

Finite Abstractions of Network of Impulsive Systems Using Dissipativity Approach

Abdalla Swikir

Abstract

This paper introduces a compositional framework for constructing finite abstractions of nonlinear interconnected impulsive systems using dissipativity-based conditions. Central to our approach is the concept of "alternating simulation functions," which serve to relate the concrete dynamics of impulsive subsystems to their finite abstractions. Dissipativity conditions are employed to ensure the compositionality of the finite abstractions, enabling the representation of complex interconnected systems as compositions of their subsystem abstractions. The methodology relies on incremental passivity properties such as supply rates and storage functions, alongside forward completeness, to construct finite abstractions for individual impulsive subsystems.

1 Introduction

Finite abstractions (a.k.a. symbolic models) provide a powerful method for simplifying complex dynamical systems by representing them through finite sets of states, inputs, and transitions that capture the core dynamics of the original system. Formal relationships, such as simulation or alternating simulation [1], link these abstract models to the concrete systems, enabling tasks like model checking and controller synthesis. These techniques are particularly valuable for designing controllers that adhere to high-level specifications expressed in temporal logic [2]. However, the need for state and input space discretization often results in exponential computational complexity, making the abstraction process computationally expensive, especially for systems with high-dimensional state spaces. This phenomenon, commonly referred to as the "curse of dimensionality," poses significant challenges.

To address the challenges posed by large-scale interconnected systems, compositional abstraction has emerged as a promising approach. By decomposing the abstraction process into subsystem-level constructions, compositional methods enable a more scalable and efficient handling of interconnected systems. Significant progress has been made in this area, leading to frameworks for the abstraction of acyclic interconnected linear [3], nonlinear [4], and discrete-time time-delay systems [5]; methods based on dissipativity properties [6]; and abstraction frameworks for interconnected switched systems [7, 8].

The compositional abstraction of interconnected discrete-time control systems is addressed in [9], where a systematic framework is developed for constructing symbolic models. Similarly, [10] investigates the compositional construction of approximately bisimilar abstractions for incrementally input-to-state stable networks of systems. In addition, compositional synthesis of abstractions for infinite networks has been explored in [11, 12, 13, 14]. Further approaches include assume-guarantee contracts [15, 16] and approximate composition methods [17, 18]. A comprehensive discussion of compositional frameworks can be found in [19].

Despite these advancements, compositional construction of finite abstractions of impulsive systems remains underexplored. Prior work, such as [20], addresses the monolithic abstraction of impulsive systems, which becomes computationally burdensome for large-scale interconnected systems. A notable recent development in [21] presents a compositional methodology for constructing symbolic models of nonlinear interconnected impulsive systems using small-gain-type conditions. However, the reliance

on gain constraints limits the applicability of this approach, particularly for certain interconnection topologies.

In this paper, we address these limitations by proposing a novel compositional framework for constructing finite abstractions of a network of impulsive systems based on dissipativity-type conditions. Unlike small-gain-type approaches, dissipativity-based conditions eliminate the need for gain constraints in some interconnection topologies, significantly broadening the applicability of the framework. Our methodology extends the concept of alternating approximate simulation functions [22] to establish formal relationships between subsystems and their symbolic models. By leveraging dissipativity properties and forward completeness, we develop a systematic process for constructing finite abstractions for individual subsystems and for the overall interconnected system.

2 Notations and Preliminaries

Notations: We denote by \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{Z} , and \mathbb{N} the set of real numbers, integers, and non-negative integers, respectively. These symbols are annotated with subscripts to restrict them in an obvious way, e.g., $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ denotes the positive real numbers. We denote the closed, open, and half-open intervals in \mathbb{R} by $[a, b]$, (a, b) , $[a, b)$, and $(a, b]$, respectively. For $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \leq b$, we use $[a; b]$, $(a; b)$, $[a; b)$, and $(a; b]$ to denote the corresponding intervals in \mathbb{N} . Given any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $|a|$ denotes the absolute value of a . Given any $u = [u_1; \dots; u_n] \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the infinity norm of u is defined by $\|u\| = \max_{i \in [1; n]} \|u_i\|$. Given a function $\nu : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, the supremum of ν is denoted by $\|\nu\|_\infty$; we recall that $\|\nu\|_\infty := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \|\nu(t)\|$. Given $\mathbf{x} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $t \geq s$, we define $\mathbf{x}^{(-t)} = \lim_{s \rightarrow t} \mathbf{x}(s)$ as the left limit operator. For a given constant $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a set $\mathcal{W} := \{\mathbf{x} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\}$, we denote the restriction of \mathcal{W} to the interval $[0, \tau]$ by $\mathcal{W}|_{[0, \tau]} := \{\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{C}(\cdot)$ the cardinality of a given set and by \emptyset the empty set. Given sets U and $S \subset U$, the complement of S with respect to U is defined as $U \setminus S = \{x : x \in U, x \notin S\}$. Given a family of finite or countable sets $S_i, i \in \mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{N}$, the j^{th} element of the set S_i is denoted by $s_{i,j}$. For any set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ of the form $S = \bigcup_{j=1}^M S_j$ for some $M \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, where $S_j = \prod_{i=1}^n [c_i^j, d_i^j] \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with $c_i^j < d_i^j$, and non-negative constant $\eta \leq \tilde{\eta}$, where $\tilde{\eta} = \min_{j=1, \dots, M} \eta_{S_j}$ and $\eta_{S_j} = \min\{|d_1^j - c_1^j|, \dots, |d_n^j - c_n^j|\}$, we define $[S]_\eta = \{a \in S \mid a_i = k_i \eta, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ if $\eta \neq 0$, and $[S]_\eta = S$ if $\eta = 0$. The set $[S]_\eta$ will be used as a finite approximation of the set S with precision $\eta \neq 0$. Note that $[S]_\eta \neq \emptyset$ for any $\eta \leq \tilde{\eta}$. We use notations \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{K}_∞ to denote different classes of comparison functions, as follows: $\mathcal{K} = \{\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid \alpha \text{ is continuous, strictly increasing, and } \alpha(0) = 0\}$; $\mathcal{K}_\infty = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{K} \mid \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(s) = \infty\}$. For $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ we write $\alpha \leq \gamma$ if $\alpha(r) \leq \gamma(r), \forall r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and, by abuse of notation, $\alpha = c$ if $\alpha(r) = cr$ for all $c, r \geq 0$. Finally, we denote by id the identity function over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, i.e. $\text{id}(r) = r, \forall r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

2.1 Concrete System

2.1.1 Impulsive Nonlinear Subsystems

We consider a collection of impulsive subsystems indexed by $i \in \mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{N} = [1; N]$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. Each subsystem, indexed by i , is formally defined as follows:

Definition 2.1 A nonlinear impulsive subsystem $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathcal{N}$, is represented by the tuple $\Sigma_i = (\mathbb{R}_i^{n_i}, \mathbb{W}_i, \mathbb{W}_i, \mathbb{U}_i, \mathbb{U}_i, f_i, g_i)$, where

- $\mathbb{R}_i^{n_i}$ is the state set;
- $\mathbb{W}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{q_i}$ is the internal input set;
- \mathbb{W}_i is the set of all measurable bounded internal input functions $\omega_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_i$;
- $\mathbb{U}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is the external input set;

- \mathbb{U}_i is the set of all measurable bounded external input functions $\nu_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}_i$;
- $f_i, g_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \times \mathbb{W}_i \times \mathbb{U}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ are locally Lipschitz functions;
- $\Omega_i = \{t_i^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a set of strictly increasing sequence of impulsive times in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ comes with $t_i^{k+1} - t_i^k \in \{\underline{z}_i \tau_i, \dots, \bar{z}_i \tau_i\}$ for fixed jump parameters $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ and $\underline{z}_i, \bar{z}_i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, $\underline{z}_i \leq \bar{z}_i$.

The nonlinear flow and jump dynamics, f_i and g_i , are characterized by the following differential and difference equations:

$$\Sigma_i : \begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) = f_i(\mathbf{x}_i(t), \omega_i(t), \nu_i(t)), & t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus \Omega_i, \\ \mathbf{x}_i(t) = g_i(\mathbf{x}_i(-t), \omega_i(-t), \nu_i(t)), & t \in \Omega_i, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $\omega_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_i$ are the state and internal input signals, respectively, and assumed to be right-continuous for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and function $\nu_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}_i$, is the external input signal. We will use $\mathbf{x}_{x_i, \omega_i, \nu_i}(t)$ to denote a point reached at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ from initial state x_i under input signals $\omega_i \in \mathbb{W}_i$ and $\nu_i \in \mathbb{U}_i$. We denote by Σ_{c_i} and Σ_{d_i} the continuous and discrete dynamics of subsystem Σ_i , i.e., $\Sigma_{c_i} : \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) = f_i(\mathbf{x}_i(t), \omega_i(t), \nu_i(t))$, and $\Sigma_{d_i} : \mathbf{x}_i(t) = g_i(\mathbf{x}_i(-t), \omega_i(-t), \nu_i(t))$.

2.1.2 Network of Impulsive Systems

The formal definition of the network of impulsive systems is expressed as:

Definition 2.2 Consider $N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ impulsive subsystems, $\Sigma_i = (\mathbb{R}^{n_i}, \mathbb{W}_i, \mathbb{W}_i, \mathbb{U}_i, \mathbb{U}_i, f_i, g_i)$ and a matrix M of an appropriate dimension defining the coupling of these subsystems. The network of impulsive systems is a tuple $\Sigma = (\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{U}, f, \mathcal{G}, \Omega)$, denoted by $\mathcal{I}(\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N)$ and described by the differential, difference equation of the form,

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = f(\mathbf{x}(t), \nu(t)), & \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus \Omega \\ \mathbf{x}(t) = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}(-t), \nu(t)) & \forall t \in \Omega \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

with $x \in \mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $\nu \in \mathbb{U} = \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbb{U}_i$, $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \Omega_i$ and

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}(t), \nu(t)) &= [f_1(x_1(t), \omega_1(t), v_1(t)), \dots, f_n(x_n(t), \omega_n(t), v_n(t))] \\ \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}(-t), \nu(t)) &= [\beta_1(x_1(-t), \omega_1(-t), v_1(t)), \dots, \beta_n(x_n(-t), \omega_n(-t), v_n(t))] \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\beta_i(x_i(-t), \omega_i(-t), v_i(t)) = \begin{cases} x_i(-t) & \text{if } t \notin \Omega_i \\ g_i(x_i(-t), \omega_i(-t), v_i(t)) & \text{if } t \in \Omega_i \end{cases}$$

and with the internal variables constrained by

$$[\omega_1; \dots; \omega_N] = M [\mathbf{x}_1; \dots; \mathbf{x}_N]. \quad (2.3)$$

2.2 Transition systems

2.2.1 Transition Subsystems

Now, we will introduce the class of transition subsystems [23], which will be later interconnected to form an interconnected transition system. Indeed, the concept of transition subsystems permits to model impulsive subsystems and their finite abstractions in a common framework.

Definition 2.3 A transition subsystem is a tuple $T_i = (X_i, X_{0_i}, W_i, \mathcal{W}_i, U_i, \mathcal{U}_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$, $i \in \mathcal{N}$, consisting of:

- a set of states X_i ;
- a set of initial states $X_{0_i} \subseteq X_i$;
- a set of internal inputs values W_i ;
- a set of internal inputs signals $\mathcal{W}_i := \{\omega_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow W_i\}$;
- a set of external inputs values U_i ;
- a set of external inputs signals $\mathcal{U}_i := \{u_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow U_i\}$;
- transition function $\mathcal{F}_i : X_i \times \mathcal{W}_i \times \mathcal{U}_i \rightrightarrows X_i$.

The transition $x_i^+ \in \mathcal{F}_i(x_i, \omega_i, u_i)$ signifies that the system can transition from state x_i to state x_i^+ under the influence of the input signals ω_i (internal) and u_i (external). Thus, the transition function \mathcal{F}_i encapsulates the dynamics governing the state transitions of the system. Let $\mathbf{x}_{x_i, \omega_i, u_i}$ denote an infinite state trajectory (or run) of the transition system T_i , associated with the initial state x_i , internal input signal ω_i , and external input signal u_i .

The sets X_i , W_i , and U_i are assumed to be subsets of normed vector spaces of appropriate finite dimensions. If, for all $x_i \in X_i$, $\omega_i \in \mathcal{W}_i$, and $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$, the cardinality of the transition function satisfies $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}_i(x_i, \omega_i, u_i)) \leq 1$, then T_i is said to be deterministic; otherwise, it is non-deterministic.

Additionally, T_i is termed finite if X_i , W_i , and U_i are finite sets; otherwise, T_i is considered infinite. Furthermore, T_i is called non-blocking if, for every $x_i \in X_i$, there exist $\omega_i \in \mathcal{W}_i$ and $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$ such that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}_i(x_i, \omega_i, u_i)) \neq 0$.

2.2.2 Network of transition system

We define the composed transition system by $\mathcal{I}(T_1, \dots, T_N)$ and we define it formally as

Definition 2.4 Consider $N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ transition subsystems $T_i = (X_i, X_{0_i}, W_i, \mathcal{W}_i, U_i, \mathcal{U}_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$. Let $x = [x_1; \dots; x_N] \in X$, $u = [u_1; \dots; u_N] \in U$, and $\|[\omega_1; \dots; \omega_N] - M[\mathbf{x}_1; \dots; \mathbf{x}_N]\| \leq [\Phi_1; \dots; \Phi_N]$, $\Phi_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. The interconnected transition system is a tuple $T = (X, X_0, U, \mathcal{F})$, denoted by $\mathcal{I}(T_1, \dots, T_N)$, where $X = \prod_{i=1}^N X_i$, $X_0 = \prod_{i=1}^N X_{0_i}$, $U = \prod_{i=1}^N U_i$. Moreover, the transition relation \mathcal{F} is defined by,

$$\mathcal{F}(x, u) := \{[x_1^+; \dots; x_N^+] \mid x_i^+ \in \mathcal{F}_i(x_i, u_i, \omega_i) \forall i \in \mathcal{N}\}, \quad (2.4)$$

2.3 Alternating Simulation Function

In this section, we recall the so-called notion of ε - approximate alternating simulation function in [24].

Definition 2.5 Let $T = (X, X_0, U, \mathcal{F})$ and $\hat{T} = (\hat{X}, \hat{X}_0, \hat{U}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$ with $\hat{X} \subseteq X$. A function $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} : X \times \hat{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called an alternating simulation function from \hat{T} to T if there exist $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty}$, $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < 1$, $\tilde{\rho}_u \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty} \cup \{0\}$, and some $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ so that the following hold:

1. For every $x \in X, \hat{x} \in \hat{X}$, we have,

$$\tilde{\alpha}(\|x - \hat{x}\|) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(x, \hat{x}); \quad (2.5)$$

2. For every $x \in X, \hat{x} \in \hat{X}, \hat{u} \in \hat{U}$ there exists $u \in U$ such that for every $x^+ \in \mathcal{F}(x, u)$ there exists $\hat{x}^+ \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\hat{x}, \hat{u})$ so that,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(x^+, \hat{x}^+) \leq \max\{\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(x, \hat{x}), \tilde{\rho}_u(\|\hat{u}\|_{\infty}), \tilde{\varepsilon}\}; \quad (2.6)$$

Then, function $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} : X \times \hat{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined as,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(x, \hat{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i \mathcal{S}_i(x_i, \hat{x}_i) \quad (3.3)$$

is an alternating simulation function from $T = \mathcal{I}(T_1, \dots, T_N)$ to $\hat{T} = \mathcal{I}(\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_N)$.

4 Construction of Finite Abstractions

In the previous section, we showed how to construct an abstraction of a system from the abstractions of its subsystems. In this section, our focus is on constructing a finite abstraction for an impulsive subsystem using an approximate alternating simulation. To ease readability, in the sequel, the index $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is omitted.

Consider an impulsive subsystem $\Sigma = (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{W}, \mathbb{W}, \mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}_\tau, f, g)$, as defined in Definition 2.1. We restrict our attention to sampled-data impulsive systems, where the input curves belong to \mathbb{U}_τ containing only curves of constant duration τ , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{U}_\tau = \{\nu : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{U} \mid \nu(t) = \nu((k-1)\tau), t \in [(k-1)\tau, k\tau), k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Moreover, we assume that there exist constant φ such that for all $\omega \in \mathbb{W}$ the following holds,

$$\|\omega(t) - \omega((k-1)\tau)\| \leq \varphi, \forall t \in [(k-1)\tau, k\tau), k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}. \quad (4.2)$$

Next, we define sampled-data impulsive systems as transition subsystems. Such transition subsystems would be the bridge that relates impulsive systems to their finite abstractions.

Definition 4.1 *Given an impulsive system $\Sigma = (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{W}, \mathbb{W}, \mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U}_\tau, f, g)$, we define the associated transition system $T_\tau(\Sigma) = (X, X_0, W, \mathcal{W}, U, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F})$ where:*

- $X = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0, \dots, \bar{z}\}$;
- $X_0 = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$;
- $U = \mathbb{U}$;
- $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{U}_\tau$;
- $W = \mathbb{W}$;
- $\mathcal{W} = \mathbb{W}$;
- $(x^+, c^+) \in \mathcal{F}((x, c), \omega, u)$ if and only if one of the following scenarios hold:
 - Flow scenario: $0 \leq c \leq \bar{z} - 1$, $x^+ = \mathbf{x}_{x, \omega, u}(-\tau)$, and $c^+ = c + 1$;
 - Jump scenario: $\underline{z} \leq c \leq \bar{z}$, $x^+ = g(x, \omega(0), u(0))$, and $c^+ = 0$.

For later use, define \mathcal{W}_τ as,

$$\mathcal{W}_\tau = \{\omega : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow W \mid \omega(t) = \omega((k-1)\tau), t \in [(k-1)\tau, k\tau), k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}\}. \quad (4.3)$$

In order to construct a finite abstraction for $T_\tau(\Sigma)$, we introduce the following assumptions and lemmas.

Assumption 4.2 Consider impulsive system $\Sigma = (\mathbb{R}^n, W, W, U, U_\tau, f, g)$. Assume that there exist a locally Lipschitz function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, \mathcal{K}_∞ functions $\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \rho_{u_c}, \rho_{u_d}$, and constants $\kappa_c \in \mathbb{R}, \kappa_d \in \mathbb{R}$, symmetric matrices D_c and D_d of appropriate dimensions with conformal block partitions $D_m^{kj}, k, j \in \{1, 2\}, m \in \{c, d\}$ such that the following hold,

- $\forall x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\underline{\alpha}(\|x - \hat{x}\|) \leq V(x, \hat{x}) \leq \bar{\alpha}(\|x - \hat{x}\|); \quad (4.4)$$

- $\forall x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ a.e., $\forall \omega, \hat{\omega} \in W$, and $\forall u, \hat{u} \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial V(x, \hat{x})}{\partial x} f(x, \omega, u) + \frac{\partial V(x, \hat{x})}{\partial \hat{x}} f(\hat{x}, \hat{\omega}, \hat{u}) \\ & \leq -\kappa_c V(x, \hat{x}) + \begin{bmatrix} \omega - \hat{\omega} \\ x - \hat{x} \end{bmatrix}^T \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} D_c^{11} & D_c^{12} \\ D_c^{21} & D_c^{22} \end{bmatrix}}_{D_c} \begin{bmatrix} \omega - \hat{\omega} \\ x - \hat{x} \end{bmatrix} + \rho_{u_c}(\|u - \hat{u}\|); \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

- $\forall x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall \omega, \hat{\omega} \in W$, and $\forall u, \hat{u} \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned} & V(g(x, \omega, u), g(\hat{x}, \hat{\omega}, \hat{u})) \\ & \leq \kappa_d V(x, \hat{x}) + \begin{bmatrix} \omega - \hat{\omega} \\ x - \hat{x} \end{bmatrix}^T \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} D_d^{11} & D_d^{12} \\ D_d^{21} & D_d^{22} \end{bmatrix}}_{D_d} \begin{bmatrix} \omega - \hat{\omega} \\ x - \hat{x} \end{bmatrix} + \rho_{u_d}(\|u - \hat{u}\|). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Assumption 4.3 There exist \mathcal{K}_∞ function $\hat{\gamma}$ such that for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$V(x, y) \leq V(x, z) + \hat{\gamma}(\|y - z\|). \quad (4.7)$$

We now have all the ingredients to construct a finite abstractions $\hat{T}_\tau(\Sigma)$ of transition system $T_\tau(\Sigma)$ associated with the impulsive system Σ admitting a function V that satisfies Assumption 4.2 as follows.

Definition 4.4 Consider a transition system $T_\tau(\Sigma) = (X, X_0, W, W, U, U, \mathcal{F})$, associated to the impulsive system $\Sigma = (\mathbb{R}^n, W, W, U, U_\tau, f, g)$. Assume Σ admits a function V that satisfies Assumption 4.2. One can construct finite abstraction $\hat{T}_\tau(\Sigma) = (\hat{X}, \hat{X}_0, \hat{W}, \hat{W}, \hat{U}, \hat{U}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$ where:

- $\hat{X} = \hat{\mathbb{R}}^n \times \{0, \dots, \bar{z}\}$, where $\hat{\mathbb{R}}^n = [\mathbb{R}^n]_{\eta^x}$ and η^x is the state set quantization parameter;
- $\hat{X}_0 = \hat{X} \times \{0\}$;
- $\hat{W} = [W]_{\eta^\omega}$, where η^ω is the internal input set quantization parameter;
- $\hat{W} = \{\hat{\omega} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \hat{W} | \hat{\omega} \in \mathcal{W}_\tau|_{[0, \tau]}\}$;
- $\hat{U} = [U]_{\eta^u}$, where η^u is the external input set quantization parameter;
- $\hat{U} = \{\hat{u} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \hat{U} | \hat{u} \in \mathcal{U}|_{[0, \tau]}\}$;
- $(\hat{x}^+, c^+) \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}((\hat{x}, c), \hat{\omega}, \hat{u})$ iff one of the following scenarios hold:
 - Flow scenario: $0 \leq c \leq \bar{z} - 1$, $|\hat{x}^+ - \mathbf{x}_{\hat{x}, \hat{\omega}, \hat{u}}(\tau)| \leq \eta^x$, and $c^+ = c + 1$;
 - Jump scenario: $\underline{z} \leq c \leq \bar{z}$, $|\hat{x}^+ - g(\hat{x}, \hat{\omega}(0), \hat{u}(0))| \leq \eta^x$, and $c^+ = 0$.

In the definition of the transition function, and throughout the remainder of this paper, we adopt a slight abuse of notation by identifying \hat{u} (respectively, $\hat{\omega}$) with the constant external (respectively, internal) input curve defined on the domain $[0, \tau)$ and taking the value \hat{u} (respectively, $\hat{\omega}$).

Now, we establish the relation from $T_\tau(\Sigma)$ to $\hat{T}_\tau(\Sigma)$, introduced above, via the notion of alternating simulation function as in Definition 2.5.

Theorem 4.5 *Consider an impulsive system $\Sigma = (\mathbb{R}^n, W, \mathcal{W}, \cup, \mathcal{U}, f, g,)$ with its associated transition system $T_\tau(\Sigma) = (X, X_0, W, \mathcal{W}, U, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F})$. Suppose Assumptions 4.2, and 4.3 hold. Consider finite abstraction $\hat{T}_\tau(\Sigma) = (\hat{X}, \hat{X}_0, \hat{\omega}, \hat{\mathcal{W}}, \hat{U}, \hat{\mathcal{U}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$ constructed as in Definition 4.4. If inequality,*

$$\ln(\kappa_d) - \kappa_c \tau c < 0, \quad (4.8)$$

holds for $c \in \{\underline{z}, \bar{z}\}$, then function \mathcal{V} defined as,

$$\mathcal{V}((x, c), (\hat{x}, c)) := \begin{cases} V(x, \hat{x}) & \text{if } \kappa_d < 1 \ \& \ \kappa_c > 0, \\ \frac{V(x, \hat{x})}{e^{-\kappa_c \tau \epsilon c}} & \text{if } \kappa_d \geq 1 \ \& \ \kappa_c > 0, \\ \frac{V(x, \hat{x})}{\kappa_d^{-\frac{c}{\delta}}} & \text{if } \kappa_d < 1 \ \& \ \kappa_c \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

for some $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and $\delta > \bar{z}$, is an alternating simulation function from $\hat{T}_\tau(\Sigma)$ to $T_\tau(\Sigma)$.

References

- [1] C. Cassandras and S. Lafortune, *Introduction to Discrete Event Systems, ; Number 1*. Springer Science & Business Media: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2009.
- [2] P. Tabuada, *Verification and control of hybrid systems: a symbolic approach*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [3] R. Lal and P. Prabhakar, “Compositional construction of bounded error over-approximations of acyclic interconnected continuous dynamical systems,” in *Proceedings of the 17th ACM-IEEE International Conference on Formal Methods and Models for System Design*, pp. 1–5, 2019.
- [4] A. Saoud, P. Jagtap, M. Zamani, and A. Girard, “Compositional abstraction-based synthesis for cascade discrete-time control systems,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 16, pp. 13–18, 2018.
- [5] M. Shahamat, J. Askari, A. Swikir, N. Noroozi, and M. Zamani, “Construction of continuous abstractions for discrete-time time-delay systems,” in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 881–886, 2020.
- [6] M. Zamani and M. Arcak, “Compositional abstraction for networks of control systems: A dissipativity approach,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1003–1015, 2017.
- [7] A. Swikir and M. Zamani, “Compositional abstractions of interconnected discrete-time switched systems,” in *the 18th Eur. Control Conf.*, pp. 1251–1256, 2019.
- [8] A. Swikir and M. Zamani, “Compositional synthesis of symbolic models for networks of switched systems,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1056–1061, 2019.
- [9] A. Swikir, A. Girard, and M. Zamani, “From dissipativity theory to compositional synthesis of symbolic models,” in *2018 Indian Control Conference (ICC)*, pp. 30–35, 2018.

- [10] N. Noroozi, A. Swikir, F. R. Wirth, and M. Zamani, “Compositional construction of abstractions via relaxed small-gain conditions part ii: discrete case,” in *2018 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pp. 1–4, 2018.
- [11] A. Swikir, N. Noroozi, and M. Zamani, “Compositional synthesis of symbolic models for infinite networks,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 1868–1873, 2020. 21st IFAC World Congress.
- [12] M. Sharifi, A. Swikir, N. Noroozi, and M. Zamani, “Compositional construction of abstractions for infinite networks of discrete-time switched systems,” *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, vol. 44, p. 101173, 2022.
- [13] M. Sharifi, A. Swikir, N. Noroozi, and M. Zamani, “Compositional construction of abstractions for infinite networks of switched systems,” in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 476–481, 2020.
- [14] S. Liu, N. Noroozi, and M. Zamani, “Symbolic models for infinite networks of control systems: A compositional approach,” *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, vol. 43, p. 101097, 2021.
- [15] A. Saoud, A. Girard, and L. Fribourg, “Contract-based design of symbolic controllers for safety in distributed multiperiodic sampled-data systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1055–1070, 2020.
- [16] A. Saoud, A. Girard, and L. Fribourg, “Assume-guarantee contracts for continuous-time systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 134, p. 109910, 2021.
- [17] A. Saoud, P. Jagtap, M. Zamani, and A. Girard, “Compositional abstraction-based synthesis for interconnected systems: An approximate composition approach,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 702–712, 2021.
- [18] S. Belamfedel Alaoui, P. Jagtap, A. Saoud, *et al.*, “Compositional approximately bisimilar abstractions of interconnected systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.08655*, 2022.
- [19] A. Swikir, *Compositional Synthesis of Symbolic Models for (In)Finite Networks of Cyber-Physical Systems*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität München, 2020.
- [20] A. Swikir, A. Girard, and M. Zamani, “Symbolic models for a class of impulsive systems,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 247–252, 2020.
- [21] S. B. Alaoui, A. Saoud, P. Jagtap, and A. Swikir, “Symbolic models for interconnected impulsive systems,” in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 5900–5905, 2023.
- [22] G. Pola and P. Tabuada, “Symbolic models for nonlinear control systems: Alternating approximate bisimulations,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 719–733, 2009.
- [23] P. Tabuada, *Verification and control of hybrid systems: A Symbolic approach*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1st ed., 2009.
- [24] A. Swikir and M. Zamani, “Compositional synthesis of finite abstractions for networks of systems: A small-gain approach,” *Automatica*, vol. 107, pp. 551–561, 2019.