

Online Fault Tolerance Strategy for Abrupt Reachability Constraint Changes

Henghua Shen, *IEEE Member*, Qixin Wang, *IEEE Member*,

Abstract—When a system’s constraints change abruptly, the system’s reachability safety does no longer sustain. Thus, the system can reach a forbidden/dangerous value. Conventional remedy practically involves online controller redesign (OCR) to re-establish the reachability’s compliance with the new constraints, which, however, is usually too slow. There is a need for an online strategy capable of managing runtime changes in reachability constraints. However, to the best of the authors’ knowledge, this topic has not been addressed in the existing literature. In this paper, we propose a fast fault tolerance strategy to recover the system’s reachability safety in runtime. Instead of redesigning the system’s controller, we propose to change the system’s reference state to modify the system’s reachability to comply with the new constraints. We frame the reference state search as an optimization problem and employ the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) method as well as the Interior Point Method (IPM) based Newton’s method (as a fallback for the KKT method) for fast solution derivation. The optimization also allows more future fault tolerance. Numerical simulations demonstrate that our method outperforms the conventional OCR method in terms of computational efficiency and success rate. Specifically, the results show that the proposed method finds a solution 10^2 (with the IPM based Newton’s method) $\sim 10^4$ (with the KKT method) times faster than the OCR method. Additionally, the improvement rate of the success rate of our method over the OCR method is 40.81% without considering the deadline of run time. The success rate remains at 49.44% for the proposed method, while it becomes 0% for the OCR method when a deadline of 1.5 seconds is imposed.

Index Terms—Abrupt constraint changes, KKT, Newton’s method, Optimization, Reachability Safety, Lyapunov

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the major requirements for Control Cyber-Physical Systems (Control-CPSs) is safety in terms of *reachability*. That is, whether the state of the *physical subsystem* (aka the “*plant*”) can reach certain forbidden values. Mathematically, the plant’s state (aka the “*plant state*” or simply the “*state*”) at any given time t is represented as an n -dimensional vector, aka the “*state vector*.” *Reachability safety* therefore means the trajectory of the state vector shall never reach some *forbidden regions* (defined by a set of *reachability constraints*) in the n -dimensional vector space (aka the “*state space*”).

In conventional Control-CPS system engineering, the reachability constraints (hence the forbidden regions) are given at the design stage.

When we design linear controllers (which is empirically the most widely used controller in the modern control theory [1]), there are well-established procedures (using the seminal

Lyapunov stability theory [2]) to design a controller, so that (starting from the given set of allowed initial states) the state vector trajectories are confined within a hyper ellipsoid (referred to as the “*Lyapunov ellipsoid*” in the following) in the n -dimensional state space. Such a controller is said to be *Lyapunov stable*.

For a Lyapunov stable controller, as long as the Lyapunov ellipsoid does not overlap¹ with the forbidden regions, the reachability safety is guaranteed. Therefore, it seems that ensuring reachability safety is equivalent to designing a Lyapunov stable controller.

However, in practice, reachability constraint(s) can change in runtime, reshaping the forbidden regions to overlap with the Lyapunov ellipsoid. If this happens, the designed Lyapunov controller can no longer guarantee reachability safety.

One remedy is to carry out online redesign of the controller (referred to as the *Online-Controller-Redesign* (OCR) method), using the same design-stage procedures. However, such procedures are usually slow, and hence cannot give a redesigned Lyapunov stable controller in time. Therefore, we need a fast enough alternative to cope with the runtime reachability constraint changes.

We propose not to redesign the Lyapunov stable controller. Instead, based on the present state, we change the *reference state* (i.e. the target state of the control) of the controller. This will immediately resize/move the Lyapunov ellipsoid in the state space, to avoid the changed reachability constraints.

Specifically, we make the following contributions.

- 1) We formulated the problem of dealing with runtime reachability constraint change as an *Online Reference State Optimization Problem* (ORSOP).
- 2) We derived conditions under which the ORSOP has analytical solutions, which can be calculated in $O(1)$ time.
- 3) When the analytical solution conditions do not sustain, we propose an *Interior Point Method* (IPM) based numerical solution, which can be calculated in $O(n)$ time.
- 4) We compare the performance of our ORSOP method with the OCR method under different computation time limits on our testbed. The ORSOP method can achieve a much higher success rate than the OCR method. Statistically, the ORSOP method can also achieve a much bigger safety margin than the OCR method.

II. RELATED WORK

The problem of preserving system safety in runtime has been studied in the fault-tolerant CPS literature. In what

¹In this paper, for narrative simplicity, unless otherwise denoted, when we say “ellipsoid,” we refer to both the surface and the interior of the ellipsoid.

follows, we briefly review some closely relevant works and explain the differences.

Model Checking: Reachability has been a core concern in model checking that decides (during the design stage or runtime) if (starting from a given set of initial states) a forbidden region in the state space will be reached [3] [4] [5]. Thus, the focus of model checking is on finding proper approximations of a reachable set [6]–[9]. While this paper focuses on how to remedy the system in runtime, in case the runtime model checking alarms us that the forbidden region becomes reachable (due to runtime reachability constraint change).

Fallback Controller: The Simplex architecture [10]–[12] proposes to switch to a fallback high assurance controller in case of runtime (front end) controller failures. These works, however, do not cover runtime reachability constraint changes. In case of runtime reachability constraint changes, our paper’s solution can complement the Simplex architecture by providing the needed high assurance controller.

Plant Modification: Another way to deal with runtime reachability constraint changes is to modify other parts of the system (typically, the plant) instead of the controller [13] [14] (for example, discarding parts of the plant to change its physics). But this is not always feasible, and is not the focus of this paper.

Path Re-Planning: Some works on smart vehicles propose path re-planning in case of runtime reachability constraint changes [15]–[17]. However, these works focus on simulating/analyzing one or a countable set of trajectories. While this paper focuses on the bound of all the possible trajectories. In addition, the literature of [15]–[17] assumes the plants are vehicles, while this paper assumes generic linear state-space models.

III. BACKGROUND

A. Control Theory

In this paper, we focus on linear control systems, where the plant state at time t is denoted as an n -dimensional vector² $\vec{x}(t) = (x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots, x_n(t))^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (where T means transpose). For simplicity, we also denote $\vec{x}(t)$ as \vec{x} , and denote the time derivative of $\vec{x}(t)$ as $\dot{\vec{x}}$.

Besides, the targeted plant state of the control, aka the *reference state*, is denoted as $\vec{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We call the set of all feasible values for \vec{x}_0 as the *feasible region of the reference state*, denoted as \mathcal{R}_0 . In this paper, we assume the following.

Assumption 1. \mathcal{R}_0 is closed, and is defined by a set of linear constraints, aka reference state constraints, denoted by

$$g_j(\vec{x}_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \vec{\omega}_j \cdot \vec{x}_0 + b_j \leq 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r. \quad (1)$$

Assumption 2. Unless otherwise denoted (e.g. when switching the reference state), we assume \vec{x}_0 is constant.

²Unless otherwise specified, in this paper, a vector variable is denoted by a lower-case letter with an overhead arrow, while a scalar variable is denoted by a lower case letter without overhead arrow. A matrix variable is denoted by an upper-case letter.

With the above notations, the dynamics of a *linear time-invariant control system* (simplified as “*linear control system*” in the following) is described by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\vec{x}} = A(\vec{x} - \vec{x}_0) + B\vec{u}, \\ \vec{u} = -K(\vec{x} - \vec{x}_0), \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are constant matrices; $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control signal outputted by the *linear controller* $\vec{u} = -K(\vec{x} - \vec{x}_0)$; and $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the constant *controller matrix*.

Definition 1. The *linear control system* (2) is Globally Asymptotically Stable (GAS) iff starting from any $\vec{x}(t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (where t_0 is the initial time instance), the trajectory of $\vec{x}(t) \rightarrow \vec{x}_0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

We have the following well-known lemma [18].

Lemma 1. Given the *linear control system* (2) (where \vec{x}_0 is a given constant). Suppose the following condition **C1** sustains.

(C1): There exist constant symmetric positive definite matrices $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, such that P solves the Lyapunov equation

$$A_{\text{cl}}^T P + P A_{\text{cl}} = -Q, \quad (3)$$

where $A_{\text{cl}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (A - BK) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

Then we have the following.

1) Denote Lyapunov function

$$V_{\vec{x}_0, P}(\vec{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\vec{x} - \vec{x}_0)^T P (\vec{x} - \vec{x}_0), \quad (4)$$

we have $\forall \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $V_{\vec{x}_0, P}(\vec{x}) \geq 0$; and $V_{\vec{x}_0, P}(\vec{x}) = 0$ iff $\vec{x} = \vec{x}_0$.

2) The *linear control system* (2) is GAS.

3) $\forall \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\dot{V}_{\vec{x}_0, P}(\vec{x}) \leq 0$; and $\dot{V}_{\vec{x}_0, P}(\vec{x}) = 0$ iff $\vec{x} = \vec{x}_0$.

If condition **C1** in Lemma 1 sustains, given the initial plant state of $\vec{x}(t_0)$, then Lemma 1 basically says that the future trajectory of $\vec{x}(t)$ ($t \geq t_0$) is confined by the hyper ellipsoid, aka *Lyapunov ellipsoid*, of

$$E(\vec{x}(t_0), \vec{x}_0, P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \vec{\xi} \mid \vec{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } V_{\vec{x}_0, P}(\vec{\xi}) \leq V_{\vec{x}_0, P}(\vec{x}(t_0)) \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where intuitively, \vec{x}_0 decides the center of the hyper ellipsoid, P decides the shape and orientation of the hyper ellipsoid, and $\vec{x}(t_0)$, as a point on the surface, decides (together with \vec{x}_0 and P) the size of the hyper ellipsoid. The Lyapunov ellipsoid $E(\vec{x}(t_0), \vec{x}_0, P)$ bounds the *reachable region* of the plant state \vec{x} of the linear control system (2), given the initial plant state $\vec{x}(t_0)$.

Meanwhile, a linear control system (2) usually faces the requirement that the plant state \vec{x} can never enter a set of *forbidden region(s)*, collectively denoted as $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, which are determined by safety concerns and plant’s physical constraints. Mathematically, these constraints are specified by a set of linear/non-linear inequalities, collectively called the “*reachability constraints*.” For narrative simplicity, we call $\bar{\mathcal{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{R}^n - \mathcal{F}$ the *operational region(s)*, and the corresponding linear/non-linear inequalities that define $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ the “*operational*

constraints.” In this paper, we focus on the cases where all operational constraints are linear, and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ is compact (i.e. closed and bounded) and convex (see Assumption 3). Meanwhile, as $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ and \mathcal{F} imply each other, operational constraints and reachability constraints also imply each other. For narrative simplicity, in the following, we may either use “operational constraints” or “reachability constraints” depending on the context.

Fig. 1 illustrates the concepts of Lyapunov ellipsoid, forbidden region, operational region, initial plant state, state trajectory, and reference state.




Fig. 1: Illustration of Lyapunov ellipsoid, forbidden region, operational region, initial state, state trajectory, and reference state.

B. KKT Method

In convex optimization, the KKT conditions [19] are a set of necessary conditions for the optimal solution(s), which is described as follows:

Lemma 2. Given a convex optimization problem of the form:

$$\min_{\vec{x}} f(\vec{x}), \quad (6)$$

$$\text{s.t. } f_i(\vec{x}) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, h, \quad (7)$$

$$\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (8)$$

Assume that $f(\vec{x})$ and $f_i(\vec{x})$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, h$) are convex and differentiable. Then the corresponding Lagrangian function is defined as

$$L(\vec{x}, \vec{\mu}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\vec{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^h \mu_i f_i(\vec{x}), \quad (9)$$

where $\vec{\mu} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_h)^T \in \mathbb{R}^h$ is the so-called Lagrange multiplier vector. Denote the optimal solution to (6) as \vec{x}^* . If \vec{x}^* exists, then there exists $\vec{\mu}^* = (\mu_1^*, \mu_2^*, \dots, \mu_h^*)^T \in \mathbb{R}^h$ such that the following conditions (aka KKT conditions) sustain:

- 1) Stationarity: $\frac{\partial L(\vec{x}^*, \vec{\mu}^*)}{\partial \vec{x}} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e. $\frac{\partial f(\vec{x}^*)}{\partial \vec{x}} + \sum_{i=1}^h \mu_i^* \frac{\partial f_i(\vec{x}^*)}{\partial \vec{x}} = \mathbf{0}$;
- 2) Primal Feasibility: $\vec{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $f_i(\vec{x}^*) \leq 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, h$);
- 3) Dual Feasibility: $\mu_i^* \geq 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, h$);
- 4) Complementary Slackness: $\mu_i^* f_i(\vec{x}^*) = 0$, ($i = 1, 2, \dots, h$).

Lemma 2 establishes a set of necessary conditions (aka KKT conditions) for any optimal solution \vec{x}^* to (6). Often we can analytically derive the set of all solutions \mathcal{S} that meet these necessary conditions. Any optimal solution \vec{x}^* to (6) should then belong to \mathcal{S} . In case \mathcal{S} is enumerable, then by checking \mathcal{S} 's elements individually, we can find \vec{x}^* .

C. Newton's Method

The KKT method mentioned in Section III-B to find \vec{x}^* is analytical. However, this analytical method is not guaranteed to work in all situations, especially when the constraint (7) is highly nonlinear. Alternatively, we can try the numerical *unconstrained Newton's method* (simplified as the “*Newton's method*” in the following), which iteratively searches for a solution for a given unconstrained optimization problem:

$$\min_{\vec{x}} F(\vec{x}), \quad \text{where } \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (10)$$

The iteration formula is

$$\vec{x}^{(t+1)} = \vec{x}^{(t)} - \eta^{(t)} [\nabla^2 F(\vec{x}^{(t)})]^{-1} \nabla F(\vec{x}^{(t)}), \quad (11)$$

where t indexes the iteration; $\nabla F(\vec{x})$ is the gradient of $F(\vec{x})$; and $\nabla^2 F(\vec{x})$ is the Hessian matrix of $F(\vec{x})$. The step size at t th iteration is denoted by $\eta^{(t)} > 0$, which can be fixed or adaptive [20]. The iteration of (11) repeats until one of the following ending conditions sustains:

(E1): The error $\|\vec{x}^{(t+1)} - \vec{x}^{(t)}\|_2$ (where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the Euclidean norm) converges within a predefined small enough bound $\varepsilon > 0$, and $|F(\vec{x}^{(t+1)})| < +\infty$.

(E2): A maximum iteration count n_{\max} is hit.

In the case of **E1**, we claim the solution to the optimization problem (10) is found: $\vec{x}^* = \vec{x}^{(t+1)}$. Otherwise, we claim “failure.”

To convert the constrained optimization problem (6)(7)(8) to an unconstrained optimization problem of form (10), the “*Barrier Method*,” aka “*Interior-Point Method (IPM)*,” is commonly used [21].

IPM needs an indicator function

$$\mathbb{I}(\xi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \xi \leq 0; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \xi > 0. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

However, the above $\mathbb{I}(\xi)$ is not differentiable, hence is inconvenient to use. A popular solution is to use the natural logarithm function $\ln(\cdot)$ to approximate the indicator function as follows:

$$\mathbb{I}(\xi) \approx -\frac{1}{\lambda} \ln(-\xi), \quad (13)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a large number (e.g., $\lambda = 10^6$ [22]) and larger λ allows for a more accurate approximation [23, pp.563]. Then, the constrained optimization problem (6)(7)(8) is converted to the following unconstrained form:

$$\min_{\vec{x}} \left(F(\vec{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\vec{x}) - \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^h \ln(-f_i(\vec{x})) \right), \quad \text{where } \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (14)$$

which can be solved using the unconstrained Newton's method described by (11).




Fig. 2: Illustration of an original Lyapunov ellipsoid \mathcal{E} (delineated by the black dash-dot line) violating the new reachability constraints (delineated by the black solid lines) in 2D space. We intend to find a new reference state $\vec{x}_o^{\#}$ (marked by the red star) in the feasible region of the reference state \mathcal{R}_o (the red area delineated by the red solid lines), so that the new Lyapunov ellipsoid \mathcal{E}'' (delineated by the red dash-dot line) does not overlap with the new forbidden region \mathcal{F}' (the gray area delineated by the black solid lines).

IV. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Given a linear control system (2) and its forbidden region \mathcal{F} (defined by a set of reachability constraints), where A and B are known, there are mature routines (e.g. the seminal LMI method [24]) to numerically find K , P , and Q , such that (C1) of Lemma 1 sustains, which also results in a Lyapunov ellipsoid $\mathcal{E} = E(\vec{x}(t_0), \vec{x}_o, P)$ (see (5)), such that $\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$. That is, the linear control system (2) is safe in terms of reachability.

However, the above assumes the forbidden region \mathcal{F} never changes. As illustrated in Fig. 2 (in 2D space as an example), if \mathcal{F} changes to \mathcal{F}' at time instance t_1 ($t_1 > t_0$), then \mathcal{E} (delineated by the black dash-dot line) may overlap with \mathcal{F}' , i.e. $\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F}' \neq \emptyset$, breaking the reachability constraints.

As described in Section I, the conventional remedy is to carry out the *Online-Controller-Redesign* (OCR), i.e. to redesign the controller online, to derive the new K' , P' , Q' , and $\mathcal{E}' = E(\vec{x}(t_1), \vec{x}_o, P')$, so that (C1) of Lemma 1 sustains, and $\mathcal{E}' \cap \mathcal{F}' = \emptyset$.

However, usually safety guarantee needs to be recovered in real-time. OCR incurs controller redesign, which costs too much time. To meet the real-time demand, we propose to keep the original controller, and find a new reference state $\vec{x}_o^{\#}$ instead (see the red star in Fig. 2). Thus, as per (5), the new Lyapunov ellipsoid \mathcal{E}'' (see the shape delineated by the red dash-dot line in Fig. 2) will become

$$\mathcal{E}'' = E(\vec{x}(t_1), \vec{x}_o^{\#}, P) = \left\{ \vec{\xi} \mid V_{\vec{x}_o^{\#}, P}(\vec{\xi}) \leq V_{\vec{x}_o, P}(\vec{x}(t_1)), \vec{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}, \quad (15)$$

where

$$V_{\vec{x}_o^{\#}, P}(\vec{\xi}) = (\vec{\xi} - \vec{x}_o^{\#})^T P (\vec{\xi} - \vec{x}_o^{\#}). \quad (16)$$

We demand $\vec{x}_o^{\#}$ to satisfy the following requirements.

(R1): (Obligatory) Confine \mathcal{E}'' within the new operational region $\bar{\mathcal{F}}' = \mathbb{R}^n - \mathcal{F}'$, i.e. ensure $\mathcal{E}'' \cap \mathcal{F}' = \emptyset$. For example, in Fig. 2, \mathcal{E}'' (the shape delineated by the red dash-dot line)

should not overlap with the new forbidden region \mathcal{F}' (the gray area delineated by the black solid lines).

(R2): (Obligatory) Confine $\vec{x}_o^{\#}$ within the feasible region of the reference state (see (1)), i.e. $\vec{x}_o^{\#} \in \mathcal{R}_o$. For example, in Fig. 2, the new reference state $\vec{x}_o^{\#}$ (marked by the red star) should reside in the feasible region of the reference state \mathcal{R}_o (the red area delineated by the red solid lines).

(R3): (Optional and Heuristic) Minimize the volume of \mathcal{E}'' .

Requirement **R1** and **R2** are obligatory. As long as they are satisfied, the plant state's reachability safety under the new reachability constraints is already guaranteed. Requirement **R3** is optional and heuristic: minimizing the volume of \mathcal{E}'' makes \mathcal{E}'' more tolerant to further changes of the reachability constraints.

To find $\vec{x}_o^{\#}$ meeting the above requirements, let us clarify some more assumptions.

First, in this paper, we focus on linear operational constraints, which define compact and convex operational regions. Formally, we have

Assumption 3. The new operational region $\bar{\mathcal{F}}'$ is compact (i.e. closed and bounded) and convex, and is defined by a set of linear operational constraints:

$$\vec{v}_k \cdot \vec{x} + \beta_k \leq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, s. \quad (17)$$

Second, the present plant state $\vec{x}(t_1)$ must be in the operational region $\bar{\mathcal{F}}'$; for otherwise, there is no way to rescue the plant. Formally, we have

Assumption 4. The present plant state $\vec{x}(t_1) \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}'$.

Third, for the time being, we further assume the following (note we will remove Assumption 5 in Section V-E):

Assumption 5. The original Lyapunov ellipsoid $\mathcal{E} = E(\vec{x}(t_0), \vec{x}_o, P)$ of the original controller $\vec{u} = -K(\vec{x} - \vec{x}_o)$ has equal principal axes lengths (i.e. \mathcal{E} is a hyper sphere). In other words, all the eigenvalues of P have a same positive real value.

Also, for narrative convenience, in the following, we denote the present plant state $\vec{x}(t_1)$ as $\vec{x}_p = (x_{p1}, x_{p2}, \dots, x_{pn})^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

With the above assumptions and notations, the search for a new reference state $\vec{x}_o^{\#}$ satisfying requirement **R1** ~ **R3** can be formulated by the following optimization problem.

Problem 1 (ORSOP).

$$\min_{\vec{x}_o^{\#}} \left(f(\vec{x}_o^{\#}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\vec{x}_o^{\#} - \vec{x}_p\|_2^2 \right), \quad (18)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad g_j(\vec{x}_o^{\#}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \vec{a}_j \cdot \vec{x}_o^{\#} + b_j \leq 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r; \quad (19)$$

$$q_k(\vec{x}_o^{\#}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\vec{x}_o^{\#} - \vec{x}_p\|_2^2 - (\vec{v}_k \cdot \vec{x}_o^{\#} + \beta_k)^2 \leq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, s; \quad (20)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean 2-norm.

We call Problem 1 the *Online Reference State Optimization Problem* (ORSOP).

Note, as the context of Problem 1, we do not change the controller design of the original linear control system, which satisfies (C1) of Lemma 1. Given the new reference state $\vec{x}_o^{\#}$, and the present plant state \vec{x}_p , according to Lemma 1,

the future trajectory of the plant state is then confined by Lyapunov ellipsoid $\mathcal{E}'' = E(\bar{x}_p, \bar{x}_o, P)$. Due to Assumption 5, \mathcal{E}'' is a hyper sphere centered at \bar{x}_o , and has a radius of $\|\bar{x}_o - \bar{x}_p\|_2$. Meanwhile, according to analytical geometry, the distance between \bar{x}_o to hyper plane $\bar{v}_k \cdot \bar{x} + \beta_k = 0$ (i.e. the boundary of the linear operational constraint $\bar{v}_k \cdot \bar{x} + \beta_k \leq 0$) is $\sqrt{(\bar{v}_k \cdot \bar{x}_o + \beta_k)^2}$. Combined with Assumption 4, (20) means $\mathcal{E}'' \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{F}}'$, hence **R1** sustains.

Meanwhile, (19) means **R2** sustains.

Thirdly, due to Assumption 5, the objective function (18) means **R3** sustains.

V. PROPOSED SOLUTION

In this section, we propose our solution to Problem 1 (aka the ORSOP).

To meet the real-time demand, ideally, we want the solution to be analytical.

Before we proceed, note constraint (19) of Problem 1, defines the *compact* (i.e. closed and bounded) feasible region of the reference state \mathcal{R}_o . For ease of narration, let us denote the boundary of \mathcal{R}_o as $\partial\mathcal{R}_o$. Note as \mathcal{R}_o is compact, $\partial\mathcal{R}_o \subseteq \mathcal{R}_o$.

Meanwhile, the objective function (18) of Problem 1 implies that the solution \bar{x}_o^* is affected by the present plant state \bar{x}_p . Therefore, we can analyze \bar{x}_o^* case by case depending on \bar{x}_p .

Case 1: $\bar{x}_p \in \mathcal{R}_o$.

Case 2: $\bar{x}_p \notin \mathcal{R}_o$.

A. Optimal Solution for Case 1

Case 1 is trivial. The solution is analytical and is $\bar{x}_o^* = \bar{x}_p$, as this sets the objective function (18) to the global minimum: $f(\bar{x}_o^*) = \|\bar{x}_o^* - \bar{x}_p\|_2^2 = 0$. Meanwhile, the solution $\bar{x}_o^* = \bar{x}_p$ satisfies both constraint (19) and (20). Specifically,

- 1) as $\bar{x}_p \in \mathcal{R}_o$, and \mathcal{R}_o is defined by (19), $\bar{x}_o^* (= \bar{x}_p)$ hence complies with (19).
- 2) When $\bar{x}_o^* = \bar{x}_p$, $q_k(\bar{x}_o^*) = -(\bar{v}_k \cdot \bar{x}_o^* + \beta_k)^2 \leq 0$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, s$), i.e. (20) sustains.

B. Optimal Solution for Case 2

Because \bar{x}_o^* must reside in³ the feasible region of the reference state \mathcal{R}_o , we cannot assign $\bar{x}_o^* = \bar{x}_p$ since $\bar{x}_p \notin \mathcal{R}_o$ in Case 2.

In addition, it is trivial that \bar{x}_o^* cannot exist inside \mathcal{R}_o , because we can always find another reference state (denoted as \bar{x}_o^{**}) that is along the direction from \bar{x}_o^* to \bar{x}_p and on the boundary of \mathcal{R}_o (i.e., $\bar{x}_o^{**} \in \partial\mathcal{R}_o$), so that $\|\bar{x}_o^{**} - \bar{x}_p\|_2 < \|\bar{x}_o^* - \bar{x}_p\|_2$.

Remark 1. In Case 2, the optimal solution \bar{x}_o^* , if exists, must reside on some boundaries of \mathcal{R}_o (i.e., $\bar{x}_o^* \in \partial\mathcal{R}_o$).

To find the optimal solution \bar{x}_o^* for Case 2, we notice the nonlinear constraint (20) complicates our analysis. To simply, we propose the following *3-step procedure*.

³For clarification, in this paper, a plant state is said to be “inside” a region when the plant state resides in the interior of the region excluding the region boundaries. On the other hand, a plant state is said to be “in” the region when the plant state resides in the interior or on the boundaries.

- 1) *Step 1:* Simplify Problem 1 to the below Problem 2 by removing the nonlinear constraint (20). Problem 2 is a classical optimization problem that can be analytically solved via the KKT method (see Section III-B). Denote the thus derived analytical optimal solution to Problem 2 as \bar{x}_o^* .

Problem 2.

$$\min_{\bar{x}_o} \left(f(\bar{x}_o) = \|\bar{x}_o - \bar{x}_p\|_2^2 \right), \quad (21)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad g_j(\bar{x}_o) = \bar{\omega}_j \cdot \bar{x}_o + b_j \leq 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r. \quad (22)$$

- 2) *Step 2:* Check if the \bar{x}_o^* from *Step 1* complies with the nonlinear constraint (20) of Problem 1. If so, return \bar{x}_o^* for Problem 2 as the optimal solution \bar{x}_o^* for Problem 1. Otherwise, proceed to *Step 3*.
- 3) *Step 3:* Apply the IPM based Newton’s method (see Section III-C) to numerically search for the solution for Problem 1. If the search finds a solution \bar{x}_o^* , return this \bar{x}_o^* as the optimal solution for Problem 1. Return “failure” otherwise.

Note, due to *Step 3*, the above *3-step procedure* uses the well-known IPM based Newton’s method as its fall-back plan in the search for \bar{x}_o^* . Therefore, we have the following trivial proposition.

Proposition 1. *If the optimal solution \bar{x}_o^* for Case 2 can be found by the IPM based Newton’s method alone, then \bar{x}_o^* can be found by the proposed 3-step procedure for Case 2.*

However, there are still two details of the 3-step procedure that need further clarification: how to conduct the “KKT method” in *Step 1*, and how to conduct the “IPM based Newton’s method” in *Step 3*. These will be elaborated in the following respectively by Section V-C and V-D.

C. Step 1 of the 3-Step Procedure

In this sub-section, we shall elaborate the “KKT method” in *Step 1* of the proposed 3-step procedure in Section V-B.

In *Step 1*, the Lagrange function for Problem 2 is given as following (see Lemma 2):

$$L(\bar{x}_o) = f(\bar{x}_o) + \sum_{j=1}^r \mu_j g_j(\bar{x}_o). \quad (23)$$

The partial derivatives (w.r.t \bar{x}_o) of the involved functions in (23) are given as follows:

$$\frac{\partial f(\bar{x}_o)}{\partial \bar{x}_o} = 2(\bar{x}_o - \bar{x}_p); \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{\partial g_j(\bar{x}_o)}{\partial \bar{x}_o} = \bar{\omega}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r. \quad (25)$$

Based on Remark 1, we can assume that the optimal solution \bar{x}_o^* resides on the intersection of exactly l ($l \in \{1, \dots, r\}$) boundaries, i.e.

$$\bar{x}_o^* \in \left\{ \xi \mid g_j(\xi) = 0 \ (\forall j \in \{[1], [2], \dots, [l]\}) \text{ and } g_j(\xi) < 0 \ (\forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\} - \{[1], [2], \dots, [l]\}) \right\}, \quad (26)$$

where $\forall i < j$ ($i, j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$), we have $[i] < [j]$ and $[i], [j] \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Furthermore, assume $\{[1], [2], \dots, [l]\}$ is the l th ($l \in \{1, \dots, \binom{r}{l}\}$) distinct combination of l indices from the index set $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$.

Let $\vec{d}_{l,\ell}$ and $W_{l,\ell}$ represent the following vector and matrix:

$$\vec{d}_{l,\ell} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{x}_p + b_{[1]} \\ \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{x}_p + b_{[2]} \\ \vdots \\ \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{x}_p + b_{[l]} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^l, \quad (27)$$

and

$$W_{l,\ell} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[1]} & \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[2]} & \cdots & \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \\ \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[1]} & \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[2]} & \cdots & \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[1]} & \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[2]} & \cdots & \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}. \quad (28)$$

Then, we have the following important theorem for finding the candidate solutions in Case 2:

Theorem 1. Given $\vec{x}_p \notin \mathcal{R}_o$, if (26) sustains and $W_{l,\ell}$ is invertible, then the candidate optimal solution to Problem 2 is

$$\vec{x}_o^{**} = \vec{x}_p - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_{[j]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[j]}, \quad (29)$$

where

$$\vec{\mu}_{l,\ell}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mu_{[1]}^*, \mu_{[2]}^*, \dots, \mu_{[l]}^*)^\top = 2W_{l,\ell}^{-1} \vec{d}_{l,\ell}. \quad (30)$$

Proof. If (26) sustains, the KKT conditions listed in Lemma 2 shall manifest in the following form.

First, due to the complementary slackness, $\forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\} - \{[1], [2], \dots, [l]\}$, we have $\mu_j^* = 0$. (*)

Second, due to the stationarity, the Lagrange function of (23) should satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L(\vec{x}_o^{**})}{\partial \vec{x}_o} &= \frac{\partial f(\vec{x}_o^{**})}{\partial \vec{x}_o} + \sum_{j=1}^r \mu_j^* \frac{\partial g_j(\vec{x}_o^{**})}{\partial \vec{x}_o} \\ &= \frac{\partial f(\vec{x}_o^{**})}{\partial \vec{x}_o} + \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_{[j]}^* \frac{\partial g_{[j]}(\vec{x}_o^{**})}{\partial \vec{x}_o} \quad (\text{due to } (*)) \\ &= 2(\vec{x}_o^{**} - \vec{x}_p) + \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_{[j]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[j]} \quad (\text{due to (24) and (25)}) \\ &= \mathbf{0} \quad (\text{due to the stationarity of the KKT conditions}). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Then, from (31), we have the following solution:

$$\vec{x}_o^{**} = \vec{x}_p - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_{[j]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[j]}. \quad (32)$$

However, the Lagrange multipliers, i.e. $\vec{\mu}_{l,\ell}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mu_{[1]}^*, \mu_{[2]}^*, \dots, \mu_{[l]}^*)^\top$, are still unknown. This can be solved by the following conditions included in (26):

$$\begin{aligned} g_{[1]}(\vec{x}_o^{**}) &= \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{x}_o^{**} + b_{[1]} = 0; \\ g_{[2]}(\vec{x}_o^{**}) &= \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{x}_o^{**} + b_{[2]} = 0; \\ &\vdots \\ g_{[l]}(\vec{x}_o^{**}) &= \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{x}_o^{**} + b_{[l]} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Substituting (32) into (33) leads to the following set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{x}_p - \frac{1}{2} (\mu_{[1]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[1]} + \mu_{[2]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[2]} + \cdots + \mu_{[l]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[l]}) \\ + b_{[1]} &= 0; \\ \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{x}_p - \frac{1}{2} (\mu_{[1]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[1]} + \mu_{[2]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[2]} + \cdots + \mu_{[l]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[l]}) \\ + b_{[2]} &= 0; \\ &\vdots \\ \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{x}_p - \frac{1}{2} (\mu_{[1]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[1]} + \mu_{[2]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[2]} + \cdots + \mu_{[l]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[l]}) \\ + b_{[l]} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which can be concatenated as

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[1]} & \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[2]} & \cdots & \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \\ \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[1]} & \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[2]} & \cdots & \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[1]} & \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[2]} & \cdots & \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{[1]}^* \\ \mu_{[2]}^* \\ \vdots \\ \mu_{[l]}^* \end{bmatrix} \\ = 2 \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\omega}_{[1]} \cdot \vec{x}_p + b_{[1]} \\ \vec{\omega}_{[2]} \cdot \vec{x}_p + b_{[2]} \\ \vdots \\ \vec{\omega}_{[l]} \cdot \vec{x}_p + b_{[l]} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Using (27) and (28), (34) can be expressed by

$$W_{l,\ell} \vec{\mu}_{l,\ell}^* = 2\vec{d}_{l,\ell}.$$

As $W_{l,\ell}$ is invertible, we have

$$\vec{\mu}_{l,\ell}^* = 2W_{l,\ell}^{-1} \vec{d}_{l,\ell}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Based on Theorem 1, the KKT method used in *Step 1* can be formally defined by Algorithm 1.

D. Step 3 of the 3-Step Procedure

In this sub-section, we shall elaborate the ‘‘IPM based Newton’s method’’ in *Step 3* of the proposed 3-step procedure in Section V-B.

Based on Section III-C, we adopt the natural logarithmic approximation form of the indicator function (see (13)), so as to re-write Problem 1 into an unconstrained form (see (14)):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\vec{x}_o} (F(\vec{x}_o)), \\ \text{where } F(\vec{x}_o) &= f(\vec{x}_o) - \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{j=1}^r \ln(-g_j(\vec{x}_o)) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^s \ln(-q_k(\vec{x}_o)). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The Newton’s method needs the gradient $\nabla F(\vec{x}_o)$ and Hessian matrix $\nabla^2 F(\vec{x}_o)$ of $F(\vec{x}_o)$. They are derived as follows.

1) Gradient $\nabla F(\vec{x}_o)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla F(\vec{x}_o) &= \frac{\partial F(\vec{x}_o)}{\partial \vec{x}_o} = 2(\vec{x}_o - \vec{x}_p) - \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{j=1}^r (g_j(\vec{x}_o))^{-1} \frac{\partial g_j(\vec{x}_o)}{\partial \vec{x}_o} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^s (q_k(\vec{x}_o))^{-1} \frac{\partial q_k(\vec{x}_o)}{\partial \vec{x}_o}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Algorithm 1: KKT method used in Step 1

function KktMethodUsedInStep1 (
input: Problem 2;
output: \vec{x}_0^* , i.e. the solution to Problem 2
):
1. Set of candidate solutions $\mathcal{X} := \emptyset$;
2. **for** l in $\{1, \dots, r\}$ **do**
3. **for** ℓ in $\{1, \dots, \binom{r}{l}\}$ **do**
4. Create the ℓ th distinct combination of l indices from the index set $\{1, \dots, r\}$, and denote this indices combination as set $\{[1], \dots, [l]\}$;
5. $\vec{x}_{0,l,\ell}^* := \text{NaN}$; //NaN: Not a Number
6. **if** $W_{l,\ell}$ is invertible **then**
7. $\vec{\mu}_{l,\ell}^* := 2W_{l,\ell}^{-1}\vec{d}_{l,\ell}$; //see (30) of Theorem 1
8. $\vec{x}_{0,l,\ell}^* := \vec{x}_p - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_{[j]}^* \vec{\omega}_{[j]}$;
 //see (29) of Theorem 1
9. //check if $\vec{x}_{0,l,\ell}^*$ satisfies presumption (26):
10. **if** $\exists [j] \in \{[1], \dots, [l]\}$ s.t. $g_{[j]}(\vec{x}_{0,l,\ell}^*) \neq 0$
 then $\vec{x}_{0,l,\ell}^* := \text{NaN}$; **endif**;
11. **if** $\exists j \in \{1, \dots, r\} - \{[1], \dots, [l]\}$ s.t. $g_j(\vec{x}_{0,l,\ell}^*) \geq 0$
 then $\vec{x}_{0,l,\ell}^* := \text{NaN}$; **endif**;
12. **endif**;
13. **if** $\vec{x}_{0,l,\ell}^* \neq \text{NaN}$ **then** $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{X} \cup \{\vec{x}_{0,l,\ell}^*\}$; **endif**;
14. **endfor**;
15. **endfor**;
16. **if** $\mathcal{X} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
17. enumerate all the elements in \mathcal{X} to find $\vec{x}_0^* \in \mathcal{X}$ that
 minimizes $f(\vec{x}_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\|\vec{x}_0 - \vec{x}_p\|_2)^2$;
 //see (21) of Problem 2
18. **return** \vec{x}_0^* ;
19. **else return** NaN; **endif**;

where

$$\frac{\partial g_j(\vec{x}_0)}{\partial \vec{x}_0} = \frac{\partial(\vec{\omega}_j \cdot \vec{x}_0 + b_j)}{\partial \vec{x}_0} = \vec{\omega}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (37)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial q_k(\vec{x}_0)}{\partial \vec{x}_0} &= \frac{\partial((\vec{x}_0 - \vec{x}_p)^2 - (\vec{v}_k \cdot \vec{x}_0 + \beta_k)^2)}{\partial \vec{x}_0} \\ &= 2(\vec{x}_0 - \vec{x}_p) - 2(\vec{v}_k \cdot \vec{x}_0 + \beta_k)\vec{v}_k \\ &= 2(\vec{x}_0 - \vec{x}_p) - 2\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_k^T \vec{x}_0 - 2\beta_k \vec{v}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

2) *Hessian matrix* $\nabla^2 F(\vec{x}_0)$: Using (37) and (38), we can respectively derive

$$\frac{\partial^2 g_j(\vec{x}_0)}{\partial \vec{x}_0^2} = \mathbf{0}_n, \quad (39)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 q_k(\vec{x}_0)}{\partial \vec{x}_0^2} = 2I_n - 2\vec{v}_k \vec{v}_k^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad (40)$$

where $I_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the identity matrix, and $\mathbf{0}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the zero matrix. With (39) and (40), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 F(\vec{x}_0) &= \frac{\partial^2 F(\vec{x}_0)}{\partial \vec{x}_0^2} \\ &= 2I_n - \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{j=1}^r \left[- (g_j(\vec{x}_0))^{-2} \left(\frac{\partial g_j(\vec{x}_0)}{\partial \vec{x}_0} \right)^2 + (g_j(\vec{x}_0))^{-1} \frac{\partial^2 g_j(\vec{x}_0)}{\partial \vec{x}_0^2} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^s \left[- (q_k(\vec{x}_0))^{-2} \left(\frac{\partial q_k(\vec{x}_0)}{\partial \vec{x}_0} \right)^2 + (q_k(\vec{x}_0))^{-1} \frac{\partial^2 q_k(\vec{x}_0)}{\partial \vec{x}_0^2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

With (36) and (41), the optimal solution for (35) can be searched iteratively by (see (11)):

$$\vec{x}_0^{(i+1)} = \vec{x}_0^{(i)} - \eta [\nabla^2 F(\vec{x}_0^{(i)})]^{-1} \nabla F(\vec{x}_0^{(i)}), \quad (42)$$

where η is the iteration step size (which is fixed in this paper). The iteration ending conditions/operations are described by **E1** and **E2** in Section III-C, which will not be repeated here.

E. Relaxation of Assumption 5

So far, all the solutions discussed in Section V-A and V-B assume Assumption 5. Simply put, the Lyapunov ellipsoid \mathcal{E} should be a hyper sphere. However, in practice, \mathcal{E} usually is not a hyper sphere, and usually is not parallel to the coordinate axes. Formally, \mathcal{E} usually has unequal principal axis lengths, and the principal axes usually are not parallel to the coordinate axes.

Fortunately, Assumption 5 can be removed by applying linear transformations to the n -dimensional state space.

For narrative convenience, let us denote the original n -dimensional state space as \mathbb{S}_1 . In \mathbb{S}_1 , let us denote the original reference state as $\vec{x}_{0,1}$, the feasible region of reference state as $\mathcal{R}_{0,1}$, the original Lyapunov ellipsoid as \mathcal{E}_1 , and the original forbidden region as \mathcal{F}_1 .

For simplicity, let us relocate the origin point of \mathbb{S}_1 's coordinate system \mathbb{C}_1 to $\vec{x}_{0,1}$, and orient the axes of \mathbb{C}_1 in parallel to the principal axes of \mathcal{E}_1 . Suppose under the relocated coordinate system \mathbb{C}_1 , \mathcal{E}_1 is described by the following formula:

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = E(\vec{x}_1(t_0), \vec{x}_{0,1}, P), \quad (43)$$

where $\vec{x}_1(t)$ is the plant state at time instance t , t_0 is the initial time instance, P is the solution to the Lyapunov equation (3) assuming coordinate system (a.c.s.) \mathbb{C}_1 , and E is defined in (5).

Suppose at time instance t_1 , the original forbidden region \mathcal{F}_1 abruptly changed to the new forbidden region \mathcal{F}'_1 , while the present plant state is $\vec{x}_1(t_1) = \vec{x}_{p,1}$. As per our proposal, we shall retain the original controller, and choose a new reference state $\vec{x}_{0,1}^*$ at t_1 . Correspondingly, the new Lyapunov ellipsoid should become

$$\mathcal{E}'_1 = E(\vec{x}_1(t_1), \vec{x}_{0,1}^*, P) = E(\vec{x}_{p,1}, \vec{x}_{0,1}^*, P). \quad (44)$$

As per our proposal, we are not going to change P , and $\vec{x}_{p,1}$ is given at t_1 , hence we can only change $\vec{x}_{0,1}^*$ to optimize \mathcal{E}'_1 . The optimization problem to search for $\vec{x}_{0,1}^*$ is a generalization of Problem 1 as follows.

Problem 3 (ORSOP-Generalized (in \mathbb{S}_1 a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_1)).

$$\min_{\vec{x}_{0,1}} \text{vol}(\mathcal{E}_1'' = E(\vec{x}_{p,1}, \vec{x}_{0,1}, P)), \quad (45)$$

$$\text{s.t. } g_{j,1}(\vec{x}_{0,1}) = \vec{\omega}_{j,1} \cdot \vec{x}_{0,1} + b_{j,1} \leq 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r; \quad (46)$$

$$q_{k,1}(\vec{x}_{0,1}) = \|\vec{x}_{0,1} - \vec{x}_{p,1}\|_2^2 - (\vec{v}_{k,1} \cdot \vec{x}_{0,1} + \beta_{k,1})^2 \leq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, s. \quad (47)$$

In Problem 3, $\text{vol}(\mathcal{E}_1'')$ calculates the volume of \mathcal{E}_1'' ; $g_{j,1}$, $\vec{\omega}_{j,1}$, $b_{j,1}$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, r$), $q_{k,1}$, $\vec{v}_{k,1}$, $\beta_{k,1}$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots, s$) respectively correspond to g_j , $\vec{\omega}_j$, b_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, r$), q_k , \vec{v}_k , β_k ($k = 1, 2, \dots, s$) in Problem 1, except that we are now a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_1 of state space \mathbb{S}_1 .

Again for Case 1 (see Section V-A), i.e. $\vec{x}_{p,1} \in \mathcal{R}_0$, the solution for Problem 3 is trivial: $\vec{x}_{0,1}^* = \vec{x}_{p,1}$. The reason is the same as that described in Section V-A (note when we take $\vec{x}_{0,1}^* = \vec{x}_{p,1}$, $\text{vol}(\mathcal{E}_1'') = 0$).

Therefore, in the rest of this subsection, we shall focus on Case 2 (see Section V-B), i.e. $\vec{x}_{p,1} \notin \mathcal{R}_0$.

To solve Case 2, we notice $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a real symmetric positive definite matrix (see Lemma 1 condition **C1**). According to linear algebra [23, pp.648], using the seminal *Singular Value Decomposition* (SVD), P can always be decomposed to the following form

$$P = U\Lambda U^T, \quad (48)$$

where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an orthogonal matrix (i.e. $UU^T = U^T U = I$, where I is the identity matrix), and $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix with P 's eigen values as its diagonal elements. Note P is positive definite, hence every diagonal element of Λ is positive. Furthermore, SVD can be conducted in a way so that the diagonal elements of Λ are sorted in descending order.

Let $\text{diag}(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ represent a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements (respectively from row 1 to n) are e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n . We can denote

$$\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n), \quad \text{where } \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n > 0; \quad (49)$$

and denote

$$\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_2}}, \dots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\right), \quad (50)$$

$$\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{diag}(\sqrt{\lambda_1}, \sqrt{\lambda_2}, \dots, \sqrt{\lambda_n}).$$

Let us carry out the following linear transformation, denoted as $T_{1 \rightarrow 2}$, of all vectors in state space \mathbb{S}_1 (a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_1) to state space \mathbb{S}_2 (a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_2): $\forall \vec{\xi}_1 \in \mathbb{S}_1$, $\vec{\xi}_1$ is linearly transformed to $\vec{\xi}_2 \in \mathbb{S}_2$ as per

$$\vec{\xi}_2 = T_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\vec{\xi}_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} U^T \vec{\xi}_1. \quad (51)$$

Obviously, the inverse transformation, denoted as $T_{2 \rightarrow 1}$, is $\forall \vec{\xi}_2 \in \mathbb{S}_2$, $\vec{\xi}_2$ is linearly transformed to $\vec{\xi}_1 \in \mathbb{S}_1$ as per

$$\vec{\xi}_1 = T_{2 \rightarrow 1}(\vec{\xi}_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{\xi}_2. \quad (52)$$

In \mathbb{S}_1 (a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_1),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1'' &= E(\vec{x}_{p,1}, \vec{x}_{0,1}, P) \quad (\text{due to (44)}) \\ &= \left\{ \vec{\xi}_1 \mid V_{\vec{x}_{0,1}, P}(\vec{\xi}_1) \leq V_{\vec{x}_{0,1}, P}(\vec{x}_{p,1}), \vec{\xi}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}, \quad (\text{due to (5)}) \\ &= \left\{ \vec{\xi}_1 \mid (\vec{\xi}_1 - \vec{x}_{0,1})^T P (\vec{\xi}_1 - \vec{x}_{0,1}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \leq (\vec{x}_{p,1} - \vec{x}_{0,1})^T P (\vec{x}_{p,1} - \vec{x}_{0,1}), \vec{\xi}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}. \quad (\text{due to (4)}) \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\xi}_2 &= T_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\vec{\xi}_1) = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} U^T \vec{\xi}_1, \\ \text{i.e. } \vec{\xi}_1 &= T_{2 \rightarrow 1}(\vec{\xi}_2) = U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{\xi}_2; \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{x}_{0,2} &= T_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\vec{x}_{0,1}) = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} U^T \vec{x}_{0,1}, \\ \text{i.e. } \vec{x}_{0,1} &= T_{2 \rightarrow 1}(\vec{x}_{0,2}) = U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{x}_{0,2}; \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{and } \vec{x}_{p,2} &= T_{1 \rightarrow 2}(\vec{x}_{p,1}) = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} U^T \vec{x}_{p,1}, \\ \text{i.e. } \vec{x}_{p,1} &= T_{2 \rightarrow 1}(\vec{x}_{p,2}) = U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{x}_{p,2}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Combining (54)(55)(56) and (53), we derive the $T_{1 \rightarrow 2}$ transformed \mathcal{E}_1'' in \mathbb{S}_2 (a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_2), denoted as \mathcal{E}_2'' as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_2'' &= \left\{ \vec{\xi}_2 \mid (U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{\xi}_2 - U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{x}_{0,2})^T P (U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{\xi}_2 - U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{x}_{0,2}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \leq (U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{x}_{p,2} - U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{x}_{0,2})^T P (U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{x}_{p,2} - U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \vec{x}_{0,2}), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \vec{\xi}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \vec{\xi}_2 \mid (\vec{\xi}_2 - \vec{x}_{0,2})^T \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} U^T P U \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\vec{\xi}_2 - \vec{x}_{0,2}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \leq (\vec{x}_{p,2} - \vec{x}_{0,2})^T \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} U^T P U \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\vec{x}_{p,2} - \vec{x}_{0,2}), \vec{\xi}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \vec{\xi}_2 \mid (\vec{\xi}_2 - \vec{x}_{0,2})^T (\vec{\xi}_2 - \vec{x}_{0,2}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \leq (\vec{x}_{p,2} - \vec{x}_{0,2})^T (\vec{x}_{p,2} - \vec{x}_{0,2}), \vec{\xi}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}. \quad (\text{due to (48)}) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

From (57), we see \mathcal{E}_2'' is a hyper sphere centered at $\vec{x}_{0,2}$ with a radius length of $\|\vec{x}_{p,2} - \vec{x}_{0,2}\|_2$. Therefore, in state space \mathbb{S}_2 (a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_2), $\text{vol}(\mathcal{E}_2'')$ strictly increases when $\|\vec{x}_{p,2} - \vec{x}_{0,2}\|_2^2$ increases. (\dagger)

Meanwhile, as \mathcal{E}_2'' in \mathbb{S}_2 is the linear transformation of \mathcal{E}_1'' in \mathbb{S}_1 (see (53)(54)(55)(56)(57)), as per [25, pp.250] and (54), we have

$$\text{vol}(\mathcal{E}_1'') = \left| \det(U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \right| \text{vol}(\mathcal{E}_2''), \quad (58)$$

where $\det(U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ is the determinant of matrix $U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Combining (58) and (\dagger) , we know $\text{vol}(\mathcal{E}_1'')$ also strictly increases when $\|\vec{x}_{p,2} - \vec{x}_{0,2}\|_2^2$ increases. Therefore, the objective of (45) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\vec{x}_{0,2}} f_2(\vec{x}_{0,2}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\vec{x}_{0,2} - \vec{x}_{p,2}\|_2^2. \quad (59)$$

On the other hand, combining (54)(55)(56) with constraints (46) and (47), we derive the $T_{1 \rightarrow 2}$ transformed constraints in

\mathbb{S}_2 (a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_2) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& g_{j,1}(\vec{x}_{0,1}) \\
&= \vec{\omega}_{j,1} \cdot U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\vec{x}_{0,2} + b_{j,1} \\
&= \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}U^T\vec{\omega}_{j,1} \cdot \vec{x}_{0,2} + b_{j,1} \leq 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r; \quad (60) \\
& q_{k,1}(\vec{x}_{0,1}) \\
&= \|U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\vec{x}_{0,2} - U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\vec{x}_{p,2}\|_2^2 - (\vec{v}_{k,1} \cdot U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\vec{x}_{0,2} + \beta_{k,1})^2 \\
&= \|U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\vec{x}_{0,2} - \vec{x}_{p,2})\|_2^2 - (\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}U^T\vec{v}_{k,1} \cdot \vec{x}_{0,2} + \beta_{k,1})^2 \\
&\leq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, s. \quad (61)
\end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\vec{\omega}_{j,2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}U^T\vec{\omega}_{j,1}, \quad b_{j,2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b_{j,1},$$

$$\text{and } g_{j,2}(\vec{x}_{0,2}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \vec{\omega}_{j,2} \cdot \vec{x}_{0,2} + b_{j,2} \leq 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r. \quad (62)$$

We can see any $\vec{x}_{0,2}$ satisfies (62) also satisfies (60), and vice versa. Therefore constraint (62) and constraint (46) are the same thing. (\ddagger)

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vec{v}_{k,2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}U^T\vec{v}_{k,1}, \quad \beta_{k,2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \beta_{k,1}, \quad \text{and} \\
& q_{k,2}(\vec{x}_{0,2}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\vec{x}_{0,2} - \vec{x}_{p,2})\|_2^2 - (\vec{v}_{k,2} \cdot \vec{x}_{0,2} + \beta_{k,2})^2 \\
&\leq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, s. \quad (63)
\end{aligned}$$

We can see any $\vec{x}_{0,2}$ satisfies (63) also satisfies (61), and vice versa. Therefore constraint (63) and constraint (47) are the same thing. (\clubsuit)

Combining (59), (\ddagger) , and (\clubsuit) , we can re-write Problem 3 in state space \mathbb{S}_2 (a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_2) as follows:

Problem 4 (ORSOP-Generalized (in \mathbb{S}_2 a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_2)).

$$\min_{\vec{x}_{0,2}} \quad \left(f_2(\vec{x}_{0,2}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\vec{x}_{0,2} - \vec{x}_{p,2}\|_2^2 \right), \quad (64)$$

$$\text{s.t. } g_{j,2}(\vec{x}_{0,2}) = \vec{\omega}_{j,2} \cdot \vec{x}_{0,2} + b_{j,2} \leq 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r; \quad (65)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{k,2}(\vec{x}_{0,2}) &= \|U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\vec{x}_{0,2} - \vec{x}_{p,2})\|_2^2 - (\vec{v}_{k,2} \cdot \vec{x}_{0,2} + \beta_{k,2})^2 \\
&\leq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, s. \quad (66)
\end{aligned}$$

Problem 4 has the same structure as Problem 1 except a minor change: compared to (20), (66) added a multiplier of $U\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ inside the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$.

Therefore, we can re-use the 3-step procedure for Problem 1 to solve Problem 4, with a minor revision to Step 2 as follows: instead of checking nonlinear constraint (20), we should check nonlinear constraint (66).

In the end, if the above *revised 3-step procedure for Problem 4* produces an optimal solution $\vec{x}_{0,2}^*$ in state space \mathbb{S}_2 (a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_2), we need to transform it back to the state space \mathbb{S}_1 (a.c.s. \mathbb{C}_1) as per (54).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. L. Williams, D. A. Lawrence *et al.*, *Linear state-space control systems*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- [2] W. Hahn, "Stability of motion," 1967.
- [3] W. Xiang, H.-D. Tran, X. Yang, and T. T. Johnson, "Reachable set estimation for neural network control systems: A simulation-guided approach," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 1821–1830, 2020.
- [4] W. Xiang and T. T. Johnson, "Reachability analysis and safety verification for neural network control systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.09944*, 2018.
- [5] T. Li, F. Tan, Q. Wang, L. Bu, J.-N. Cao, and X. Liu, "From offline toward real time: A hybrid systems model checking and cps codesign approach for medical device plug-and-play collaborations," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 642–652, 2014.
- [6] A. Kurzhanski and P. Varaiya, "Reachability under state constraints—the ellipsoidal technique," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 353–358, 2002.
- [7] H.-D. Tran, F. Cai, M. L. Diego, P. Musau, T. T. Johnson, and X. Koutsoukos, "Safety verification of cyber-physical systems with reinforcement learning control," *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS)*, vol. 18, no. 5s, pp. 1–22, 2019.
- [8] V. Liu, C. Manzie, and P. M. Dower, "Reachability of linear time-invariant systems via ellipsoidal approximations," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 126–131, 2023.
- [9] L. Zhang, Z. She, S. Ratschan, H. Hermanns, and E. M. Hahn, "Safety verification for probabilistic hybrid systems," *European Journal of Control*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 572–587, 2012.
- [10] L. Sha, "Using simplicity to control complexity," *IEEE Software*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 20–28, 2001.
- [11] S. Bak, T. T. Johnson, M. Caccamo, and L. Sha, "Real-time reachability for verified simplex design," in *2014 IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 138–148.
- [12] A. Biondi, F. Nesti, G. Cicero, D. Casini, and G. Buttazzo, "A safe, secure, and predictable software architecture for deep learning in safety-critical systems," *IEEE Embedded Systems Letters*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 78–82, 2019.
- [13] S. Aseev, "An optimal control problem for a differential inclusion with state constraints. smooth approximations and necessary optimality conditions," *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 103, no. 6, pp. 670–685, 2001.
- [14] M. Gusev, "On reachability analysis for nonlinear control systems with state constraints," pp. 579–587, 2015.
- [15] M. Althoff and J. M. Dolan, "Online verification of automated road vehicles using reachability analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 903–918, 2014.
- [16] B. Schürmann, D. Heß, J. Eilbrecht, O. Stursberg, F. Köster, and M. Althoff, "Ensuring drivability of planned motions using formal methods," in *2017 IEEE 20th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–8.
- [17] D. Althoff, M. Althoff, and S. Scherer, "Online safety verification of trajectories for unmanned flight with offline computed robust invariant sets," in *2015 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 3470–3477.
- [18] W. L. Brogan, *Modern control theory*. Pearson education india, 1985.
- [19] H. W. Kuhn and A. W. Tucker, "Nonlinear programming," in *Traces and emergence of nonlinear programming*. Springer, 2013, pp. 247–258.
- [20] B. Polyak and A. Tremba, "New versions of newton method: step-size choice, convergence domain and under-determined equations," *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1272–1303, 2020.
- [21] S. J. Wright, "On the convergence of the newton/log-barrier method," *Mathematical programming*, vol. 90, pp. 71–100, 2001.
- [22] B. Ghojogh, A. Ghodsi, F. Karray, and M. Crowley, "Kkt conditions, first-order and second-order optimization, and distributed optimization: tutorial and survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01858*, 2021.
- [23] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [24] S. Boyd, L. El Ghaoui, E. Feron, and V. Balakrishnan, *Linear matrix inequalities in system and control theory*. SIAM, 1994.
- [25] D. Margalit, J. Rabinoff, and L. Rolen, "Interactive linear algebra," *Georgia Institute of Technology*, 2017.