

Unifying Controller Design for Stabilizing Nonlinear Systems with Norm-Bounded Control Inputs [★]

Ming Li ^a, Zhiyong Sun ^a, Siep Weiland ^a

^a*Control Systems Group, Department of Electrical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven 5600MB, The Netherlands*

Abstract

This paper revisits a classical challenge in the design of stabilizing controllers for nonlinear systems with a norm-bounded input constraint. By extending Lin-Sontag's universal formula and introducing a generic (state-dependent) scaling term, a unifying controller design method is proposed. The incorporation of this generic scaling term gives a unified controller and enables the derivation of alternative universal formulas with various favorable properties, which makes it suitable for tailored control designs to meet specific requirements and provides versatility across different control scenarios. Additionally, we present a constructive approach to determine the optimal scaling term, leading to an explicit solution to an optimization problem, named optimization-based universal formula. The resulting controller ensures asymptotic stability, satisfies a norm-bounded input constraint, and optimizes a predefined cost function. Finally, the essential properties of the unified controllers are analyzed, including smoothness, continuity at the origin, stability margin, and inverse optimality. Simulations validate the approach, showcasing its effectiveness in addressing a challenging stabilizing control problem of a nonlinear system.

Key words: Nonlinear Systems; Stabilizing Control; Norm-Bounded Input Constraint; Universal Formula.

1 Introduction

The design of stabilizing controllers is crucial for complex nonlinear systems, such as power systems, chemical processes, and biomedical systems [1]. Over the years, many nonlinear control methods have emerged for designing stabilizing controllers, including techniques like linearization, recursive integrator backstepping, state-dependent Riccati control, and control Lyapunov functions (CLFs) [2]. Among these solutions, the CLF-based method is particularly valuable because it offers analytical guarantees such as asymptotic stability, inverse optimality, and robustness to uncertainty [3].

Sontag's universal formula [4] is a widely used CLF-based approach in the design of stabilizing controllers [5]. In contrast to Freeman and Kokotovic's pointwise minimum (PMN) method [3], Sontag's formula eliminates

the need for real-time optimization by offering an explicit and analytical expression based on CLF conditions. This results in a faster real-time computation, making it well-suited for platforms with limited computational resources. Moreover, it enjoys several desirable properties, including smoothness, inverse optimality, and infinite stability margin [1, 6], rendering the resulting controller applicable to various fields such as unmanned aerial vehicles [7, 8], adaptive cruise control [9], and biomedical applications [10].

Despite these benefits, Sontag's universal formula does not take input constraints into account [11]. This restriction becomes especially critical given that a considerable number of real-world feedback systems incorporate actuators with saturation constraints. To overcome this challenge, Lin and Sontag have introduced a modified version of Sontag's universal formula (Lin-Sontag's universal formula) in [11], where a special (state-dependent) scaling term is introduced to ensure asymptotic stability and the satisfaction of a norm-bounded input constraint. Building upon the work of Lin and Sontag in [11], in recent years, substantial progress has been made in extending the design of stabilizing controllers to address different types of input constraints, utilizing modified versions of Sontag's universal formulas. Specifically, according to the criteria outlined in [12], the extension work is

[★] This paper was not presented at any IFAC meeting. This work was supported in part by a starting grant from Eindhoven Artificial Intelligence Systems Institute (EAISI), The Netherlands. Corresponding author: Z. Sun.

Email addresses: m.li3@tue.nl (Ming Li), z.sun@tue.nl (Zhiyong Sun), s.weiland@tue.nl (Siep Weiland).

categorized into control input sets with smooth boundaries, such as the Euclidean ball [11] and Minkowski ball [13], and those with non-smooth boundaries, exemplified by polytopes [12, 14, 15] and hyperboxes [16, 17]. More recently, beyond the categorization, some authors have attempted to design universal formulas for stabilizing controllers with model uncertainty and input constraints [18], state and input constraints [19], and safety constraints (e.g., control barrier function, (CBF)) [9, 20].

In this paper, different from the work that focuses on finding a modified universal formula adaptable to different sets of control inputs, our goal is to develop a unifying controller design method that allows us to derive alternative universal formulas for addressing stabilization problems with a constrained control input. Generally, those universal formulas provide flexibility for tailored control designs to specific requirements and offer versatility across various control scenarios. Besides, applying these formulas aids in developing an optimal stabilizing controller, addressing objectives such as achieving an ideal stability margin, minimizing control energy consumption, and maximizing convergence speed.

In this paper, we establish a unifying controller design method for formulating alternative universal formulas tailored to the design of a stabilizing controller with a *norm-bounded* control input. The contributions of the paper are three-fold:

- (1) We propose a unifying controller design method that extends Lin-Sontag’s universal formula to a unified controller that satisfies a norm-bounded input constraint. By generalizing the specific (state-dependent) scaling term in Lin-Sontag’s formula, we define a generic scaling term with a specified validity range, resulting in a unified controller with a certain structure. This unifying controller design method allows for exploring alternative universal formulas by selecting different scaling terms, and we demonstrate that Lin-Sontag’s universal formula corresponds to a particular scaling term.
- (2) We develop a constructive method to identify an optimal scaling term. By formulating an optimization aimed at minimizing the control input energy and the modification of Sontag’s universal formula, we obtain an optimization-based universal formula. It not only guarantees asymptotic stability and satisfies a norm-bounded input constraint but also optimizes a predefined cost function.
- (3) We analyze the crucial properties of the unified controller, including smoothness, continuity at the origin, stability margin, and inverse optimality. Specifically, the unified controller is smooth for all points except the origin as long as the scaling term is a real-analytic function. Moreover, continuity at the origin is guaranteed by the small control property (SCP) assumption. The unified controller, which

has a stability margin $[0, \infty)$, is always inverse optimal.

Finally, we highlight additional advantages of the unified controllers. Firstly, it is well-known that Sontag’s (and Lin-Sontag’s) universal formulas lack parameters for tuning control performances. In contrast, the generic scaling term in our solution enables the fine-tuning of the universal formula’s performances, resulting in a controller with various favorable properties. Moreover, our proposed framework can be extended to address challenges present in current studies, particularly those related to safety-critical control [21, 22]. As indicated in [23], Sontag’s universal formula may exhibit excessive intrusiveness when applied to a safety filter. The incorporation of the scaling term in our unified controller allows us to mitigate this intrusiveness while simultaneously introducing other desired properties.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the PMN controller, Sontag’s universal formula, and Lin-Sontag’s universal formula are introduced. In Section 3, the unifying controller method is presented, which extends Lin-Sontag’s formula with a generic scaling term, and we further outline a constructive approach for identifying an optimal scaling term. Section 4 studies crucial properties of the unified controllers, followed by validation through a numerical example in Section 5. Conclusions and further research directions are reported in Section 6.

2 Universal Formulas for Stabilizing Nonlinear Systems

Consider a control-affine system

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{x}_0, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input, and $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{g} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are smooth functions, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$. Given a smooth state-feedback controller $\mathbf{u} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, the closed-loop system dynamics are:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{f}_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2)$$

Since the functions \mathbf{f} , \mathbf{g} , and \mathbf{u} are assumed to be smooth, the function $\mathbf{f}_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x})$ is also smooth. Consequently, for any initial condition $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{0}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a time interval $I(\mathbf{x}_0) = [0, t_{\text{max}})$ such that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is the unique smooth solution to (2) on $I(\mathbf{x}_0)$. Note that, without a specific declaration, \mathbf{u} consistently refers a state-feedback control law $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})$ afterward.

Definition 2.1. (CLF [4]) *A smooth, positive definite, and radially unbounded function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a CLF for the system (1) if, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, there exists a control $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying*

$$a(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} < 0 \quad (3)$$




Fig. 1. A graphical exhibition illustrating the construction of our proposed universal formula in an \mathbf{x} -compatible scenario: the whole area indicates a 2-D control space $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^2$; the admissible control input set $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ and \mathcal{B} are represented by the green and lavender areas, respectively; the magenta dashed segment (relating to $\max\left(-\frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}, 0\right) \leq \kappa \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}$) represents solutions of PMN controllers that simultaneously satisfy the constraint (10) and the input constraint (7). In contrast, the blue ray (corresponding to $\kappa > \frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}$) represents solutions that satisfy the constraint (10) but not satisfying the input constraint (7); Sontag's universal formula is the blue point on the blue ray; Lin-Sontag's universal formula is the magenta point on the magenta dashed segment; the green dashed line represents a hyperplane \mathbf{H}_{CLF} .

where $a(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = L_{\mathbf{f}}V(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = L_{\mathbf{g}}V(\mathbf{x})$, $L_{\mathbf{f}}$ and $L_{\mathbf{g}}$ denote the Lie derivatives along \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} , respectively.

Definition 2.1 indicates the existence of a state-feedback controller that renders the origin of the closed-loop system (1) globally asymptotically stable. Moreover, the CLF condition (3) limits the choice of admissible control inputs for stabilizing. Because of the dependency on \mathbf{x} , we write the admissible input as a set-valued function $\mathcal{S}_V : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m : a(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} < 0\}.$$

To provide a graphical illustration of $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$, a 2-D control input space $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is provided in Fig. 1. For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ is a half-space.

2.1 PMN Controller and Sontag's Universal Formula

Given a CLF, a specific state-feedback control law can be synthesized through the pointwise min-norm (PMN) approach [24] and Sontag's universal formula [24]. To exhibit the relationship between these two approaches, the CLF condition given in (3) is tightened with a continuous, positive definite function $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, where the PMN optimization is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{u}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here, $\|\mathbf{u}\|$ denotes the 2-norm of the control input \mathbf{u} , and the cost function of (4) aims to minimize the energy of the control input.

Lemma 2.2. *The solution of (4) can be explicitly expressed as*

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{PMN}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{m}_{\text{PMN}}^*(\mathbf{x}), & a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where the superscript “*” indicates that $\mathbf{u}_{\text{PMN}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ is the optimal solution of (4), and $\mathbf{m}_{\text{PMN}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top$.

Proof. The solution to (4) can be obtained using the projection theorem. More details can be found in [3]. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Sontag's universal formula, which is expressed as follows:*

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{m}_{\text{Stg}}^*(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{0}, & \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{m}_{\text{Stg}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top$, and

$$\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) := \sqrt{(a(\mathbf{x}))^2 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^4},$$

is a special solution to the PMN optimization (4) if $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ in (4) equals to $\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$.

Proof. By comparing the solution to the PMN controller (5) with Sontag's universal formula (6), we recognize that $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ is a special result of $\mathbf{u}_{\text{PMN}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ by choosing $\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$. \square

Remark 2.4. *The function $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ in (4) offers various choices, and the selection is made according to specific application requirements. In addition to choosing $\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ as in (6) which gives Sontag's universal formula, an alternative special choice is*

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = l(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u},$$

where $l(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, and $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})$ is a positive definite function for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. This formulation leads to the stabilizing controller design for satisficing control [25].

Further, the small control property (SCP) for the CLF V is provided to investigate the continuity of the universal formula at the origin.

Definition 2.5. (SCP) *The SCP holds for a CLF V if, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that if $0 < \|\mathbf{x}\| < \delta$, there is some \mathbf{u}_c with $\|\mathbf{u}_c\| < \varepsilon$ satisfying the CLF condition (3).*

2.2 Lin-Sontag's Universal Formula

Sontag's universal formula is valid for designing stabilizing controllers with unbounded control inputs, i.e., the control input \mathbf{u} in condition (3) allows to take arbitrary values. However, it may not be applicable to situations where control inputs are bounded. Specifically, we consider the following constraint on the control input.

$$\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq 1, \quad (7)$$

and define the closed unit ball $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|\mathbf{u}\| \leq 1\}$. We note that there is no loss of generality in enforcing $\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq 1$ since, by properly scaling of $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ with a constant $\gamma > 0$, this can easily be extended to a more generic input constraint $\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \gamma$.

Definition 2.6. (*x-Compatibility*) *The CLF condition is said to be x-compatible with a norm-bounded input constraint if, for a particular $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ that satisfies (3) and (7) simultaneously.*

Assumption 2.7. *The CLF condition (3) is x-compatible with the norm-bounded input constraint (7).*

In practice, Assumption 2.7 may not always be satisfied, which indicates potential incompatibility between the CLF condition and control input constraint. To address this, relaxation strategies can be employed. One approach is to relax the CLF condition, and thus we define the δ -CLF condition as $a(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} < \delta$, where $\delta > 0$. Consequently, it leads to an expansion of $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ in Fig. 1, which ensures intersections between the expanded $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ and \mathcal{B} . Alternatively, the control input constraint can be relaxed by inflating the area \mathcal{B} by requiring $\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \gamma$, where $\gamma > 1$. This operation will guarantee intersections between the $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ and the enlarged \mathcal{B} . Generally, the first solution can be understood as implicitly choosing a new CLF $\tilde{V}(\mathbf{x})$ that $\tilde{a}(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} = a(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} - \delta$, where $\tilde{a}(\mathbf{x}) = L_{\mathbf{f}}\tilde{V}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{x}) = L_{\mathbf{g}}\tilde{V}(\mathbf{x})$. For the second solution, we interpret it as a scaling operation that redefines the control input constraint as $\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\| \leq 1$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u}/\gamma$, $\gamma > 1$. Utilizing one of the strategies will guarantee the x-compatibility of the δ -CLF condition and the scaled control input constraint, which means that Assumption 2.7 still holds for the newly defined CLF and the scaled control input constraint.

In the following, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we always assume that Assumption 2.7 holds.

Lemma 2.8. *The CLF condition given by (3) is x-compatible with the input constraint (7) if and only if \mathbf{x} is in the set $\mathcal{S}_{\text{cpt}} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} : \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq a(\mathbf{x})\}$.*

Proof. We establish the proof of this lemma through a graphical explanation. When $a(\mathbf{x}) < 0$, we notice that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ is within both $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ and \mathcal{B} . This indicates that the CLF condition (3) and the input constraint (7) are always x-compatible for all \mathbf{x} that satisfies $a(\mathbf{x}) < 0$. In

the case of $a(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, as illustrated in Fig. 1, the CLF condition corresponds to the green dashed line. The x-compatibility condition necessitates that the minimum distance from the origin to the hyperplane \mathbf{H}_{CLF} (green dashed line) is less than 1, i.e., $\|-\frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top\| \leq 1$, which gives $\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq a(\mathbf{x})$. Combining both cases, we conclude that $\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq a(\mathbf{x})$ ensures x-compatibility irrespective of the sign of $a(\mathbf{x})$. \square

Note that the statement of Lemma 2.8 has been presented in [11] but without a formal proof. Moreover, we remark that when considering the input constraint $\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \gamma$, the necessary and sufficient condition for the x-compatibility of the CLF and the input constraint scales to $\gamma\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq a(\mathbf{x})$. The proof can be done by following the same process of proving Lemma 2.8.

Fig. 1 illustrates an example that satisfies Assumption 2.7. In this depiction, there are intersections between sets $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ and \mathcal{B} , but Sontag's universal formula (denoted by the blue point) does not extend into the region of intersection. This suggests that, although it is possible to achieve closed-loop asymptotic stability, Sontag's universal formula fails to satisfy the CLF condition (3) and the input constraint (7) simultaneously. To overcome this challenge, a modification of Sontag's universal formula is proposed by Lin and Sontag in [11], named Lin-Sontag's formula, which is given as

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg-BI}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{m}_{\text{Stg-BI}}^*(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{0}, & \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{m}_{\text{Stg-BI}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2(1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2})}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top$.

Lemma 2.9. *Lin-Sontag's universal formula (8) is the solution to the following PMN optimization:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \\ & \text{s.t.} \frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}} + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Proof. Firstly, we introduce a state-dependent scaling term $\frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}}$ to the offset of the constraint in (4), i.e., $a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma(\mathbf{x})$, and replace $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ with $\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$. Consequently, it gives a PMN optimization as provided in (9). Next, utilizing Lemma 2.2 gives the solution to (9), which is Lin-Sontag's universal formula (8). \square

Generally, Lemma 2.2 demonstrates that an explicit solution to a PMN optimization can be obtained, which is usually referred to as a universal formula. In contrast, Lemma 2.9 reveals that a universal formula corresponds to a PMN optimization. This observation high-

lights the intrinsic connections between the PMN optimization and a universal formula.

Geometrically, the scaling term in (9), i.e., $\frac{1}{1+\sqrt{1+\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}}$, leads to the blue point in Fig. 1 shifting to the magenta point that lies in the intersection region of $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ and \mathcal{B} , which means that the resulting universal formula in (9) ensures closed-loop asymptotic stability and satisfies a norm-bounded input constraint simultaneously.

3 A Unifying Controller Design Method

This section is devoted to generalizing the results in (8) by introducing a generic scaling term, which modifies Sontag's universal formula law in (6) and gives a universal formula that takes the norm-bounded input constraint (7) into account. Furthermore, we present a constructive approach to identify the optimal scaling term, which gives an optimization-based universal formula.

3.1 A Unified Controller

As explained in (9), the scaling term $\frac{1}{1+\sqrt{1+\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}}$ leads to a shift of the blue point in Fig. 1 associated with Sontag's universal formula law. However, in Fig. 1, the existence of a magenta dashed segment within the intersection regions of $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ and \mathcal{B} implies that we have various choices of the scaling term. These terms enable a feasible shift, ensuring that the blue point in Fig. 1 moves to a point situated within the intersection region of $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ and \mathcal{B} . With this recognition, we introduce a tightened CLF condition with a state-dependent scaling term $\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\kappa \geq 0$, as follows.

$$(a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \leq 0. \quad (10)$$

Remark 3.1. *The constraint presented in (9) can be interpreted as a constraint of the form*

$$\zeta(a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} < 0, \quad (11)$$

with the specific choice of $\zeta = \zeta_{\text{Stg-BI}} = \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{1+\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}}$.

This insight motivates us to generalize the constraint in (9) to (11) with a generic scaling term ζ . We notice that employing (10) achieves a similar shifting effect as (11), and has more straightforward interpretations. Specifically, when choosing $\kappa = 0$ and $\kappa = 1$ in (10), they correspond to the CLF condition (3) and the tightened CLF constraint in (4) with $\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$, respectively.

Theorem 3.2. *The following universal formula law ensures the closed-loop system (1) to be global asymptotically stable and satisfies the norm-bounded input constraint (7) simultaneously:*

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{m}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}), & \kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x}), \\ \mathbf{0}, & \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x}) := \{\kappa \in \mathbb{R} \mid \max\left(-\frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0\right) \leq \kappa \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\}$, $\mathbf{m}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top$.

Proof. Due to Assumption 2.7, we have $\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq a(\mathbf{x})$ using Lemma 2.8. Therefore, we can always ensure that $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \emptyset$ as $\frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} \geq \max\left(-\frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0\right)$. Next, we examine whether $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies the CLF condition (3). Firstly, the case of $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ is trivial since $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ is given in (12) by definition. For the case of $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{m}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})$, substituting it into (3) gives

$$a(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top = -\kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) < 0.$$

Additionally, we need to ensure that $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ remains within the specified control input limit range defined by $\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq 1$. Firstly, $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ is included in the set denoted by \mathcal{B} , thus the second case in (12) always satisfies the input constraint. Afterward, we notice that

$$\|\mathbf{m}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})\| = \left\| \frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top \right\| \leq 1$$

given the condition $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x})$. Thereby the universal formula law $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ ensures closed-loop asymptotic stability for the system (1) with bounded control inputs. The proof is complete. \square

Generally, the control input given in Theorem 3.2 shifts the blue point in Fig. 1 using the scaling term κ . With the control input given in (12), it ensures that the shifted point, associated with $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})$, always resides within the intersection regions of $\mathcal{S}_V(\mathbf{x})$ and \mathcal{B} . We point out that a specific choice for κ can be made, such as

$$\kappa_{\text{Lin-Stg}} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - a(\mathbf{x})\sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}\right)}. \quad (13)$$

With this selection, the resulting control law (12) becomes Lin-Sontag's universal formula, i.e., $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg-BI}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ as in (8). This indicates that Lin-Sontag's universal formula can be obtained by defining a specific scaling term within the unified controller. Furthermore, as demonstrated in [11], this choice yields desirable properties for the control input, such as smoothness away from the origin and continuity everywhere. Furthermore, note that alternative choices for κ are possible as long as κ satisfies (12), e.g., $\kappa_1 = \frac{\|a(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}$, $\kappa_2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} - a(\mathbf{x})\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 (1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2})}$, and $\kappa_3 = (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2)/2$, and we can easily show that $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x})$.

3.2 A Constructive Approach

As noticed, Theorem 3.2 presents the general expression of a universal formula for stabilizing a nonlinear system, which incorporates the norm-bounded input constraint. However, a constructive method for designing such a universal formula, i.e., specifying a particular κ for the universal formula in (12), is not given. To fill this gap, we propose to obtain an optimal κ by treating the scaling term κ as a decision variable. Motivated by Lin-Sontag's formula, which modifies Sontag's formula to derive a control law that respects both the CLF condition (3) and the input constraint (7), our objective is to minimize modifications to Sontag's universal formula (corresponding to $1 - \kappa$) while minimizing control input energy simultaneously. Consequently, we formulate the following optimization problem.

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{u}, \kappa\} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}} \frac{1}{2} (\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + m(1 - \kappa)^2), \quad (14a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad a(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \leq -\kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (14b)$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq 1, \quad (14c)$$

where $m \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant that satisfies $m \geq \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Note that $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})$ is a smooth and bounded function, thus there always exists an m satisfying the given conditions. If one does not incorporate the constraint on m , it may lead to $\kappa < 0$, which will be highlighted in the proof of Theorem 3.4. Furthermore, we emphasize that Sontag's universal formula corresponds to the specific case for (14b) where $\kappa = 1$. Based on this, we recognize that minimizing the modification of Sontag's universal formula essentially is to make $(1 - \kappa)^2$ as small as possible.

Theorem 3.3. *The solution of (14) defines a universal formula, which is given by*

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg-Opt}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} -\frac{m(a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}))}{(\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}))^2 + m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top, & \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_1, \\ -\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top, & \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_2, \\ \mathbf{0}, & \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_4, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1 &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) - ma(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \\ &\quad - m\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| > 0, \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_2 &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) - ma(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \\ &\quad - m\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq 0, \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_4 &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The control law (15) can equivalently be expressed by the form of the unified controller in (12), where

$$\kappa = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{(a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) + m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}, & \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_1, \\ \frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, & \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_2. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Proof. Given that Assumption 2.7 is satisfied, we can infer that $\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq a(\mathbf{x})$ according to Lemma 2.8. Furthermore, the optimization problem (14) is consistently feasible because $\kappa = 0$ (relating to the satisfaction of Assumption 2.7) always guarantees the compatibility of (14b) and (14c). The Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \kappa, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{2} (\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + m(1 - \kappa)^2) + \lambda_1 [a(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \\ &\quad + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})] + \lambda_2 (\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - 1). \end{aligned}$$

According to the Karush-Kuhn-Trucker (KKT) conditions [26], the solution is optimal if the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{u}^\top + \lambda_1 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) + 2\lambda_2 \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (17a)$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbf{u} = -\frac{\lambda_1}{1 + 2\lambda_2} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top,$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \kappa} = m(\kappa - 1) + \lambda_1 \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad (17b)$$

$$\Rightarrow \kappa = 1 - \frac{\lambda_1 \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{m},$$

$$\lambda_1 F_1 = \lambda_1 [a(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})] = 0, \quad (17c)$$

$$\lambda_2 F_2 = \lambda_2 (\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - 1) = 0, \quad (17d)$$

where $F_1 = a(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ and $F_2 = \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - 1$.

Generally, we consider the following four cases.

Case 1. $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$. *The tightened CLF condition (14b) is active while the input constraint (14c) is inactive.*

In this case, we have

$$(a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (18a)$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 < 1, \quad (18b)$$

$$\lambda_1 \geq 0, \quad (18c)$$

$$\lambda_2 = 0. \quad (18d)$$

By substituting (18d) into (17a), it gives $\mathbf{u} = -\lambda_1 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top$. Then utilizing the result $\mathbf{u} = -\lambda_1 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top$ and (17b), (18a) will lead to $\lambda_1 = \frac{m(a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}))}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) + m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}$. Consequently, we know that the control input is $\mathbf{u} = -\frac{m(a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}))}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) + m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top$ and the scaling variable $\kappa = 1 - \frac{(a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) + m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}$. The conditions (18b) and (18c) define the domain set to be $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) - ma(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - m\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| > 0, \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\}$.

Case 2. $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$. *Both the tightened CLF condition (14b) and the input constraint (14c) are active.*

For this special case, we obtain that

$$(a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (19a)$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 = 1, \quad (19b)$$

$$\lambda_1 \geq 0, \quad (19c)$$

$$\lambda_2 \geq 0. \quad (19d)$$

We substitute the results in (17a) and (17b) into (19a) and (19b), which yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})}{m} & 0 \\ \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| & -2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x}) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

Solving the equation (20) gives

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{m(a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})) - \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x})},$$

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|(a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|)}{2\sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{1}{2}.$$

By using (17a) and (17b), we can deduce that if $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{u} = -\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top$ and $\kappa = \frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}$. Finally, with (19c) and (19d), it gives

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg-Opt}} = -\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_2,$$

where $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) - ma(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - m\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq 0, \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\}$.

Case 3. $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$. The tightened CLF condition (14b) is not activated (no matter whether the input constraint (14c) is active or inactive).

Since the tightened CLF condition (14b) is inactive, we know that

$$(a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} < 0, \quad (21a)$$

$$\lambda_1 = 0. \quad (21b)$$

Therefore, by substituting $\lambda_1 = 0$ into (17a) and (17b), we obtain that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\kappa = 1$. Next, we substitute the obtained results into (21a), and it leads to $a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) < 0$. As a result, the domain set is defined as $\mathcal{S}_3 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) < 0\}$. Due to that $a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is always true, it implies that $\mathcal{S}_3 = \emptyset$. Thereby Case 3 will never occur.

Case 4. $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$.

When $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, it corresponds to the second case of (12), which gives $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. Correspondingly, the domain set is defined as $\mathcal{S}_4 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}\}$ \square

Theorem 3.4. *The optimization-based universal formula, i.e., control law provided in (15), ensures that the closed-loop system (1) is globally asymptotically stable and satisfies the input constraint (7) simultaneously.*

Proof. It has been proved in Theorem 3.3 that the optimization-based universal formula can be written in the form of the unified controller (12). However, it remains to verify that $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x})$ when $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_2$. Firstly, consider $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_1$. It can be verified that $\max\left(-\frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0\right) < \kappa = 1 - \frac{(a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}))\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) + m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} < \frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}$ since $m \geq \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}$ and $m\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) - ma(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - m\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| > 0$. Note that, without the condition $m \geq \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}$, it may yield $\kappa < 0$. For the case that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_2$, we observe that $\kappa = \frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| - a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x})$ according to the definition of $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x})$ in (12). Based on Theorem 3.2, we obtain the conclusion that, with control law provided in (15), the closed-loop system (1) is globally asymptotically stable and satisfies the input constraint (7) simultaneously. \square

4 Property Analysis of the Unified Controller

In this section, we propose to show some essential properties of the unified controller (12) and the optimization-based universal formula (15). These properties include smoothness, continuity at the origin, stability margin, and inverse optimality.

4.1 Smoothness and Continuity at the Origin

4.1.1 The Unified Controller

Firstly, we define an open subset in \mathbb{R}^2 , denoted as $\Xi = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 | b > 0 \text{ or } a < 0\}$, and introduce the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume $\iota : \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be real-analytic. The following function $\varphi(a, b, \iota(a, b))$ defined by*

$$\varphi(a, b, \iota(a, b)) = \begin{cases} \frac{a + \iota\sqrt{a^2 + bq(b)}}{b} & \text{if } b \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } b = 0, \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

is real-analytic, where $q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a real-analytic function such that $q(0) = 0$ and $bq(b) > 0$ whenever $b \neq 0$.

Proof. By following the proof in [4], we know that the function

$$\phi(a, b) = \begin{cases} \frac{a + \sqrt{a^2 + bq(b)}}{b} & \text{if } b \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } b = 0, \end{cases}$$

is real-analytic on Ξ . Further, we define an alternative function as follows.

$$\Gamma(a, b) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{a^2 + bq(b)}}{b} & \text{if } b \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } b = 0. \end{cases}$$

It can be verified that $\Gamma(a, b)$ is the solution of the following algebraic equation.

$$F(a, b, p) = bp^2 - \sqrt{a^2 + bq(b)}p = 0,$$

for each $(a, b) \in \Xi$. By computing the derivative of F with respect to p , it gives

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial p} = 2bp - \sqrt{a^2 + bq(b)}.$$

It shows that $\frac{\partial F}{\partial p} = a < 0$ if $b = 0$ and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial p} = \sqrt{a^2 + bq(b)} > 0$ when $b \neq 0$. Based on the implicit function theorem, we know that $\Gamma(a, b)$ must be real-analytic since $\frac{\partial F}{\partial p}$ is nonzero at each point of the form $(a, b, \Gamma(a, b))$ with $(a, b) \in \Xi$.

Next, we write $\varphi(a, b, \iota)$ as the following form:

$$\varphi(a, b, \iota(a, b)) = \phi(a, b) + (\iota - 1) \cdot \Gamma(a, b).$$

Given that ι is a real-analytic function, we conclude that $\varphi(a, b, \iota(a, b))$ is real-analytic. \square

Theorem 4.2. *For the unified controller provided in (12), if one chooses $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x})$ to be a real-analytic function, then the resulting control law is smooth everywhere except at the origin. Moreover, if the CLF given in (3) satisfies the SCP and $0 \leq \kappa \leq 1$, then the control law given in (12) exhibits continuity at the origin.*

Proof. For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, we know that $(a(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2) \in \Xi$ since $a(\mathbf{x}) < 0$ when $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ (according to (3)) and $\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 > 0$ when $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then the control law expressed in (12) can be represented as the function $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}) = \varphi(a(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa)\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top$, where $\varphi(a(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa)$ follows the definition in (22) with $q(b) = b$. Therefore, the control input $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ is smooth for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

Furthermore, as the CLF provided in (3) possesses the SCP, it implies that there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that, if $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ satisfies $0 < \|\mathbf{x}\| < \delta$, there is a continuous control law \mathbf{u}_c with $\|\mathbf{u}_c\| < \varepsilon'$ ($3\varepsilon' = \varepsilon$) that ensures $(a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma(\mathbf{x})) + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}_c \leq 0$. Moreover, given that V is positive definite, it attains a minimum at 0, leading to $\nabla V(0) = 0$, and thus $\mathbf{b}(0) = \mathbf{0}$. As both $V(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$

are smooth, thus $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ is smooth, and it implies $\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| < \varepsilon'$. Subsequently, applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to (3), we obtain:

$$|a(\mathbf{x})| \leq \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|\|\mathbf{u}_c\| < \varepsilon'\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|. \quad (23)$$

Next, we examine the condition $\|\mathbf{u}_c\| < \varepsilon'$. It can be easily deduced that if $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, then $\|\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})\| = 0 < \varepsilon$. On the other hand, if $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, and for all $a(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ it gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{m}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})\| &= \frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|} \\ &\leq \frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|} + \kappa \cdot \left(\frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|} + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \right) \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|} + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon' = \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

by using $0 \leq \kappa \leq 1$, the condition (23), and $\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| < \varepsilon'$. Then for the case $a(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$ with $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{m}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})\| &= \frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|} \\ &\leq \frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|} + \kappa \cdot \left(-\frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|} + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \right) \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.3. *The control law $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg-BI}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ defined in (8) exhibits smoothness everywhere except at the origin, where it maintains continuity.*

Proof. As noted, the control law $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg-BI}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ can be represented in the unified controller form as given in (12), and the scaling term κ is defined by

$$\kappa = \frac{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - a(\mathbf{x})\sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \right)}. \quad (24)$$

Firstly, it can be verified that κ belongs to $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x})$ with Assumption 2.7 and Lemma 2.8. Following this, we claim that $\frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}$ is a real-analytic function since $a(\mathbf{x})$ and $\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ are both real-analytic functions. Consequently, this further leads to a deduction that

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}} - \frac{a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}}{1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}}$$

is real-analytic. Therefore, in line with Theorem 4.2, it is established that the control law $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg-BI}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ is smooth

everywhere except at the origin. Further, we can demonstrate that $0 \leq \kappa \leq 1$ based on the condition $\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq a(\mathbf{x})$ (given by Lemma 2.8). Then, with Theorem 4.2, the control law $\mathbf{u}_{\text{Stg-BI}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ is continuous at the origin. \square

4.1.2 The Optimization-Based Universal Formula

The control law presented in (15) does not exhibit smoothness property. This is because κ given in (16) cannot always be expressed as a real-analytic formula. For example, let us consider using the optimization-based universal formula to design a stabilizing controller for the dynamical model $\dot{x} = u$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$. By setting $V = \frac{1}{2}x^2$ and $m = 10$ in Theorem 3.3, we will obtain that

$$\kappa = \begin{cases} \frac{10}{x^2+10}, & x \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1, \\ \frac{1}{|x|}, & x \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_2, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x^2 + 10 - 10|x| > 0 \text{ and } x \neq 0\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x^2 + 10 - 10|x| \leq 0 \text{ and } x \neq 0\}$. We can verify that κ is not real-analytic by demonstrating the lack of continuity in its first derivative to x . Actually, such a controller's non-smooth nature has been noted, a frequent outcome when employing an optimization-based solution for controller synthesis [27]. However, despite this compromise in smoothness, the control input specified in (15) remains continuous at the origin. As proved in Theorem 3.3, the optimization-based universal formula can be expressed as the unified form of (12). Since the relating κ given in (16) satisfies $0 \leq \kappa \leq 1$, and with the SCP assumption, one can follow the proof given in Theorem 4.2 to show the continuity at the origin.

4.2 Stability Margin

Definition 4.4. (Stability margin [25]) A stabilizing control law, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x})$, has stability margins (m_1, m_2) where

$$-1 \leq m_1 < m_2 \leq \infty,$$

if for every $\xi \in [m_1, m_2)$, the control $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = (1 + \xi)\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x})$ also asymptotically stabilizes the system.

Theorem 4.5. The unified controller defined in (12) has a stability margin $\xi \in [0, \infty)$.

Proof. As we demonstrated in Theorem 3.2, the unified controller defined by (12) satisfies the tightened CLF condition given in (10). In this case, by adding $\xi\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ to both sides of (10), it gives

$$\begin{aligned} a(\mathbf{x}) + (1 + \xi)\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}) \\ \leq \xi\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

A sufficient condition for asymptotic stability is that the right-hand side of (25) is negative for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Therefore, we substitute the control law given in (12) into the right-hand side of (25), and it yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \xi\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x}) - \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}), \\ & = \begin{cases} -\xi(a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})) - \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}), & \kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x}), \\ -\kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain the following condition for stability margin.

$$\begin{aligned} \xi & \geq -\frac{\kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, \quad \kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x}) \\ & \Rightarrow \xi \in [0, \infty). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The proof is complete. \square

Theorem 4.5 shows that the unified controller, despite variations in scaling terms, shares a common stability margin. This implies that both Lin-Sontag's universal formula and the optimization-based universal formula have a stability margin $\xi \in [0, \infty)$. To verify this, we choose $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x})$ using (24), which leads to Lin-Sontag's universal formula. By substituting κ into (26), the stability margin can be determined with the inequality $\xi \geq -1 + \frac{a(\mathbf{x})(1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2})}{a(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}$, and then it gives $m_1 = 0$ and $m_2 = \infty$ since $\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq a(\mathbf{x})$. Additionally, the stability margin of the optimization-based universal formula can be calculated using the same approach as that for the corresponding κ provided in (16).

4.3 Inverse Optimality

Definition 4.6. (Inverse optimality [28]) The control law $\mathbf{u}^*(\mathbf{x})$ is said to be an inverse optimal stabilizing control law for the system (1) if

- (1) it achieves global asymptotic stability of $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ for the system (1).
- (2) it is of the form

$$\mathbf{u}^*(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top \quad (27)$$

where $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})$ is positive definite for all $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and $V(\mathbf{x})$ is a radially unbounded and positive definite function, which satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation [29]

$$l(\mathbf{x}) + a(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})^{-1}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top = 0, \quad (28)$$

where $a(\mathbf{x}) = L_{\mathbf{f}}V(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = L_{\mathbf{g}}V(\mathbf{x})$.

Theorem 4.7. Every control law defined by the unified controller (12) is inverse optimal.

Proof. The proof follows the arguments in [28, p.108]. The unified controller given in (12) can be rewritten in the form of (27), where $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})$ is given by $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2\gamma(\mathbf{x})}\mathbf{I}_m$, and

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \frac{a(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}, & \kappa \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x}), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It can be verified that $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})$ is positive definite and the control law $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{u}^*(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies the CLF condition (3), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & a(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}^*(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= a(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we choose $l(\mathbf{x}) = -a(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})^\top > 0$, then the HJB equation (28) is satisfied for all \mathbf{x} . We conclude that the unified controller (12) is inverse optimal. \square

5 Simulations

In this section, we first apply our unifying controller design method to establish various universal formulas incorporating different scaling terms. Subsequently, we evaluate the efficacy of our approach by comparing the stabilization performances and control input behaviors with those derived from Sontag's and Lin-Sontag's universal formulas. Finally, we highlight the optimality of the control input outlined in (15), as it simultaneously minimizes both control input energy and the modification of Sontag's universal formula.¹

Let us consider the following dynamical model, which is adapted from [1, Example 6.5].

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= -x_1^3 + e^{x_2}u_1, \\ \dot{x}_2 &= -x_2 + u_2, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2]^\top$ and $\mathbf{u} = [u_1, u_2]^\top$.

The input constraint is $\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq 1$. We use the CLF $V(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}(x_1^2 + x_2^2)$, and it leads to $a(\mathbf{x}) = -x_1^4 - x_2^2$ and $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) = [x_1e^{x_2}, x_2]^\top$. Furthermore, we set the system with an initial state $\mathbf{x}_0 = [-1, 0.6]^\top$. The simulation time is $t_{\text{sim}} = 100\text{s}$, while we exclusively display the control input for the initial 5 seconds, as it becomes nearly zero in the subsequent duration. In Fig. 2, we employ various control laws to design

stabilizing controllers, namely Sontag's universal formula (9), Lin-Sontag's universal formula (8) with $\kappa_{\text{Lin-Stg}}$ given in (13), our unified controller (12) with $\kappa_1 = -\frac{2a(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}$, $\kappa_2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2\sqrt{1+\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} - a(\mathbf{x})\sigma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_{\text{Stg}}^2(\mathbf{x}) + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2(1+\sqrt{1+\|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2})}$, and $\kappa_3 = (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2)/2$, as well as the optimization-based universal formula (15) with $m = 10$. The stabilizing performances and control input behaviors are presented in Fig. 2.

As outlined in Theorem 3.2, numerous universal formulas can be derived as long as a suitable κ — such as κ_1 , κ_2 , and κ_3 in Fig. 2 — is provided. Additionally, it is worth noting that, except for Sontag's universal formula, all methods achieve asymptotic stability for the closed-loop system (29) while satisfying the norm-bounded input constraint. We also highlight that different choices of κ lead to different stabilizing performances. This variation aligns with our expectations since κ governs the convergence speed of a stabilizing task.

Finally, we point out that the green curve depicted in Fig. 2 is optimal based on the criterion that minimizes both the control input energy and the modification of Sontag's universal formula. This optimality is visually apparent in Fig. 2, where the optimization-based universal formula closely aligns with Sontag's universal formula (owing to a sufficiently large setting of parameter m). To provide a more precise comparison, we have evaluated the cost associated with each method, as illustrated in Fig. 3 (presenting only the initial 10 seconds, as the cost of all methods converges to a constant after $t = 10\text{s}$). This comparison supports the conclusion that the control input presented in (15) stands out as optimal.

6 Conclusions and Future Research Directions

In this paper, we propose a unifying controller design method to derive alternative universal formulas for addressing stabilizing controller design issues with a norm-bounded control input. Utilizing Lin-Sontag's universal formula as a foundation, we replace the special scaling term to a generic one with a specified valid range to explore alternative formulas capable of meeting diverse requirements and providing versatility across various control scenarios. Additionally, we present a constructive approach to determine an optimal scaling term, resulting in an optimization-based universal formula that ensures stability, satisfies a norm-bounded input constraint, and optimizes a predefined cost function. Finally, we demonstrate that the unified controller is smooth everywhere (except at the origin) when the scaling term is a real-analytic function. Continuity at the origin is guaranteed when the SCP assumption holds and the scaling term falls within the range of $[0, 1]$. The stability margin of the inverse optimal unified controller is $[0, \infty)$.

In future research, we will extend the unifying controller

¹ The simulation code is available at: https://github.com/lyric12345678/Unifying_Controller_Design.




Fig. 2. Stabilizing performances and control input behaviors for different solutions.




Fig. 3. A comparison of the cost of different solutions.

design method to: i) deal with alternative sets of input constraints with smooth and non-smooth boundaries; ii) address a safety-critical control problem with a norm-bound control input; and iii) tackle the challenges in stabilizing control when it involves a safety constraint.

References

- [1] W. M. Haddad and V. Chellaboina, *Nonlinear dynamical systems and control: a Lyapunov-based approach*. Princeton University Press, 2008.
- [2] H. Khalil, *Nonlinear systems*, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [3] R. Freeman and P. V. Kokotovic, *Robust nonlinear control design: state-space and Lyapunov techniques*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [4] E. D. Sontag, “A ‘universal’ construction of Artstein’s theorem on nonlinear stabilization,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 117–123, 1989.
- [5] Z. Artstein, “Stabilization with relaxed controls,” *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 1163–1173, 1983.
- [6] M. Krstic, H. Deng *et al.*, *Stabilization of nonlinear uncertain systems*. Springer, 1998.
- [7] J.-F. Guerrero-Castellanos, J. J. Téllez-Guzmán, S. Durand, N. Marchand, J. U. Alvarez-Muñoz, and V. R. Gonzalez-Diaz, “Attitude stabilization of a quadrotor by means of event-triggered nonlinear control,” *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 73, pp. 123–135, 2014.
- [8] M. Li, Z. Sun, and S. Weiland, “Quadrotor stabilization with safety guarantees: A universal formula approach,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03500*, 2024.
- [9] M. Li and Z. Sun, “A graphical interpretation and universal formula for safe stabilization,” in *2023 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 3012–3017.
- [10] A. Mohammadi and M. W. Spong, “Chetaev instability framework for kinetostatic compliance-based protein unfolding,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 2755–2760, 2022.
- [11] Y. Lin and E. D. Sontag, “A universal formula for stabilization with bounded controls,” *Systems & Control*

- Letters*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 393–397, 1991.
- [12] H. Leyva, B. Aguirre-Hernández, and J. F. Espinoza, “Stabilization of affine systems with polytopic control value sets,” *Journal of Dynamical and Control Systems*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 1929–1941, 2023.
- [13] M. Malisoff and E. D. Sontag, “Universal formulas for feedback stabilization with respect to Minkowski balls,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 247–260, 2000.
- [14] J. W. Curtis, “CLF-based nonlinear control with polytopic input constraints,” in *2003 IEEE 42nd Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, vol. 3. IEEE, 2003, pp. 2228–2233.
- [15] J. Solís-Daun and H. Leyva, “On the global CLF stabilization of systems with polytopic control value sets,” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 11 042–11 047, 2011.
- [16] H. Leyva, J. Solís-Daun, and R. Suárez, “Global CLF stabilization of systems with control inputs constrained to a hyperbox,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 745–766, 2013.
- [17] H. Leyva and J. Solís-Daun, “Global CLF stabilization of systems with respect to a hyperbox, allowing the null-control input in its boundary (positive controls),” in *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 3107–3112.
- [18] N. H. El-Farra and P. D. Christofides, “Integrating robustness, optimality and constraints in control of nonlinear processes,” *Chemical Engineering Science*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 1841–1868, 2001.
- [19] P. Mhaskar, N. H. El-Farra, and P. D. Christofides, “Stabilization of nonlinear systems with state and control constraints using Lyapunov-based predictive control,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 55, no. 8, pp. 650–659, 2006.
- [20] P. Ong and J. Cortés, “Universal formula for smooth safe stabilization,” in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 2373–2378.
- [21] A. D. Ames, X. Xu, J. W. Grizzle, and P. Tabuada, “Control barrier function based quadratic programs for safety critical systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 3861–3876, 2016.
- [22] M. Krstic, “Inverse optimal safety filters,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023.
- [23] M. H. Cohen, P. Ong, G. Bahati, and A. D. Ames, “Characterizing smooth safety filters via the implicit function theorem,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2023.
- [24] J. A. Primbs, V. Nevistic, and J. C. Doyle, “A receding horizon generalization of pointwise min-norm controllers,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 898–909, 2000.
- [25] J. W. Curtis and R. W. Beard, “Satisficing: A new approach to constructive nonlinear control,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 1090–1102, 2004.
- [26] E. K. Chong, W.-S. Lu, and S. H. Zak, *An Introduction to Optimization: With Applications to Machine Learning*. John Wiley & Sons, 2023.
- [27] P. Mestres, A. Allibhoy, and J. Cortés, “Robinson’s counterexample and regularity properties of optimization-based controllers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13167*, 2023.
- [28] R. Sepulchre, M. Jankovic, and P. V. Kokotovic, *Constructive nonlinear control*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [29] B. D. O. Anderson and J. B. Moore, *Optimal control: linear quadratic methods*. Courier Corporation, 2007.