

# Composition of Control Barrier Functions With Differing Relative Degrees for Safety Under Input Constraints

Pedram Rabiee and Jesse B. Hoagg

**Abstract**—This paper presents a new approach for guaranteed safety subject to input constraints (e.g., actuator limits) using a composition of multiple control barrier functions (CBFs). First, we present a method for constructing a single CBF from multiple CBFs, which can have different relative degrees. This construction relies on a soft minimum function and yields a CBF whose 0-superlevel set is a subset of the union of the 0-superlevel sets of all the CBFs used in the construction. Next, we extend the approach to systems with input constraints. Specifically, we introduce control dynamics that allow us to express the input constraints as CBFs in the closed-loop state (i.e., the state of the system and the controller). The CBFs constructed from input constraints do not have the same relative degree as the safety constraints. Thus, the composite soft-minimum CBF construction is used to combine the input-constraint CBFs with the safety-constraint CBFs. Finally, we present a feasible real-time-optimization control that guarantees that the state remains in the 0-superlevel set of the composite soft-minimum CBF. We demonstrate these approaches on a nonholonomic ground robot example.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Control barrier functions (CBFs) are a set-theoretic approach to obtain forward invariance and guarantee that constraints are satisfied [1]. CBFs are often integrated into real-time optimization-based control methods (e.g., quadratic programs) as safety filters [2], [3] and in conjunction with stability constraints or performance objectives [4]. CBF methods have been demonstrated in a variety of applications, including mobile robots [5], unmanned aerial vehicles [6], and autonomous driving [1], [7]. Nevertheless, verifying a candidate CBF (i.e., confirming that it satisfies the conditions to be a CBF) can be challenging [8].

For systems without input constraints (e.g., actuator limits), a candidate CBF can often be verified provided that it satisfies certain structural assumptions (e.g., constant relative degree) [1]. In contrast, verifying a candidate CBF under input constraints can be challenging, and this challenge is exacerbated in the case where the desired forward invariant set (e.g., the safe set) is described using multiple CBFs. Offline sum-of-squares optimization methods can be used to verify a candidate CBF [9]–[12].

An online approach to obtain forward invariance (e.g., safety) with input constraints is to use a prediction of the system trajectory into the future under a backup control [13]–[15]. For example, [14], [15] determine a control forward

invariant subset of the safe set by using a finite-horizon prediction of the system under a backup control, and to use a soft-minimum function to construct a single composite barrier function from the multiple barrier functions that arise from using a prediction horizon. In addition, [15] allows for multiple backup controls, which helps to enlarge the verified forward-invariant subset of the safe set. However, all of these methods rely on a prediction of the system trajectories into the future, which can be computationally intensive.

Another approach to address forward invariance subject to input constraints is to compose a single CBF from multiple CBFs. For example, [16] presents a CBF composition that uses adaptable weights. However, the feasibility of the composition-weight update law relies on the assumption that an underlying optimization problem satisfies Slater’s condition.

This paper presents a new approach for guaranteed safety subject to input constraints (e.g., actuator limits). The approach relies on a composite soft-minimum CBF that combines multiple safety constraints and multiple input constraints into a single CBF constraint that can be enforced through a real-time optimization, specifically, a quadratic program. This paper presents several new contributions. First, we present a method for constructing a single CBF from multiple CBFs, where each CBF in the composition can have different relative degree. The construction relies on a soft minimum function and yields a CBF whose 0-superlevel set is a subset of the union of the 0-superlevel sets of all the CBFs used in the construction.

Next, we use the composite soft-minimum CBF construction to address guaranteed safety under input constraints. To do this, we introduce control dynamics such that the control signal is an algebraic function of the internal controller states and the input to the control dynamics is the output of a real-time optimization. Other methods using control dynamics and CBFs include [17], [18]. The use of control dynamics allows us to express the input constraints as CBFs in the closed-loop state (i.e., the state of the system and the controller). Notably, the input constraint CBFs do not have the same relative degree as the safety CBFs. However, this difficult is addressed using the new composite soft-minimum CBF construction. Then, we present a real-time-optimization control that minimizes a quadratic performance cost subject to the constraint that the state remains in the 0-superlevel set of the composite soft-minimum CBF, which guarantees both safety and the input constraints are satisfied. Finally, we demonstrate the method on a simulation of a nonholonomic ground robot subject to position constraints, speed constraints, and input

P. Rabiee and J. B. Hoagg are with the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, USA. (e-mail: pedram.rabiee@uky.edu, jesse.hoagg@uky.edu).

This work is supported in part by the National Science Foundation (1849213, 1932105) and Air Force Office of Scientific Research (FA9550-20-1-0028).

constraints—none of which have the same relative degree.

## II. NOTATION

The interior, boundary, and closure of the set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  are denoted by  $\text{int } \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\text{bd } \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\text{cl } \mathcal{A}$ , respectively. Let  $\mathbb{P}^n$  denote the set of symmetric positive-definite matrices in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ .

Let  $\eta : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell$ , be continuously differentiable. Then,  $\eta' : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times n}$  is defined as  $\eta'(x) \triangleq \frac{\partial \eta(x)}{\partial x}$ . The Lie derivatives of  $\eta$  along the vector fields of  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  are defined as  $L_f \eta(x) \triangleq \eta'(x)f(x)$ ,  $L_g \eta(x) \triangleq \eta'(x)g(x)$ , and for all positive integer  $d$ , define  $L_f^d \eta(x) \triangleq L_f L_f^{d-1} \eta(x)$ . Throughout this paper, we assume that all functions are sufficiently smooth such that all derivatives that we write exist and are continuous.

Let  $\rho > 0$ , and consider the function  $\text{softmin}_\rho : \mathbb{R} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$\text{softmin}_\rho(z_1, \dots, z_N) \triangleq -\frac{1}{\rho} \log \sum_{i=1}^N e^{-\rho z_i}, \quad (1)$$

which is the *soft minimum*. The next result relates the soft minimum to the minimum.

**Fact 1.** Let  $z_1, \dots, z_N \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \{z_1, \dots, z_N\} - \frac{\log N}{\rho} &\leq \text{softmin}_\rho(z_1, \dots, z_N) \\ &< \min \{z_1, \dots, z_N\}. \end{aligned}$$

## III. COMPOSITE SOFT-MINIMUM CBF

This section presents a method for constructing a single CBF from multiple CBFs, which can have different relative degrees. Next, this section presents a feasible real-time-optimization control that guarantees safety with respect to all of the original CBFs.

### A. Problem Formulation

Consider

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t)) + g(x(t))u(t), \quad (2)$$

where  $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state,  $x(0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the initial condition, and  $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the control.

Let  $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_\ell : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be continuously differentiable, and define the *safe set*

$$\mathcal{S}_s \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h_1(x) \geq 0, h_2(x) \geq 0, \dots, h_\ell(x) \geq 0\}. \quad (3)$$

Unless otherwise stated, all statements in this section that involve the subscript  $j$  are for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$ . We assume that there exists a positive integer  $d_j$  such that:

$$(A1) \text{ For all } x \in \mathcal{S}_s \text{ and all } i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d_j - 2\}, \\ L_g L_f^i h_j(x) = 0.$$

$$(A2) \text{ For all } x \in \mathcal{S}_s, L_g L_f^{d_j-1} h_j(x) \neq 0.$$

Assumptions (A1) and (A2) imply  $h_j$  has well-defined relative degree  $d_j$  with respect to (2); however, these relative degrees need not be equal.

Next, consider the cost function  $J : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$J(x, u) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} u^T Q(x) u + c(x)^T u, \quad (4)$$

where  $Q : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^m$  and  $c : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ . The objective is to design a full-state feedback control  $u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  such that for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $J(x(t), u(t))$  is minimized subject to the safety constraint that  $x(t) \in \mathcal{S}_s$ .

### B. Composite Soft-Minimum CBF Construction and Control

For  $i \in \{0, \dots, d_j - 2\}$ , let  $\alpha_{j,i} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an extended class- $\mathcal{K}$  function, and consider  $b_{j,i+1} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$b_{j,i+1}(x) \triangleq L_f b_{j,i}(x) + \alpha_{j,i}(b_{j,i}(x)), \quad (5)$$

where  $b_{j,0}(x) \triangleq h_j(x)$ .

Next, for  $i \in \{0, \dots, d_j - 2\}$  define

$$\mathcal{C}_{j,i} \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : b_{j,i}(x) \geq 0\}. \quad (6)$$

For notational convenience, we define  $b_j(x) \triangleq b_{j,d_j-1}(x)$ . Then, consider  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$h(x) \triangleq \text{softmin}_\rho(b_1(x), b_2(x), \dots, b_\ell(x)), \quad (7)$$

and define

$$\mathcal{S} \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(x) \geq 0\}. \quad (8)$$

The following result is the immediate consequence of Fact 1.

**Fact 2.**  $\mathcal{S} \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : b_1(x) \geq 0, \dots, b_\ell(x) \geq 0\}$ .

Next, define the sets

$$\mathcal{C}_j \triangleq \bigcap_{i=0}^{d_j-2} \mathcal{C}_{j,i}, \quad \mathcal{C} \triangleq \bigcap_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{C}_j \subseteq \mathcal{S}_s, \quad (9)$$

and it follows that  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{S}_s$ . Furthermore, we note that if for all  $x \in \text{bd } \mathcal{S}$ ,  $L_g h(x) \neq 0$ , then  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{C}$  is control forward invariant.

Next, we design a control that for all  $t \geq 0$ , seeks to minimize  $J(x(t), u(t))$  subject to the constraint that  $x(t) \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{S}_s$ . Let  $\gamma > 0$ , and let  $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a nondecreasing function such that  $\alpha(0) = 0$ . For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the control is given by

$$\left(u(x), \mu(x)\right) \triangleq \underset{\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \tilde{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{argmin}} J(x, \tilde{u}) + \gamma \tilde{\mu}^2 \quad (10a)$$

subject to

$$L_f h(x) + L_g h(x) \tilde{u} + \alpha(h(x)) + \tilde{\mu} h(x) \geq 0. \quad (10b)$$

The following result shows that the quadratic program (10) is feasible if  $L_g h(x) \neq 0$  for all  $x \in \text{bd } \mathcal{S}$ .

**Lemma 1.** Assume that for all  $x \in \text{bd } \mathcal{S}$ ,  $L_g h(x) \neq 0$ . Then, for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ , there exists  $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\tilde{\mu} \geq 0$  such that (10b) is satisfied.

The next theorem is the main result on the control (4), (5), (7), and (10) that uses the composite soft-minimum CBF  $h$ .

**Theorem 1.** Consider (2), where (A1) and (A2) are satisfied, and consider  $u$  given by (4), (5), (7), and (10). Assume that for all  $x \in \text{bd } \mathcal{S}$ ,  $L_g h(x) \neq 0$ . Let  $x_0 \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{C}$ . Then, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $x(t) \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{S}_s$ .

Next, we present an example to demonstrate the control (4), (5), (7), and (10) that uses the composite soft-minimum CBF.

**Example 1.** Consider the nonholonomic ground robot modeled by (2), where

$$f(x) = \begin{bmatrix} v \cos \theta \\ v \sin \theta \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, g(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, x = \begin{bmatrix} q_x \\ q_y \\ v \\ \theta \end{bmatrix}, u = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $[q_x \ q_y]^T$  is the robot's position in an orthogonal coordinate system,  $v$  is the speed, and  $\theta$  is the direction of the velocity vector (i.e., the angle from  $[1 \ 0]^T$  to  $[\dot{q}_x \ \dot{q}_y]^T$ ).

Consider the map shown in Figure 1, which has 6 obstacles and a wall. For  $j \in \{1, \dots, 6\}$ , the area outside the  $j$ th obstacle is modeled as the 0-superlevel set of

$$h_j(x) = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} a_{x,j}(q_x - b_{x,j}) \\ a_{y,j}(q_y - b_{y,j}) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_p - c_j,$$

where  $b_{x,j}, b_{y,j}, a_{x,j}, a_{y,j}, c_j, p > 0$  specify the location and dimensions of the  $j$ th obstacle. Similarly, the area inside the wall is modeled as the 0-superlevel set of  $h_7(x) = c_7 - \left\| \begin{bmatrix} a_{x,7} q_x \\ a_{y,7} q_y \end{bmatrix} \right\|_p$ , where  $a_{x,7}, a_{y,7}, c_7, p > 0$  specify the dimension of the space inside the wall. The bounds on speed  $v$  are modeled as the 0-superlevel sets of  $h_8(x) = 9 - v$ ,  $h_9(x) = v + 1$ . The safe set  $\mathcal{S}_s$  is given by (3) where  $\ell = 9$ , and its projection onto the  $q_x$ - $q_y$  plane is shown in Figure 1. Note that for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}_s$ , the speed satisfies  $v \in [-1, 9]$ .

Let  $q_d = [q_{d,x} \ q_{d,y}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be the goal location, that is, the desired location for  $[q_x \ q_y]^T$ .

Next, the desired control is

$$u_d(x) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} u_{d1}(x) \\ u_{d2}(x) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where  $u_{d1}, u_{d2}, r, \psi : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are defined by

$$u_{d1}(x) \triangleq -(k_1 + k_3)v + (1 + k_1 k_3)r(x) \cos \psi(x) + k_1(k_2 r(x) + v) \sin^2 \psi(x), \quad (12)$$

$$u_{d2}(x) \triangleq \left( k_2 + \frac{v}{r(x)} \right) \sin \psi(x), \quad (13)$$

$$r(x) \triangleq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} q_x - q_{d,x} \\ q_y - q_{d,y} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2, \quad (14)$$

$$\psi(x) \triangleq \text{atan2}(q_y - q_{d,y}, q_x - q_{d,x}) - \theta + \pi, \quad (15)$$

and  $k_1 = 0.2, k_2 = 1$ , and  $k_3 = 2$ . Note that the desired control is designed using a process similar to [19, pp. 30–31], and it drives  $[q_x \ q_y]^T$  to  $q_d$  but does not account for safety.

Next, we consider the cost function (4), where  $Q(x) = I_2$  and  $c(x) = -u_d(x)$ . Thus, for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the minimizer of (4) is equal to the minimizer of the minimum-intervention cost  $\|u - u_d(x)\|_2^2$ .

We note that (A1) and (A2) are satisfied by  $d_1 = d_2 = \dots = d_7 = 2$  and  $d_8 = d_9 = 1$ .

We implement the control (4), (5), (7), and (10) with  $\rho = 10$ ,  $\gamma = 10^{24}$ ,  $\alpha_{1,0}(h) = \dots = \alpha_{7,0}(h) = 7h$ , and  $\alpha(h(x)) = 0.5h(x)$ . The control is updated at 1 kHz.

Figure 1 shows the closed-loop trajectories for  $x_0 = [-1 \ -8.5 \ 0 \ \frac{\pi}{2}]^T$  with 4 different goal locations  $q_d = [3 \ 4.5]^T$ ,  $q_d = [-7 \ 0]^T$ ,  $q_d = [7 \ 1.5]^T$ , and  $q_d = [-1 \ 7]^T$ . In all cases, the robot position converges to the goal location while satisfying safety constraints.

Figures 2 and 3 show the trajectories of the relevant signals for the case where  $q_d = [3 \ 4.5]^T$ . Figure 3 shows that  $h$ ,  $\min b_{j,i}$ , and  $\min h_j$  are positive for all time, which implies trajectory remains in  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{S}_s$ .  $\triangle$




Fig. 1.  $\mathcal{S}_s$ , and closed-loop trajectories for 4 goal locations.




Fig. 2.  $q_x, q_y, v, \theta, u$  and  $u_d$  for  $q_d = [3 \ 4.5]^T$ .

#### IV. GUARANTEED SAFETY WITH INPUT CONSTRAINTS

This section uses the composite soft-minimum CBF from the previous section to address safety with input constraints.

##### A. Problem Formulation

Consider

$$\dot{\hat{x}}(t) = \hat{f}(\hat{x}(t)) + \hat{g}(\hat{x}(t))\hat{u}(t), \quad (16)$$




Fig. 3.  $h$ ,  $\min b_{j,i}$ , and  $\min h_j$  for  $q_d = [3 \ 4.5]^T$ .

where  $\hat{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}}$  is the state,  $\hat{x}(0) = \hat{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}}$  is the initial condition, and  $\hat{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the control.

Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{\ell_{\hat{u}}} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be continuously differentiable, and define

$$\mathcal{U} \triangleq \{\hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \phi_1(\hat{u}) \geq 0, \dots, \phi_{\ell_{\hat{u}}}(\hat{u}) \geq 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m, \quad (17)$$

which we assume is bounded and not empty. Unless otherwise stated, all statements in this section that involve the subscript  $\kappa$  are for all  $\kappa \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell_{\hat{u}}\}$ . We assume that for all  $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\phi'_\kappa(\hat{u}) \neq 0$ .

Next, let  $\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_{\ell_{\hat{x}}} : \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be continuously differentiable, and define the safe set

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_s \triangleq \{\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}} : \hat{h}_1(\hat{x}) \geq 0, \hat{h}_2(\hat{x}) \geq 0, \dots, \hat{h}_{\ell_{\hat{x}}}(\hat{x}) \geq 0\}. \quad (18)$$

Unless otherwise stated, all statements in this section that involve the subscript  $\nu$  are for all  $\nu \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell_{\hat{x}}\}$ . We assume that there exists a positive integer  $\hat{d}_\nu$  such that:

$$(A3) \text{ For all } \hat{x} \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_s \text{ and all } i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \hat{d}_\nu - 2\}, \\ L_{\hat{g}} L_{\hat{f}}^i \hat{h}_\nu(\hat{x}) = 0.$$

$$(A4) \text{ For all } \hat{x} \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_s, L_{\hat{g}} L_{\hat{f}}^{\hat{d}_\nu - 1} \hat{h}_\nu(\hat{x}) \neq 0.$$

Next, consider the cost function  $\hat{J} : \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$\hat{J}(\hat{x}, \hat{u}) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \hat{u}^T \hat{Q}(\hat{x}) \hat{u} + \hat{c}(\hat{x})^T \hat{u}, \quad (19)$$

where  $\hat{Q} : \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^m$  and  $\hat{c} : \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ . The objective is to design a feedback control such that for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\hat{J}(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}(t))$  is minimized subject to the safety constraints  $x(t) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_s$  and the input constraint  $\hat{u}(t) \in \mathcal{U}$ .

### B. Control for Safety with Input Constraints

To address this problem, we introduce control dynamics. Specifically, consider a control  $\hat{u}$  that satisfies

$$\dot{x}_c(t) = f_c(x_c(t)) + g_c(x_c(t))u(t), \quad (20)$$

$$\hat{u}(t) = h_c(x_c(t)), \quad (21)$$

where  $x_c(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ ,  $x_c(0) = x_{c0} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$  is the initial condition, and  $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the input, which is computed from a quadratic program presented below.

Define the set

$$\mathcal{S}_c \triangleq \{x_c \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c} : h_c(x_c) \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

The functions  $f_c$ ,  $g_c$  and  $h_c$  are selected such that there exist positive integers  $d_c$  and  $\zeta$  such that the following conditions hold:

$$(C1) \text{ For all } x_c \in \mathcal{S}_c \text{ and all } i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d_c - 2\}, \\ L_{g_c} L_{f_c}^i h_c(x_c) = 0.$$

$$(C2) \text{ For all } x_c \in \mathcal{S}_c, L_{g_c} L_{f_c}^{d_c - 1} h_c(x_c) \text{ is nonsingular.}$$

$$(C3) \text{ For all } \hat{x} \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_s \text{ and all } x_c \in \mathcal{S}_c, \\ L_{\hat{g}} L_{\hat{f}}^{\hat{d}_\nu - 1} \hat{h}_\nu(\hat{x}) L_{g_c} L_{f_c}^{d_c - 1} h_c(x_c) \neq 0.$$

$$(C4) \text{ For all } x_c \in \mathcal{S}_c \text{ and all } i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \zeta - 2\}, \\ L_{g_c} L_{f_c}^i \phi_\kappa(h_c(x_c)) = 0.$$

$$(C5) \text{ For all } x_c \in \mathcal{S}_c, L_{g_c} L_{f_c}^{\zeta - 1} \phi_\kappa(h_c(x_c)) \neq 0.$$

Note that there exist constructions of  $f_c$ ,  $g_c$ , and  $h_c$  for which (C1)–(C5) are satisfied. The following example provides one such construction.

**Example 2.** Let

$$f_c(x_c) = A_c x_c, \quad g_c(x_c) = B_c, \quad h_c(x_c) = C_c x_c, \quad (22)$$

where  $A_c \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c \times n_c}$ ,  $B_c \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c \times m}$ ,  $C_c \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_c}$ , and  $C_c B_c$  is nonsingular. Thus,  $L_{g_c} h_c(x_c) = C_c B_c$  is nonsingular, which implies that (C1) and (C2) are satisfied with  $d_c = 1$ . Next, since  $L_{g_c} h_c(x_c)$  is nonsingular, it follows from (A2) that (C3) is satisfied. Finally, note that  $L_{g_c} \phi_\kappa(h_c(x_c)) = \phi'_\kappa(h_c(x_c)) L_{g_c} h_c(x_c) = \phi'_\kappa(h_c(x_c)) C_c B_c$ . Since  $C_c B_c$  is nonsingular and for all  $x_c \in \mathcal{S}_c$ ,  $\phi'_\kappa(h_c(x_c)) \neq 0$ , it follows that (C4) and (C5) are satisfied with  $\zeta = 1$ .  $\triangle$

Next, the cascade of (16), (20), and (21) is given by (2), where

$$f(x) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{f}(\hat{x}) + \hat{g}(\hat{x}) h_c(x_c) \\ f_c(x_c) \end{bmatrix}, g(x) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ g_c(x_c) \end{bmatrix}, x \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x} \\ x_c \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

and  $n \triangleq \hat{n} + n_c$ . Let  $\ell \triangleq \ell_{\hat{x}} + \ell_{\hat{u}}$ , and for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$ ,  $h_j$  is defined as

$$h_j(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} \hat{h}_j(\hat{x}), & \text{if } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell_{\hat{x}}\}, \\ \phi_{j - \ell_{\hat{x}}}(h_c(x_c)), & \text{if } j \in \{\ell_{\hat{x}} + 1, \ell_{\hat{x}} + 2, \dots, \ell\}. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Consider the set  $\mathcal{S}_s$  defined in (3), and note that  $\mathcal{S}_s = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_s \times \mathcal{S}_c$ . The following result demonstrates that the cascade (23) satisfies (A1) and (A2).

**Proposition 1.** Consider (16), where (A3) and (A4) are satisfied, and consider (20) and (21), where (C1)–(C5) are satisfied. Then,  $f$ ,  $g$ , and  $h_j$  given by (23) and (24) satisfy (A1) and (A2) with

$$d_j \triangleq \begin{cases} \hat{d}_j + d_c, & \text{if } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell_{\hat{x}}\}, \\ \zeta, & \text{if } j \in \{\ell_{\hat{x}} + 1, \ell_{\hat{x}} + 2, \dots, \ell\}. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Since Proposition 1 implies that the cascade (23) with the CBFs (24) satisfy (A1) and (A2), it follows that the composite soft-minimum CBF construction from the previous section can be applied to combine the CBFs (24) that describe a set  $\mathcal{S}_s = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_s \times \mathcal{S}_c$  that combines the safe set  $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_s$  and the set of controller states  $\mathcal{S}_c$  that yield control signals in the

admissible set  $\mathcal{U}$ . In other words, we can apply the composite soft-minimum CBF construction to enforce safety and input constraints. To do this, for  $i \in \{0, \dots, d_j - 2\}$ , let  $b_{j,i+1} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by (5). Furthermore, let  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the composite soft-minimum CBF given by (7), and let  $\mathcal{S}$  be given by (8).

Next, note that we cannot directly apply the quadratic program (10) because the cost  $J$  given by (4) is a function of  $u$ , whereas the cost  $\hat{J}$  given by (19) is a function of  $\hat{u}$ . Thus, we introduce an expression for the cost  $J$  that is a surrogate for the cost  $\hat{J}$ . In other words, we develop an expression for  $J$  such that minimizing  $J$  tends to minimize  $\hat{J}$ .

Consider  $\hat{u}_d : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  defined by

$$\hat{u}_d(x) \triangleq -\hat{Q}(\hat{x})^{-1}\hat{c}(\hat{x}), \quad (26)$$

which is the minimizer of (19). Next, let  $\gamma_{d_c} = 1$ , and consider  $u_d : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  defined by

$$u_d(x) \triangleq \left( L_{g_c} L_{f_c}^{d_c-1} h_c(x_c) \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{d_c} \gamma_i \left( L_{f_c}^i \hat{u}_d(x) - L_{f_c}^i h_c(x_c) \right) \right), \quad (27)$$

where  $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{d_c-1} > 0$  are selected such that

$$s^{d_c} + \gamma_{d_c-1} s^{d_c-1} + \gamma_{d_c-2} s^{d_c-2} + \dots + \gamma_1 s + \gamma_0 \quad (28)$$

has all its roots in the open left-hand complex plane.

The following result considers the closed-loop (16), (20), and (21) system under  $u_d$ . This result demonstrates that the trajectory of closed-loop system under  $u_d$  converges exponentially to the trajectory of (16) under the ideal control  $\hat{u}_d$ , which minimizes  $\hat{J}$ .

**Proposition 2.** Consider (16), (20), and (21), where  $u = u_d$ . For all  $t \geq 0$ , define  $e(t) \triangleq \hat{u}(t) - \hat{u}_d(x(t))$ . Then, the following statements hold:

(a) The signal  $e$  satisfies  $e^{(d_c)} + \gamma_{d_c-1} e^{(d_c-1)} + \dots + \gamma_1 \dot{e} + \gamma_0 e = 0$ , and for all  $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) = 0$  exponentially.

(b) Assume that  $\hat{Q}(\hat{x})$  is bounded. Then, for all  $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \hat{J}(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}(t)) - \hat{J}(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}_d(x(t))) \right] = 0.$$

(c) Let  $\hat{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{n}}$ . Assume that  $x_{c0} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$  is such that for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d_c - 1\}$ ,  $L_{f_c}^i h_c(x_{c0}) = L_{f_c}^i \hat{u}_d(x_0)$ , where  $x_0 \triangleq [\hat{x}_0^T \quad x_{c0}^T]^T$ . Then, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $e(t) = 0$ .

Proposition 2 implies that  $u = u_d$  yields an output  $\hat{u}$  from the control dynamics (20) and (21) that converges exponentially to the minimizer  $\hat{u}_d$  of  $\hat{J}$ . Thus, we consider a cost  $J$  that is minimized by  $u_d$ . Specifically, consider  $J$  given by (4), where

$$Q(x) = I_n, \quad c(x) = -u_d(x). \quad (29)$$

Finally, we consider the input signal  $u$  to the controller dynamics (20) and (21) given by (10), where  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a nondecreasing function with  $\alpha(0) = 0$ .

The following corollary is the main result on the control (4), (5), (7), (10), (20), (21), (23), (24), (26), (27), and (29) that uses the composite soft-minimum CBF.

**Corollary 1.** Consider (16), where (A3) and (A4) are satisfied. Furthermore, consider the control  $\hat{u}$  is given by (20) and (21), where (C1)–(C5) are satisfied, and  $u$  is given by (4), (5), (7), (10), (23), (24), (26), (27), and (29). Assume that for all  $x \in \text{bd } \mathcal{S}$ ,  $L_g h(x) \neq 0$ . Let  $x_0 \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{C}$ . Then, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $x(t) \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{C}$ ,  $\hat{x}(t) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_s$ , and  $\hat{u}(t) \in \mathcal{U}$ .

Next, we present an example that demonstrates the composite soft-minimum CBF approach for safety with input constraints.

**Example 3.** We revisit the nonholonomic ground robot from Example 1 and include not only safety constraints but also input constraints. The nonholonomic ground robot modeled by (16), where

$$\hat{f}(\hat{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} v \cos \theta \\ v \sin \theta \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{g}(\hat{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{x} = \begin{bmatrix} q_x \\ q_y \\ v \\ \theta \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{u} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{u}_1 \\ \hat{u}_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $q_x, q_y, v, \theta$  are the same as in Example 1.

Consider the map shown in Figure 4, which is the same map considered in Example 1. For  $j \in \{1, \dots, 9\}$ , consider  $\hat{h}_j(\hat{x})$  given by the expression for  $h_j(x)$  in Example 1. The safe set  $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_s$  is given by (18), and its projection onto the  $q_x$ – $q_y$  plane is shown in Figure 4. The bounds on input  $\hat{u}$  are modeled as the 0-superlevel sets of

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1(\hat{u}) &= 4 - \hat{u}_1, & \phi_2(\hat{u}) &= \hat{u}_1 + 4, \\ \phi_3(\hat{u}) &= 1 - \hat{u}_2, & \phi_4(\hat{u}) &= \hat{u}_2 + 1, \end{aligned}$$

and  $\mathcal{U}$  is given by (17).

Let  $q_d = [q_{d,x} \quad q_{d,y}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be the goal location, that is, the desired location for  $[q_x \quad q_y]^T$ . Next, we consider a desired control  $\hat{u}_d(\hat{x})$  that is the same as  $u_d(x)$  considered in Example 1. Specifically,  $\hat{u}_d$ ,  $\hat{u}_{d_1}$ , and  $\hat{u}_{d_2}$  are given by (11)–(13), where  $u_d$ ,  $u_{d_1}$  and  $u_{d_2}$  are replaced by  $\hat{u}_d$ ,  $\hat{u}_{d_1}$  and  $\hat{u}_{d_2}$ . Thus, we consider the cost function (19), where  $Q(x) = I_2$  and  $\hat{c}(x) = -\hat{u}_d(x)$ .

We consider the controller dynamics (20)–(22), where  $A_c = -I_2$ ,  $B_c = I_2$ ,  $C_c = I_2$ ,  $u = [u_1 \quad u_2]^T$ .

Let  $f$  and  $g$  be given by (23). We note that (A1) and (A2) are satisfied by  $d_1 = d_2 = \dots = d_7 = 3$ ,  $d_8 = d_9 = 2$ ,  $d_{10} = d_{11} = d_{12} = d_{13} = 1$ ,  $d_c = 1$ ,  $\zeta = 1$ .

We implement the control (4), (5), (7), (10), (20), (21), (23), (24), (26), (27), and (29) with  $\rho = 10$ ,  $\gamma = 100$ ,  $\alpha_{1,0}(h) = \dots = \alpha_{6,0}(h) = 1$ ,  $\alpha_{1,1}(h) = \dots = \alpha_{6,1}(h) = 2.5h$ ,  $\alpha_{7,0}(h) = 6$ ,  $\alpha_{7,1}(h) = 1$ ,  $\alpha_{8,0}(h) = \alpha_{9,0}(h) = 10h$ ,  $\alpha = 0$ , and  $\gamma_1 = 1$ . The control is updated at 1 kHz.

Figure 4 shows the closed-loop trajectories for  $x_0 = [-1 \quad -8.5 \quad 0 \quad \frac{\pi}{2} \quad 0 \quad 0]^T$  with 4 different goal locations  $q_d = [3 \quad 4.5]^T$ ,  $q_d = [-7 \quad 0]^T$ ,  $q_d = [7 \quad 1.5]^T$ , and  $q_d = [-1 \quad 7]^T$ . In all cases, the robot position converges to the goal location while satisfying safety and input constraints.

Figures 5 and 6 show the trajectories of the relevant signals

for the case where  $q_d = [3 \ 4.5]^T$ . Figure 6 shows that  $h$ ,  $\min b_{j,i}$ , and  $\min h_j$  are positive for all time, which implies that  $\hat{x}$  remains in  $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_s$  and  $\hat{u}$  remains in  $\mathcal{U}$ .  $\triangle$




Fig. 4.  $\mathcal{S}_s$  and closed-loop trajectories for 4 goal locations.




Fig. 5.  $q_x, q_y, v, \theta, \hat{u}, \hat{u}_d, e, u$  and  $u_d$  for  $q_d = [3 \ 4.5]^T$ .




Fig. 6.  $h, \min b_{j,i},$  and  $\min h_j$  for  $q_d = [3 \ 4.5]^T$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. D. Ames, X. Xu, J. W. Grizzle, P. Tabuada, Control barrier function based quadratic programs for safety critical systems, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.* (2016) 3861–3876.
- [2] S. V. Rakovic, P. Grieder, M. Kvasnica, D. Q. Mayne, M. Morari, Computation of invariant sets for piecewise affine discrete time systems subject to bounded disturbances, in: *Proc. Conf. Dec. Contr. (CDC)*, 2004, pp. 1418–1423.
- [3] Y. Chen, H. Peng, J. Grizzle, N. Ozay, Data-driven computation of minimal robust control invariant set, in: *Proc. Conf. Dec. Contr. (CDC)*, 2018, pp. 4052–4058.
- [4] I. M. Mitchell, A. M. Bayen, C. J. Tomlin, A time-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi formulation of reachable sets for continuous dynamic games, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.* (2005) 947–957.
- [5] Q. Nguyen, K. Sreenath, Safety-critical control for dynamical bipedal walking with precise footstep placement, *IFAC-PapersOnLine* (2015) 147–154.
- [6] J. H. Gillula, S. Kaynama, C. J. Tomlin, Sampling-based approximation of the viability kernel for high-dimensional linear sampled-data systems, in: *Proc. Int. Conf. Hybrid Sys.: Comp. and Contr.*, 2014, pp. 173–182.
- [7] X. Jin, Adaptive fixed-time control for MIMO nonlinear systems with asymmetric output constraints using universal barrier functions, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.* (2018) 3046–3053.
- [8] R. Wisniewski, C. Sloth, Converse barrier certificate theorems, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.* (2015) 1356–1361.
- [9] L. Wang, D. Han, M. Egerstedt, Permissive barrier certificates for safe stabilization using sum-of-squares, in: *2018 Amer. Contr. Conf. (ACC)*, 2018, pp. 585–590.
- [10] A. Clark, Verification and synthesis of control barrier functions, in: *Proc. Conf. Dec. Contr. (CDC)*, 2021, pp. 6105–6112.
- [11] A. Isaly, M. Ghanbarpour, R. G. Sanfelice, W. E. Dixon, On the feasibility and continuity of feedback controllers defined by multiple control barrier functions for constrained differential inclusions, in: *2022 Amer. Contr. Conf. (ACC)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 5160–5165.
- [12] E. Pond, M. Hale, Fast verification of control barrier functions via linear programming, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.00598* (2022).
- [13] T. Gurriet, M. Mote, A. Singletary, P. Nilsson, E. Feron, A. D. Ames, A scalable safety critical control framework for nonlinear systems, *IEEE Access* (2020) 187249–187275.
- [14] P. Rabiee, J. B. Hoagg, Soft-minimum barrier functions for safety-critical control subject to actuation constraints, in: *Proc. Amer. Contr. Conf. (ACC)*, 2023, pp. 2646–2651.
- [15] P. Rabiee, J. B. Hoagg, Soft-minimum and soft-maximum barrier functions for safety with actuation constraints, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10620* (2023).
- [16] M. Black, D. Panagou, Consolidated control barrier functions: Synthesis and online verification via adaptation under input constraints, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01815* (2023).
- [17] W. Xiao, C. G. Cassandras, C. A. Belta, D. Rus, Control barrier functions for systems with multiple control inputs, in: *2022 Amer. Contr. Conf. (ACC)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 2221–2226.
- [18] A. D. Ames, G. Notomista, Y. Wardi, M. Egerstedt, Integral control barrier functions for dynamically defined control laws, *IEEE Contr. Sys. Let.* 5 (3) (2020) 887–892.
- [19] A. De Luca, G. Oriolo, M. Vendittelli, Control of wheeled mobile robots: An experimental overview, *RAMSETE* (2002) 181–226.