

Generation of bounded invariants via stroboscopic set-valued maps: Application to the stability analysis of parametric time-periodic systems

J. Jerray

Université Sorbonne Paris Nord, LIPN, CNRS,
Villetaneuse, France

L. Fribourg

Université Paris-Saclay, LSV, CNRS, ENS
Paris-Saclay

ABSTRACT

A method is given for generating a bounded invariant of a differential system with a given set of initial conditions around a point x_0 . This invariant has the form of a tube centered on the Euler approximate solution starting at x_0 , which has for radius an upper bound on the distance between the approximate solution and the exact ones. The method consists in finding a real $T > 0$ such that the “snapshot” of the tube at time $t = (i + 1)T$ is included in the snapshot at $t = iT$, for some integer i . In the phase space, the invariant is therefore in the shape of a torus. A simple additional condition is also given to ensure that the solutions of the system can never converge to a point of equilibrium. In dimension 2, this ensures that all solutions converge towards a limit cycle. The method is extended in case the dynamic system contains a parameter p , thus allowing the stability analysis of the system for a range of values of p . This is illustrated on classical Van der Pol’s system.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

G.1.7 [Mathematics of Computing]: Numerical Analysis;
F.1.1 [Theory of Computation]: Computation by Abstract Devices

Keywords

differential equations, periodicity, limit cycle, stability

1. INTRODUCTION

Given a differential system $\Sigma : dx/dt = f(x)$ of dimension n , an initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a real $\varepsilon > 0$, and a ball $B_0 = B(x_0, \varepsilon)$ ¹, we present here a simple method allowing to find a bounded invariant set of Σ containing the trajectories starting at B_0 . This invariant set has the form of a tube

¹ $B(x_0, \varepsilon)$ is the set $\{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|z - x_0\| \leq \varepsilon\}$ where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean distance.

whose center at time t is the Euler approximate solution $\tilde{x}(t)$ of the system starting at x_0 , and radius is a function $\delta_\varepsilon(t)$ bounding the distance between $\tilde{x}(t)$ and an exact solution $x(t)$ starting at B_0 . The tube can thus be described as $\bigcup_{t \geq 0} B(t)$ where $B(t) \equiv B(\tilde{x}(t), \delta_\varepsilon(t))$.

To find a *bounded* invariant, we then look for a positive real T such that $B((i + 1)T) \subseteq B(iT)$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$. In case of success, the ball $B(iT)$ is guaranteed to contain the “stroboscopic” sequence $\{B(jT)\}_{j=i, i+1, \dots}$ of sets $B(t)$ at time $t = iT, (i + 1)T, \dots$. It follows that the bounded portion $\bigcup_{t \in [iT, (i+1)T]} B(t)$ is equal to $\bigcup_{t \in [iT, \infty)} B(t)$, and thus constitutes the sought bounded invariant set.

We apply the finding of such an invariant to the stability analysis of parameterized time-periodic differential systems. We illustrate our results on the example of a parametric Van der Pol (VdP) system for which we show that, for a whole range of values of the parameter, the solutions always converge towards a limit cycle.

Comparison with related work.

We explain here some similarities and differences of our method with several kinds of related work.

- There exists a trend of work on the generation of torus-shaped invariants using stroboscopic maps of quasi-periodic systems with possible parameters (see, e.g., [3, 7, 13]). A first difference is that these works consider stroboscopic mappings of *points* of \mathbb{R}^n , while our stroboscopic maps apply to *sets* of points. A second difference is that they often use a Fourier analysis in the *frequency domain* (using, e.g., the notion of “radial polynomials” [4]) while we remain in the *time domain*.
- Our method makes use of a rigorous time-integration method in order to enclose the exact solutions with tubes, which is similar to what is done using high order of Taylor method in ODE integration as proposed by Lohner or Taylor models [11, 17]. Such methods are used in [4, 8] to rigorously compute the eigenvalues of a so-called “monodromy matrix”, which allows to determine the linear stability of the equilibrium points of the system. Unlike these works, our stability analysis does not try to compute such eigenvalues of monodromy matrices.
- Our method shares also some common features with the works of [2, 1, 16], which aim at proving a *contractivity* property of the system (i.e., that any two solutions converge exponentially to each other). In [1], con-

tractivity amounts to the finding of a negative definitive quadratic form (which is equivalent to the existence of a Lyapunov function for the system). In [2], “Squares-of-Sum programming is used to find ranges of uncertainty under which a system with uncertain perturbations is always contracting with the original contraction metric”. In [16], they turn the stability problem into the contractivity of a fixed point operator that is checked with the assistance of a computer. The difference here is that we do not try to prove a contractivity property, but only the existence of two set-valued snapshots, one of which is included in the other one. This is a much weaker property and easier to prove.

Our method is simple and *a priori* efficient, but, as explained in [Example 3](#), cannot compete with the specialized tools of the literature (which can use, e.g., a large number of Fourier modes) on complex quasi-periodic systems like Van der Pol system with high values of parameter, or chaotic systems with strange attractors.

Plan of the paper.

In [Section 2](#), we present our method, then explain how to apply it to the stability analysis of parameterized systems in [Section 3](#). We conclude in [Section 4](#).

2. METHOD

2.1 Euler’s method and error bounds

Let us consider the differential system:

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = f(x(t)),$$

with states $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We will use $x(t; x_0)$ (or sometimes just $x(t)$) to denote the exact continuous solution of the system at time t , for a given initial condition x_0 . We use $\tilde{x}(t; y_0)$ (or just $\tilde{x}(t)$) to denote Euler’s approximate value of $x(t; y_0)$ (defined by $\tilde{x}(t; y_0) = y_0 + tf(y_0)$ for $t \in [0, \tau]$, where τ is the integration time-step).

We suppose that we know a bounded region $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ containing the solutions of the system for a set of initial conditions B_0 and a certain amount of time. We now give an upper bound to the error between the exact solution of the ODE and its Euler approximation on \mathcal{S} (see [5, 10]).

DEFINITION 1. Let ε be a given positive constant. Let us define, for $t \in [0, \tau]$, $\delta_\varepsilon(t)$ as follows:
if $\lambda < 0$:

$$\delta_\varepsilon(t) = \left(\varepsilon^2 e^{\lambda t} + \frac{C^2}{\lambda^2} \left(t^2 + \frac{2t}{\lambda} + \frac{2}{\lambda^2} (1 - e^{\lambda t}) \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

if $\lambda = 0$:

$$\delta_\varepsilon(t) = \left(\varepsilon^2 e^t + C^2 (-t^2 - 2t + 2(e^t - 1)) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

if $\lambda > 0$:

$$\delta_\varepsilon(t) = \left(\varepsilon^2 e^{3\lambda t} + \frac{C^2}{3\lambda^2} \left(-t^2 - \frac{2t}{3\lambda} + \frac{2}{9\lambda^2} (e^{3\lambda t} - 1) \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

where C and λ are real constants specific to function f , defined as follows:

$$C = \sup_{y \in \mathcal{S}} L \|f(y)\|,$$

where L denotes the Lipschitz constant for f , and λ is the “one-sided Lipschitz constant” (or “logarithmic Lipschitz constant” [1]) associated to f , i.e., the minimal constant such that, for all $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{S}$:

$$\langle f(y_1) - f(y_2), y_1 - y_2 \rangle \leq \lambda \|y_1 - y_2\|^2, \quad (H0)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the scalar product of two vectors of \mathcal{S} .

The constant λ can be computed using a nonlinear optimization solver (e.g., CPLEX [6]) or using the Jacobian matrix of f (see, e.g., [1]).

PROPOSITION 1. [10] Consider the solution $x(t; y_0)$ of $\frac{dx}{dt} = f(x)$ with initial condition y_0 and the approximate Euler solution $\tilde{x}(t; x_0)$ with initial condition x_0 . For all $y_0 \in B(x_0, \varepsilon)$, we have:

$$\|x(t; y_0) - \tilde{x}(t; x_0)\| \leq \delta_\varepsilon(t).$$

[Proposition 1](#) underlies the principle of our set-based method where set of points are represented as balls centered around the Euler approximate values of the solutions. This illustrated in [Fig. 1](#): for any initial condition x^0 belonging to the ball $B(\tilde{x}^0, \delta(0))$ with $\delta(0) = \varepsilon$, the exact solution $x^1 \equiv x(\tau; x^0)$ belongs to the ball $B(\tilde{x}^1, \delta_\varepsilon(\tau))$ where \tilde{x}^1 denotes the Euler approximation $\tilde{x}^0 + \tau f(\tilde{x}^0)$ at $t = \tau$.




Figure 1: Illustration of [Proposition 1](#)

2.2 Systems with bounded uncertainty

Let us now show how the method extends to systems with “disturbance” or “bounded uncertainty”. A differential system with bounded uncertainty is of the form

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = f(x(t), w(t)),$$

with $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, states $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and uncertainty $w(t) \in \mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (\mathcal{W} is compact, i.e., closed and bounded). We assume that any possible disturbance trajectory is bounded at any point in time in the compact set \mathcal{W} . We denote this by $w(\cdot) \in \mathcal{W}$, which is a shorthand for $w(t) \in \mathcal{W}, \forall t \geq 0$. See [15, 14] for details. We now suppose (see [9]) that there exist constants $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that, for all $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{W}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle f(y_1, w_1) - f(y_2, w_2), y_1 - y_2 \rangle \\ & \leq \lambda \|y_1 - y_2\|^2 + \gamma \|y_1 - y_2\| \|w_1 - w_2\| \end{aligned} \quad (H1).$$

This formula can be seen as a generalization of (H0) (see [Section 2.1](#)). Recall that λ has to be computed in the absence of uncertainty ($|\mathcal{W}| = 0$). The additional constant γ is used for taking into account the uncertainty w . Given λ , the constant γ can be computed itself using a nonlinear optimization solver (e.g., CPLEX [\[6\]](#)). Instead of computing them globally for \mathcal{S} , it is advantageous to compute λ and γ *locally* depending on the subregion of \mathcal{S} occupied by the system state during a considered interval of time. Note that the notion of contraction (often used in the literature [\[12, 1\]](#)) corresponds to the case where $\lambda < 0$, but we do not need this assumption here (λ can be positive, at least locally). We now give a version of [Proposition 1](#) with bounded uncertainty $w(\cdot) \in \mathcal{W}$, originally proved in [\[9\]](#).

PROPOSITION 2. [\[9\]](#) *Consider a system Σ with bounded uncertainty of the form $\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = f(x(t), w(t))$ satisfying (H1).*

Consider a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and a point $y_0 \in B(x_0, \varepsilon)$. Let $x(t; y_0)$ be the exact solution of the system $\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = f(x(t), w(t))$ with bounded uncertainty \mathcal{W} and initial condition y_0 , and $\tilde{x}(t; x_0)$ the Euler approximate solution of the system $\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = f(x(t), 0)$ without uncertainty ($|\mathcal{W}| = 0$) with initial condition x_0 . We have, for all $w(\cdot) \in \mathcal{W}$ and $t \in [0, \tau]$:

$$\|x(t; y_0) - \tilde{x}(t; x_0)\| \leq \delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(t).$$

with

- if $\lambda < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(t) = & \left(\frac{C^2}{-\lambda^4} \left(-\lambda^2 t^2 - 2\lambda t + 2e^{\lambda t} - 2 \right) \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left(\frac{C\gamma|\mathcal{W}|}{-\lambda} \left(-\lambda t + e^{\lambda t} - 1 \right) \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \lambda \left(\frac{\gamma^2(|\mathcal{W}|/2)^2}{-\lambda} (e^{\lambda t} - 1) + \lambda \varepsilon^2 e^{\lambda t} \right) \right) \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

- if $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(t) = & \frac{1}{(3\lambda)^{3/2}} \left(\frac{C^2}{\lambda} \left(-9\lambda^2 t^2 - 6\lambda t + 2e^{3\lambda t} - 2 \right) \right. \\ & + 3\lambda \left(\frac{C\gamma|\mathcal{W}|}{\lambda} \left(-3\lambda t + e^{3\lambda t} - 1 \right) \right. \\ & \left. \left. + 3\lambda \left(\frac{\gamma^2(|\mathcal{W}|/2)^2}{\lambda} (e^{3\lambda t} - 1) + 3\lambda \varepsilon^2 e^{3\lambda t} \right) \right) \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

- if $\lambda = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(t) = & (C^2 (-t^2 - 2t + 2e^t - 2) \\ & + (C\gamma|\mathcal{W}| (-t + e^t - 1) \\ & + (\gamma^2(|\mathcal{W}|/2)^2 (e^t - 1) + \varepsilon^2 e^t))^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We will sometimes write $\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(t)$ instead of $\delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(t)$.

2.3 Correctness

Consider a differential system $\Sigma : dx/dt = f(x, w)$ with $w \in \mathcal{W}$, an initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a real $\varepsilon > 0$ and a ball $B_0 = B(x_0, \varepsilon)$. Let $B(t)$ denote $B(\tilde{x}(t), \delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(t))$ where $\tilde{x}(t)$

is the Euler approximate solution of the system without uncertainty and initial condition x_0 ². It follows from [Proposition 2](#) that $\bigcup_{t \geq 0} B(t)$ is an invariant set containing B_0 . We can make an a stroboscopic map of this invariant. by considering periodically the set $B(t)$ at the moments $t = 0, T, 2T$, etc., with $T = k\tau$ for some k (τ is the time-step used un Euler's method).

If moreover, we can find an integer $i \geq 0$ such that $B((i+1)T) \subseteq B(iT)$, then we have $B(iT) = \bigcup_{j=i, i+1, \dots} B(jT)$ and $\bigcup_{t \in [iT, (i+1)T]} B(t) = \bigcup_{t \in [iT, \infty)} B(t)$. The set $\bigcup_{t \in [iT, (i+1)T]} B(t)$ (abbreviated to $B([iT, (i+1)T])$) is thus a *bounded invariant* which contains all the solutions $x(t)$ starting at B_0 , for $t \in [iT, \infty)$. In the phase space, this bounded invariant has a ‘‘torus’’ shape. We have:

PROPOSITION 3. *Suppose that there exist $T > 0$ (with $T = k\tau$ for some k) and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that: $B((i+1)T) \subseteq B(iT)$. Then $B([iT, (i+1)T]) \equiv \bigcup_{t \in [iT, (i+1)T]} B(t)$ is a compact (i.e., bounded and closed) invariant set containing, for $t \in [iT, \infty)$, all the solutions $x(t)$ of Σ with initial condition in B_0 .*

REMARK 1. *The value T is an approximate value of the exact period T^* of the system. Actually, for a system involving a parameter p (see [Section 3](#)), the exact value of the period of the system depends on the value of p . However, we will see (see [Section 3](#)) that a same approximate value T allows us to analyze the system for a range of values of the parameter p , and thus a whole range of periods of the system.*

REMARK 2. *Note that the limit ball $\bigcap_{j=i, i+1, \dots} B(jT)$ does not usually have a zero diameter (whereas, under the assumption of point-to-point contraction, it always does). So we cannot use our method to immediately show the convergence to a limit cycle (see, e.g., [\[2\]](#)) except in the 2-dimensional case where Poincaré-Bendixson's theorem applies (see [Example 2](#)). In the general case ($n > 2$), our method only allows us to show that the system remains indefinitely in a spatially bounded region, and under an additional condition, never converges towards an equilibrium point (see [Section 3](#)).*

3. APPLICATION TO THE STABILITY ANALYSIS OF PARAMETRIC SYSTEMS

Let us now consider a family $\{\Sigma_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ of differential systems Σ_p of the form $dx/dt = f_p(x)$ involving a *parameter* $p \in \mathcal{P}$ (but no uncertainty). It is useful to find a subset \mathcal{Q} of \mathcal{P} and a system $\Sigma' : dx/dt = f(x, w)$ with uncertainty such that, for any $p \in \mathcal{Q}$, Σ_p is a particular form of Σ' for an appropriate uncertainty function $w(\cdot) \in \mathcal{W}$. This is useful to infer certain common properties of the solutions of $\{\Sigma_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{Q}}$ from the analysis of the system Σ' with uncertainty (cf. [\[2\]](#), [Section 5](#)).

EXAMPLE 1. *Consider the Van der Pol (VdP) system Σ_p of dimension $n = 2$ with parameter $p \in \mathbb{R}$, and initial condition in $B_0 = B(x_0, \varepsilon)$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ (see [\[16\]](#)):*
$$du_1/dt = u_2$$

²Note that $B(0) = B_0$ because $\tilde{x}(0) = x_0$ and $\delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(0) = \varepsilon$.

$du_2/dt = pu_2 - pu_1^2u_2 - u_1$.
Consider now the system Σ' with uncertainty $w(\cdot) \in \mathcal{W}_0 = [-0.5, 0.5]$ and initial condition x_0 :

$du_1/dt = u_2$
 $du_2/dt = (p_0 + w)u_2 - (p_0 + w)u_1^2u_2 - u_1$,
with $p_0 = 1.1$. It is easy to see that each solution of Σ_p with $p \in [p_0 - 0.5, p_0 + 0.5] = [0.6, 1.6]$ is a particular solution of system Σ' .

PROPOSITION 4. *Suppose that, for some index $1 \leq j \leq n$, we have $m_+^j < M_-^j$ where m_+^j (resp. M_-^j) denotes the minimum (resp. maximum) of $\tilde{x}^j(t) + \delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(t)$ (resp. $\tilde{x}^j(t) - \delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(t)$) for $t \in [iT, (i+1)T]$. Then $B[iT, (i+1)T]$ contains no fixed point of Σ' .*

PROOF. By *reductio ad absurdum*. Suppose that there is an uncertainty function $w(\cdot) \in \mathcal{W}$ such that there exists a fixed point y_0 of Σ' in $B[iT, (i+1)T] \equiv \bigcup_{t \in [iT, (i+1)T]} B(\tilde{x}(t), \delta_{\mathcal{W}}(t))$. Then the j -coordinate y_0^j of y_0 satisfies $\tilde{x}^j(t) - \delta_{\mathcal{W}}(t) \leq y_0^j \leq \tilde{x}^j(t) + \delta_{\mathcal{W}}(t)$ for all $t \in [iT, (i+1)T]$. It follows that $M_-^j \leq y_0^j \leq m_+^j$, which contradicts the hypothesis $m_+^j < M_-^j$. \square

THEOREM 1. *Given a system $dx/dt = f(x, w)$ with uncertainty $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and a set of initial conditions $B_0 \equiv B(x_0, \varepsilon)$, suppose:*

1. any solution $x(t)$ of the parametric system $\Sigma_p : dx/dt = f_p(x)$ with $p \in \mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ and initial condition x_0 is a solution of the system $\Sigma' : dx/dt = f(x, w)$ with initial set of conditions B_0 for some uncertainty function $w(\cdot) \in \mathcal{W}$.
2. Σ' is such that there exist $T > 0$ (with $T = k\tau$ for some k) and $i \in \mathbb{N}$: $B((i+1)T) \subseteq B(iT)$.
3. $m_+^j < M_-^j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$ (where m_+^j and M_-^j are defined as in [Proposition 4](#)).

Then no solution $x(t)$ of Σ_p with $p \in \mathcal{Q}$, converges towards a point of \mathbb{R}^n when $t \rightarrow \infty$. In the case of dimension $n = 2$, this implies that every solution $x(t)$ of Σ_p with $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ converges towards a limit cycle.

PROOF. By *reductio ad absurdum*. Suppose that $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the limit of a solution $x(t)$ of Σ_p with $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$. Since $x(t)$ is a solution of Σ' and $B((i+1)T) \subseteq B(iT)$ by hypotheses 1 and 2 of [Theorem 1](#), then $x(t) \in B[iT, (i+1)T]$ for all $t > 0$ by [Proposition 3](#). So the limit y_0 belongs to the adherence of $B[iT, (i+1)T]$, which is equal to $B[iT, (i+1)T]$ (since $B[iT, (i+1)T]$ is closed). On the other hand, by hypothesis 3 of [Theorem 1](#) and [Proposition 4](#), $B[iT, (i+1)T]$ contains no fixed point, whence a contradiction. \square

The implementation has been done in Python and corresponds to a program of around 500 lines. The source code is available at lipn.univ-paris13.fr/~jerray/parameter/. In the experiments below, the program runs on a 2.80 GHz Intel Core i7-4810MQ CPU with 8 GiB of memory. Given x_0 , one searches for values of $\tau, \varepsilon, p, |\mathcal{W}|, T$ at hand (by trial and error) in order to make the program verify $B(iT) \subset B((i+1)T)$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $m_+^j < M_-^j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. This is illustrated in the following examples.

EXAMPLE 2. *Consider the system Σ_p of [Example 1](#) and the system Σ' with uncertainty $|\mathcal{W}_0| = 0.5$, and let $p_0 = 1.1$.*

Each solution of Σ_p with $p \in [p_0 - 0.5, p_0 + 0.5] = [0.6, 1.6]$ and initial condition x_0 is thus a particular solution of the system Σ' with uncertainty $|\mathcal{W}_0| = 0.5$ and set of initial conditions $B(x_0, \varepsilon_0)$ with $\varepsilon_0 = 0.2$. For $x_0 = (u_1(0), u_2(0)) = (1.70177925, -0.12841500)$, $\tau = 1/1000$, $T_0 = 6.746 = 6746\tau$, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}(0) &= (1.70177925, -0.12841500), \delta_{\mathcal{W}}(0) = 0.2 \\ \tilde{x}(T_0) &= (1.86291588, -0.49830119), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(T_0) = 1.80979852 \\ \tilde{x}(2T_0) &= (1.86246936, -0.49899153), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(2T_0) = 1.81704178 \\ \tilde{x}(3T_0) &= (1.86195743, -0.49951212), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(3T_0) = 1.83409614 \\ \tilde{x}(4T_0) &= (1.86144495, -0.50003175), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(4T_0) = 1.82669790 \\ \tilde{x}(5T_0) &= (1.86093193, -0.50055048), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(5T_0) = 1.81964175 \end{aligned}$$

It follows: $B((i_0+1)T_0) \subset B(i_0T_0)$ for $i_0 = 3$.

On [Fig. 2](#), the curve of Euler's approximation $\tilde{x}(t)$ is depicted in red for initial condition x_0 and $t \in [0, 5T_0]$. The borders of the tube $B(t) \equiv B(\tilde{x}(t), \delta_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{W}}(t))$ are depicted in green. Various simulation curves are given in blue, and one can check that they lie inside the green borders of the tube (by [Proposition 2](#)). The black vertical lines delimit the portion of the tube between $t = i_0T_0$ and $t = (i_0+1)T_0$ (i.e., $B[i_0T_0, (i_0+1)T_0]$). We also see on [Fig. 2](#) that the minimum m_+^1 (represented by a small cyan ball) of the upper green curve $\tilde{u}_1(t) + \delta_{\mathcal{W}}(t)$ is less than the maximum M_-^1 (represented by a small gray ball) of the lower green curve $\tilde{u}_1(t) - \delta_{\mathcal{W}}(t)$ (numerically, $m_+^1 = -0.55695 < M_-^1 = -0.55411$). It follows by [Theorem 1](#) that no solution $x(t)$ from $B(x_0, \varepsilon_0)$ converges to a point of \mathbb{R}^n . As explained in [Example 1](#), this shows that whatever the value of $p \in [p_0 - |\mathcal{W}_0|, p_0 + |\mathcal{W}_0|] = [0.6, 1.6]$, the solution of Σ_p never converges to a point of \mathbb{R}^n . Since the size of the system is $n = 2$, it follows by Poincaré-Bendixson's theorem that the solution of Σ_p converges always towards a limit circle for any $p \in [0.6, 1.6]$ and initial condition in $B(x_0, \varepsilon_0)$.

The computation took 31s.

EXAMPLE 3. *We repeat the same experience as in [Example 2](#), but for the value of the parameter $p_1 = 0.4$, the amplitude of uncertainty $|\mathcal{W}_1| = 0.2$. Each solution of Σ_p with $p \in [p_1 - 0.2, p_1 + 0.2] = [0.2, 0.6]$ and initial condition x_0 is now a particular solution of Σ' with uncertainty $|\mathcal{W}_1| = 0.2$ and set of initial conditions $B(x_0, \varepsilon_1)$ with $\varepsilon_1 = 0.2$. For $T_1 = 6.347$, we find:*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}(0) &= (1.70177925, -0.12841500), \delta_{\mathcal{W}}(0) = 0.2 \\ \tilde{x}(T_1) &= (1.93787992, -0.35063219), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(T_1) = 1.15449575 \\ \tilde{x}(2T_1) &= (1.96045193, -0.37539412), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(2T_1) = 1.40421766 \\ \tilde{x}(3T_1) &= (1.96234271, -0.37680622), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(3T_1) = 1.43088067 \\ \tilde{x}(4T_1) &= (1.96262148, -0.37636672), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(4T_1) = 1.42796887 \\ \tilde{x}(5T_1) &= (1.96277676, -0.37578520), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(5T_1) = 1.42671414. \end{aligned}$$

We have: $B((i_1+1)T_1) \subset B(i_1T_1)$ for $i_1 = 3$. We now check on [Fig. 3](#): $m_+^1 < M_-^1$. It follows by [Theorem 1](#) that no solution $x(t)$ from $B(x_0, \varepsilon_1)$ converges to a point of \mathbb{R}^n . This shows that whatever the value of $p \in [p_1 - |\mathcal{W}_1|, p_1 + |\mathcal{W}_1|] = [0.2, 0.6]$, the solution of Σ_p never converges to a point of \mathbb{R}^n . It follows by Poincaré-Bendixson's theorem that




Figure 2: VdP system with parameter $p_0 = 1.1$, uncertainty $|\mathcal{W}_0| = 0.5$, initial radius $\varepsilon_0 = 0.2$, initial point $x_0 = (1.7018, -0.1284)$, period $T_0 = 6.746$, time-step $\tau = 10^{-3}$.

the solution of Σ_p converges always towards a limit circle for any $p \in [0.2, 0.6]$ and initial condition in $B(x_0, \varepsilon_1)$.

The computation time is 31s.

EXAMPLE 4. We repeat again the same experience as in *Example 2*, but for the value of the parameter $p_2 = 1.9$, the amplitude of uncertainty $|\mathcal{W}_2| = 0.3$, and initial radius $\varepsilon_2 = 0.1$. Each solution of Σ_p with $p \in [p_2 - 0.3, p_2 + 0.3] = [1.6, 2.2]$ and initial condition x_0 is now a particular solution of Σ' with uncertainty $|\mathcal{W}_2| = 0.3$ and set of initial conditions $B(x_0, \varepsilon_2)$. For $T_2 = 7.531$, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}(0) &= (1.70177925, -0.12841500), \delta_{\mathcal{W}}(0) = 0.1 \\ \tilde{x}(T_2) &= (1.77514170, -0.39762673), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(T_2) = 2.26229880 \\ \tilde{x}(2T_2) &= (1.77450915, -0.39786534), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(2T_2) = 2.29620538 \\ \tilde{x}(3T_2) &= (1.7738762, -0.39810409), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(3T_2) = 2.33196104 \\ \tilde{x}(4T_2) &= (1.77324288, -0.39834298), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(4T_2) = 2.25291437 \\ \tilde{x}(5T_2) &= (1.77260918, -0.39858202), \\ &\delta_{\mathcal{W}}(5T_2) = 2.18787865. \end{aligned}$$

We have here: $B((i_2 + 1)T_2) \subset B(i_2T_2)$ for $i_2 = 3$. We now check on *Fig. 4*: $m_+^1 < M_-^1$. It follows by *Theorem 1* that no solution $x(t)$ from $B(x_0, \varepsilon_2)$ converges to a point of \mathbb{R}^n . This shows that whatever the value of $p \in [p_2 - |\mathcal{W}_2|, p_2 + |\mathcal{W}_2|] = [1.6, 2.2]$, the solution of Σ_p never converges to a point of \mathbb{R}^n . It follows by Poincaré-Bendixson's theorem that the solution of Σ_p converges always towards a limit circle for any $p \in [1.6, 2.2]$ and initial condition in $B(x_0, \varepsilon_2)$. The computation took 31s. Using the




Figure 3: VdP system with parameter $p_1 = 0.4$, uncertainty $|\mathcal{W}_1| = 0.2$, initial radius $\varepsilon_1 = 0.2$, initial point $x_0 = (1.7018, -0.1284)$, period $T_1 = 6.347$, time-step $\tau = 10^{-3}$.

results of *Example 2* and *Example 3*, we know actually that, for any $p \in [0.2, 2.2]$, the solution of Σ_p always converges towards a limit cycle, for initial condition in $B(x_0, \varepsilon_2)$.

For each *Examples 2 to 4*, once the inputs $\tau, \varepsilon, |\mathcal{W}|, T$ have been fixed, the program takes less than 100s to find i such that $B(T(i+1)) \subset T(i)$ and $m_+ < M_-$. The method is thus efficient for treating such a range of parameters. However, for $p > 2.2$, it becomes difficult to find appropriate values of T and $|\mathcal{W}|$ that make $B(T(i+1)) \subset T(i)$ provable for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and this points to a current limit of the method. As explained in [16]: “The VdP system has a unique attracting limit cycle for any $p > 0$. In the limit $p \downarrow 0$ it tends to a circle in phase space and is essentially described by a single Fourier mode. For large p its dynamics fall in the fast-slow paradigm and more and more Fourier modes are required to describe the orbit accurately”. In [16], they manage to prove the convergence towards a limit cycle for $p = 9$, using more than 1000 Fourier modes (the computation time is cubic in the number of modes). Note on the other hand, that their approach, unlike ours, is limited to systems with polynomial vector field f .

4. CONCLUSION

We have given a simple method to generate a bounded invariant for a differential system. We have seen that the method can be used to show that, for a parameterized differential system, the solutions never converge to an equilibrium point, for any value of the parameter varying over a certain domain. The method uses a very general criterion of inclusion of one set in another. This is more general and




Figure 4: VdP system with parameter $p_2 = 1.9$, uncertainty $|\mathcal{W}_2| = 0.3$, initial radius $\varepsilon_2 = 0.1$, initial point $x_0 = (1.7018, -0.1284)$, period $T_2 = 7.531$, time-step $\tau = 10^{-3}$.

a priori simpler to show than the classical contraction property which states that any two trajectories converge exponentially towards each other, and often requires the finding of a Lyapunov function. We have illustrated the interest of the method on the parameterized example of a VdP system. We have also pointed out some limits of the method which cannot account for convergence to a limit cycle for complex systems whereas it is feasible with specialized methods using Fourier analysis. In future work, we plan to extend our method in order to account for such an analysis.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Zahra Aminzare and Eduardo D. Sontag. Contraction methods for nonlinear systems: A brief introduction and some open problems. In *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, CDC 2014, Los Angeles, CA, USA, December 15-17, 2014*, pages 3835–3847, 2014.
- [2] Erin M. Aylward, Pablo A. Parrilo, and Jean-Jacques E. Slotine. Stability and robustness analysis of nonlinear systems via contraction metrics and SOS programming. *Automatica*, 44(8):2163–2170, 2008.
- [3] Baresi and Scheeres. Quasi-periodic invariant tori of time-periodic dynamical systems: Applications to small body exploration. In *67th International Conference on Astronautical Congress, Guadalajara, Mexico, 2016*.
- [4] Roberto Castelli and Jean-Philippe Lessard. Rigorous numerics in Floquet theory: computing stable and unstable bundles of periodic orbits. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 12(1):204–245, 2013.
- [5] Adrien Le Coënt and Laurent Fribourg. Guaranteed optimal reachability control of reaction-diffusion equations using one-sided Lipschitz constants and model reduction. In *Model-Based Design of Cyber Physical Systems (CyPhy’19), N.-Y., USA, 2019*.
- [6] IBM ILOG Cplex. V12. 1: User’s manual for cplex. *International Business Machines Corporation*, 46(53):157, 2009.
- [7] G. Gómez and J. M. Mondelo. The dynamics around the collinear equilibrium points of the RTBP. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 157(4):283–321, 2001.
- [8] Tomasz Kapela and Carles Simo. Computer assisted proofs for nonsymmetric planar choreographies and for stability of the eight. *Nonlinearity*, 20(5), 2007.
- [9] Adrien Le Coënt, Julien Alexandre Dit Sandretto, Alexandre Chapoutot, Laurent Fribourg, Florian De Vuyst, and Ludovic Chamoin. Distributed control synthesis using Euler’s method. In *Proc. of International Workshop on Reachability Problems (RP’17)*, volume 247 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 118–131. Springer, 2017.
- [10] Adrien Le Coënt, Florian De Vuyst, Ludovic Chamoin, and Laurent Fribourg. Control synthesis of nonlinear sampled switched systems using Euler’s method. In *Proc. of International Workshop on Symbolic and Numerical Methods for Reachability Analysis (SNR’17)*, volume 247 of *EPTCS*, pages 18–33. Open Publishing Association, 2017.
- [11] Rudolf J. Lohner. Enclosing the solutions of ordinary initial and boundary value problems. *Computer Arithmetic*, pages 255–286, 1987.
- [12] Ian R. Manchester and Jean-Jacques E. Slotine. Transverse contraction criteria for existence, stability, and robustness of a limit cycle. In *Proceedings of the 52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, CDC 2013, December 10-13, 2013, Firenze, Italy*, pages 5909–5914. IEEE, 2013.
- [13] Zubin P. Olikara and Daniel J. Scheeres. Numerical method for computing quasi-periodic orbits and their stability in the restricted three-body problem. *Advances in the Astronautical Sciences*, 145, 2012.

- [14] Bastian Schürmann and Matthias Althoff. Guaranteeing constraints of disturbed nonlinear systems using set-based optimal control in generator space. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 50(1):11515 – 11522, 2017. 20th IFAC World Congress.
- [15] Bastian Schürmann and Matthias Althoff. Optimal control of sets of solutions to formally guarantee constraints of disturbed linear systems. In *2017 American Control Conference, ACC 2017, Seattle, WA, USA, May 24-26, 2017*, pages 2522–2529, 2017.
- [16] Jan Bouwe van den Berg and Elena Queirolo. A general framework for validated continuation of periodic orbits in systems of polynomial ODEs. *Journal of Computational Dynamics*, 0(2158-2491-2019-0-10), 2020.
- [17] Piotr Zgliczynski. C1 Lohner algorithm. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 2(4), 2002.