

Initialization-Free Lie-Bracket Extremum Seeking in \mathbb{R}^n *

Mahmoud Abdelgalil^a, Jorge Poveda^a

^aDepartment of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, 92093, California, USA

Abstract

Stability results for extremum seeking control in \mathbb{R}^n have predominantly been restricted to local or, at best, semi-global practical stability. Extending semi-global stability results of extremum-seeking systems to unbounded sets of initial conditions often demands a stringent global Lipschitz condition on the cost function, which is rarely satisfied by practical applications. In this paper, we address this challenge by leveraging tools from higher-order averaging theory. In particular, we establish a novel second-order averaging result with *global* (practical) stability implications. By leveraging this result, we characterize sufficient conditions on cost functions under which uniform global practical asymptotic stability can be established for a class of extremum-seeking systems acting on static maps. Our sufficient conditions include the case when the gradient of the cost function, rather than the cost function itself, satisfies a global Lipschitz condition, which covers quadratic cost functions. Our results are also applicable to vector fields that are not necessarily Lipschitz continuous at the origin, opening the door to non-smooth Lie-bracket ES dynamics. We illustrate all our results via different analytical and/or numerical examples.

Keywords: Extremum Seeking, Second-Order Averaging, Adaptive Systems, Zeroth-Order Optimization

1. Introduction

Extremum seeking (ES) systems are some of the most popular real-time derivative-free optimization algorithms developed during the last century [1]. The stability and robustness guarantees, simplicity of implementation, and model-agnostic nature of ES make it an attractive option for a large number of practical model-free control problems [2, 3, 4]. The classical tool for analyzing the stability of ES systems is a (first-order) combination of singular perturbation and averaging theory that enables local practical stability results [5]. These ideas have also been used to study ES systems that approximate Newton's method rather than gradient descent [6, 7]. In addition, it has been shown that standard ES systems also have non-local stability properties [8, 9, 10], and different schemes have been developed to tackle control and optimization problems in more general systems, such as systems with delays [11], partial differential equations [12], as well as hybrid dynamical systems [13, 14, 15].

On the other hand, recent years have seen the emergence of an alternative approach for designing and analyzing the stability of ES systems based on higher-order averaging [16, 17]. Employing higher-order averaging techniques can offer some flexibility in the design and analysis of the exploration-exploitation mechanism of the system, which led to the discovery of ES algorithms with desirable properties such as bounded update rates [18], vanishing amplitudes [19, 20], and even local exponential/asymptotic stability [21]. Higher-order averaging is also better suited for geometric settings when ES is performed on

manifolds [22, 23, 15, 24], or when additional structure is imposed on the exploration dynamics, e.g. when the exploration is done through a Levi-Civita connection associated with a mechanical system [25, 26, 27, 28].

Irrespective of the nature of the averaging tool used for the analysis and design of the algorithm, when the extremum seeking problem is defined on smooth compact boundaryless manifolds, achieving uniform global stability results (either practical or asymptotic) is in general not possible due to topological obstructions that apply to continuous-time systems evolving on such sets [29], a limitation that also applies to time-varying periodic systems, see [30, Sec. 4.1]. However, when the ES problem is defined in \mathbb{R}^n , such obstructions do not emerge, and, in principle, it might be possible to achieve global extremum seeking. Nevertheless, the majority of results on ES in \mathbb{R}^n have achieved, at best, semi-global practical asymptotic stability [6, 8, 16, 17, 18]. Such results enable convergence from arbitrarily large pre-defined compact sets of initial conditions by appropriately tuning the parameters of the controller. However, without further re-tuning of these parameters, solutions initialized (or pushed via perturbations) outside of these pre-defined compact sets might exhibit finite escape times. Recently, global practical convergence properties were studied in [31] using a normalized scheme, and also in [32] using tools from quasi-stochastic approximation theory. Nevertheless, results that assert *uniform global practical asymptotic stability* (characterized by, e.g., \mathcal{KL} bounds) in ES controllers are still absent in the literature. Indeed, one of the main limitations that makes achieving such a result difficult using standard averaging theory stems from the global Lipschitz conditions that are usually required in the vector fields of the dynamics, see [33, Ch.10], [15, Sec. 6.1], a condition that is violated even in the simplest ES problems corresponding to cost functions charac-

*This work was supported in part by the grants NSF ECCS CAREER 2305756 and AFOSR YIP: FA9550-22-1-0211.

Email addresses: mabdelgalil@ucsd.edu (Mahmoud Abdelgalil), jipoveda@ucsd.edu (Jorge Poveda)

terized by quadratic maps.

Based on the above background, the main contribution of this paper is to establish that certain ES systems can achieve uniform global (practical) stability results once one moves from *first-order* averaging-based feedback designs, such as those considered in [31, 8, 5, 13], to *second-order* averaging-based feedback designs, similar in spirit to those studied in [22, 23, 15, 24, 25, 26], but using a different averaging tool for the purpose of analysis. In particular, the main contribution of this paper is twofold: First, we introduce a novel *second-order* averaging theorem with *global* practical stability implications for a general class of highly-oscillatory systems under appropriate assumptions on the maps involved. For standard (i.e., first-order) averaging, global stability results have been studied in [34] for ODEs, and in [15] for hybrid systems. However, to the best of our knowledge, a result of this nature was absent in the literature of second-order averaging. Furthermore, in contrast to existing results on second-order averaging [16], the novel averaging tool enables the relaxation of the local Lipschitz condition on the vector field at the origin to mere continuity. This relaxation opens the door to novel non-smooth dynamics that could potentially lead to improved transient performance away from the origin. Second, we use the aforementioned averaging results to establish uniform global practical asymptotic stability properties for a class of ES systems for which a variety of “typical” cost functions apply, including quadratic maps, and, more generally, strongly convex functions with smooth gradients. However, we also show that convexity of the cost function is, in general, not a necessary condition to achieve global ES under the algorithms studied in this paper. Different analytical and numerical examples are presented to illustrate our results.

The rest of the manuscript is organized as follows. We begin by introducing our notation in Section 2. Our averaging results are then presented in Section 3. In Section 4, we apply the results of Section 3 to study a class of extremum seeking systems that attain global (practical) stability properties. The proofs of the results are presented in Section 5. Finally, the conclusions and future work are discussed in Section 6.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Notation

We use $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ to denote the set of non-negative real numbers and $\mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ to denote the set of positive real numbers. Similarly, we use $\mathbb{Q}_{> 0}$ to denote the set of positive rational numbers and $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ to denote the set of positive integers. The 2-norm of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $|x| := \sqrt{x^\top x}$, and the operator 2-norm of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is also denoted as $|A| := \sup\{|Ax| : x \in \mathbb{R}^n, |x| = 1\}$. If $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are vectors, we use $(x, y) = [x^\top, y^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ to denote the vector consisting of their concatenation. Given functions $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$, we use $g \circ f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ to denote their composition, i.e. $g \circ f(x) = g(f(x))$. We use C^0 to denote the class of continuous functions, and C^k to denote the class of functions that are k -times continuously differentiable, for $k \geq 1$. Given a closed set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the function f is said to

be C^k on K if there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $K \subset \mathcal{U}$ and f is C^k on \mathcal{U} . For each $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, we denote the closed ball of radius δ , centered at the origin, by $\delta\mathbb{B}$, i.e. $\delta\mathbb{B} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \leq \delta\}$. Given a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we use $\text{cl}(\mathcal{A})$ to denote the closure of \mathcal{A} with respect to the natural topology in \mathbb{R}^n . When $f \in C^1$ is a vector-valued map, Df denotes the Jacobian of f . If $f \in C^2$ is a real-valued function, then ∇f denotes the gradient of f , and $\nabla^2 f$ is the Hessian of f , i.e. $\nabla^2 f = D(\nabla f)$. If $f \in C^1$ and $f = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is vector-valued, then $D_{x_i} f$ denotes the Jacobian of f with respect to the i^{th} argument. The map $\pi_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is the canonical projection onto the x_i -factor, which is defined by $\pi_i(x_1, \dots, x_k) = x_i$. A class \mathcal{K} -function is a strictly increasing continuous function $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\alpha(0) = 0$. A class \mathcal{K}_∞ -function is a class \mathcal{K} -function with the additional requirement that $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha(\rho) = +\infty$. A class \mathcal{KL} -function $\beta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a continuous function such that, for every $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the function $\beta(\cdot, s)$ is a class \mathcal{K}_∞ -function, and, for every $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the function $\beta(r, \cdot)$ is a strictly decreasing function and $\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \beta(r, s) = 0$. To simplify notation, given two (or more) vectors $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$, we use $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2}$ to denote the concatenation of x_1 and x_2 .

2.2. Dynamical Systems and Stability Notions

In this paper, we study continuous-time dynamical systems with states $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and dynamics

$$\dot{x} = f_\varepsilon(x, \tau), \quad \dot{\tau} = \varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (1)$$

where $f_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a continuous function parameterized by a small constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Systems of the form (1) can model highly oscillatory systems that showcase fast variations of τ compared to the state x . For completeness, the notion of solutions to systems of the form (1) is reviewed below.

Definition 1. For $(x_0, \tau_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a function $(x, \tau) : \text{dom}(x, \tau) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is said to be a solution to (1) from the initial condition (x_0, τ_0) if: i) there exist $t_s \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $\text{dom}(x, \tau) = [0, t_s)$, ii) $(x(0), \tau(0)) = (x_0, \tau_0)$, and iii) the function (x, τ) is continuously differentiable on $\text{dom}(x, \tau)$ and satisfies

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = f_\varepsilon(x(t), \tau(t)), \quad \frac{d\tau(t)}{dt} = \varepsilon^{-2}.$$

for all $t \in \text{dom}(x, \tau)$. A solution (x, τ) to system (1) is said to be complete if $t_s = \infty$. \square

Under the action of a C^1 diffeomorphism $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, a solution (x, τ) of the ODE (1) is transformed into a new function $\Psi \circ (x, \tau) : \text{dom}(x, \tau) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. The following definition (see, e.g., [35, p. 183]) characterizes an ODE for which $\Psi \circ (x, \tau)$ is a solution.

Definition 2. Let $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a C^1 diffeomorphism such that $\pi_2 \circ \Psi(x, \tau) = \tau$. The *pushforward* of the ODE (1) under the action of Ψ is the ODE

$$\dot{x} = \Psi_* f_\varepsilon(x, \tau), \quad \dot{\tau} = \varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (2a)$$

where the map $\Psi_* f_\varepsilon$ is given by

$$\Psi_* f_\varepsilon = \left(D_x(\pi_1 \circ \Psi) \circ \Psi^{-1} \right) f_\varepsilon \circ \Psi^{-1} + D_\tau(\pi_1 \circ \Psi) \circ \Psi^{-1} \varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (2b)$$

defined for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. \square

To study the (uniform) stability properties of the parameter-dependent system (1), we will use the following standard notions (see, e.g., [36]). Note that we do not insist on uniqueness of solutions, but rather impose the appropriate bound (and the property of completeness) to every solution of the system.

Definition 3. The origin $x^* = 0$ is said to be *uniformly globally practically asymptotically stable (UGpAS)* for system (1) if there exists a class \mathcal{KL} -function β such that, for every $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists $\varepsilon^* > 0$, such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$, each solution (x, τ) to system (1) from the initial condition $(x_0, \tau_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies

$$|x(t)| \leq \beta(|x_0|, t) + \nu, \quad (3)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. When $\nu = 0$, the origin $x^* = 0$ is said to be *uniformly globally asymptotically stable (UGAS)* for (1). \square

When the residual upper-bound ν in (3) cannot be controlled by the parameter ε , we will study the following property.

Definition 4. The origin $x^* = 0$ is said to be Δ -*uniformly globally ultimately bounded (Δ -UGUB)* for system (1) if there exists $\Delta > 0$, $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$, and $\varepsilon^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$, each solution (x, τ) to system (1) from the initial condition $(x_0, \tau_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies

$$|x(t)| \leq \beta(|x_0|, t) + \Delta, \quad (4)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. \square

3. On Global Stability via Second-Order Averaging

We consider a sub-class of systems of the form (1), given by

$$\dot{x} = f_\varepsilon(x, \tau) = \varepsilon^{-1} f_1(x, \tau) + f_2(x, \tau), \quad \dot{\tau} = \varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (5)$$

where $f_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $k \in \{1, 2\}$, are continuous functions, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Such types of systems commonly emerge in extremum-seeking [20, 16] and vibrational control [37], and they are typically studied via averaging theory. A representative example is given by control-affine systems of the form

$$\dot{x} = \varepsilon^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^2 b_{i,j} u_{i,j}(J(x), \tau) \right) + b_0(x), \quad \dot{\tau} = \varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (6)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $r \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq \frac{n}{2}}$, J is an application-dependent C^2 cost function to be minimized, $b_{i,j}$ are suitable vectors, $u_{i,j}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a scalar-valued feedback law to be designed, and $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small tunable parameter, see Figure 1 for a block representation of these systems. Particular examples of functions $b_0, b_{i,j}, u_{i,j}$ and J will be discussed later in Section 4.




Figure 1: Block diagram description of system (6). In the diagram, the matrix $B_i = [b_{i,1}, b_{i,2}]$ multiplies the vector $u_i(J(x), \tau) = (u_{i,1}(J(x), \tau), u_{i,2}(J(x), \tau))$.

3.1. A Global Practical Near-Identity Transformation

Traditionally, the averaging-based analysis of oscillatory systems relies on the construction of a suitable (first-order) “near-identity” transformation that maps the original dynamics into a perturbed version of the so-called average dynamics, see [33, Ch.10]. Therefore, to study the global stability properties of (5), we first construct a similar “second-order” near-identity transformation, of global nature, and we show how to use this transformation to transform (5) into a perturbed version of its average dynamics.

We consider the following regularity conditions on f_k :

Assumption 1. There exists $\delta_1 \in [0, \infty)$ such that, for all $k \in \{1, 2\}$, the following conditions hold

- (a) The map f_k is C^0 in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and there exist positive constants L_k such that

$$|f_k(x_1, \tau) - f_k(x_2, \tau)| \leq L_k |x_1 - x_2|,$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \geq \delta_1\}$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

- (b) There exists $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that

$$f_k(x, \tau + T) = f_k(x, \tau), \quad \int_0^T f_1(x, \tau) d\tau = 0,$$

for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

- (c) The map f_k is C^{3-k} with respect to x in the domain $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \geq \delta_1\}$.

- (d) There exists $L_3 > 0$ such that

$$|D_x f_1(x_1, \tau_1) f_1(x_1, \tau_2) - D_x f_1(x_2, \tau_1) f_1(x_2, \tau_2)| \leq L_3 |x_1 - x_2|,$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \geq \delta_1\}$ and all $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. \square

In Assumption 1, the case $\delta_1 = 0$ is included. However, we allow for positive values of δ_1 to account for the situation in which the regularity of the maps f_k drops from being C^{3-k} to merely C^0 , as required by item (a) in Assumption 1, near the origin. Relaxing the smoothness requirement allows us to include in our analysis certain non-smooth ES dynamics that




Figure 2: Visual depiction of φ and the sets \mathcal{M}_j for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

have been show to exhibit suitable local exponential/asymptotic stability [19, 38].

Next, we introduce the auxiliary functions $\chi_j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, given by

$$\chi_1(r) := \begin{cases} \exp(-r^{-1}) & r > 0 \\ 0 & r \leq 0 \end{cases}, \quad \chi_2(r) := \frac{\chi_1(r)}{\chi_1(r) + \chi_1(1-r)}.$$

Also, for each $\epsilon > 0$ we consider a vector of constants given by $\delta := (\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)$, which satisfy

$$\delta_1 \geq 0, \quad \delta_2 \geq (1 + \epsilon)\delta_1, \quad \delta_3 > (1 + \epsilon)\delta_2. \quad (7)$$

Using the function χ_2 and the vector δ , we define the smooth “reverse” bump function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as:

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} \chi_2\left(\frac{|x| - \delta_1}{\delta_2 - \delta_1}\right) & \delta_2 > \delta_1 \\ 1 & \delta_2 = \delta_1 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (8a)$$

The function φ will be used only for the purpose of analysis, and any similarly defined smooth “reverse” bump function suffices for our purposes. The following Lemma states some useful properties of φ .

Lemma 1. *Let $\delta_2 > \delta_1$. Then, the function φ is C^∞ on \mathbb{R}^n , all of its derivatives have the compact support $[\delta_1, \delta_2]$, and it satisfies:*

- (a) $\varphi(x) = 1$ for all $x \in \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \geq \delta_2\}$.
- (b) $\varphi(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \leq \delta_1\}$.

Proof: Follows by [35, Lemmas 2.20-2.22] and the construction of the argument of χ_2 . \square

To state our first result, and using φ , we introduce the auxiliary maps $\hat{f}_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, defined as

$$\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) := \varphi(x)f_k(x, \tau), \quad (8b)$$

as well as the transformation Ψ , defined as

$$\pi_1 \circ \Psi(x, \tau) = \Phi(x, \tau), \quad \pi_2 \circ \Psi(x, \tau) = \tau, \quad (9a)$$

for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where the map Φ is defined as follows:

$$\Phi(x, \tau) := x - \varepsilon v_1(x, \tau) - \varepsilon^2 v_2(x, \tau), \quad (9b)$$

for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, with

$$v_1(x, \tau) := \int_0^\tau \hat{f}_1(x, s) ds, \quad (9c)$$

$$v_2(x, \tau) := w(x, \tau) - D_x v_1(x, \tau)v_1(x, \tau), \quad (9d)$$

$$w(x, \tau) := \int_0^\tau (\hat{f}_2(x, s) + D_x \hat{f}_1(x, s)v_1(x, s) - \bar{f}(x)) ds, \quad (9e)$$

and where the *second-order average mapping* \bar{f} is given by

$$\bar{f}(x) := \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T (2\hat{f}_2(x, \tau) + [v_1, \hat{f}_1](x, \tau)) d\tau, \quad (9f)$$

for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, with $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ being the same constant from Assumption 1, and $[v_1, \hat{f}_1]$ denoting the Lie bracket between the vector v_1 and \hat{f}_1 , i.e.,

$$[v_1, \hat{f}_1](x, \tau) = D_x \hat{f}_1(x, \tau)v_1(x, \tau) - D_x v_1(x, \tau)\hat{f}_1(x, \tau).$$

Remark 1. The map Ψ defined via (9) is an example of a (second-order) *near-identity* transformation [39], which is a standard tool in the averaging literature. The nomenclature stems from the fact that when $\varepsilon = 0$, the transformation (9) reduces to the identity map on its domain and, by choosing $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ sufficiently small, the transformation (9) can be made arbitrarily close to the identity map on bounded subsets of its domain [39, Lemma 2.8.3]. Note that Ψ depends (smoothly) on ε , but we suppress this dependency in the notation for brevity. \square

Finally, for each $\epsilon > 0$ and δ of the form (7), we also consider the closed sets

$$\mathcal{M}_j := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| \geq \delta_j\}, \quad j \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \quad (10)$$

which satisfy $\mathcal{M}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{M}_2 \supseteq \mathcal{M}_3$. In fact, by construction, the case $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_2 = \mathbb{R}^n$ can only occur if $\delta_1 = 0$. We illustrate the function φ and the sets \mathcal{M}_j , for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, in Figure 2, and the local effect of the map Ψ , which will act as a coordinate transformation, in Figure 3.

The following proposition, key for our results, characterizes some useful properties of the function Ψ and the pushforward under Ψ of the vector field (5), c.f., Def. 2.

Proposition 1. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds, and let $\epsilon > 0$ and δ satisfy (7). Then, there exists $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $L_\Psi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $L_g \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and a C^0 map $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ the following holds:*

- (a) *The map $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism.*
- (b) *The map Ψ and its inverse Ψ^{-1} satisfy:*

$$|\pi_1 \circ \Psi(0, \tau)| \leq L_\Psi \varepsilon,$$

$$|\pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau)| \leq L_\Psi \varepsilon,$$

$$|\Psi(x_1, \tau) - \Psi(x_2, \tau)| \leq (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon)|x_1 - x_2|,$$

$$|\Psi^{-1}(x_1, \tau) - \Psi^{-1}(x_2, \tau)| \leq (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon)|x_1 - x_2|,$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

- (c) *For all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have $\Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.*




Figure 3: Visual depiction of the local effect of Ψ on the integral curves of f_ε .

(d) The map $\Psi_* f_\varepsilon$ satisfies

$$\Psi_* f_\varepsilon(x, \tau) = \bar{f}(x) + \varepsilon g(x, \tau, \varepsilon), \quad (11)$$

for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

(e) The map g satisfies

$$|g(x, \tau, \varepsilon)| \leq L_g(|x| + 1), \quad (12)$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$. \square

Proof: See Section 5.1.

Remark 2. Apart from the suitable smoothness and boundedness properties of Ψ , Proposition 1 asserts that system (2a) can be seen as a perturbation of the nominal second-order average system

$$\dot{\bar{x}} = \bar{f}(\bar{x}), \quad \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (13)$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (0, \varepsilon_0]$, where \bar{f} is given by (9f). By using this relationship, as well as the properties of Ψ , we can inform the stability analysis of system (5) based on the stability properties of the nominal averaged system (13). \square

3.2. Global Stability via Second-Order Averaging

To study the stability properties of (5) via averaging, we make the following assumption on the average map \bar{f} .

Assumption 2. There exists $\varepsilon > 0$, a vector δ satisfying (7) with the same δ_1 generated by Assumption 1, a C^1 -function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, $c_i > 0$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and a positive definite function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, such that the following holds:

(a) For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have that

$$\alpha_1(|x|) \leq V(x) \leq \alpha_2(|x|), \quad (14a)$$

$$|\nabla V(x)| \leq c_2 \phi(x). \quad (14b)$$

(b) For all $x \in \mathcal{M}_3$, we have that

$$\langle \nabla V(x), \bar{f}(x) \rangle \leq -c_1 \phi(x)^2. \quad (14c)$$

(c) At least one of the following statements holds:

(i) There exists $\bar{L}_g > 0$, such that

$$|g(x, \tau, \varepsilon)| \leq \bar{L}_g(\phi(x) + 1),$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$, where g is the map generated by Proposition 1.

(ii) There exists $\alpha_3 \in \mathcal{K}$, such that $\alpha_3(|x|)|x| \leq \phi(x)$. \square

The quadratic-type Lyapunov conditions in items (a) and (b) of Assumption 2 are identical to those studied in the literature of perturbed ODEs [33, Section 9.1]. They imply that the origin is UGUB for the nominal average system (13) [33, Thm. 4.18]. However, without further restrictions on the rate of growth of the norm of the map g in (11) relative to the map ϕ , the perturbation εg may dominate the average map \bar{f} far from the origin for any non-zero ε , thereby destroying global stability properties. To preclude this possibility, we impose the additional assumption in item (c) of Assumption 2.

Remark 3. Item (c)-(i) in Assumption 2 is automatically satisfied whenever the map g is uniformly bounded. As we show in the proof of Theorem 3, ES systems with bounded vector fields (see, e.g. [37]) satisfy this condition under appropriate assumptions on the cost function. However, item (i) leaves room for unbounded growth of the map g , provided that it can be dominated by the positive definite function ϕ , for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$. For example, item (c)-(i) in Assumption 2 automatically holds for the case $\phi(x) = |x|$ thanks to item (e) in Proposition 1.

Remark 4. Item (c)-(ii) in Assumption 2 is automatically satisfied for the case $\phi(x) = |x|$. However, since α_3 is an arbitrary \mathcal{K} function, item (c)-(ii) is a substantial relaxation of the local behavior of the function ϕ on any compact neighborhood of the origin.

By leveraging the previous constructions and Proposition 1, we can now state the first main result of the paper. All the proofs are presented in Section 5.

Theorem 1. Suppose that Assumptions 1-(c) hold. Then, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and δ satisfying (7), there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that the origing $x^* = 0$ is Δ -UGUB for system (2).

We now provide several useful corollaries of Theorem 1. The first corollary concerns the stability properties of the original system (5).

Corollary 1. Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold. Then, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and δ satisfying (7), there exists $\tilde{\Delta} > 0$ such that $x^* = 0$ is $\tilde{\Delta}$ -UGUB for system (5).

Corollary 2. Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied for each $\delta_1 > 0$, and that there exists V and ϕ satisfying the conditions of Assumption 2 for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and δ satisfying (7). Then, $x^* = 0$ is UGpAS for system (5).

Corollary 3. Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied for $\delta_1 = 0$, and that there exists a function V and a function ϕ such that the conditions of Assumption 2 hold for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and δ satisfying (7). Then, $x^* = 0$ is UGpAS for system (5).

Remark 5. Corollary 2 considers the situation in which Assumption 1 is satisfied for each $\delta_1 > 0$ but might be violated for $\delta_1 = 0$. Such a situation arises when the vector fields defining




Figure 4: Numerical results for Example 1. The initial conditions are: $x(0) = (10^6, -10^6)$, $v(0) = (10^3, -10^3)$. The parameters are: $\varepsilon = 1/\sqrt{8\pi}$, $\gamma_1 = \frac{3}{4}$, $\gamma_2 = 1$.

system (5) satisfy Assumption 1 on any *closed* subset of the set $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, but strictly violate Assumption 1 on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We illustrate this situation in Example 1 below. \square

Remark 6. Corollary 3 considers the situation in which Assumption 1 is satisfied for $\delta_1 = 0$, i.e. for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, which differs significantly from the case considered in Corollary 2. \square

We conclude this section with a few illustrative examples. The first example serves the purpose of illustrating Corollary 2.

Example 1. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and consider the dynamical system

$$\dot{x} = -|x|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{sign}(x) \sin(\tau)^2, \quad \dot{\tau} = \varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (15)$$

which fits the structure of the class of systems (5) with $f_1 = 0$ and $f_2(x, \tau) = -|x|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{sign}(x) \sin(\tau)^2$. For any fixed $\delta_1 > 0$, there exists a constant $L_{\delta_1} > 0$ such that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (-\delta_1, \delta_1)$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the function f_2 satisfies $|f_2(x_1, \tau) - f_2(x_2, \tau)| \leq L_{\delta_1} |x_1 - x_2|$. However, the constant $L_{\delta_1} > 0$ tends to $+\infty$ in the limit $\delta_1 \rightarrow 0$. In other words, there is no constant $L_0 > 0$ such that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have $|f_2(x_1, \tau) - f_2(x_2, \tau)| \leq L_0 |x_1 - x_2|$. Nevertheless, system (15) satisfies Assumption 1 for any $\delta_1 > 0$. Using formula (9f), we obtain that, for any choice of $\delta_1 > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and δ satisfying (7), the corresponding nominal averaged system is given by

$$\dot{\bar{x}} = -\frac{1}{2} \varphi(\bar{x}) |\bar{x}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{sign}(\bar{x}), \quad (16)$$

where φ is the function defined in (8a). Consider the function $V(x) = |x|^{\frac{3}{2}}$, which is C^1 , and the function $\phi(x) = |x|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, which is positive definite. Observe that the functions V and ϕ satisfy item (a) in Assumption 2 with $c_1 = \frac{3}{2}$. Direct computation gives

$$\nabla V(x) = \frac{3}{2} |x|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{sign}(x), \quad \langle \nabla V(x), \bar{f}(x) \rangle = -\frac{3}{4} \varphi(x) \phi(x)^2. \quad (17)$$

Moreover, observe that, by construction, for any choice of $\delta_1 > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and δ satisfying (7), we have that $\varphi(x) = 1$, for all $|x| \geq \delta_2$. Consequently, it follows that the functions V and ϕ satisfy item (b) in Assumption 2 with $c_2 = \frac{3}{4}$, for any choice of $\delta_1 > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and δ satisfying (7). Finally, notice that $f_1(x, \tau) = 0$, and $|f_2(x, \tau)| \leq \phi(x)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. As a consequence, it can be shown that the function g generated by Proposition 1 is such that the function ϕ satisfies (c)-(i), for

any choice of $\delta_1 > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and δ satisfying (7). Therefore, we have argued that system (15) satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 2. By invoking Corollary 2, we conclude that the point $x^* = 0$ is UGpAS for system (15).

The second example, adapted from [40], shows that *global* stabilization is possible via vibrational feedback control in certain systems with unknown control directions.

Example 2. Let $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ such that $\text{rank}(B) = 2$, and consider the dynamical system

$$\dot{x} = v, \quad \dot{v} = B\hat{u}, \quad (18)$$

where $\hat{u} = (\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the control input. The goal is to stabilize the equilibrium position $x = v = 0$ for system (18) under the assumption that B is unknown. To tackle this problem, we consider a model-free controller inspired by the ES systems studied in [38]. Namely, we let $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and consider the feedback law:

$$\hat{u}_1 = \varepsilon^{-1} u_1(x, v, \tau), \quad \hat{u}_2 = \varepsilon^{-1} u_2(x, v, \tau), \quad \dot{\tau} = \varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (19a)$$

where the functions u_i are given by

$$u_1(x, v, \tau) = \sqrt{2V(x, v)} \cos(\ln(V(x, v)) + \tau), \quad (19b)$$

$$u_2(x, v, \tau) = \sqrt{4V(x, v)} \cos(\ln(V(x, v)) + 2\tau), \quad (19c)$$

and where the function V is taken as

$$V(x, v) = |\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 v|^2 + \frac{1}{2}, \quad (20)$$

and the positive gains γ_1 and γ_2 are tuning parameters. It can be shown that the closed loop system defined by (18)-(20) satisfies Assumption 1 for $\delta_1 = 0$ (see the proof of Theorem 2 in Section 5.6). Hence, we are allowed to pick $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$ and an arbitrary $\delta_3 > 0$. Using the formula (9f), we obtain that the nominal averaged system is given, for all $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\bar{x}} \\ \dot{\bar{v}} \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x} \\ \bar{v} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -\gamma_1 \gamma_2 B B^\top & -\gamma_2^2 B B^\top \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x} \\ \bar{v} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

which turns out to be linear and time-invariant. If the matrix A in (21) is Hurwitz, then system (21) is UGAS [33, Theorem 4.5] and, by converse Lyapunov theorems [33, Theorem 4.14], it also satisfies Assumption 2 with $\phi(x, v) = |(x, v)|$, and $\alpha_3(r) = \tanh(r)$. Consequently, by invoking Corollary 3 we

conclude that the closed-loop system defined by (18)-(20) renders the origin UGpAS. Figure 4 shows the behavior exhibited by the trajectories of the system. In all the simulations, we used $B = (1, 1; 1, -1)$. We remark that, although we take B here as a constant matrix, a similar result can be established when B is time-varying under suitable uniform persistence of excitation conditions, see [40]. \square

4. Applications to Extremum Seeking Systems

In this section, we leverage the averaging results established in Theorem 1 and Corollaries 1-3 to study uniform global practical asymptotic stability (UGpAS) for a class of ES systems of the form (6).

4.1. Main Assumptions

To guarantee that the (open-loop) amplitudes of the exploration signals in (6) have access to all directions in the parameter space, we consider the following assumption on the vectors $b_{i,j}$.

Assumption 3. There exists $\gamma > 0$, such that the vectors $b_{i,j}$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^2 (b_{i,j}^\top v)^2 \geq \gamma |v|^2$, for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. \square

We also make the following regularity assumption on the cost functions J and the drift term b_0 . In all cases, we assume that $J^* := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} J(x) > -\infty$, and that $J^* = J(x^*)$ for some unique $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Similar conditions were used in [21, 38] to analyze ES systems with (local) asymptotic stability properties.

Assumption 4. The following holds:

- (a) $J(x) > J(x^*)$, for all $x \neq x^*$.
- (b) $\nabla J(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = x^*$.
- (c) There exists $L_J > 0$ such that $|\nabla^2 J(x)| \leq L_J$.
- (d) There exists $\kappa_3 > 0$ such that $|b_0(x)| \leq \kappa_3 |\nabla J(x)|$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- (e) There exists $L_0 > 0$ such that $|b_0(x_1) - b_0(x_2)| \leq L_0 |x_1 - x_2|$, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. \square

Remark 7. Items (a)-(b) in Assumption 5 are standard in ES problems [8, 5]. Similarly, item (c) is equivalent to the assumption that ∇J is L_J -globally Lipschitz [41, Lemma 1.2.2], which is satisfied by quadratic maps, which are typically studied in ES problems [2]. Finally, note that items (d)-(e) are relevant only when the drift term b_0 in (6) is not zero. However, in most ES systems this term is set to zero. \square

Next, we consider two classes of cost functions $J : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that we seek to globally minimize via the dynamics (6).

Assumption 5. The cost J is a radially unbounded C^2 -function and there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$ such that at least one of the following statements holds:

- a) For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\alpha_J(|x - x^*|)^2 |x - x^*|^2 \leq |\nabla J(x)|^2.$$

- b) There exists $M_J > 0$ such that

$$\alpha_J(|x - x^*|)^2 \leq |\nabla J(x)|^2 \leq M_J^2,$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. \square

Remark 8. As shown in Lemma 7 in the Appendix, item (a) in Assumption 5 is satisfied by any strongly convex C^2 -function with a globally Lipschitz gradient. This family of functions includes quadratic cost functions having a positive definite Hessian, which are common in ES. However, as shown in the next example, convexity of the cost function J is not needed to satisfy Assumption 5. \square

Example 3. Let $n = 2$, $x^* = (10^{10}, -10^{10})$, and let the cost function $J : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$J(x) := |x - x^*|^2 + 3 \sin(|x - x^*|) + 1, \quad (22)$$

which is not convex [42, pp.4]. However, as shown in Lemma 8 in the Appendix, J satisfies items (a)-(c) in Assumption 4 and item (a) in Assumption 5 with $L_J = 20$ and class- \mathcal{K} function $\alpha_J(s) = 0.5 \tanh(s)$. \square

The following example considers a cost function J obtained as a regularization of the vector norm function, which satisfies item b) in Assumption 5.

Example 4. Let $n = 2$, $x^* = (10^3, -10^3)$, and let the cost function $J : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$J(x) := |x - x^*| \tanh(|x - x^*|) - 100. \quad (23)$$

Therefore, it can be directly verified that the function J satisfies items (a)-(c) in Assumption 4 and item b) in Assumption 5 with $L_J = 3$, $M_J = 2$, and the class- \mathcal{K} function $\alpha_J(s) = \tanh(s)$. \square

4.2. ES Dynamics with Linear Growth

We now consider two different algorithms of the form (6) that are able to achieve global ES. The first algorithm that we consider, initially introduced in [38], can be written as system (6) with the following time-varying feedback law:

$$u_{i,1}(J(x), \tau) := \begin{cases} \sqrt{2\omega_i J(x)} \cos(\ln(J(x)) + \omega_i \tau) & J(x) > 0 \\ 0 & J(x) \leq 0 \end{cases}, \quad (24a)$$

$$u_{i,2}(J(x), \tau) := \begin{cases} \sqrt{2\omega_i J(x)} \sin(\ln(J(x)) + \omega_i \tau) & J(x) > 0 \\ 0 & J(x) \leq 0 \end{cases}, \quad (24b)$$

where $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, such that $\omega_i \neq \omega_j$ for $i \neq j$.

Using the coordinate shift $\tilde{x} = x - x^*$, system (6) can be written as follows:

$$\dot{\tilde{x}} = b_0(\tilde{x} + x^*) + \varepsilon^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^2 b_{i,j} u_{i,j}(J(\tilde{x} + x^*), \tau), \quad (25a)$$

$$\dot{\tau} = \varepsilon^{-2}, \quad (25b)$$

which has the same form as (5).

The following theorem is the second main result of this paper.





Figure 5: Numerical results for Example 4 (left) and Example 5 (right). The insets in the top right of the figures depict the quasi-steady state in the vicinity of x^* .

Theorem 2. *Suppose that Assumptions 3 and 4 hold with $\gamma > \kappa_3$. Then, if item a) in Assumption 5 holds:*

- (a) *The origin $\tilde{x} = 0$ is UGUB for system (25) under the feedback law (24).*
- (b) *If $J^* \geq 0$, then the origin $\tilde{x} = 0$ is UGpAS for system (25) under the feedback law (24).* \square

The novelty of Theorem 2 is to establish *global* bounds of the form (3)-(4) for the ES dynamics (6) with feedback law (24). As discussed in Example 3, such bounds can be obtained even when J is not convex.

Example 5. (Example 3 continued) Let $\omega_1 = 1$, $r = 1$, and consider the ES system (6) with destabilizing drift $b_0(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x - x^*)$, and constant vectors $b_{1,1} = (1, 0)$, $b_{1,2} = (0, 1)$. Notice that in this case $\gamma = 1$, and it can be shown that $\kappa_3 = 0.8$. Therefore, item d) in Assumption 4 is satisfied. The feedback law is given by (24), with cost function (22). Since all the assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied and $J^* > 0$, we conclude that x^* is UGpAS. Numerical simulation results are shown in Fig. 5. In the figure, we present simulations obtained from various randomly generated initial conditions and using $\varepsilon = 1/\sqrt{4\pi}$. As observed, all trajectories converge to a neighborhood of the optimizer. \square

4.3. ES Dynamics with Bounded Control

The second ES algorithm that we consider can also be written as system (6) with feedback law:

$$u_{i,1}(J(x), \tau) := \sqrt{2\omega_i} \cos(J(x) + \omega_i\tau), \quad (26a)$$

$$u_{i,2}(J(x), \tau) := \sqrt{2\omega_i} \sin(J(x) + \omega_i\tau). \quad (26b)$$

The semi-global practical stability properties of these systems have been studied in [37, 18]. These algorithms are characterized by uniformly bounded vector fields, which are suitable for applications with actuator constraints. Note that using the coordinate shift $\tilde{x} = x - x^*$, system (6) with the feedback law (26) can also be written as (25).

The following theorem is the third main result of this paper.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that Assumptions 3 and 4 hold. If $\gamma > \kappa_3$ and item b) in Assumption 5 is satisfied, then the origin $\tilde{x} = 0$ is UGpAS for system (25) under the feedback law (26).* \square

The novelty of Theorem 3 compared to the results of [37, 18], is to establish a global bound of the form (3) for all solutions of the system, albeit under stronger assumptions on the cost functions.

We conclude this section by presenting a numerical example that illustrates the application of Theorem 3.

Example 6. (Example 4 continued) Let $\omega_1 = 1$, $r = 1$, and consider the ES system (6) with $b_0(x) = (0, 0)$, $b_{1,1} = (2, 0)$, $b_{1,2} = (0, 2)$, and the feedback law (26). Notice that in this case $\kappa_3 = 0$ and $\gamma = 2$, so the assumption that $\kappa_3 < \gamma$ holds trivially. We consider the cost function (23), which satisfies the required Assumptions to apply Theorem 3. We simulate the system from randomly generated initial conditions with $\varepsilon = 1/\sqrt{4\pi}$. Numerical simulation results are shown in Fig. 5. Since item b) in Assumption 5 restricts the gradient to be uniformly bounded, the convergence rate that emerges is slower compared to the convergence rate of the ES dynamics of Example 5. However, Theorem 3 still asserts UGpAS of the minimizer. \square

5. Proofs

In this section, we present the proofs of the main results.

5.1. Proof of Proposition 1

For the sake of clarity, we divide the proof into several key lemmas. The following lemma is a direct consequence of Assumption 1 and the properties of the map φ summarized in Lemma 1 (see also [35, Lemmas 2.20-2.22]).

Lemma 2. *Let the assumptions of Proposition 1 be satisfied. Then, for all $k \in \{1, 2\}$, the following holds:*

- (a) *The map \hat{f}_k is C^0 and there exist positive constants \hat{L}_k such that for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the map \hat{f}_k satisfies*

$$|\hat{f}_k(x_1, \tau) - \hat{f}_k(x_2, \tau)| \leq \hat{L}_k |x_1 - x_2|.$$

- (b) *For all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and for the same $T \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ from item (b) in Assumption 1, we have that*

$$\hat{f}_k(x, \tau + T) = \hat{f}_k(x, \tau), \quad \int_0^T \hat{f}_1(x, \tau) d\tau = 0.$$

- (c) *The map \hat{f}_k is C^{3-k} with respect to x on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.*

(d) There exists a positive constant \hat{L}_3 such that, for all $(x_1, \tau_1), (x_2, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the map $D_x \hat{f}_1 \cdot \hat{f}_1$, satisfies

$$|D_x \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau_1) \cdot \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau_1) - D_x \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau_1) \cdot \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau_2)| \leq \hat{L}_3 |x_1 - x_2|.$$

(e) For all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_2$, we have that $\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = f_k(x, \tau)$.

(f) For all $(x, \tau) \in \text{cl}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{M}_1) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have that $\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = 0$.

Proof: If $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$, then $\varphi(x) = 1$ and all the properties follow directly by (8b) and Assumption 1. On the other hand, suppose that $\delta_2 > \delta_1$. We begin by proving items (e) and (f). By Lemma 1, $\varphi(x) = 1$, for all $x \in \mathcal{M}_2$. Hence, by definition, the map \hat{f}_k satisfies $\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = f_k(x, \tau)$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, which proves item (e). Similarly, by Lemma 1, $\varphi(x) = 0$, for all $x \in \delta_1 \mathbb{B}$. Hence, by construction, the map \hat{f}_k also satisfies $\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = 0$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \delta_1 \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, which proves item (f).

Next, we prove item (a). By Lemma 1, the map $\varphi(x)$ is C^∞ . Hence, by item (a) in Assumption 1, the definition of the map \hat{f}_k implies that $\hat{f}_k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is C^0 on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Since $\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = f_k(x, \tau)$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, it follows that \hat{f}_k inherits all the properties of f_k in the domain $\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. In particular, items (a) and (c) in Assumption 1 imply that $D_x \hat{f}_k$ is well-defined and satisfies the bound $|D_x \hat{f}_k(x, \tau)| \leq L_k$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Consequently, $D_x \hat{f}_k(x, \tau)$ also satisfies the bound $|D_x \hat{f}_k(x, \tau)| \leq L_k$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Similarly, since $\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = 0$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \delta_1 \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, it follows that $D_x \hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = 0$ is well-defined and satisfies $D_x \hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = 0$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \delta_1 \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Finally, the definition of the map \hat{f}_k implies that, for all $(x, \tau) \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_1 \setminus \mathcal{M}_2) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$D_x \hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = \varphi(x) D_x f_k(x, \tau) + f_k(x, \tau) \nabla \varphi(x)^\top,$$

which is continuous. Since $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_1 \setminus \mathcal{M}_2)$ is compact and, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $D_x \hat{f}_k(x, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is C^0 and periodic, it follows that there exists a constant $\tilde{L}_k \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ such that, for all $(x, \tau) \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_1 \setminus \mathcal{M}_2) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the Jacobian $D_x \hat{f}_k$ satisfies the upper bound $|D_x \hat{f}_k(x, \tau)| \leq \tilde{L}_k$. Let $\hat{L}_k := \max\{L_k, \tilde{L}_k\}$. Then, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the Jacobian $D_x \hat{f}_k$ is well-defined and satisfies the upper bound $|D_x \hat{f}_k(x, \tau)| \leq \hat{L}_k$. Consequently, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\forall \tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the map \hat{f}_k satisfies

$$|\hat{f}_k(x_1, \tau) - \hat{f}_k(x_2, \tau)| \leq \hat{L}_k |x_1 - x_2|,$$

which proves item (a). Item (b) follows directly from the definition of the map \hat{f}_k .

Next, we prove item (c). Since the map φ is C^∞ , the definition of the map \hat{f}_k implies that it inherits all the smoothness properties of f_k in the domain $\mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. In particular, item (c) in Assumption 1 implies that $\hat{f}_k(\cdot, \tau)$ is C^{3-k} on the closed set \mathcal{M}_1 , for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. On the other hand, since $\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = 0$ for all $(x, \tau) \in \delta_1 \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, it follows that $\hat{f}_k(\cdot, \tau)$ is C^∞ on the open set $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{M}_1$, for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. It follows that $\hat{f}_k(\cdot, \tau)$ is C^{3-k} on \mathbb{R}^n , for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, which proves item (c).

Next, we prove item (d). For $(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, define the maps

$$F(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) := D_x \hat{f}_1(x, \tau_1) f_1(x, \tau_2),$$

$$\hat{F}(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) := \varphi(x) F(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) = D_x \hat{f}_1(x, \tau_1) \hat{f}_1(x, \tau_2).$$

Since $\hat{f}_1(\cdot, \tau_1)$ is C^2 on \mathbb{R}^n , for all $\tau_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and $f_1(\cdot, \tau_1)$ is C^2 on \mathcal{M}_1 , for all $\tau_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, it follows that the map $F(\cdot, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ is C^1 on \mathcal{M}_1 , for all $(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. In addition, since the map φ is C^∞ , it follows that the map $F(\cdot, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ is also C^1 on \mathcal{M}_1 , for all $(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. From Lemma 1, $\varphi(x) = 1$, for all $x \in \mathcal{M}_2$. Hence, by definition, the map \hat{F} satisfies $\hat{F}(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) = F(x, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, for all $(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, which means that \hat{F} inherits all the properties of the map F in the domain $\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. In particular, from items (c) and (d) in Assumption 1, $D_x F$ is well-defined and satisfies the bound $|D_x F(x, \tau_1, \tau_2)| \leq L_3$, for all $(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, which implies that $D_x \hat{F}$ also satisfies the bound $|D_x \hat{F}(x, \tau_1, \tau_2)| \leq L_3$, for all $(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. From Lemma 1, $\varphi(x) = 0$, for all $x \in \delta_1 \mathbb{B}$. Hence, by definition, the map \hat{F} satisfies $\hat{F}(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) = 0$, for all $(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \delta_1 \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, which implies that $\hat{F}(\cdot, \tau_1, \tau_2)$ is C^1 on \mathbb{R}^n , for all $(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and that $D_x \hat{F}$ satisfies $D_x \hat{F}(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) = 0$, for all $(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \delta_1 \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Finally, the definition of the map \hat{F} implies that, for all $(x, \tau) \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_1 \setminus \mathcal{M}_2) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$D_x \hat{F}(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) = \varphi(x) D_x F(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) + F(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) \nabla \varphi(x)^\top,$$

which is continuous. Since $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_1 \setminus \mathcal{M}_2)$ is compact and, for all $(x, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $D_x \hat{F}(x, \cdot, \tau_2) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is C^0 and periodic, and for all $(x, \tau_1) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $D_x \hat{F}(x, \tau_1, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is C^0 and periodic, it follows that there exists a constant $\tilde{L}_3 \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ such that, for all $(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_1 \setminus \mathcal{M}_2) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the Jacobian $D_x \hat{F}$ satisfies the upper bound $|D_x \hat{F}(x, \tau_1, \tau_2)| \leq \tilde{L}_3$. Let $\hat{L}_3 := \max\{L_3, \tilde{L}_3\}$. Then, for all $(x, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the Jacobian $D_x \hat{F}$ satisfies the upper bound $|D_x \hat{F}(x, \tau_1, \tau_2)| \leq \hat{L}_3$. Consequently, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\forall (\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the map \hat{F} satisfies

$$|\hat{F}(x_1, \tau_1, \tau_2) - \hat{F}(x_2, \tau_1, \tau_2)| \leq \hat{L}_3 |x_1 - x_2|,$$

which proves item (d) and concludes the proof of the Lemma. ■

Lemma 3. *Let the assumptions of Proposition 1 be satisfied. Then, the following holds:*

- (a) The maps \bar{f} and v_k , for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, are C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.
- (b) There exist $\bar{L}, L_{v,k} > 0$, for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, such that:

$$|\bar{f}(x_1) - \bar{f}(x_2)| \leq \bar{L} |x_1 - x_2|,$$

$$|v_k(x_1, \tau) - v_k(x_2, \tau)| \leq L_{v,k} |x_1 - x_2|, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2\},$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Proof: First, we prove item a). Since v_1 is the integral of \hat{f}_1 with respect to τ , it follows from item (c) in Lemma 2 that the map v_1 is C^2 in x , and C^1 in τ . In addition, since \bar{f} is a multiple of the definite integral with respect to τ of the terms $D_x v_1 \hat{f}_1$, $D_x \hat{f}_1 v_1$, and \hat{f}_2 , and, from item (c) in Lemma 2, all those of terms are C^1 in x , it follows that \bar{f} is C^1 . Moreover, since v_2 is the sum of the term $D_x v_1 v_1$, which is C^1 in all arguments, and the integral with respect to τ of the terms $D_x v_1 \hat{f}_1$, $D_x \hat{f}_1 v_1$, and \hat{f}_2 , which are all, from item (c) in Lemma 2, C^1 in x and C^0 in τ , it follows that v_2 is C^1 in all arguments.

Next, we prove item b). From the definition of the map v_1 and item (a) in Lemma 2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |v_1(x_1, \tau) - v_1(x_2, \tau)| &= \left| \int_0^\tau (\hat{f}_1(x_1, s) - \hat{f}_1(x_2, s)) ds \right| \\ &\leq \hat{L}_1 \tau |x_1 - x_2| \leq T \hat{L}_1 |x_1 - x_2|, \end{aligned}$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in [0, T]$. In addition, from item (b) in Lemma 2, v_1 is periodic in τ . It follows that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$|v_1(x_1, \tau) - v_1(x_2, \tau)| \leq L_{v,1} |x_1 - x_2|, \quad L_{v,1} := T \hat{L}_1.$$

From the definition of v_1 , and by interchanging matrix multiplication with the integral, we have that

$$D_x \hat{f}_1(x, \tau) v_1(x, \tau) = \int_0^\tau D_x \hat{f}_1(x, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x, s) ds$$

From item (d) in Lemma 2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &|D_x \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau) v_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau) v_1(x_2, \tau)| \\ &= \left| \int_0^\tau (D_x \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_1, s) - D_x \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_2, s)) ds \right| \\ &\leq \hat{L}_3 \tau |x_1 - x_2| \leq T \hat{L}_3 |x_1 - x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in [0, T]$. In addition, from item (b) in Lemma 2, v_1 and \hat{f}_1 are periodic in τ . It follows that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have that

$$|D_x \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau) v_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau) v_1(x_2, \tau)| \leq T \hat{L}_3 |x_1 - x_2|.$$

From the definition of v_1 , using Leibniz's rule, and by interchanging matrix multiplication with the integral, we have that

$$D_x v_1(x, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x, \tau) = \int_0^\tau D_x \hat{f}_1(x, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x, s) ds$$

From item (d) in Lemma 2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &|D_x v_1(x_1, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x v_1(x_2, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau)| \\ &= \left| \int_0^\tau (D_x \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_1, s) - D_x \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_2, s)) ds \right| \\ &\leq \hat{L}_3 \tau |x_1 - x_2| \leq T \hat{L}_3 |x_1 - x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in [0, T]$. In addition, from item (b) in Lemma 2, v_1 and \hat{f}_1 are periodic in τ . It follows that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have that

$$|D_x v_1(x_1, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x v_1(x_2, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau)| \leq T \hat{L}_3 |x_1 - x_2|.$$

From the definition of v_1 , using Leibniz's rule, and interchanging matrix multiplication with the integral, we have that

$$D_x v_1(x, \tau) v_1(x, \tau) = \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau D_x \hat{f}_1(x, s) \hat{f}_1(x, \sigma) ds d\sigma$$

From item (d) in Lemma 2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &|D_x v_1(x_1, \tau) v_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x v_1(x_2, \tau) v_1(x_2, \tau)| \\ &= \left| \int_0^\tau \int_0^\tau (D_x \hat{f}_1(x_1, s) \hat{f}_1(x_1, \sigma) - D_x \hat{f}_1(x_2, s) \hat{f}_1(x_2, \sigma)) ds d\sigma \right| \\ &\leq \hat{L}_3 \tau^2 |x_1 - x_2| \leq T^2 \hat{L}_3 |x_1 - x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in [0, T]$. In addition, from item (b) in Lemma 2, v_1 is periodic in τ . It follows that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have that

$$|D_x v_1(x_1, \tau) v_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x v_1(x_2, \tau) v_1(x_2, \tau)| \leq T^2 \hat{L}_3 |x_1 - x_2|.$$

Finally, note that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} T |\bar{f}(x_1) - \bar{f}(x_2)| &\leq \int_0^T |\hat{f}_2(x_1, \tau) - \hat{f}_2(x_2, \tau)| d\tau \\ &+ \int_0^T |D_x v_1(x_1, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x v_1(x_2, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau)| d\tau \\ &+ \int_0^T |D_x \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau) v_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau) v_1(x_2, \tau)| d\tau \\ &\leq T^2 (\hat{L}_2 + 2\hat{L}_3) |x_1 - x_2|, \end{aligned}$$

and, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |v_2(x_1, \tau) - v_2(x_2, \tau)| &\leq \int_0^\tau |\hat{f}_2(x_1, \tau) - \hat{f}_2(x_2, \tau)| d\tau \\ &+ \int_0^\tau |\bar{f}(x_1) - \bar{f}(x_2)| d\tau \\ &+ \int_0^\tau |D_x \hat{f}_1(x_1, \tau) v_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x \hat{f}_1(x_2, \tau) v_1(x_2, \tau)| d\tau \\ &+ |D_x v_1(x_1, \tau) v_1(x_1, \tau) - D_x v_1(x_2, \tau) v_1(x_2, \tau)| \\ &\leq T^2 (2\hat{L}_2 + 4\hat{L}_3) |x_1 - x_2|, \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the Lemma is concluded by defining $\bar{L} := T(\hat{L}_2 + 2\hat{L}_3)$ and $L_{v,2} := T^2(2\hat{L}_2 + 4\hat{L}_3)$. \blacksquare

Lemma 4. *Let the assumptions of Proposition 1 be satisfied. Then, there exists $\varepsilon_0, L_\Psi > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$, the following holds:*

- (a) Ψ is a C^1 -diffeomorphism on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.
- (b) For all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the diffeomorphism Ψ and its inverse Ψ^{-1} satisfy

$$|\pi_1 \circ \Psi(0, \tau)| \leq L_\Psi \varepsilon, \quad |\pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau)| \leq L_\Psi \varepsilon.$$

- (c) For all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the map Ψ and its inverse Ψ^{-1} satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(x_1, \tau) - \Psi(x_2, \tau)| &\leq (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) |x_1 - x_2|, \\ |\Psi^{-1}(x_1, \tau) - \Psi^{-1}(x_2, \tau)| &\leq (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) |x_1 - x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

- (d) For all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_2$.

Proof: We first establish item a). Let (x, τ) and $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\tau})$ be any two points in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and suppose that $\Psi(x, \tau) = \Psi(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\tau})$. Then, by construction, we have $\tau = \tilde{\tau}$, and

$$|x - \tilde{x}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \varepsilon^i |v_i(x, \tau) - v_i(\tilde{x}, \tau)|.$$

From item (b) in Lemma 3, we obtain that

$$|x - \tilde{x}| \leq \varepsilon (L_{v,1} + L_{v,2} \varepsilon) |x - \tilde{x}|$$

Let $\bar{\varepsilon}_1 := \min\{1, 1/(2(L_{v,1} + L_{v,2}))\}$ and note that for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_1]$ we have that $|x - \tilde{x}| \leq \frac{1}{2} |x - \tilde{x}|$, which can only happen if $|x - \tilde{x}| = 0$. Therefore, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for all $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\tau}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_1]$, $\Psi(x, \tau) = \Psi(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\tau}) \implies x = \tilde{x}$, and $\tau = \tilde{\tau}$,

which in turn implies that the map Ψ is injective on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Next, for each $(\tilde{x}, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, define the map $\tilde{\Phi} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\tilde{\Phi}(x) = \tilde{x} + x - \Phi(x, \tau).$$

By direct computation

$$\tilde{\Phi}(x) = \tilde{x} + \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k v_k(x, \tau).$$

Now let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be any two points and observe that

$$|\tilde{\Phi}(x_1) - \tilde{\Phi}(x_2)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k |v_k(x_1, \tau) - v_k(x_2, \tau)|.$$

From item (b) in Lemma 3, we obtain that

$$|\tilde{\Phi}(x_1) - \tilde{\Phi}(x_2)| \leq \varepsilon (L_{v,1} + L_{v,2} \varepsilon) |x_1 - x_2|.$$

Let $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_1]$. Then, $|\tilde{\Phi}(x_1) - \tilde{\Phi}(x_2)| \leq \frac{1}{2} |x_1 - x_2|$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which implies that $\tilde{\Phi}$ is a contraction. Thus, $\tilde{\Phi}$ has a unique fixed point [35, Lemma C.35], which implies that for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_1]$, for all $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, there exists a unique point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\tilde{x} = \pi_1 \circ \Psi(x, \tau) = \Phi(x, \tau). \quad (27)$$

In other words, Ψ is onto, and therefore a bijection on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

From item (a) in Lemma 3, we know that the map Ψ is C^1 on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and so its Jacobian $D\Psi$ is well-defined, and given by

$$D\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} D_x \Phi & D_\tau \Phi \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the Jacobians $D_x \Phi$ and $D_\tau \Phi$ are given by

$$D_x \Phi = I - \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k D_x v_k, \quad D_\tau \Phi = -\sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k D_\tau v_k.$$

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $k \in \{1, 2\}$, let $R_{v,k}^i : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be given by

$$R_{v,k}^i(x, \tau) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n |(D_x v_k(x, \tau))_{ij}|,$$

where $(D_x v_k(x, \tau))_{ij}$ are the entries of the matrix $D_x v_k(x, \tau)$. From items (a) and (b) in Lemma 3, the maps v_k are C^1 and globally Lipschitz with respect to x , uniformly in τ . It follows that, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, we have that $|D_x v_k(x, \tau)| \leq L_{v,k}$. In particular, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and for all $k \in \{1, 2\}$, we have that $|(D_x v_k(x, \tau))_{ij}| \leq L_{v,k}$. As such, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and for all $k \in \{1, 2\}$, we have that $0 \leq R_{v,k}^i(x, \tau) \leq (n-1)L_{v,k}$.

Next, note that the entries of $D_x \Phi$ are given by:

$$(D_x \Phi(x, \tau))_{ii} = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k (D_x v_k(x, \tau))_{ii}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

$$(D_x \Phi(x, \tau))_{ij} = -\sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k (D_x v_k(x, \tau))_{ij}, \quad \forall i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, n\},$$

Consequently, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for all $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R^i(x, \tau) &:= \sum_{j \neq i}^n |(D_x \Phi(x, \tau))_{ij}| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k \sum_{j \neq i}^n |(D_x v_k(x, \tau))_{ij}| \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k R_{v,k}^i(x, \tau) \leq (n-1) \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k L_{v,k}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$1 - \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k L_{v,k} \leq (D_x \Phi(x, \tau))_{ii} \leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k L_{v,k}.$$

Let $\bar{\varepsilon}_2 := \min\{1, 1/(4n(L_{v,1} + L_{v,2}))\}$. Then, it follows that for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_2]$, all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$:

$$\frac{3}{4} \leq 1 - \tilde{L}_\Psi \varepsilon \leq (D_x \Phi(x, \tau))_{ii} \leq 1 + \tilde{L}_\Psi \varepsilon \leq \frac{5}{4},$$

$$0 \leq R^i(x, \tau) \leq \tilde{L}_\Psi \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

where $\tilde{L}_\Psi := n(L_{v,1} + L_{v,2})$. By applying the Geršgorin circle theorem [43, p.269], we obtain that for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_2]$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix $D_x \Phi(x, \tau)$ are contained in the compact interval $[1 - 2\tilde{L}_\Psi \varepsilon, 1 + 2\tilde{L}_\Psi \varepsilon] \subset [1/2, 3/2]$.

Then, we have the following claim, proved in Appendix B.1.

Claim 1. For all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_2]$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the Jacobian matrix $D_x \Phi(x, \tau)$ is invertible and there exists a constant $L_\Psi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that

$$|D_x \Phi(x, \tau)| \leq 1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon \leq 2, \quad |D_x \Phi(x, \tau)^{-1}| \leq 1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon \leq 2.$$

and $D\Psi(x, \tau)^{-1}$ is well-defined and given by

$$D\Psi(x, \tau)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} D_x \Phi(x, \tau)^{-1} & -D_x \Phi(x, \tau)^{-1} D_\tau \Phi(x, \tau) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. \square

Let $\bar{\varepsilon} := \min\{\bar{\varepsilon}_1, \bar{\varepsilon}_2\}$. For all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$, the map Ψ is bijective and, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the Jacobian $D\Psi(x, \tau)$ is invertible and its inverse is continuous. Thus, by invoking the global rank theorem [35, Theorem 4.14], we conclude that, for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$, the map Ψ is a C^1 -diffeomorphism.

To establish item (b), we note that by [35, Proposition C.4] the Jacobian of Ψ^{-1} is given by

$$D\Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) = (D\Psi \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau))^{-1}.$$

From the definition of Ψ , for all $(\tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$, we have that $\pi_1 \circ \Psi(0, \tau) = -\sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k v_k(0, \tau)$. Since $v_k(0, \tau)$ is periodic in τ , there exists $M_k > 0$ such that $|v_k(0, \tau)| \leq M_k$, for all τ . Without loss of generality, we assume that $L_\Psi \geq M_1 + M_2$. It follows that, for all $(\tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$, we have $|\pi_1 \circ \Psi(0, \tau)| \leq L_\Psi \varepsilon$. Since Ψ is a diffeomorphism, we have

$$0 = \pi_1 \circ \Psi \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau) = \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau) - \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau),$$

which implies that $|\pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau)| \leq |\sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau)|$. Similar reasoning allows us to conclude that, without loss of generality, we may assume that $|\pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau)| \leq L_\Psi \varepsilon$.

To establish item (c), note that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$, we obtain via Hadamard's Lemma [44, Lemma 2.8] that

$$|\Psi(x_1, \tau) - \Psi(x_2, \tau)| \leq |J_\Psi(x_1, x_2, \tau)| |x_1 - x_2|,$$

$$|\Psi^{-1}(x_1, \tau) - \Psi^{-1}(x_2, \tau)| \leq |J_{\Psi^{-1}}(x_1, x_2, \tau)| |x_1 - x_2|,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_\Psi(x_1, x_2, \tau) &:= \int_0^1 D_x \Phi(x_2 + \lambda(x_1 - x_2), \tau) d\lambda \\ J_{\Psi^{-1}}(x_1, x_2, \tau) &:= \int_0^1 D_x \Phi^{-1}(x_2 + \lambda(x_1 - x_2), \tau) d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

and where we used

$$D_x \Phi^{-1}(x, \tau) := \left(D_x \Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right)^{-1}.$$

It follows that

$$|\Psi(x_1, \tau) - \Psi(x_2, \tau)| \leq (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) |x_1 - x_2|, \quad (29a)$$

$$|\Psi^{-1}(x_1, \tau) - \Psi^{-1}(x_2, \tau)| \leq (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) |x_1 - x_2|. \quad (29b)$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$.

Finally, to establish item (d), note that, since Ψ is a diffeomorphism, we have

$$x = \pi_1 \circ \Psi \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) = \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau).$$

Therefore, for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$:

$$\left| \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - x \right| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right|. \quad (30)$$

From item (b) in Lemma 3 and the inequality (29), we know that the maps $v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}$ are globally Lipschitz in x , uniformly in τ , for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, i.e., there exists constants $\hat{L}_{v,k}$ such that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$:

$$\left| v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(x_1, \tau) - v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(x_2, \tau) \right| \leq \hat{L}_{v,k} |x_1 - x_2|.$$

Since the maps $v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}$ are also continuous and periodic in τ , we may assume, without loss of generality, that, for all $(\tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$, we have $\left| v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau) \right| \leq \hat{L}_{v,k}$. Thus, adding and subtracting terms to (30), and using the triangle inequality and the previous bounds, we obtain

$$\left| \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - x \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k \hat{L}_{v,k} (|x| + 1),$$

for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}]$. Using the reverse triangle inequality, we get

$$|x| - \varepsilon (|x| + 1) \sum_{k=1}^2 \hat{L}_{v,k} \leq \left| \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right|,$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \hat{\varepsilon}]$. Let $\hat{\varepsilon} = \min\{1, \bar{\varepsilon}, 1/((\hat{L}_{v,1} + \hat{L}_{v,2}))\}$ and observe that, for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \hat{\varepsilon}]$, we have that $0 \leq 1 - \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^2 \hat{L}_{v,k}$ for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Hence, we obtain that

$$\left(1 - \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^2 \hat{L}_{v,k} \right) |x| - \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^2 \hat{L}_{v,k} \leq \left| \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right|,$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \hat{\varepsilon}]$, which implies that

$$\left(1 - \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^2 \hat{L}_{v,k} \right) \delta_3 - \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^2 \hat{L}_{v,k} \leq \left| \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right|,$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \hat{\varepsilon}]$. The result follows by defining $\varepsilon_0 := \min\{\hat{\varepsilon}, (\delta_3 - \delta_2)/((\delta_3 + 1)(\hat{L}_{v,1} + \hat{L}_{v,2}))\}$. \blacksquare

Lemma 5. *There exists a C^0 map $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and all $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$, the map $\Psi_* f_\varepsilon$, given by (2b), satisfies*

$$\Psi_* f_\varepsilon(x, \tau) = \bar{f}(x) + \varepsilon g(x, \tau, \varepsilon),$$

where \bar{f} is given by (9f).

Proof: By direct computation, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_* f_\varepsilon(x, \tau) &= \left(D_x \Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right) f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \\ &\quad + \left(D_x \Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right) f_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \varepsilon^{-1} \\ &\quad + D_\tau \Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \varepsilon^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_\tau \Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) &= -\sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k D_\tau v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \\ D_x \Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) &= \left(I - \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k D_x v_k \right) \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, note that

$$D_\tau v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) = \hat{f}_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau),$$

and also that

$$\begin{aligned} D_\tau v_2(x, \tau) &= \underbrace{\hat{f}_2(x, \tau) + D_x \hat{f}_1(x, \tau) v_1(x, \tau) - \bar{f}(x)}_{=D_\tau w(x, \tau)} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{D_x \hat{f}_1(x, \tau) v_1(x, \tau) - D_x v_1(x, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x, \tau)}_{=-D_\tau(D_x v_1(x, \tau) v_1(x, \tau))} \\ &= \hat{f}_2(x, \tau) - D_x v_1(x, \tau) \hat{f}_1(x, \tau) - \bar{f}(x) \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} D_\tau v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) &= \hat{f}_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - \bar{f} \circ \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \\ &\quad - \left(D_x v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right) \hat{f}_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, another direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_* f_\varepsilon(x, \tau) &= \left(f_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - \hat{f}_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right) \varepsilon^{-1} \\ &\quad + \left(f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - \hat{f}_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \right) \\ &\quad - D_x v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) f_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \\ &\quad + D_x v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \hat{f}_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \\ &\quad + \bar{f}(x) + \hat{f}(x, \tau, \varepsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the map \hat{f} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(x, \tau, \varepsilon) &= \bar{f} \circ \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - \bar{f}(x) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon D_x v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon D_x v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) f_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^2 D_x v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Using Hadamard's Lemma [44, Lemma 2.8] and the fact that \bar{f} is C^1 , we obtain:

$$\bar{f}(x_1) - \bar{f}(x_2) = \bar{F}(x_1, x_2)(x_1 - x_2),$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where \bar{F} is given by

$$\bar{F}(x_1, x_2) := \int_0^1 D_x \bar{f}(\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda) x_2) d\lambda.$$

Hence, using the fact that Ψ^{-1} is a bijection:

$$\bar{f} \circ \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - \bar{f}(x) = \bar{F}(x, \tau) \left(\pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - x \right),$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where \tilde{F} is given by

$$\tilde{F}(x, \tau) := \tilde{F}(\pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), x). \quad (32)$$

However, since Ψ is a diffeomorphism, we have

$$x = \pi_1 \circ \Psi \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) = \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - \sum_{k=1}^2 \varepsilon^k v_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau),$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f} \circ \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) - \tilde{f}(x) &= \varepsilon \tilde{F}(x, \tau) v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \tilde{F}(x, \tau) v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), \end{aligned}$$

and that \hat{f} can be written as

$$\hat{f}(x, \tau, \varepsilon) = \varepsilon g(x, \tau, \varepsilon),$$

where g can be written in compact form as:

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \tilde{F} v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1} - D_x v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1} f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1} - D_x v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1} f_1 \circ \Psi^{-1} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon (\tilde{F} v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1} - D_x v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1} f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Since Ψ is a C^1 diffeomorphism, and g is a combination of C^0 maps composed with Ψ , it follows that g is C^0 in all arguments.

Finally, by item (d) in Lemma 4, for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$, we have that $\Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Also, by item (e) in Lemma 2, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have that $\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = f_k(x, \tau)$. Therefore,

$$\hat{f}_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau) = f_k \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau),$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$. Hence, in this set the first four terms in (31) cancel, and we obtain that pushforward map $\Psi_* f_\varepsilon$ satisfies

$$\Psi_* f_\varepsilon(x, \tau) = \tilde{f}(x) + \varepsilon g(x, \tau, \varepsilon).$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$. \blacksquare

Lemma 6. *There exists a positive constant $L_g > 0$ such that the map g , defined in (33), satisfies*

$$|g(x, \tau, \varepsilon)| \leq L_g(|x| + 1), \quad (34)$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$.

Proof: The map g can be written in compact form as

$$g(x, \tau, \varepsilon) = \sum_{k=1}^5 G_k(x, \tau, \varepsilon) g_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon), \quad (35)$$

with the matrix-valued maps G_i given by

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(x, \tau) &= \tilde{F}(x, \tau), & G_2(x, \tau) &= D_x v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), \\ G_3(x, \tau) &= D_x v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), & G_4(x, \tau) &= \varepsilon \tilde{F}(x, \tau), \\ G_5(x, \tau) &= \varepsilon D_x v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), \end{aligned}$$

and the maps g_i given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x, \tau) &= v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), & g_2(x, \tau) &= -f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), \\ g_3(x, \tau) &= -f_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), & g_4(x, \tau) &= v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), \\ g_5(x, \tau) &= -f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

where the explicit (smooth) dependence on ε is omitted to simplify notation. By Lemma 3, the maps \tilde{f} and v_k are C^1 and globally Lipschitz in x , uniformly in τ . It follows that there exists constants $M_{g,i} > 0$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 5\}$, such that, for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$, we have that $|G_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon)| \leq M_{g,i}$ for all i . By Lemma 4, the diffeomorphism Ψ and its inverse Ψ^{-1} are globally Lipschitz in x . In addition, from items (a) in Assumption 1 and Lemma 3, the maps f_k are Lipschitz in x for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and are C^0 for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Since the composition of (globally Lipschitz) continuous functions is (globally Lipschitz) continuous, there exist constants $L_{g,i} > 0$ such that, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{M}_3$ and for all $(\tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$, we have that $|g_i(x_1, \tau, \varepsilon) - g_i(x_2, \tau, \varepsilon)| \leq L_{g,i}|x_1 - x_2|$.

Finally, since g_i is continuous in all arguments, periodic in τ , $[0, \varepsilon_0]$ is compact, and $\delta_3 \mathbb{B}$ is compact, there exist constants $M_{0,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $|g_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon)| \leq M_{0,i}$, for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \delta_3 \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$. Let $x_m \in \{x : \mathbb{R}^n : |x| = \delta_3\}$ be an arbitrary point, and note that $x_m \in \mathcal{M}_3 \cap \delta_3 \mathbb{B}$, and that, for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$, we have that each term in (35) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} G_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon) g_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon) &= G_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon) (g_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon) - g_i(x_m, \tau, \varepsilon)) \\ &\quad + G_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon) g_i(x_m, \tau, \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, either $x \in \mathcal{M}_3$ or $x \in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{M}_3) \subset \delta_3 \mathbb{B}$. If $x \in \mathcal{M}_3$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |G_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon) g_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon)| &\leq M_{g,i} L_{g,i} |x - x_m| + M_{g,i} M_{g,0} \\ &\leq M_{g,i} L_{g,i} |x| + M_{g,i} (L_{g,i} \delta_3 + M_{g,0}). \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, if $x \in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{M}_3)$, then we have that

$$|G_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon) g_i(x, \tau, \varepsilon)| \leq M_{g,i} M_{g,0}.$$

Combining all of the above, we obtain that, for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$, the map g satisfies the inequality

$$|g(x, \tau, \varepsilon)| \leq L_g(|x| + 1),$$

where $L_g := \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^5 M_{g,i} L_{g,i}, \sum_{i=1}^5 M_{g,i} (L_{g,i} \delta_3 + M_{g,0}) \right\}$. \blacksquare

All the claims of Proposition 1 follow now directly by Lemmas 2-6. \blacksquare

5.2. Proof of Theorem 1

Let Assumption 1 generate δ_1 , let $\epsilon > 0$, and let δ_2 and δ_3 satisfy (7). Let Proposition 1 generate $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that its conclusions hold. Then, from Assumption 1 and Proposition 1, and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, the map $\Psi_* f_\varepsilon$ is continuous. Hence, for all $(x_0, \tau_0, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (0, \varepsilon_0)$, a solution to system (2a) starting at the initial condition (x_0, τ_0) exists.

Let V be given by Assumption 2. Its time derivative along the trajectories of (2a) satisfies:

$$\dot{V} = \nabla V(x)^\top \Psi_* f_\varepsilon(x, \tau, \varepsilon).$$

Using item (d) in Proposition 1 and the bounds from Assumption 2, we obtain that for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (0, \varepsilon_0)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &\leq \nabla V(x)^\top \tilde{f}(x) + \varepsilon \nabla V(x)^\top g(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \\ &\leq -c_1 \phi(x)^2 + \varepsilon c_2 \phi(x) |g(x, \tau, \varepsilon)|. \end{aligned}$$

We consider two possible cases:

C1) Item (c)-(i) in Assumption 2 holds, and in this case we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} \leq & -\frac{c_1}{2}\phi(x)^2 - \left(\frac{c_1}{4} - \varepsilon c_2 \bar{L}_g\right)\phi(x)^2 \\ & - \phi(x) \left(\frac{c_1}{4}\phi(x) - \varepsilon c_2 \bar{L}_g\right), \end{aligned}$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Since the function ϕ is positive definite, there exists a class \mathcal{K} function α_4 such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\alpha_4(|x|) \leq \phi(x)$ [33, Lemma 4.3] and $\alpha_4^{-1}(s)$ is defined for s sufficiently small. Therefore, there exists $\varepsilon_1^* \in (0, \min\{\varepsilon_0, \eta^*\})$, where $\eta^* = \frac{c_1}{4c_2\bar{L}_g}$, such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1^*)$:

$$\dot{V} \leq -\frac{c_1}{2}\phi(x)^2, \quad \forall |x| \geq \delta_3 + \alpha_4^{-1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta^*}\right).$$

C2) Item (c)-(ii) in Assumption 2 holds, and in this case:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} \leq & -\frac{c_1}{2}\phi(x)^2 - \phi(x) \left(\frac{c_1}{4}\alpha_3(|x|) - \varepsilon c_2 L_g\right)|x| \\ & - \phi(x) \left(\frac{c_1}{4}\alpha_3(|x|)|x| - \varepsilon c_2 L_g\right), \end{aligned}$$

for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}_3 \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (0, \varepsilon_0)$, where $\alpha_3 \in \mathcal{K}$, and where we used Proposition 1-(e). Thus, there exists $\varepsilon_2^* \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2^*)$:

$$\dot{V} \leq -\frac{c_1}{2}\phi(x)^2, \quad \forall |x| \geq \delta_3 + \alpha_3^{-1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta^*}\right) + \alpha_5^{-1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta^*}\right)$$

where $\alpha_5(|x|) := \alpha_3(|x|)|x|$, and where, without loss of generality, we assumed $\bar{L}_g \geq L_g$.

Let $\varepsilon^* := \min\{1, \varepsilon_1^*, \varepsilon_2^*\}$, $\rho(\varepsilon, \delta_1) := \sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_{i+2}^{-1}(\varepsilon/\eta^*(\delta_1))$. Then combining the above two cases we obtain that $\dot{V} \leq -c\phi(x)^2$, for all $|x| \geq 2\delta_3 + \rho(\varepsilon, \delta_1)$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$, with $c := c_1/2$. Then, following similar steps as in [33, Appendix C.9] and the proof of [45, Appendix C.], there exist functions $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ and $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that, for all $(x_0, \tau_0, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (0, \varepsilon^*)$, any solution to system (2a) starting at (x_0, τ_0) , satisfies

$$|x(t)| \leq \beta(|x(t)|, t) + \Delta_{\delta, \varepsilon}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (36)$$

where $\Delta_{\delta, \varepsilon} := \kappa(2\delta_3 + \rho(\varepsilon, \delta_1))$. ■

5.3. Proof of Corollary 1

By Theorem 1, there exists an $\varepsilon^* \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ such that, for all $(\bar{x}_0, \tau_0, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times (0, \varepsilon^*)$, any solution (\bar{x}, τ) of system (2a) starting from (\bar{x}_0, τ_0) satisfies $|\bar{x}(t)| \leq \beta(|\bar{x}_0|, t) + \Delta(\varepsilon, \delta)$, for all $t \geq 0$, with $\Delta(\varepsilon, \delta) := \kappa(\rho(\delta, \varepsilon))$. For any (x_0, τ_0) , let (x, τ) be a solution of system (5) starting from the initial condition (x_0, τ_0) . Since Ψ is a C^1 diffeomorphism, and system (2a) is the pushforward of system (5) under Ψ , it follows that $(x(t), \tau(t)) = \Psi^{-1}(\bar{x}(t), \tau(t))$, for all $t > 0$, where (\bar{x}, τ) is a solution of system (2a) with initial condition $\Psi(x_0, \tau_0)$. Therefore, for all $t \geq 0$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |x(t)| &= \left| \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(\bar{x}(t), \tau(t)) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(\bar{x}(t), \tau(t)) - \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau(t)) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau(t)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

From item (b) in Proposition 1, we obtain that

$$\left| \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(\bar{x}(t), \tau(t)) - \pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau(t)) \right| \leq (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) |\bar{x}(t)|,$$

and also $|\pi_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(0, \tau(t))| \leq L_\Psi \varepsilon$. Therefore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |x(t)| &\leq (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) \beta(|\pi_1 \circ \Psi(x_0, \tau_0)|, t) \\ &\quad + (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) \Delta_{\delta, \varepsilon} + L_\Psi \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi_1 \circ \Psi(x_0, \tau_0)| &\leq |\pi_1 \circ \Psi(x_0, \tau_0) - \pi_1 \circ \Psi(0, \tau_0)| + |\pi_1 \circ \Psi(0, \tau_0)| \\ &\leq (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) |x_0| + L_\Psi \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, it is strictly increasing and satisfies

$$\beta(|\pi_1 \circ \Psi(x_0, \tau_0)|, t) \leq \beta((1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon)|x_0| + L_\Psi \varepsilon, t).$$

for all $(x_0, \tau_0, t, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon^*]$. We then have two possible cases:

C1) If $|x_0| \leq L_\Psi \varepsilon$, then

$$\beta(|\pi_1 \circ \Psi(x_0, \tau_0)|, t) \leq \beta(2L_\Psi \varepsilon + L_\Psi^2 \varepsilon^2, t).$$

C2) If $|x_0| > L_\Psi \varepsilon$, then

$$\beta(|\pi_1 \circ \Psi(x_0, \tau_0)|, t) \leq \beta((2 + L_\Psi \varepsilon)|x_0|, t).$$

Therefore, for all $(x_0, \tau_0, t, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon^*]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(|\pi_1 \circ \Psi(x_0, \tau_0)|, t) &\leq \beta((2 + L_\Psi \varepsilon)|x_0|, t) + \beta(2L_\Psi \varepsilon + L_\Psi^2 \varepsilon^2, t) \\ &\leq \beta((2 + L_\Psi \varepsilon)|x_0|, t) + \beta(2L_\Psi \varepsilon + L_\Psi^2 \varepsilon^2, 0). \end{aligned}$$

However, from Claim 1, we have that $L_\Psi \varepsilon \leq 1$, for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon^*]$. Therefore, we have that

$$\beta(|\pi_1 \circ \Psi(x_0, \tau_0)|, t) \leq \beta(3|x_0|, t) + \beta(3L_\Psi \varepsilon, 0).$$

The result of the corollary follows by defining

$$\tilde{\Delta}(\delta, \varepsilon) := (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) \Delta_{\delta, \varepsilon} + L_\Psi \varepsilon + (1 + L_\Psi \varepsilon) \beta(3L_\Psi \varepsilon, 0) \quad (37)$$

and

$$\tilde{\beta}(r, s) := 2\beta(3r, s), \quad (38)$$

for all $r, s \geq 0$. ■

5.4. Proof of Corollary 2

It follows from the assumptions of the corollary that $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ generated by the proof of Theorem 1 are independent of the choice of $\delta_1 > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and δ satisfying (7). Let $\nu > 0$ be given. Hence, there exists $r > 0$ sufficiently small such that $\kappa(r) < \frac{\nu}{4}$. Let $\delta_1 < r/16$, and choose $\varepsilon = \sqrt{3} - 1$, $\delta_2 = (1 + \varepsilon)\delta_1$, $\delta_3 = \frac{4}{3}(1 + \varepsilon)\delta_2 = \frac{4}{3}(1 + \varepsilon)^2\delta_1 = 4\delta_1$, which satisfy (7). It follows that $2\delta_3 = 8\delta_1 < \frac{r}{2}$. Let $\varepsilon_a > 0$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_{i+2}^{-1}(\varepsilon/\eta^*(\delta_1)) < \frac{r}{2}$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_a)$. Such ε_a always exist because $\alpha_{i+2}^{-1} \in \mathcal{K}$. It follows that $\Delta_{\delta, \varepsilon} = \kappa(2\delta_3 + \sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_{i+2}^{-1}(\varepsilon/\eta^*(\delta_1))) < \frac{\nu}{4}$. Let $\varepsilon_b > 0$ be such that $L_\Psi \varepsilon \leq \min\{\nu/3, 1/3\}$ and $\beta(3L_\Psi \varepsilon, 0) \leq \nu/4$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_b)$, where β comes from (36). Such ε_b always exist because $\beta(\cdot, s) \in \mathcal{K}$. Let $\varepsilon^* > 0$ be generated by Corollary 1, and define $\varepsilon^{**} = \min\{\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_b, \varepsilon^*\}$. Then, every solution of system (5) starting at (x_0, τ_0) satisfies the bound (4) with \mathcal{KL} function given by (38) and ultimate bound $\tilde{\Delta}_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ given by (37). However, by the choice of δ and ε , we have that $\tilde{\Delta}_{\delta, \varepsilon} \leq \nu$, which establishes the desired bound. ■

5.5. Proof of Corollary 3

Since Assumption 1 is satisfied for $\delta_1 = 0$, we may pick $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$, and $\delta_3 \in (0, \infty)$ arbitrarily small. Following similar steps to the proof of Corollary 2 yields the result. \blacksquare

5.6. Proof of Theorem 2

We first consider the case when $J^* \in \mathbb{R}$ is arbitrary, and we verify that the maps defining system (25) satisfy Assumption 1. Clearly, the right hand side in (25) is C^0 and satisfies item (b) in Assumption 1. Let $\bar{J} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and let $\delta_1 \in [0, \infty)$ be such that $J(x) \geq \bar{J}$, for all $|x| \geq \delta_1$. Such δ_1 always exists because J is radially unbounded. It follows that the feedback law

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i,1}(J(x), \tau) &= \sqrt{2\omega_i J(x)} \cos(\log(J(x)) + \omega_i \tau) \\ u_{i,2}(J(x), \tau) &= \sqrt{2\omega_i J(x)} \sin(\log(J(x)) + \omega_i \tau), \end{aligned}$$

is C^2 for all $|x| \geq \delta_1$. Therefore, system (25) satisfies item (c) in Assumption 1. Next, via direct differentiation, we obtain that

$$\left| D_x \left(u_{i,j}^{\varepsilon,1}(J(x), \tau) \right) \right| \leq \sqrt{2\omega_i J(x)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\nabla J(x)|.$$

From Assumption 5-(c), we have that ∇J is L_J -globally Lipschitz, which implies that $|\nabla J(x)^2| \leq 2L_J(J(x) - J^*)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ [46, Lemma 1, pp.23]. It follows that

$$\left| D_x \left(u_{i,1}^{\varepsilon,1}(J(x), \tau) \right) \right| \leq \sqrt{2\omega_i \kappa} (1 - J^* J(x)^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq m, \quad (39)$$

for all $|x| \geq \delta_1$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, where $m := \sqrt{2\omega_i \kappa} (1 + |J^*| \bar{J}^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\kappa = 2L_J$. Therefore, system (25) satisfies item (a) in Assumption 1. A similar computation shows that system (25) satisfies item (d) in Assumption 1.

Next, let $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $\delta_2 \in [(1 + \epsilon)\delta_1, \infty)$, $\delta_3 \in ((1 + \epsilon)\delta_2, \infty)$, and let \mathcal{M}_j , for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, be the corresponding nested subsets defined in (10). Using the formula (9f), the nominal average system (13) corresponding to system (25) on \mathcal{M}_3 , is given by

$$\dot{\bar{x}} = \bar{f}(\bar{x}) = b_0(\bar{x} + x^*) + \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^2 b_{i,j} b_{i,j}^\top \nabla J(\bar{x} + x^*). \quad (40)$$

Consider the Lyapunov function candidate V and the positive definite function ϕ defined by

$$V(\bar{x}) = J(\bar{x} + x^*) - J(x^*), \quad \phi(\bar{x}) = |\nabla J(\bar{x} + x^*)|, \quad (41)$$

which satisfy the inequalities

$$\alpha_1(|\bar{x}|) \leq V(\bar{x}) \leq \alpha_2(|\bar{x}|), \quad (42)$$

$$|\nabla V(\bar{x})| \leq \phi(\bar{x}), \quad (43)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and satisfy the inequality

$$\nabla V(\bar{x})^\top \bar{f}(\bar{x}) \leq (\kappa_3 - \gamma) |\nabla J(\bar{x} + x^*)|^2 < 0 \quad (44)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{M}_3$, where the functions α_1 and α_2 are \mathcal{K}_∞ functions, whose existence is guaranteed by the radial unboundedness of V [33, Lemma 4.3]. Since, by assumption $\gamma > \kappa_3$, system (25) satisfies items (a)-(b) in Assumption 2. Moreover, from Assumption 5, we have that $\alpha_J(|\bar{x}|)|\bar{x}| \leq |\nabla J(\bar{x} + x^*)|$, where α_J is a class \mathcal{K} function. Hence, system (25) satisfies item (c)-(ii)

in Assumption 2 with $\phi(\bar{x}) := |\nabla J(\bar{x} + x^*)|$. By Theorem 1 we conclude that system (25) is UGUB.

Next, we consider the case when $J^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. In this case, there exists $\bar{J} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $0 < \bar{J} < J^*$. Since J^* is the minimum value of the cost, it follows that $J(x) > \bar{J}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which implies that the previous computations hold with $\delta_1 = 0$. In addition, in this case Assumption 1 holds with $\delta_1 = 0$, and the Lyapunov function candidate V and the positive definite function ϕ in (41) still satisfy the inequalities (42)-(44) for any choice of $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$ and δ satisfying (7), with \mathcal{M}_j , for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, being the corresponding nested subsets defined in (10). Therefore, by invoking Corollary 3, we conclude that system (25) is UGpAS. Finally, if $J^* = 0$, we can take $\bar{J} = 0$ and in this case, Assumption 1 will be satisfied for all $\delta_1 \in (0, \infty)$ using $\bar{m} = \sqrt{2\omega_i \kappa}$ in (39). Therefore, by Corollary 2, we conclude that the closed-loop system is UGpAS. \blacksquare

5.7. Proof of Theorem 3

It is easy to see that the right hand side in (25) is C^0 and satisfies item (b) in Assumption 1. In addition, the maps $u_{i,j}$ are C^∞ , which implies that the maps $u_{i,j}(J(\cdot), \tau)$ are C^2 for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore, system (25) satisfies item (c) in Assumption 1. Also, note that

$$\left| D_x \left(u_{i,j}(J(x), \tau) \right) \right| \leq \sqrt{2\omega_i} |\nabla J(x)| \leq \sqrt{2\omega_i} M_J, \quad (45)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where we used item b) in Assumption 5. Therefore, system (25) satisfies item (a) in Assumption 1. A similar computation shows that system (25) satisfies item (d) in Assumption 1. Therefore, system (25) satisfies Assumption 1. Next, let $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$, and fix a choice of $\delta_3 \in (0, \infty)$, and let \mathcal{M}_j for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ be the corresponding nested subsets as defined in (10). Using the formula (9f), the nominal average system (13) corresponding to system (25) on \mathbb{R}^n , is given by

$$\dot{\bar{x}} = \bar{f}(\bar{x}) = b_0(\bar{x} + x^*) + \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^2 b_{i,j} b_{i,j}^\top \nabla J(\bar{x} + x^*). \quad (46)$$

Since the Lyapunov function candidate V and the function ϕ (41) now satisfy the inequalities (42)-(44) for all $x \in \mathcal{M}_3$, for any choice of $\delta_3 \in (0, \infty)$, it follows that system (25) satisfies items (a)-(b) in Assumption 2. Moreover, from item b) in Assumption 5, we have that $\alpha_J(|\bar{x}|) \leq |\nabla J(\bar{x} + x^*)|$, where α_J is a class \mathcal{K} function. Finally, using item b) in Assumption 5 and item d) in Assumption 4, we obtain that $|b_0(x)| \leq |\nabla J(x)| \leq L_J$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, we have the following Claim.

Claim 2. *The remainder map g from item (d) in Proposition 1 is uniformly bounded, for all $(x, \tau, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times [0, \varepsilon_0]$.*

The proof of Claim 2 can be found in the Appendix. From Claim 2, it follows that system (25) satisfies item (c)-(i) in Assumption 2. Therefore, by Corollary 3 we conclude that system (25) is UGpAS. \blacksquare

6. Conclusion and Future Work

In this manuscript, we introduced a (second-order) averaging method that allows us to study the stability properties of a

class of oscillatory systems with periodic flows based on the stability properties of their corresponding averaged systems. In contrast to existing results in the literature, the method is suitable for the study of uniform global (practical) stability properties. Such properties are studied under suitable assumptions, which, naturally, are stronger compared to others that only enable local or semi-global practical results. By leveraging the proposed method, we showed that a class of extremum seeking algorithms is able to achieve uniform global practical asymptotic stability for a broad range of cost functions, which include quadratic (with positive definite Hessian), strongly convex, and certain invex functions. Future research will extend these results via singular perturbation theory to study dynamic plants in the loop, as well as systems with hybrid dynamics.

References

- [1] M. Leblanc, Sur l'electrication des chemins de fer au moyen de courants alternatifs de frequence elevee, *Revue Generale de l'Electricite* (1922).
- [2] K. B. Ariyur, M. Krstic, *Real-time optimization by extremum-seeking control*, John Wiley & Sons, 2003.
- [3] Y. Tan, W. H. Moase, C. Manzie, D. Nešić, I. M. Mareels, Extremum seeking from 1922 to 2010, in: *Proceedings of the 29th Chinese control conference*, IEEE, 2010, pp. 14–26.
- [4] A. Scheinker, 100 years of extremum seeking: A survey, *Automatica* 161 (2024) 111481.
- [5] M. Krstić, H.-H. Wang, Stability of extremum seeking feedback for general nonlinear dynamic systems, *Automatica* 36 (4) (2000) 595–601.
- [6] D. Nesić, Y. Tan, W. H. Moase, C. Manzie, A unifying approach to extremum seeking: Adaptive schemes based on estimation of derivatives, in: *49th IEEE conference on decision and control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2010, pp. 4625–4630.
- [7] A. Ghaffari, M. Krstić, D. Nešić, Multivariable newton-based extremum seeking, *Automatica* 48 (8) (2012) 1759–1767.
- [8] Y. Tan, D. Nešić, I. Mareels, On non-local stability properties of extremum seeking control, *Automatica* 42 (6) (2006) 889–903.
- [9] Y. Tan, D. Nešić, I. Mareels, A. Astolfi, On global extremum seeking in the presence of local extrema, *Automatica* 45 (1) (2009) 245–251.
- [10] N. Mimmo, L. Marconi, G. Notarstefano, Uniform quasi-convex optimisation via extremum seeking, in: *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 6306–6311.
- [11] T. R. Oliveira, M. Krstić, D. Tsubakino, Extremum seeking for static maps with delays, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 62 (4) (2016) 1911–1926.
- [12] T. R. Oliveira, J. Feiling, S. Koga, M. Krstić, Multivariable extremum seeking for pde dynamic systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 65 (11) (2020) 4949–4956.
- [13] J. I. Poveda, A. R. Teel, A framework for a class of hybrid extremum seeking controllers with dynamic inclusions, *Automatica* 76 (2017) 113–126.
- [14] J. I. Poveda, N. Li, Robust hybrid zero-order optimization algorithms with acceleration via averaging in time, *Automatica* 123 (2021) 109361.
- [15] M. Abdelgalil, D. E. Ochoa, J. I. Poveda, Multi-time scale control and optimization via averaging and singular perturbation theory: From odes to hybrid dynamical systems, *Annual Reviews in Control* 56 (2023) 100926.
- [16] H.-B. Dürr, M. S. Stanković, C. Ebenbauer, K. H. Johansson, Lie bracket approximation of extremum seeking systems, *Automatica* 49 (6) (2013) 1538–1552.
- [17] M. Abdelgalil, H. Taha, Recursive averaging with application to bio-inspired 3-d source seeking, *IEEE Control Systems Letters* 6 (2022) 2816–2821.
- [18] A. Scheinker, M. Krstić, Extremum seeking with bounded update rates, *Systems & Control Letters* 63 (2014) 25–31.
- [19] A. Scheinker, M. Krstić, Non-c2 lie bracket averaging for nonsmooth extremum seekers, *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control* 136 (1) (2014).
- [20] M. Abdelgalil, H. Taha, Lie bracket approximation-based extremum seeking with vanishing input oscillations, *Automatica* 133 (2021) 109735.
- [21] V. Grushkovskaya, A. Zuyev, C. Ebenbauer, On a class of generating vector fields for the extremum seeking problem: Lie bracket approximation and stability properties, *Automatica* 94 (2018) 151–160.
- [22] H.-B. Dürr, M. S. Stanković, K. H. Johansson, C. Ebenbauer, Examples of distance-based synchronization: An extremum seeking approach, in: *2013 51st Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, IEEE, 2013, pp. 366–373.
- [23] H.-B. Dürr, M. S. Stanković, K. H. Johansson, C. Ebenbauer, Extremum seeking on submanifolds in the euclidian space, *Automatica* 50 (10) (2014) 2591–2596.
- [24] M. Abdelgalil, J. I. Poveda, On lie-bracket averaging for a class of hybrid dynamical systems with applications to model-free control and optimization, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15732* (2023).
- [25] R. Suttner, Extremum-seeking control for a class of mechanical systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 68 (2) (2022) 1200–1207.
- [26] R. Suttner, M. Krstić, Extremum seeking control for fully actuated mechanical systems on lie groups in the absence of dissipation, *Automatica* 152 (2023) 110945.
- [27] R. Suttner, M. Krstić, Attitude optimization by extremum seeking for rigid bodies actuated by internal rotors only, *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* (2023).
- [28] R. Suttner, M. Krstić, Nonholonomic source seeking in three dimensions using pitch and yaw torque inputs, *Systems & Control Letters* 178 (2023) 105584.
- [29] W. Jongeneel, E. Moulay, *Topological Obstructions to Stability and Stabilization: History, Recent Advances and Open Problems*, Springer Nature, 2023.
- [30] C. G. Mayhew, A. R. Teel, On the topological structure of attraction basins for differential inclusions, *Systems & Control Letters* 60 (12) (2011) 1045–1050.
- [31] N. Mimmo, L. Marconi, G. Notarstefano, An extremum seeking scheme with global convergence properties, *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 54 (14) (2021) 454–459.
- [32] C. K. Lauand, S. Meyn, Quasi-stochastic approximation: Design principles with applications to extremum seeking control, *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* 43 (5) (2023) 111–136.
- [33] H. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [34] S. Sastry, M. Bodson, J. F. Bartram, *Adaptive control: stability, convergence, and robustness* (1990).
- [35] J. M. Lee, *Smooth manifolds*, Springer, 2012.
- [36] A. R. Teel, D. Nesić, Averaging for a class of hybrid systems, *Dynamics of Continuous, Discrete and Impulsive Systems* 17 (6) (2010) 829–851.
- [37] A. Scheinker, X. Pang, L. Rybarcyk, Model-independent particle accelerator tuning, *Physical Review Special Topics-Accelerators and Beams* 16 (10) (2013) 102803.
- [38] R. Suttner, S. Dashkovskiy, Exponential stability for extremum seeking control systems, *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 50 (1) (2017) 15464–15470.
- [39] J. A. Sanders, F. Verhulst, J. Murdock, *Averaging methods in nonlinear dynamical systems*, Vol. 59, Springer, 2007.
- [40] A. Scheinker, M. Krstić, Minimum-seeking for clfs: Universal semiglobally stabilizing feedback under unknown control directions, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 58 (5) (2012) 1107–1122.
- [41] Y. Nesterov, *Lectures on Convex Optimization*, Springer, 2018.
- [42] H. Karimi, J. Nutini, M. Schmidt, Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the polyak-lojasiewicz condition, in: *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2016, Riva del Garda, Italy, September 19-23, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 16*, Springer, 2016, pp. 795–811.
- [43] D. S. Bernstein, *Matrix mathematics: theory, facts, and formulas*, Princeton university press, 2009.
- [44] J. Nestruev, A. Bocharov, S. Duzhin, *Smooth manifolds and observables*, Springer, 2003.
- [45] C. Cai, A. R. Teel, Characterizations of input-to-state stability for hybrid systems, *Systems & Control Letters* 58 (1) (2009) 47–53.
- [46] B. Polyak, *Introduction to Optimization*, Optimization Software Inc., NY, 2010.

Appendix A. Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma 7. *Let $J : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a μ -strongly convex C^1 function with L globally Lipschitz gradient. Then, item (d) in Assumption 5 is satisfied.*

Proof: The upper bound follows directly by [41, Thm. 2.1.5]. To obtain the lower bound, note that by μ -strong convexity:

$$(\nabla J(x_1) - \nabla J(x_2))^\top (x_1 - x_2) \geq \mu |x_1 - x_2|^2,$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, it is easy to see that the following holds $|\nabla J(x_1) - \nabla J(x_2)| \geq \mu |x_1 - x_2|$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It follows that

$$|\nabla J(x_1) - \nabla J(x_2)|^2 \geq \mu^2 |x_1 - x_2|^2.$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\alpha_J : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \mu)$ be given by $\alpha_J(s) := \mu \tanh(s)$, which is strictly increasing and satisfies $\alpha_J(0) = 0$. Therefore, $\alpha_J \in \mathcal{K}$ and, by definition, $\alpha_J(s) < \mu$, for all $s \geq 0$. It follows that

$$|\nabla J(x_1) - \nabla J(x_2)|^2 \geq \alpha_J(|x_1 - x_2|)^2 |x_1 - x_2|^2.$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 8. *Let $J : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined in Example 3. Then, J satisfies Assumption 3.*

Proof: The cost function J can be written as $J = h \circ H$ where $h(s) = s + 3 \sin(\sqrt{s})^2$ and $H(x) := |x - x^*|^2$ are C^∞ everywhere on their domain. Moreover, $H(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore, the function $J = h \circ H$ is C^∞ . The derivative of J satisfies

$$\nabla J(x) = Dh(H(x))\nabla H(x) = 2Dh(H(x))(x - x^*),$$

where

$$Dh(H(x)) = \frac{1}{2} \left(2 + \frac{3 \sin(2\sqrt{H(x)})}{\sqrt{H(x)}} \right) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It follows that

$$|\nabla J(x)|^2 = 4|Dh(H(x))(x - x^*)|^2 = 4Dh(H(x))^2(x - x^*)^2,$$

and it can be verified that $\frac{1}{4} < Dh(H(x)) < 4$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore, there exists $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have that

$$|\nabla J(x)|^2 \geq 4\mu^2 |x - x^*|^2 \geq \alpha_J(|x - x^*|)^2 |x - x^*|^2,$$

where $\alpha_J(s) := 2\mu \tanh(s)$. Similarly, the second derivative of J satisfies

$$\nabla^2 J(x) = D^2h(H(x))\nabla H(x)\nabla H(x)^\top + Dh(H(x))\nabla^2 H(x),$$

where

$$D^2h(H(x)) = \frac{3 \cos(2\sqrt{H(x)})}{2H(x)} - \frac{3 \sin(2\sqrt{H(x)})}{4H(x)^{3/2}},$$

It follows that

$$|\nabla^2 J(x)| \leq |D^2h(H(x))|\|\nabla H(x)\|^2 + |Dh(H(x))|\|\nabla^2 H(x)\|,$$

where $|D^2h(H(x))| \leq \frac{3}{H(x)}$. Hence, the Hessian satisfies the inequality

$$|\nabla^2 J(x)| \leq \frac{3|\nabla H(x)|^2}{H(x)} + 8 \leq 20.$$

Appendix B. Proofs of Auxiliary Claims

Appendix B.1. Proof of Claim 1

Proof: The matrix $D_x\Phi(x, \tau)$ is a square matrix, and therefore its singular value decomposition is given by

$$D_x\Phi(x, \tau) = V(x, \tau)\Sigma(x, \tau)U(x, \tau)^\top,$$

where the matrices $V(x, \tau)$ and $U(x, \tau)$ are orthonormal matrices and $\Sigma(x, \tau)$ is a square diagonal matrix with the singular values of $D_x\Phi(x, \tau)$ on the diagonal. Since for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \bar{\varepsilon}_2]$, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix $D_x\Phi(x, \tau)$ are contained in the compact interval $[1 - 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon, 1 + 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon] \subset [1/2, 3/2]$, it follows that the singular values of $D_x\Phi(x, \tau)$ coincide with its eigenvalues and therefore are also contained in the compact interval $[1 - 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon, 1 + 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon] \subset [1/2, 3/2]$. Moreover, the matrix $D_x\Phi(x, \tau)$ is invertible and its inverse coincides with its pseudo-inverse. From the singular value decomposition of $D_x\Phi(x, \tau)$, we have that its pseudo-inverse $D_x\Phi(x, \tau)^\dagger$ is given by

$$D_x\Phi(x, \tau)^\dagger = U(x, \tau)\Sigma(x, \tau)^\dagger V(x, \tau)^\top,$$

However, $\Sigma(x, \tau)^\dagger$ is simply the inverse of $\Sigma(x, \tau)$ which is well-defined since $\Sigma(x, \tau)$ is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries belong to the compact interval $[1 - 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon, 1 + 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon] \subset [1/2, 3/2]$. Therefore, we have that

$$D_x\Phi(x, \tau)^{-1} = D_x\Phi(x, \tau)^\dagger = U(x, \tau)\Sigma(x, \tau)^{-1}V(x, \tau)^\top,$$

and, using the properties of the operator norm of matrices, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |D_x\Phi(x, \tau)| &\leq |U(x, \tau)| |\Sigma(x, \tau)| |V(x, \tau)| \\ |D_x\Phi(x, \tau)^{-1}| &\leq |U(x, \tau)| |\Sigma(x, \tau)^{-1}| |V(x, \tau)| \end{aligned}$$

Since $U(x, \tau)$ and $V(x, \tau)$ are orthonormal matrices, it follows that $|U(x, \tau)| = |V(x, \tau)| = 1$. In addition, since $\Sigma(x, \tau)$ is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries belong to the compact interval $[1 - 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon, 1 + 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon] \subset [1/2, 3/2]$, we have that $|\Sigma(x, \tau)| \leq 1 + 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon \leq \frac{3}{2}$, and $|\Sigma(x, \tau)^{-1}| \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon} \leq 2$. However, since $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4\tilde{L}_\Psi}$, then $\frac{1}{1 - 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon} \leq 1 + 4\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon$. Therefore, we have that

$$|D_x\Phi(x, \tau)| \leq 1 + 2\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon, \quad |D_x\Phi(x, \tau)^{-1}| \leq 1 + 4\tilde{L}_\Psi\varepsilon.$$

It follows that the inverse of the Jacobian matrix $D\Psi(x, \tau)$ is well-defined and is given by (28), [43, p.146]. The proof of the claim is concluded by defining $L_\Psi := 4\tilde{L}_\Psi$. \blacksquare

Appendix B.2. Proof of Claim 2

Proof: The map g from item (d) in Proposition 1 has the explicit form

$$g(x, \tau, \varepsilon) = \sum_{k=1}^5 G_k(x, \tau, \varepsilon) g_k(x, \tau, \varepsilon),$$

where the matrix-valued maps G_i are uniformly bounded and the maps g_i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x, \tau) &= v_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), & g_2(x, \tau) &= -f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), \\ g_3(x, \tau) &= -f_1 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), & g_4(x, \tau) &= v_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau), \\ g_5(x, \tau) &= -f_2 \circ \Psi^{-1}(x, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

In this case, since $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$, we have that $\hat{f}_k(x, \tau) = f_k(x, \tau)$, and therefore we obtain that

$$f_1(x, \tau) = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^2 b_{i,j} \sqrt{2\omega_i} \xi_i(J(x) + \omega_i \tau), \quad f_2(x, \tau) = b_0(x),$$

where $\xi_1(s) = \cos(s)$ and $\xi_2(s) = \sin(s)$. Clearly, for all $(x, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have that

$$|f_1(x, \tau)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^2 \sqrt{2\omega_i} |b_{i,j}|, \quad |f_2(x, \tau)| \leq |\nabla J(x)| \leq M_J.$$

where used item b) in Assumption 5. In addition, direct differentiation shows that

$$|D_x f_1(x, \tau)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^2 \sqrt{2\omega_i} |b_{i,j}| |\nabla J(x)|,$$

which is also uniformly bounded due to item b) in Assumption 5. Since v_1 is the integral of f_1 with respect to τ and is periodic in τ , it follows that v_1 is also uniformly bounded. Similarly, v_2 is the integral with respect to τ of terms that (smoothly) depend on f_1 , $D_x f_1$, and f_2 , all of which are uniformly bounded, and is periodic in τ . It follows that v_2 is also uniformly bounded. Finally, since Ψ^{-1} is C^1 -diffeomorphism, it follows that all the maps g_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ are uniformly bounded. Therefore, the remainder map g is also uniformly bounded. ■