

A Tunable Universal Formula for Safety-Critical Control

Ming Li, Zhiyong Sun, Patrick J. W. Koelewijn, and Siep Weiland

Abstract—Sontag’s universal formula is a widely-used technique for stabilizing control through control Lyapunov functions, and it has been extended to address safety-critical control in recent years by incorporating control barrier functions (CBFs). However, how to derive a universal formula that satisfies requirements on essential properties, including safety, robustness, and smoothness, is still an open problem. To address this challenge, this paper introduces a novel solution – a tunable universal formula – incorporating a (state-dependent) tunable scaling term into Sontag’s universal formula. This tunable scaling term enables the regulation of safety control performances, allowing the attainment of desired properties through a proper selection. Furthermore, we extend this tunable universal formula to address safety-critical control problems with norm-bounded input constraints, showcasing its applicability across diverse control scenarios. Finally, we demonstrate the efficacy of our method through a collision avoidance example, investigating the essential properties including safety, robustness, and smoothness under various tunable scaling terms.

Index Terms—Safety-Critical Control, Control Barrier Functions, Universal Formula, Norm-Bounded Input Constraint

I. INTRODUCTION

SAFETY-critical control refers to the design of control systems within environments characterized by strict safety constraints [1]. These constraints involve physical hardware limits (e.g., workspace, joint position, and velocity constraints in robotic arms [2]) and controller constraints for safe system operations (e.g., collision, contact force, and range constraints in quadrotor applications [3]). Generally, designing controllers to incorporate these safety-critical constraints into practical applications is challenging, which requires achieving the forward invariance of a safe set, defined as super-level sets of scalar constraint functions [4].

Control barrier functions (CBFs), which utilize Lyapunov-like arguments to ensure set forward invariance, have garnered significant attention in recent years [4], [5]. Due to their advantages in handling nonlinear systems, suitability for real-time control, and effectiveness in managing high-relative-degree constraints [6], they have been applied to various safety-critical applications, including adaptive cruise control [4], bipedal robot walking [7], and multi-robot coordination [8]. Among

existing studies, a prevalent application of CBFs is the formulation of quadratic programs (QPs) for controller synthesis [4]. The fundamental properties of the QP-synthesized controller, such as robustness, smoothness, and inverse optimality, are studied in [9]–[11]. Specifically, it was revealed that the QP-synthesized controller may exhibit non-smooth behavior [9] and requires additional modifications to enhance its robustness against input disturbances [10]. As an alternative, Sontag’s universal formula [12], which is a frequently-used tool in control Lyapunov theory for the design of stabilizing controllers, has been adapted to address challenges in safety-critical control using CBFs [9], [13]. In contrast to the QP-synthesized controller, Sontag’s universal formula provides a smooth controller and demonstrates to be more robust (against input disturbances) [14]. However, as noted in [9], the application of Sontag’s universal formula to safety-critical control in certain scenarios is overly conservative, which is far from ideal for applying to dynamic and rapidly changing environments.

Given the aforementioned discussions, we pose the question: *Can we design a safety controller that maintains certain desirable properties according to the requirements of a specific application?* To answer this question, a promising solution is presented in [9], which seeks to design a smooth safety controller with quantified robustness. This is achieved by recognizing that Sontag’s universal formula is derived via solving an algebraic equation defined by an implicit function. The authors of [9] suggest constructing a *tunable* implicit function to adjust the robustness of Sontag’s universal formula, while ensuring smoothness by satisfying specific conditions. Different from [9], our solution proposes to start from a controller (rather than an implicit function) with a predetermined structure (i.e., Sontag’s universal formula in this paper) and then incorporate a tunable scaling term to regulate the controller performance. Consequently, instead of establishing a particular ordinary differential equation and using set invariance theory to find tunable universal formulas as in [9], our focus is on the selection of tunable scaling terms within a valid range and incorporating real-analytic conditions on these scaling terms to guarantee certain robustness and smoothness. Furthermore, our approach also offers the potential to regulate properties like safety margins and inverse optimality [11].

To summarize, the contributions of this paper are two-fold:

- We propose a tunable universal formula for safety-critical control, which incorporates a (state-dependent) tunable scaling term to Sontag’s universal formula. Through the selection of a specific tunable scaling term under

This work was supported in part by a starting grant from Eindhoven Artificial Intelligence Systems Institute (EAISI), The Netherlands. (*Corresponding author: Ming Li.*)

The authors are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, and also with the Eindhoven Artificial Intelligence Systems Institute, PO Box 513, Eindhoven 5600 MB, The Netherlands. { m.li3, z.sun, p.j.w.koelewijn, s.weiland}@tue.nl

conditions like being real-analytic and within a specified validity range, alternative universal formulas are derived. The properties of these universal formulas are further discussed, including safety, smoothness, and robustness.

- We extend the tunable universal formula to address a safety-critical control problem with a norm-bounded input constraint. We demonstrate that, with a simple adaptation to the validity range of the tunable scaling term, we can still regulate the performance of the safety controller in terms of safety, smoothness, and robustness while satisfying the norm-bounded input constraint.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider a control-affine system [15]

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

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

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

Since the functions \mathbf{f} , \mathbf{g} , and \mathbf{k} 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 $I(\mathbf{x}_0) = [0, t_{\max})$ such that $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is the unique smooth solution to (2) on $I(\mathbf{x}_0)$.

A. CBFs and Universal Formula for Safety Control

Consider a closed convex set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ as the 0-superlevel set of a smooth function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &\triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0\}, \\ \partial\mathcal{C} &\triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Int}(\mathcal{C}) \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : h(\mathbf{x}) > 0\},$$

where we assume that \mathcal{C} is nonempty and has no isolated points, that is, $\text{Int}(\mathcal{C}) \neq \emptyset$ and $\bar{\text{Int}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}$.

Definition 1. (*Forward Invariance & Safety*) A set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is forward invariant if for every $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{C}$, the solution to (2) satisfies $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ for all $t \in I(\mathbf{x}_0)$. The system is safe on the set \mathcal{C} if the set \mathcal{C} is forward invariant.

Definition 2. (*Extended class K function, \mathbb{K}_e*). A continuous function $\alpha : (-b, a) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $a, b > 0$, is an extended class K function ($\alpha \in \mathbb{K}_e$) if $\alpha(0) = 0$, and α is strictly monotonically increasing.

Definition 3. (*Control Barrier Function, (CBF) [4]*). Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the 0-superlevel set of a smooth function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is defined by (3). Then h is a CBF for (1) if there exists a smooth function $\beta \in \mathbb{K}_e$ such that, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a control input $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \geq 0, \quad (4)$$

where $c(\mathbf{x}) = L_{\mathbf{f}}h(\mathbf{x}) + \beta(h(\mathbf{x}))$, $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = L_{\mathbf{g}}h(\mathbf{x})$, $L_{\mathbf{f}}h(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \frac{\partial h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ and $L_{\mathbf{g}}h(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \frac{\partial h(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ denote the Lie derivatives along \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} , respectively.

Theorem 1. ([4]) Given $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ defined as the 0-superlevel set of a smooth function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and h serves as a

CBF for (1) on \mathcal{C} , then any smooth controller $\mathbf{k} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying the condition (4) ensures the safety of the closed-loop system (1) with respect to the set \mathcal{C} .

Based on Theorem 1, a feedback control law $\mathbf{k}_{\text{PMN}}(\mathbf{x})$ can be synthesized by solving the following pointwise min-norm (PMN) optimization problem [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{k}_{\text{PMN}}(\mathbf{x}) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \\ &\text{s.t. } c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \geq \Gamma(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a positive semidefinite function. The constraint in (5) can be viewed as a sufficient condition of (4), and we term it a tightened CBF condition. Moreover, we emphasize that $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ is introduced to provide freedom to regulate the control performance and establish the connection between a PMN controller and Sontag's universal formula (when it applies to safety control) [9].

Lemma 1. The solution to (5) can be explicitly expressed as

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{PMN}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{PMN}}(c(\mathbf{x}) - \Gamma(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2)\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\lambda_{\text{PMN}}(c, d) := \begin{cases} 0, & d = 0, \\ \text{ReLU}(-c/d), & d > 0, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

and $\text{ReLU}(y) := \max\{0, y\}$.

Proof. The solution to (5) can be obtained using the projection theorem. More details can be found in [17]. \square

The selection of the function $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ significantly impacts the performances of $\mathbf{k}_{\text{PMN}}(\mathbf{x})$ for safety control, such as smoothness, robustness, optimality, etc. For instance, by setting $\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \Gamma_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ in the constraint of equation (5), as per Equation (6), it yields a control law denoted as $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})$ [5]:

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{PMN}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2)\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top. \quad (8)$$

Remark 1. The function $\lambda_{\text{PMN}}(c, d)$ defined by (7) may be non-smooth due to the inherent non-smoothness of the $\text{ReLU}(\cdot)$ function. Consequently, the QP-synthesized controller $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})$ given in (8) may also be non-smooth. Moreover, the QP-synthesized controller $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})$ could exhibit non-robust behavior when it is subjected to an input disturbance. Specifically, the CBF condition is ensured by the QP-synthesized controller $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})$, i.e., $c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$, while an input disturbance $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$ may lead to $c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})) < 0$. As a result, the system (1) may become unsafe due to an input disturbance $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$.

Alternatively, one can choose

$$\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{c^2(\mathbf{x}) + \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^4}, \quad (9)$$

which gives

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \geq \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (10)$$

By applying the condition (10) to the constraint in (5) and leveraging Lemma 1, we obtain Sontag's universal formula for safety-critical control, which is given by:

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{Stg}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2)\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\lambda_{\text{Stg}}(c, d) := \begin{cases} 0, & d = 0, \\ (-c + \sqrt{c^2 + d^2})/d, & d > 0. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Sontag's universal formula for safety-critical control has also been presented in [9], [13]. As demonstrated in [9], the control law $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ given in (11) is smooth. Moreover, we conclude that Sontag's universal formula is a special solution to the PMN optimization in (5) since the control law $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ is derived from (6) by choosing $\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$.

Remark 2. *The utilization of Sontag's universal formula $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ give in (11) may result in a conservative behavior for safety-critical control. As noticed, $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies a stricter safety condition, i.e., the tightened CBF condition (10), compared to the standard CBF condition (4). Thereby we can infer that Sontag's universal formula exhibits a conservative safety control performance. Due to the tightened CBF condition, Sontag's universal formula $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ is also more robust against input disturbance than the QP-synthesized controller $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})$ for a safety-critical control. In particular, when introducing an input disturbance $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$ to both control inputs \mathbf{k}_{Stg} and \mathbf{k}_{Stg} , we will have the following results by substituting $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$ into (4) and using the condition (10).*

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})) \geq \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}),$$

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})) \geq \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x}).$$

As noticed, $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$ is more likely to render the system (1) unsafe compared to $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$ due to the positive semidefinite function $\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$. Therefore, we conclude that Sontag's universal formula is more robust against input disturbance compared to the QP-synthesized controller.

B. Problem Statement

The above discussions suggest that both the QP-synthesized controller and Sontag's universal formula may not achieve the desired performance requirements when applied to some safety-critical control scenarios. Given that the selection of $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ significantly influences the properties of the resulting controller, we aim to find a suitable $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ to derive alternative universal formulas that satisfy safety, smoothness, and robustness requirements. Therefore, the research problem of this paper is formally stated as follows.

Problem Statement: Design a suitable $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ to construct a universal formula for a safety-critical system, which should feature favorable properties, such as safety, smoothness, robustness, and so on.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, a tunable universal formula is derived, and the properties of the tunable universal formula related to safety guarantees, smoothness, and safety margin, are studied. Furthermore, we extend the tunable universal formula to the application of input-constrained safety-critical control.

A. Tunable Universal Formulas for Safety Control

To address the problem stated in Section II-B, our solution is to design a function of the form $\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Basis}}(\mathbf{x})$. Here,

$\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ serves as a state-dependent tunable scaling term, while $\Gamma_{\text{Basis}}(\mathbf{x})$ represents a basis function that influences the properties of the derived universal formulas. Considering that Sontag's universal formula maintains numerous favorable properties, e.g., smoothness [9], inverse optimality [11], and has an infinite safety margin [18], we set $\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ as a basis function. Then the constraint in (5) is reformulated as:

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \geq \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

With Lemma 1, the following control law is obtained by solving (5) with constraint (13).

$$\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{Tun}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa(\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (14)$$

where

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } d = 0, \\ \text{ReLU}\left(\frac{-c + \iota\sqrt{c^2 + d^2}}{d}\right), & \text{if } d \neq 0. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Similar to the analysis in Remark 1, the existence of the function $\text{ReLU}(\cdot)$ may lead to the control law $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$ non-smooth. For instance, when one sets $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$, the QP-synthesized controller $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})$ presented in (8) is obtained, and $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})$ maybe non-smooth as revealed in Remark 1. To eliminate the influence of the function $\text{ReLU}(\cdot)$, the constraint $-c + \iota\sqrt{c^2 + d^2} > 0$ is enforced on (15). This simplifies $\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota)$ to

$$\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } d = 0, \\ \frac{-c + \iota\sqrt{c^2 + d^2}}{d}, & \text{if } d \neq 0. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Next, the following control law is introduced.

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa(\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (17)$$

where the tunable scaling term $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$, $\mathcal{K} = \{\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \geq \max(\frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0)\}$.

Remark 3. *As seen from (12) and (16), the function $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota)$ can be obtained by introducing a term ι to $\lambda_{\text{Stg}}(c, d, \iota)$. With this observation, we remark that the control law presented in (17) can be considered as a resultant control law of Sontag's universal formula (cf. Equation (11)) with the introduction of a tunable scaling term $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$. Furthermore, since different choices of the tunable scaling term $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ in (17) will result in distinct universal formulas, each characterized by unique safety, smoothness, and robustness properties, we call $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$ a tunable universal formula in this paper.*

Remark 4. *Note that one can also adapt the tunable universal formula (17) to a safety filter framework [4], which aims to make a minimal modification to a predefined nominal control $\mathbf{k}_d(\mathbf{x})$. In this case, the cost function in (5) is adjusted to $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{k}_d\|^2$. By following the same derivation routine for obtaining (17), the tunable universal formula for a safety filter is acquired, which is expressed as:*

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{SF}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{Tun}}(\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa(\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (18)$$

where $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{SF}}$, $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x}) = c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{k}_d$, and $\mathcal{K}_{\text{SF}} = \{\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \geq \max(\frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0)\}$.

1) *Safety Guarantees:* We provide the following lemma to guarantee the safety of the system (1) by using the tunable universal formula given in (17) with the valid range $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$.

Theorem 2. *The control tunable universal formula provided by (17), with $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$, gives a safety controller.*

Proof. By substituting (17) into (4), it shows that the CBF condition (4) is always satisfied for all $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$. This ensures that the closed-loop system (1) is safe. \square

2) *Smoothness:* Firstly, we define two open subsets $\Phi = \{(c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^2 | c > 0 \text{ or } d > 0\}$ and $\Xi = \{(c, d, \iota) \in \mathbb{R}^3 | c > 0 \text{ or } d > 0\}$, and introduce the following Lemma.

Lemma 2. *Assume that $\iota : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is real-analytic. Then the following function $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota)$ defined in (16) is real-analytic on Φ .*

Proof. By following the proof in [19, Proposition 5.9.10], we can prove that the function

$$\phi(c, d) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d = 0, \\ \frac{-c + \sqrt{c^2 + d^2}}{d} & \text{if } d \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

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

$$\xi(c, d) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d = 0, \\ \frac{\sqrt{c^2 + d^2}}{d} & \text{if } d \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

It can be verified that $\xi(c, d)$ is the solution of the following algebraic equation.

$$F(c, d, p) = dp^2 - \sqrt{c^2 + d^2}p = 0,$$

for each $(c, d) \in \Phi$. By computing the derivative of F with respect to p , it gives

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial p} = 2dp - \sqrt{c^2 + d^2}.$$

It shows that $\frac{\partial F}{\partial p} = -c < 0$ if $d = 0$ and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial p} = \sqrt{c^2 + d^2} > 0$ when $d \neq 0$. Based on the implicit function theorem, we know that $\xi(c, d)$ must be real-analytic since $\frac{\partial F}{\partial p}$ is nonzero at each point of the form $(c, d, \xi(c, d))$ with $(c, d) \in \Phi$. Next, we write $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota)$ in (16) as the following form:

$$\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota) = \phi(c, d) + (\iota - 1) \cdot \xi(c, d).$$

Given that ι is a real-analytic function, we conclude that $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota)$ is real-analytic on Ξ . \square

Theorem 3. *For the tunable universal formula provided in (17), if one chooses $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$ to be a real-analytic function, then the resulting control law gives a smooth safety controller.*

Proof. Firstly, since $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$ and with Theorem 2, we know that the tunable universal formula $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$ gives a safety controller. Next, given that $c(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ when $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 > 0$ for $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, we can verify that $(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2) \in \Phi$ and $(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa(\mathbf{x})) \in \Xi$. Since the function $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota)$ is smooth for all $(c, d, \iota) \in \Xi$ as proved in Lemma 2, we can deduce that the tunable universal formula presented in (17) is also smooth. \square

3) *Safety Margin:* While the term ‘‘safety margin’’ is commonly used in existing literature, a precise definition has not been established. In [20], the concept of stability margin [18] has been extended to safety-critical control. This extension still allows for a quantitative assessment of the robustness of a safety controller, similar to that of a stabilizing control. In this regard, we follow the definition of stability margin presented in [21] and adapt it to the definition of safety margin as follows.

Definition 4. (*Safety margin*) *A safety control law, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x})$, has safety margins (m_1, m_2) ,*

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

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

Theorem 4. *The safety margin of the tunable universal formula presented in (17) is $[\bar{\xi}, \infty)$, where $\bar{\xi} := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$,*

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq -1 + \frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{c(\mathbf{x}) - \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, \quad (19)$$

and $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$.

Proof. Given that the tunable universal formula defined in (17) satisfies the tightened CBF condition presented in (13) with $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$, we substitute $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$ into (13) and add $\xi \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}_{\text{Unif}}^*(\mathbf{x})$ to both sides of (13) based on the safety margin definition. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathbf{x}) + (1 + \xi)\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \geq \xi \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

A sufficient condition for guaranteeing the safety of the system (1) is that the right-hand side of (20) is non-negative for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore, we substitute the tunable universal formula (17) into the right-hand side of (20), and it gives the following results with $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}), \\ = \begin{cases} \xi(\kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - c(\mathbf{x})) + \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Considering that $\kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ always holds when $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, it remains to consider the first case of (21). Since the condition $\xi \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ gives $\xi \geq \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$ and according to the definition $\bar{\xi} := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$, we know that the tunable universal formula $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$ has a safety margin $[m_1, m_2)$ with $m_1 = \bar{\xi}$ and $m_2 = \infty$. \square

Remark 5. *The condition $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$ ensures that the function $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$ in (19) is always satisfied. Thereby it implies that there always exists a constant $\bar{\xi} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$. Further, we emphasize that the safety margin of the tunable universal formula can be more precisely determined with a specific $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$. For example, setting $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ corresponds to Sontag’s universal formula, leading to a safety margin $\xi \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ due to the relationship $\bar{\xi} = -\frac{1}{2} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\frac{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{c(\mathbf{x}) - \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} \right), \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This conclusion aligns with the established condition for the stability margin of Sontag’s universal formula, which can be found in [20].*

B. Tunable Universal Formulas Addressing a Norm-Bounded Input Constraint

Thus far, the tunable universal formula presented in (17) does not demonstrate its capability in handling safety-critical control problems associated with input constraints. To explore this aspect, we consider the following control input constraint.

$$\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \gamma, \quad (22)$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is a constant.

Definition 5. (*x-Compatibility*) The CBF condition is *x-compatible* with the norm-bounded input constraint if there exists a $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, that satisfies (4) and (22) simultaneously.

Assumption 1. The CBF condition (4) is *x-compatible* with the norm-bounded input constraint (22).

In the following, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we always assume that Assumption 1 holds.

Lemma 3. The CBF condition given by (4) is *x-compatible* with the input constraint (22) if and only if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{cpt}} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \gamma \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq -c(\mathbf{x})\}$.

Proof. Suppose there exists a state-feedback control law $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x})$ satisfying the CBF condition (4). To ensure that the CBF condition (4) is *x-compatible* with the norm-bounded input constraint, a necessary and sufficient condition is that there always exists a control law $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x})$ such that $\|\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \gamma$. In other words, we need guarantee that the norm of the control law $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}) := \min \|\mathbf{u}\|, \text{s.t. } c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \geq 0$ is less than γ . Notably, this is equivalent to requiring $\|\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \gamma$. By substituting (8) into the inequality $\|\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \gamma$, the condition $\gamma \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq -c(\mathbf{x})$ is obtained. \square

1) *Safety Guarantees:* When applying the tunable universal formula $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$ from (17) to safety-critical control with input constraints, the choices for selecting $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ become more limited compared to the scenario without input constraints in Section III-A. This is because $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$ must satisfy both the CBF condition and the input constraint simultaneously.

Theorem 5. The following tunable universal formula law ensures the closed-loop system (1) is safe and satisfies the norm-bounded input constraint (22) simultaneously:

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa(\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top \quad (23)$$

where $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}} := \{\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \max\left(\frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0\right) \leq \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{\gamma \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| + c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}\}$.

Proof. Due to Assumption 1, we have $\gamma \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq -c(\mathbf{x})$ using Lemma 3. Therefore, we can always ensure that $\bar{\mathcal{K}} \neq \emptyset$. Next, we examine whether $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies the CBF condition (4). Firstly, substituting $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ into (23), it gives $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$. Given that $c(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ when $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, then it can be verified that the CBF condition is satisfied by substituting $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ into (4). For the case $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, we know that $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}} = \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - c(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top$. Substituting $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$ into (4) gives

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - c(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top = \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0.$$

Finally, we need to verify that $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$ remains within the specified control input range defined by $\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \gamma$. When $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, the control law $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ always satisfies the input constraint. For the case $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, we notice that

$$\|\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})\| = \left\| \frac{-c(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top \right\| \leq \gamma$$

given the condition $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$. Therefore, we conclude that the closed-loop system (1) is safe and simultaneously satisfies the input constraint (22). \square

We highlight that various choices for $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ can be made to ensure simultaneously satisfying the CBF condition (4) and the input constraint (22) as long as $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$. For example, we can choose $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\gamma \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| + c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}$, $\kappa_2(\mathbf{x}) = \max\left(\frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, \frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} + \frac{\gamma \|c(\mathbf{x})\|}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}\right)$, and $\kappa_3(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}(\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa_2(\mathbf{x}))$, where $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_2(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_3(\mathbf{x}) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$.

2) *Smoothness:* Similar to the tunable universal formula provided in (17), the controller defined by (23) is also smooth.

Theorem 6. If $\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is selected from the set $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ as a real-analytic function, the resulting tunable universal formula $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$ given in (23) is smooth for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. As Lemma 2 applies to all $\iota : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the real-analyticity of ι remains unaffected by changes in its range. Recognizing this property, one can follow the proof presented in Theorem 3 to verify the smoothness of $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$. \square

For smoothness consideration, the choices of $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_2(\mathbf{x})$, and $\kappa_3(\mathbf{x})$ given in Section III-B1 are not valid anymore since they are not real-analytic functions. This means we need to find alternative functions of $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ to ensure safety and smoothness requirements simultaneously. For this regard, a specific choice for $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ is

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - c(\mathbf{x})\sqrt{1 + \gamma^2 \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \gamma^2 \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}\right)} \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}. \quad (24)$$

This selection leads the tunable universal formula in (23) to Lin-Sontag's universal formula (that adapts to safety-critical control) as presented in [22].

3) *Safety Margin:* We continue to use the safety margin definition as given in Definition 4 to demonstrate the safety margin associated with the tunable universal formula presented in (23).

Theorem 7. The controller defined by the tunable universal formula given in (23) has a safety margin $\xi \in [0, \infty)$.

Proof. As $\bar{\mathcal{K}} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, Theorem 4 remains applicable to (23). This implies that the safety margin for (23) is within $\xi \in [\bar{\xi}, \infty)$, $\bar{\xi} := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$. Given that $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, we can deduce that $\bar{\xi} = 0$ based on (19), which indicates that the safety margin of $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$ is $[0, \infty)$. \square

IV. SIMULATION RESULTS

In our simulation, we employ a single integrator model $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{u}$, where $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2]^\top$, as presented in [9], to illustrate the advantages of our proposed approach. The objective is to design smooth safety controllers for a collision avoidance example using the proposed tunable universal formulas with different choices of $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$. Specifically, we aim to ensure that the system trajectory remains within the admissible set defined by $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : h(\mathbf{x}) = (x_1 + 2)^2 + (x_2 - 2)^2 - 1 \geq 0\}$.¹

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




Fig. 1. Safety-critical control utilizing tunable universal formulas with different tunable scaling terms, with a comparison to both a QP-synthesized controller and Sontag’s universal formula.

A. Safety-Critical Control without Input Constraints

For a better performance demonstration, we introduce a nominal stabilizing control input $\mathbf{k}_d = -\mathbf{x}$ to achieve stabilization. Leveraging the results given in Remark 4, we design tunable universal formulas under the safety filter framework. Specifically, we first compute $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = [2(x_1 + 2), 2(x_2 - 2)]$ and $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x}) = c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{k}_d = -2x_1(x_1 + 2) - 2x_2(x_2 - 2) + 5h(\mathbf{x})$ (cf. Remark 4). Subsequently, we select different $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ using $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = \max(\frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, \frac{\zeta}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})})$ with $\zeta = 2, 6, 10, 15$, which gives $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_2(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_3(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_4(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$, respectively. However, one will argue that the function $\max(\cdot)$ may lead to a non-smooth safety controller. To address this problem, we use the smooth function $\frac{1}{\eta} \ln[\exp(\eta \cdot \frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}) + \exp(\eta \cdot \frac{\zeta}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})})]$ to approximate $\max(\frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, \frac{\zeta}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})})$, where $\eta = 100$ [8]. By utilizing these selections of $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ and employing (18), several tunable universal formulas are derived. As shown in Fig. 1, we assess the robustness and smoothness of those tunable universal formulas. This evaluation involves a comparison among these formulas and extends to a comparison with a QP-synthesized controller, as well as Sontag’s universal formula. In Fig. 1 (Left), the collision avoidance behavior is depicted for different safety controllers resulting from various $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$, each offering different degrees of robustness while ensuring safety guarantees. Note that Sontag’s universal formula exhibits a conservative behavior in safety-critical control, as it starts obstacle avoidance at an earlier stage compared to alternative controllers. In Fig. 1 (Right), the norms of control inputs $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{k}_{\text{SF}}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{k}_d(\mathbf{x})$ for our tunable universal formulas exhibit smoothness, which is because $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_2(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_3(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_4(\mathbf{x})$ are all real-analytic functions.

B. Safety-critical Control with Input Constraints

In this subsection, we study the effectiveness of tunable universal formulas in addressing safety-critical control when a norm-bound control input constraint is considered. Assume that $\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \gamma$, $\gamma = 3$. It is observed that $\kappa_3(\mathbf{x})$ and $\kappa_4(\mathbf{x})$ given in Section IV-A are not valid choices anymore since their controls exceed the norm bound $\gamma = 3$. In this case, we should switch to the tunable universal formula provided in (23) (note that it also has to be adapted to a safety filter framework). Firstly, it can be verified that $\gamma\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq -\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})$, and hence

we can always guarantee \mathbf{x} -compatibility of the CBF condition and control input constraint according to Lemma 3. Next, we continue to utilize $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\eta} \ln[\exp(\eta \cdot \frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}) + \exp(\eta \cdot \frac{\zeta}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})})]$. By noticing that $\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq 2$ in our application, we only need $0 \leq \zeta \leq 6$ to ensure $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$. Then the safety is guaranteed by using Theorem 5. Consequently, with the derived safety controllers, e.g., $\zeta = 2, 6$ (as shown in Fig. 1 with $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x})$ and $\kappa_2(\mathbf{x})$), we can draw analogous conclusions to those in Section IV-A based on Theorem 6 and Theorem 7

V. CONCLUSIONS

This paper introduces a tunable universal formula for safety-critical control based on Sontag’s universal formula. By incorporating a tunable scaling term to Sontag’s universal formula, we establish a flexible framework for tuning controllers’ safety guarantees, smoothness, and safety margins. Furthermore, we showcase that the tunable universal formula is applicable to various control scenarios by extending it to a safety-critical control task with norm-bounded input constraints. The effectiveness of the tunable universal formula is showcased through a collision avoidance example.

REFERENCES

- [1] Q. Nguyen and K. Sreenath, “Safety-critical control for dynamical bipedal walking with precise footstep placement,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 48, no. 27, pp. 147–154, 2015.
- [2] W. S. Cortez, D. Oetomo, C. Manzie, and P. Choong, “Control barrier functions for mechanical systems: Theory and application to robotic grasping,” *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 530–545, 2019.
- [3] G. Wu and K. Sreenath, “Safety-critical geometric control for systems on manifolds subject to time-varying constraints,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control (TAC)*, in review, 2016.
- [4] 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.
- [5] X. Xu, P. Tabuada, J. W. Grizzle, and A. D. Ames, “Robustness of control barrier functions for safety critical control,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 48, no. 27, pp. 54–61, 2015.
- [6] W. Xiao and C. Belta, “High-order control barrier functions,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 3655–3662, 2021.
- [7] S.-C. Hsu, X. Xu, and A. D. Ames, “Control barrier function based quadratic programs with application to bipedal robotic walking,” in *2015 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 4542–4548.
- [8] L. Lindemann and D. V. Dimarogonas, “Control barrier functions for signal temporal logic tasks,” *IEEE control systems letters*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 96–101, 2018.
- [9] 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.
- [10] S. Kolathaya and A. D. Ames, “Input-to-state safety with control barrier functions,” *IEEE control systems letters*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 108–113, 2018.
- [11] M. Krstic, “Inverse optimal safety filters,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023.
- [12] E. D. Sontag, “A ‘universal’ construction of Artstein’s theorem on nonlinear stabilization,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 117–123, 1989.
- [13] 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.
- [14] P. Mestres and J. Cortés, “Feasibility and regularity analysis of safe stabilizing controllers under uncertainty,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04603*, 2023.
- [15] P. Jagtap, G. J. Pappas, and M. Zamani, “Control barrier functions for unknown nonlinear systems using Gaussian processes,” in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 3699–3704.

- [16] 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.
- [17] R. Freeman and P. V. Kokotovic, *Robust nonlinear control design: state-space and Lyapunov techniques*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [18] R. Sepulchre, M. Jankovic, and P. V. Kokotovic, *Constructive nonlinear control*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [19] E. D. Sontag, *Mathematical control theory: deterministic finite dimensional systems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 6.
- [20] M. Jankovic, "Robust control barrier functions for constrained stabilization of nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 96, pp. 359–367, 2018.
- [21] 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.
- [22] 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.