

# 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 has been extended to address safety-critical control in recent years by incorporating control barrier functions (CBFs). However, deriving 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 – by incorporating a (state-dependent) tunable term into Sontag’s universal formula. This tunable 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 terms.

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

## I. INTRODUCTION

**S**AFETY-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 [1].

Control barrier functions (CBFs), which utilize Lyapunov-like arguments to ensure set forward invariance, have received significant attention in recent years [1]. Due to their advantages in handling nonlinear systems, suitability for real-time control, and effectiveness in managing high-relative-degree constraints [4], they have been applied to various safety-critical applications [1], including adaptive cruise control, lane keeping, and bipedal robot walking. Among existing studies, a prevalent application of CBFs is the formulation of quadratic programs (QPs) for controller synthesis [1]. The fundamental

properties of the QP-synthesized controller, such as robustness, Lipschitz continuity, smoothness, and inverse optimality, are studied in [5]–[9]. Among these, smoothness is a desirable property in safety-critical control, as evidenced by its necessity in implementing certain safety-critical control methods (e.g., safe backstepping algorithms through multi-layer cascaded dynamics [10]) and its preference in practical applications (e.g., ensuring passenger comfort in autonomous driving [11]). However, it was revealed that the QP-synthesized controller may exhibit non-smooth behavior [5] and requires additional modifications to enhance its robustness against input disturbances [6]. 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 [5], [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 [5], 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 controller that maintains certain desirable properties (e.g., safety, smoothness, and robustness) according to the requirements of a specific application?* To answer this question, a promising solution is presented in [5], which seeks to design a smooth controller with quantified robustness and safety guarantees. 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 [5] suggest constructing a *tunable* implicit function to adjust the robustness of Sontag’s universal formula while ensuring smoothness by satisfying specific conditions. Different from [5], our approach 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 term to regulate the controller performance. This design idea is inspired by our prior work [15] that extends Lin-Sontag’s universal formula [16] to address a stabilizing control problem. While both papers explore essential properties of the tunable universal formula, this paper focuses on safety-critical control, aiming to establish conditions for tunable functions to achieve desirable controller properties. Consequently, instead of establishing a particular ordinary differential equation and using set invariance theory to find tunable universal formulas as in [5], our focus is

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

on the selection of tunable terms within a valid range and incorporating certain conditions on these scaling terms to guarantee certain robustness and smoothness.

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 term to Sontag's universal formula. By properly selecting the tunable term within the specified conditions and validity range derived in this paper, we ensure the tunable universal formula exhibits desirable properties like 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 term, we can still regulate the performance of the controller in terms of safety, smoothness, and robustness while satisfying a norm-bounded input constraint.

## II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider a control-affine system

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

where  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state,  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the control input, and  $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{g} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  are smooth functions.<sup>1</sup> 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  $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , there exists a time interval  $I(\mathbf{x}_0) = [0, t_{\text{max}})$  such that  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  is the unique solution to (2) on  $I(\mathbf{x}_0)$ .

### A. CBFs and Universal Formula for Safety Control

Consider a closed 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  $\overline{\text{Int}(\mathcal{C})} = \mathcal{C}$ .

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

**Definition 3.** (Control Barrier Function, (CBF) [1]). 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  $\beta \in K_e$  such that, for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , there exists a control input  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  satisfying

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

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.

Note that, to ensure the continuity of the tunable universal formula, it is crucial to adjust the standard CBF condition in [1] to a strict inequality, i.e., Equation (4), as emphasized by [8] and [10, Remarks 1 and 3].

**Theorem 1.** ([1]) 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 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  $\mathcal{C}$ .

To provide freedom to regulate the control performance, the tightened CBF condition, which is a sufficient condition of (4), is introduced as follows:

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \geq \Gamma(\mathbf{x}), \quad (5)$$

where  $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a positive definite function satisfying  $c(\mathbf{x}) \geq \Gamma(\mathbf{x})$  whenever  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ .

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 [17]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{k}_{\text{PMN}}(\mathbf{x}) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \\ &\text{s.t. Condition (5),} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\|\mathbf{u}\|$  denotes the 2-norm of the control input.

**Lemma 1.** The solution to (6) can be explicitly expressed as

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{PMN}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{PMN}}(c(\mathbf{x}) - \Gamma(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2)\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\lambda_{\text{PMN}}(c, d) := \begin{cases} 0, & d = 0, \\ \text{ReLU}(-c/d), & d > 0, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

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

*Proof.* The solution to (6) can be obtained using the projection theorem. More details can be found in [18].  $\square$

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 (6), as per Equation (7), it yields a control law denoted as:

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{PMN}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2)\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})$  is commonly known as a QP-synthesized controller [19].

**Remark 1.** The function  $\lambda_{\text{PMN}}(c, d)$  defined by (8) 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 (9) 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-

<sup>1</sup>A function is smooth if it can be differentiated as many times as needed [5].

synthesized controller  $\mathbf{k}_{QP}(\mathbf{x})$ , i.e.,  $c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{k}_{QP}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ , while an input disturbance  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$  will give a control input  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{k}_{QP}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$  and may lead to  $c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} < 0$ . As a result, the system (1) may become unsafe due to an input disturbance  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$ .

Alternatively, one can choose

$$\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{c^2(\mathbf{x}) + \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^4}, \quad (10)$$

which gives

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \geq \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (11)$$

By applying condition (11) to the constraint in (6) and leveraging Lemma 1, we obtain Sontag's universal formula for safety-critical control, which is given by:

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{Stg}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2)\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\lambda_{\text{Stg}}(c, d) := \begin{cases} 0, & d = 0, \\ (-c + \sqrt{c^2 + d^2})/d, & d > 0. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Sontag's universal formula for safety-critical control has also been presented in [5], [13]. As demonstrated in [5], the control law  $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$  given in (12) is smooth. Moreover, we conclude that Sontag's universal formula is a special solution to the PMN optimization in (6) since the control law  $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$  is derived from (7) by choosing  $\Gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ .

**Remark 2.** *The utilization of Sontag's universal formula  $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$  in (12) 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 (11), 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  $\mathbf{k}_{QP}(\mathbf{x})$  for a safety-critical control. In particular, we denote an input disturbance by  $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$ , the control input  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{k}_{QP}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$  is more likely to render the system (1) unsafe compared to  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{x})$  due to the positive definite 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 addressing a safety-critical control task, which should feature desirable properties, such as safety, smoothness, and robustness.

## 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-Critical 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 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 desirable properties, e.g., smoothness [5], inverse optimality [9], and has strict safety guarantees [13], we set  $\Gamma_{\text{Basis}}(\mathbf{x}) = \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ . Then the constraint in (6) is reformulated as:

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \geq \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (14)$$

To establish (14) as a sufficient condition for the CBF condition (4), two conditions must be satisfied: i)  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ , and ii)  $c(\mathbf{x}) \geq \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$  when  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ . By examining both conditions and considering (10), we determine the range of  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$  to be  $0 < \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1$ . Next, we substitute the constraint in (6) with the condition (14). With Lemma 1, the following control law is obtained:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{Tun}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa(\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (15)$$

where

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

**Remark 3.** *For the control law  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  defined in (15), different choices of the tunable term  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$  will result in distinct control laws, each characterized by unique smoothness, safety, and robustness properties. For instance, when one sets  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$ , the QP-synthesized controller  $\mathbf{k}_{QP}(\mathbf{x})$  presented in (9) is obtained, and  $\mathbf{k}_{QP}(\mathbf{x})$  maybe non-smooth as revealed in Remark 1. When  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ , the control law  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  leads to Sontag's universal formula  $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$  as specified in (12), which is a smooth function. Moreover, it is worthy to mention that, as the value of  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$  increases, the controller  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  will become more robust to input disturbance and have more conservative safety-critical control behavior according to the condition (14) and similar analysis as in Remark 2. Motivated by the above analysis, we call  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  a tunable universal formula.*

1) *Safety Guarantees:* We provide the following theorem to guarantee the safety of the system (1) by using the tunable universal formula given in (15).

**Theorem 2.** *Assume that  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a CBF. Then the tunable universal formula  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  provided by (15), with  $0 < \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1$ , ensures the safety of the closed-loop system (1).*

*Proof.* By substituting (15) into (4), it shows that the CBF condition (4) is always satisfied for all  $0 < \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1$ . Next, with Theorem 1, we conclude that the closed-loop system (1) (with  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$ ) is safe.  $\square$

2) *Smoothness*: To ensure a proper choice of  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$  that leads to the tunable universal formula  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  being a smooth control law, we first need to eliminate the influence of the function  $\text{ReLU}(\cdot)$  as appeared in (16). To achieve this, we choose a function  $\iota$  that satisfies  $\iota > c/\sqrt{c^2 + d^2}$ , which gives  $-c + \iota\sqrt{c^2 + d^2} > 0$ . This choice simplifies the function  $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota)$  (defined in (16)) to

$$\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } d = 0, \\ \frac{-c + \iota\sqrt{c^2 + d^2}}{d}, & \text{if } d \neq 0. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

This choice is essentially to require  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) > \frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}$  in (15). Then combine the constraint  $0 < \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  leads to

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

where the tunable term  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathcal{K} = \{\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \max(\frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0) < \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1\}$ .

**Remark 4.** Note that one can also adapt the tunable universal formula (18) to a safety filter framework [1], which aims to make a minimal modification to a predefined nominal control  $\mathbf{k}_d(\mathbf{x})$ . In this case, the cost function in (6) is adjusted to  $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{k}_d\|^2$ . By following the same derivation routine for obtaining (18), the tunable universal formula for a safety filter is acquired, which is expressed as:

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{SF}}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_{\text{Tun}}(\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa(\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top, \quad (19)$$

where  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{SF}}$ ,  $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x}) = c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{k}_d$ , and  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{SF}} = \{\kappa : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \max(\frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0) < \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1\}$ , where  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$  can be obtained by substituting  $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})$  for  $c(\mathbf{x})$  into (10).

Next, we define an open subset  $\Phi = \{(c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid c > 0 \text{ or } d > 0\}$  and introduce the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** Assume that  $\zeta(c, d)$  is real-analytic on  $\Phi$  and let  $\iota(c, d) = (1 - \zeta(c, d)) \cdot \frac{c}{\sqrt{c^2 + d^2}} + \zeta(c, d)$ . The function  $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota(c, d))$  defined in (17) is real-analytic on  $\Phi$ .

*Proof.* Firstly, we substitute  $\iota(c, d) = (1 - \zeta(c, d)) \cdot \frac{c}{\sqrt{c^2 + d^2}} + \zeta(c, d)$  into (17), which gives

$$\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota(c, d)) = \zeta(c, d) \cdot \lambda_{\text{Stg}}(c, d). \quad (20)$$

Note that one can prove that  $\lambda_{\text{Stg}}(c, d)$  given in (13) is real-analytic on  $\Phi$  by following the proof in [20, Proposition 5.9.10]. Furthermore, due to  $\zeta(c, d)$  being a real-analytic function on  $\Phi$  by assumption, we can infer from (20) that  $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota(c, d))$  is also real-analytic on  $\Phi$ .  $\square$

Generally, there are various choices of  $\iota(c, d)$  to ensure the smoothness of the function  $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota(c, d))$  given in (18). For instance, setting  $\iota(c, d) = 1$  or  $\iota(c, d) = \sqrt{c^2 + d^4}/\sqrt{c^2 + d^2}$ , one can easily verify that the function  $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota(c, d))$  is smooth by following the proof in [20, Proposition 5.9.10]. As for Lemma 2, it provides a family of feasible  $\iota(c, d)$  that ensures the smoothness of the function  $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c, d, \iota(c, d))$ . We also emphasize that (20) is the solution to the tunable implicit function as given in [5, Equation (28)]. This further implies that the tunable universal formula defined in the following theorem is equivalent to the results in [5].

**Theorem 3.** Assume that  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a CBF and

$\eta(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2)$  is a real-analytic function on  $\Phi$ .<sup>2</sup> For the tunable universal formula provided in (18), if one chooses  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = (1 - \eta) \cdot \frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} + \eta$  and ensures  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$ , then the resulting control law is smooth and ensures the closed-loop system (1) is safe for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* Firstly, due to  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$  and Theorem 2, we can deduce that the closed-loop system (1) is safe. Next, according to (4), we know that  $c(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  when  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ , and it is evident that  $\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 > 0$  for  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Consequently, we can verify that  $(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2) \in \Phi$ . Moreover, due to that  $\eta$  is a real-analytic function on  $\Phi$  and  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = (1 - \eta) \cdot \frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} + \eta$ , one can prove that the function  $\lambda_{\text{Tun}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \kappa(\mathbf{x}))$  is a real-analytic function on  $\Phi$  according to Lemma 2. Therefore, the tunable universal formula given in (18) is real-analytic on  $\Phi$ , and hence smooth for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ .  $\square$

In Theorem 3, one should note that the condition  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$  necessitates the smooth function  $\eta \in \Xi$ , where  $\Xi := \{\eta : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \max(\frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{c(\mathbf{x}) - \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0) < \eta \leq 1\}$ . Therefore, Theorem 3 suggests finding a real-analytic function  $\eta \in \Xi$  first and then using  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = (1 - \eta) \cdot \frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} + \eta$  to construct the tunable term  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ . For example, one can choose  $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\eta = 1$ ,  $\eta = 1/(1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\|^2})$ , which leads to  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = (c(\mathbf{x}) + \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})) / (2\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}))$ ,  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = (c(\mathbf{x}) + \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})) / \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = (\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - c(\mathbf{x})\sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}) / (\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})(1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2}))$  and gives Half-Sontag's formula [5], Sontag's formula [12], and Lin-Sontag's formula [16], respectively.

3) *Safety Margin*: While the term ‘‘safety margin’’ is commonly used in existing literature, a precise definition has not been established. In [8], the concept of stability margin [21] has been extended to safety-critical control. This extension still allows for a quantitative assessment of the robustness of a controller, similar to that of a stabilizing control. In this regard, we follow the definition of stability margin presented in [17] 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 (18) is  $[\bar{\xi}, \infty)$ , where  $\bar{\xi} := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$ ,

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq -1 + \frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{c(\mathbf{x}) - \kappa(\mathbf{x})\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, \quad (21)$$

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

*Proof.* Given that the tunable universal formula defined in (18) satisfies the tightened CBF condition presented in (14) with  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$ , we substitute  $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  into (14) and add

<sup>2</sup>To simplify notation, we denote  $\eta(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2)$  by  $\eta$  thereafter.

$\xi \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  to both sides of (14) based on the safety margin definition. This yields:

$$c(\mathbf{x}) + (1 + \xi) \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \xi \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x}) + \kappa(\mathbf{x}) \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (22)$$

A sufficient condition for guaranteeing the safety of the system (1) is that the right-hand side of (22) is non-negative for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , which leads to  $\xi \geq \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$ . 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 (21) 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 [8].

4) *Discussions:* In Theorem 2, we have established the conditions for the tunable universal formula  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  to ensure the safety of the closed-loop system (1), where  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun}}(\mathbf{x})$  is not necessarily to be smooth. Then, we demonstrate that a family of smooth controllers (with safety guarantees) can be designed according to Theorem 3 with different  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$  (relating to different  $\eta$ ). This suggests that both safety and smoothness properties can be achieved simultaneously by appropriately selecting  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ . Further, to evaluate the robustness and conservatism of these safe and smooth controllers, one can refer to the conclusions in Theorem 4. As noticed in (21), an increase in  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$  will lead to a large  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$ , resulting in a larger safety margin, and hence the control law is more robust against input disturbances. However, a large  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$  will result in a more conservative safety-critical control because of (14) and by following the discussions in Remark 2. Therefore, there is an inherent trade-off between the robustness and conservatism of a safe and smooth control law. In practice, the choice of a specific  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ , which leads to certain levels of robustness and conservatism, relies on the specific demands of the application.

### B. Addressing Norm-Bounded Input Constraints

Thus far, the tunable universal formula presented in (18) 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.

$$\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \gamma, \quad (23)$$

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 a particular  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , that satisfies (4) and (23) simultaneously.

**Assumption 1.** The CBF condition (4) is *x-compatible* with the norm-bounded input constraint (23).

**Lemma 3.** The CBF condition given by (4) is *x-compatible* with the input constraint (23) 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  $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}) := \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} \|\mathbf{u}\|, \text{s.t. } c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u} \geq 0$  is less than  $\gamma$ . Notably, this is equivalent to requiring  $\|\mathbf{k}_{\text{QP}}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq \gamma$ . By substituting (9) 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 (18) 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.** Assume that  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a CBF and Assumption 1 holds. The following tunable universal formula law ensures the closed-loop system (1) is safe and satisfies the norm-bounded input constraint (23) simultaneously:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{Tun}}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2, \tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x})) \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top \quad (24)$$

where  $0 \leq \tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{\gamma \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| + c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}$ .

*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  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} \neq \emptyset$ . Next, we examine whether  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$  satisfies the CBF condition (4). Firstly, substituting  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$  into (24), it gives  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ . 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  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$  into (4). For the case  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ , we know that  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - c(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top$ . Substituting  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$  into (4) gives  $c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - c(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})^\top = \tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) \Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ .

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

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

given the condition  $\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ . Therefore, we conclude that the closed-loop system (1) is safe and simultaneously satisfies the input constraint (23).  $\square$

2) *Smoothness:* In the following theorem, we provide conditions to guarantee the controller defined by (24) is smooth.




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

**Theorem 6.** Suppose that  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a CBF, Assumption 1 holds, and  $\tilde{\eta}(c(\mathbf{x}), \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\|^2)$  is a real-analytic function on  $\Phi$ . For the tunable universal formula provided in (24), if one chooses  $\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) = (1 - \tilde{\eta}) \cdot \frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} + \tilde{\eta}$  and ensures  $\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} := \{\tilde{\kappa} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \max(\frac{c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, 0) < \tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{\gamma \|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| + c(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}\}$ . Then the resulting control law is smooth and ensures the closed-loop system (1) is safe for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* One can follow the proof presented in Theorem 3 to verify the smoothness of  $\mathbf{k}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$ .  $\square$

3) *Safety Margin:* We continue to use Definition 4 and Theorem 4 to assess the safety margin associated with the tunable universal formula given in (24). However, for (24), we rely on  $\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x})$  for defining  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$  (see Equation (21)). Without a more precise  $\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x})$ , we determine that  $\bar{\xi} = 0$ .

**Theorem 7.** The controller defined by the tunable universal formula given in (24) has a safety margin  $\xi \in [0, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* As  $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ , Theorem 4 remains applicable to (24). This implies that the safety margin for (24) is within  $\xi \in [\bar{\xi}, \infty)$ ,  $\bar{\xi} := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$ . Given that  $\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ , we can deduce that  $\bar{\xi} = 0$  based on (21), which indicates that the safety margin of  $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Tun-BI}}(\mathbf{x})$  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 [5], to illustrate the advantages of our proposed approach. The objective is to design smooth 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  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : h(\mathbf{x}) = (x_1 + 2)^2 + (x_2 - 2)^2 - 1 \geq 0\}$ .<sup>3</sup>

For a better performance demonstration, we introduce a nominal stabilizing control input  $\mathbf{k}_d(\mathbf{x}) = -\mathbf{x}$  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  $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x}) = c(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{k}_d(\mathbf{x}) = -2x_1(x_1 + 2) - 2x_2(x_2 - 2) + 5h(\mathbf{x})$  (cf. Remark 4). Subsequently, we select  $\eta = \max(\frac{\zeta - \tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}, 0) \in \Xi$  and obtain  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$  through  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = (1 - \tilde{\eta}) \cdot \frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})} + \eta$ , which gives  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = \max(\frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, \frac{\zeta}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})})$ . By choose  $\zeta = 2, 6, 10, 15$ , it leads to  $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_2(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_3(\mathbf{x}), \kappa_4(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}$ , respectively. However, one will argue that the function  $\max(\cdot)$  may lead to a non-smooth tunable universal formula. To address this problem, we use the smooth function  $\frac{1}{\epsilon} \ln[\exp(\epsilon \cdot \frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}) + \exp(\epsilon \cdot \zeta)]$  to approximate  $\max(\frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, \frac{\zeta}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})})$ , where  $\epsilon = 100$  [22]. Furthermore, we intentionally devise a non-smooth function  $\kappa_5(\mathbf{x}) = \max(\frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x})}{\Gamma_{\text{Stg}}(\mathbf{x})}, s)$ , where  $s = 0.3$  if  $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x}) > -1.5$ , and  $s = 0.4$  if  $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{x}) \leq -1.5$ . This demonstration illustrates that a non-smooth controller can arise from an improper choice of  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$ . By utilizing these selections of  $\kappa(\mathbf{x})$  and employing (19), several tunable universal formulas are derived. As shown in Fig. 1 (Left), the collision avoidance behavior is depicted for different 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 real-analytic functions. However, because  $\kappa_5(\mathbf{x})$  is not smooth, the control law exhibits some oscillatory phenomena.

Additionally, we study the effectiveness of tunable universal formulas in addressing safety-critical control when a norm-bounded control input constraint is considered. Assume that  $\|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \gamma$ ,  $\gamma = 3$ . It is observed that  $\kappa_3(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\kappa_4(\mathbf{x})$  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 (24) (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 x-compatibility of the CBF condition and control input constraint according to Lemma 3. By noticing that  $\|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x})\| \geq 2$  in our application, we need  $0 \leq \zeta \leq 6$  to ensure  $\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{x}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ . Then the safety is guaranteed by using Theorem 5. Consequently, with the derived controllers (as shown in Fig. 1 with  $\kappa_1(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\kappa_2(\mathbf{x})$ ), we can draw similar conclusions to the case without input constraints based on Theorem 5 and Theorem 6.

#### V. CONCLUSIONS

This paper introduced a tunable universal formula for safety-critical control based on Sontag’s universal formula. By incorporating a tunable 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. Our future work will focus on

<sup>3</sup>The simulation code is available at: [https://github.com/lyric12345678/Tunable\\_Universal\\_Formula](https://github.com/lyric12345678/Tunable_Universal_Formula).

extending the tunable universal formula to accommodate other types of input constraints.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 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.
- [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] W. Xiao and C. Belta, "High-order control barrier functions," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 3655–3662, 2021.
- [5] 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.
- [6] 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.
- [7] B. Morris, M. J. Powell, and A. D. Ames, "Sufficient conditions for the lipschitz continuity of qp-based multi-objective control of humanoid robots," in *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 2920–2926.
- [8] M. Jankovic, "Robust control barrier functions for constrained stabilization of nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 96, pp. 359–367, 2018.
- [9] M. Krstic, "Inverse optimal safety filters," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023.
- [10] M. H. Cohen, T. G. Molnar, and A. D. Ames, "Safety-critical control for autonomous systems: Control barrier functions via reduced-order models," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 57, p. 100947, 2024.
- [11] W. Xiao, T.-H. Wang, R. Hasani, M. Chahine, A. Amini, X. Li, and D. Rus, "Barriernet: Differentiable control barrier functions for learning of safe robot control," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 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] M. Li, Z. Sun, and S. Weiland, "Unifying controller design for stabilizing nonlinear systems with norm-bounded control inputs," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03030*, 2024.
- [16] 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.
- [17] 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.
- [18] R. Freeman and P. V. Kokotovic, *Robust nonlinear control design: state-space and Lyapunov techniques*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [19] 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.
- [20] E. D. Sontag, *Mathematical control theory: deterministic finite dimensional systems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 6.
- [21] R. Sepulchre, M. Jankovic, and P. V. Kokotovic, *Constructive nonlinear control*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [22] 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.