

A Lyapunov-based ISS small-gain theorem for infinite networks of nonlinear systems

Christoph Kawan, Andrii Mironchenko, Majid Zamani, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we show that an infinite network of input-to-state stable (ISS) subsystems, admitting ISS Lyapunov functions, itself admits an ISS Lyapunov function, provided that the couplings between the subsystems are sufficiently weak. The strength of the couplings is described in terms of the properties of an infinite-dimensional nonlinear positive operator, built from the interconnection gains. If this operator induces a uniformly globally asymptotically stable (UGAS) system, a Lyapunov function for the infinite network can be constructed. We analyze necessary and sufficient conditions for UGAS and relate them to small-gain conditions used in the stability analysis of finite networks.

Index Terms—Nonlinear systems, small-gain theorems, infinite-dimensional systems, input-to-state stability, Lyapunov methods, large-scale systems

I. INTRODUCTION

We are surrounded by networks: social networks, power grids, transportation and manufacturing networks, etc. These networks grow in size every year, and emerging technologies, such as Cloud Computing and 5G communication, make this trend even more apparent. As stability properties of networks may deteriorate with the increase in the number of participating agents [1], it is natural to study infinite networks which over-approximate large-scale networks as a worst-case scenario.

A prominent place in these investigations is occupied by the theory of linear *spatially invariant systems* [2], [3], [4]. In such networks, infinitely many subsystems are coupled via the same pattern. This nice geometrical structure together with the *linearity* of subsystems allowed researchers to develop powerful criteria for the stability of such networks.

On the other hand, in the stability analysis of *finite networks with nonlinear components*, groundbreaking results have been obtained within the framework of *input-to-state stability (ISS)* [5]. According to the ISS *small-gain approach*, the influence

of any subsystem on other subsystems in a network is characterized by so-called gain functions. The *gain operator* constructed from these functions characterizes the interconnection structure of the network. The small-gain theorems for finite networks of ISS systems described by ordinary differential equations (ODEs) [6], [7], [8], [9] show that if the gains are small enough (which is expressed in terms of a so-called *small-gain condition* of the gain operator), the network is ISS. These results have numerous applications in systems theory [10], [11], and play a major role in a large part of modern nonlinear control [12], [13].

Recently, significant advances have been achieved in an *infinite-dimensional ISS theory*, see [14], [15] for a comprehensive overview of the topic, and [16] for an overview of the linear theory.

This progress motivated the development of the ISS small-gain framework for the stability analysis of infinite interconnections of nonlinear systems without any spatial invariance assumption. This research was initiated in [17], where nonlinear Lyapunov-based small-gain theorems have been obtained under the very strong assumption that all gains are uniformly less than the identity. In [17], the authors also apply their small-gain theorem for stabilization of infinite nonlinear networks by revisiting a backstepping method. In [18], tight Lyapunov-based small-gain theorems have been obtained for networks of exponentially ISS systems with linear gains, and these results have been applied to distributed observer design and cooperative control of infinite networks in [19].

Nonlinear *trajectory-based small-gain theorems* for infinite networks have been developed in [20], where it was shown that an infinite network of ISS systems is ISS if the corresponding nonlinear gain operator satisfies the so-called *monotone limit property*. The monotone limit property implies the *uniform small-gain condition* [20], which is equivalent to the monotone bounded invertibility property. The latter played a key role in the derivation of the ISS small-gain theorem for finite networks in [8, Lem. 13].

This paper is strongly motivated by [21], where the *robust strong small-gain condition* was introduced and a method to construct paths of strict decay, based on the concept of the *strong transitive closure* of the gain operator, was proposed. For finite networks, this method was used in [22, Prop. 2.7, Rem. 2.8], see also [23] for more details on the importance of this concept in small-gain theory. Based on these results, in [21] a small-gain theorem for infinite networks, and the construction of associated ISS Lyapunov functions were pro-

C. Kawan is with the Institute of Informatics, LMU Munich, Germany; e-mail: christoph.kawan@lmu.de. His work is supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the grant ZA 873/4-1.

A. Mironchenko is with Faculty of Computer Science and Mathematics, University of Passau, 94032 Passau, Germany; e-mail: andrii.mironchenko@uni-passau.de. His work is supported by the DFG through the grant MI 1886/2-1.

M. Zamani is with the Computer Science Department, University of Colorado Boulder, CO 80309, USA. M. Zamani is also with the Institute of Informatics, LMU Munich, Germany; email: majid.zamani@colorado.edu. His work is supported in part by the DFG through the grant ZA 873/4-1 and the H2020 ERC Starting Grant AutoCPS (grant agreement No. 804639).

posed under the assumption that a *linear* path of strict decay for the gain operator exists. Although there are examples of nonlinear infinite networks with nonlinear gains, whose gain operators admit a linear path of strict decay, in general, this requirement is quite restrictive. In fact, the Lyapunov-based small-gain theorems for finite networks developed in [9] do not require the linearity of the path of strict decay.

Contribution. We consider infinite networks of ISS control systems described by ODEs, admitting ISS Lyapunov functions with a corresponding gain operator, characterizing the influence of the subsystems on each other. In our first main result (Theorem III.1), we show that *the existence of a (possibly nonlinear) path of strict decay for the gain operator Γ (together with some uniformity conditions) implies that the whole network is ISS and a corresponding ISS Lyapunov function for the network can be constructed.* Our result extends (up to some extra uniformity condition which we require from the path of strict decay) the nonlinear Lyapunov-based small-gain theorem for finite networks (in maximum formulation) shown in [9] to the setting of infinite networks, recovers the Lyapunov-based small-gain theorem for infinite networks from [21], and partially recovers the main result in [17]; see Section VIII for a detailed discussion.

Next, we introduce the concept of a *max-robust small-gain condition*, which is less conservative than the robust small-gain condition from [21], but better compatible with max-type gain operators, and can be fully characterized in terms of the asymptotic properties of the discrete-time system induced by the gain operator.

In our second main result (Theorem VI.1), we show that *the uniform global asymptotic stability (UGAS) of the system induced by a scaled gain operator guarantees the existence of a path of strict decay.* Furthermore, we explicitly construct this path via the concept of the strong transitive closure of the gain operator, adopted from [21]. Finally, we characterize the UGAS property of the induced system in terms of small-gain conditions and give useful sufficient conditions for it.

New vistas. Our nonlinear ISS small-gain theorem (Theorem III.1) has been developed for the case of the maximum formulation of the ISS property for the subsystems. However, our proof technique can be used for other formulations of the ISS property (semimaximum, summation, etc.), leading to very flexible small-gain results. In contrast to that, our method for the construction of the paths of strict decay for the gain operator relies strongly on the maximum formulation of the ISS property for subsystems. If the internal gains are all linear, and the ISS property for subsystems is given in a sum formulation, then the gain operator is linear and a path of strict decay with respect to such a gain operator exists (and can be explicitly constructed) if and only if the spectral radius of Γ is less than one. Numerous characterizations of this condition have been developed in [24]. Some of these characterizations, and in particular, the method for the construction of paths of strict decay, have been extended in [25] to the case of homogeneous and subadditive gain operators. The general nonlinear case remains, however, a challenging open problem.

Notation. We write \mathbb{R} for the reals and \mathbb{Z} for the integers. The sets of nonnegative reals and integers are denoted by \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{Z}_+ , respectively. By $C^0(X, Y)$, we denote the set of all continuous mappings from a space X to a space Y . In any metric space, we write $B_\delta(x)$ for the open ball of radius $\delta > 0$ centered at x , and $\text{int}(A)$ for the interior of a subset $A \subset X$. We use the following classes of comparison functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &:= \{\gamma \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) : \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(r) > 0, \forall r > 0\}, \\ \mathcal{K} &:= \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P} : \gamma \text{ is strictly increasing}\}, \\ \mathcal{K}_\infty &:= \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K} : \gamma \text{ is unbounded}\}, \\ \mathcal{L} &:= \{\gamma \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+) : \gamma \text{ is strictly decreasing with} \\ &\quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(t) = 0\}, \\ \mathcal{K}\mathcal{L} &:= \{\beta \in C^0(\mathbb{R}_+^2, \mathbb{R}_+) : \beta(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{K}, \forall t \geq 0, \\ &\quad \beta(r, \cdot) \in \mathcal{L}, \forall r > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We write ℓ_∞ for the space of bounded real sequences $s = (s_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, which is a Banach space with the norm $\|s\|_{\ell_\infty} := \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |s_i|$. The *positive cone* in ℓ_∞ is given by $\ell_\infty^+ := \{s \in \ell_\infty : s_i \geq 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We define $\mathbb{1} := (1, 1, 1, \dots) \in \ell_\infty^+$. By e_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the i -th unit vector in ℓ_∞ . Given $s^1, s^2 \in \ell_\infty$, we write $s^1 \oplus s^2$ for the vector given by the componentwise maximum of s^1 and s^2 . If \mathbb{N} is replaced by another index set I , we also write $\ell_\infty(I)$ for the corresponding Banach space and $\ell_\infty^+(I)$ for its positive cone. The notation $L_\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, U)$ is used for the Banach space of essentially bounded strongly measurable functions from \mathbb{R}_+ into a Banach space U .

A function $\lambda : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow X$ into some space X is called *piecewise right-continuous* if there is a partition of \mathbb{R}_+ into disjoint subintervals, $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, t_1) \cup [t_1, t_2) \cup [t_2, t_3) \cup \dots$, such that the restriction of λ to each of the subintervals is continuous.

II. TECHNICAL SETUP

A. Interconnections

Consider a family of control systems of the form

$$\Sigma_i : \quad \dot{x}_i = f_i(x_i, \bar{x}_i, u_i), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1)$$

This family comes with sequences $(n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(m_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive integers as well as *finite* (possibly empty) sets $I_i \subset \mathbb{N}$, $i \notin I_i$, such that the following assumptions are satisfied:

- The *state vector* x_i is an element of \mathbb{R}^{n_i} .
- The *internal input vector* \bar{x}_i is composed of the state vectors x_j , $j \in I_i$, and thus is an element of \mathbb{R}^{N_i} , where $N_i := \sum_{j \in I_i} n_j$.
- The *external input vector* u_i is an element of \mathbb{R}^{m_i} .
- The *right-hand side* $f_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_i} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is a continuous function.
- For every initial state $x_{i0} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and all essentially bounded inputs $\bar{x}_i(\cdot)$ and $u_i(\cdot)$, there is a unique solution of Σ_i , which we denote by $\phi_i(t, x_{i0}, \bar{x}_i, u_i)$ (it may be defined only on a bounded time interval).

For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we fix norms on the spaces \mathbb{R}^{n_i} and \mathbb{R}^{m_i} , respectively (these norms can be chosen arbitrarily). For

brevity in notation, we avoid adding an index to these norms, indicating to which space they belong, and simply write $|\cdot|$ for each of them. The interconnection of the systems Σ_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$, is defined on the state space $X := \ell_\infty(\mathbb{N}, (n_i))$, where

$$\ell_\infty(\mathbb{N}, (n_i)) := \{x = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} : x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}, \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |x_i| < \infty\}.$$

This space is a Banach space with the ℓ_∞ -type norm

$$\|x\|_X := \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |x_i|.$$

The space of admissible external input values is likewise defined as the Banach space

$$U := \ell_\infty(\mathbb{N}, (m_i)), \quad \|u\|_U := \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |u_i|.$$

We choose the class of admissible external input functions as

$$\mathcal{U} := \{u \in L_\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, U) : u \text{ is piecewise right-continuous}\},$$

which will be equipped with the L_∞ -norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}} := \text{ess sup}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} |u(t)|_U.$$

We define the right-hand side of the interconnected system by

$$f : X \times U \rightarrow \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{R}^{n_i}, \quad f(x, u) := (f_i(x_i, \bar{x}_i, u_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

Hence, the interconnected system can formally be written as the differential equation

$$\Sigma : \quad \dot{x} = f(x, u).$$

To make sense of this equation, we need to define an appropriate notion of solution. For fixed $(u, x^0) \in \mathcal{U} \times X$, a function $\lambda : J \rightarrow X$, where $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval of the form $[0, T)$ with $0 < T \leq \infty$, is called a *solution* of the Cauchy problem

$$\dot{\lambda} = f(\lambda, u), \quad \lambda(0) = x^0,$$

provided that $s \mapsto f(\lambda(s), u(s))$ is a locally integrable X -valued function (in the Bochner integral sense) and

$$\lambda(t) = x^0 + \int_0^t f(\lambda(s), u(s)) ds \quad \text{for all } t \in J.$$

We say that the system Σ is *well-posed* if for every initial state $x^0 \in X$ and every external input $u \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists a unique maximal solution. We denote this solution by $\phi(\cdot, x^0, u) : [0, t_{\max}(x^0, u)) \rightarrow X$, where $0 < t_{\max}(x^0, u) \leq \infty$.

The following theorem provides sufficient conditions for well-posedness of Σ , see [18, Cor. III.3].

Theorem II.1 *Consider the coupled system Σ , composed of the subsystems Σ_i , and let the following assumptions hold:*

- (i) $f(x, u) \in X$ for all $(x, u) \in X \times U$.
- (ii) $f(\cdot, u) : X \rightarrow X$ is continuous for each $u \in U$.
- (iii) $f(x, \cdot) : U \rightarrow X$ is continuous for each $x \in X$.
- (iv) For each $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and $x^0 \in X$, there are $\delta > 0$ and locally integrable functions $\ell, \ell_0 : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\|f(x^1, u(t)) - f(x^2, u(t))\|_X \leq \ell(t) \|x^1 - x^2\|_X,$$

$$\|f(x^0, u(t))\|_X \leq \ell_0(t),$$

for all $x^1, x^2 \in B_\delta(x^0)$ and almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Then Σ is well-posed.

If Σ is well-posed, one has

$$\pi_i(\phi(t, x^0, u)) = \phi_i(t, x_i^0, \bar{x}_i, u_i) \quad (2)$$

for all $t \in [0, t_{\max}(x^0, u))$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\pi_i : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ denotes the canonical projection onto the i -th component, $\bar{x}_i(\cdot) = (\pi_j(\phi(\cdot, x^0, u)))_{j \in I_i}$, and x_i^0, u_i denote the i -th components of x^0 and u , respectively, see [18, Sec. 3].

In the rest of the paper, we assume that the following holds.

Assumption II.2 *The system Σ is well-posed, and all of its uniformly bounded maximal solutions $\phi(\cdot, x, u)$ are global, i.e., they exist on \mathbb{R}_+ (this latter property is also called boundedness-implies-continuation (BIC) property).*

Remark II.3 If the function f is uniformly bounded on bounded balls, and Lipschitz continuous on bounded balls with respect to the first argument, then Σ is well-posed, and for any $R > 0$ there is $\tau_R > 0$ such that for all x with $\|x\|_X \leq R$ and u with $\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}} \leq R$ the solution $\phi(\cdot, x, u)$ exists at least on $[0, \tau_R]$, which easily implies the BIC property; see [26, Thm. 4.3.4] for a related result for systems without inputs.

B. Input-to-state stability

We now recall the definition of input-to-state stability.

Definition II.4 *A well-posed system Σ is called (uniformly) input-to-state stable (ISS) if it is forward complete and there exist $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that*

$$\|\phi(t, x, u)\|_X \leq \beta(\|x\|_X, t) + \gamma(\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}})$$

for all $(t, x, u) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times X \times \mathcal{U}$.

Input-to-state stability is most often verified via the construction of an ISS Lyapunov function which is defined as follows.

Definition II.5 *A function $V : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is called an ISS Lyapunov function (in an implication form) for Σ if it satisfies the following properties:*

- (i) V is continuous.
- (ii) There exist $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that
$$\psi_1(\|x\|_X) \leq V(x) \leq \psi_2(\|x\|_X) \quad \text{for all } x \in X. \quad (3)$$
- (iii) There exist $\gamma \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ such that for all $x \in X$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}$ the following implication holds:

$$V(x) > \gamma(\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad D^+ V_u(x) \leq -\alpha(V(x)), \quad (4)$$

where $D^+ V_u(x)$ denotes the right upper Dini orbital derivative, defined as

$$D^+ V_u(x) := \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(\phi(t, x, u)) - V(x)}{t}.$$

The importance of ISS Lyapunov functions is due to the following result (cf. [15, Thm. 2.17]).

Proposition II.6 *If Σ admits an ISS Lyapunov function, then it is ISS.*

The construction of an ISS Lyapunov function is a complex problem, which becomes especially challenging if the system is nonlinear and of large size. In this paper, we assume that all components Σ_i of an infinite network are ISS with corresponding ISS Lyapunov functions V_i . To find an ISS Lyapunov function V for Σ , we exploit the interconnection structure and construct V from V_i . Hence, we make the following assumption.

Assumption II.7 *For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a continuous function $V_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which is continuously differentiable outside of $x_i = 0$ and satisfies the following properties:*

(L1) *There exist $\psi_{i1}, \psi_{i2} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that*

$$\psi_{i1}(|x_i|) \leq V_i(x_i) \leq \psi_{i2}(|x_i|) \quad \text{for all } x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}. \quad (5)$$

(L2) *There exist $\gamma_{ij} \in \mathcal{K} \cup \{0\}$, where $\gamma_{ij} = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus I_i$, and $\gamma_{iu} \in \mathcal{K}$ as well as $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{P}$ such that for all $x = (x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in X$ and $u = (u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in U$ the following implication holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} V_i(x_i) &> \max \left\{ \sup_{j \in I_i} \gamma_{ij}(V_j(x_j)), \gamma_{iu}(|u_i|) \right\} \\ &\Rightarrow \nabla V_i(x_i) f_i(x_i, \bar{x}_i, u_i) \leq -\alpha_i(V_i(x_i)). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The function V_i is called an ISS Lyapunov function for Σ_i . The functions γ_{ij} and γ_{iu} are called internal gains and external gains, respectively.

Using the internal gains γ_{ij} from Assumption II.7, we define the gain operator $\Gamma : \ell_\infty^+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$ by

$$\Gamma(s) := \left(\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{ij}(s_j) \right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}. \quad (7)$$

In general, Γ might be neither well-defined nor continuous. The following assumption guarantees both, see [21, Lem. 2.1] and [20, Prop. 2].

Assumption II.8 *The family $\{\gamma_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is pointwise equicontinuous. That is, for every $r \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(r, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that $|r - \tilde{r}| \leq \delta$, $\tilde{r} \in \mathbb{R}_+$, implies $|\gamma_{ij}(r) - \gamma_{ij}(\tilde{r})| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Additionally, we make the following assumption on the external gains.

Assumption II.9 *There is $\gamma_{\max}^u \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\gamma_{iu} \leq \gamma_{\max}^u$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.*

We now introduce the concept of a *path of strict decay* (for the gain operator Γ) which is of crucial importance in the construction of an ISS Lyapunov function for the interconnected system.

Definition II.10 *A mapping $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$ is called a path of strict decay (for Γ), if the following properties hold:*

(i) *There exists a function $\rho \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that*

$$\Gamma(\sigma(r)) \leq (\text{id} + \rho)^{-1} \circ \sigma(r) \quad \text{for all } r \geq 0,$$

where $(\text{id} + \rho)^{-1}$ is applied componentwise.

(ii) *There exist $\sigma_{\min}, \sigma_{\max} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ satisfying*

$$\sigma_{\min} \leq \sigma_i \leq \sigma_{\max} \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

(iii) *Each component function $\sigma_i = \pi_i \circ \sigma$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, is a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function.*

(iv) *For every compact interval $K \subset (0, \infty)$, there exist $0 < c \leq C < \infty$ such that for all $r_1, r_2 \in K$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$c|r_1 - r_2| \leq |\sigma_i^{-1}(r_1) - \sigma_i^{-1}(r_2)| \leq C|r_1 - r_2|.$$

In Section VI, we provide a method to construct paths of strict decay under suitable assumptions.

III. NONLINEAR SMALL-GAIN THEOREM

Now we are able to present our small-gain result which yields an ISS Lyapunov function for the interconnected system Σ .

Theorem III.1 *Consider the interconnected system Σ , composed of subsystems Σ_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and let the following assumptions hold.*

(i) *The system Σ is well-posed and satisfies the BIC property (Assumption II.2).*

(ii) *There exist ISS Lyapunov functions V_i for the subsystems Σ_i with associated internal gains γ_{ij} and external gains γ_{iu} (Assumption II.7). Moreover, there exist $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that*

$$\psi_1 \leq \psi_{i1} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{i2} \leq \psi_2 \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (8)$$

(iii) *The family $\{\gamma_{ij}\}$ of internal gains is pointwise equicontinuous and the external gains γ_{iu} are uniformly upper bounded by a \mathcal{K} -function (Assumptions II.8 and II.9).*

(iv) *There exists a path $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$ of strict decay for the gain operator Γ , defined via the internal gains γ_{ij} .*

(v) *For each $R > 0$, there is a constant $L(R) > 0$ such that*

$$|V_i(x_i) - V_i(y_i)| \leq L(R)|x_i - y_i| \quad (9)$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_i, y_i \in B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$.

(vi) *There exists $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\alpha_i \geq \tilde{\alpha}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Then Σ is ISS and an ISS Lyapunov function for Σ is given by

$$V(x) := \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(x_i)) \quad \text{for all } x \in X. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, V is locally Lipschitz continuous on $X \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof: The proof proceeds in six steps.

Step 1: We show that V satisfies inequalities of the form (3), which also proves that V assumes finite nonnegative values and $V(0) = 0$. Using (5) and (8), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(x_i)) &\leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\psi_{i2}(|x_i|)) \\ &\leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\psi_2(\|x\|_X))\end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we obtain the lower estimate

$$\sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(x_i)) \geq \sigma_{\max}^{-1}(\psi_{i1}(|x_i|)) \geq \sigma_{\max}^{-1}(\psi_1(\|x\|_X)).$$

Together, these estimates imply

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{\max}^{-1} \circ \psi_1(\|x\|_X) &= \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_{\max}^{-1}(\psi_1(|x_i|)) \\ &\leq V(x) \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1} \circ \psi_2(\|x\|_X).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\sigma_{\max}^{-1} \circ \psi_1$ and $\sigma_{\min}^{-1} \circ \psi_2$ are \mathcal{K}_∞ -functions, the desired coercivity estimates hold.

Step 2: We prove that V is continuous and locally Lipschitz continuous outside of $x = 0$. Continuity at $x = 0$ follows from coercivity as shown in Step 1. Hence, let $0 \neq x \in X$. Define

$$\delta = \delta(x) := \frac{1}{3} \psi_2^{-1} \circ \sigma_{\min} \circ \sigma_{\max}^{-1} \circ \psi_1 \left(\frac{\|x\|_X}{4} \right) \leq \frac{\|x\|_X}{12}.$$

For all $y \in B_\delta(x)$, it holds that $\|y\|_X \geq \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_X$, implying

$$V(y) \geq \sigma_{\max}^{-1} \circ \psi_1(\|y\|_X) \geq \sigma_{\max}^{-1} \circ \psi_1 \left(\frac{\|x\|_X}{2} \right). \quad (11)$$

Define $I_\delta := \{i \in \mathbb{N} : |x_i| \geq 2\delta\}$. For any $y \in B_\delta(x)$ and $i \notin I_\delta$, we have

$$|y_i| \leq |x_i| + |x_i - y_i| \leq 3\delta = \psi_2^{-1} \circ \sigma_{\min} \circ \sigma_{\max}^{-1} \circ \psi_1 \left(\frac{\|x\|_X}{4} \right).$$

This implies

$$\sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(y_i)) \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1} \circ \psi_2(|y_i|) \leq \sigma_{\max}^{-1} \circ \psi_1 \left(\frac{\|x\|_X}{4} \right).$$

In view of (11), we see that

$$V(y) = \sup_{i \in I_\delta} \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(y_i))$$

for all $y \in B_\delta(x)$. It is then easy to see that

$$|V(y^1) - V(y^2)| \leq \sup_{i \in I_\delta} |\sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(y_i^1)) - \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(y_i^2))|$$

for all $y^1, y^2 \in B_\delta(x)$. Since $V_i(y_i^1)$ and $V_i(y_i^2)$ on the right-hand side of this inequality are contained in the compact interval $[\psi_1(\delta), \psi_2(\|x\|_X + \delta)] \subset (0, \infty)$, the definition of a path of strict decay together with Assumption (v) implies the existence of a constant $L > 0$ such that for all $y^1, y^2 \in B_\delta(x)$

$$|V(y^1) - V(y^2)| \leq \sup_{i \in I_\delta} L|y_i^1 - y_i^2| \leq L\|y^1 - y^2\|_X.$$

This proves Lipschitz continuity of V on $B_\delta(x)$.

Step 3: We prove an auxiliary result needed for the proof of implication (4). Let $\rho \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ satisfy

$$\Gamma(\sigma(r)) \leq (\text{id} + \rho)^{-1} \circ \sigma(r) \quad \text{for all } r \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (12)$$

as required in the definition of a path of strict decay. Then we fix a function $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that $\mu(r) < \rho(r)$ for all $r > 0$ and introduce for every $0 \neq x \in X$ the set

$$I(x) := \{i \in \mathbb{N} : V(x) \leq \sigma_i^{-1}((\text{id} + \mu)(V_i(x_i)))\}. \quad (13)$$

Now we prove the following claim:

Every $x \neq 0$ has a neighborhood in X on which all of the functions $\sigma_i^{-1} \circ V_i \circ \pi_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus I(x)$, are bounded away from V , formally:

$$\begin{aligned}\exists \varepsilon, \delta > 0 : \|x - y\|_X \leq \delta \wedge i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus I(x) \\ \Rightarrow V(y) > \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(y_i)) + \varepsilon.\end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

In particular, this shows that $I(x) \neq \emptyset$.

Assume towards a contradiction that the claim is false. Then we can find sequences $y^n \rightarrow x$ and $i_n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus I(x)$ such that

$$V(y^n) \leq \sigma_{i_n}^{-1}(V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n)) + \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (15)$$

At the same time, $i_n \notin I(x)$ implies

$$V(x) > \sigma_{i_n}^{-1}((\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}))) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Combining these two inequalities, we obtain

$$V(x) - V(y^n) > \sigma_{i_n}^{-1}((\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}))) - \sigma_{i_n}^{-1}(V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n)) - \frac{1}{n}.$$

We can find a compact interval $K \subset (0, \infty)$ such that for sufficiently large n we have $(\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})), V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n) \in K$. Indeed, this follows from the estimates

- $(\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})) \leq (\text{id} + \mu) \circ \psi_2(\|x\|_X)$;
- $V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n) \leq \psi_2(\|y^n\|_X) \leq \psi_2(2\|x\|_X)$ for all n large enough;
- $V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n) \geq \sigma_{i_n}(V(y^n) - 1/n) \geq \sigma_{\min}(V(y^n) - 1/n) \geq \sigma_{\min}(\sigma_{\max}^{-1}(\psi_1(\frac{1}{2}\|x\|_X)) - 1/n) > 0$ for all n large enough;
- $(\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})) \geq (\text{id} + \mu) \circ \psi_1(|x_{i_n}|) \geq (\text{id} + \mu) \circ \psi_1(|y_{i_n}^n| - |x_{i_n} - y_{i_n}^n|) \geq (\text{id} + \mu) \circ \psi_1(\frac{1}{2}|y_{i_n}^n|) \geq (\text{id} + \mu) \circ \psi_1(\frac{1}{2}\psi_2^{-1}(V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n)))$ for all n large enough; this can be lower bounded by using the previous estimates.

By the definition of a path of strict decay, we thus have constants $0 < c \leq C < \infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}|\sigma_{i_n}^{-1}((\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}))) - \sigma_{i_n}^{-1}(V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n))| \\ = c_n |(\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})) - V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n)|\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_n \in [c, C]$, when n is large enough, which (by monotonicity of $\sigma_{i_n}^{-1}$) yields

$$V(x) - V(y^n) > c_n ((\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})) - V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n)) - \frac{1}{n}.$$

From (9) it follows that for some $L > 0$ (independent of n),

$$\begin{aligned}V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n) &= V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) + V_{i_n}(y_{i_n}^n) - V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) \\ &\leq V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) + L\|y^n - x\|_X.\end{aligned}$$

Putting $\delta_n := \|y^n - x\|_X$, we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned}V(x) - V(y^n) \\ > c_n ((\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})) - [V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) + L\delta_n]) - \frac{1}{n} \\ &= c_n \mu(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})) - c_n L\delta_n - \frac{1}{n} \\ &\geq c_n \mu(\psi_1(|x_{i_n}|)) - c_n L\delta_n - \frac{1}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

We can also write this as

$$0 \leq \mu \circ \psi_1(|x_{i_n}|) < b_n,$$

$$b_n := c_n^{-1} \left([V(x) - V(y^n)] + c_n L \delta_n + \frac{1}{n} \right).$$

Note that $b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which implies $|x_{i_n}| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and since $y^n \rightarrow x$, also $|y_{i_n}^n| \rightarrow 0$. Then (15) yields

$$0 \leq V(y^n) \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1} \circ \psi_2(|y_{i_n}^n|) + \frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $V(y^n) \rightarrow V(x)$, we obtain $V(x) = 0$, and hence $x = 0$, a contradiction.

Step 4: We define the \mathcal{K} -function γ by

$$\gamma(r) := \sigma_{\min}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \rho) \circ \gamma_{\max}^u(r) \quad \text{for all } r \geq 0,$$

and prove the following claim:

The inequality $V(x) > \gamma(\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}})$ for some $x \in X$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}$ implies the existence of $T > 0$ such that

$$\nabla V_i(\phi_i(t)) f_i(\phi_i(t), \bar{\phi}_i(t), u_i(t)) \leq -\tilde{\alpha}(V_i(\phi_i(t))) \quad (16)$$

for all $i \in I(x)$ and $t \in [0, T]$, where $\phi(t) := \phi(t, x, u)$, $\phi_j(t)$ is the j -th component of $\phi(t)$ (for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$) and $\bar{\phi}_i(t) = (\phi_j(t))_{j \in I_i}$.

Let us fix x and u as in the claim and note that $x \neq 0$. As V and $\phi(\cdot)$ are continuous, $V(x) > \gamma(\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}})$ implies

$$V(\phi(t)) > \sigma_{\min}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \rho) \circ \gamma_{\max}^u(\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}}) \quad (17)$$

$$\geq \sigma_{\min}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \rho) \circ \gamma_{iu}(|u_i(t)|)$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, T]$, where $T > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small. If T is chosen further small enough, then

$$V(\phi(t)) < \sigma_i^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \rho) \circ V_i(\phi_i(t)) \quad \forall i \in I(x), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (18)$$

We prove this by contradiction. Assume that there are sequences $0 < t_n \rightarrow 0$ and $i_n \in I(x)$ such that

$$V(\phi(t_n)) \geq \sigma_{i_n}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \rho) \circ V_{i_n}(\phi_{i_n}(t_n)).$$

The left-hand side of this inequality converges to $V(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, we find a sequence $0 < \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\sigma_{i_n}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \rho) \circ V_{i_n}(\phi_{i_n}(t_n)) \leq V(x) + \varepsilon_n$$

$$\leq \sigma_{i_n}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \mu) \circ V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) + \varepsilon_n.$$

We can further estimate

$$V_{i_n}(\phi_{i_n}(t_n)) \geq V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) - |V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) - V_{i_n}(\phi_{i_n}(t_n))|$$

$$\geq V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) - L|x_{i_n} - \phi_{i_n}(t_n)|$$

$$\geq V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) - L\|x - \phi(t_n)\|_X,$$

where we use that $|\phi_{i_n}(t_n)| \leq |\phi_{i_n}(t_n) - x_{i_n}| + |x_{i_n}| \leq \|\phi(t_n) - x\|_X + \|x\|_X$ (implying the existence of $L > 0$ by Assumption (v)). Hence, we obtain

$$\sigma_{i_n}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \rho)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) - L\|x - \phi(t_n)\|_X)$$

$$\leq \sigma_{i_n}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})) + \varepsilon_n.$$

We write this inequality as

$$\varepsilon_n \geq \sigma_{i_n}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \rho)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) - L\|x - \phi(t_n)\|_X)$$

$$- \sigma_{i_n}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \mu)(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})).$$

With a similar reasoning as used before, we can show that the arguments of $\sigma_{i_n}^{-1}$ are contained in a compact subset of $(0, \infty)$ for all sufficiently large n . Hence, there are numbers $c_n \in [c, C]$ such that

$$\varepsilon_n \geq c_n \left[\rho(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) - L\|x - \phi(t_n)\|_X) \right.$$

$$\left. - \mu(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})) - L\|x - \phi(t_n)\|_X \right].$$

Using that $V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})$ is contained in a compact interval for all n and ρ is uniformly continuous on this interval, we find a sequence $0 < \delta_n \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\rho(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) - L\|x - \phi(t_n)\|_X) \geq \rho(V_{i_n}(x_{i_n})) - \delta_n \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Also using that $\rho - \mu > 0$ (on $(0, \infty)$) and $V_{i_n}(x_{i_n}) \geq (\text{id} + \mu)^{-1} \circ \sigma_{\min}(V(x))$, this implies

$$\varepsilon_n \geq c_n \left[(\rho - \mu)((\text{id} + \mu)^{-1} \circ \sigma_{\min}(V(x))) \right.$$

$$\left. - \delta_n - L\|x - \phi(t_n)\|_X \right].$$

Hence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the contradiction $V(x) = 0$, as $V(x) > \gamma(\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}}) \geq 0$. This proves (18).

From (18), it then follows that for all $i \in I(x)$ and $t \in [0, T]$:

$$V_i(\phi_i(t)) > (\text{id} + \rho)^{-1} \circ \sigma_i(V(\phi(t))) \stackrel{(12)}{\geq} \Gamma_i(\sigma(V(\phi(t))))$$

$$= \sup_{j \in I_i} \gamma_{ij}(\sigma_j(V(\phi(t)))) \geq \sup_{j \in I_i} \gamma_{ij}(V_j(\phi_j(t))).$$

At the same time, (17) together with (18) implies

$$V_i(\phi_i(t)) > (\text{id} + \rho)^{-1} \circ \sigma_i \circ \sigma_{\min}^{-1} \circ (\text{id} + \rho) \circ \gamma_{iu}(|u_i(t)|)$$

$$\geq \gamma_{iu}(|u_i(t)|).$$

Putting both estimates together, we obtain

$$V_i(\phi_i(t)) > \max \left\{ \sup_{j \in I_i} \gamma_{ij}(V_j(\phi_j(t))), \gamma_{iu}(|u_i(t)|) \right\}.$$

By (6) together with Assumption (vi), this implies (16), which proves the claim.

Step 5: We show the implication (4). First observe that the case $x = 0$ does not occur, since $V(0) = 0 > \gamma(\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}})$ is never satisfied. Hence, let us fix $0 \neq x \in X$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying $V(x) > \gamma(\|u\|_{\mathcal{U}})$. By Step 3, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$V(y) = \sup_{i \in I(x)} \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(y_i)) \quad \text{for all } y \in B_\delta(x).$$

Step 4 shows that for all sufficiently small $t \geq 0$ we have

$$\nabla V_i(\phi_i(t)) f_i(\phi_i(t), \bar{\phi}_i(t), u_i(t)) \leq -\tilde{\alpha}(V_i(\phi_i(t))) \quad \forall i \in I(x).$$

Now let us introduce the Cauchy problem

$$\dot{v}(t) = -\tilde{\alpha}(v(t)), \quad v(0) = v_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

By [20, Lem. 6], we can assume that $\tilde{\alpha}$ is globally Lipschitz. Then the Cauchy problem has a globally defined unique

solution that we denote by $\mathcal{V}(t, v_0)$. For every $i \in I(x)$ and all sufficiently small $t \geq 0$, Lemma IX.1 guarantees that

$$V_i(\phi_i(t)) \leq \mathcal{V}(t, V_i(x_i)).$$

It thus follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{t}(V(\phi(t)) - V(x)) \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \left[\sup_{i \in I(x)} \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(\phi_i(t))) - \sup_{i \in I(x)} \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(x_i)) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \sup_{i \in I(x)} [\sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(\phi_i(t))) - \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(x_i))] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \sup_{i \in I(x)} [\sigma_i^{-1}(\mathcal{V}(t, V_i(x_i))) - \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(x_i))] \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \sup_{i \in I(x)} -|\sigma_i^{-1}(\mathcal{V}(t, V_i(x_i))) - \sigma_i^{-1}(V_i(x_i))|. \end{aligned}$$

For all $i \in I(x)$ and all $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{V}(t, V_i(x_i)) \leq V_i(x_i) \leq \sigma_i \circ V(x) \leq \sigma_{\max}(V(x))$$

and

$$V_i(x_i) \geq (\text{id} + \mu)^{-1} \circ \sigma_i \circ V(x) \geq (\text{id} + \mu)^{-1} \circ \sigma_{\min} \circ V(x).$$

With $t^* > 0$ chosen small enough, for all $t \in (0, t^*)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t, V_i(x_i)) &\geq \mathcal{V}(t, (\text{id} + \mu)^{-1} \circ \sigma_{\min} \circ V(x)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}(\text{id} + \mu)^{-1} \circ \sigma_{\min} \circ V(x). \end{aligned}$$

Now, define

$$K(r) := \left[\frac{1}{2}(\text{id} + \mu)^{-1}(\sigma_{\min}(r)), \sigma_{\max}(r) \right]$$

and let $c = c(K(r)) > 0$ be the maximal constant such that

$$|\sigma_i^{-1}(r_1) - \sigma_i^{-1}(r_2)| \geq c|r_1 - r_2|, \quad \forall r_1, r_2 \in K(r).$$

For all $t \in (0, t^*)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{t}(V(\phi(t)) - V(x)) \\ &\leq -c(K(V(x))) \inf_{i \in I(x)} \frac{1}{t} (V_i(x_i) - \mathcal{V}(t, V_i(x_i))) \\ &= -c(K(V(x))) \inf_{i \in I(x)} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \tilde{\alpha}(\mathcal{V}(s, V_i(x_i))) ds \\ &\leq -c(K(V(x))) \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \min_{\varrho \in K(V(x))} \tilde{\alpha}(\mathcal{V}(s, \varrho)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the function

$$s \mapsto \min_{\varrho \in K(V(x))} \tilde{\alpha}(\mathcal{V}(s, \varrho))$$

is continuous as $\mathcal{V}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is continuous, and thus uniformly continuous on compact sets. Hence,

$$D^+V_u(x) \leq -c(K(V(x))) \min_{\varrho \in K(V(x))} \tilde{\alpha}(\varrho).$$

Therefore, we have proved the implication

$$V(x) > \gamma(\|u\|_U) \Rightarrow D^+V_u(x) \leq -\hat{\alpha}(V(x))$$

for all $0 \neq x \in X$ with

$$\hat{\alpha}(r) := c(K(r)) \min_{\varrho \in K(r)} \tilde{\alpha}(\varrho), \quad \forall r > 0.$$

Step 6: It remains to lower bound $\hat{\alpha}$ by a positive definite function. For each $r > 0$, define $K_2(r) := \bigcup_{q \in K(r)} \text{str}(1, q)$, where $\text{str}(1, q)$ equals $[1, q]$ for $q \geq 1$ and $[q, 1]$ for $q < 1$. Clearly, $K_2(r)$ is a compact subset of $(0, \infty)$. Further, we introduce

$$\hat{\alpha}_2(r) := c(K_2(r)) \min_{\varrho \in K_2(r)} \tilde{\alpha}(\varrho), \quad \forall r > 0.$$

As $K(r) \subset K_2(r)$ for any $r > 0$, $\hat{\alpha}(r) \geq \hat{\alpha}_2(r)$ for all $r > 0$. Furthermore, there is r_{\min} such that $K_2(r_1) \supset K_2(r_2)$ for all $r_1, r_2 \in (0, r_{\min})$ with $r_1 < r_2$. This implies that $\hat{\alpha}_2$ is a non-decreasing positive function on $(0, r_{\min})$, and $\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \hat{\alpha}_2(r) = 0$. Moreover, for all $r \in (0, r_{\min})$ we have

$$\hat{\alpha}_2(r) = \frac{2}{r} \int_{r/2}^r \hat{\alpha}_2(s) ds \geq \frac{2}{r} \int_{r/2}^r \hat{\alpha}_2(s) ds,$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_2$ is integrable on $(0, r_{\min})$ as it is monotone on this interval. Hence, $\hat{\alpha}_2$ and thus $\hat{\alpha}$ can be lower bounded by a continuous function on $[0, r_{\min}]$. Similarly, there is r_{\max} such that $K_2(r_1) \supset K_2(r_2)$ for all $r_1, r_2 \in (r_{\max}, \infty)$ with $r_1 > r_2$. This implies that $\hat{\alpha}_2$ is a non-increasing positive function on (r_{\max}, ∞) . Consequently, for $r \in (r_{\max}, \infty)$, we have

$$\hat{\alpha}_2(r) = \frac{1}{r} \int_r^{2r} \hat{\alpha}_2(s) ds \geq \frac{1}{r} \int_r^{2r} \hat{\alpha}_2(s) ds.$$

Hence, $\hat{\alpha}_2$, and thus $\hat{\alpha}$, can be lower bounded by a continuous function on $[r_{\max}, \infty)$. As $\hat{\alpha}$ assumes positive values and is bounded away from zero on every compact interval in $(0, \infty)$, $\hat{\alpha}$ can be lower bounded by a positive definite function, which we denote by α , on \mathbb{R}_+ . This implies

$$V(x) > \gamma(\|u\|_U) \Rightarrow D^+V_u(x) \leq -\alpha(V(x)) \quad \forall x \in X. \quad (19)$$

Thus, V is an ISS Lyapunov function for Σ . Proposition II.6 implies that Σ is ISS. The proof is complete. \square

IV. GAIN OPERATORS AND THEIR PROPERTIES

A crucial assumption in our small-gain theorem is the existence of a path of strict decay for the operator Γ . Our next goal is to understand under which conditions such a path exists, and to provide an explicit expression for it. We base our analysis on the properties of the gain operator, derived in this section.

From now on, we always assume that the family $\{\gamma_{ij}\}$ is pointwise equicontinuous (Assumption II.8), implying that Γ is well-defined and continuous. We assume throughout this section that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_{ij} \neq 0$ only for finitely many $j \in \mathbb{N}$, though many of the following results hold without this assumption.

The most important property of Γ is its monotonicity: for all $s^1, s^2 \in \ell_\infty^+$ we have the implication

$$s^1 \leq s^2 \Rightarrow \Gamma(s^1) \leq \Gamma(s^2).$$

Moreover, we note that $\Gamma(0) = 0$ and that Γ is a *max-preserving operator*, i.e.

$$\Gamma(s^1 \oplus s^2) = \Gamma(s^1) \oplus \Gamma(s^2) \quad \text{for all } s^1, s^2 \in \ell_\infty^+.$$

Now, we recall the important *robust and robust strong small-gain conditions*, introduced in [21], which are closely related to the stability properties of the discrete-time system induced by Γ . We modify these properties to make them more compatible with max-type gain operators.

Definition IV.1 We say that the operator Γ satisfies

(i) the small-gain condition (SGC) if

$$\Gamma(s) \not\leq s \quad \text{for all } s \in \ell_\infty^+ \setminus \{0\}. \quad (20)$$

(ii) the strong small-gain condition if there is $\rho \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ with

$$D_\rho \circ \Gamma(s) \not\leq s \quad \text{for all } s \in \ell_\infty^+ \setminus \{0\} \quad (21)$$

for the operator $D_\rho : \ell_\infty^+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$, defined by

$$D_\rho(s) := ((\text{id} + \rho)(s_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

(iii) the max-robust small-gain condition if there is $\omega \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ with $\omega < \text{id}$ such that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ the operator

$$\Gamma_{ij}(s) := \Gamma(s) \oplus \omega(s_j)e_i \quad \text{for all } s \in \ell_\infty^+ \quad (22)$$

satisfies the small-gain condition.

(iv) the max-robust strong small-gain condition if there are $\omega \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ with $\omega < \text{id}$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ the operator Γ_{ij} , defined in (22), satisfies the strong small-gain condition with the same ρ for all i, j .

In the next lemma, we introduce the so-called *strong transitive closure* (or Kleene star operator) Q of the gain operator Γ , which provides the crucial tool for the construction of a path of strict decay. This result was first shown in [21, Lem. 4.3], strengthened in [20, Lem. B.5], and is now even more strengthened, since the robust SGC is replaced by the less restrictive max-robust SGC.

Lemma IV.2 Assume that Γ satisfies the max-robust SGC with some $\omega \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. Then the operator

$$Q(s) := \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \Gamma^k(s) \quad \text{for all } s \in \ell_\infty^+, \quad (23)$$

is well-defined and has the following properties:

$$s \leq Q(s) \leq \omega^{-1}(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty})\mathbf{1} \quad \text{for all } s \in \ell_\infty^+, \quad (24)$$

$$\Gamma(Q(s)) \leq Q(s) \quad \text{for all } s \in \ell_\infty^+. \quad (25)$$

Proof: The proof is only a slight variation of the proof of [20, Lem. B.5]. Here, it suffices to show that the assumption $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \Gamma_i^k(s) > \omega^{-1}(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty})$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in \ell_\infty^+$ leads to a contradiction. From this assumption, the existence of $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j_1, \dots, j_{k-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ follows such that

$$\gamma_{ij_1} \circ \gamma_{j_1 j_2} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1} j}(s_j) > \omega^{-1}(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty}).$$

Now, consider the operator Γ_{ji} , as defined in (22):

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ji}(s) &= \left(\max_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{ \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{lk}(s_k), \omega(s_i) \delta_{jl} \} \right)_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \\ &= \left(\max_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{ \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{lk}(s_k), \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \omega(s_k) \delta_{jl} \delta_{ik} \} \right)_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left(\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \max \{ \gamma_{lk}(s_k), \omega(s_k) \delta_{jl} \delta_{ik} \} \right)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

Hence, Γ_{ji} is a gain operator induced by the gains

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{lk}(r) := \max \{ \gamma_{lk}(r), \delta_{jl} \delta_{ik} \omega(r) \}.$$

Since Γ_{ji} satisfies the SGC by assumption, by [20, Lem. B.3], all cycles built from the gains $\tilde{\gamma}_{lk}$ are contractions. This implies a contradiction, namely

$$\begin{aligned} s_j &> \tilde{\gamma}_{ji} \circ \tilde{\gamma}_{ij_1} \circ \tilde{\gamma}_{j_1 j_2} \circ \dots \circ \tilde{\gamma}_{j_{k-1} j}(s_j) \\ &\geq \tilde{\gamma}_{ji} \circ \gamma_{ij_1} \circ \gamma_{j_1 j_2} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1} j}(s_j) \\ &= \max \{ \gamma_{ji}, \omega \} \circ \gamma_{ij_1} \circ \gamma_{j_1 j_2} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1} j}(s_j) \\ &> \omega \circ \omega^{-1}(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty}) = \|s\|_{\ell_\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is the same as that of [20, Lem. B.5]. \square

Some further simple properties of the operator Q are summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition IV.3 Assume that $\Gamma : \ell_\infty^+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$ is well-defined, continuous and satisfies the max-robust SGC. Then the operator Q defined in (23) has the following properties:

(i) $Q(0) = 0$ and Q is a monotone operator.

(ii) The image of Q is the set of all points of decay for Γ :

$$\text{im } Q = \{s \in \ell_\infty^+ : \Gamma(s) \leq s\}.$$

This set is closed, contains $s = 0$, is cofinal (i.e., for any $x \in \ell_\infty^+$ there is $s \in \text{im } Q$ with $x \leq s$) and forward-invariant with respect to Γ , i.e., $\Gamma(\text{im } Q) \subset \text{im } Q$.

(iii) $Q \circ Q = Q$.

Proof: (i). This immediately follows from the corresponding properties of Γ and the definition of Q .

(ii). Lemma IV.2 implies that $\text{im } Q \subset \{s \in \ell_\infty^+ : \Gamma(s) \leq s\}$. Conversely, $\Gamma(s) \leq s$ implies $\Gamma^k(s) \leq s$ for all $k \geq 0$, and hence, $Q(s) = s$ implying $s \in \text{im } Q$. Since Γ is continuous, it follows that $\text{im } Q$ is closed. Since for each $s \in \ell_\infty^+$ it holds that $s \leq Q(s) \in \text{im } Q$, the set $\text{im } Q$ is cofinal. Since for any $s \in \text{im } Q$ we have $\Gamma(s) \leq s$, by monotonicity of Γ it follows that $\Gamma(\Gamma(s)) \leq \Gamma(s)$, showing forward-invariance of $\text{im } Q$.

(iii). This follows immediately from the proof of (ii). \square

For the gain operator Γ and any $\theta \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, we define the operator $\Gamma_\theta : \ell_\infty^+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$ by

$$\Gamma_\theta(s) := (\text{id} + \theta) \circ \Gamma(s) \quad \text{for all } s \in \ell_\infty^+. \quad (26)$$

Here, we apply the function $\text{id} + \theta$ componentwise, i.e.

$$\Gamma_\theta(s) = \left(\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} (\text{id} + \theta) \circ \gamma_{ij}(s_j) \right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

Hence, the operator Γ_θ is structurally the same as Γ , but with scaled gain functions.

We close the section with a simple lemma on gain operators satisfying the *max-robust strong SGC*.

Lemma IV.4 Assume that Γ satisfies the max-robust strong SGC with some $\rho, \omega \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. Then Γ_ρ satisfies the max-robust SGC with the same $\omega \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. Furthermore, there is $\theta \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that Γ_θ also satisfies the max-robust strong SGC.

Proof: Let Γ satisfy the max-robust strong SGC with certain $\omega \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. By [27, Lem. 1.1.3], we can find $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that $\text{id} + \rho = (\text{id} + \rho_1) \circ (\text{id} + \rho_2)$. Note that for any $s \in \ell_\infty^+$ and $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{id} + \rho) \circ \Gamma_{ij}(s) &= (\text{id} + \rho_1) \circ (\text{id} + \rho_2) \circ (\Gamma(s) \oplus \omega(s_j)e_i) \\ &\geq (\text{id} + \rho_1) \circ ((\text{id} + \rho_2) \circ \Gamma(s) \oplus \omega(s_j)e_i). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\text{id} + \rho) \circ \Gamma_{ij}(s) \not\geq s$ for all $s \neq 0$, it also holds that

$$(\text{id} + \rho_1) \circ (\Gamma_{\rho_2}(s) \oplus \omega(s_j)e_i)(s) \not\geq s, \quad \forall s \in \ell_\infty^+ \setminus \{0\},$$

showing that Γ_{ρ_2} satisfies the max-robust strong SGC. Similar arguments show that Γ_ρ satisfies the max-robust SGC. \square

V. THE DISCRETE-TIME SYSTEM INDUCED BY THE GAIN OPERATOR

In this section, we relate the properties of the gain operator Γ and its strong transitive closure Q to the stability properties of the discrete-time system induced by the gain operator Γ :

$$s(k+1) = \Gamma(s(k)), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (27)$$

As we will see, the stability properties of system (27) play an important role in the construction of paths of strict decay for Γ , and hence for the construction of ISS Lyapunov functions for interconnected systems via the small-gain approach.

The next proposition characterizes the max-robust SGC in terms of the stability properties of the system (27).

Proposition V.1 (Criterion for max-robust SGC) Let Γ be well-defined and continuous. Then Γ satisfies the max-robust SGC if and only if the following two properties hold:

- (i) The system (27) is uniformly globally stable (UGS), i.e., there is $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that for any initial state $s \in \ell_\infty^+$, the solution of (27) satisfies

$$\|\Gamma^k(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \sigma(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty}), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (28)$$

- (ii) Each trajectory of (27) converges to zero componentwise, i.e. $\pi_i \circ \Gamma^k(s) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for every $s \in \ell_\infty^+$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof: “ \Leftarrow ”: We first show that our assumption implies the existence of $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ satisfying

$$s \leq \Gamma(s) \oplus b \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|s\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \varphi(\|b\|_{\ell_\infty}) \quad (29)$$

for any $s, b \in \ell_\infty^+$. To this end, assume that $s \leq \Gamma(s) \oplus b$. Using that Γ is a max-preserving operator, inductively we obtain

$$s \leq \Gamma^k(s) \oplus \bigoplus_{l=0}^{k-1} \Gamma^l(b) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1. \quad (30)$$

Looking at this inequality componentwise and letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ yields $s \leq \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^l(b)$. Consequently, by the assumption of uniform global stability, there is $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that

$$\|s\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \sup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \|\Gamma^l(b)\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \varphi(\|b\|_{\ell_\infty}).$$

Hence, the implication (29) holds. To complete the proof, assume that $\Gamma(s) \oplus \omega(s_j)e_i \geq s$ for some $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \in \ell_\infty^+ \setminus \{0\}$ and $\omega < \varphi^{-1}$. Then $\|s\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \varphi(\omega(s_j)) < s_j \leq \|s\|_{\ell_\infty}$, a contradiction.

“ \Rightarrow ” By definition of Q , we have $\Gamma^k(s) \leq Q(s)$ for all $s \in \ell_\infty^+$, and by monotonicity of the norm and using Lemma IV.2, we obtain that $\|\Gamma^k(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \|Q(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \omega^{-1}(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty})$ for all s, k . This shows the UGS property.

To show (ii), consider the operator Q induced by Γ and let $s \in \text{im } Q$. Then $\Gamma(s) \leq s$ implying $\Gamma^{k+1}(s) \leq \Gamma^k(s)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Hence, each of the sequences $(\Gamma_i^k(s))_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, is monotonically decreasing and bounded below by zero. So the following limits exist:

$$s_i^* := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_i^k(s), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The vector $s^* := (s_i^*)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an element of ℓ_∞^+ , since $0 \leq s^* \leq s$. We claim that $s^* = 0$. To prove this, let I_i be the finite set of $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\gamma_{ij} \neq 0$. Then observe that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_i(s^*) &= \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{ij}(s_j^*) = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{ij}(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_j^k(s)) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{ij}(\Gamma_j^k(s)) = \max_{j \in I_i} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{ij}(\Gamma_j^k(s)) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{j \in I_i} \gamma_{ij}(\Gamma_j^k(s)) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_i(\Gamma^k(s)) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_i^{k+1}(s) = s_i^*. \end{aligned}$$

The identity (a) holds because γ_{ij} is continuous and (b) holds because the maximum (over finitely many quantities) commutes with the limit operation. Hence, the pointwise limit s^* of the trajectory $(\Gamma^k(s))_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a fixed point of Γ . Since Γ satisfies the SGC, this implies $s^* = 0$. We thus completed the proof for the case that $s \in \text{im } Q$. For any other s , we have $s \leq Q(s)$, and hence $0 \leq \Gamma^k(s) \leq \Gamma^k(Q(s))$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, implying that $\Gamma^k(s) \rightarrow 0$ componentwise. \square

In the next proposition, we define several basic stability properties of (27) and show their equivalence.

Proposition V.2 Assume that Γ satisfies the max-robust SGC. The following statements are equivalent:

- (i) System (27) is uniformly globally asymptotically stable (UGAS), i.e., there is $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$, such that for any initial condition $s \in \ell_\infty^+$, the solution of (27) satisfies

$$\|\Gamma^k(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \beta(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty}, k), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (31)$$

- (ii) System (27) is globally attractive, i.e., for all $s \in \ell_\infty^+$ it holds that $\Gamma^k(s) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

- (iii) System (27) is globally weakly attractive on $\text{im } Q$, i.e., $\inf_{k \geq 0} \|\Gamma^k(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} = 0$ for all $s \in \text{im } Q$.

Proof: Clearly, (i) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) holds. Let us show the implication (iii) \Rightarrow (i).

Let (27) be globally weakly attractive on $\text{im } Q$. For any $r > 0$ and any $s \in B_r(0)$, it holds that $s \leq r\mathbf{1} \leq Q(r\mathbf{1}) \in \text{im } Q$. By monotonicity of Γ , it holds that $\Gamma^k(s) \leq \Gamma^k(Q(r\mathbf{1}))$, and thus $\|\Gamma^k(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \|\Gamma^k(Q(r\mathbf{1}))\|_{\ell_\infty}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Hence, $\inf_{k \geq 0} \sup_{s \in B_r(0)} \|\Gamma^k(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} = 0$ (the so-called uniform global weak attractivity of (27)). Together with the UGS property, this implies UGAS (for continuous-time systems one can find this result, e.g., in [28, Thm. 4.2]; the proof of the discrete-time version is completely analogous). \square

The next example shows that even if the gains γ_{ij} are all linear and Γ satisfies the strong as well as the max-robust SGC, the system induced by Γ is not necessarily UGAS.

Example V.3 Consider linear gains defined by

$$\gamma_{k+1,k} := \delta_k \frac{k}{k+1} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \in \{2^s : s \in \mathbb{N}\}, \\ \frac{k}{k+1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and $\gamma_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \neq j+1$. Since $\gamma_{ij} \leq 1$ for all k , the gain operator Γ is well-defined. Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\Gamma^{2^k-1}(\mathbf{1}))_{2^k} &= \gamma_{2^k,2^k-1} \cdot \dots \cdot \gamma_{2^k-1,2^k-1+1} \\ &= \frac{2^k-1+1}{2^k} \geq \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

showing that $\Gamma^k(\mathbf{1}) \not\rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and thus the discrete-time system (27) induced by Γ is not UGAS. Now, [25, Prop. 8] implies, in particular, that Γ *does not satisfy the so-called robust strong SGC with linear ρ and ω* . On the other hand,

- Γ *satisfies the strong SGC*. Assume to the contrary that there is $s \in \ell_\infty^+ \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\Gamma s \geq (1-\varepsilon)s$ for a fixed but arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then we get $Rs \geq \Gamma s \geq (1-\varepsilon)s$, where R is the right-shift operator from [24, Ex. 3.15]. However, in view of [24, Ex. 3.15], R satisfies the strong SGC with any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and we come to a contradiction.
- Γ *satisfies the max-robust SGC*. Pick any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ and perturb the ij -component of Γ by the linear function $\omega(r) = \frac{1}{2}r$. The resulting operator Γ_{ij} is a block-diagonal operator with finite-dimensional blocks, and all its finite cycles are contractions. Thus, by [20, Prop. B.4], Γ_{ij} satisfies the SGC (here we use the fact that the robust SGC used in [20] implies the max-robust SGC). \square

We thus arrive at the following relations:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{UGS} \wedge \text{global attractivity (GATT)} & \iff & \text{UGAS} \\ & \Downarrow \Uparrow & \\ \text{UGS} \wedge \text{componentwise GATT} & \iff & \text{max-robust SGC} \end{array}$$

Since we need UGAS for the construction of a path of strict decay, we need to understand what is required in addition to the max-robust SGC to obtain UGAS.

It is well-known that for finite networks the max-preserving gain operator Γ induces a UGAS discrete-time system if and

only if all cycles composed of gains are contractions, see, e.g., [29, Thm. 6.4]. In the case of infinite networks, UGAS of the induced system can be characterized in terms of sufficiently long chains of gains, as shown in the next proposition.

Proposition V.4 *Assume that the gain operator Γ is well-defined, continuous and satisfies the max-robust small-gain condition. Then the following are equivalent:*

- The induced system (27) is UGAS.
- There exists $\eta \in \mathcal{K}$ with $\eta < \text{id}$ such that for every $r \geq 0$ there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\sup_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_n \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{j_0 j_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{n-1} j_n}(r) \leq \eta(r). \quad (32)$$

- There exist $\eta \in \mathcal{K}$ with $\eta < \text{id}$ and $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $r \geq 0$ there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\sup_{\substack{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_n \in \mathbb{N} \\ j_0 \geq i_0}} \gamma_{j_0 j_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{n-1} j_n}(r) \leq \eta(r).$$

Proof: (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Assume that (27) is UGAS. Then there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ such that $\|\Gamma^k(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \beta(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty}, k)$ for all $s \in \ell_\infty^+$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. We put $\eta(r) := r/2$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$. For a given $r > 0$, choose n so large that $\beta(r, n) \leq r/2$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_n \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{j_0 j_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{n-1} j_n}(r) &= \sup_{j_0 \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma_{j_0}^n(r\mathbf{1}) \\ &= \|\Gamma^n(r\mathbf{1})\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \beta(r, n) \leq \eta(r). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (32) holds.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): This is obvious.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): By Proposition V.2, it suffices to prove global attractivity on $\text{im } Q$. To this end, fix $s \in \text{im } Q$ and put $r_1 := \|s\|_{\ell_\infty}$. By assumption, there exists $\tilde{n}_1 = \tilde{n}_1(r_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\sup_{\substack{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{\tilde{n}_1} \in \mathbb{N} \\ j_0 \geq i_0}} \gamma_{j_0 j_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{\tilde{n}_1-1} j_{\tilde{n}_1}}(r_1) \leq \eta(r_1).$$

This implies

$$\Gamma_i^{\tilde{n}_1}(s) \leq \Gamma_i^{\tilde{n}_1}(r_1 \mathbf{1}) \leq \eta(r_1) \quad \text{for all } i \geq i_0.$$

By Proposition V.1, we further find $\hat{n}_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\Gamma_i^{\hat{n}_1}(s) \leq \eta(r_1) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i < i_0.$$

Now, put $n_1 := \max\{\tilde{n}_1, \hat{n}_1\}$. As $s \in \text{im } Q$, we obtain that $\Gamma^{n_1}(s) \leq \Gamma^{\tilde{n}_1}(s)$ and $\Gamma^{n_1}(s) \leq \Gamma^{\hat{n}_1}(s)$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma^{n_1}(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} &= \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma_i^{n_1}(s) = \max\left\{ \max_{1 \leq i < i_0} \Gamma_i^{n_1}(s), \sup_{i \geq i_0} \Gamma_i^{n_1}(s) \right\} \\ &\leq \max\left\{ \max_{1 \leq i < i_0} \Gamma_i^{\hat{n}_1}(s), \sup_{i \geq i_0} \Gamma_i^{\tilde{n}_1}(s) \right\} \leq \eta(r_1). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we put $r_2 := \eta(r_1)$. Proceeding in the same way, we find $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\|\Gamma^{n_1+n_2}(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \eta(r_2) = \eta^2(r_1).$$

Inductively, we find a sequence $N_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\|\Gamma^{N_k}(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \eta^k(r_1) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0.$$

Since $\eta < \text{id}$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{K}$, it follows that $\eta^k(r_1) \rightarrow 0$ (the only fixed point of η) as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This shows that (iii) in Proposition V.2 is satisfied. \square

The UGAS property of (27) implies important approximation and continuity properties of the operator Q .

Proposition V.5 *Assume that $\Gamma : \ell_\infty^+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$ is well-defined and continuous and system (27) is UGAS. Then the following statements hold:*

(i) $\text{im } Q$ is path-connected.

(ii) For all $s_1, s_2 \in \text{int}(\ell_\infty^+)$ with $s_1 \leq s_2$, there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$Q(s) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(s), \quad \forall s : s_1 \leq s \leq s_2. \quad (33)$$

(iii) For each $q \in \text{int}(\ell_\infty^+)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $s \in \ell_\infty^+$ with $0 \leq s \leq q$

$$\bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(s) \leq Q(s) \leq \bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(s) + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}. \quad (34)$$

(iv) Q is continuous on ℓ_∞^+ .

Proof: (i). It suffices to prove that any point $s \in \text{im } Q$ can be connected with 0 by a continuous path. Hence, take any $s \in \ell_\infty^+$ with $\Gamma(s) \leq s$. Now define $s_\alpha := \alpha s + (1 - \alpha)\Gamma(s)$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(s) &= \alpha \Gamma(s) + (1 - \alpha)\Gamma(s) \leq s_\alpha \\ &= \alpha s + (1 - \alpha)\Gamma(s) \leq \alpha s + (1 - \alpha)s = s. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\Gamma(s) \leq s_\alpha \leq s$ and applying Γ once again and using its monotonicity yields $\Gamma(s_\alpha) \leq \Gamma(s) \leq s_\alpha$. This implies $s_\alpha \in \text{im } Q$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. We can repeat this process and thus construct a continuous (piecewise linear) path connecting s with $\Gamma^k(s)$ for any $k \geq 1$. Since $\Gamma^k(s) \rightarrow 0$ by assumption, it follows that s can be connected with 0 by a continuous path.

(ii). Pick any $s_1, s_2 \in \text{int}(\ell_\infty^+)$ with $s_1 \leq s_2$. As 0 is globally attractive, and $s_1 \in \text{int}(\ell_\infty^+)$, there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Gamma^k(s_2) \leq s_1$ for all $k \geq m$. Since Γ is monotone, one gets $\Gamma^k(s) \leq \Gamma^k(s_2) \leq s_1 \leq s$ whenever $k \geq m$ and $s_1 \leq s \leq s_2$. This implies (33).

(iii). Pick any $q \in \text{int}(\ell_\infty^+)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. As 0 is globally attractive, there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Gamma^k(q) \leq \varepsilon \mathbf{1}$ for all $k \geq m$. Since Γ is monotone, then also $\Gamma^k(s) \leq \Gamma^k(q) \leq \varepsilon \mathbf{1}$ whenever $k \geq m$ and $s \leq q$. By definition of Q , it holds that $Q(s) \leq \sup\{\bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(s), \varepsilon \mathbf{1}\}$, which implies (34).

(iv). Take any $q \in \text{int}(\ell_\infty^+)$, and pick $s \leq q$ satisfying $B_\delta(s) \subset [0, q] = \{x \in \ell_\infty^+ : 0 \leq x \leq q\}$ for some $\delta > 0$. Take any $\tilde{s} \in B_\delta(s)$. By (iii), for each $\varepsilon > 0$, we find $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(w) \leq Q(w) \leq \bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(w) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon \mathbf{1}, \quad \forall w \in [0, q],$$

and thus

$$\bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(s) - \bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(\tilde{s}) - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon \mathbf{1} \leq Q(s) - Q(\tilde{s})$$

$$\leq \bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(s) - \bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(\tilde{s}) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon \mathbf{1}.$$

Hence,

$$\|Q(s) - Q(\tilde{s})\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \left\| \bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(s) - \bigoplus_{k=0}^m \Gamma^k(\tilde{s}) \right\|_{\ell_\infty} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Using the simple representation of the iterates Γ^k in terms of gains (see, e.g., [20, Lem. 12]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q(s) - Q(\tilde{s})\|_{\ell_\infty} &\leq \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \max_{k=0}^m \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_k} \gamma_{ij_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1}j_k}(s_{j_k}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \max_{k=0}^m \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_k} \gamma_{ij_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1}j_k}(\tilde{s}_{j_k}) \right| + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\gamma_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is pointwise equicontinuous by assumption, the same is true for the family $\{\gamma_{ij_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1}j_k} : i, j_1, \dots, j_k \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq k < m\}$. Hence, this family is uniformly equicontinuous on compact intervals, and thus there exists $\rho \in (0, \delta)$ such that $\|s - \tilde{s}\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \rho$ implies

$$|\gamma_{ij_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1}j_k}(s_{j_k}) - \gamma_{ij_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1}j_k}(\tilde{s}_{j_k})| \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$$

for all $i, j_1, \dots, j_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq k < m$. This, in turn, implies $\|Q(s) - Q(\tilde{s})\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq \varepsilon$. We have thus proved continuity of Q at s , and since any $s \in \ell_\infty^+$ satisfies $s \leq q$ for some $q \in \text{int}(\ell_\infty^+)$, the proof is complete. \square

VI. CONSTRUCTION OF PATHS OF STRICT DECAY

We can finally present our main result on the existence and construction of paths of strict decay. It extends the first result of this kind in [21, Lem. 4.5], where properties (i)–(iii) of a path of strict decay have been shown under similar assumptions. See Section VIII for an extended discussion of this issue.

Theorem VI.1 *Let the following assumptions hold:*

- (a) There exists $\theta \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that the system induced by $\Gamma_\theta = (\text{id} + \theta) \circ \Gamma$ is UGAS.
- (b) For each compact interval $K \subset (0, \infty)$, there are $0 < l \leq L < \infty$ with $l(r_2 - r_1) \leq \gamma_{ij}(r_2) - \gamma_{ij}(r_1) \leq L(r_2 - r_1)$ for all nonzero γ_{ij} and $r_1 < r_2$ in K .

Then there exists a path of strict decay $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$ for Γ .

Proof: First, we fix $\theta \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that the system induced by Γ_θ is UGAS. We also put $\gamma_{ij}^\theta := (\text{id} + \theta) \circ \gamma_{ij}$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, and define $\sigma(r) := Q_\theta(r\mathbf{1})$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $Q_\theta(s) = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \Gamma_\theta^k(s)$. Then we can verify all properties of a path of strict decay for σ :

Since $\Gamma_\theta(Q_\theta(r\mathbf{1})) \leq Q_\theta(r\mathbf{1})$ by Lemma IV.2, we obtain $\Gamma(\sigma(r)) \leq (\text{id} + \theta)^{-1} \circ \sigma(r)$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Hence, σ satisfies property (i) of a path of strict decay.

Property (ii) of a path of strict decay holds with $\sigma_{\min} = \text{id}$, since $\sigma(r) \geq r\mathbf{1}$, and $\sigma_{\max} = \omega^{-1}$ by Lemma IV.2.

From property (ii), we can conclude that $\sigma_i(0) = 0$, $\sigma_i(r) > 0$ for all $r > 0$, and $\sigma_i(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. As 0 is a

globally attractive fixed point for Γ_θ , Q_θ is continuous on ℓ_∞^+ by Proposition V.5. Thus, all σ_i are continuous as well. Furthermore, for $r_1, r_2 \in (0, \infty)$ with $r_1 < r_2$, we obtain by Proposition V.5(ii), that

$$\sigma_i(r) = \max_{0 \leq k < k_0} \pi_i \circ \Gamma_\theta^k(r\mathbb{1}) \quad \text{for all } r \in [r_1, r_2].$$

By our assumption that for each i only finitely many γ_{ij} are nonzero, the supremum in

$$\sigma_i(r) = \max_{0 \leq k < k_0} \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_k} \gamma_{ij_1}^\theta \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1}j_k}^\theta(r)$$

is in fact a supremum over finitely many strictly increasing functions (since we can ignore all chains which contain a zero function). This implies that σ_i is also strictly increasing on $[r_1, r_2]$, and hence everywhere. It follows that all σ_i are \mathcal{K}_∞ -functions (property (iii) of a path of strict decay).

We complete the proof by verifying property (iv) of a path of strict decay. It suffices to prove the statement for σ_i in place of σ_i^{-1} . Indeed, assume that for every compact interval $L \subset (0, \infty)$, we have constants $\tilde{c}, \tilde{C} > 0$ satisfying

$$\tilde{c}|r_1 - r_2| \leq |\sigma_i(r_1) - \sigma_i(r_2)| \leq \tilde{C}|r_1 - r_2| \quad \forall r_1, r_2 \in L.$$

If $K = [a, b] \subset (0, \infty)$, then $\sigma_i^{-1}(K) = [\sigma_i^{-1}(a), \sigma_i^{-1}(b)]$ which is a subset of $[\sigma_{\max}^{-1}(a), \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(b)] =: L \subset (0, \infty)$. Hence, the above estimates imply

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{C}}|r_1 - r_2| \leq |\sigma_i^{-1}(r_1) - \sigma_i^{-1}(r_2)| \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{c}}|r_1 - r_2| \quad \forall r_1, r_2 \in K.$$

To verify the statement for σ_i , we first prove the following claim: If $K = [a, b] \subset (0, \infty)$ is a compact interval, then there exists another compact interval $[c, d] \subset (0, \infty)$ such that $\gamma_{ij}^\theta(K) \subset [c, d]$ for all nonzero γ_{ij} . By uniform equicontinuity of the functions $\{\gamma_{ij}^\theta\}$ on compact intervals, we know that $\gamma_{ij}^\theta(b)$ is uniformly bounded from above by some $d > 0$. Now pick $\rho > 0$ such that $a - \rho > 0$. Then by assumption, there is $l > 0$ with $\gamma_{ij}^\theta(a) - \gamma_{ij}^\theta(a - \rho) \geq l\rho$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma_{ij} \neq 0$. Hence, $\gamma_{ij}^\theta(a) \geq (1 + \theta)l\rho$ whenever $\gamma_{ij} \neq 0$. This implies $\gamma_{ij}^\theta(K) \subset [c, d]$ with $c := (1 + \theta)l\rho$.

Now fix a compact interval $K \subset (0, \infty)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and consider all chains of the form

$$c_{j_1 \dots j_k} := \gamma_{j_1 j_2}^\theta \circ \gamma_{j_2 j_3}^\theta \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1} j_k}^\theta$$

which are built from nonzero gains. From the claim and our assumptions, it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} l_1 l_2 \dots l_k |r_1 - r_2| &\leq |c_{j_1 \dots j_k}(r_1) - c_{j_1 \dots j_k}(r_2)| \\ &\leq L_1 L_2 \dots L_k |r_1 - r_2| \end{aligned}$$

for certain positive numbers $l_i, L_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, and all $r_1, r_2 \in K$. The same Lipschitz bounds then also hold for the functions $r \mapsto \pi_i \circ \Gamma_\theta^k(r\mathbb{1}) = \sup_{j_2 \dots j_k} c_{ij_2 \dots j_k}(r)$, where for the lower bound we need to require that at least one nonzero chain $c_{ij_2 \dots j_k}$ exists. By what we have shown above, on every compact interval $K \subset (0, \infty)$, σ_i can be written as the maximum over finitely many of such functions:

$$\sigma_i(r) = \max_{0 \leq k < k_0} \max_{j_2 \dots j_k} c_{ij_2 \dots j_k}(r) \quad \text{for all } r \in K. \quad (35)$$

With $C := \max\{1, L_1, L_1 L_2, \dots, L_1 \dots L_{k_0}\}$ (keeping in mind that $\pi_i \circ \Gamma_\theta^0(r\mathbb{1}) = r$), then the following holds:

$$|\sigma_i(r_1) - \sigma_i(r_2)| \leq C|r_1 - r_2| \quad \text{for all } r_1, r_2 \in K.$$

For the lower bound, we put $c := \min\{1, l_1, l_1 l_2, \dots, l_1 l_2 \dots l_{k_0}\}$ and apply Lemma IX.2. Observe that in taking the supremum, we can ignore all functions which are identically zero. Considering $k = 0$, we see that at least one nonzero function is involved in taking the supremum, namely, the identity. \square

Remark VI.2 Properties (i)–(iii) of a path of strict decay actually hold for the mapping $\sigma(r) = Q_\theta(r\mathbb{1})$ under the assumption that Γ_θ satisfies the max-robust SGC only, since this already implies that $\pi_i \circ \Gamma_\theta^k(r\mathbb{1}) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, which is enough to write σ_i locally as the maximum over finitely many continuous and strictly increasing functions. The stronger assumption of UGAS is only needed to verify the uniform local Lipschitz condition (iv), which requires that we can locally write $\sigma_i(r) = \max_{0 \leq k < k_0} \pi_i \circ \Gamma_\theta^k(r\mathbb{1})$ with k_0 being independent of i .

Remark VI.3 Assumption (b) in Theorem VI.1 is, in general, unnecessarily strong. This can be seen best by looking at the case when all gains γ_{ij} are linear functions. Then the maximum in (35) is taken over linear functions, and since one of them is the identity, only those linear functions with slope > 1 need to be taken into account. However, then it is clear that no uniform lower bound on the slopes of the individual γ_{ij} are necessary to obtain a uniform lower bound on the Lipschitz constants of the σ_i . In general, the situation is more complicated, and detailed information about the gains and their compositions is necessary to relax assumption (b).

VII. SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR UGAS

Since UGAS of the discrete-time system, induced by the scaled gain operator, is a key requirement for the existence of a path of strict decay (and thus, for the application of the small-gain theorem), in this section, we analyze sufficient conditions for UGAS of the system induced by the gain operator Γ . The next proposition describes a way of reducing the proof of UGAS of (27) to finitely many computations.

Proposition VII.1 *Assume that there exists a positive integer N and a map $p : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, N\}$ as well as a family $\{\bar{\gamma}_{ij} : i, j = 1, \dots, N\} \subset \mathcal{K} \cup \{0\}$ of virtual gains such that*

$$\gamma_{ij} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{p(i)p(j)} \quad \text{for all } i, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $\bar{\Gamma} : \mathbb{R}_+^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $s \mapsto (\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N} \bar{\gamma}_{ij}(s_j))_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ be the associated virtual gain operator. If $\bar{\Gamma}$ satisfies the SGC, $\bar{\Gamma}(s) \not\geq s$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \{0\}$, the system (27) induced by Γ is UGAS.

Proof: For any $s \in \ell_\infty^+$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have with a convention $j_0 := i$:

$$\Gamma_i^k(s) = \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_k \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{ij_1} \circ \dots \circ \gamma_{j_{k-1}j_k}(s_{j_k})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_k \in \mathbb{N}} \bar{\gamma}_{p(i)p(j_1)} \circ \dots \circ \bar{\gamma}_{p(j_{k-1})p(j_k)} (\|s\|_{\ell_\infty}) \\
&\leq \sup_{1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_k \leq N} \bar{\gamma}_{p(i)j_1} \circ \bar{\gamma}_{j_2 j_3} \circ \dots \circ \bar{\gamma}_{j_{k-1} j_k} (\|s\|_{\ell_\infty}) \\
&= \bar{\Gamma}_{p(i)}^k (\|s\|_{\ell_\infty} \mathbb{1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ in the last line. By [29, Thm. 6.4], the assumption that $\bar{\Gamma}$ satisfies the SGC implies that the ℓ_∞ -norm in \mathbb{R}^N of $\bar{\Gamma}^k(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty} \mathbb{1})$ is bounded by $\beta(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty}, k)$ for some \mathcal{KL} -function β (depending on $\bar{\Gamma}$ only). Hence, the system induced by Γ is UGAS. \square

Another method of checking UGAS of (27) via the introduction of virtual gains, based on a compactification of the index set \mathbb{N} , is described in the next proposition.

Proposition VII.2 *Let $\mathbb{N}^* := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and assume that there exist virtual gains $\bar{\gamma}_{ij} \in \mathcal{K} \cup \{0\}$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N}^*$ (where $\bar{\gamma}_{\infty\infty} \neq 0$ is allowed), satisfying the following assumptions:*

(i) $\bar{\gamma}_{ij} = \gamma_{ij}$ whenever $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) *The virtual gain operator*

$$\bar{\Gamma} : \ell_\infty^+(\mathbb{N}^*) \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+(\mathbb{N}^*), \quad s \mapsto \left(\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \bar{\gamma}_{ij}(s_j) \right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*},$$

is well-defined, continuous and satisfies the max-robust SGC with some $\omega \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$.

(iii) *For each $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\bar{\gamma}_{ij} \neq 0$ only for finitely many $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$.*

(iv) *There exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $r > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_{k_0} \in \mathbb{N}^*} \bar{\gamma}_{ij_1} \circ \dots \circ \bar{\gamma}_{j_{k_0-1} j_{k_0}} \circ \omega^{-1}(r) \\
&\leq \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_{k_0} \in \mathbb{N}^*} \bar{\gamma}_{\infty j_1} \circ \dots \circ \bar{\gamma}_{j_{k_0-1} j_{k_0}}(r).
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Then, the system (27) induced by Γ is UGAS.

Proof: First, we turn \mathbb{N}^* into a compact metrizable space by declaring ∞ to be an accumulation point and all other elements isolated points. Now, let $s = \bar{Q}(r\mathbb{1})$ for some $r > 0$, where $\bar{Q}(s) = \sup_{k \geq 0} \bar{\Gamma}^k(s)$. Then, by Lemma IV.2, $\bar{\Gamma}(s) \leq s$ and $r\mathbb{1} \leq s \leq \omega^{-1}(r)\mathbb{1}$. For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we define

$$f_k(i) := \bar{\Gamma}_i^k(s), \quad f_k : \mathbb{N}_* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+.$$

By the choice of s , the functions f_k form a decreasing sequence, i.e. $f_{k+1} \leq f_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. We claim that the function f_{k_0} is upper semicontinuous. Since ∞ is the only accumulation point of \mathbb{N}_* , this is equivalent to

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\Gamma}_i^{k_0}(s) \leq \bar{\Gamma}_\infty^{k_0}(s).$$

In terms of the gains $\bar{\gamma}_{ij}$, this can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_{k_0} \in \mathbb{N}^*} \bar{\gamma}_{ij_1} \circ \dots \circ \bar{\gamma}_{j_{k_0-1} j_{k_0}}(s_{j_{k_0}}) \\
&\leq \sup_{j_1, \dots, j_{k_0} \in \mathbb{N}^*} \bar{\gamma}_{\infty j_1} \circ \dots \circ \bar{\gamma}_{j_{k_0-1} j_{k_0}}(s_{j_{k_0}}).
\end{aligned}$$

From $r\mathbb{1} \leq s \leq \omega^{-1}(r)\mathbb{1}$, it follows that this inequality is implied by our assumption (36). Hence, f_{k_0} is upper semicontinuous. It now easily follows that also f_{kk_0} is upper semicontinuous for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, $(f_{kk_0})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is

a decreasing sequence of upper semicontinuous functions on a compact metric space. Hence, Lemma IX.3 implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{\Gamma}^{kk_0}(s)\|_{\ell_\infty} = \inf_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} f_{kk_0}(i) \\
&= \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \inf_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+} f_{kk_0}(i) = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\Gamma}_i^{kk_0}(s) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Proposition V.1. This clearly implies $\bar{\Gamma}^k(s) \rightarrow 0$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$. Now, it is easy to see that the same property holds for the original gain operator Γ . The proof is completed by applying Proposition V.2. \square

Remark VII.3 To get a better understanding of condition (36), consider the case $k_0 = 1$:

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \bar{\gamma}_{ij} \circ \omega^{-1}(r) \leq \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \bar{\gamma}_{\infty j}(r).$$

This implies that for all sufficiently large i , up to some small error, one gets $\bar{\gamma}_{ij} \circ \omega^{-1} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{\infty j^*}$ for some j^* and all $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$. However, from the proof of Lemma IV.2, we know that $\bar{\gamma}_{\infty j^*} < \omega^{-1}$ as a consequence of the max-robust SGC. Hence,

$$\bar{\gamma}_{ij} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{\infty j^*} \circ \omega < \omega^{-1} \circ \omega = \text{id}.$$

Thus, asymptotically, the gains become contractions. If $k_0 > 1$, this is true for all chains of k_0 gains.

Example VII.4 Consider a cascade network built from subsystems

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1 : \quad &\dot{x}_1 = f_1(x_1, u_1), \\
\Sigma_i : \quad &\dot{x}_i = f_i(x_i, x_{i-1}, u_i), \quad i \geq 2.
\end{aligned}$$

We assume that ISS Lyapunov functions V_i for Σ_i exist with associated interconnection gains $\gamma_{i(i-1)}$, which form an equicontinuous family. Then, the gain operator Γ is well-defined and continuous. Let us assume that Γ satisfies the max-robust small-gain condition with some $\omega \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, $\omega < \text{id}$. We add a virtual gain $\bar{\gamma}_{\infty\infty} \in \mathcal{K} \cup \{0\}$. It is then easy to see that with $\bar{\gamma}_{i(i-1)} := \gamma_{i(i-1)}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \geq 2$, the virtual gain operator $\bar{\Gamma}$ satisfies the max-robust small-gain condition with the same ω if and only if

$$\bar{\gamma}_{\infty\infty}(r) < r \quad \text{for all } r > 0.$$

Additionally, the asymptotic condition (iv) in Proposition VII.2 for $k_0 = 1$ requires that

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{i(i-1)} \circ \omega^{-1}(r) \leq \bar{\gamma}_{\infty\infty}(r) \quad \text{for all } r > 0.$$

This means that the gains $\gamma_{i(i-1)}$ asymptotically have to become smaller than the composition of the two contractions $\bar{\gamma}_{\infty\infty}$ and ω .

The following proposition characterizes an interesting special case of Proposition VII.2.

Proposition VII.5 *Assume that the virtual gains in Proposition VII.2 are chosen as $\bar{\gamma}_{ij} := 0$ if $i = \infty$ or $j = \infty$. Further, assume that Γ is well-defined, continuous and satisfies the max-robust small-gain condition. Then the same is true for the*

virtual gain operator $\bar{\Gamma}$. Moreover, the following implications hold:

- (i) If (36) holds, then the operator Γ^{k_0} is compact, i.e., the image of any bounded set under Γ^{k_0} is relatively compact.
- (ii) If the operator Γ^{k_0} is compact and every subsystem of Σ can only influence finitely many other subsystems, then condition (36) is satisfied.

Proof: The proof is subdivided into three steps.

Step 1: The proof that $\bar{\Gamma}$ is well-defined or continuous if Γ has the corresponding property is trivial, and hence we omit it. To verify that $\bar{\Gamma}$ satisfies the max-robust small-gain condition if Γ does, we need to verify that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the operator $\bar{\Gamma}_{ij}(s) = \bar{\Gamma}(s) \oplus \omega(s_j)e_i$ satisfies $\bar{\Gamma}_{ij}(s) \not\geq s$ for all $s \in \ell_\infty^+(\mathbb{N}^*) \setminus \{0\}$. To this end, we fix $s = (s_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ and distinguish several cases:

- $i, j < \infty$ and $s_k > 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, with $\hat{s} := (s_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, the claim follows directly from $\Gamma_{ij}(\hat{s}) \not\geq \hat{s}$.
- $i, j < \infty$ and $s_k = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $s_\infty > 0$ and thus $\bar{\Gamma}_\infty(s) = 0 < s_\infty$, showing that $\bar{\Gamma}_{ij}(s) \not\geq s$.
- $i = \infty$ or $j = \infty$ and $s_k > 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, with $\hat{s} := (s_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, it follows that $\Gamma(\hat{s}) \not\geq \hat{s}$, and consequently $\bar{\Gamma}_{ij}(s) \not\geq s$.
- $(i = \infty, j < \infty)$ or $(i < \infty, j = \infty)$ and $s_k = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In both cases, $\pi_\infty \circ \bar{\Gamma}_{ij}(s) = 0 < s_\infty$.
- $i, j = \infty$ and $s_k = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\omega < \text{id}$ implies

$$\bar{\Gamma}_\infty(s) \oplus \omega(s_\infty) = \omega(s_\infty) < s_\infty.$$

Step 2: We prove statement (i). Without loss of generality, we assume that $k_0 = 1$. Condition (36) can then be reformulated as follows: for each $r > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $i_0 = i_0(r, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $i \geq i_0$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\gamma_{ij}(r) \leq \varepsilon$. Now, let $B \subset \ell_\infty^+$ be a bounded set, say $\|s\|_{\ell_\infty} \leq b$ for all $s \in B$. We have to show that $\Gamma(B)$ is relatively compact. By [30, Thm. 6, p. 260], this is equivalent to the following: $\Gamma(B)$ is bounded and for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a finite partition $\mathbb{N} = J_1 \cup \dots \cup J_N$ such that for every $s \in \Gamma(B)$ we have $|s_i - s_j| \leq \varepsilon$ whenever $i, j \in J_k$ for some k . Boundedness of $\Gamma(B)$ is a consequence of the equicontinuity of $\{\gamma_{ij}\}$. If we choose $i_0 = i_0(b, \varepsilon)$ as above, we can put $J_l := \{l\}$ for $l = 1, \dots, i_0 - 1$ and $J_{i_0} := \{i \in \mathbb{N} : i \geq i_0\}$. For any $s = \Gamma(t) \in \Gamma(B)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{i_1} - s_{i_2} &= \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{i_1 j}(t_j) - \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{i_2 j}(t_j) \leq \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{i_1 j}(t_j) \\ &\leq \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{i_1 j}(b) \leq \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

whenever $i_1 \geq i_0$. Interchanging the roles of i_1 and i_2 yields $|s_{i_1} - s_{i_2}| \leq \varepsilon$ whenever $i_1, i_2 \in J_{i_0}$. Hence, Γ is compact.

Step 3: We prove statement (ii) for $k_0 = 1$. To this end, let us assume that condition (36) does not hold. Then there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_{ij}(r) > 0.$$

Hence, there exist $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha > 0$ and sequences $i_k \rightarrow \infty$, $j_k \in I_{i_k}$ such that $\gamma_{i_k j_k}(r) \geq \alpha$ for all $k \geq K_0$. Now, consider

the bounded set $C := \{re_{j_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \ell_\infty^+$. We prove that $\Gamma(C)$ is not relatively compact, and thus Γ is not compact. First, observe that

$$\Gamma_{i_k}(re_{j_k}) \geq \gamma_{i_k j_k}(r) \geq \alpha \quad \text{for all } k \geq K_0.$$

Moreover, by our assumption that every subsystem can only influence finitely many other subsystems, we have $\Gamma_i(re_{j_k}) = 0$ for almost all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume to the contrary that $\mathbb{N} = J_1 \cup \dots \cup J_N$ is a finite partition such that $|\Gamma_i(re_{j_k}) - \Gamma_j(re_{j_k})| \leq \alpha/2$ whenever $i, j \in J_l$ for some $l \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Assuming that J_l contains infinitely many elements (which must be true for at least one of the index sets), we find that $\Gamma_{i_k}(re_{j_k}) - \Gamma_j(re_{j_k}) \geq \alpha - 0 = \alpha$ for some $j \in J_l$, a contradiction. \square

VIII. DISCUSSION OF THE OBTAINED RESULTS

Comparison to [17]. The first Lyapunov-based small-gain theorem for infinite networks can be found in [17, Thm. 1]. It requires that all internal gains are identical ($\gamma_{ij} \equiv \gamma$), and the SGC in [17] requires that $\gamma < \text{id}$, which is in most cases much more conservative than the SGC employed in our paper.

As $\gamma_{ij} = \gamma < \text{id}$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, the gain operator in [17] has a simple representation

$$\Gamma(s) = \left(\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{i\}} \gamma(s_j) \right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \leq \gamma(\|s\|_{\ell_\infty}) \mathbf{1}.$$

Define $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$ by $\sigma(r) := r \mathbf{1}$, $r \geq 0$. Then

$$\Gamma(\sigma(r)) \leq \gamma(\|r \mathbf{1}\|_{\ell_\infty}) \mathbf{1} = \gamma(r) \mathbf{1} = \gamma \circ \sigma(r) < \sigma(r). \quad (37)$$

If $\gamma < \text{id}$ satisfies

$$\text{id} - \gamma \geq \eta \quad \text{with a certain } \eta \in \mathcal{K}_\infty, \quad (38)$$

then $\gamma = \text{id} - (\text{id} - \gamma) \leq \text{id} - \eta = (\text{id} + \rho)^{-1}$ for a suitable $\rho \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ (this is easy to see, and was stated in [20, Lem. 8]). In this case, we obtain that σ is a path of strict decay as in Definition II.10, and the corresponding ISS Lyapunov function constructed by our small-gain theorem is $V(s) = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} V_i(s_i)$ for any $s = (s_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_\infty(\mathbb{N}, (n_i))$, which is precisely the Lyapunov function proposed in [17, Thm. 1]. Thus, we obtain the main result of [17] as a special case of ours. Nevertheless, if the condition (38) does not hold, then Γ decays at the points of the form $\sigma(r)$, but not in a uniform way as we require in this work. In this case, the result in [17] is applicable, while our theorem is not.

Comparison to [21]. The setting of [21] is very similar to that of our paper, in particular, the Lyapunov gains γ_{ij} may be distinct nonlinear functions, and the number of neighbors is also taken to be finite. The small-gain theorem [21, Thm. 5.1] is shown under the requirement that there is a linear path of strict decay for the gain operator Γ , with a linear ρ (see Definition II.10), whereas we do not require linearity, which makes our result truly nonlinear.

In [21], it was proposed to use the strong transitive closure Q to construct a path of strict decay, and a robust SGC was introduced to describe under which conditions a path of strict

decay exists. In [21, Lem. 4.5], it was shown that there is $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \ell_\infty^+$, satisfying properties (i)–(iii) of Definition II.10 with a linear ρ , provided that Γ satisfies the robust strong SGC with linear ρ, ω , and the discrete-time system (27) induced by Γ is UGAS.

We improve these results in several directions. We introduce the concept of max-robust small-gain condition, which is weaker than the robust small-gain condition, and show that UGAS of the discrete-time system induced by the gain operator implies the max-robust small-gain condition (Proposition V.1). Finally, we show in Theorem VI.1, that under certain regularity assumptions, UGAS of a system induced by a scaled gain operator is only needed to ensure the existence of a path of strict decay, which we also construct explicitly.

Finite networks. Finally, let us compare our results to the available results for finite networks. A nonlinear Lyapunov-based small-gain theorem for finite networks of ODE systems has been proposed in [9]. As in the first part of this section, we require a bit more uniformity in the definition of a path of strict decay, and thus we cannot fully recover the small-gain result in [9]. Also, since we formulate our result in a maximum formulation, the gain operator is a so-called max-preserving operator [22], [23], and it is known that the SGC (not even the strong one) is equivalent to UGAS of an induced discrete-time system and to the existence of a path of strict decay as defined in [9], see [29, Thm. 6.4].

On the other hand, we know that for finite networks the strong SGC is equivalent to the robust strong SGC [20, Prop. 14], and implies UGAS of the discrete-time system [29, Thm. 4.6]. Thus, for finite networks, our Theorem VI.1 states that the strong SGC for Γ implies the existence of a path of strict decay with a uniform decay rate, characterized by ρ , which is not far from the sharp result for finite networks.

IX. CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

We have proved a fully nonlinear Lyapunov-based small-gain theorem for ISS of infinite networks. In our result, we use the maximum formulation and the implication form to describe the ISS property of the subsystems. A crucial assumption in our result is the existence of a (nonlinear) path of strict decay for the gain operator, which acts on the positive cone in the sequence space ℓ_∞ . We have proved that such a path exists if the discrete-time system induced by a scaled gain operator is UGAS and, additionally, the interconnection gains satisfy a uniform local Lipschitz condition. While the second assumption is not hard to check in a concrete example, the first one is more delicate. We have characterized a weaker property in terms of the so-called max-robust small-gain condition, which is again tractable. The difference between UGAS and this weaker property is that trajectories may only converge to zero componentwise and not necessarily uniformly, i.e. with respect to the ℓ_∞ -norm. Different types of sufficient conditions for the uniform convergence were also provided and their tractability was shown in an example.

One open question for future research is whether there exist characterizations of UGAS (of the gain-operator-induced system) that can be checked by a condition formulated in terms of single gains instead of their compositions. Another open problem is to extend the theory to different formulations of the ISS property for the subsystems, which lead to other types of gain operators.

APPENDIX: TECHNICAL LEMMAS

We omit the proofs of the following two simple lemmas, the first of which follows from [31, Lem. 3.4].

Lemma IX.1 *Let $s_1, s_2 : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be differentiable functions such that $s_1(0) = s_2(0)$, $\dot{s}_1(t) \leq -\alpha(s_1(t))$ and $\dot{s}_2(t) = -\alpha(s_2(t))$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and some locally Lipschitz $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$. Then $s_1(t) \leq s_2(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.*

Lemma IX.2 *Let f_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, be finitely many strictly increasing functions $f_i : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$. Further assume that $|f_i(r_1) - f_i(r_2)| \geq l_i|r_1 - r_2|$ for all $r_1, r_2 \in [a, b]$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, where $l_i > 0$. Put $f(r) := \max_{i=1, \dots, n} f_i(r)$, $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, with $l := \min\{l_1, \dots, l_n\}$, we have*

$$|f(r_1) - f(r_2)| \geq l|r_1 - r_2| \quad \text{for all } r_1, r_2 \in [a, b].$$

The following lemma can be found in [32, Fact A.1.24].

Lemma IX.3 *Let $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a decreasing sequence of upper semicontinuous functions $f_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on a compact metric space X . Then*

$$\inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{x \in X} f_k(x) = \sup_{x \in X} \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} f_k(x).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Bamieh, M. R. Jovanovic, P. Mitra, and S. Patterson, "Coherence in large-scale networks: Dimension-dependent limitations of local feedback," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 2235–2249, 2012.
- [2] B. Bamieh, F. Paganini, and M. A. Dahleh, "Distributed control of spatially invariant systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 1091–1107, 2002.
- [3] B. Bamieh and P. G. Voulgaris, "A convex characterization of distributed control problems in spatially invariant systems with communication constraints," *Systems Control Lett.*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 575–583, 2005.
- [4] R. Curtain, O. V. Iftime, and H. Zwart, "System theoretic properties of a class of spatially invariant systems," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 1619–1627, 2009.
- [5] E. D. Sontag, "Smooth stabilization implies coprime factorization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 435–443, 1989.
- [6] Z.-P. Jiang, A. R. Teel, and L. Praly, "Small-gain theorem for ISS systems and applications," *Math. Control Signals Systems*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 95–120, 1994.
- [7] Z.-P. Jiang, I. M. Y. Mareels, and Y. Wang, "A Lyapunov formulation of the nonlinear small-gain theorem for interconnected ISS systems," *Automatica*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 1211–1215, 1996.
- [8] S. Dashkovskiy, B. S. Rüffer, and F. R. Wirth, "An ISS small gain theorem for general networks," *Math. Control Signals Systems*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 93–122, 2007.
- [9] S. N. Dashkovskiy, B. S. Rüffer, and F. R. Wirth, "Small gain theorems for large scale systems and construction of ISS Lyapunov functions," *SIAM J. Control Opt.*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 4089–4118, 2010.
- [10] T. Liu, Z.-P. Jiang, and D. J. Hill, *Nonlinear Control of Dynamic Networks*. CRC Press, 2014.

- [11] S. N. Dashkovskiy, D. V. Efimov, and E. D. Sontag, "Input to state stability and allied system properties," *Autom. Remote Control*, vol. 72, no. 8, pp. 1579–1614, 2011.
- [12] E. D. Sontag, "Input to state stability: Basic concepts and results," in *Nonlinear and Optimal Control Theory*. Heidelberg: Springer, 2008, ch. 3, pp. 163–220.
- [13] M. Krstic, I. Kanellakopoulos, and P. V. Kokotovic, *Nonlinear and Adaptive Control Design*. Wiley, 1995.
- [14] I. Karafyllis and M. Krstic, *Input-to-State Stability for PDEs*. Springer, 2019.
- [15] A. Mironchenko and C. Prieur, "Input-to-state stability of infinite-dimensional systems: recent results and open questions," *SIAM Review*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 529–614, 2020.
- [16] F. L. Schwenninger, "Input-to-state stability for parabolic boundary control: linear and semilinear systems," in *Control Theory of Infinite-Dimensional Systems*. Springer, 2020, pp. 83–116.
- [17] S. Dashkovskiy and S. Pavlichkov, "Stability conditions for infinite networks of nonlinear systems and their application for stabilization," *Automatica*, vol. 112, pp. 108 643, 12 pp., 2020.
- [18] C. Kawan, A. Mironchenko, A. Swikir, N. Noroozi, and M. Zamani, "A Lyapunov-based small-gain theorem for infinite networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 12, pp. 5830–5844, 2021.
- [19] N. Noroozi, A. Mironchenko, C. Kawan, and M. Zamani, "Small-gain theorem for stability, cooperative control and distributed observation of infinite networks," *ArXiv preprint <http://arxiv.org/abs/2002.07085>*, 2020.
- [20] A. Mironchenko, C. Kawan, and J. Glück, "Nonlinear small-gain theorems for input-to-state stability of infinite interconnections," *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 573–615, 2021.
- [21] S. Dashkovskiy, A. Mironchenko, J. Schmid, and F. Wirth, "Stability of infinitely many interconnected systems," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 52, no. 16, pp. 550–555, 2019.
- [22] I. Karafyllis and Z.-P. Jiang, "A vector small-gain theorem for general non-linear control systems," *IMA J. Math. Control Inform.*, vol. 28, pp. 309–344, 2011.
- [23] B. S. Rüffer, "Nonlinear left and right eigenvectors for max-preserving maps," in *Positive Systems*, ser. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences. Springer, Cham, 2017, vol. 471, pp. 227–237.
- [24] J. Glück and A. Mironchenko, "Stability criteria for positive linear discrete-time systems," *Positivity*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 2029–2059, 2021.
- [25] A. Mironchenko, N. Noroozi, C. Kawan, and M. Zamani, "ISS small-gain criteria for infinite networks with linear gain functions," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 157, p. 105051, 2021.
- [26] T. Cazenave and A. Haraux, *An Introduction To Semilinear Evolution Equations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- [27] B. Rüffer, "Monotone dynamical systems, graphs, and stability of large-scale interconnected systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Fachbereich 3 (Mathematik & Informatik) der Universität Bremen, 2007.
- [28] A. Mironchenko, "Uniform weak attractivity and criteria for practical global asymptotic stability," *Systems Control Lett.*, vol. 105, pp. 92–99, 2017.
- [29] B. S. Rüffer, "Monotone inequalities, dynamical systems, and paths in the positive orthant of Euclidean n-space," *Positivity*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 257–283, 2010.
- [30] N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz, *Linear operators, part 1: general theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1988, vol. 10.
- [31] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*. New York: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [32] T. Downarowicz, *Entropy in dynamical systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011, vol. 18.



Christoph Kawan received the diploma and doctoral degree in mathematics (both under supervision of Prof. Fritz Colonius) from the University of Augsburg, Germany, in 2006 and 2009, respectively. He spent four months as a research scholar at the State University of Campinas, Brazil, in 2011, and nine months at the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences at New York University, in 2014. He is the author of the book 'Invariance Entropy for Deterministic Control Systems - An Introduction' (Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2089. Berlin: Springer, 2013).

His research interests include networked and information-based control and large-scale networks.



Andrii Mironchenko was born in 1986. He received the M.Sc. degree in applied mathematics from the Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Odesa, Ukraine, in 2008, and the Ph.D. degree in mathematics from the University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany in 2012.

He has held a research position with the University of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany and was a Postdoctoral Fellow of Japan Society for Promotion of Science (JSPS) with the Kyushu Institute of Technology, Fukuoka Prefecture, Japan (2013–2014). In

2014 he joined the Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Passau, Passau, Germany.

His research interests include infinite-dimensional systems, stability theory, hybrid systems and applications of control theory to biological systems and distributed control.



Majid Zamani (M'12–SM'16) is an Assistant Professor in the Computer Science Department at the University of Colorado Boulder, USA. He received a B.Sc. degree in Electrical Engineering in 2005 from Isfahan University of Technology, Iran, an M.Sc. degree in Electrical Engineering in 2007 from Sharif University of Technology, Iran, an MA degree in Mathematics and a Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering both in 2012 from University of California, Los Angeles, USA. Between September 2012 and December 2013 he was a postdoctoral researcher at

the Delft Centre for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands. From May 2014 to January 2019 he was an Assistant Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the Technical University of Munich, Germany. From December 2013 to April 2014 he was an Assistant Professor in the Design Engineering Department, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands. He received an ERC starting grant award from the European Research Council in 2018.

His research interests include verification and control of hybrid systems, embedded control software synthesis, networked control systems, and incremental properties of nonlinear control systems.