{W}(v_1^2, v_2^2) \right\},$$

for each  $(x, u_d) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  the jump map  $g$  is given by

$$g(x, u_d) := R(\pi/4) \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u_d \end{bmatrix}, \quad R(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos s & \sin s \\ -\sin s & \cos s \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $\gamma > 0$  is such that  $\exp(\pi/(2\omega))\gamma^2 < 1$ . For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , the vectors  $v_1^i, v_2^i \in \mathbb{R}^2$  are such that  $\mathcal{W}(v_1^1, v_2^1) \cap \mathcal{W}(v_1^2, v_2^2) = \{0\}$ . The set of interest is  $\mathcal{A} := \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ . Figure 1 depicts the flow and jump sets projected onto the  $x$  plane.




Fig. 1. Sets for Example 4.1. The white region (and its boundary) corresponds to the flow set projected onto the  $x$  plane. The dashed line represents  $D$ .

To construct a state-feedback law for (41), consider the candidate control Lyapunov function  $V$  given by

$$V(x) = \exp(T(x))x^\top x \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (42)$$

where  $T$  denotes the minimum time to reach the set  $\mathcal{W}(v_1^2, v_2^2)$  with the continuous dynamics of (41) and  $u_c \in \{-1, 1\}$ . The function  $T$  is precisely defined as follows. It is defined as a continuously differentiable function from  $\mathbb{R}^2$  to  $[0, \frac{\pi}{2\omega}]$  given as  $T(x) := \frac{1}{\omega} \arcsin\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \frac{|x_1| + x_2}{|x|}\right)$  on  $\widehat{C}$  and zero for every other point in  $\mathcal{W}(v_1^2, v_2^2)$ . The definition of  $V$  is such that (2) holds with  $\alpha_1(s) := s^2$  and  $\alpha_2(s) := \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) s^2$  for each  $s \geq 0$ .

Next, we construct the set-valued maps  $\Psi_c$  and  $\Psi_d$  and then check (3) and (4). Note that  $\Pi(C) = \widehat{C}$  and  $\Pi(D) = \partial\mathcal{W}(v_1^2, v_2^2)$ . For each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,

$$\Psi_c(x) = \begin{cases} \{-1, 1\} & \text{if } x \in \widehat{C} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$\Psi_d(x) = \begin{cases} \{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : u_d \geq \gamma|x|\} & \text{if } x \in \partial\mathcal{W}(v_1^2, v_2^2), \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

During flows, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle &= \langle \nabla T(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle V(x) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2\omega} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{|x_1| + x_2}{|x|}\right)^2}} \left\langle \nabla \frac{|x_1| + x_2}{|x|}, f(x, u_c) \right\rangle V(x) \\ &= \frac{u_c}{\omega} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_2}{|x|^2} & -\frac{x_1}{|x|^2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega \\ -\omega & 0 \end{bmatrix} x V(x) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $(x, u_c) \in C$ . For  $x \in \widehat{C}$ ,  $x_1 > 0$ ,  $\langle \nabla T(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle = 1$  when  $u_c = 1$ , and for  $x \in \widehat{C}$ ,  $x_1 < 0$ ,  $\langle \nabla T(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle = -1$  when  $u_c = -1$ . Then

$$\inf_{u_c \in \Psi_c(x)} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle \leq -x^\top x \quad (43)$$

for all  $x \in \Pi(C)$ . During jumps, we have that, for each  $(x, u_d) \in D$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} V(g(x, u_d)) &= \exp(T(g(x, u_d)))g(x, u_d)^\top g(x, u_d) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) u_d^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{u_d \in \Psi_d(x)} V(g(x, u_d)) - V(x) &\leq \inf_{u_d \in \Psi_d(x)} \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) u_d^2 - \exp(T(x))x^\top x \\ &\leq -\left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) \gamma^2\right) x^\top x \end{aligned}$$

for each  $x \in \Pi(D)$ . Finally, both (3) and (4) hold with  $s \mapsto \alpha_3(s) := \left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) \gamma^2\right) s^2$ . Then,  $V$  is a CLF for (41).

Now, we determine an asymptotic stabilizing control law for the above hybrid system. First, we compute the set-valued map  $\mathcal{T}_c$  in (6). To this end, the definition of  $\Gamma_c$  gives, for each  $r \geq 0$ ,

$$\Gamma_c(x, u_c, r) = \begin{cases} \frac{u_c}{\omega} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_2}{|x|^2} & -\frac{x_1}{|x|^2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega \\ -\omega & 0 \end{bmatrix} x V(x) + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) & \text{if } (x, u_c) \in C \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c}), \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

from where we get  $\Upsilon_c(x, u_c) = \Gamma_c(x, u_c, V(x))$ . Then, for each  $r > 0$  and  $(x, u_c) \in C \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c})$ , the set-valued map  $\mathcal{T}_c$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_c(x) &= \Psi_c(x) \cap \{u_c \in \mathcal{U}_c : \Upsilon_c(x, u_c) \leq 0\} \\ &= \{-1, 1\} \cap (\{1 : x_1 > 0\} \cup \{-1 : x_1 < 0\}), \end{aligned}$$

which reduces to

$$\mathcal{T}_c(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_1 > 0 \\ -1 & x_1 < 0 \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

for each  $x \in \Pi(C) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) > 0\}$ .



Proceeding in the same way, the definition of  $\Gamma_d$  gives, for each  $r \geq 0$ ,

$$\Gamma_d(x, u_d, r) = \begin{cases} \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) u_d^2 - V(x) + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) & \text{if } (x, u_d) \in D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d}), \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

from where we get  $\Upsilon_d(x, u_c) = \Gamma_d(x, u_d, V(x))$ . Then, for each  $r > 0$  and  $(x, u_d) \in D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d})$ , the set-valued map  $\mathcal{T}_d$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_d(x) &= \Psi_d(x) \cap \{u_d \in \mathcal{U}_d : \Upsilon_d(x, u_d) \leq 0\} \\ &= \{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : u_d \geq \gamma|x|\} \cap \left\{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) u_d^2 - \exp(T(x))x^\top x + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \leq 0\right\} \\ &= \{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : u_d \geq \gamma|x|\} \cap \left\{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) u_d^2 - x^\top x + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \leq 0\right\} \end{aligned}$$

and using the definition of  $\alpha_3$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_d(x) &= \{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : u_d \geq \gamma|x|\} \cap \left\{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) u_d^2 - \exp\left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right) \gamma^2|x|^2 \leq 0\right\} \\ &= \{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : u_d \geq \gamma|x|\} \cap \{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : -\gamma|x| \leq u_d \leq \gamma|x|\} \\ &= \{u_d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : u_d = \gamma|x|\} \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

for each  $x \in \Pi(D) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) > 0\}$ . Then, according to (9), from (44), for each  $x \in \Pi(C) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) > 0\}$  we can take the pointwise minimum norm control selection

$$\rho_c(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & x_1 > 0 \\ -1 & x_1 < 0 \end{cases}$$

According to (10), from (45), for each  $x \in \Pi(D) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) > 0\}$  we can take the pointwise minimum norm control selection

$$\rho_d(x) := \gamma|x|.$$

Figure 2 depicts a closed-loop trajectory with the control selections above when the region of operation is restricted to  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) \geq r\}$ ,  $r = 0.15$ .

*Example 4.2 (Impact control of a pendulum):* Consider a point-mass pendulum impacting on a controlled slanted surface. Denote the pendulum's angle (with respect to the vertical) by  $x_1$  and the pendulum's velocity (positive when the pendulum rotates in the clockwise direction) by  $x_2$ . When  $x_1 \geq \mu$  with  $\mu$  denoting the angle of the surface, its continuous evolution is given by

$$\dot{x}_1 = x_2, \quad \dot{x}_2 = -a \sin x_1 - bx_2 + \tau,$$




Fig. 2. Closed-loop trajectory to the system in Example 4.1 starting from  $x(0,0) = (2,0.9)$  and evolving within  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) \geq r\}$ ,  $r = 0.15$ . The lines at  $\pm 45$  deg define the boundary of the flow and jump sets projected onto the  $x$  plane. The  $r$ -contour plot of  $V$  is also shown.

where  $a > 0$ ,  $b \geq 0$  capture the system constants (e.g., gravity, mass, length, and friction) and  $\tau$  corresponds to torque actuation at the pendulum's end. For simplicity, we assume that  $x_1 \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]$  and  $\mu \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0]$ . Impacts between the pendulum and the surface occur when

$$x_1 \leq \mu, \quad x_2 \leq 0. \quad (46)$$

At such events, the jump map takes the form

$$x_1^+ = x_1 + \tilde{\rho}(\mu)x_1, \quad x_2^+ = -e(\mu)x_2,$$

where the functions  $\tilde{\rho} : [-\pi/2, 0] \rightarrow (-1, 0)$  and  $e : [-\pi/2, 0] \rightarrow [0, 1)$  are continuous and capture the effect of pendulum compression and restitution at impacts, respectively, as a function of  $\mu$ . The function  $\tilde{\rho}$  captures rapid displacements of the pendulum at collisions while  $e$  models the effect of the angle  $\mu$  on energy dissipation at impacts. For a vertical surface ( $\mu = 0$ ),  $\tilde{\rho}$  is chosen such that  $\tilde{\rho}(0) \in (-1, 0)$  and  $e$  is chosen to satisfy  $e(0) = e_0$ , where  $e_0 \in (0, 1)$  is the nominal (no gravity effect) restitution coefficient. For slanted surfaces ( $\mu \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)$ ), when conditions (46) hold,  $\tilde{\rho}$  is chosen as  $x_1 + \tilde{\rho}(\mu)x_1 > x_1$ ,  $\tilde{\rho}(\mu) \in (-1, 0)$ , so that, after the impacts, the pendulum is pushed away from the contact condition, while the function  $e$  is chosen as a

nondecreasing function of  $\mu$  satisfying  $e_0 \leq e(\mu) < 1$  at such angles so that, due to the effect of the gravity force at impacts, less energy is dissipated as  $|\mu|$  increases.

The model above can be captured by the hybrid system  $\mathcal{H}$  given by

$$\mathcal{H} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{x}_1 = x_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 = -a \sin x_1 - bx_2 + u_{c,1} \end{array} \right\} =: f(x, u_c) \quad (x, u_c) \in C, \quad (47)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} x_1^+ = x_1 + \tilde{\rho}(u_d)x_1 \\ x_2^+ = -e(u_d)x_2 \end{array} \right\} =: g(x, u_d) \quad (x, u_d) \in D,$$

where  $u_c = [u_{c,1} \ u_{c,2}]^\top = [\tau \ \mu]^\top \in \mathbb{R} \times [-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0] =: \mathcal{U}_c$ ,  $u_d = \mu \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0] =: \mathcal{U}_d$ ,

$$C := \left\{ (x, u_c) \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi\right] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{U}_c : x_1 \geq u_{c,2} \right\},$$

$$D := \left\{ (x, u_d) \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi\right] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{U}_d : x_1 \leq u_d, x_2 \leq 0 \right\}.$$

Note that the definitions of  $C$  and  $D$  impose state constraints on the inputs.

Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{(0, 0)\}$  and consider the candidate control Lyapunov function with  $\mathcal{U}$  controls for  $\mathcal{H}$  given by

$$V(x) = x^\top P x, \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (48)$$

During flows, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle &= 4x_1x_2 + 2x_2^2 \\ &\quad + 2(-a \sin x_1 - bx_2 + u_{c,1})(x_2 + x_1) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $(x, u_c) \in C$ . It follows that (3) is satisfied with  $\alpha_3$  defined as  $\alpha_3(s) := s^2$  for all  $s \geq 0$ .

In fact, note that, for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,

$$\Psi_c(x) = \begin{cases} \{u_c : x_1 \geq u_{c,2}\} = \mathbb{R} \times [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \min\{x_1, 0\}] & x_1 \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi] \\ \emptyset & x_1 \notin [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi]. \end{cases}$$

and that  $\Pi(C) = [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi] \times \mathbb{R}$ . Then

$$\inf_{u_c \in \Psi_c(x)} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle = -x^\top x$$

for all  $x \in \Pi(C)$  such that  $x_1 + x_2 = 0$ , while when  $x_1 + x_2 \neq 0$ , we have

$$\inf_{u_c \in \Psi_c(x)} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u_c) \rangle = -\infty.$$

Note that, for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , we have

$$\Psi_d(x) = \begin{cases} \{u_d : x_1 \leq u_d\} = [x_1, 0] & x_1 \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0], x_2 \leq 0 \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and that  $\Pi(D) = [-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0] \times (-\infty, 0]$ . Then, during jumps, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{u_d \in \Psi_d(x)} V(g(x, u_d)) - V(x) &= V(g(x, x_1)) - V(x) \\ &\leq -\min\{2(1 - (1 + \tilde{\rho}(x_1))^2), 1 - e^2(x_1)\} x^\top x \end{aligned}$$

for all  $x \in \Pi(D)$ . Then, condition (4) is satisfied with  $\alpha_3$  defined as  $\alpha_3(s) := \lambda s^2$  for all  $s \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda := \min_{x_1 \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0]} \{2(1 - (1 + \tilde{\rho}(x_1))^2), 1 - e^2(x_1)\}$ . It follows that both (3) and (4) hold with this choice of  $\alpha_3$ .

The definition of  $\Gamma_c$  gives, for each  $r \geq 0$ ,

$$\Gamma_c(x, u_c, r) = \begin{cases} 4x_1x_2 + 2x_2^2 + 2(-a \sin x_1 - bx_2 + u_{c,1})(x_2 + x_1) + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) & \text{if } (x, u_c) \in C \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c}) \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

from where we get  $\Upsilon_c(x, u_c) = \Gamma_c(x, u_c, V(x))$ . Then, for each  $r > 0$  and  $(x, u_c) \in C \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_c})$ , the set-valued map  $\mathcal{T}_c$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_c(x) &= \Psi_c(x) \cap \{u_c \in \mathcal{U}_c : \Upsilon_c(x, u_c) \leq 0\} \\ &= \left( \mathbb{R} \times \left[ -\frac{\pi}{2}, \min\{x_1, 0\} \right] \right) \\ &\quad \cap \{u_c \in \mathcal{U}_c : 4x_1x_2 + 2x_2^2 + 2(-a \sin x_1 - bx_2 + u_{c,1})(x_2 + x_1) + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) \leq 0\} \\ &= \left\{ u_c \in \mathbb{R} \times \left[ -\frac{\pi}{2}, \min\{x_1, 0\} \right] : 4x_1x_2 + 2x_2^2 + 2(-a \sin x_1 - bx_2 + u_{c,1})(x_2 + x_1) + \lambda x^\top x \leq 0 \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

for each  $x \in \Pi(C) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) > 0\}$ . Proceeding in the same way, the definition of  $\Gamma_d$  gives, for each  $r \geq 0$ ,

$$\Gamma_d(x, u_d, r) = \begin{cases} -2x_1^2(1 - (1 + \tilde{\rho}(u_d))^2) - x_2^2(1 - e^2(u_d)) - 2x_1x_2(2 + \tilde{\rho}(u_d))e(u_d) + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) & \text{if } (x, u_d) \in D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d}) \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

from where we get  $\Upsilon_d(x, u_c) = \Gamma_d(x, u_d, V(x))$ . Then, for each  $r > 0$  and  $(x, u_d) \in D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d})$ , the set-valued map  $\mathcal{T}_d$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_d(x) &= \Psi_d(x) \cap \{u_d \in \mathcal{U}_d : \Upsilon_d(x, u_d) \leq 0\} \\ &= \left\{ u_d \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0\right] : u_d \in [x_1, 0] \right\} \\ \cap \{u_d \in \mathbb{R} : -2x_1^2(1 - (1 + \tilde{\rho}(u_d))^2) - x_2^2(1 - e^2(u_d)) - 2x_1x_2(2 + \tilde{\rho}(u_d))e(u_d) + \lambda x^\top x \leq 0\} \\ &= \left\{ u_d \in \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0\right] : -2x_1^2(1 - (1 + \tilde{\rho}(u_d))^2) - x_2^2(1 - e^2(u_d)) + \lambda x^\top x \leq 0 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where we dropped the term  $-2x_1x_2(2 + \tilde{\rho}(u_d))e(u_d)$  since on  $D$  we have that  $x_1x_2 \geq 0$ .

Defining  $\psi_0(x) := 4x_1x_2 + 2x_2^2 + 2(-a \sin x_1 - bx_2)(x_2 + x_1) + \lambda x^\top x$ , and  $\psi_1(x) := 2(x_1 + x_2)$ , the (49) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{T}_c(x) = \left\{ u_c \in \mathbb{R} \times \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \min\{x_1, 0\}\right] : \psi_0(x) + \psi_1(x)u_{c,1} \leq 0 \right\}$$

for each  $x \in \Pi(C) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) > 0\}$ . To determine the pointwise minimum norm control selection according to (9), note that, when  $\psi_0(x) \leq 0$ , then the pointwise minimum norm control selection is  $u_{c,1} = 0$  and that, when  $\psi_0(x) > 0$ , is given by

$$-\frac{\psi_0(x)\psi_1(x)}{\psi_1^2(x)} = -\frac{\psi_0(x)}{\psi_1(x)}$$

which leads to  $\psi_0(x) + \psi_1(x)u_{c,1} = 0$ . Then, the pointwise minimum norm control selection is given by

$$\rho_{c,1}(x) := \begin{cases} -\frac{\psi_0(x)}{\psi_1(x)} & \psi_0(x) > 0 \\ 0 & \psi_0(x) \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad \rho_{c,2}(x) := 0$$

on  $\Pi(C) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) > 0\}$  (see [6, Chapter 4]). According to (10), from (50), since  $\tilde{\rho}$  maps to  $(-1, 0)$  and  $e$  to  $(0, 1)$ , for each  $x \in \Pi(D) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) > 0\}$ , the pointwise minimum norm control selection is given by

$$\rho_d(x) := 0.$$

Since  $\rho_{c,2} = \rho_d$ , the selection above can be implemented.

Figure 3 depicts a closed-loop trajectory on the plane with the control selections above when the region of operation is restricted to  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) \geq r\}$ ,  $r = 0.0015$ . Figure 4 shows the position and velocity trajectories projected on the  $t$  axis. The functions  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $e$  used in the simulations are defined as  $\tilde{\rho}(s) = 0.5s - 0.1$  and  $e(s) = -0.28s + 0.5$  for each  $s \in [-\pi/2, 0]$ .




Fig. 3. Closed-loop trajectory to the system in Example 4.2 on the plane starting from  $x(0, 0) = (2, -10)$  and evolving within  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) \geq r\}$ ,  $r = 0.0015$ .




Fig. 4. Closed-loop position ( $x_1$ ) and velocity ( $x_2$ ) to the system in Example 4.2 starting from  $x(0, 0) = (2, -10)$  and evolving within  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) \geq r\}$ ,  $r = 0.0015$ .

*Example 4.3 (Desynchronization of coupled timers with controlled resets):* Consider the hy-

brid system with state

$$x := \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 \\ \tau_2 \end{bmatrix} \in P := [0, \bar{\tau}] \times [0, \bar{\tau}],$$

with  $x_1, x_2$  being timer states with threshold  $\bar{\tau} > 0$ . The state  $x$  evolves continuously according to the flow map

$$f(x) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

when

$$x \in C := P \tag{51}$$

The state  $x$  jumps when any of the timers expires. Defining inputs affecting the jumps by  $u_d = (u_{d,1}, u_{d,2}) \in P$ , jumps will be triggered when

$$(x, u_d) \in D := \{(x, u_d) \in P \times P : \max\{\tau_1, \tau_2\} = \bar{\tau}\}. \tag{52}$$

At jumps, if a timer  $x_i$  reached the threshold  $\bar{\tau}$ , then it gets reset to the value of the respective input component of  $u_{d,i}$ , while if  $x_j, j \neq i$ , did not reach the threshold then it gets reduced by a fraction of its value. More precisely, the jump map is given by

$$g(x, u_d) = \begin{bmatrix} g(x_1, x_2, u_{d,1}) \\ g(x_2, x_1, u_{d,2}) \end{bmatrix} \quad \forall (x, u_d) \in D,$$

where  $g$  is defined as

$$g(s_1, s_2, s_3) = \begin{cases} (1 + \varepsilon)s_1 & \text{if } s_1 < \bar{\tau}, s_2 = \bar{\tau} \\ s_3 & \text{if } s_1 = \bar{\tau}, s_2 < \bar{\tau} \\ \{(1 + \varepsilon)s_1, s_3\} & \text{if } s_1 = \bar{\tau}, s_2 = \bar{\tau} \end{cases} \quad \forall (s_1, s_2) \in \Pi(D), s_3 \in P$$

with parameter  $\varepsilon \in (-1, 0)$ .

We are interested in the asymptotic stabilization of the set

$$\mathcal{A} := \{x \in P : |x_2 - x_1| = k\}, \quad k > 0, \tag{53}$$

which, for an appropriate  $k$ , would correspond to the two timers being desynchronized since asymptotic stability of  $\mathcal{A}$  would imply

$$\lim_{(t,j) \in \text{dom } x, t+j \rightarrow \infty} |x_2(t, j) - x_1(t, j)| = k > 0$$

for every complete solution  $x$ . Let  $k = \frac{\varepsilon+1}{\varepsilon+2}\bar{\tau}$ , which for  $\varepsilon \in (-1, 0)$  is such that  $k \in (0, \bar{\tau})$ .

Consider the candidate control Lyapunov function  $V : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$V(x) = \min \{|x_2 - x_1 + k|, |x_2 - x_1 - k|\} \quad (54)$$

Defining

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \tilde{\ell}_1 \cup \tilde{\ell}_2 \supset \mathcal{A},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\ell}_1 &= \left\{ x : \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\tau} \\ \frac{\bar{\tau}}{\varepsilon+2} \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}t \in P \cup \sqrt{2}\bar{\tau}\mathbb{B}, t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}, \\ \tilde{\ell}_2 &= \left\{ x : \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\bar{\tau}}{\varepsilon+2} \\ \bar{\tau} \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}t \in P \cup \sqrt{2}\bar{\tau}\mathbb{B}, t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Note that  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2$  is an inflation of  $\mathcal{A}_2$  and is such that  $V(x) = |x|_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2}$  on  $P$ .

Next, we construct the set-valued map  $\Psi_d$ , and then check (4). Note that  $\Pi(D) = \{x : \max\{x_1, x_2\} = \bar{\tau}\}$ . For each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,

$$\Psi_d(x) = \begin{cases} P & \text{if } x \in \Pi(D) \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

We have the following properties. For all  $x \in C$  where  $V$  is differentiable, we obtain

$$\langle \nabla V(x), f(x) \rangle = 0 \quad (56)$$

For each  $(x, u_d) \in D$ , we have that there exists  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $x_i = \bar{\tau}$  and  $x_j \leq \bar{\tau}$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that  $i = 1$  and  $j = 2$ . Then,  $\eta \in g(x, u_d)$ , is such that  $\eta_1 = u_{d,1}$  and  $\eta_2 = (1 + \varepsilon)x_2$  if  $x_2 < \bar{\tau}$ , while  $\eta_1 \in \{(1 + \varepsilon)x_1, u_{d,1}\}$  and  $\eta_2 \in \{(1 + \varepsilon)x_2, u_{d,2}\}$  if  $x_2 = \bar{\tau}$ . Then, for each  $(x, u_d) \in D$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} V(\eta) - V(x) &= \min \{|\eta_2 - \eta_1 + k|, |\eta_2 - \eta_1 - k|\} - \min \{|x_2 - \bar{\tau} + k|, |x_2 - \bar{\tau} - k|\} \\ &= \min \{|\eta_2 - \eta_1 + k|, |\eta_2 - \eta_1 - k|\} - |x_2 - \bar{\tau} + k|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that  $k = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}\bar{\tau}$ , it follows that for every  $x \in \Pi(D)$ ,  $x_1 = \bar{\tau}$ ,  $x_2 \leq \bar{\tau}$ ,  $\eta \in g(x, u_d)$ , we have

$$\inf_{u_d \in \Psi_d(x)} V(\eta) - V(x) \leq \varepsilon \left| x_2 - \frac{\bar{\tau}}{2+\varepsilon} \right| = \varepsilon ||x_2 - x_1| - k| = \varepsilon |x|_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}. \quad (57)$$



Proceeding similarly for every other point in  $D$ , we have that (4) holds with  $s \mapsto \alpha_3(s) := -\varepsilon s$ .

Now, we determine an asymptotic stabilizing control law for the above hybrid system. We compute the set-valued map  $\mathcal{T}_d$  in (6). To this end, the definition of  $\Gamma_d$  gives, for each  $r \geq 0$ ,

$$\Gamma_d(x, u_d, r) = \begin{cases} \max_{\eta \in g(x, u_d)} V(\eta) - V(x) + \alpha_3(|x|_{\mathcal{A}}) & \text{if } (x, u_d) \in D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \times \mathbb{R}^{m_d}) \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

from where we get  $\Upsilon_d(x, u_d) = \Gamma_d(x, u_d, V(x))$ . Then, for each  $r > 0$  and  $(x, u_d) \in D \cap (\mathcal{I}(r) \cap \mathbb{R}^{m_d})$ , the set-valued map  $\mathcal{T}_d$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_d(x) &= \Psi_d(x) \cap \{u_d \in \mathcal{U}_d : \Upsilon_d(x, u_d) \leq 0\} \\ &= \left\{ u_d \in P : \max_{\eta \in g(x, u_d)} V(\eta) - V(x) - \varepsilon|x|_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \leq 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

To determine the pointwise minimum norm control  $u_d$ , consider again  $x_1 = \bar{\tau}$  and  $x_2 \leq \bar{\tau}$ , which implies that  $\eta \in g(x, u_d)$  is such that  $\eta_1 = u_{d,1}$  and  $\eta_2 = (1 + \varepsilon)x_2$  if  $x_2 < \bar{\tau}$ , while  $\eta_1 \in \{(1 + \varepsilon)x_1, u_{d,1}\}$  and  $\eta_2 \in \{(1 + \varepsilon)x_2, u_{d,2}\}$  if  $x_2 = \bar{\tau}$ . Then if  $x_2 < \bar{\tau}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_d(x) &= \{u_d \in P : \min\{|\eta_2 - \eta_1 + k|, |\eta_2 - \eta_1 - k|\} - |x_2 - \bar{\tau} + k| - \varepsilon|x|_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \leq 0\} \\ &= \{u_d \in P : \min\{|(1 + \varepsilon)x_2 - u_{d,1} + k|, |(1 + \varepsilon)x_2 - u_{d,1} - k|\} - |x_2 - \bar{\tau} + k| - \varepsilon|x|_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \leq 0\} \end{aligned}$$

For each  $x_2 < \bar{\tau}$ ,  $(u_{d,1}, u_{d,2})$  with  $u_{d,1} = 0$  belongs to  $\mathcal{T}_d(x)$  since

$$\min\{|(1 + \varepsilon)x_2 - 0 + k|, |(1 + \varepsilon)x_2 - 0 - k|\} - |x_2 - \bar{\tau} + k| - \varepsilon|x|_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \quad (58)$$

$$= |(1 + \varepsilon)x_2 - k| - |x_2 - \bar{\tau} + k| - \varepsilon||x_2 - x_1| - k| \quad (59)$$

$$= |(1 + \varepsilon)x_2 - k| - (1 + \varepsilon)|x_2 - \bar{\tau} + k| \quad (60)$$

$$= (1 + \varepsilon) \left( \left| x_2 - \frac{k}{1 + \varepsilon} \right| - |x_2 - \bar{\tau} + k| \right) \quad (61)$$

$$= (1 + \varepsilon) \left( \left| x_2 - \frac{k}{1 + \varepsilon} \right| - |x_2 - \bar{\tau} + k| \right) \quad (62)$$

$$= 0 \quad (63)$$

since  $\frac{k}{1 + \varepsilon} = \frac{\bar{\tau}}{2 + \varepsilon}$  and  $-\bar{\tau} + k = -\frac{\bar{\tau}}{2 + \varepsilon}$ . When  $x_2 = \bar{\tau}$ , then  $\eta_1 = u_{d,1}$  and  $\eta_2 = u_{d,2}$  are possible values of  $\eta$ , in which case  $u_{d,1} = u_{d,2} = 0$  belong to  $\mathcal{T}_d(x)$ . The same property holds for every other possibility of  $\eta$ .

Then, according to (10), for each  $x \in \Pi(D)$  we can take the pointwise minimum norm control selection

$$\rho_d(x) := 0.$$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Artstein. Stabilization with relaxed controls. *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods & Applications*, 11:1163–1173, 1983.
- [2] F.H. Clarke, Yu. S. Ledyaev, L. Rifford, and R.J. Stern. Feedback stabilization and Lyapunov functions. *SIAM: Journal of Control and Optimization*, 39(1):25–48, 2000.
- [3] E.D. Sontag and H.J. Sussmann. General classes of control-Lyapunov functions. In *Stability theory: Hurwitz Centenary Conference, Centro Stefano Franscini, Ascona, 1995*. 1996.
- [4] E. D. Sontag. A ‘universal’ construction of Artstein’s theorem on nonlinear stabilization. *Systems and Control Letters*, 13:117–123, 1989.
- [5] E. Moulay and W. Perruquetti. Stabilization of nonaffine systems: A constructive method for polynomial systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 50(4):520–526, 2005.
- [6] R. A. Freeman and P. V. Kokotovic. *Robust Nonlinear Control Design: State-Space and Lyapunov Techniques*. Birkhauser, 1996.
- [7] R. Freeman and P.V. Kokotovic. Inverse optimality in robust stabilization. *SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization*, 34:1365–1391, 1996.
- [8] R. G. Sanfelice. Results on input-to-output and input-output-to-state stability for hybrid systems and their interconnections. In *Proc. 49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 2396–2401, 2010.
- [9] R. G. Sanfelice. On the existence of control Lyapunov functions and state-feedback laws for hybrid systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(12):3242–3248, December 2013.
- [10] R.T. Rockafellar and R. J-B Wets. *Variational Analysis*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 1998.
- [11] R. Goebel, R. G. Sanfelice, and A. R. Teel. *Hybrid Dynamical Systems: Modeling, Stability, and Robustness*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 2012.
- [12] M. Krstic and H. Deng. *Stabilization of nonlinear uncertain systems*. Springer-Verlag New York, 1998.

