

REGULAR PAIRINGS FOR NON-QUADRATIC LYAPUNOV FUNCTIONS AND CONTRACTION ANALYSIS

ANTON V. PROSKURNIKOV* AND FRANCESCO BULLO†

Abstract. Recent studies on stability and contractivity have highlighted the importance of semi-inner products, which we refer to as “pairings”, associated with general norms. A pairing is a binary operation that relates the derivative of a curve’s norm to the radius-vector of the curve and its tangent. This relationship, known as the curve norm derivative formula, is crucial when using the norm as a Lyapunov function. Another important property of the pairing, used in stability and contraction criteria, is the so-called Lumer inequality, which relates the pairing to the induced logarithmic norm. We prove that the curve norm derivative formula and Lumer’s inequality are, in fact, equivalent to each other and to several simpler properties. We then introduce and characterize *regular pairings* that satisfy all of these properties. Our results unify several independent theories of pairings (semi-inner products) developed in previous work on functional analysis and control theory. Additionally, we introduce the polyhedral max pairing and develop computational tools for polyhedral norms, advancing contraction theory in non-Euclidean spaces.

Key words. Semi-inner product, polyhedral norm, logarithmic norm, contraction, stability

AMS subject classifications. 93D30, 93D20, 46C50

1. Introduction.

Problem description and motivation. This article is motivated by the broad and growing interest in the stability and contractivity properties of dynamic systems defined on vector spaces with norms. In such problems, it is natural to consider Lyapunov functions defined using the ambient norm. When computing their Lie derivative along the system flow, an appropriate binary operation on the space, which we refer to as a “pairing”, naturally arises. A pairing is a generalization of a conventional inner product on the vector space that satisfies a reduced set of axioms. Close relationships exist between pairings and the induced logarithmic norm on the normed space. In summary, this paper focuses on pairings on normed spaces and two key properties they exhibit: the *curve norm derivative formula* and *Lumer’s property* [23].

Building on rich and insightful historical developments (reviewed in the next section), recent applications have identified the minimal set of axioms necessary for enabling the Lie product computation. These recent works have facilitated the systematic treatment of contraction theory¹ for dynamical systems over vector spaces with general non-Euclidean norms. In particular, the *sign pairing* and the *max pairing* have been defined, which are associated, respectively, with the widely used ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms on \mathbb{R}^n . This emerging framework has recently been applied to control, learning, and optimization problems; example results based upon the ℓ_1 and

*Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy (anton.p.1982@ieee.org). Anton Proskurnikov is supported by the project 2022K8EZBW “Higher-order interactions in social dynamics with application to monetary networks”, funded by European Union – Next Generation EU within the PRIN 2022 program (D.D. 104 - 02/02/2022 Ministero dell’Università e della Ricerca). This manuscript reflects only the authors’ views and opinions, and the Ministry for Universities and Research cannot be considered responsible for them.

†Center for Control, Dynamical Systems, and Computation, UC Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93101 USA (bullo@ucsb.edu). The work by Francesco Bullo was supported in part by AFOSR grant FA9550-22-1-0059.

¹A discrete-time dynamical system is *contracting* if its update map is a contraction in some metric. Analogously, a continuous-time system is contracting if its flow map is a contraction. Contraction theory for dynamical systems [5, 16, 62] provides a set of concepts and tools for the study and design of continuous and discrete-time dynamical systems.

ℓ_∞ norms include contractivity of recurrent neural network [26, 39], a non-Euclidean S-Lemma [24], and a monotone operator theory [52].

Despite this progress, fundamental open questions remain regarding which specific pairings satisfy the curve norm derivative formula and Lumer’s property and the relationship between various relevant definitions of pairings (or semi-inner products) in the literature. There is also a natural desire to enrich the theory with additional examples of norms relevant to applications. Motivated by this analysis, this paper provides a comprehensive, unifying characterization of pairings satisfying a broad range of equivalent useful properties. We call such pairings *regular*. Additionally, we define the notion of polyhedral max pairing and develop corresponding computational tools for polyhedral max norms over finite-dimensional vector spaces.

Historical review of semi-inner products. Major efforts aimed at extending the well-established theory of Hilbert spaces [7, 36] to encompass broader categories of normed spaces have led to the development of the theory of *semi-inner* product (SIP) spaces. In its broadest sense, it refers to a binary operation on a vector space that satisfies only some of the axioms of an inner product while discarding others. In some functional analysis monographs (e.g., in [19]) the term SIP is used to denote a binary operation that adheres to all the axioms of an inner product except for strict positivity; such an operation is linked with a seminorm rather than a norm.

In this paper, we explore alternative types of SIPs that are positive definite and linked to norms but are characterized by linearity (or even sublinearity) in only one argument and the absence of symmetry. To avoid ambiguity, we refer such SIPs to as *pairings*. Three important classes of pairings were independently introduced in the literature, stemming from the distinct lines of research.

The **first** direction of research leading to a generalization of an inner product was initiated in the seminal work by James [40] on orthogonality in normed spaces, followed by contributions by Miličić [45, 46] and Tapia [60], on characterization of inner product spaces. The upper and lower semi-inner products in the *James-Miličić-Tapia* sense, henceforth referred to as JMT pairings, arise from the directional derivatives of a norm, which exist due to the norm’s convexity. Defined on a real or a complex normed space, JMT pairings are real-valued, continuous, semi-linear with respect to one argument (the direction of the derivative), and positive definite, however, they are not conjugate-symmetric. Deimling [27, Ch. 3] established several important properties of JMT pairings, including the relationship between them and the derivative of the norm of a curve in a Banach space; in [23], JMT pairings were also called “Deimling’s pairings”. A further review of the JMT pairing theory is available in [29].

On a parallel **second** line of research, Lumer [43, 44] introduced an alternative definition of a SIP with the aim of extending certain results and concepts from operator theory—such as dissipative C_0 -semigroups, Hermitian operators and associated Hermitian forms—to Banach spaces that lack an inner product. A SIP, as defined by Lumer, can be defined on both real and complex normed spaces, and, unlike the JMT pairings, is *linear* in its first argument. This SIP also lacks symmetry (except in case where it coincides with a conventional inner product). Additionally, Lumer’s definition permits non-homogeneity in its second argument. Giles [34] further advanced Lumer’s concept and proved that each norm is generated by a SIP that possesses homogeneity in both arguments. Moreover, this SIP can be rendered continuous in the second argument if and only if the norm associated with it is differentiable. By incorporating the convenient homogeneity axiom into Lumer’s definition of a SIP, the notion of the *Lumer-Giles* (LG) pairing emerges.

The **third** line of research, developed recently by Davydov et al. [23], introduced the concept of a *weak pairing*, an axiomatic definition with weaker assumptions than the LG pairing notion. The *sign pairing* (naturally associated with the ℓ_1 norm) and the *max pairing* (generating the ℓ_∞ norm) are examples of weak pairings. In fact, every LG and JMT pairing on a real normed space is a special case of a weak pairing. Aimed at developing a unified contraction theory in normed spaces, [23] reveals the minimum critical properties required from a weak pairing to establish Lyapunov-based contractivity criteria, namely, Lumer’s property, the curve norm derivative formula, and the dominance by the upper JMT pairing, or the “Deimling inequality” [23].

Applications. The three types of pairings surveyed above prove to be valuable tools in the realms of control theory, optimization and nonlinear functional analysis.

The formalism of JMT pairings enables the introduction of the one-sided Lipschitz constant of a mapping [58] and establishes a straightforward relationship with the logarithmic norm of the mapping’s Jacobian, if it exists. This theory extends naturally to more general weak pairings [23] and non-differentiable locally Lipschitz maps [26]. Aminzare and Sontag [4–6] were the first to establish important connections between the logarithmic norms (also known as “matrix measures”), JMT pairings and contraction theory for dynamical systems; this theory has been further developed in [16, 23]. JMT pairings also illuminate the properties of accretive and dissipative operations in general Banach spaces. The accretivity property can be expressed as a standard monotonicity condition, with the inner product replaced by a JMT pairing [27]. This theory has been further developed in [24], where the concept of monotonicity in a general non-Euclidean norm is introduced using weak pairings.

Applications of LG pairings include elegant characterizations of isometric operators on normed space [42, 64] and a refined theory of semi-polarity in non-Euclidean norms [37]. Inspired by the applications of Hilbert spaces in machine learning, signal processing and numerical analysis, the concepts of reproducing kernel Banach spaces [65, 66] and Riesz bases in Banach spaces [67] have been introduced, both of which exploit the theory of LG pairings and their extensions, or “generalized SIPs” [66].

Finally, it is useful to motivate our interest for computational tools adapted to general norms on vector spaces. The interest for non-Euclidean norms (e.g., the non-differentiable ℓ_1 , ℓ_∞ and polyhedral norms) is motivated by classes of multi-agent networked systems, such as compartmental systems [38], biological transcriptional systems [56], Hopfield neural networks [25, 26, 31, 39, 53], chemical reaction networks [2], traffic networks [18, 20, 21], vehicle platoons [48], and coupled oscillators [6, 57]. References on polyhedral Lyapunov functions and polyhedral set invariance include [9, 11–14, 41, 47, 49, 50, 63]. Other examples of non-Euclidean norms that should be mentioned include Barabanov (or extremal) norms [61], polynomial norms, defined by the d th root of a degree- d homogeneous polynomial [1], and canonical dilation-induced homogeneous norms [51].

Main contributions and paper organization. Section 2 introduces the notation and preliminary information on pairings and logarithmic norms.

In Section 3, we present our main results. We begin in Section 3.1 by introducing the key properties typically desired from a pairing, including Lumer’s property, the curve norm derivative formula, and several other characterizations. These basic concepts set the stage for our main *characterization theorem*, proven in Section 3.2, where we demonstrate that these properties are, in fact, equivalent. This theorem allows us to define a weak pairing that satisfies any—hence all—of these equivalent properties as a *regular pairing* on a vector space. In Section 3.3, we extend our results

by proving that all LG and JMT pairings are regular, enabling us to establish their properties in a unified framework. Finally, in Section 3.4, we address the uniqueness of regular pairings on a normed space, showing that there exists a unique regular pairing compatible with the norm if and only if the normed space is Gateaux differentiable [34]. While regular pairings are generally non-unique, we demonstrate that in finite-dimensional spaces, any two regular pairings coincide almost everywhere.

Section 4 demonstrates that the theory of regular pairings developed in this paper clarifies the relationships between LG pairings, JMT pairings, and weak pairings, enabling a unified approach to establishing several of their properties. In Section 4.1, we revisit the standard ℓ_p norms and the associated pairings on \mathbb{R}^n leveraging and extending results in [23]. In particular, we clarify that the sign and max pairings associated to the ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms are regular pairings. We prove that the max pairing, in fact, is the JMT pairing, associated to ℓ_∞ norm. More notably, in Section 4.2 we introduce the novel polyhedral max pairing associated with a polyhedral norm, demonstrate that it is regular and, in fact, also the upper JMT pairing associated with the polyhedral norm, and provide a linear program for the computation of its associated logarithmic norm. Finally, in Section 4.3 we review the basic theorem of contraction theory in light of our results on regular pairings and, specifically, in light of the curve norm derivative formula and the Lumer inequality.

2. Preliminaries. In this section, we introduce the basic definitions and notation that will be used throughout the text. We use $j \in \mathbb{C}$ to denote the imaginary unit. The conjugate of a complex number $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is denoted by \bar{z} .

Given a function $f : I = (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, one can define the quadruple of *Dini derivatives* at $t_0 \in I$ as follows

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} D_+ f(t_0) &= \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(t_0 + h) - f(t_0)}{h}, & D^+ f(t_0) &= \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(t_0 + h) - f(t_0)}{h}, \\ D_- f(t_0) &= \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(t_0 + h) - f(t_0)}{h}, & D^- f(t_0) &= \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(t_0 + h) - f(t_0)}{h}. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, if the derivative $\dot{f}(t_0)$ exists, it coincides with all the Dini derivatives.

We use $\|\cdot\|_p$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, to denote the conventional ℓ_p -norm on \mathbb{R}^n . The weighted ℓ_p -norm is $\|x\|_{p,R} := \|Rx\|_p$, where R is an invertible square matrix. The corresponding logarithmic norms (see Definition 2.1) are denoted by μ_p and $\mu_{p,R}$.

Operators and Induced Norms. Henceforth, X denotes a vector space over the field of scalars \mathbb{K} (which is either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C}). We use \mathbf{I}_X to denote the identity map on X and denote the zero vector by $\mathbf{0}$. If X is equipped by a norm $\|\cdot\|$, we use $\mathcal{B}(X)$ to denote the set of bounded linear operators on X . We will broadly use the induced operator and logarithmic (log) norms of a bounded operator [43, 58].

DEFINITION 2.1 (The Induced Operator Norm and Logarithmic Norm).

For an operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ on a normed space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$, we define

- the induced operator norm

$$\|A\| := \sup_{x \in X: \|x\|=1} \|Ax\| \quad \text{and}$$

- the induced logarithmic (log) norm²

$$(2.2) \quad \mu(A) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|\mathbf{I}_X + hA\| - 1}{h}.$$

²The limit in (2.2) always exists due to the convexity of the norm.

Log norms on $\mathcal{B}(X)$ have practically the same properties as log norms on square complex matrices (known also as “matrix measures”) that are surveyed in [16, 28, 58].

Three Types of Pairings (Semi-Inner Products). In this work, we are primarily interested in three types of binary operations³ on a vector space: LG pairings, JMT pairings and weak pairings whose definitions are given below.

DEFINITION 2.2 (LG Pairing, or the Lumer-Giles SIP). *A semi-inner product in the sense of Lumer and Giles, or briefly LG pairing, on the vector space X is a binary operation $[\cdot, \cdot]$ satisfying the three axioms:*

(i) *Linearity in the first argument:*

$$(2.3) \quad [x_1 + x_2, y] = [x_1, y] + [x_2, y] \quad \forall x_1, x_2, y \in X;$$

$$(2.4) \quad [\lambda x, y] = \lambda [x, y] \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{K} \quad \forall x, y \in X; .$$

(ii) *Positive definiteness:*

$$(2.5) \quad [x, x] > 0 \quad \forall x \in X \setminus \{0\};$$

(iii) *The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:*

$$(2.6) \quad [x, y] \leq \sqrt{[x, x][y, y]} \quad \forall x, y \in X;$$

(iv) *Complex-conjugate homogeneity in the second argument:*

$$(2.7) \quad [x, \lambda y] = \bar{\lambda} [x, y] \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{K} \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

In his first works Lumer [43, 44] defined a SIP as a binary operation satisfying the axioms (i)-(iii); his definition resembles the usual inner however, the (conjugate) symmetry axiom $[x, y] = \overline{[y, x]}$ is discarded. It can be easily shown that, similar to usual inner products, such a binary operation naturally induces a norm

$$(2.8) \quad \|x\| := \sqrt{[x, x]},$$

and, on the other hand, every norm on X can be obtained in this way. Axiom (iv) (which is often convenient in applications) was later introduced by Giles [34] who showed that every norm could in fact be represented by a SIP satisfying (i)-(iv).

DEFINITION 2.3 (JMT Pairings, or the James-Miličić-Tapia SIPs). *Consider a vector space X equipped with a norm $\|\cdot\|$. The upper and lower semi-inner products in the sense of James,⁴ Miličić⁵ and Tapia (termed JMT pairings) induced by $\|\cdot\|$ are the real-valued binary operations $[x, y]_+$, $[x, y]_-$ defined by*

$$(2.9) \quad [x, y]_+ := \|y\| \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|y + hx\| - \|y\|}{h}, \quad [x, y]_- := \|y\| \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{\|y + hx\| - \|y\|}{h}.$$

Using the convexity of the norm, it can be shown [40, 45] that both limits in (2.9) exist, furthermore, $[x, y]_- \leq [x, y]_+ = -[-x, y]_-$ for all $x, y \in X$.

³A binary operation on X is a function $[\cdot, \cdot] : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$.

⁴James [40] introduced the left and right Gateaux derivatives $N_+(y, x)$ and $N_-(y, x)$ of a general norm. Adopting his notation, $[x, y]_+ = N_+(y, x)\|y\|$ and $[x, y]_- = N_-(y, x)\|y\|$.

⁵Miličić [45] introduced another generalization of the inner product, which is sometimes also called the semi-inner product in the Miličić sense (M-SIP) [29, Chapter 4, Definition 8] and is defined as the average of the upper and the lower JMT pairings (2.9). This binary operation, in general, does not belong to the class of weak pairings defined below and is beyond the scope of our work.

Remark 2.4 (Differences Between the LG and JMT Pairings). It is useful to review the principal differences between the LG and JMT pairings [29]. In complex spaces, LG pairings are complex-valued, whereas JMT pairings can only be real-valued. Whereas LG pairings can be defined on an arbitrary vector space and induces a norm on it in accordance with (2.8), the JMT pairings can be defined only on a normed space, providing, however, the compatibility between the SIP and the norm

$$\|x\|^2 = [x, x]_+ = [x, x]_-.$$

The upper and lower JMT pairings obey (2.4)-(2.7) yet do not satisfy (2.3), being, instead, subadditive and superadditive in the first argument respectively

$$(2.10) \quad [x_1 + x_2, y]_+ \leq [x_1, y]_+ + [x_2, y]_+$$

$$(2.11) \quad [x_1 + x_2, y]_- \geq [x_1, y]_- + [x_2, y]_-.$$

Finally, the JMT pairings are not homogeneous: in fact, equations (2.4) and (2.7) hold only for $\lambda \geq 0$. However, it can be shown that for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ one has

$$[\lambda x, \lambda y]_+ = |\lambda|^2 [x, y]_+, \quad [\lambda x, \lambda y]_- = |\lambda|^2 [x, y]_- \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

This concludes our comparison. \square

Another definition of a pairing, which enjoys particular properties of both LG and JMT pairings, was proposed in [23], which paper has also coined a term *weak pairing* (WP) for this class of operations. Formally, the definition from [23] was confined to \mathbb{R}^n but can be trivially extended to an arbitrary space.

DEFINITION 2.5 (Weak Pairing). A real-valued binary operation $[[\cdot, \cdot]]$ on X is said to be a weak pairing (WP) if it satisfies the following axioms⁶

(i) (Subadditivity in the first argument)

$$(2.12) \quad [[x_1 + x_2, y]] \leq [[x_1, y]] + [[x_2, y]] \quad \forall x_1, x_2, y \in X;$$

(ii) (Weak homogeneity)

$$(2.13) \quad [[\alpha x, y]] = [[x, \alpha y]] = \alpha [[x, y]] \quad \forall x, y \in X, \quad \forall \alpha \geq 0$$

$$(2.14) \quad [[-x, -y]] = [[x, y]] \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

(iii) (Positive definiteness) $[[x, x]] > 0$, for all $x \neq 0$,

(iv) (Cauchy-Schwarz inequality)

$$(2.15) \quad [[x, y]] \leq \sqrt{[[x, x]] [[y, y]]} \quad \forall x, y \in X;$$

The upper JMT pairing and the LG pairing are special cases of a weak pairing, which inherits properties from both. Like the JMT pairing, the weak pairing is real-valued, subadditive, and satisfies a weak form of homogeneity. Simultaneously, similar to the LG pairing, the weak pairing is defined on a general vector space and automatically induces a norm, as demonstrated by the following.

LEMMA 2.6 (Weak Pairings and Norms). For every WP $[[\cdot, \cdot]]$ on X , the function $\|x\| := \sqrt{[[x, x]]}$ is a norm. In this norm, the function $[[\cdot, y]] : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz continuous for every $y \in X$, and its Lipschitz constant is $\|y\|$, that is,

$$(2.16) \quad |[x_1, y] - [x_2, y]| \leq \|x_1 - x_2\| \|y\| \quad \forall x_1, x_2, y \in X.$$

⁶Notice that in [23] (considering $X = \mathbb{R}^n$) an additional assumption on the continuity in the first argument was imposed. Our Corollary 2.7 shows that this assumption was in fact superfluous.

Proof. The first statement is proved similarly to [23, Theorem 16]. To prove the second statement, notice that for all vectors $x_1, x_2, y \in X$ the subadditivity, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the definition of the norm imply that

$$\llbracket x_1, y \rrbracket \stackrel{(2.12)}{\leq} \llbracket x_1 - x_2, y \rrbracket + \llbracket x_2, y \rrbracket \stackrel{(2.15)}{\leq} \|x_1 - x_2\| \|y\| + \llbracket x_2, y \rrbracket.$$

which, in turn, implies that $\llbracket x_1, y \rrbracket - \llbracket x_2, y \rrbracket \leq \|x_1 - x_2\| \|y\|$. Swapping x_1 and x_2 , one proves similarly that $\llbracket x_2, y \rrbracket - \llbracket x_1, y \rrbracket \leq \|x_1 - x_2\| \|y\|$, which entails (2.16). \square

By recalling that all norms on a finite-dimensional space are equivalent, one arrives at the following corollary.

COROLLARY 2.7 (WP Continuity on Finite-Dimensional Spaces). *If $X = \mathbb{K}^n$, then every WP defined on X is Lipschitz continuous in its first argument⁷.*

3. Regular Pairings and Their Characterization. In this section, we will show that some useful properties established for LG and JMT pairings [29] and some special WPs [23] are mutually equivalent and are enjoyed by a broad class of WP that we call *regular pairings*. The key Theorem 3.6 below generalizes, as will be shown, a number of results on semi-inner products available in the literature.

Henceforth, $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed space whose norm is associated with a WP $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$.

3.1. Technical Definitions: Key Properties of a Pairing. We start with auxiliary definitions and introduce key properties desired from a pairing [23].

DEFINITION 3.1 (Lumer's Property). *Following [23], we say that Lumer's property holds for the WP if, for each linear bounded operator $A : X \rightarrow X$,*

$$(3.1) \quad \mu(A) = \sup_{x : \|x\|=1} \llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket.$$

Recalling that a WP is weakly homogeneous (2.13), by substituting $x = z/\|z\|$, where $z \neq 0$, Lumer's property can be reformulated as follows:

$$(3.2) \quad \mu(A) = \sup_{z \neq 0} \frac{\llbracket Az, z \rrbracket}{\|z\|^2}.$$

DEFINITION 3.2 (Curve Norm Derivative). *The WP enjoys the curve norm derivative property if the norm $\|x(\cdot)\|$ of every differentiable curve $x : (a, b) \rightarrow X$ (where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$) satisfies the following equality*

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|x(t)\|^2) = \|x(t)\| \frac{d}{dt} \|x(t)\| = \llbracket \dot{x}(t), x(t) \rrbracket.$$

at any point $t \in (a, b)$ where the left-hand side is defined⁸.

The importance of the curve norm derivative formula will be further clarified in Section 4.3. In stability and contraction analysis for dynamical systems over normed spaces, this formula enables the use of the squared norm $V(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2$ as a Lyapunov function, explicitly computing its Lie derivative.

For the upper JMT pairing a stronger form of the curve norm derivative property can be proved. The following lemma generalizes the result of [27, Proposition 13.1]. Notice that formally the result in [27] (provided without a proof) is confined to Banach spaces; the lemma remain valid in a general normed space.

⁷Many weak pairings are discontinuous in their second arguments; see, e.g., Remark 3.17 below.

⁸According to Lemma 3.3, the norm of a differentiable curve is differentiable at almost any point.

LEMMA 3.3 (Dini Derivatives and the JMT Pairings). *For every differentiable curve $x : (a, b) \rightarrow X$ and $t \in (a, b)$ the following statements are valid:*

(i) *all Dini derivative of the function $f(t) := \|x(t)\|$ are finite, and*

$$(3.4) \quad -\|\dot{x}(t)\| \leq D_- f(t), D_+ f(t), D^- f(t), D^+ f(t) \leq \|\dot{x}(t)\|;$$

(ii) *the Dini derivatives are related to the JMT pairings by the equalities*

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} f(t) D^+ f(t) &= f(t) D_+ f(t) = [\dot{x}(t), x(t)]_+ & \forall t \in (a, b), \\ f(t) D^- f(t) &= f(t) D_- f(t) = [\dot{x}(t), x(t)]_- & \forall t \in (a, b). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $f(t) \neq 0$, then the right and left derivatives $\dot{f}(t \pm 0)$ exist;

(iii) *The derivative $\dot{f}(t)$ exists at almost all $t \in (a, b)$.*

The proof of Lemma 3.3 is given in Appendix A.

DEFINITION 3.4 (Partial Linearity). *The WP is partially linear in its first argument if $\llbracket x + ay, y \rrbracket = \llbracket x, y \rrbracket + a\|y\|^2$ for all $x \in X, y \in X, a \in \mathbb{R}$.*

DEFINITION 3.5 (Straight Angle Property). *The WP satisfies the straight angle property if $\llbracket -x, x \rrbracket = -\|x\|^2$ for all $x \in X$.*

The term ‘‘straight angle property’’ is inspired by an analogy with inner-product spaces: for an inner product (\cdot, \cdot) , the angle between vectors $x, y \neq 0$ is defined as

$$\angle(x, y) = \arccos \frac{\operatorname{Re}(x, y)}{\|x\| \|y\|}.$$

Generalizing this definition to WPs, one can reformulate the relation $\llbracket -x, x \rrbracket = -\|x\|^2$ as the requirement $\angle(-x, x) = \pi$ whenever $x \neq 0$. Notice that, in general, WP may fail to satisfy this condition and, moreover, may attain only *nonnegative* values. This is illustrated, e.g., by the following WP on \mathbb{R}^n , compatible with the Euclidean norm:

$$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i y_i|.$$

3.2. Main result: The Characterization Theorem and Regular Pairings.

We are now ready to formulate the main result of this section.

THEOREM 3.6 (The Characterization Theorem). *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space and $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$ be a WP compatible with the norm: $\|x\|^2 = \llbracket x, x \rrbracket$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *the WP obeys the straight angle property;*

(ii) *the WP is partially linear in its first argument;*

(iii) *the WP is related to the JMT pairings (2.9), corresponding to the norm $\|\cdot\|$, by the following inequalities*

$$(3.6) \quad [x, y]_- \leq -\llbracket -x, y \rrbracket \leq \llbracket x, y \rrbracket \leq [x, y]_+ \quad \forall x, y \in X;$$

(iv) *for each bounded linear operator A , the ‘‘one-sided’’ Lumer inequality holds*

$$(3.7) \quad \llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket \leq \mu(A) \quad \forall x \in X : \|x\| = 1;$$

(v) *the curve norm derivative formula (3.3) holds for all differentiable curves $x : (a, b) \rightarrow X$;*

(vi) the equality (3.3) holds for affine functions $x(t) = tv + x_0$ defined on $(a, b) = \mathbb{R}$ (here $v, x_0 \in X$), that is,

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|x_0 + vt\|^2 = \|x_0 + vt\| \left(\frac{d}{dt} \|x_0 + vt\| \right) = \llbracket v, x_0 + vt \rrbracket$$

at each point $t \in (a, b)$ where the left-hand side is well defined;

(vii) the WP enjoys the Lumer property.

Proof. We first prove the equivalence of statements (i)-(iv).

Implication (i) \implies (ii). Combining the straight angle property with (2.13), one shows that $\llbracket ay, y \rrbracket = a\|y\|^2$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. For $a \geq 0$ this is implied by (2.13). If $a = -|a| < 0$, then $\llbracket ay, y \rrbracket = |a| \llbracket -y, y \rrbracket = -|a| \|y\|^2 = a\|y\|^2$. Thanks to (2.12),

$$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket = \llbracket x + ay - ay, y \rrbracket \stackrel{(2.12)}{\leq} \llbracket x + ay, y \rrbracket - a\|y\|^2 \stackrel{(2.12)}{\leq} \llbracket x, y \rrbracket + a\|y\|^2 - a\|y\|^2 = \llbracket x, y \rrbracket$$

for all $x, y \in X$, which means that $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket + a\|y\|^2 = \llbracket x + ay, y \rrbracket$.

Implication (ii) \implies (iii). Assuming that the WP is partially linear and fixing $x, y \in X$, $h > 0$ one obtains, due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, that

$$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket = \frac{\llbracket y + hx, y \rrbracket - \|y\|^2}{h} \stackrel{(2.15)}{\leq} \frac{\|y + hx\| \|y\| - \|y\|^2}{h} = \|y\| \frac{\|y + hx\| - \|y\|}{h}.$$

Passing to the limit as $h \rightarrow 0+$, one proves the rightmost inequality in (3.6). To prove the remaining inequalities in (3.6), it now suffices to notice that

$$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_- = -\llbracket -x, y \rrbracket_+ \leq -\llbracket -x, y \rrbracket \stackrel{(!)}{\leq} \llbracket x, y \rrbracket,$$

where the inequality (!) is straightforward by substituting $x_1 = x = -x_2$ into (2.12).

Implication (iii) \implies (iv) is proved similarly to the first part of [23, Theorem 18]. Notice that $\|x + hAx\| \leq \|\mathbf{I} + hA\|$ whenever A is bounded and x is a unit vector ($\|x\| = 1$). Using the definition of the upper JMT pairing (2.9), one obtains

$$\llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket \stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket_+ = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|x + hAx\| - \|x\|}{h} \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|\mathbf{I} + hA\| - 1}{h} = \mu(A).$$

whenever $\|x\| = 1$, which is nothing else than the condition (iv).

Implication (iv) \implies (i) is proved by substituting $A = -\mathbf{I}_X$ into (3.7):

$$\llbracket -x, x \rrbracket \leq -1 \quad \forall x \in X : \|x\| = 1 \stackrel{(2.13)}{\implies} \llbracket -x, x \rrbracket \leq -\|x\|^2 \quad \forall x \in X.$$

In view of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, one also has $|\llbracket -x, x \rrbracket| \leq \|x\|^2$, and thus the $\llbracket -x, x \rrbracket = -\|x\|^2$, which finishes the first part of the proof.

Next, we show that the conditions (v), (vi) are equivalent to each other and to statements (i)-(iv). This is proved by the following three implications.

Implication (v) \implies (vi) is straightforward.

Implication (vi) \implies (i). Considering the linear curve $x(t) = x_0 - tx_0 = (1-t)x_0$ whose norm is differentiable at point $t = 0$ and using (3.3), one shows that

$$\llbracket -x_0, x_0 \rrbracket = \llbracket \dot{x}(0), x(0) \rrbracket = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (\|x_0\|^2 (1-t)^2) \Big|_{t=0} = -\|x_0\|^2 \quad \forall x_0 \in X.$$

Implication (iii) \implies (v). Suppose that (iii) holds and consider a differentiable curve $x : (a, b) \rightarrow X$ whose norm $f(t) = \|x(t)\|$ is differentiable at some $t_0 \in (a, b)$. We are going to show that (3.3) holds at $t = t_0$. Without loss of generality, assume that $t_0 = 0$ and $b = -a > 0$. In accordance with Lemma 3.3,

$$(3.9) \quad f(0)\dot{f}(0) = f(0)D^+f(0) \stackrel{(3.5)}{\geq} [\dot{x}(0), x(0)]_+ \stackrel{(iii)}{\geq} \llbracket \dot{x}(0), x(0) \rrbracket.$$

Consider now the function $\tilde{x}(t) = x(-t)$ whose norm $\tilde{f}(t) = \|\tilde{x}(t)\| = f(-t)$ is, obviously, also differentiable at $t = 0$. Applying (3.9) to \tilde{x}, \tilde{f} , one shows that

$$(3.10) \quad -f(0)\dot{f}(0) = \tilde{f}(0)\dot{\tilde{f}}(0) \geq \llbracket \dot{\tilde{x}}(0), \tilde{x}(0) \rrbracket = \llbracket -\dot{x}(0), x(0) \rrbracket.$$

Summing up the inequalities (3.9) and (3.10) and using the subadditivity property (2.12),

$$0 = f(0)\dot{f}(0) - f(0)\dot{f}(0) \geq \llbracket \dot{x}(0), x(0) \rrbracket + \llbracket -\dot{x}(0), x(0) \rrbracket \stackrel{(2.12)}{\geq} \llbracket 0, x(0) \rrbracket = 0.$$

The latter inequality can only hold when $f(0)\dot{f}(0) = \llbracket \dot{x}(0), x(0) \rrbracket$. Hence, (3.3) holds at $t = t_0$ whenever $\dot{f}(t_0)$ exists, which finishes the proof of implication (iii) \implies (v).

The equivalence of (vii) and (i)-(vi). It remains to prove that the Lumer property is equivalent to the remaining conditions. The implication (vii) \implies (iv) is straightforward, and hence (vii) implies all conditions (i)-(vi). To prove the opposite implication, it remains to prove that (i)-(vi) imply the inequality

$$(3.11) \quad \mu_0 := \sup_{x: \|x\|=1} \llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket = \sup_{x \neq 0} \frac{\llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket}{\|x\|} \geq \mu(A) \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(X).$$

To prove this, choose a vector $x_0 \in X$ such that $\|x_0\| = 1$ and consider the functions $x(t) = x_0 + tAx_0$, $f(t) = \|x(t)\|$. Applying (3.8) to $v = Ax$, for almost all t one has

$$\begin{aligned} f(t)\dot{f}(t) &= \llbracket Ax_0, x(t) \rrbracket = \llbracket Ax(t) - tA^2x_0, x(t) \rrbracket \leq \llbracket Ax(t), x(t) \rrbracket + \llbracket -tA^2x_0, x(t) \rrbracket \\ &\stackrel{(3.11), (2.15), \|A^2x_0\| \leq c}{\leq} \mu_0 \|x(t)\| + c|t| \|x(t)\| = (\mu_0 + |t|c)f(t). \end{aligned}$$

Here $c := \|A^2\|$ is a constant. Choosing now $h > 0$ so small that $f(t) > 0$ for $t \in [0, h]$, one has $\dot{f}(t) \leq \mu_0 + tc$ for all $t \in [0, h]$. Notice that f is Lipschitz, and hence also absolutely continuous. Integrating the inequality over $[0, h]$, one proves that

$$\|x_0 + hAx_0\| - 1 = f(h) - f(0) \leq \int_0^h (\mu_0 + tc)dt = \mu_0 h + \frac{h^2 c}{2} \quad \forall x_0 : \|x_0\| = 1.$$

Taking the supremum over all x_0 such that $\|x_0\| = 1$, one shows that

$$\|\mathbf{I}_X + hA\| - 1 \leq \mu_0 h + O(h^2),$$

and therefore $\mu(A) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} h^{-1}(\|\mathbf{I}_X + hA\| - 1) \leq \mu_0$, which, in view of (iv), proves the Lumer equality (3.1). The proof of Theorem 3.6 is finished. \square

Remark 3.7 (Absolutely Continuous Curves). In $X = \mathbb{K}^n$, a differentiable curve $x(\cdot)$ in the statement (v) can be replaced by an absolutely continuous⁹ (e.g., locally Lipschitz) curve. In this situation, $\|x(\cdot)\|$ is also absolutely continuous and (3.3) holds at each point t where both the left-hand side and the right-hand side are well defined (this hold at almost any t [55, Theorem 7.18]). The proof is same. \square

⁹We call $x : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ absolutely continuous if all coordinate functions $x_i(\cdot), i = 1, \dots, n$ are absolutely continuous on (a, b) in the standard sense [55, Definition 7.17].

Remark 3.8 (“Deimling Inequality” [23]). The equivalence (vii) \iff (iii) was essentially established in [23, Theorem 18] for the case $X = \mathbb{R}^n$; the rightmost inequality in (3.6) is referred in [23] as the “Deimling inequality”. The proof given in [23] generalizes to a general normed space X and operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ whose resolvent $(\mathbf{I} - hA)^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ exists for h being sufficiently small. If the normed space X is Banach, the latter condition holds as $(\mathbf{I} - hA)^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h^j A^j$, which series converges when $|h| < \|A\|^{-1}$. Theorem 3.6, however, *does not* rely on the completeness of X . \square

We codify the numerous equivalences in Theorem 3.6 via the following definition.

DEFINITION 3.9 (Regular Pairing). *A regular pairing on the space X is a weak pairing that enjoys the properties (i)-(vii) from Theorem 3.6.*

The importance of regular pairings for control theory will be highlighted in Section 4, where the contraction criterion (Theorem 4.8) is formulated. While this criterion essentially appears in [23] (Theorem 31), our Theorem 3.6 allows us to bypass the direct validation of the curve norm derivative formula and the rightmost inequality in (3.6) (referred in [23] to as the “Deimling inequality”) for the ambient weak pairing.

3.3. Relations between the LG, JMT and Regular Pairings. In this section, we formulate important corollaries of Theorem 3.6 that are concerned with the LG pairings and the upper JMT pairing that are special cases of a regular pairing.

COROLLARY 3.10 (Upper JMT Pairings are Regular Pairings). *For every normed space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$, the upper JMT pairing $[\cdot, \cdot]_+$ associated with the norm is a regular pairing on X . In particular, the upper JMT pairing enjoys the Lumer property.*

Proof. It suffices to notice that $[\cdot, \cdot]_+$ obeys (3.6) (where the leftmost and the rightmost inequalities turn into equalities). \square

COROLLARY 3.11 (Real parts of LG Pairings are Regular Pairings). *The real part¹⁰ $\Re[x, y] = \text{Re}[x, y]$ of an LG pairing on the space X is a regular pairing on X . In particular, this pairing*

- (i) *obeys the inequality $[x, y]_- \leq \text{Re}[x, y] \leq [x, y]_+$ for all $x, y \in X$, where the JMTPs $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\pm}$ correspond to the induced norm (2.8).*
- (ii) *enjoys the Lumer property (3.1), and*
- (iii) *possesses also the curve norm property (3.3).*

Proof. The proof is straightforward, because $[-x, x] = -[x, x] = -\|x\|^2$, and hence the straight angle condition holds. \square

Notice that statement (i) of Corollary 3.11 is known in the literature, see, e.g., [30, Lemma 2.2] and [29, Chapter X, Lemma 5]. Notice that we give a direct proof, which does not exploit the multi-valued duality mappings [30]. Statement (ii) is the well-known result by Lumer result [43, Lemma 12], relating the log norm and the numerical range of an operator. Statement (iii) of Corollary 3.11 is, however, not easily available in the literature. The curve norm derivative formula enables the proof of certain technical results, which are quite difficult to establish directly, as exemplified by the next corollary related to generalized orthogonality in normed spaces.

COROLLARY 3.12 (A Note on Orthogonality [30, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2]).

For each LG pairing on X , generating the norm $\|\cdot\|$, and all $x_0, v \in X$ the following three statements are equivalent:

- (i) *the norm $f(t) = \|x_0 + tv\|$ is constant;*

¹⁰If the space X is real, the real part can, obviously, be omitted.

- (ii) the ‘‘orthogonality’’ condition holds $\operatorname{Re} [v, x_0 + tv] = 0$ for almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (iii) $v = 0$.

Here the real part of the LG pairing can be replaced by any other regular pairing, associated with the same norm.

Proof. The proof is immediate from the curve norm derivative property for affine functions (3.8). Notice that $f(t) = \|x_0 + tv\|$ is a Lipschitz (and hence absolutely) continuous function and, thanks to (3.8), for almost all t one has

$$\dot{f}(t) = \operatorname{Re} [v, x_0 + tv].$$

The equivalence (i) \implies (ii) is now straightforward: an absolutely continuous function is constant if and only if its derivative vanishes almost everywhere. The implication (iii) \implies (i) is trivial. To prove that (i) \implies (iii), it suffices to note that $f(t) \geq |t| \|v\| - \|x_0\|$. This finishes the proof. \square

A natural question arises: which regular pairings can be represented by real parts of LG pairings? The answer is given by the following simple lemma.

LEMMA 3.13 (Regular Pairings Arising from LG Pairings). *For a regular pairing $[\cdot, \cdot]$ on a real vector space X , two conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $[\cdot, \cdot]$ is a LG pairing on X ;
- (ii) $[-x, y] = -[x, y]$ for all $x, y \in X$.

For a WP on a complex vector space X , the following conditions are equivalent:

- (iv) $[\cdot, \cdot] = \operatorname{Re} [\cdot, \cdot]$ is a real part of some LG pairing on X ;
- (v) $[-x, y] = -[x, y]$, $[jx, x] = 0$, and $[x, \lambda y] = [\bar{\lambda}x, y]$ for all $x, y \in X$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\|\lambda\| = 1$.

The LG pairing $[\cdot, \cdot]$ satisfying (iv) is unique.

Proof. The real space case. Implication (i) \implies (ii) is straightforward.

To prove the inverse implication, notice first that (ii) entails the additivity (2.3) of $[x, y] = [x, y]$ in view of the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} [x_1 + x_2, y] &\leq [x_1, y] + [x_2, y] = [x_1, y] + [x_1 + x_2 - x_1, y] \\ &\leq [x_1, y] + [-x_1, y] + [x_1 + x_2, y] = [x_1 + x_2, y]. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (2.13) and (2.14), (2.4) and (2.7) are also valid. Finally, (2.5) and (2.6) are ensured by the axioms of WP. This finishes the proof in the real space case.

The complex space case. Implication (iv) \implies (v) is straightforward.

To prove the inverse implication (v) \implies (iv), notice first that for any LG pairing $[\cdot, \cdot]$ one has $[jx, y] = j[x, y]$. Hence, if LG pairing satisfying (iv) does exist, we have $[x, y] = \operatorname{Re} [x, y]$ for all $x, y \in X$, whence $[jx, y] = -\operatorname{Im} [x, y]$. Hence, if an LG pairing satisfying (iv) exists, it is uniquely determined from

$$(3.12) \quad [x, y] := [x, y] - j[jx, y] \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

It remains to check that the conditions (v) indeed make (3.12) an LG pairing. The proof of additivity (2.3) retraces the real case, as well as the proof of (2.4) and (2.7) for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Since by definition $[jx, y] = j[x, y]$ and the pairing (3.12) is additive, (2.4) also holds for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. To prove (2.7), it suffices to consider λ such that $|\lambda| = 1$. Using (v), one has $[x, \lambda y] = [\bar{\lambda}x, \lambda \bar{\lambda}y] = [\bar{\lambda}x, y]$ for all $x, y \in X$. Hence

$$[x, \lambda y] = [\bar{\lambda}x, y] - j[j\bar{\lambda}x, y] = [\bar{\lambda}x, y] \stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \bar{\lambda}[x, y].$$

Since $[x, x] = [x, x]$, (2.5) and (2.6) also hold. We have proved that (3.12) is the unique LG pairing, satisfying (iv). \square

3.4. Uniqueness of regular pairings. Whereas the class of all possible weak pairings compatible with a given norm is very broad, regular pairings constitute a much more narrow class which, in some situations, consists of only *one* binary operation. This holds if and only if the normed space is “Gateaux differentiable” [34, 40, 60].

DEFINITION 3.14 (Gateaux Differentiable Normed Space). *A normed space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is Gateaux differentiable if the derivative $\left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \|y + tx\|$ exists for each non-zero point $y \neq 0$ and each direction $x \in X$. Notice that in this situation $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_- = \llbracket x, y \rrbracket_+$, for all $x, y \in X$.*

An inner product space is always Gateaux differentiable; other examples include ℓ_p and functions L_p spaces for $1 < p < \infty$ [34].

LEMMA 3.15 (Unique Regular Pairing for Gateaux Differentiable Norms).

A norm $\|\cdot\|$ on X is induced by only one regular pairing if and only if the space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is Gateaux differentiable. In this case, the only regular pairing compatible with the norm is $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket := \llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket_+ = \llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket_-$ and the only LG pairing compatible with the norm is $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$ in the real case and (3.12) in the complex case.

Proof. The proof exploits the result by Giles [34, Theorem 1], stating that every normed space admits at least one LG pairing.

The “if” part is straightforward from Theorem 3.6. Indeed, if the lower and upper JMT pairings are equal, then every regular pairing is coincident with them in view of (3.6). Taking the LG pairing $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$ compatible with the norm, Corollary 3.11 entails that $\operatorname{Re} \llbracket x, y \rrbracket = \llbracket x, y \rrbracket_+$ for all $x, y \in X$. Using Lemma 3.13, one proves that the uniqueness of such an LG pairing.

To prove the “only if” part, recall that $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_- = -\llbracket -x, y \rrbracket_+$. Hence, if the normed space is not Gateaux differentiable, one has $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_+ \neq -\llbracket -x, y \rrbracket_+$ for some pair of vectors $x, y \in X$. Obviously, such a regular pairing does not satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.13, and thus cannot be represented as a real part of an LG pairing. According to the Giles theorem and Corollary 3.11, we can have at least one regular pairing different from $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_+$. This finishes the proof. \square

Remark 3.16. Notice that we in fact have proved that a normed space that is not Gateaux differentiable admits infinitely many different regular pairings, because a convex combination of two regular pairings is, obviously, also a regular pairing. \square

Remark 3.17. Retracing the arguments from [34, Theorem 3], it can be shown that all regular pairings on non-differentiable (in the Gateaux sense) normed spaces are discontinuous in the second argument. Moreover, for some $x, y \in X$ the function $t \mapsto \llbracket x, x + ty \rrbracket$ is discontinuous at $t = 0$. \square

Remark 3.18. It should be noticed that Theorem 3.15 is not valid for irregular weak pairings. For instance, the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^n is induced by pairings

$$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_\alpha = \alpha \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i y_i|, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1],$$

among which the only regular WP corresponds to $\alpha = 1$, whereas the others fail to satisfy the straight angle property. \square

In finite-dimensional spaces, a regular pairing compatible with the norm is “almost unique” even for non-differentiable norms as described by the following lemma.

LEMMA 3.19 (Regular Pairing on \mathbb{K}^n is Almost Unique). *In a finite dimensional normed space $(\mathbb{K}^n, \|\cdot\|)$, $[\cdot, y]_+ \equiv [\cdot, y]_-$ for almost all $y \in X$. In particular, for each regular pairing $[\cdot, \cdot]$ that induces the norm $\|\cdot\|$ one has $[\cdot, y] \equiv [\cdot, y]_+$ for almost all $y \in X$.*

Proof. The first statement is immediate from the Rademacher theorem [33] stating that on a finite dimensional space X (considered as a *real* space) each Lipschitz function (in particular, the norm), is almost everywhere differentiable in the Gateaux (and even Fréchet [27]) sense. If the norm is differentiable at point $y \in X$, then one has $[x, y]_- = [x, y]_+ \forall x \neq 0$. The second statement follows from the property (3.6). \square

4. Regular Pairings on \mathbb{R}^n : Examples and Applications. In this section, we focus on regular pairings in finite-dimensional spaces, extending the theory from [23] to highlight the importance of regular pairings for analysis of dynamical systems.

4.1. Regular Pairings Associated to Weighted ℓ_p Norms. Formally, all norms on a finite-dimensional vector space are equivalent; however, the constant factors establishing this equivalence increase with the space's dimension.¹¹ Consequently, estimating a solution with one norm can become overly conservative when converted to another norm. Therefore, while positive definite quadratic forms (equivalently, squared weighted ℓ_2 norms, see below) are the most typical Lyapunov functions, many applications require tight estimates of system solutions in non-Euclidean norms. For instance, a long-standing challenge in machine learning is obtaining certifiable robustness bounds for deep neural networks against adversarial perturbations [32, 54, 59], which are typically measured in the ℓ_∞ norm [35]. Therefore, the input/output Lipschitz constants of neural networks in ℓ_∞ norm need to be tightly estimated. Other applications, leading to stability and contraction in weighted ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms are surveyed in [24, 26, 39]. Among them are tight estimates for iterative algorithms seeking fixed points or monotone operators, and efficiently computable contraction rates of recurrent neural networks, to name a few.

Table 1, borrowed from [23], summarizes the standard weak pairings compatible with weighted ℓ_p norms and the corresponding induced logarithmic norms. As will be discussed below, a special role is played by the *sign pairing* $[\cdot, \cdot]_1$ and *max pairing* $[\cdot, \cdot]_\infty$, associated respectively with the ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms [23]:

$$(4.1) \quad \llbracket x, y \rrbracket_1 = \|y\|_1 \operatorname{sign}(y)^\top x,$$

$$(4.2) \quad \llbracket x, y \rrbracket_\infty = \max_{i \in I_\infty(y)} y_i x_i = \|y\|_\infty \max_{i \in I_\infty(y)} \operatorname{sign}(y_i) x_i,$$

where $I_\infty(y) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid |y_i| = \|y\|_\infty\}$ is the set of indices where y takes its maximal absolute value.

While it is known from [23] that both the sign and max pairings satisfy various properties of a regular pairing, as guaranteed by Theorem 3.6, each statement in [23] is proved using ad-hoc methods. The approach in this paper clearly demonstrates that the sign and max pairings are regular pairings, and thus automatically satisfy the numerous equivalent properties in Theorem 3.6. This improves upon the original analysis in [23] and provides a more streamlined and comprehensive treatment of the standard pairings summarized in Table 1.

LEMMA 4.1 (Regularity of Standard Pairings). *Each pairing collected in Table 1 is regular. If $1 < p < \infty$, then the norm $\|\cdot\|_{p,R}$ admits no regular pairing other than $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_{p,R} = \llbracket Rx, Ry \rrbracket_p$ (being both LG and upper JMT pairings).*

¹¹For example, it is known that $\|x\|_1 \leq \sqrt{n}\|x\|_2 \leq n\|x\|_\infty$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Norm	Weak Pairing	Logarithmic norm
$\ x\ _{2,P^{1/2}}$	$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_{2,P^{1/2}} = x^\top P y$	$\mu_{2,P^{1/2}}(A) = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\max}(P A P^{-1} + A^\top)$ $= \max_{\ x\ _{2,P^{1/2}}=1} x^\top P A x$
$\ x\ _p$	$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_p = \ y\ _p^{2-p} (y \circ y ^{p-2})^\top x$	$\mu_p(A) = \max_{\ x\ _p=1} (x \circ x ^{p-2})^\top A x$
$\ x\ _1$	$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_1 = \ y\ _1 \operatorname{sign}(y)^\top x$	$\mu_1(A) = \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left(a_{jj} + \sum_{i \neq j} a_{ij} \right)$ $= \sup_{\ x\ _1=1} \operatorname{sign}(x)^\top A x$
$\ x\ _\infty$	$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_\infty = \max_{i \in I_\infty(y)} x_i y_i$	$\mu_\infty(A) = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left(a_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ij} \right)$ $= \max_{\ x\ _\infty=1} \max_{i \in I_\infty(x)} (A x)_i x_i$

TABLE 1

Weak pairings, and log norms for weighted ℓ_2 and general ℓ_p , for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ norms. We adopt the shorthand $I_\infty(x) = \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid |x_i| = \|x\|_\infty\}$. The matrix P is positive definite; the symbol \circ stands for the Hadamard (element-wise) product. Only the unweighted ℓ_p norms, weak pairings, and log norms for $p \neq 2$ are included here since $\mu_{p,R}(A) = \mu_p(R A R^{-1})$ and $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_{p,R} = \llbracket R x, R y \rrbracket_p$.

Proof. It is known from [23] that the binary operations $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket_{p,R}$ are weak pairings. A straightforward computation shows that all of them satisfy the straight angle property $\llbracket -x, x \rrbracket = -\|x\|^2$. The final statement follows directly from Lemma 3.15, noting that ℓ_p and weighted ℓ_p norms for $p \in (1, \infty)$ are C^1 -smooth (and thus Gateaux differentiable) at every point except the origin. \square

Since ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms are not Gateaux differentiable, Lemma 3.15 predicts that the regular pairing is non-unique. Note that the sign-pairing $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket_1$ is a special case of the LG pairing. It is also known from [27, Example 13.1(b)] that the upper JMT pairing (referred to as the ‘‘Deimling pairing’’ in [23]) for the ℓ_1 norm is:

$$(4.3) \quad \llbracket x, y \rrbracket_{+,1} = \|y\|_1 \left(\operatorname{sign}(y)^\top x + \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| \chi_{\{0\}}(y_i) \right) \geq \llbracket x, y \rrbracket_1,$$

where $\chi_0(y_i)$ is the indicator function, equal to 1 when $y_i = 0$ and 0 otherwise. Although, in accordance with Lemma 3.19, $\llbracket \cdot, y \rrbracket_{+,1} = \llbracket \cdot, y \rrbracket_1$ for almost all y (specifically, when $y \neq 0$), the sign pairing is more convenient for the curve norm derivation formula due to its simpler representation and its linearity in the first argument.

Similarly, the max pairing is not the unique regular pairing associated with the ℓ_∞ norm. The max pairing is nonlinear in both arguments, e.g., if $y = [1, \dots, 1]^\top$, then $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_\infty = \max_i x_i$. Hence, it is *not* an LG pairing. However, one can easily construct LG pairings for ℓ_∞ norms; for instance, let

$$\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_{\infty, \min\text{-index}} = x_{m(y)} y_{m(y)} = \|y\|_\infty x_{m(y)} \operatorname{sign} y_{m(y)},$$

where $m(y) = \min I_\infty(y)$ is the *minimal* index m such that $|y_m| = \|y\|_\infty$. Instead of the minimal index, one can consider the maximal index. More generally, one can choose $m(y) = \mathcal{M}(I_\infty(y))$, where $\mathcal{M} : 2^{\{1, \dots, n\}} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a selector map, such that $\mathcal{M}(I) \in I$ for all non-empty $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, ensuring that $|y_{m(y)}| = \|y\|_\infty$.

An important advantage of the max pairing is that it is *permutation-invariant* (remains unchanged under the permutation of coordinates). In contrast, this property is clearly lost by the ‘‘min-index’’ LG pairing $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket_{\infty, \min\text{-index}}$.

Unlike the sign pairing, the max pairing is a special case of the JMT pairing.

LEMMA 4.2 (Max Pairing is the Upper JMT Pairing). *For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$(4.4) \quad \llbracket x, y \rrbracket_\infty = [x, y]_{\infty,+} := \|y\|_\infty \lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \frac{\|y + hx\|_\infty - \|y\|_\infty}{h}.$$

Proof. For $y = 0$, the statement is obvious. Hence, we assume that $\|y\|_\infty > 0$ without loss of generality.

Notice that if x_i, y_i change their signs simultaneously for some i , neither norms $\|y + hx\|_\infty$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, nor the product $y_i x_i$ change. In other words, both the max pairing and the upper JMT pairing for the ℓ_∞ norm are invariant to transformations $x \mapsto Ex$, $y \mapsto Ey$, where E is a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries equal to ± 1 .

Hence, it suffices to prove the lemma for the case where the second argument is a nonnegative vector: $y_i \geq 0$ for each i . In this situation, $I_\infty(y) = \{i : y_i = \|y\|_\infty = \max_i y_i\}$; furthermore, it can be shown that $\|y + hx\|_\infty = \max_i (y_i + hx_i)$ for $h > 0$ being sufficiently small¹². Hence, the upper JMT pairing is found as

$$[x, y]_{\infty,+} = \|y\|_\infty \lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \frac{f(y + hx) - f(y)}{h} = \|y\|_\infty \frac{\partial f(y)}{\partial x},$$

where $f(y) := \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} f_i(y)$ and $f_i(y) := y_i$. Using the Danskin theorem¹³ [22, Theorem I], the latter directional derivative can be computed as follows

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = \max_{i \in I_\infty(y)} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x} = \max_{i \in I_\infty(y)} x_i.$$

Here we use the fact that $I_\infty(y) = \{i : f_i(y) = y_i = f(y) = \|y\|_\infty\}$. Hence, assuming that y is a nonnegative vector with $\|y\|_\infty > 0$, for each x we have

$$[x, y]_{\infty,+} = \|y\|_\infty \frac{\partial \|y\|}{\partial x} = \|y\|_\infty \max_{i \in I_\infty(y)} x_i = \max_{i \in I_\infty(y)} x_i y_i = \llbracket x, y \rrbracket_\infty,$$

which, in view of the previous remarks, finishes the proof. \square

Remark 4.3. It should be noticed that the infinite-dimensional counterpart of the relation (4.4), dealing with continuous functions on a line segment $I = [a, b]$ and the standard norm $\|f\|_C = \max_{s \in I} |f(s)|$, appears in [40, Theorem 4.5]. The latter theorem states that the upper JMT pairing, corresponding to this norm, is found as

$$\begin{aligned} [g, f]_{C,+} &= \|f\|_C \max_{s \in A(f)} g(s) \operatorname{sign} f(s) = \max_{s \in A(f)} g(s) f(s), \\ A(f) &:= \{s \in I : |f(s)| = \|f\|_C\}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Notice, finally, that Lemma 4.2 trivially extends to the weighted max pairing. We will prove a more general statement (Lemma 4.6) in the next subsection.

4.2. Regular Pairings for Polyhedral Norms. The previously considered ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ norms are examples of *polyhedral norms*. In this subsection, we consider a more general and novel case of a polyhedral norm, called the *polyhedral max norm*, and study the induced norm and a *polyhedral max pairing* related to this norm.

¹²Indeed, it is easily seen that $I_\infty(y + hx) \subseteq I_\infty(y)$ for h being small. Recalling that $y \neq 0$ and thus $y_i > 0$ for $i \in I_\infty(y)$, one has $y_i + hx_i > 0$ for all $i \in I_\infty(y + hx)$ when h is small enough.

¹³Formally, the Danskin theorem in [22] is formulated for the minimum, but its extension to the maximum is straightforward.

DEFINITION 4.4 (Polyhedral and polyhedral max norms). A norm $\|\cdot\|$ is polyhedral if its unit disk $\{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|v\| \leq 1\}$ is a polyhedron.

Given a full-column rank matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $m \geq n$, the polyhedral max norm $\|\cdot\|_W$ on \mathbb{R}^n is defined by

$$(4.5) \quad \|x\|_W = \|Wx\|_\infty = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}} |w_i^\top x|,$$

where $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the i th row of W (regarded as a column vector).

Clearly, the standard non-Euclidean norms ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ are polyhedral. It is simple to verify that the polyhedral max norm $\|\cdot\|_W$ satisfies the three defining properties of a norm (the positive definite property follows from W being full column rank). Finally, from the hyperplane characterization of convex polytopes, it is also easy to see that each polyhedral norm can be written as a polyhedral max norm.

DEFINITION 4.5. The polyhedral max pairing $[\![\cdot, \cdot]\!]_W : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$(4.6) \quad [\![x, y]\!]_W = [\![Wx, Wy]\!]_\infty.$$

We are now ready to state our main result on polyhedral pairings.

LEMMA 4.6 (**Properties of Polyhedral Max Pairings**). For a full-column rank matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $m \geq n$, the polyhedral max pairing $[\![\cdot, \cdot]\!]_W$ is the upper JMT pairing (and hence a regular pairing), associated with the norm $\|\cdot\|_W$.

For each $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, its associate log norm is

$$(4.7a) \quad \mu_W(A) = \min_{H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}} \mu_\infty(H)$$

$$(4.7b) \quad \text{subject to } WA = HW,$$

where the linear constraint (4.7b) is feasible and the minimum exists¹⁴.

It should be noted that the convex program (4.7b) can, in fact, reduce¹⁵ be written as a standard LP with $2m^2 - m$ variables, as implied by the following remark.

Remark 4.7. When $m > n$, the matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is under-determined by the $m \times n$ equalities $WA = HW$, in other words, the solutions to equation (4.7b) live in an $m(m - n)$ -dimensional vector subspace. Visually,

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{W} \\ (m \times n) \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{A} \\ (n \times n) \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{H} \\ (m \times m) \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{W} \\ (m \times n) \end{array}.$$

Also note that, at fixed A and W , the optimization problem (4.7) can be rewritten as a linear program by parametrizing the variable H as follows. From [39], we know that $\mu_\infty(H) \leq \gamma$ if and only if there exists zero-diagonal $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ satisfying

$$(4.8a) \quad \text{diag}(H) - T \leq H \leq \text{diag}(H) + T,$$

$$(4.8b) \quad (\text{diag}(H) + T)\mathbf{1}_n \leq \gamma\mathbf{1}_n.$$

¹⁴Notice that the set of admissible matrices H is an affine subspace in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, which is non-compact (closed yet unbounded), and the convex function μ_∞ is not radially unbounded. Hence, the existence of a minimum in (4.7) is a self-standing result that is not fully obvious.

¹⁵It should be emphasized, however, that matrix W needs to be fixed. As discussed by [14], when only A is given and one is interested to find the polyhedral norm with minimal value of $\mu_W(A)$, the constraint (4.7b) is bilinear in the unknowns (W, H) so the feasible set is non-convex.

where $\text{diag}(H)$ is the diagonal matrix with entries equal to the diagonal entries of H . In this transcription we used the fact that, for a Metzler M , $\mu_\infty(M) = \min\{b \in \mathbb{R} \mid M\mathbf{1}_n \leq b\mathbf{1}_n\}$; e.g., see [16, Lemma 2.8]. Hence, finding the minimum in (4.7) is equivalent to finding the minimal γ , for which constraints (4.8) are feasible. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.6. It is immediate to verify that the norm associated to $[\cdot, \cdot]_W$ is $\|\cdot\|_W$. The upper JMT pairing for this norm is found via Lemma 4.2 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} [x, y]_{W,+} &= \|y\|_W \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|y + hx\|_W - \|y\|_W}{h} = \|Wy\|_\infty \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|W(y + hx)\|_\infty - \|Wy\|_\infty}{h} \\ &= [Wx, Wy]_{\infty,+} \stackrel{(4.4)}{=} \llbracket Wx, Wy \rrbracket_\infty = \llbracket x, y \rrbracket_W. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes our proof of the first statement: the polyhedral max pairing is the upper JMT pairing (and thus is regular).

To establish the equality (4.7), we first construct a matrix H^* that satisfies (4.7b) and the inequality $\mu_\infty(H^*) \leq \mu_W(A)$. This construction is broadly known in the literature [9, 17, 47] and exploits the homogeneous Farkas lemma [8, Lemma 1.4.1].

Denote the row vectors of W by $w_1^\top, \dots, w_m^\top$ and let $b_0 := \mu_\infty(A)$. Choose an index $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and consider a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ obeying $2(m-1)$ inequalities

$$(4.9a) \quad w_i^\top x \geq w_j^\top x \quad \forall j \neq i,$$

$$(4.9b) \quad w_i^\top x \geq -w_j^\top x \quad \forall j \neq i.$$

Then, one obviously has $\|x\|_W = \|Wx\|_\infty = w_i^\top x$. Using the definition of max pairing and the Lumer inequality, we compute

$$b_0(w_i^\top x)^2 = b_0\|x\|_W^2 \stackrel{(3.7)}{\geq} \llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket_W = \llbracket WAx, Wx \rrbracket_\infty \stackrel{(4.1)}{\geq} (w_i^\top Ax)(w_i^\top x),$$

which, dividing by¹⁶ $w_i^\top x = \|x\|_W$, leads to the following inequality:

$$(4.10) \quad (b_0 w_i^\top - w_i^\top A)x \geq 0.$$

In other words, the system of inequalities (4.9) implies the inequality (4.10) for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. The homogeneous Farkas lemma [8, Lemma 1.4.1] thus guarantees the existence of numbers $\lambda_{ij}^+, \lambda_{ij}^- \geq 0$ (defined for $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ and $i \neq j$) such that

$$b_0 w_i^\top - w_i^\top A = \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^+ (w_i^\top - w_j^\top) + \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^- (w_i^\top + w_j^\top),$$

which is equivalently written as follows:

$$(4.11) \quad \left(b_0 - \sum_{j \neq i} (\lambda_{ij}^+ + \lambda_{ij}^-)\right) w_i^\top + \sum_{j \neq i} (\lambda_{ij}^+ - \lambda_{ij}^-) w_j^\top = w_i^\top A.$$

The desired matrix H^* can now be defined by

$$H_{ij}^* = \begin{cases} \lambda_{ij}^+ - \lambda_{ij}^-, & i \neq j, \\ b_0 - \sum_{j \neq i} (\lambda_{ij}^+ + \lambda_{ij}^-), & i = j \end{cases}$$

¹⁶As we have proved, if $\|x\|_W = \|Wx\|_\infty = 0$, then $x = 0$ and (4.10) retains its validity.

Recalling that $\lambda_{ij}^\pm \geq 0$ and using Table 1, it is easily shown that

$$H_{ii}^* + \sum_{j \neq i} |H_{ij}^*| \leq b_0 \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\},$$

and hence $\mu_\infty(H^*) \leq b_0 = \mu_W(A)$. Note that the i th row of matrix H^*W is found as

$$(H^*W)_i = H_{ii}^* w_i^\top + \sum_{j \neq i} H_{ij}^* w_j^\top \stackrel{(4.11)}{=} w_i^\top A,$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, which is nothing else than the i th row of WA . Hence, H^* satisfies (4.7b) and the inequality $\mu_\infty(H^*) \leq \mu_W(A)$.

Next, we prove the converse inequality $b_0 = \mu_W(A) \leq \mu_\infty(H)$ for all H satisfying (4.7b). To do so, we proceed as follows. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket_W &= \llbracket WAx, Wx \rrbracket_\infty \stackrel{(4.7b)}{=} \llbracket HWx, Wx \rrbracket_\infty \stackrel{\text{Lumer's property (3.2)}}{\leq} \mu_\infty(H) \|Wx\|_\infty^2 \\ &= \mu_\infty(H) \|x\|_W^2. \end{aligned}$$

By taking the maximum over x such that $\|x\|_W = 1$, Lumer's property for the regular pairing $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket_W$ results in $\mu_W(A) = \sup_{\|x\|_W=1} \llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket_W \leq \mu_\infty(H)$.

We have proved that $b_0 = \mu_W(A) \leq \mu_\infty(H)$ whenever H satisfies (4.7b). In particular, $b_0 \leq \mu(H^*)$. This means that the matrix H^* constructed in the first part of the proof is a minimizer in the LP (4.7), and the minimum is $\mu_\infty(H^*) = b_0 = \mu_W(A)$. \square

It can be noticed that the ℓ_1 norm is a special case of polyhedral max norm, where matrix W has $m = 2^n$ rows, among which are all possible n -tuples of ± 1 . Lemma 4.6 implies that the corresponding polyhedral max pairing coincides with (4.3), which can also be verified directly through some tedious computations.

4.3. Elements of Contraction Analysis Based upon Regular Pairings. In this section, we review the basic features of contraction theory in light of our results on regular pairings, specifically the curve norm derivative formula and Lumer's property.

We begin by illustrating some direct implications of the curve norm derivative formula and Lumer's property. Given a curve $z : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and a norm with a compatible regular pairing $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$, the curve norm derivative formula implies

$$(4.12) \quad \frac{1}{2} \|z(t)\|^2 = \llbracket \dot{z}(t), z(t) \rrbracket.$$

for almost all t . For instance, given a trajectory $z(t)$ that is a solution to a time-varying system $\dot{z}(t) = A(t)z(t)$ with a locally bounded matrix $A(\cdot)$, the curve norm derivative formula and Lumer's property imply

$$(4.13) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|z(t)\|^2 = \llbracket A(t)z(t), z(t) \rrbracket \leq \mu(A(t)) \|z(t)\|^2.$$

Hence, upper bounds on the matrix's induced norm can be easily transformed into explicit estimates of the solution's norm. For commonly used norms, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(A(t)) \leq b &\implies \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|z\|_1^2 = \|z\|_1 \text{sign}(z)^\top \dot{z} \leq b \|z\|_1^2, \\ \mu_2(A(t)) \leq b &\implies \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|z\|_2^2 = z^\top \dot{z} \leq b \|z\|_2^2, \\ \mu_\infty(A(t)) \leq b &\implies \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|z\|_\infty^2 = \max_{i \in I_\infty(z)} \{z_i \dot{z}_i\} \leq b \|z\|_\infty^2. \end{aligned}$$

The importance of these three norms (and their weighted counterparts) lies in the possibility of explicitly computing the log norm. The same applies to the polyhedral max norm, examined in the previous section. Unlike these, no algorithm for computing $\mu_p(A)$ for $p \neq 1, 2, \infty$ is known to the best of the authors' knowledge. Remarkably, the computation of the induced operator ℓ_p -norm is known to be NP-hard [10].

Contraction analysis deals with a similar argument, where $z(t) = x_1(t) - x_2(t)$ is a discrepancy of two solutions to the same dynamical system

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(t, x(t)).$$

Assuming the right-hand side to be C^1 -smooth in x , $z(t)$ satisfies the equation

$$\dot{z}(t) = A(t)z(t), \quad A(t) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\theta x(t) + (1 - \theta)y(t))d\theta.$$

Although the matrices $A(t)$ usually cannot be computed explicitly, they belong to the convex hull spanned by the Jacobian values, which often allows estimation of their log norm $\mu(A(t))$ using the integral Jensen inequality. Our characterization of regular pairings (Theorem 3.6) leads to the following result, which clarifies the contraction criterion for continuously differentiable vector fields¹⁷ as presented in [23].

THEOREM 4.8 (Contraction Criteria for C^1 -Smooth Vector Fields). *Consider the dynamics $\dot{x} = f(t, x)$, with f continuously differentiable in x and continuous in t . Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, convex, and forward invariant set and let $\|\cdot\|$ denote a norm with a compatible regular pairing $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$. Then, for $b \in \mathbb{R}$, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\llbracket f(t, x) - f(t, y), x - y \rrbracket \leq b\|x - y\|^2$, for all $x, y \in C, t \geq 0$,
- (ii) $\llbracket Df(t, x)v, v \rrbracket \leq b\|v\|^2$, for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \in C, t \geq 0$,
- (iii) $\mu(Df(t, x)) \leq b$, for all $x \in C, t \geq 0$,
- (iv) $D^+\|\phi(t, t_0, x_0) - \phi(t, t_0, y_0)\| \leq b\|\phi(t, t_0, x_0) - \phi(t, t_0, y_0)\|$, for all $x_0, y_0 \in C, 0 \leq t_0 \leq t$ for which the solutions exist,
- (v) $\|\phi(t, t_0, x_0) - \phi(t, t_0, y_0)\| \leq e^{b(t-s)}\|\phi(s, t_0, x_0) - \phi(s, t_0, y_0)\|$, for all $x_0, y_0 \in C$ and $0 \leq t_0 \leq s \leq t$ for which the solutions exist.

Here $Df(t, x) := \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(t, x)$ is the Jacobian of f .

Proof. According to [23, Theorem 31], the conditions (i)-(v) are equivalent for any weak pairing that satisfies the curve norm derivative formula and the rightmost inequality in (3.6) (called the ‘‘Deimling inequality’’). According to our Theorem 3.6, this holds if and only if the pairing is regular. \square

Remark 4.9. The condition (i) is known as the *one-sided Lipschitz condition*, which is most typically validated with respect to the JMT upper pairing [58]. Theorem 4.8 shows that, to prove the contraction property, the JMT upper pairing can be replaced by an arbitrary regular pairing (for instance, an LG pairing compatible with the norm). \square

5. Conclusion. This paper introduces a novel, computationally-friendly notion of regular pairing, along with a characterization theorem that demonstrates the equivalence of several useful properties. We describe how the concept of a regular pairing is weaker than previous notions, retaining the critical properties of Lumer’s equality and the curve norm derivative formula. These tools are vital for Lyapunov stability

¹⁷A similar result can also be proved under local Lipschitz continuity in x ; see [26].

analysis and contraction theory. Since regular pairings are unique for Gateaux differentiable norms, we give special attention to non-differentiable polyhedral norms, defining and characterizing a polyhedral max pairing for the polyhedral max norm.

Future work will focus on (1) defining regular pairings for other examples of norms, including polynomial norms [1], canonical homogeneous norms [51], and Barabanov norms [61]; and (2) contractivity analysis with respect to appropriate polyhedral norms for biochemical reaction networks, with some results already available in [3].

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Alexander Davydov for insightful conversations on pairings and contraction theory.

References.

- [1] A. A. AHMADI, E. DE KLERK, AND G. HALL, *Polynomial norms*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 29 (2019), pp. 399–422, <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1172843>.
- [2] M. A. AL-RADHAWI AND D. ANGELI, *New approach to the stability of chemical reaction networks: Piecewise linear in rates Lyapunov functions*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 61 (2016), pp. 76–89, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2015.2427691>.
- [3] M. A. AL-RADHAWI, D. ANGELI, AND E. D. SONTAG, *On structural contraction of biological interaction networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13678, (2023), <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.13678>.
- [4] Z. AMINZARE AND E. D. SONTAG, *Logarithmic Lipschitz norms and diffusion-induced instability*, Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications, 83 (2013), pp. 31–49, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2013.01.001>.
- [5] Z. AMINZARE AND E. D. SONTAG, *Contraction methods for nonlinear systems: A brief introduction and some open problems*, in IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control, Dec. 2014, pp. 3835–3847, <https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2014.7039986>.
- [6] Z. AMINZARE AND E. D. SONTAG, *Synchronization of diffusively-connected nonlinear systems: Results based on contractions with respect to general norms*, IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering, 1 (2014), pp. 91–106, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSE.2015.2395075>.
- [7] A. V. BALAKRISHNAN, *Applied Functional Analysis*, Springer New York, 1981.
- [8] A. BEN-TAL AND A. NEMIROVSKI, *Lectures on Modern Convex Optimization: Analysis, Algorithms, and Engineering Applications*, SIAM, 2001.
- [9] A. BENZAOUIA AND C. BURGAT, *Regulator problem for linear discrete-time systems with non-symmetrical constrained control*, International Journal of Control, 48 (1988), pp. 2441–2451, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207178808906339>.
- [10] A. BHASKARA AND A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN, *Approximating matrix p-norms*, in ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SIAM, Jan. 2011, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973082.40>.
- [11] G. BITSORIS, *Existence of positively invariant polyhedral sets for continuous-time linear systems*, Control-Theory and Advanced Technology, 7 (1991), pp. 407–427, <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1573668926472634368>.
- [12] F. BLANCHINI, *Constrained control for uncertain linear systems*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 71 (1991), pp. 465–484, <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00941398>.
- [13] F. BLANCHINI, *Nonquadratic Lyapunov functions for robust control*, Automatica, 31 (1995), pp. 451–461, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-1098\(94\)00133-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-1098(94)00133-4).
- [14] F. BLANCHINI, *Set invariance in control*, Automatica, 35 (1999), pp. 1747–1767, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-1098\(99\)00113-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-1098(99)00113-2).

- [15] A. M. BRUCKNER, *Differentiation of Real Functions*, Springer, 1978, <https://doi.org/10.1007/bfb0069821>.
- [16] F. BULLO, *Contraction Theory for Dynamical Systems*, Kindle Direct Publishing, 1.2 ed., 2024, <https://fbullo.github.io/ctds>.
- [17] E. B. CASTELAN AND J. C. HENNET, *On invariant polyhedra of continuous-time linear systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 38 (1993), pp. 1680–1685, <https://doi.org/10.1109/9.262058>.
- [18] G. COMO, E. LOVISARI, AND K. SAVLA, *Throughput optimality and overload behavior of dynamical flow networks under monotone distributed routing*, IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems, 2 (2015), pp. 57–67, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCNS.2014.2367361>.
- [19] J. B. CONWAY, *A Course in Functional Analysis*, Springer, 1990.
- [20] S. COOGAN, *A contractive approach to separable Lyapunov functions for monotone systems*, Automatica, 106 (2019), pp. 349–357, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2019.05.001>.
- [21] S. COOGAN AND M. ARCAK, *A compartmental model for traffic networks and its dynamical behavior*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 60 (2015), pp. 2698–2703, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2015.2411916>.
- [22] J. M. DANSKIN, *The theory of max-min, with applications*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics, 14 (1966), pp. 641–664, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0114053>.
- [23] A. DAVYDOV, S. JAFARPOUR, AND F. BULLO, *Non-Euclidean contraction theory for robust nonlinear stability*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 67 (2022), pp. 6667–6681, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2022.3183966>.
- [24] A. DAVYDOV, S. JAFARPOUR, A. V. PROSKURNIKOV, AND F. BULLO, *Non-Euclidean monotone operator theory and applications*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, (2023), <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.11273>. Submitted.
- [25] A. DAVYDOV, A. V. PROSKURNIKOV, AND F. BULLO, *Non-Euclidean contractivity of recurrent neural networks*, in American Control Conference, Atlanta, USA, May 2022, pp. 1527–1534, <https://doi.org/10.23919/ACC53348.2022.9867357>.
- [26] A. DAVYDOV, A. V. PROSKURNIKOV, AND F. BULLO, *Non-Euclidean contraction analysis of continuous-time neural networks*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2024.3422217>. To appear.
- [27] K. DEIMLING, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Springer, 1985.
- [28] C. A. DESOER AND M. VIDYASAGAR, *Feedback Systems: Input-Output Properties*, Academic Press, 1975, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898719055>.
- [29] S. S. DRAGOMIR, *Semi-Inner Products and Applications*, Nova Science Publishers, 2004.
- [30] S. S. DRAGOMIR AND J. J. KOLIHA, *Two mappings related to semi-inner products and their applications in geometry of normed linear spaces*, Applications of Mathematics, 45 (2000), pp. 337–355, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022268627299>.
- [31] Y. FANG AND T. G. KINCAID, *Stability analysis of dynamical neural networks*, IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks, 7 (1996), pp. 996–1006, <https://doi.org/10.1109/72.508941>.
- [32] M. FAZLYAB, M. MORARI, AND G. J. PAPPAS, *Safety verification and robustness analysis of neural networks via quadratic constraints and semidefinite programming*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 67 (2022), pp. 1–15, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2020.3046193>.
- [33] H. FEDERER, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer, 1969.
- [34] J. R. GILES, *Classes of semi-inner-product spaces*, Transactions of the Amer-

- ican Mathematical Society, 129 (1967), pp. 436–446, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1994599>.
- [35] I. J. GOODFELLOW, J. SHELNS, AND C. SZEGEDY, *Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples*, in International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR), 2015, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6572>.
- [36] P. R. HALMOS, *A Hilbert Space Problem Book*, Springer New York, 1982.
- [37] A. G. HORVÁTH, Z. LÁNGI, AND M. SPIROVA, *Semi-inner products and the concept of semi-polarity*, Results in Mathematics, 71 (2015), p. 127–144, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00025-015-0510-y>.
- [38] J. A. JACQUEZ AND C. P. SIMON, *Qualitative theory of compartmental systems*, SIAM Review, 35 (1993), pp. 43–79, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1035003>.
- [39] S. JAFARPOUR, A. DAVYDOV, A. V. PROSKURNIKOV, AND F. BULLO, *Robust implicit networks via non-Euclidean contractions*, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, Dec. 2021, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2106.03194>.
- [40] R. C. JAMES, *Orthogonality and linear functionals in normed linear spaces*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 61 (1947), pp. 265–292, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-1947-0021241-4>.
- [41] H. KIENDL, J. ADAMY, AND P. STELZNER, *Vector norms as Lyapunov functions for linear systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 37 (1992), pp. 839–842, <https://doi.org/10.1109/9.256362>.
- [42] D. KOEHLER AND P. ROSENTHAL, *On isometries of normed linear spaces*, Studia Mathematica, 36 (1970), pp. 212–216.
- [43] G. LUMER, *Semi-inner-product spaces*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 100 (1961), pp. 29–43, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-1961-0133024-2>.
- [44] G. LUMER AND R. S. PHILLIPS, *Dissipative operators in a Banach space*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 11 (1961), pp. 679–698, <https://doi.org/10.2140/pjm.1961.11.679>.
- [45] MILIČIĆ, *Sur le semi-produit scalaire dans quelques espaces vectoriels normés*, Matematički Vesnik, 8(23) (1971), pp. 181–185.
- [46] MILIČIĆ, *Sur le semi-produit scalaire généralisé*, Matematički Vesnik, 10(25) (1973), pp. 325–329.
- [47] A. P. MOLCHANOV AND E. S. PYATNITSKY, *Lyapunov functions defining necessary and sufficient conditions for the absolute stability of nonlinear nonstationary control systems*, Automation and Remote Control, 5 (1986), pp. 38–49, <http://mi.mathnet.ru/eng/at6230>. (In Russian).
- [48] J. MONTEIL, G. RUSSO, AND R. SHORTEN, *On \mathcal{L}_∞ string stability of nonlinear bidirectional asymmetric heterogeneous platoon systems*, Automatica, 105 (2019), pp. 198–205, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2019.03.025>.
- [49] A. POLANSKI, *On infinity norms as Lyapunov functions for linear systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 40 (1995), pp. 1270–1274, <https://doi.org/10.1109/9.400479>.
- [50] A. POLANSKI, *Lyapunov function construction by linear programming*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 42 (1997), pp. 1013–1016, <https://doi.org/10.1109/9.599986>.
- [51] A. POLYAKOV, *Sliding mode control design using canonical homogeneous norm*, International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control, 29 (2018), pp. 682–701, <https://doi.org/10.1002/rnc.4058>.
- [52] A. V. PROSKURNIKOV, A. DAVYDOV, AND F. BULLO, *The Yakubovich S-Lemma revisited: Stability and contractivity in non-Euclidean norms*, SIAM Journal on

- Control and Optimization, 61 (2023), pp. 1955–1978, <https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1512600>.
- [53] H. QIAO, J. PENG, AND Z.-B. XU, *Nonlinear measures: A new approach to exponential stability analysis for Hopfield-type neural networks*, IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks, 12 (2001), pp. 360–370, <https://doi.org/10.1109/72.914530>.
- [54] M. REVAY, R. WANG, AND I. R. MANCHESTER, *A convex parameterization of robust recurrent neural networks*, IEEE Control Systems Letters, 5 (2021), pp. 1363–1368, <https://doi.org/10.1109/LCSYS.2020.3038221>.
- [55] W. RUDIN, *Real and Complex Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, 3 ed., 1987.
- [56] G. RUSSO, M. DI BERNARDO, AND E. D. SONTAG, *Global entrainment of transcriptional systems to periodic inputs*, PLoS Computational Biology, 6 (2010), p. e1000739, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000739>.
- [57] G. RUSSO, M. DI BERNARDO, AND E. D. SONTAG, *A contraction approach to the hierarchical analysis and design of networked systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 58 (2013), pp. 1328–1331, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2012.2223355>.
- [58] G. SÖDERLIND, *The logarithmic norm. History and modern theory*, BIT Numerical Mathematics, 46 (2006), pp. 631–652, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10543-006-0069-9>.
- [59] C. SZEGEDY, W. ZAREMBA, I. SUTSKEVER, J. BRUNA, D. ERHAN, I. GOODFELLOW, AND R. FERGUS, *Intriguing properties of neural networks*, in International Conference on Learning Representations, 2014, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6199>.
- [60] R. A. TAPIA, *A characterization of inner product spaces*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 41 (1973), pp. 569–574, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2039136>.
- [61] R. TEICHER AND M. MARGALOT, *Explicit construction of a Barabanov norm for a class of positive planar discrete-time linear switched systems*, Automatica, 48 (2012), pp. 95–101, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2011.09.028>.
- [62] H. TSUKAMOTO, S.-J. CHUNG, AND J.-J. E. SLOTTINE, *Contraction theory for nonlinear stability analysis and learning-based control: A tutorial overview*, Annual Reviews in Control, 52 (2021), pp. 135–169, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol.2021.10.001>.
- [63] M. VASSILAKI AND G. BITSORIS, *Constrained regulation of linear continuous-time dynamical systems*, Systems & Control Letters, 13 (1989), pp. 247–252, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6911\(89\)90071-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6911(89)90071-6).
- [64] P. WÓJCIK AND T. STYPUŁA, *Semi-inner products and operators which attain their norm*, Proceedings of the Japan Academy, Series A, Mathematical Sciences, 97 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.3792/pjaa.97.002>.
- [65] H. ZHANG, Y. XU, AND J. ZHANG, *Reproducing kernel Banach spaces for machine learning*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 10 (2009), pp. 2741–2775, <http://www.jmlr.org/papers/volume10/zhang09b/zhang09b.pdf>.
- [66] H. ZHANG AND J. ZHANG, *Generalized semi-inner products with applications to regularized learning*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 372 (2010), p. 181–196, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2010.04.075>.
- [67] H. ZHANG AND J. ZHANG, *Frames, Riesz bases, and sampling expansions in Banach spaces via semi-inner products*, Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis, 31 (2011), pp. 1–25, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acha.2010.09.007>.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 3.3.

To prove statement (i), notice that $|f(t+h) - f(t)| = |\|x(t+h)\| - \|x(t)\|| \leq \|x(t+h) - x(t)\|$ for each h . Hence,

$$\frac{|f(t+h) - f(t)|}{|h|} \leq \left\| \frac{x(t+h) - x(t)}{h} \right\| \quad \forall h \neq 0.$$

Taking \liminf and \limsup as $h \rightarrow 0+$ and as $h \rightarrow 0-$, one proves (3.4).

The last statement (iii) now follows from the celebrated Denjoy-Young-Saks theorem [15, Chapter IV, Theorem 4.4] stating that at almost every point $t \in (a, b)$ either $\dot{f}(t)$ exists or at least two of the four Dini derivatives are infinite (which, as we have shown, is impossible in our case).

The statement (ii) is trivial in the case where $x(t) \neq 0$ (i.e., $f(t) = 0$). Indeed, the Dini derivatives are all finite (3.4), and hence $f(t)D^\pm f(t) = f(t)D_\pm f(t) = 0 = [\dot{x}, 0]$. If $x(t) = 0$, recall that $x(t+h) = x(t) + h\dot{x}(t) + v(t, h)$, where $h^{-1}\|v(t, h)\| \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} 0$, by definition of the derivative. Therefore,

$$f(t) \frac{f(t+h) - f(t)}{h} = \|x(t)\| \frac{\|x(t) + h\dot{x}(t)\| - \|x(t)\|}{h} + \alpha(t, h),$$

where $\alpha(t, h)$ vanishes as $h \rightarrow 0$. Passing to the limit as $h \rightarrow 0+$ and using (2.9) (where x, y are replaced by, respectively, \dot{x} and x), one shows that

$$(A.1) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} f(t) \frac{f(t+h) - f(t)}{h} = [\dot{x}(t), x(t)]_+ \quad \forall t \in (a, b).$$

This, obviously, entails the first line in equations (3.5):

$$\dot{f}(t+0) = D^+ f(t) = D_+ f(t) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \frac{f(t+h) - f(t)}{h} \stackrel{(A.1)}{=} \frac{[\dot{x}(t), x(t)]_+}{f(t)},$$

The second line in (3.5) is proved in the same way by considering limits as $h \rightarrow 0-$.