

Computing Safety Margins of Parameterized Nonlinear Systems for Vulnerability Assessment via Trajectory Sensitivities

Michael W. Fisher, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Physical systems experience nonlinear disturbances which have the potential to disrupt desired behavior. For a particular disturbance, whether or not the system recovers from the disturbance to a desired stable equilibrium point depends on system parameter values, which are typically uncertain and time-varying. Therefore, to quantify proximity to vulnerability we define the safety margin to be the smallest change in parameter values from a nominal value such that the system will no longer be able to recover from the disturbance. Safety margins are valuable but challenging to compute as related methods, such as those for robust region of attraction estimation, are often either overly conservative or computationally intractable for high dimensional systems. Recently, we developed algorithms to compute safety margins efficiently and non-conservatively by exploiting the large sensitivity of the system trajectory near the region of attraction boundary to small perturbations. Although these algorithms have enjoyed empirical success, they lack theoretical guarantees that would ensure their generalizability. This work develops a novel characterization of safety margins in terms of trajectory sensitivities, and uses this to derive well-posedness and convergence guarantees for these algorithms, enabling their generalizability and successful application to a large class of nonlinear systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Physical systems experience nonlinear disturbances which have the potential to disrupt desired operation. For example, a short circuit in a power system can lead to blackout conditions, and a push on the torso of a humanoid robot can cause it to fall over. Consider a particular finite-time disturbance, such as a particular short circuit in a power system or push on a robot. If the system is able to recover after the disturbance to a desired stable equilibrium point (SEP), then it is not vulnerable to that disturbance. Knowledge of the proximity to vulnerability is important because it provides a quantitative measure of the margins for safe operation. As disturbance recovery depends on system parameter values, which are typically uncertain and time-varying, it is valuable to measure proximity to vulnerability as a function of system parameters.

Towards that end, we define the *recovery region* to be the set of parameter values for which the system recovers to the desired SEP, and the *recovery boundary* to be the boundary in parameter space of the recovery region. Given an initial nominal parameter value, we call the distance from this nominal value to the recovery boundary the *safety margin*. The safety margin quantifies proximity to vulnerability by providing a measure of how much conditions would have to change, or how much uncertainty can be tolerated, before the system would become vulnerable to the potential disturbance. Determining the safety margin is a very challenging problem

because of the intractability of computing the recovery boundary in high dimensional parameter space.

The recovery boundary depends on the disturbance, which we model as a map from parameter values to a post-disturbance initial condition. This map can be implicit, such as a known dynamic model for a particular contingency, or explicit, such as a static algebraic map, and is therefore a very general model. As a special case, consider a constant additive disturbance to the state of the form $x_0 + p$, where x_0 is some nominal state and p are parameters. In this case, the recovery boundary in parameter space would be equal to the region of attraction (RoA) boundary of the SEP in state space, and the safety margin would be the distance from the nominal state to the RoA boundary. So, the recovery boundary framework can be thought of as a generalization of the RoA boundary to incorporate the impact of parameter variation on safety.

Although the notions of recovery region and recovery boundary are novel, there is a long history with an extensive literature on RoA estimation in state space. Some of the most common approaches to RoA estimation include methods based on sublevel sets of Lyapunov functions [1]–[3] and the solutions of related partial differential equations [4]–[6]. However, often these methods are either overly conservative in practice or computationally intractable for high dimensional systems. There exist many approaches for robust RoA estimation in the presence of uncertainty [7], [8], including for parametric uncertainty [9], [10]. However, these methods are usually derived by extending approaches for RoA estimation in the absence of uncertainty to this more general setting and, thus, are prone to inheriting similar properties of conservatism and/or computational complexity.

To address these limitations, we have developed novel algorithms for numerically computing safety margins which are both non-conservative and computationally efficient for high dimensional nonlinear systems [11]. In particular, in [11] we successfully apply these algorithms to a realistic, nonlinear power system model with state space dimension 312 and parameter space dimension 86 to compute the safety margins in response to a short circuit to within a chosen tolerance of 10^{-3} . This requires only 39 iterations, each of which involves a time domain simulation and the solution of a quadratic program. However, despite the empirical success of these algorithms, they lack theoretical guarantees such as well-posedness and convergence certificates that would ensure their generalizability to a wide variety of nonlinear systems and operating conditions.

The purpose of the present paper is to address this gap by providing well-posedness and convergence guarantees for these algorithms for a large class of parameterized nonlinear systems. To do so, we begin by noting that the derivative of

M. W. Fisher is with the ECE Department, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON Canada, michael.fisher@uwaterloo.edu.

the system trajectory at each time with respect to parameters, known as the trajectory sensitivity, can be efficiently computed numerically from a single time domain simulation [12]. It seems intuitive that the trajectory sensitivities will be very small for post-disturbance initial conditions near the SEP, and will diverge towards infinity as the RoA boundary is approached. Motivated by this intuition, we define a function G to be the reciprocal of the supremum over time of the norm of the trajectory sensitivity at each time. Under mild assumptions about the structure of the RoA boundary - similar to those in [1] - we prove that for a parameter value p in the recovery boundary almost everywhere, $G(p) = 0$ and G extends to a C^2 function on a neighborhood of p . Furthermore, we show that G is strictly positive and continuous over the recovery region. Thus, we show that G provides an exact characterization of the recovery boundary in terms of trajectory sensitivities.

This characterization allows us to transform the challenging and abstract problem of computing safety margins into a concrete numerical optimization problem where we seek the closest parameter value p^* to a nominal value subject to the constraint that $G(p^*) = 0$. More generally, in [11] algorithms are presented which use G to (i) find a point on the recovery boundary in one dimensional parameter space, (ii) numerically trace the recovery boundary in two dimensional parameter space, and (iii) find the closest point on the recovery boundary to a nominal value in arbitrary dimensional parameter space to compute the safety margin. The optimization problem of (iii) is nonconvex, can possess multiple solutions, and has a solution that can vary nonsmoothly with respect to the nominal parameter value, so it may not be well-posed and is particularly challenging to solve.

In the present paper, for an initial parameter value sufficiently close to the recovery boundary, we provide well-posedness and convergence guarantees for algorithms (i) and (ii), show that there exists a unique solution to the nonconvex optimization problem of (iii) that depends smoothly on the nominal value, and provide convergence guarantees for algorithm (iii). It is important to note that these convergence guarantees are for convergence to the true recovery boundary, not to an estimate or approximation of it, and therefore represent non-conservative guarantees for these methods of finding the recovery boundary or the closest point on it. These theoretical guarantees facilitate successful application of these algorithms for computing the recovery boundary or the safety margin to a large class of nonlinear systems.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II provides background information, Section III shows a motivating example, Section IV provides the main results, Sections V and VI show the proofs, and Section VII offers concluding remarks.

II. BACKGROUND

Let J be a connected smooth manifold that is a subset of some Euclidean space and represents parameter space. Let P be a symmetric positive definite matrix, and define the inner product $\langle p, q \rangle_P = p^\top P q$, metric $d_p(p, q)^2 = \langle p - q, p - q \rangle_P$,

and norm $\|p\|_P^2 = \langle p, p \rangle_P$. For any $p \in J$ and $Q \subset J$, define the set distance $d_P(p, Q) = \inf_{q \in Q} d_P(p, q)$. Let $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ be Euclidean space and represent state space. Let $\{V_p\}_{p \in J}$ be a family of C^r vector fields over M for $r \geq 1$ which vary C^r continuously with parameter.¹ We can define a composite vector field V on $M \times J$ by $V(x, p) = (V_p(x), 0)$ and write $\dot{x} = V(x, p)$. Then V is C^r so it possesses a C^r flow ϕ , where $\phi_{(t,p)}(x)$ denotes the flow from the initial condition x at time t for parameter value p .

Consider a fixed $\hat{p} \in J$. For any $x \in M$ we say that x is nonwandering under $V_{\hat{p}}$ if for any open neighborhood U of x and any $T \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $t \in \mathbb{R}$ of the same sign as T with $|t| > T$ such that $\phi_{(t,\hat{p})}(U) \cap U \neq \emptyset$. Let $\Omega(V_{\hat{p}})$ denote the set of all nonwandering points of $V_{\hat{p}}$, and note that this includes all equilibria and periodic orbits of $V_{\hat{p}}$, as well as chaotic dynamics and other forms of recurrent behavior. Let a *critical element* $X_{\hat{p}}$ be either an equilibrium point or a periodic orbit of $V_{\hat{p}}$. An equilibrium point $X_{\hat{p}}$ of $V_{\hat{p}}$ is hyperbolic if its linearization $\frac{\partial V_{\hat{p}}(X_{\hat{p}}, \hat{p})}{\partial x}$ has no purely imaginary eigenvalues. A periodic orbit $X_{\hat{p}}$ of $V_{\hat{p}}$ is hyperbolic if there exists $x \in X_{\hat{p}}$ and a cross section S containing x such that the Poincare first return map $\tau : S \rightarrow S$ is well-defined and its linearization $\frac{d\tau(x)}{dx}$ has no eigenvalues of norm one. Every hyperbolic critical element $X_{\hat{p}}$ of $V_{\hat{p}}$ possesses a stable manifold $W^s(X_{\hat{p}})$ and an unstable manifold $W^u(X_{\hat{p}})$ where $W^s(X_{\hat{p}})$ ($W^u(X_{\hat{p}})$) consists of all initial conditions that converge to $X_{\hat{p}}$ in forwards (backwards) time. Furthermore, there exist local stable and unstable manifolds, denoted $W_{\text{loc}}^s(X_{\hat{p}})$ and $W_{\text{loc}}^u(X_{\hat{p}})$ and which are invariant in forwards and backwards time, respectively. Furthermore, for any hyperbolic critical element $X_{\hat{p}}$ of $V_{\hat{p}}$, for J sufficiently small and any $p \in J$ there exists a unique hyperbolic critical element X_p that is equal to $X_{\hat{p}}$ at $p = \hat{p}$, and such that X_p , $W_{\text{loc}}^s(X_p)$, and $W_{\text{loc}}^u(X_p)$ all vary C^r continuously with p . For any $J' \subset J$, define $X_{J'} = \cup_{p \in J'} X_p \times \{p\} \subset M \times J$. Define $W^s(X_{J'})$ and $W^u(X_{J'})$ analogously.

The notion of a generic property is meant to capture typical or expected behavior, such as if a vector field or parameter were chosen at random, and can be used to rule out undesirable pathological behavior. In a measure space, we say a property is generic if it holds for a set of full measure (i.e., its complement has measure zero). In a topological space, we say a property is generic if it holds for a countable intersection of open dense sets. In this paper, the topological notion of generic is used when referring to properties of vector fields (for which there is a natural topology, but no natural measure), and the measure space notion is used when referring to parameters (which lie in the smooth manifold J , where the notion of measure zero is well-defined).

For any set A in a topological space, let ∂A denote its topological boundary, and let \bar{A} denote its topological closure. For any sets A, B in a metric space with metric d , define the set distance $d(A, B)$ to be the infimum over $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ of $d(x, y)$. For any point x in a metric space and any $r > 0$, define $B_r(x)$ to be the open ball of radius r centered at x . For

¹In particular, they vary continuously with respect to the strong C^r topology (see [13] for a rigorous definition and further background).

any manifold A and $x \in A$, let $T_x A$ denote the tangent space to A at x . Two manifolds $A, B \subset M$ are transverse if for every $x \in A \cap B$, $T_x A + T_x B = T_x M$. For additional background in differential topology, including regular values, embedded submanifolds, tubular neighborhoods, and retractions, we refer the reader to [14, Chapters 4-6].

Suppose $p_0 \in J$ such that V_{p_0} possesses a hyperbolic stable equilibrium point (SEP) $X_{p_0}^s$. Then for J sufficiently small and any $p \in J$, there exists a unique hyperbolic SEP X_p^s near $X_{p_0}^s$. Note that for $p \in J$, $W^s(X_p^s)$ is the RoA of X_p^s , and $\partial W^s(X_p^s)$ is the RoA boundary.

We model a finite-time nonlinear parameter-dependent disturbance as a parameter-dependent post-disturbance initial condition (which we simply refer to as the initial condition) $y : J \rightarrow M$ given by $y_p := y(p)$. Then, the subsequent dynamics are given by the vector field V_p for each $p \in J$. For a parameter value $p \in J$, the system recovers from the disturbance if and only if $y_p \in W^s(X^s(p))$. Let the *recovery region* R be the set of parameter values in J for which the system recovers, and define the *recovery boundary* to be its topological boundary ∂R in J . For a fixed $p_0 \in R$, the distance $d(p_0, \partial R)$ is the recovery margin, and provides a quantitative measure of the margins for safe operation. Therefore, it is valuable to develop algorithms for finding points on the recovery boundary - often, the closest such point - in order to determine the safety margin.

Proposition 1 was proved in [15], [16], and states that under general assumptions satisfied by a large class of dynamical systems, and for sufficiently small J , the following holds. The RoA boundary in state space varies continuously with respect to parameter, and is equal to the union of the stable manifolds of the critical elements it contains. Every parameter value in the recovery boundary has corresponding initial condition which lies on the RoA boundary in state space, and therefore in the stable manifold of some critical element, which we call the controlling critical element. The unstable manifold of the controlling critical element intersects the RoA. This proposition provides an explicit link between the recovery boundary in parameter space and the RoA boundary in state space, which will be exploited for the design and theoretical guarantees of algorithms which compute points on the recovery boundary.

Proposition 1. [15, Theorem 4.17, Corollary 4.18, Theorem 4.21, Corollary 4.23] Assume there exists $p_0 \in J$ such that:

- (i) Every critical element in $\partial W^s(X_{p_0}^s)$ is hyperbolic.
- (ii) The intersections of the stable and unstable manifolds of the critical elements in $\partial W^s(X_{p_0}^s)$ are transverse.
- (iii) The intersection of $\partial W^s(X_{p_0}^s)$ with $\Omega(V_{p_0})$ consists of a finite union of critical elements $\{X_{p_0}^i\}_{i \in I}$.
- (iv) There exists a neighborhood of infinity which contains no nonwandering points of V_{p_0} and no orbits which diverge to infinity in both forwards and backwards time.
- (v) Additional generic assumptions.²

Then for J sufficiently small, $\partial W^s(X_p^s)$ varies continuously

with p ,³ $\partial W^s(X_p^s) = \bigcup_{i \in I} W^s(X_p^i)$, and for any $p^* \in \partial R$, $y_{p^*} \in \partial W^s(X_{p^*}^s)$. Then $y_{p^*} \in W^s(X_{p^*}^j)$ for a unique $j \in I$, we call $X_{p^*}^j$ the controlling critical element for p^* , and $W^u(X_{p^*}^j) \cap W^s(X_{p^*}^s) \neq \emptyset$.

Note that Assumptions (i), (ii), and (v) are generic, and it is generically true that $\Omega(V_{p_0})$ is equal to the closure of the union of the critical elements of V_{p_0} (compare to Assumption (iii)), so the conditions of Proposition 1 are very general and hold for a large class of realistic engineering system models.

As $\phi_{(t,p)}(y(p))$ gives the flow of the vector field V_p at time t starting from initial condition $y(p)$, as t varies from zero to infinity this traces out the system trajectory after the disturbance. Then $\frac{d\phi_{(t,p)}(y(p))}{dp}$ is the derivative of this flow with respect to parameter, and represents the sensitivity of the post-disturbance system trajectory with respect to parameter: the trajectory sensitivity. The trajectory sensitivities are a function of parameter p and time t . We note that trajectory sensitivities can be efficiently computed numerically as a byproduct of the underlying numerical integration of the system dynamics [12].

We will use local linearizations near an equilibrium point to analyze the behavior of the trajectory sensitivities. However, since trajectory sensitivities require a derivative of the flow, standard C^0 linearizations (such as that provided by the Hartman-Grobman Theorem) will not preserve the trajectory sensitivities in the local coordinates. Therefore, we will need to resort to smooth linearizations [17], which require an additional assumption: the strong Sternberg condition. We define an integer combination of order Q to be a linear combination with nonnegative integer coefficients where the sum of the coefficients is equal to Q . We say that a matrix N satisfies the strong Sternberg condition of order Q if (i) every integer combination of its eigenvalues of order between 2 and Q is not equal to any single eigenvalue, and (ii) the real part of every integer combination of its eigenvalues of order Q is not equal to the real part of any single eigenvalue. This is a mild non-resonance assumption. Define ρ^- to be the ratio of the maximum over the minimum of the absolute values of the real parts of the stable eigenvalues of N , and define ρ^+ analogously for the unstable eigenvalues. Then for any positive integer Q , the Q -smoothness of N is the largest integer $K \geq 0$ such that $Q = Q^+ + Q^-$ for $Q^+, Q^- \geq 0$ integers, $Q^+ \geq K\rho^+$, and $Q^- \geq K\rho^-$. Note that the Q -smoothness approaches infinity as Q does, so for Q sufficiently large it will be at least three. For any complex-valued matrix N , let $\|N\|_1 = \sum_{i,j} |N_{i,j}|$. Let $\text{diag}(A_1, \dots, A_n)$ refer to the block diagonal matrix with matrices A_1, \dots, A_n on the diagonal.


III. MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

To motivate the algorithms of this paper, we provide intuition from the simple power system model of a single machine infinite bus, which has the same structure as a nonlinear pendulum as follows

$$\dot{x}_1 = x_2$$

²The additional generic assumptions are that certain lower semicontinuous functions over J are continuous at p_0 (see [15, Theorem 4.17] for more details).

³The continuity is with respect to the Chabauty topology, which is an extension of the Hausdorff topology to (noncompact) Euclidean space.



(a) The recovery region, recovery boundary, safety margin, and three highlighted parameter values (open circles). (b) The post-disturbance initial conditions (open circles) and the RoA boundaries (dotted and dashed lines) corresponding by color to the highlighted parameter values in (a).

Fig. 1: Parameter space and state space for the example of Section III.

$$\dot{x}_2 = p_1 \sin(x_1) - 0.5x_2 + p_2$$

where p_1 and p_2 are parameters. The disturbance we consider is a temporary short circuit which is modeled by temporarily setting $p_1 = 0$ for a time of 0.8 seconds and then restoring p_1 to its prior value. We define the reciprocal trajectory sensitivity function G to be

$$G(p) = \inf_{t \geq 0} \left\| \frac{\partial \phi_{(t,p)}(y(p))}{\partial p} \right\|_1^{-1}.$$

Figure 1(a) shows the recovery region and recovery boundary⁴ in parameter space for this disturbance, and the safety margin for a nominal parameter value of $[p_1 \ p_2] = [1.9 \ 1.5]$. Figure 1(b) shows the (post-disturbance) initial condition and the RoA boundary of the SEP in state space for three parameter values shown in Figure 1(a). For the parameter values inside the recovery region, on the recovery boundary, and outside the recovery boundary, their initial conditions lie inside the RoA, on the RoA boundary, and outside the RoA boundary, respectively. Figure 2(a) shows a contour plot of G in parameter space. Note that G converges to zero exactly at the true recovery boundary.⁵ Figure 2(b) plots a representative trajectory sensitivity as a function of time for three parameter values shown in Figure 2(a). Note that the trajectory sensitivities grows large as parameter values approach the recovery boundary, providing intuition for the contour plot of G shown in Figure 2(a).


IV. MAIN RESULTS

A. Expressing Recovery Boundary via Trajectory Sensitivities

The recovery boundary ∂R is defined abstractly, is typically nonsmooth and nonconvex, and is usually intractable to compute or approximate accurately, especially in high dimensions. The first main result of this work is to provide an exact characterization of the recovery boundary in terms of trajectory sensitivities, which measure the derivative of the flow with

⁴In this simple example the recovery boundary is linear, but this is typically not the case for more complex systems.

⁵In this simple example G approaches zero monotonically as the recovery boundary is approached, but this is not always the case for more complex systems.



(a) Contour plot for the trajectory sensitivity function G and three highlighted parameter values. (b) The trajectory sensitivity of state x_1 with respect to parameter p_2 as a function of time for the highlighted parameter values in (a).

Fig. 2: Trajectory sensitivities for the example of Section III.

respect to parameters and can be efficiently computed numerically. This characterization will then be used to transform the abstract problem of finding points on the recovery boundary into a concrete formulation which can be solved using tractable and efficient numerical algorithms [11], [18], as discussed further in Section IV-B. Before presenting the main result of this section, several assumptions and definitions are required.

Assume the conditions of Proposition 1. Then for each $p^* \in \partial R$ there exists a controlling critical element $X^*(p^*)$ such that $y(p^*) \in W^s(X^*(p^*))$. All of the assumptions below are made for J sufficiently small; in other words, they are local assumptions in parameter space.

Assumption 1. By Proposition 1, $\partial W^s(X_J^s) = \bigcup_{i \in I} W^s(X_J^i)$. Assume that y_J is transverse to $W^s(X_J^i)$ for all $i \in I$.

Remark 1. Assumption 1 is generic because C^1 submanifolds are generically transverse [19, Theorem A.3.20].

Assumption 2. Assume that for each $p \in R$, there exists some time $t \geq 0$ such that $\frac{d\phi_{(t,p)}(y(p))}{dp} \neq 0$.

Remark 2. Assumption 2 implies that the parameter p has a nonzero effect on the flow, which is a very mild assumption.

Assumption 3. The vector field family $\{V_p\}_{p \in J}$ is strong C^3 continuous, each vector field V_p for $p \in J$ is C^∞ at each equilibrium point in $\overline{W}^s(X^s(p))$, and y is C^3 .

Remark 3. Assumption 3 is required to ensure the existence of a smooth local linearization (see Assumption 4) near equilibrium points. It is possible to relax the condition that each vector field be C^∞ at equilibria to C^Q for a particular finite Q , but for simplicity of presentation we focus on the C^∞ case. It may be possible in future work to relax the assumption of C^3 continuity to certain classes of piecewise smooth vector fields (see, e.g., [20]).

Assumption 4. For any $p \in \overline{R}$, if $p \in R$ let $X = X^s(p)$ and if $p \in \partial R$ let $X = X^*(p)$. Assume that the matrix $\frac{\partial V_p(X)}{\partial x}$ satisfies the strong Sternberg condition for Q with Q sufficiently large such that the Q -smoothness is at least three.

Remark 4. The strong Sternberg condition for Q of Assumption 4 is a non-resonance condition that will ensure the existence of a C^3 local linearization about the controlling critical element. Note that this is stronger than the C^0 local

linearization given by the Hartman-Grobman Theorem, and is required to ensure that the trajectory sensitivities in the local linear coordinates can be related to those of the original nonlinear system.

Assumption 5. For every $p^* \in \partial R$, if $W^s(X^*(p^*))$ has codimension one then $X^*(p^*)$ is an equilibrium point.

Remark 5. For many practical nonlinear systems including power systems, Assumption 5 is ubiquitous and has been observed through numerical experiments on a wide range of realistic models [21].

For any $p^* \in \partial R$ where $W^s(X^*(p^*))$ has codimension one, since by Assumption 5 $X^*(p^*)$ is an equilibrium point, this implies by hyperbolicity that the unstable manifold $W^u(X^*(p^*))$ is one dimensional.

Assumption 6. Let $p^* \in \partial R$ such that $W^s(X^*(p^*))$ has codimension one. We will define a function $f(t, p)$ that is equal to $g(p) \left\| \frac{d\phi_{(t,p)}(y(p))}{dp} \right\|_1$, where $g(p)$ is a particular scalar function, in the limit as $p \rightarrow p^*$. We will show that $f(t, p^*)$ attains a finite maximum over $t \geq 0$. Assume that this maximum is attained at a unique time \hat{t} .

Remark 6. Assumption 6 is required to ensure the trajectory sensitivities vary C^2 with parameter near ∂R . It could be relaxed to attaining the maximum at a finite number of times.

Define a function $H : [0, \infty) \times \bar{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by $H(t, p) = \left\| \frac{d\phi_{(t,p)}(y(p))}{dp} \right\|_1^{-1}$. Then $H(t, p)$ represents the reciprocal of the norm of the trajectory sensitivity at time t and for parameter value p . Define the function $G : \bar{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by $G(p) = \inf_{t \in [0, \infty)} H(t, p)$. Then G gives the infimum over time of the reciprocal of the norm of the trajectory sensitivity.

Intuitively, it is natural to expect that the flow would become infinitely sensitive to perturbations along the RoA boundary, and less sensitive from within the RoA. This would imply that the trajectory sensitivities would diverge to infinity along the RoA boundary and stay finite within the RoA, and that the reciprocal trajectory sensitivities would approach zero along the RoA boundary and stay positive within the RoA. By Proposition 1, $p^* \in \partial R$ implies that the initial condition $y(p^*)$ lies on the RoA boundary. Therefore, it seems intuitive that $p^* \in \partial R$ would imply that $G(p^*) = 0$, and that $p \in R$ would imply that $G(p) > 0$. Theorem 1 makes this intuition explicit, thus providing a characterization of \bar{R} in terms of the reciprocal trajectory sensitivities G . Furthermore, it shows that G is continuous so that $G(p)$ approaches zero as p approaches ∂R , motivating algorithms which find points on ∂R by solving for roots of G [11], [18]. It also shows that G extends to a C^2 function near ∂R , which is valuable for providing convergence guarantees for these algorithms, as presented in Section IV-B.

Theorem 1. Assume the conditions of Proposition 1 and Assumptions 1-6. Then G is finite, strictly positive, and continuous over R . For generic⁶ $p^* \in \partial R$, $G(p^*) = 0$, G is

⁶By Lemma 2, ∂R consists of a finite union of C^3 submanifolds. The generic assumption is that p^* belongs to a submanifold with codimension one.

continuous at p^* , and G extends to a C^2 function over an open neighborhood of p^* in J which is strictly negative outside of \bar{R} .

Remark 7. If all critical elements in the RoA boundary are equilibria, it can be shown that $G(p^*) = 0$ for all $p^* \in \partial R$, so that $\partial R = G^{-1}(0)$. We conjecture that the same holds even in the presence of periodic orbits in the RoA boundary.

B. Recovery Boundary Algorithms and Convergence Guarantees

Based on the characterization of the recovery boundary in terms of trajectory sensitivities from Theorem 1, we present algorithms that minimize inverse trajectory sensitivities to find points on the recovery boundary, and provide convergence guarantees for these algorithms. We note for use in these algorithms that for any $p \in R$, $G(p)$ and $DG(p)$ can be efficiently computed numerically from a single time domain simulation [11], [18]. The algorithms are organized based on the dimension of the parameter space J in which the points on the recovery boundary are computed, which is determined by the user based on their selection of the parameters of interest.

1) *Finding Recovery Boundary in One Dimensional Parameter Space:* When the parameter space J is one dimensional, a connected component of the recovery boundary consists of a single point. Therefore, in this setting our goal is to find a single point on the recovery boundary, i.e., $p^* \in \partial R$. To do so, motivated by Theorem 1 we wish to solve for p^* which satisfies $G(p^*) = 0$. To solve this nonlinear equation, we would like to apply Newton-Raphson, which results in the following update at each iteration s :

$$\tilde{F}(p^s) := p^s - DG(p^s)^{-1}G(p^s). \quad (1)$$

However, it is possible that for $p^s \in R$, $\tilde{F}(p^s) \notin R$. As the asymptotic behavior of the system is not known outside of R , where the system will not recover from the disturbance, and since G is not defined outside of \bar{R} , it is desirable to enforce that each iteration of the algorithm lies inside R . This is achieved with a backtracking line search performed by bisection which is defined formally as follows. Let $m \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$, \tilde{F} be as in (1), and define

$$\begin{aligned} F_m(p^s) &= p^s + \frac{1}{2^m} (\tilde{F}(p^s) - p^s) \\ m(p^s) &= \min\{m \in \{0, 1, \dots\} : F_m(p^s) \in R\} \\ p^{s+1} &= F(p^s) := F_{m(p^s)}(p^s). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

As $R = \{p : G(p) > 0\}$ is open by continuity of G , for any $p^s \in R$, $m(p^s)$ is finite. Thus, $p^{s+1} \in R$ so R is forward invariant under this algorithm.

Theorem 2 provides convergence guarantees for finding a point on the recovery boundary in one dimensional parameter space using the algorithm defined by (2) with \tilde{F} as in (1).

Theorem 2. Assume the conditions of Theorem 1 and an additional generic assumption.⁷ Then there exists an open neighborhood N of ∂R such that for $p_0 \in N$, the sequence

⁷The generic assumption is that zero is a regular value of the C^2 function \tilde{G} .

$\{p^s\}_{s=1}^{\infty}$ starting from $p^1 = p_0$ and defined by the algorithm (2) with \tilde{F} as given by (1) is well-defined and converges to a unique $p^* \in \partial R$.

2) *Tracing Recovery Boundary in Two Dimensional Parameter Space:* When the parameter space J is two dimensional, by the proof of Theorem 1 (in particular, Lemma 2) the recovery boundary consists of a finite union of one dimensional manifolds (i.e., smooth curves). Therefore, in this setting our goal is to numerically trace the recovery boundary by generating a sequence of points along it. To do so, we use a predictor-corrector algorithm [11] which alternates between predictor steps, which start from a point on ∂R and move along the tangent to ∂R to find a predicted point, and corrector steps, which project onto a point in the intersection of ∂R with the hyperplane containing the predicted point and orthogonal to that tangent. More formally, for $\hat{p} \in \partial R$ the predicted point is given by

$$p^{pred}(p) = \hat{p} + \kappa\eta(p) \quad (3)$$

where $\kappa > 0$ and $\eta(p)$ is the tangent to ∂R at p . Next, the hyperplane for the correction step is equal to the set of $p \in J$ that satisfy

$$(p - p^{pred}(p))^\top (p^{pred}(p) - \hat{p}) = 0$$

which is equivalent by (3) to

$$(p - \hat{p})^\top \eta(p) - \kappa = 0,$$

so let H_κ denote this hyperplane. Thus, to find a point in the intersection of H_κ and $G^{-1}(0)$, it suffices to solve

$$f(p) := \begin{bmatrix} G(p) \\ (p - \hat{p})^\top \eta(p) - \kappa \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

To solve these nonlinear equations, we use the following Newton-Raphson update at each iteration s :

$$\tilde{F}(p^s) := p^s - Df(p^s)^{-1} f(p^s) \quad (4)$$

together with the backtracking line search of (2) so that R is forward invariant under this algorithm. If $p^{pred}(\hat{p}) \in R$ then we set $p^1 = p^{pred}(\hat{p})$. Otherwise, observing that H_κ is a line in J , we perform a line search using, for example, the bisection or golden section search methods, to find $p^1 \in H_\kappa \cap R$.

Theorem 3 provides convergence guarantees for finding the next point on the recovery boundary from the current point using the algorithm defined by (2) with \tilde{F} as in (4). Repeated application of this theorem therefore guarantees that this algorithm will numerically trace a sequence of points along the recovery boundary, and can approximate the recovery boundary to arbitrary accuracy as the step size $\kappa \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 3. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 1 and an additional generic assumption.⁸ Then for generic $\hat{p} \in \partial R$ there exists $r > 0$ such that for generic $\kappa \in (0, r)$, the sequence $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^{\infty}$ starting from $p^1 \in H_\kappa \cap R$ and defined by the algorithm (2) with \tilde{F} as given by (4) is well-defined and converges to a unique $p^* \in \partial R \cap H_\kappa$.*

⁸The generic assumption is that zero is a regular value of the C^2 function \tilde{G} .

3) *Closest Point on Recovery Boundary in Arbitrary Dimensional Parameter Space:* For parameter space J of high dimension, it is no longer feasible to numerically trace the recovery boundary. Instead, our goal in this setting is to find the closest point on the recovery boundary to some initial parameter value $p_0 \in J$, which provides a quantitative measure of the margins for safe operation. Therefore, we wish to solve the following (abstract) optimization problem for some $p_0 \in J$ and P symmetric positive definite:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_p \quad & \frac{1}{2}(p - p_0)^\top P(p - p_0) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & p \in \partial R. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Note that the choice of P determines the metric for measuring distance in parameter space (e.g., $P = I$ results in the Euclidean metric). This is a very challenging problem to solve, because efficient computational methods for identifying the constraint set ∂R are not known, especially in higher dimensional parameter spaces, and ∂R is in general nonconvex and nonsmooth. However, Theorem 1 allows us to transform the abstract problem of (5) into the following concrete optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_p \quad & \frac{1}{2}(p - p_0)^\top P(p - p_0) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & G(p) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Unfortunately, in general (6) may not be feasible, there may be many - possibly infinite - solutions, and the solution(s) may vary discontinuously with the initial parameter value p_0 . These imply that there may not exist a unique closest point on the recovery boundary for every p_0 and, even if there does, that it may experience discrete jumps as p_0 varies. These present serious potential challenges for numerical algorithms which aim to solve (6).

Fortunately, Theorem 4 shows that for generic p_0 sufficiently close to the recovery boundary, p_0 has a unique closest point on the recovery boundary that varies smoothly with respect to p_0 . This ensures that (6) is a well-posed and well-behaved problem, as it has a unique solution which varies smoothly with p_0 , which will be crucial for proving convergence of the main algorithm of this section.

Theorem 4. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 1. Then there exists an open neighborhood N of ∂R such that for generic $p_0 \in N$ there exists a unique solution to (6), and that this solution varies C^3 with initial parameter value p_0 .*

As our goal is to solve (6) numerically, as with any numerical optimization problem we can only require that the equality constraints (in this case, $G(p) = 0$) be satisfied up to some finite tolerance $\epsilon > 0$. In the following we explicitly introduce this tolerance ϵ for use in the convergence analysis. This leads to the following numerical optimization variation of (6):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{p,x} \quad & \frac{1}{2}(p - p_0)^\top P(p - p_0) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & G(p) = x \\ & |x| \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We will show (in Lemma 5 below) that the solution to this optimization problem is given by the following optimization:⁹

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{p,s} \quad & \frac{1}{2}(p - p_0)^\top P(p - p_0) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & G(p) = \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

To solve (8) we consider the sequential quadratic programming algorithm employed in [11] which solves the following quadratic program at each iteration s obtained by linearizing the nonconvex constraint $G(p) = \epsilon$ from (8):

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}(p^s) := \arg \min_p \quad & \frac{1}{2}(p - p_0)^\top P(p - p_0) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & G(p^s) + DG(p^s)^\top(p - p^s) = \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We combine (9) with the backtracking line search of (2) so that R is forward invariant under this algorithm.

Theorem 5 provides convergence guarantees for finding the closest point on the recovery boundary from an initial parameter value p_0 using the algorithm defined by (2) with \tilde{F} given by (9).

Theorem 5. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 1. Then there exists an open neighborhood N of ∂R such that for generic $p_0 \in N$ there exists a unique solution \hat{p} to (6) and the following holds. Under an additional generic assumption,¹⁰ for any $\epsilon \in (0, G(p_0))$ there exists a unique solution p^* to (8) and the sequence $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ starting from $p^1 = p_0$ and defined by the algorithm (2) with \tilde{F} as given by (9) is well-defined and converges to p^* .*

V. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

This section contains the proof of Theorem 1. Before providing it, however, a number of technical lemmas are required. Lemma 1 will establish the first claim of Theorem 1.

Lemma 1. *G is well-defined, positive, and continuous on R .*

Proof of Lemma 1. Define the functions $\mathcal{F} : [0, \infty) \times \bar{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by $\mathcal{F}(t, p) = \left\| \frac{d\phi_{(t,p)}(y(p))}{dp} \right\|_1$ and $F : \bar{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by $F(p) = \sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \mathcal{F}(t, p)$. Then $G = \frac{1}{F}$, so to prove the claim it suffices to show that F is positive, finite, and continuous over R . Fix $\hat{p} \in R$. First we show that F is positive over R . As \hat{p} is arbitrary, it suffices to show that $F(\hat{p}) > 0$. By Assumption 2, there exists some time $t \geq 0$ such that $\frac{d\phi_{(t,\hat{p})}(y(\hat{p}))}{dp} \neq 0$. This implies that $\mathcal{F}(t, \hat{p}) > 0$, so $F(\hat{p}) \geq \mathcal{F}(t, \hat{p}) > 0$.

By Assumption 4 and [17, Theorem 7], there exists a neighborhood N of $X^s(\hat{p})$, a neighborhood J' of \hat{p} in J , and a C^3 conjugacy $h : N \times J' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ known as a smooth linearization such that for $p \in J'$, $X^s(p) \in N$ and the vector field V_p is conjugate by h to a linear vector field in \mathbb{R}^n . In particular, in these coordinates the vector field V_p has the form $V_p(x) = A_s(p)x$ where $A_s(p)$ is a C^3 matrix such that $\|e^{A_s(p)}\| < 1$ for all $p \in J'$. As $y(\hat{p}) \in W^s(X^s(\hat{p}))$, there exists $t' > 0$ such that $\phi_{(t',\hat{p})}(y(\hat{p})) \in N$. Shrink

⁹The only exception is the trivial special case where $|G(p_0)| \leq \epsilon$, in which case the solution is $p^* = p_0$. This case is not of practical concern.

¹⁰The additional generic assumption is that \hat{p} lies in a set of full measure in ∂R and zero is a regular value of the C^2 function \tilde{G} .

J' if necessary so that $\phi_{(t',p)}(y(p)) \in N$ for all $p \in J'$, and let $\hat{y}(p) = \phi_{(t',p)}(y(p))$. Then the dynamics in these coordinates are given by the flow $\psi_{(t,p)}(\hat{y}(p)) = e^{A_s(p)t}\hat{y}(p)$. There exist invertible matrices $W(p)$, and block diagonal matrices $J(p) = \text{diag}(J_1(p), \dots, J_m(p))$ where each $J_i(p)$ is an elementary Jordan block of size n_i with eigenvalue $\lambda_i(p)$, such that $A_s(p) = W(p)J(p)W(p)^{-1}$. Define

$$N_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & t & \dots & \frac{t^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & \ddots & t \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad E(p) = \text{diag}(e^{\lambda_1 t} N_{n_1}, \dots, e^{\lambda_n t} N_{n_m}), \quad \Lambda(p) = \text{diag}(\lambda_1 I_{n_1}, \dots, \lambda_m I_{n_m}), \quad \frac{d\Lambda(p)}{dp} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \Lambda(p)}{\partial p_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial \Lambda(p)}{\partial p_{\dim J}} \end{bmatrix},$$

and $\frac{dW(p)}{dp} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial W(p)}{\partial p_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial W(p)}{\partial p_{\dim J}} \end{bmatrix}$. Although in general $W(p)$ and $\Lambda(p)$ may not be C^1 everywhere (in fact, W may not even be C^0), as the flow ψ is at least C^1 the above expression for $\frac{d\psi_{(t,p)}(\hat{y}(p))}{dp}$ is well-defined and continuous. As $A_s(p)$ is Hurwitz, and hence the eigenvalues $\Lambda(p)$ are stable, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d\psi_{(t,p)}(\hat{y}(p))}{dp} = 0$.

We have that $\phi_{(t+t',p)}(y(p)) = h^{-1} \circ \psi_{(t,p)}(\hat{y}(p))$. Let $x(t, p) = \psi_{(t,p)}(\hat{y}(p))$. Then this implies that $\frac{d\phi_{(t+t',p)}(y(p))}{dp} = \frac{\partial h^{-1}(x(t,p), p)}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial h^{-1}(x(t,p), p)}{\partial x} \frac{d\psi_{(t,p)}(\hat{y}(p))}{dp}$.

As $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \psi(t, \hat{p}) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d\psi_{(t,\hat{p})}(\hat{y}(\hat{p}))}{dp} = 0$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d\phi_{(t+t',\hat{p})}(y(\hat{p}))}{dp} = \frac{\partial h^{-1}(0, \hat{p})}{\partial p} = \frac{dX^s(\hat{p})}{dp}$, which is finite since X^s is (at least) C^1 in p , so $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(t' + t, \hat{p})$ exists and is finite. As $[0, t']$ is compact, $\mathcal{F}(t, \hat{p})$ achieves a finite maximum c_m over $t \in [0, t']$. Thus, either $F(\hat{p}) = c_m$ or $F(\hat{p}) = \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{F}(t' + t, \hat{p})$ which is finite, so $F(\hat{p})$ is finite.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. As h is a diffeomorphism, the derivatives of h^{-1} are continuous. Therefore, there exist $\delta, \delta' > 0$ such that $\|x\|_1 < \delta$ and $p \in B_{\delta'}(\hat{p})$ implies that $\left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(x,p)}{\partial p} - \frac{\partial h^{-1}(0,\hat{p})}{\partial p} \right\|_1 < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$. As $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \psi(t, \hat{p}) = 0$, there exists $T > 0$ such that $t \geq T$ implies $\|\psi(t, \hat{p})\|_1 < \delta$. By continuity of $\psi(T, \hat{p})$, and since $\|\psi(t, p)\|_1$ is monotonically decreasing in t for any $p \in J'$, shrinking δ' if necessary implies that for $p \in B_{\delta'}(\hat{p})$ and $t \geq T$, $\|\psi(t, p)\|_1 < \delta$. As $\frac{\partial h^{-1}(x,p)}{\partial x}$ is continuous and $B := \bar{B}_\delta(0) \times \bar{B}_{\delta'}(\hat{p})$ is compact, there exists $c_m > 0$ finite such that the maximum of $\left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(x,p)}{\partial x} \right\|_1$ over B is equal to c_m . Furthermore, as $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d\psi_{(t,p)}}{dp} = 0$ and $A_s(p)$ and its eigenvalues are continuous, increasing T and shrinking δ' if necessary implies that for $t \geq T$ and $p \in B_{\delta'}(\hat{p})$, $\left\| \frac{d\psi_{(t,p)}}{dp} \right\|_1 < \frac{\epsilon}{4c_m n^3}$ where n is the dimension of x . Thus, for any $t \geq T$ and $p \in B_{\delta'}(\hat{p})$,¹¹

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{d\phi(t,p)}{dp} - \frac{d\phi(t,\hat{p})}{dp} \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t,p), p)}{\partial p} - \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t,\hat{p}), \hat{p})}{\partial p} \right\|_1 \\ & \quad + \left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t,p), p)}{\partial x} \frac{d\psi(t,p)}{dp} - \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t,\hat{p}), \hat{p})}{\partial x} \frac{d\psi(t,\hat{p})}{dp} \right\|_1 \end{aligned}$$

¹¹It is straightforward to verify that for matrices A and B , $\|AB\|_1 \leq n^3 \|A\|_1 \|B\|_1$ since $|(AB)_{ij}| \leq \|A\|_1 \|B\|_1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t, p), p)}{\partial p} - \frac{\partial h^{-1}(0, \hat{p})}{\partial p} \right\|_1 \\
&+ \left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(0, \hat{p})}{\partial p} - \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t, \hat{p}), \hat{p})}{\partial p} \right\|_1 \\
&+ \left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t, p), p)}{\partial x} \frac{d\psi(t, p)}{dp} \right\|_1 \\
&+ \left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t, \hat{p}), \hat{p})}{\partial x} \frac{d\psi(t, \hat{p})}{dp} \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} + n^3 \left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t, p))}{\partial x} \right\|_1 \left\| \frac{d\psi(t, p)}{dp} \right\|_1 \\
&+ n^3 \left\| \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi(t, \hat{p}))}{\partial x} \right\|_1 \left\| \frac{d\psi(t, \hat{p})}{dp} \right\|_1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} = \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, as $[0, T]$ is compact and $\frac{d\phi(t, p)}{dp}$ is continuous, shrinking δ' further if necessary implies that for $t \in [0, T]$ and $p \in B_{\delta'}(\hat{p})$, $\left\| \frac{d\phi(t, p)}{dp} - \frac{d\phi(t, \hat{p})}{dp} \right\|_1 \leq \epsilon$. Thus, for any $p \in B_{\delta'}(\hat{p})$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{d\phi(t, p)}{dp} \right\|_1 &\leq \left\| \frac{d\phi(t, p)}{dp} - \frac{d\phi(t, \hat{p})}{dp} \right\|_1 + \left\| \frac{d\phi(t, \hat{p})}{dp} \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{d\phi(t, \hat{p})}{dp} \right\|_1 + \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over time implies

$$F(p) = \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\| \frac{d\phi(t, p)}{dp} \right\|_1 \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\| \frac{d\phi(t, \hat{p})}{dp} \right\|_1 + \epsilon = F(\hat{p}) + \epsilon.$$

By an analogous argument, reversing the roles of p and \hat{p} we have $F(\hat{p}) \leq F(p) + \epsilon$. Thus, $p \in B_{\delta'}(\hat{p})$ implies $|F(p) - F(\hat{p})| \leq \epsilon$, so F is continuous at \hat{p} . Therefore, as $\hat{p} \in R$ was arbitrary, F is positive, finite, and continuous over R . \square

Lemma 2. ∂R consists of a finite union of C^3 embedded submanifolds.

Proof of Lemma 2. By Assumption 1, y_J is transverse to $W^s(X_j^i)$ for all $i \in I$. Therefore, $M_i = y_J \cap W^s(X_j^i)$ is a C^3 embedded submanifold with codimension equal to the sum of the codimensions of y_J and $W^s(X_j^i)$ in $M \times J$. In particular, the dimension of M_i is less than the dimension of y_J , which is equal to the dimension of J . As $y_J = \text{graph } y$, $y : J \rightarrow y_J$ is a C^3 diffeomorphism onto its image with inverse $y^{-1} = \pi_J|_{y_J}$ the projection that sends $(x, p) \rightarrow p$. Thus, $\pi_J|_{y_J}$ is a C^3 diffeomorphism onto its image, so since $M_i \subset y_J$, its restriction $\pi_J|_{M_i}$ is a C^3 embedding into J . Thus, $\pi_J(M_i) = \pi_J|_{M_i}(M_i)$ is a C^3 embedded submanifold in J for each $i \in I$. However, by Proposition 1 we have $\partial R = \pi_J(y_J \cap \partial W^s(X_j^i)) = \pi_J(y_J \cap \cup_{i \in I} W^s(X_j^i)) = \cup_{i \in I} \pi_J(M_i)$ so ∂R consists of a finite union of C^3 embedded submanifolds in J . Moreover, for any $p^* \in \partial R$ there exists a unique critical element $X^{i^*}(p^*)$ such that $y(p^*) \in W^s(X^{i^*}(p^*))$. Then we have that $p^* \in M_{i^*} = \pi_J(y_J \cap W^s(X_j^{i^*}))$. \square

Lemma 3. For any $p^* \in \partial R$, by Proposition 1 $y(p^*) \in W^s(X^*(p^*))$ for some critical element X^* . Then for $p^* \in \partial R$ almost everywhere, $W^s(X^*(p^*))$ has codimension one.

Proof of Lemma 3. By Lemma 2 and its proof, $\partial R = \cup_{i \in I} M_i$, where each M_i is a C^3 embedded submanifold in J




Fig. 3: Local coordinates for the proof of Theorem 1.

with codimension equal to the codimension of $W^s(X^i(p^*))$ for each $p^* \in M_i$. Note that no M_i can have codimension zero, since this would contradict that $M_i \subset \partial R$. As R is open and not dense in J , by [22, Corollary 2] there must exist at least one i^* such that M_{i^*} has codimension one. Therefore, ∂R has positive Lebesgue measure in $(\dim J - 1)$ dimensions. Furthermore, for each M_i which corresponds to $W^s(X^i(p^*))$ for $p^* \in M_i$ with codimension greater than one, that M_i also has codimension greater than one and, therefore, zero Lebesgue measure in $(\dim J - 1)$ dimensions. Hence, the set of $p^* \in \partial R$ such that $W^s(X^*(p^*))$ has codimension greater than one is equal to the finite union of the M_i which each have codimension greater than one, and therefore has zero Lebesgue measure in $(\dim J - 1)$ dimensions. Thus, for $p^* \in \partial R$ almost everywhere, $W^s(X^*(p^*))$ has codimension one. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $p^* \in \partial R$. Then $y(p^*) \in W^s(X^*(p^*))$ for some critical element $X^*(p^*)$. Assume that $W^s(X^*(p^*))$ has codimension one, which is true almost always by Lemma 3. By Assumption 5, X^* is an equilibrium point. By Assumption 4 and [17, Theorem 7], there exists a neighborhood N of $X^*(p^*)$, a neighborhood J' of p^* in J , and a C^3 conjugacy $h : N \times J' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ known as a smooth linearization such that for $p \in J'$, $X^*(p) \in N$ and the vector field V_p is conjugate by h to a linear vector field in \mathbb{R}^n . Shrinking N and J' if necessary, there exist local coordinates on N as constructed in [23, p. 81] which straighten out the stable and unstable manifolds of a hyperbolic equilibrium point so that they are orthogonal linear subspaces of the local coordinates. With an abuse of notation, let h denote the composition of the smooth linearization h with these local coordinates. Figure 3 illustrates the coordinate systems and notation used in this proof. Under the local conjugacy h , V_p becomes linear and decomposable into orthogonal eigenspaces representing the (straightened out) stable and unstable eigenspaces of the linearization of V_p at $X^*(p)$. In particular, in these coordinates V_p has the form $V_p(x) = \begin{bmatrix} A_u(p) & 0 \\ 0 & A_s(p) \end{bmatrix}$ where $A_u(p)$ and $A_s(p)$ are C^3 matrices such that $e^{A_u(p)} > 1$ (since by Assumption 5 the unstable manifold of $X^*(p)$ is one dimensional) and $\|e^{A_s(p)}\| < 1$ for all $p \in J'$. Let π_u and π_s denote projection onto the unstable and stable manifolds (which are also eigenspaces) of the equilibrium point in these coordinates. As $y(p^*) \in W^s(X^*(p^*))$ and $X^*(p^*) \in N$,

there exists $t' > 0$ such that $\phi_{(t', p^*)}(y(p^*)) \in N$. Let $\hat{y}(p) = h \circ \phi_{(t', p)}(y(p))$. By continuity of the flow and $y(p)$, shrinking J' if necessary implies that for $p \in J'$, $\hat{y}(p)$ is well-defined and C^3 . Let $x_u(p) = \pi_u \hat{y}(p)$ and $x_s(p) = \pi_s \hat{y}(p)$ for $p \in J'$. Then the dynamics in these coordinates are given by (where we let ψ denote the flow in this coordinate system) $\psi_{(t, p)}(\hat{y}(p)) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{A_u(p)t} x_u(p) \\ e^{A_s(p)t} x_s(p) \end{bmatrix}$. Assume that $A_s(p^*)$ has distinct eigenvalues, which is generically true. As this is an open condition, shrinking J if necessary implies that $A_s(p)$ is diagonalizable for all $p \in J$. Thus, we can write $A_s(p) = W(p)\Lambda(p)W(p)^{-1}$ where $\Lambda(p)$ is diagonal and $W(p)$ is invertible. Note that by the implicit function theorem, and since the eigenvalues are distinct, $\Lambda(p)$ and $V(p)$ are (at least) C^3 over J . Define $\frac{dW(p)}{dp} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial W(p)}{\partial p_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial W(p)}{\partial p_{\dim J}} \end{bmatrix}$ and $\frac{d\Lambda(p)}{dp} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \Lambda(p)}{\partial p_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial \Lambda(p)}{\partial p_{\dim J}} \end{bmatrix}$. Then the derivative of the flow with respect to p is given by the following, where we omit the dependence on p for brevity

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\psi_{(t, p)}(\hat{y}(p))}{dp} &= \begin{bmatrix} t e^{A_u t} \frac{dA_u}{dp} x_u + e^{A_u t} \frac{dx_u}{dp} \\ \frac{dW}{dp} (I \otimes W^{-1} e^{A_s t} x_s) \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ e^{A_s t} \left(\left(t W \frac{d\Lambda}{dp} - \frac{dW}{dp} \right) (I \otimes W^{-1} x_s) + \frac{dx_s}{dp} \right) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

As $\phi_{(t', p)}(y(p^*)) \in W^s(X^*(p^*)) \cap N$ and $h(W^s(X^*(p^*)) \cap N) = \{x : \pi_u x = 0\}$, $x_u(p^*) = 0$. Note that, by Assumption 1, $\frac{dx_u(p^*)}{dp} \neq 0$ since otherwise $y(J)$ would not be transversal to $W^s(X^s(p^*))$ at p^* . Then evaluating (10) at p^* implies $\pi_u \frac{d\psi_{(t, p^*)}(\hat{y}(p^*))}{dp} = e^{A_u(p^*)t} \frac{dx_u(p^*)}{dp}$ since $x_u(p^*) = 0$. Thus, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \pi_u \frac{d\psi_{(t, p^*)}(\hat{y}(p^*))}{dp} = \infty \frac{dx_u(p^*)}{dp}$ since $\frac{dx_u(p^*)}{dp} \neq 0$ and $A_u(p^*)$ is an unstable eigenvalue. Assume that $\frac{dx_u(p^*)}{dp}$ is nonzero in each entry, which is generically true. The flow in the original coordinates is given by $\phi_{(t'+t, p)}(y(p)) = h(\cdot, p)^{-1} \circ \psi_{(t, p)}(\hat{y}(p))$. Taking a derivative with respect to p yields $\frac{d\phi_{(t'+t, p)}(y(p))}{dp} = \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi_{(t, p)}(\hat{y}(p)), p)}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\psi_{(t, p)}(\hat{y}(p)), p)}{\partial x} \frac{d\psi_{(t, p)}(\hat{y}(p))}{dp}$. As h is a diffeomorphism, $\frac{\partial h^{-1}}{\partial x}$ is full rank everywhere. Thus, by (10), at $p = p^*$ we have $\sup_{t \geq 0} \left\| \frac{d\phi_{(t'+t, p)}(y(p))}{dp} \right\|_1 = \infty$, which implies that $G(p^*) = 0$. For any $p \in R \cap J'$, $x_u(p) \neq 0$ since otherwise $\hat{y}(p)$ would lie in the stable manifold of $X^*(p)$, which it cannot by definition of R . Without loss of generality, suppose $x_u(p) > 0$, and fix a constant $c_u > 0$. For $p \in R \cap J'$, let $t(p)$ denote the time that $\pi_u \psi_{(t(p), p)}(\hat{y}(p)) = c_u$. Then solving for $t(p)$ yields $t(p) = \frac{1}{A_u(p)} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u(p)}$.

As $p^* \in \partial R$, by Lemma 2 and its proof there exists a C^3 embedded submanifold \hat{M} in J with codimension one such that $p^* \in \hat{M}$. As \hat{M} is an embedded submanifold, there exists a local slice chart centered at p^* : i.e. local coordinates in J such that the intersection of \hat{M} with this coordinate neighborhood is equal to $\mathbb{R}^{\dim J - 1} \times \{0\}$. Shrink J' if necessary so that J' is contained in the neighborhood of these slice chart coordinates. As $\hat{M} \subset \partial R$, without loss of generality we may assume that in this slice chart any point (p, s) with $s < 0$ lies in R , and any point (p, s) with $s > 0$ lies outside of \bar{R} . In this slice chart, abuse notation to represent p^* as $(p^*, 0)$ and let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \bar{R}$

be represented by $\gamma(s) = (p^*, s - 1)$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. Then $\gamma(s) \in R$ for all $s \in [0, 1)$ and $\gamma(1) = p^*$. Also, $\gamma'(1) = (0, 1) \neq 0$, so γ is transverse to \bar{M} , and thus to ∂R , at p^* .

For $p \in \gamma$, say $p = \gamma(s)$, define $\hat{y}'(\gamma'(s)) = d(\hat{y} \circ \gamma)_s$. Define $\hat{y}''(\gamma''(s))$ and $\hat{y}'''(\gamma'''(s))$ analogously for the second and third derivatives, which exist and are continuous since y is C^3 . For the remainder of the proof, let $x_u(s) = \pi_u \hat{y}(\gamma(s))$, $x_s(s) = \pi_s \hat{y}(\gamma(s))$, and define $x'_u(s)$, $x'_s(s)$, $x''_u(s)$, $x''_s(s)$, $x'''_u(s)$, and $x'''_s(s)$ analogously by composing the i th derivative of \hat{y} with π_u or π_s for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, respectively. By Assumption 1, $x'_u(\gamma'(1)) \neq 0$ since otherwise $y(J)$ would not be transversal to $W^s(X^s(p^*))$ at p^* . As $y(J)$ is transverse to $W^s(X^*(J))$ by Assumption 1 and h is C^3 , $\hat{y}(J)$ is transverse to $W^s(X^*(J))$ in the coordinates of h . This implies that $\pi_u d(\hat{y})_{p^*}$ is full rank (i.e. nonzero). So, since $\gamma'(1) \neq 0$, $x'_u(\gamma'(1)) = \pi_u d(\hat{y})_{p^*}(\gamma'(1)) \neq 0$. For brevity we often omit the dependence on s . For $p \in \gamma \cap R \cap J'$, say $p = \gamma(s)$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(p) &:= \frac{d\psi_{(t, p)}(\hat{y}(p))}{dp} \Big|_{t=t(p)} = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_u \Phi(p) \\ \pi_s \Phi(p) \end{bmatrix} \\ \Phi(s) &:= \Phi(\gamma(s)) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{c_u}{A_u} \frac{dA_u}{dp} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + \frac{dx_u}{dp} \frac{c_u}{x_u} \\ \frac{dW}{dp} \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{\frac{A_s}{A_u} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} x_s \right) \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ e^{\frac{A_s}{A_u} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(\left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} W \frac{d\Lambda}{dp} - \frac{dW}{dp} \right) (I \otimes W^{-1} x_s) + \frac{dx_s}{dp} \right) \end{bmatrix} \\ &=: \begin{bmatrix} B_1(s) \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + B_2(s) \frac{1}{x_u} \\ B_4(s) \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{B_3(s) A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} x_s \right) \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ e^{B_3(s) A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} B_5(s) + B_6(s) \right) \end{bmatrix} \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

where it is straightforward to verify that $B_1(s)$, $B_2(s)$, $B_3(s)$, $B_4(s)$, $B_5(s)$, and $B_6(s)$ are C^2 . Note $B_3(s)A_s(s) = \frac{A_s(s)}{A_u(s)}$ is Hurwitz since $A_s(s)$ is Hurwitz and $A_u(s) > 0$. For the following, we omit the explicit dependence on s and indicate derivatives with respect to s using primes. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_s \Phi'(s) &= B'_4 \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} x_s \right) \\ &+ B_4 \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(x'_s + \left(-W' \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. + W \left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} (\Lambda' B_3 + \Lambda B'_3) - \Lambda B_3 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} \right) \right) W^{-1} x_s \right) \right) \\ &+ \left(W' W^{-1} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} + e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(W \left(-\Lambda B_3 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. + \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} (\Lambda' B_3 + \Lambda B'_3) \right) - W' \right) W^{-1} \right) \left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} B_5 + B_6 \right) \\ &+ e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} B'_5 - B_5 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B'_6 \right) \\ &=: B'_4 \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} x_s \right) \\ &+ B_4 \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(B_7 \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + B_8 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B_9 \right) \right) \\ &+ \left(e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(B_{11} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + B_{12} \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B_{13} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + B_{10} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \right) \left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} B_5 + B_6 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} B'_5 - B_5 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B'_6 \right) \quad (12)$$

where it is straightforward to verify that $B_7(s), B_8(s), B_9(s), B_{10}(s), B_{11}(s), B_{12}(s)$, and $B_{13}(s)$ are C^1 . We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_s \Phi''(s) &= B_4'' \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} x_s \right) \\ &+ 2B_4' \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(B_7 \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + B_8 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B_9 \right) \right) \\ &+ B_4 \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(W \left((\Lambda' B_3 + \Lambda B'_3) \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. - \Lambda B_3 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} \right) - W' \right) W^{-1} \left(B_7 \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + B_8 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B_9 \right) \right) \\ &+ B_4 \left(I \otimes W^{-1} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(B'_7 \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} - B_7 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B'_8 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + B_8 \frac{x''_u x_u - (x'_u)^2}{x_u^2} + B'_9 \right) \right) \\ &+ \left(\left(e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(B_{11} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + B_{12} \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B_{13} \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + B_{10} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(B_{11} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + B_{12} \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B_{13} \right) \right) \right) \quad (13) \\ &+ e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(B'_{11} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} - B_{11} \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B'_{12} \frac{x'_u}{x_u} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + B_{12} \frac{x''_u x_u - (x'_u)^2}{x_u^2} + B'_{13} \right) + B'_{10} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \\ &+ B_{10} \left(B_{10} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} + e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(B_{11} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + B_{12} \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B_{13} \right) \right) \left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} B_5 + B_6 \right) \\ &+ 2 \left(e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(B_{11} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + B_{12} \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B_{13} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + B_{10} e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \right) \left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} B'_5 - B_5 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} + B'_6 \right) \\ &+ e^{B_3 A_s \log \frac{c_u}{x_u}} \left(\log \frac{c_u}{x_u} B'_5 - B_5 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} - B'_5 \frac{x'_u}{x_u} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - B_5 \frac{x''_u x_u - (x'_u)^2}{x_u^2} + B'_6 \right) \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

We compute

$$\pi_u \Phi'(s) = B'_1 \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + (B'_2 - B_1 x'_u) \frac{1}{x_u} - B_2 x'_u \frac{1}{x_u^2} \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_u \Phi''(s) &= B''_1 \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} + (B''_2 - 2B'_1 x'_u - B_1 x''_u) \frac{1}{x_u} \\ &+ (B_1 (x'_u)^2 - 2B'_2 x'_u - B_2 x''_u) \frac{1}{x_u^2} + 2B_2 (x'_u)^2 \frac{1}{x_u^3} \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

Let $x(p) = \psi_{(t(p), p)}(\hat{y}(p))$ for $p \in J' \cap R$. We can write $\phi_{(t, p)}(x(p)) = \phi_{(t, p)} \circ h(\cdot, p)^{-1} \circ \psi_{(t(p), p)}(\hat{y}(p))$. Taking a derivative implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\phi_{(t, p)}(x(p))}{dp} &= \frac{\partial \phi_{(t, p)}(x(p))}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial \phi_{(t, p)}(x(p))}{\partial x} \\ &* \left(\frac{\partial h^{-1}(x(p), p)}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial h^{-1}(x(p), p)}{\partial x} \Phi(p) \right). \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

For $t \geq 0$, we define the function

$$\begin{aligned} f(t, p) &= x_u(p) \left\| \frac{\partial \phi_{(t, p)}(x(p))}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial \phi_{(t, p)}(x(p))}{\partial x} \right. \\ &\quad \left. * \left(\frac{\partial h^{-1}(x(p), p)}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial h^{-1}(x(p), p)}{\partial x} \frac{c_u}{x_u(p)} \frac{dx_u(p)}{dp} \right) \right\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{x} = h^{-1}([c_u \ 0]^\top)$. Note $\lim_{p \rightarrow p^*} x(p) = \tilde{x}$. As $x_u(p^*) = 0$, $f(t, p^*) = c_u \left\| \frac{\partial \phi_{(t, p^*)}(\tilde{x})}{\partial x} \frac{\partial h^{-1}(\tilde{x}, p^*)}{\partial x} \frac{dx_u(p^*)}{dp} \right\|_1$ is finite and well-defined. As $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{(t, p)}(x) = X^s(p)$ for any $p \in R$ and $x \in W^s(X^s(p))$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial \phi_{(t, p)}(x)}{\partial x} = 0$. Thus, since $\frac{\partial \phi_{(t, p)}(x)}{\partial x}$, $\frac{\partial h^{-1}(x, p)}{\partial x}$, and $\frac{dx_u(p)}{dp}$ are all full rank for p near p^* , $f(t, p)$ is strictly positive for all $t \geq 0$ and zero in the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$, so it must have a finite supremum over $t \geq 0$. As f is continuous, this supremum must be a maximum that is attained in finite time. By Assumption 6, there exists a unique time \hat{t} at which the maximum of $f(t, p^*)$ over $t \geq 0$ is attained. As this is a local maximum, $\frac{\partial f(\hat{t}, p^*)}{\partial t} = 0$ and $\frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{t}, p^*)}{\partial t^2} < 0$. Thus, by the implicit function theorem there exist neighborhoods U of p^* and T of \hat{t} , and a C^2 function $\hat{t} : U \rightarrow T$ such that $\hat{t}(p^*) = \hat{t}$ and $p \in U$ implies $\frac{\partial f(\hat{t}(p), p)}{\partial t} = 0$. As $f(t, p)$ attains a maximum over $t \geq 0$ in finite time for any p near p^* , and since f is C^2 , shrinking U if necessary implies that for each $p \in U$, $\hat{t}(p)$ will be the unique global maximum of $f(t, p)$ over $t \geq 0$. Shrink J' if necessary so that $J' \subset U$.

As $x_u(p)$ is constant in time, note that $\arg \max_{t \geq 0} \frac{1}{x_u(p)} f(t, p) = \arg \max_{t \geq 0} f(t, p) = \hat{t}(p)$. In the limit as $p \rightarrow p^*$, (11) implies that $\Phi \rightarrow [\pi_u \Phi \ 0]^\top$ and that $\pi_u \Phi \rightarrow \frac{c_u}{x_u(p)} \frac{dx_u(p)}{dp}$. Thus, in the limit as $p \rightarrow p^*$, by (17) $\left\| \frac{d\phi_{(t, p)}(x(p))}{dp} \right\|_1 \rightarrow \frac{1}{x_u(p)} f(t, p)$, so it attains a unique global maximum over $t \geq 0$ at $\hat{t}(p)$. Then for $t \geq 0$, we define the function $H(t, p) = \left\| \frac{d\phi_{(t, p)}(x(p))}{dp} \right\|_1^{-1}$ and note that in the limit as $p \rightarrow p^*$, $G(p) = \inf_{t \geq 0} H(t, p) = \left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \left\| \frac{d\phi_{(t, p)}(x(p))}{dp} \right\|_1 \right)^{-1} = \left\| \frac{d\phi_{(\hat{t}(p), p)}(x(p))}{dp} \right\|_1^{-1} = H(\hat{t}(p), p)$. Write $p = \gamma(s)$. Then we define the functions

$$\begin{aligned} C(s) &= \frac{\partial \phi_{(\hat{t}(p), p)}(x(p))}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial \phi_{(\hat{t}(p), p)}(x(p))}{\partial x} \frac{\partial h^{-1}(x(p), p)}{\partial p} \\ D(s) &= \frac{\partial \phi_{(\hat{t}(p), p)}(x(p))}{\partial x} \frac{\partial h^{-1}(x(p), p)}{\partial x}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the above implies that for $p = \gamma(s) \in J' \cap R$,

$$G(s) := G(\gamma(s)) = H(\hat{t}(p), p) = \|C(s) + D(s)\Phi(s)\|_1^{-1}. \quad (18)$$

Define $\text{sign}(M)$ by $\text{sign}(M)_{ij} = \text{sign}(M_{ij})$. We compute, omitting the explicit dependence on s , and letting primes denote derivatives with respect to s ,

$$G' = -G^2 \text{vec}(\text{sign}(C + D\Phi))^\top \text{vec}(C' + D'\Phi + D\Phi') \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} G'' &= 2G^3 (\text{vec}(\text{sign}(C + D\Phi))^\top \text{vec}(C' + D'\Phi + D\Phi'))^2 \\ &\quad - G^2 \text{vec}(\text{sign}(C + D\Phi))^\top \text{vec}(C'' + D''\Phi + 2D'\Phi' + D\Phi'') \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

where G'' is well-defined only in regions where $\text{sign}(C + D\Phi)$ is locally constant.

Next, we will take the limit as $p \rightarrow p^*$ along γ , which is equivalent to the limit as $s \rightarrow 1$. Note that each term in (18)-(20) can be expressed as a signed sum of the elements in $C + D\Phi$ or its derivatives. Thus, in the limit as $s \rightarrow 1$, these terms will be dominated by the entries of $C + D\Phi$ (or its derivatives) with the fastest asymptotic growth as $s \rightarrow 1$. Based on (11)-(16), in the limit as $s \rightarrow 1$ the only terms which do not converge are the terms involving $\frac{1}{x_u}$ because $\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} x_u(s) = x_u(p^*) = 0$. In $\pi_s\Phi$, $\pi_s\Phi'$, and $\pi_s\Phi''$, the fastest growth rate is $e^{\frac{A_s}{A_u} \log \frac{c_u}{x_u} \frac{1}{x_u}}$, which is strictly slower than $\frac{1}{x_u}$ because $\frac{A_s}{A_u}$ is Hurwitz since A_s is Hurwitz and $A_u > 0$. In contrast, the fastest growth rates for $\pi_u\Phi$, $\pi_u\Phi'$, and $\pi_u\Phi''$ are $\frac{1}{x_u}$, $\frac{1}{x_u^2}$, and $\frac{1}{x_u^3}$, respectively, and the coefficients of these terms are nonzero because they are a product of $B_2 = \frac{dx_u}{dp}$ and powers of x'_u , both of which are nonzero at $s = 1$ by Assumption 1 since $y(J)$ is transverse to $W^s(X^s(p^*))$, and since γ is transverse to \hat{M} . Thus, in the limit as $s \rightarrow 1$, the entries in Φ , Φ' , and Φ'' with the fastest growth rates lie within $\pi_u\Phi$, $\pi_u\Phi'$, and $\pi_u\Phi''$, respectively, and dominate all the entries in $\pi_s\Phi$, $\pi_s\Phi'$, and $\pi_s\Phi''$, respectively. Note that $D(1)$ is full rank since the flow ϕ and local coordinates h are each diffeomorphisms. Therefore, based on the terms appearing in (18)-(20), for purposes of computing the limits as $s \rightarrow 1$ of G , G' , and G'' , it suffices to consider $\begin{bmatrix} \pi_u\Phi \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\begin{bmatrix} \pi_u\Phi' \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and $\begin{bmatrix} \pi_u\Phi'' \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ in place of Φ , Φ' , and Φ'' , respectively. Furthermore, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \text{vec}(\text{sign}(C(s) + D(s)\Phi(s))) \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \text{vec} \left(\text{sign} \left(C(1) + D(1) \begin{bmatrix} \pi_u\Phi(s) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) \\ &= \text{vec} \left(\text{sign} \left(D(1) \begin{bmatrix} B_2(1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \right) =: \sigma \end{aligned}$$

which is nonzero (and thus constant sign) in each entry since $B_2(1) = c_u \frac{dx_u(p^*)}{dp}$ is nonzero in each entry. Thus, G'' is well-defined for s sufficiently close to 1. By (11)-(20) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} G(s) &= 0 = G(1) \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} G'(s) &= x'_u(1) \left\| D(1) \begin{bmatrix} B_2(1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|^{-1} \\ \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} G''(s) &= \sigma^\top \text{vec} \left(-2x'_u D'(1) \begin{bmatrix} B_2(1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2x'_u D(1) \begin{bmatrix} B'_2(1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + 3(x'_u)^2 D(1) \begin{bmatrix} B_1(1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + x''_u D(1) \begin{bmatrix} B_2(1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \left\| D(1) \begin{bmatrix} B_2(1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|^{-2} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, using L'Hospital's Rule we compute

$$\begin{aligned} G'(1) &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{G(s) - G(1)}{s - 1} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} G'(s) \\ G''(1) &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{G'(s) - G'(1)}{s - 1} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} G''(s). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, G , G' , and G'' are all continuous at $p^* = \gamma(1)$ along any smooth curve γ from inside R to ∂R . In particular, G is C^2 along any such curve.

Next, we extend G to a neighborhood of p^* in J' using the slice chart coordinates constructed above. As G is already well-defined for any $p \in J' \cap \bar{R}$, we define \tilde{G} for $p \notin \bar{R}$ as follows. If $p \notin \bar{R}$, we can abuse notation to write it as (p, s) for some $s > 0$ in the slice chart coordinates. Then we define $\tilde{G}((p, s)) = -\tilde{G}((p, -s))$, which is well-defined since $(p, -s) \in R \cap J'$. Let $\hat{\gamma}(s) = (p^*, 1 - s)$. Then $\tilde{G}(\hat{\gamma}(s)) = -G(\gamma(s))$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$, so the limit as $s \rightarrow 1$ of $\tilde{G}(\hat{\gamma}(s))$ and its first and second derivatives is equal to the same limit of $G(\gamma(s))$ and its first and second derivatives. This implies that \tilde{G} and its first and second partial derivatives in the direction of the s coordinate in the slice chart exist and are continuous. The other standard coordinate directions for approaching $(p^*, 0)$ in the slice chart are all in the set with s coordinate equal to zero, which is precisely the linear subspace that lies in ∂R , and therefore \tilde{G} and its first and second derivatives are identically zero over this subspace. Thus, \tilde{G} and its first and second partial derivatives exist and are continuous in all of the standard coordinate directions in the slice chart, so \tilde{G} is C^2 at p^* . Furthermore, by definition of \tilde{G} , $\partial R = \{p : \tilde{G}(p) = 0\}$ and $R = \{p : \tilde{G}(p) > 0\}$ since $\tilde{G}(p) < 0$ for all $p \notin \bar{R}$. \square

VI. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 2-5

Lemma 4. *Suppose $p^* \in J$, $r > 0$, and $k \in (0, 1)$ satisfy $\|\tilde{F}(p) - p^*\| \leq k\|p - p^*\|$ for all $p \in \bar{B}_r(p^*)$, and one of the following:*

- (a) $R \cap \bar{B}_r(p^*)$ is forward invariant under F and $\partial R \cap \bar{B}_r(p^*) = \{p^*\}$.
- (b) For some hyperplane H , $R \cap \bar{B}_r(p^*) \cap H$ is forward invariant under F and $\partial R \cap \bar{B}_r(p^*) \cap H = \{p^*\}$.
- (c) $R \cap \bar{B}_r(p^*)$ is forward invariant under F and for each $\hat{p} \in \partial R \cap \bar{B}_r(p^*)$ with $\hat{p} \neq p^*$, $\tilde{F}(\hat{p}) \in R$.

Then the sequence $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ with $p^1 = p_0$ and generated by the rule $p^{s+1} = F(p^s)$ converges to p^* .

Proof of Lemma 4. For cases (a) and (c) let $B = \bar{B}_r(p^*)$, and for case (b) let $B = \bar{B}_r(p^*) \cap H$. Recall that for any $p \in R \cap B$, $F(p) = F_{m(p)}(p) = p + \frac{1}{2m(p)} (\tilde{F}(p) - p)$ where $m(p)$ is the smallest integer such that $F_{m(p)}(p) \in R$, which is finite since R is open. Furthermore, for any nonnegative integer m let $k_m = (1 - \frac{1}{2^m}(1 - k))$ and note $k_m \in (0, 1)$ since $k \in (0, 1)$. Then for any $p \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_m(p) - p^*\|_P &= \left\| \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^m} \right) (p - p^*) + \frac{\tilde{F}(p) - p^*}{2^m} \right\|_P \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^m}(1 - k) \right) \|p - p^*\|_P = k_m \|p - p^*\|_P. \end{aligned}$$

As $p^1 \in R \cap B$, by forward invariance $p^s \in R \cap B$ for all $s \geq 1$. As $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty \subset R \cap B \subset \bar{R} \cap B$ and $\bar{R} \cap B$ is compact, this implies that the ω limit set of $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ is nonempty and contained in $\bar{R} \cap B$. So, let q be in the ω limit set of $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{p^{s_n}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p^{s_n} = q$. We will show that $q = p^*$.

First suppose $q \in \partial R$. For cases (a) or (b) this implies that $q = p^*$, so suppose case (c) holds. Assume towards a contradiction that $q \neq p^*$. Then since $q \in \partial R \cap B$, $\tilde{F}(q) \in R$. Thus, since \tilde{F} is continuous and R is open, there exists $N > 0$ sufficiently large such that $n \geq N$ implies that $\tilde{F}(p^{s_n}) \in R$. So, $n \geq N$ implies $F(p^{s_n}) = \tilde{F}(p^{s_n})$. Then $\|F(p^{s_n}) - p^*\|_P = \|\tilde{F}(p^{s_n}) - p^*\|_P \leq k^{n-N} \|F(p^{s_n}) - p^*\|_P$. As $k \in (0, 1)$, taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|F(p^{s_n}) - p^*\|_P = 0$, which implies that $F(p^{s_n}) \rightarrow p^*$. As $F(p^{s_n}) \rightarrow q$, this implies that $q = p^*$, which yields a contradiction. So, we must have $q = p^*$.

Next suppose $q \in R$. As $F(q) = F_{m(q)} \in R$, since $F_{m(q)}$ is continuous and R is open, there exists $N > 0$ sufficiently large such that $n \geq N$ implies that $F_{m(q)}(p^{s_n}) \in R$. This implies that for $n \geq N$, $m(p^{s_n}) \leq m(q)$. Thus, $n \geq N$ implies $F(p^{s_n}) \in \{F_m(p^{s_n})\}_{m=0}^{m(q)}$. Note that for $m_1 < m_2$, $k_{m_1} < k_{m_2}$. Hence, for $n \geq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(p^{s_n}) - p^*\|_P &\leq \max\{\|F_m(p^{s_n}) - p^*\|_P\}_{m=0}^{m(q)} \\ &\leq \max\{k_m\}_{m=0}^{m(q)} \|F(p^{s_{n-1}}) - p^*\|_P \\ &= k_{m(q)} \|F(p^{s_{n-1}}) - p^*\|_P. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this iteratively we obtain $\|F(p^{s_n}) - p^*\|_P \leq k_{m(q)}^n \|F(p^{s_1}) - p^*\|_P$. As $k_{m(q)} \in (0, 1)$, taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|F(p^{s_n}) - p^*\|_P = 0$, which implies that $F(p^{s_n}) \rightarrow p^*$. As $F(p^{s_n}) \rightarrow q$, this implies that $q = p^* \in \partial R$, which contradicts that $q \in R$. Thus, combining the two cases implies that $q = p^*$.

Hence, as q was arbitrary, the ω limit set of $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ is equal to the single point p^* . This implies that $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ converges and that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} p^s = p^*$. Recall that p^* was any arbitrary solution to (8), so let \bar{p}^* be any other solution. By the above, the sequence $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ starting from $p^1 = p_0$ converges to p^* and to \bar{p}^* , so we must have $p^* = \bar{p}^*$. Therefore, there exists a unique solution p^* to (8), and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} p^s = p^*$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. As J is one dimensional and R is open and path connected, ∂R consists of at most two points, say $\partial R = \{p_1, p_2\}$. As the only subset of ∂R with full measure is ∂R itself, by Theorem 1 this implies that G extends to a C^2 function \tilde{G} on an open neighborhood J' of ∂R . By Sard's Theorem [14, Theorem 6.10], the set of regular values of \tilde{G} has full measure, so it is generically true that zero is a regular value of \tilde{G} . Thus, $d\tilde{G}_p$ is full rank over $\partial R = \tilde{G}^{-1}(0)$. Let $r > 0$ such that $\bar{B}_r(p_1), \bar{B}_r(p_2) \subset J'$ and $\bar{B}_r(p_1), \bar{B}_r(p_2)$ are disjoint. Let $B = \bar{B}_r(p_1) \cup \bar{B}_r(p_2)$ and let N be the interior of B , which is an open neighborhood of ∂R . As $d\tilde{G}_p$ is continuous over B compact, there exist constants c_m, c_M such that $c_m \leq |d\tilde{G}_p| \leq c_M$ for all $p \in B$. As $d\tilde{G}_p$ is full rank over ∂R , $|d\tilde{G}_p| > 0$ on ∂R , so shrinking r if necessary implies that $c_m, c_M > 0$. Let $d > 0$ such that $k := \frac{d}{c_m} < 1$. As $d\tilde{G}_p$ is continuous over B compact, it is uniformly continuous, so there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $p, q \in B$ with $|p - q| < \alpha$ implies that $|d\tilde{G}_p - d\tilde{G}_q| < d$. Shrink r further if necessary so that p, q in one connected component of B implies that $|p - q| < \alpha$. For any $p \in R \cap B$, by (1) we have that $\tilde{F}(p) = p - (dG_p)^{-1}G(p)$. Let p^* be the closest point in ∂R to p , which is unique since $\bar{B}_r(p_1), \bar{B}_r(p_2)$ are disjoint. By the mean value theorem, there

exists q such that $q = tp + (1-t)p^*$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$ and $d\tilde{G}_q(p - p^*) = \tilde{G}(p) - \tilde{G}(p^*) = \tilde{G}(p) - G(p)$, where the last equality holds since $\tilde{G}(p^*) = 0$ since $p^* \in \partial R$, and since $\tilde{G}(p) = G(p)$ since $p \in R$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}(p) - p^* &= p - p^* - (dG_p)^{-1}G(p) \\ &= p - p^* - (dG_p)^{-1}d\tilde{G}_q(p - p^*) \\ &= p - p^* - (dG_p)^{-1}(d\tilde{G}_q - dG_p + dG_p)(p - p^*) \\ &= -(dG_p)^{-1}(d\tilde{G}_q - dG_p)(p - p^*). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the above bounds on $|d\tilde{G}_p|$ and $|d\tilde{G}_p - d\tilde{G}_q|$ yield $|\tilde{F}(p) - p^*| \leq \frac{d}{c_m} |p - p^*| = k |p - p^*|$. As $p^* \in \partial R = \{p_1, p_2\}$, $p \in B \cap R$ implies that $|p - p^*| \leq r$ so that $|\tilde{F}(p) - p^*| \leq kr$. Thus, as $p \in R$ and R is open, $m(p)$ is finite so $|F(p) - p^*| < r$. Since $\partial R \cap \bar{B}_r(p^*) = \{p^*\}$, by Lemma 4(a) the sequence $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ converges to p^* . \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Fix $\hat{p} \in \partial R$. Let η be the unit vector which is orthogonal to $dG_{\hat{p}}$. For any $\kappa \geq 0$, let H_κ denote the hyperplane defined by $(p - \hat{p})^\top \eta = \kappa$, and note that H_κ is a one dimensional C^∞ manifold. By Lemma 2, ∂R consists of a finite union of C^2 manifolds $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$. As J is two dimensional, each M_i has dimension one or less. As C^1 submanifolds are generically transverse [19, Theorem A.3.20], it is generically true that H_κ is transverse to M_i for each $i \in I$ for generic $\kappa \geq 0$, including at $\kappa = 0$. Thus, as J is two dimensional, $H_\kappa \cap M_i$ has dimension zero (or is empty) for each $i \in I$. Hence, $H_\kappa \cap \partial R = \cup_{i \in I} H_\kappa \cap M_i$ is a zero dimensional manifold, so it consists of a countable number of isolated points. As $H_0 \cap \partial R$ contains \hat{p} , there exists $j \in I$ such that $H_0 \cap M_j$ is nonempty and H_0, M_j are transverse. Thus, by the openness of points of transversal intersection [19, Corollary A.3.18], since H_κ varies C^∞ with κ , there exists $r > 0$ such that $\kappa \in [0, r]$ implies that $H_\kappa \cap M_j$ is nonempty, with at least one point of intersection, call it $p(\kappa)$, varying C^2 with κ and approaching \hat{p} as $\kappa \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore, by the proof of Theorem 1, G extends to a C^2 function \tilde{G} on a neighborhood of every manifold M_i with codimension one, so assume that \hat{p} lies in one such manifold, say M_j , which is true almost always (i.e., for generic \hat{p}). By Sard's Theorem [14, Theorem 6.10], zero is generically a regular value of \tilde{G} . As $M_j \subset \tilde{G}^{-1}(0)$, this implies that $d\tilde{G}_p$ is full rank over M_j . In particular, as $\hat{p} \in M_j$, $d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}}$ is full rank so it is nonzero. As $d\tilde{G}_p$ is continuous and $d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}}^\top d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}} = \|d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}}\|_2^2 > 0$, shrinking r if necessary implies that for $p \in p([0, r])$, $d\tilde{G}_p^\top d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}} > 0$. As $p(\kappa)$ is continuous, there exists $\hat{r} > 0$ such that $\|\hat{p} + \kappa\eta - p(\kappa)\| \leq \hat{r}$ for all $\kappa \in [0, r]$. As the closed \hat{r} -neighborhood of $p([0, r])$ is compact and $d\tilde{G}_p$ is continuous, shrinking r further if necessary there exists $c_m > 0$ such that

$$0 < c_m \leq d\tilde{G}_p^\top d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}} \quad (21)$$

for all p in the \hat{r} -neighborhood of $p([0, r])$. This implies that the above bound holds for any $\kappa \in [0, r]$ and any p such that $\|p - p(\kappa)\| \leq \|\hat{p} + \kappa\eta - p(\kappa)\|$ as the latter is bounded by \hat{r} . As $p(\kappa)$ is isolated in $M_j \cap H_\kappa$ for all $\kappa \in [0, r]$, and since the \hat{r} -neighborhood of $p([0, r])$ is compact, shrinking r further if necessary implies that this \hat{r} -neighborhood does not contain any points in M_j other than $p([0, r])$ (otherwise, transversality

of M_j and H_κ over this compact neighborhood would have to be lost for new points of intersection to arise arbitrarily close to $\hat{p} = p(0)$). Shrink r further if necessary so that the \hat{r} -neighborhood of $p([0, r])$ does not intersect M_i for any $i \in I$ with $i \neq j$ (this is possible since $p([0, r])$ is compact and M_i, M_j are pairwise disjoint for $i \neq j$). Choose $d > 0$ such that

$$k := \frac{4d\|d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}}\|}{c_m} < 1 \quad (22)$$

As $d\tilde{G}_p$ is continuous over the \hat{r} -neighborhood of $p([0, r])$, which is compact, it is uniformly continuous, so there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\|p - q\| < \alpha$ implies

$$\|d\tilde{G}_p - d\tilde{G}_q\| < d. \quad (23)$$

Shrink r further if necessary so that p, q in the \hat{r} -neighborhood of $p([0, r])$ implies that $\|p - q\| < \alpha$.

Fix $\kappa \in [0, r]$ and let $p^* = p(\kappa)$. For any p in the domain of \tilde{G} , write $w_p = d\tilde{G}_p = [a \ b]^\top$ and define the map $\eta_p = \eta(p) = [-b \ a]^\top$. Then $\eta(p)$ is orthogonal to dG_p and satisfies $\|\eta(p)\| = \|dG_p\|$. Note that $\eta(\hat{p}) = \eta$. Fix any $p \in \bar{B}_{\hat{r}}(p(\kappa)) \cap H_\kappa$, where $\bar{B}_{\hat{r}}(p(\kappa))$ is the closed ball of radius \hat{r} centered at $p(\kappa)$. We have that $d\tilde{F}_p = \begin{bmatrix} w_p^\top \\ \eta^\top \end{bmatrix}$, and its inverse is given by $d\tilde{F}_p^{-1} = \frac{1}{w_p^\top w_{\hat{p}}} [w_{\hat{p}} \ \eta_p]$, which is well-defined by the choice of p due to (21). By the multivariate mean value theorem, there exists q such that $q = tp + (1-t)p^*$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\tilde{F}(p) - \tilde{F}(p^*) = d\tilde{F}_q(p - p^*)$ where the first equality follows since $\tilde{F}(p^*) = 0$ because p^* satisfies $G(p^*) = 0$ and $p^* \in H_\kappa$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}(p) - p^* &= p - p^* - d\tilde{F}_p^{-1}\tilde{F}(p) \\ &= p - p^* - \frac{1}{w_p^\top w_{\hat{p}}} [w_{\hat{p}} \ \eta_p] \begin{bmatrix} w_p^\top \\ \eta^\top \end{bmatrix} (p - p^*). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

As $w_{\hat{p}}$ and $\eta = \eta_{\hat{p}}$ are orthogonal, we can decompose the identity matrix I as $I = \frac{w_{\hat{p}} w_{\hat{p}}^\top}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} + \frac{\eta \eta^\top}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}}$ since, letting R denote rotation of a vector by 90° , we have that $\eta = R w_{\hat{p}}$ so $\eta^\top \eta = w_{\hat{p}}^\top R^\top R w_{\hat{p}} = w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}$ because R is orthogonal so $R^\top = R^{-1}$. Writing $p - p^* = I(p - p^*)$ and substituting this decomposition into (24) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}(p) - p^* &= \left(I - \frac{w_{\hat{p}} w_q^\top + \eta_p \eta^\top}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} \right) (p - p^*) \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{w_p^\top w_{\hat{p}}}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} - 1 + 1 \right) w_{\hat{p}} w_{\hat{p}}^\top - w_{\hat{p}} w_q^\top}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} (p - p^*) \\ &\quad + \frac{\left(\frac{w_p^\top w_{\hat{p}}}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} - 1 + 1 \right) \eta \eta^\top - \eta_p \eta^\top}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} (p - p^*) \\ &= \frac{\frac{(w_p - w_{\hat{p}})^\top w_{\hat{p}}}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} w_{\hat{p}} w_{\hat{p}}^\top + w_{\hat{p}} (w_{\hat{p}} - w_q)^\top}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} (p - p^*) \\ &\quad + \frac{\frac{(w_p - w_{\hat{p}})^\top w_{\hat{p}}}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} \eta \eta^\top + (\eta - \eta_p) \eta^\top}{w_{\hat{p}}^\top w_{\hat{p}}} (p - p^*). \end{aligned}$$

For vectors u, v , we have $\|uv^\top\|_2 = \|u\|_2 \|v\|_2$. Thus, by submultiplicity, the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\|\eta\| = \|w_{\hat{p}}\|$, and by (23), (21) we have

$$\|\tilde{F}(p) - p^*\|_2 \leq \frac{4d\|w_{\hat{p}}\|_2}{c_m} \|p - p^*\|_2 = k \|p - p^*\|_2$$

where $k \in (0, 1)$ by (22).

Note that, as $(p - \hat{p})^\top \eta - \kappa$ is a linear equation (which defines the hyperplane H_κ), Newton's method automatically ensures that $\tilde{F}(p)$ satisfies this equation (i.e., that $\tilde{F}(p) \in H_\kappa$). If the initial condition p^1 lies in $R \cap H_\kappa \cap B_{\hat{r}}(p^*)$, then $F(p^s)$ must also lie in H_κ for all future iterations as well, so H_κ is forward invariant under F . In general, $\hat{p} + \kappa \eta$ may not lie in $R \cap B_{\hat{r}}(p^*)$, as will be required to show convergence of the method. Therefore, to find a suitable starting point, we use a line search (such as with the bisection or golden section methods) along H_κ starting from $\hat{p} + \kappa \eta$. This procedure yields $p^1 \in R \cap H_\kappa \cap B_{\hat{r}}(p^*)$. Suppose $p \in R \cap H_\kappa \cap B_{\hat{r}}(p^*)$. Then $\|p - p^*\|_2 \leq \hat{r}$ so $\|\tilde{F}(p) - p^*\|_2 \leq k \|p - p^*\|_2 \leq k \hat{r} < \hat{r}$. Thus, as $p \in R$ and R is open, $m(p)$ is finite so $\|F(p) - p^*\|_2 < \hat{r}$. Thus, $B_{\hat{r}}(p^*)$ is forward invariant as well. By the choice of r and κ , the \hat{r} -neighborhood of $p([0, r])$ does not contain any points of M_j other than $p([0, r])$, and also does not intersect M_i for any $i \neq j$. Thus, $\partial R \cap H_\kappa \cap B_{\hat{r}}(p^*) = \{p^*\}$. Therefore, by Lemma 4(b) the sequence $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ converges to p^* . \square

Lemma 5. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 5. Then for any $\epsilon \in (0, G(p_0))$, the solutions to (7) are equal to the solutions to (8).*

Proof of Lemma 5. As (7) has the same objective function and a strictly larger feasible set than (8), the optimal cost of (7) is less than or equal to the optimal cost of (8). Assume towards a contradiction that there exists a solution p^* to (7) that is not a solution to (8). If $G(p^*) = \epsilon$ then p^* would be feasible for (8), but suboptimal since by assumption it is not a solution to (8). However, this contradicts that the optimal cost of (8) is no less than that of (7). So, we must have $G(p^*) < \epsilon$. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow J$ be a length-minimizing geodesic with respect to the metric d_P such that $\gamma(0) = p_0$, $\gamma(1) = p^*$, and γ is continuous. As G extends to a continuous function on a neighborhood of ∂R by Theorem 1, $G \circ \gamma$ is continuous and satisfies $(G \circ \gamma)(0) = G(p_0) > \epsilon$ and $(G \circ \gamma)(1) = G(p^*) < \epsilon$. Thus, by the intermediate value theorem there must exist $s \in (0, 1)$ such that $(G \circ \gamma)(s) = \epsilon$. Define $\hat{p} = \gamma(s)$ and note that $G(\hat{p}) = \epsilon$ so \hat{p} is feasible for (7). As γ is length-minimizing and $s < 1$, $d_P(p_0, \hat{p}) = d_P(\gamma(0), \gamma(s)) < d_P(\gamma(0), \gamma(1)) = d_P(p_0, p^*)$ which, since \hat{p} is feasible for (7), contradicts that p^* is a solution to (7). Thus, every solution to (7) is a solution to (8). In particular, as (7) has the same objective function and a strictly larger feasible set than (8), this implies that they have the same solutions. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. By Lemma 2, $\partial R = \cup_{i \in I} M_i$ where each M_i is a C^3 embedded submanifold, I is finite, and M_i and M_j are disjoint for all $j \neq i$ in I . Therefore, for each $i \in I$ there exists a tubular neighborhood N_i of M_i in J and a C^3 retraction $r_i : V_i \rightarrow M_i$ such that for every $p_0 \in V_i$, $r_i(p_0)$ is the unique closest point in M_i to p_0 [14, Problem 6-5]

where distance is measured by the metric d_P . Note that, for any $p_0 \in J$, $d_P(p_0, \partial R) = d_P(p_0, M_i)$ for some $i \in I$ since $\partial R = \cup_{i \in I} M_i$, and $r_i(p_0)$ is the unique closest point in M_i to p_0 (in particular, $d_P(p_0, M_i) = d_P(p_0, r_i(p_0))$).

Let $N = \cup_{i \in I} V_i$, and note that N is an open neighborhood of ∂R . Let \hat{V} consist of the set of p_0 such that $d_P(p_0, \partial R) = d_P(p_0, M_i) = d_P(p_0, M_j)$ for at least two distinct i, j , and define $V = N - \hat{V}$. We claim that V is open and dense (in particular, generic) in N . For, let $p_0 \in V$. Then there exists a unique $i \in I$ such that $d_P(p_0, \partial R) = d_P(p_0, M_i) = d_P(p_0, r_i(p_0))$, so $r_i(p_0)$ is the unique closest point to p_0 in ∂R . By uniqueness, this implies that $d_P(p_0, \partial R) = d_P(p_0, r_i(p_0)) = d_P(p_0, M_i) < d_P(p_0, M_j) = d_P(p_0, r_j(p_0))$ for all $j \neq i$ in I . As each r_i is continuous and d_P is continuous, there exists an open neighborhood J' of p_0 in J such that $p \in J'$ implies that $d_P(p, r_i(p)) < d_P(p, r_j(p))$ for all $j \neq i$ in I . In turn, this implies that $d_P(p, M_i) = d_P(p, r_i(p)) < d_P(p, r_j(p)) = d_P(p, M_j)$ for all $j \neq i$ in I . Thus, $d_P(p, \partial R) = d_P(p, M_i) = d_P(p, r_i(p))$, and $r_i(p)$ is the unique closest point in ∂R to p . Therefore, $p \in V$ for all $p \in J'$, so V is open.

Next, suppose $p_0 \in N - V$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $I' \subset I$ be such that for $i \in I$, $d_P(p_0, \partial R) = d_P(p_0, M_i)$ if and only if $i \in I'$. By the choice of p_0 , I' must contain at least two elements. Fix any $i \in I'$. As $d_P(p_0, M_i) = d_P(p_0, r_i(p_0))$, and by construction of the tubular neighborhood V_i , there exists a unique length-minimizing geodesic $\gamma : [0, d_P(p_0, M_i)] \rightarrow J$ such that $\gamma(0) = p_0$, $\gamma(1) = r_i(p_0)$, $d_P(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) = s - t$ for every $t < s \in [0, d_P(p_0, M_i)]$, and r_i is constant over γ (i.e. $r_i(\gamma(s)) = r_i(p_0)$ for all $s \in [0, d_P(p_0, M_i)]$). Consider $\gamma(\epsilon)$. First of all, $d_P(p_0, \gamma(\epsilon)) = d_P(\gamma(0), \gamma(\epsilon)) = \epsilon$. Furthermore, $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_i) = d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), r_i(\gamma(\epsilon))) = d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), \gamma(d_P(p_0, M_i))) = d_P(p_0, M_i) - \epsilon$ so $\gamma(\epsilon)$ is ϵ closer to M_i than p_0 . Consider any $j \in I'$ with $j \neq i$. If $\gamma(\epsilon)$ lies on the same length-minimizing geodesic as the one from $r_j(p_0)$ to p_0 (i.e. the geodesic from M_j to p_0), then by uniqueness this must be the same geodesic (extended to larger s) as γ . In this case, we must have $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_j) = d_P(p_0, M_j) \pm \epsilon = d_P(p_0, M_i) \pm \epsilon$. But, if $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_j) = d_P(p_0, M_i) - \epsilon$ then $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), r_j(p_0)) = d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_j) = d_P(p_0, M_i) - \epsilon = d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), r_i(p_0))$ and $d_P(p_0, r_j(p_0)) = d_P(p_0, r_i(p_0))$ so $r_i(p_0), r_j(p_0)$ both lie on the same geodesic γ and are equidistant from p_0 and $\gamma(s)$, which are distinct and also lie on γ . This is only possible if $r_i(p_0) = r_j(p_0)$, which contradicts that M_i and M_j are disjoint. Thus, in case $\gamma(\epsilon)$ lies on the same geodesic as the one from p_0 to $r_j(p_0)$, we must have $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_j) = d_P(p_0, M_i) + \epsilon > d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_i)$.

In case $\gamma(\epsilon)$ does not lie on the same geodesic as the one from p_0 to $r_j(p_0)$ (which is the unique length-minimizing geodesic from p_0 to M_j), $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_j) > d_P(p_0, M_j) - \epsilon$ by uniqueness of the length-minimizing geodesic. This implies that $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_j) > d_P(p_0, M_j) - \epsilon = d_P(p_0, M_i) - \epsilon = d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_i)$. Finally, for any $j \in I - I'$, $d_P(p_0, r_i(p_0)) = d_P(p_0, M_i) < d_P(p_0, M_j) = d_P(p_0, r_j(p_0))$. So by continuity of r_j and d_P , as $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), p_0) = \epsilon$, for ϵ sufficiently small it will hold that $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_i) = d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), r_i(\gamma(\epsilon))) < d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), r_j(\gamma(\epsilon))) = d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_j)$. Combining the above cases implies that $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_i) < d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_j)$ for all $j \neq i$

in I . This implies that $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), \partial R) = d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_i)$ and $d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), \partial R) < d_P(\gamma(\epsilon), M_j)$ for all $j \neq i$ in I , so $\gamma(\epsilon) \in V$. As $\gamma(\epsilon) \rightarrow p_0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, this implies that V is dense in N .

Let $p_0 \in V$. Then there exists a unique $i \in I$ such that $r_i(p_0)$ is the unique closest point in ∂R to p_0 . As any solution to (6) is a closest point on ∂R to p_0 in terms of the metric d_P , this implies that $r_i(p_0)$ is the unique solution to (6) for p_0 . Furthermore, by the proof of openness of V above, there exists an open neighborhood J' of p_0 such that $J' \subset V$ and for $p \in J'$, $d_P(p, \partial R) = d_P(p, r_i(p))$, and thus $r_i(p)$ is the unique solution to (6). As each r_i is C^3 , this implies that the solution varies C^3 over J' . Hence, as $p_0 \in V$ was arbitrary, this implies that the solution varies C^3 over V . \square

Proof of Theorem 5. By Lemma 2, $\partial R = \cup_{i \in I} M_i$ a finite union of C^3 submanifolds. By Lemma 3 and its proof, the set of $p^* \in \partial R$ such that $W^s(X^*(p^*))$ has codimension one is a subset of the $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$, call them $Y := \{M_i\}_{i \in \hat{I}}$ for some $\hat{I} \subset I$, with full Lebesgue measure in ∂R . By Theorem 1, for each $p^* \in Y$ there exists an open neighborhood N_{p^*} of p^* such that G extends to a C^2 function \tilde{G} on N_{p^*} . For each $i \in \hat{I}$, let $\hat{N}_i = \cup_{p^* \in M_i} N_{p^*}$, and note \hat{N}_i is an open neighborhood of M_i on which \tilde{G} exists and is C^2 . By the proof of Theorem 4, for each $i \in I$ there exists an open neighborhood V_i of M_i such that for generic $p_0 \in V_i$ there exists a unique solution to (6). For each $i \in \hat{I}$, let $N_i = \hat{N}_i \cap V_i$, and for each $i \in I - \hat{I}$ let $N_i = V_i$. Let $N = \cup_{i \in I} N_i$. Then N is an open neighborhood of ∂R . Let $p_0 \in N$. By construction, there exists a unique solution \hat{p} to (6) for p_0 , which implies that $\hat{p} \in \partial R$. Assume that $\hat{p} \in Y$, which is generic since Y has full measure in ∂R . This implies that $\hat{p} \in \hat{N}_i =: J'$ for some $i \in \hat{I}$. Then \tilde{G} is well-defined and C^2 over J' by construction.

For any $r > 0$, define $\bar{B}_r(\hat{p}) = \{p \in J : d_P(p, \hat{p}) \leq r\}$ to be the closed ball of radius r centered at \hat{p} . Then there exists $r > 0$ sufficiently small such that $\bar{B}_r(\hat{p}) \subset J'$. As \tilde{G} is C^2 over $\bar{B}_r(\hat{p})$, $d\tilde{G}_p$ is C^1 over $\bar{B}_r(\hat{p})$ compact. Thus, $d\tilde{G}_p$ is L -Lipschitz over $\bar{B}_r(\hat{p})$, and satisfies

$$\|d\tilde{G}_p - d\tilde{G}_q\|_P \leq L\|p - q\|_P \quad (25)$$

for all $p, q \in \bar{B}_r(\hat{p})$. As \tilde{G} is C^2 , by Sard's Theorem [14, Theorem 6.10] zero is generically a regular value of \tilde{G} , so $d\tilde{G}_p$ is full rank over $\tilde{G}^{-1}(0)$. As $\hat{p} \in \tilde{G}^{-1}(0)$, $d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}}$ is full rank, so $\|d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}}\|_P > 0$. As $\|d\tilde{G}_p\|_P$ is continuous over $\bar{B}_r(\hat{p})$ compact, it achieves a maximum c_M and a minimum c_m over $\bar{B}_r(\hat{p})$. As $\|d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}}\|_P > 0$, shrinking r yields $c_m > 0$. Thus,

$$0 < c_m \leq \|d\tilde{G}_p\|_P \leq c_M \quad (26)$$

for all $p \in \bar{B}_r(\hat{p})$. Furthermore, as $d\tilde{G}_{\hat{p}}$ is full rank and full rank is an open condition, shrinking r further if necessary we may have that $d\tilde{G}_p$ is full rank for all $p \in \bar{B}_r(\hat{p})$. As P is symmetric positive definite, its eigenvalues are real and positive. Let λ_{max} and λ_{min} denote the maximum and minimum eigenvalues of P , respectively. Choose any $\epsilon \in (0, G(p_0))$. Shrink r if necessary and choose $d > 0$ such that

$$k := \frac{\lambda_{max}^2 c_M}{\lambda_{min}^2 c_m^2} (d + 2rL) < 1 \quad (27)$$

$$\left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{max}^2 c_M}{\lambda_{min}^2 c_m^2} d\right) \epsilon - \frac{r}{\lambda_{min}} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_{max}^2 c_M}{\lambda_{min}^2 c_m^2}\right) d > 0. \quad (28)$$

As $d\tilde{G}_p$ is continuous over $\overline{B}_r(\hat{p})$ compact, it is uniformly continuous, so there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for $\|p - q\|_P < \alpha$,

$$\|d\tilde{G}_p - d\tilde{G}_q\|_P < d. \quad (29)$$

Shrink r if necessary so that $p, q \in \overline{B}_r(\hat{p})$ implies that $\|p - q\|_P < \alpha$. As for Theorem 5, assume that $d_P(p_0, \partial R) < \frac{r}{3}$.

Consider now the program in (8). As $G^{-1}(\epsilon)$ is closed and $\{p_0\}$ is compact, there exists at least one point $p^* \in G^{-1}(\epsilon)$ such that $d_P(p_0, G^{-1}(\epsilon)) = d_P(p_0, p^*)$. Thus, p^* is a solution to (8), so it is also a local optimum. Therefore, since $d\tilde{G}_{p^*}$ is full rank, by the Lagrange multiplier theorem there exists a unique $\lambda^* \neq 0$ such that $df_{p^*} = -\lambda^* dG_{p^*}$, where $f(p) = \frac{1}{2}(p - p_0)^\top P(p - p_0)$. As $df_p = P(p - p_0)$, this implies that

$$P(p^* - p_0) = -\lambda^* dG_{p^*}, \quad G(p^*) = \epsilon. \quad (30)$$

Let $\gamma(t) = (1 - t)p_0 + t\hat{p}$. As $\epsilon \in (0, G(p_0)) = (G(\gamma(1)), G(\gamma(0)))$, by the intermediate value theorem there exists $t \in (0, 1)$ such that $G(\gamma(t)) = \epsilon$. This implies that $d_P(p_0, p^*) = d_P(p_0, G^{-1}(\epsilon)) \leq d_P(p_0, \gamma(t)) < d_P(p_0, \hat{p}) = d_P(p_0, \partial R) < \frac{r}{3}$. Hence, for any $x \in B_{d_P(p_0, p^*)}(p^*)$, $d_P(x, \hat{p}) \leq d_P(x, p^*) + d_P(p^*, p_0) + d_P(p_0, \hat{p}) = \frac{r}{3} + \frac{r}{3} + \frac{r}{3} = r$. So, $B_{d_P(p_0, p^*)}(p^*) \subset B_r(\hat{p})$.

Consider now the quadratic program given by (9) whose solution is $\tilde{F}(p^s)$ for p^s the current iteration. The Lagrangian for this constrained optimization is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(p^{s+1}, \lambda) &= \frac{1}{2}(p^{s+1} - p_0)^\top P(p^{s+1} - p_0) \\ &\quad + \lambda(G(p^s) + dG_{p^s}^\top(p^{s+1} - p^s) - \epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Stationary points of the Lagrangian are given by

$$0 = \nabla \mathcal{L}(p^{s+1}, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} P(p^{s+1} - p_0) + \lambda dG_{p^s} \\ G(p^s) + dG_{p^s}^\top(p^{s+1} - p^s) - \epsilon \end{bmatrix}.$$

Write $p = p^s$, $\tilde{F}(p) = p^{s+1}$, and $w_p = d\tilde{G}_{p^s}$. Then a stationary point of the Lagrangian is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & w_p \\ w_p^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{F}(p) \\ \lambda \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Pp_0 \\ \epsilon - G(p) + w_p^\top p \end{bmatrix}.$$

For any $p \in \overline{B}_r(\hat{p})$, $w_p = d\tilde{G}_p \neq 0$, so the above equation has a unique solution $(\tilde{F}(p), \lambda)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{F}(p) \\ \lambda \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} P^{-1}(w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p I - w_p w_p^\top P^{-1}) & P^{-1} w_p \\ w_p^\top P^{-1} & -1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad * \frac{1}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} \begin{bmatrix} Pp_0 \\ \epsilon - G(p) + w_p^\top p \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

for each $p \in \overline{B}_r(\hat{p})$. This implies that

$$\tilde{F}(p) = p_0 + \frac{P^{-1} w_p w_p^\top}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} (p - p_0) - \frac{P^{-1} w_p}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} (G(p) - \epsilon). \quad (31)$$

Fix $p \in \overline{B}_r(\hat{p})$. By the multivariate mean value theorem, there exists q with $q = tp + (1 - t)p^*$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$ and $(G(p) - \epsilon) - (G(p^*) - \epsilon) = w_q^\top (p - p^*)$. As $G(p^*) = \epsilon$, this implies that $G(p) - \epsilon = w_q^\top (p - p^*)$. Substituting this into (31), writing $p_0 - p^* = p_0 - p + p - p^*$, and writing $p - p_0 = p - p^* + p^* - p_0$, we compute

$$\tilde{F}(p) - p^* = \left(I + \frac{P^{-1} w_p (w_p - w_q)^\top}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} \right) (p - p^*)$$

$$+ p_0 - p + \frac{P^{-1} w_p w_p^\top}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} (p^* - p_0). \quad (32)$$

The last term in this expression can be written, using (30), as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{P^{-1} w_p w_p^\top}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} (p^* - p_0) \\ &= -\lambda^* \frac{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_{p^*}}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} P^{-1} (w_{p^*} - w_{p^*} + w_p) \\ &= \frac{w_p^\top P^{-1} (w_p - w_{p^*} + w_{p^*})}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} (p^* - p_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{w_p^\top (p^* - p_0)}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} P^{-1} (w_p - w_{p^*}) \\ &= p^* - p_0 + \frac{w_p^\top P^{-1} (w_{p^*} - w_p)}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} (p^* - p_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{w_p^\top (p^* - p_0)}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} P^{-1} (w_p - w_{p^*}). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this expression back into (32), taking the norm $\|\cdot\|_P$, and applying (25), (26), and (29) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{F}(p) - p^*\|_P &\leq \frac{|(w_p - w_q)^\top (p - p^*)|}{|w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p|} \|P^{-1} w_p\|_P \\ &\quad + \frac{|w_p^\top P^{-1} (w_{p^*} - w_p)|}{|w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p|} \|p^* - p_0\|_P \\ &\quad + \frac{|w_p^\top (p^* - p_0)|}{|w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p|} \|P^{-1} (w_p - w_{p^*})\|_P \\ &\leq \frac{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}^2} dc_M}{\lambda_{\max}^2 c_m^2} \|p - p^*\|_P + \frac{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}^2} c_M Lr}{\lambda_{\max}^2 c_m^2} \|p - p^*\|_P \\ &\quad + \frac{\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}^2} c_M r L}{\lambda_{\max}^2 c_m^2} \|p - p^*\|_P \\ &= \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2 c_M}{\lambda_{\min}^2 c_m^2} (d + 2rL) \|p - p^*\|_P = k \|p - p^*\|_P \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (27) and that

$$|v^\top w| = |\langle v, P^{-1} w \rangle_P| \leq \|v\|_P \|P^{-1} w\|_P \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}} \|v\|_P \|w\|_P \quad (33)$$

$$|c^\top P^{-1} c| = |\langle P^{-1} c, P^{-1} c \rangle_P| = \|P^{-1} c\|_P^2 \geq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}^2} \|c\|_P^2 \quad (34)$$

where the former follows by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Thus, for any $p \in \overline{B}_r(\hat{p})$, we have

$$\|\tilde{F}(p) - p^*\|_P \leq k \|p - p^*\|_P \quad (35)$$

where $k \in (0, 1)$ by (27). As $B_{d_P(p_0, p^*)}(p^*) \subset B_r(\hat{p})$ and p^* was arbitrary, the same inequality holds for any solution p^* to (8) and any p with $d_P(p, p^*) \leq d_P(p_0, p^*)$.

Next, for any solution p^* to (8), let $p \in \partial R$ with $d_P(p, p^*) \leq d_P(p_0, p^*)$. Then $p \in \partial R$ implies that $\tilde{G}(p) = 0$. By Theorem 1, $R \cap J' = \{p : \tilde{G}(p) > 0\} \cap J'$. By (35),

$$\begin{aligned} d_P(\hat{p}, \tilde{F}(p)) &\leq d_P(\hat{p}, p_0) + d_P(p_0, p^*) + d_P(p^*, \tilde{F}(p)) \\ &< d_P(\hat{p}, p_0) + d_P(p_0, p^*) + d_P(p, p^*) \\ &\leq d_P(\hat{p}, p_0) + 2d_P(p_0, p^*) \leq \frac{r}{3} + \frac{2r}{3} = r, \end{aligned}$$

so $\tilde{F}(p) \in B_r(\hat{p}) \subset J'$. So, to show that $\tilde{F}(p) \in R$ it suffices to show that $\tilde{G}(\tilde{F}(p)) > 0$. By the multivariate mean value theorem, there exists q such that $q = t\tilde{F}(p) + (1-t)p$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\tilde{G}(\tilde{F}(p)) - \tilde{G}(p) = w_q^\top(\tilde{F}(p) - p)$. As $\tilde{G}(p) = G(p) = 0$, this implies that $\tilde{G}(\tilde{F}(p)) = w_q^\top(\tilde{F}(p) - p)$. Substituting Eq. 31 for $\tilde{F}(p)$, noting that $G(p) = 0$, and writing $w_q = w_p - w_p + w_q$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}(\tilde{F}(p)) &= \frac{(w_p - w_p + w_q)^\top P^{-1} w_p}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} (w_p^\top (p - p_0) + \epsilon) \\ &\quad - w_q^\top (p - p_0) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{(w_q - w_p)^\top P^{-1} w_p}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} \right) \epsilon \\ &\quad - \frac{(w_p - w_q)^\top P^{-1} w_p}{w_p^\top P^{-1} w_p} w_p^\top (p - p_0) - (w_q - w_p)^\top (p - p_0) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2 c_M}{\lambda_{\min}^2 c_m} d \right) \epsilon - \frac{r}{\lambda_{\min}} d - \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2 c_M^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2 c_m^2} \frac{r}{\lambda_{\min}} d \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2 c_M}{\lambda_{\min}^2 c_m^2} d \right) \epsilon - \frac{r}{\lambda_{\min}} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2 c_M^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2 c_m^2} \right) d > 0 \end{aligned}$$

using (33)-(34), (28), and $d_P(p, p_0) \leq \frac{2r}{3} < r$. Thus, $p \in \partial R$ with $d_P(p, p^*) \leq d_P(p_0, p^*)$ for any solution p^* to (8) implies $\tilde{G}(\tilde{F}(p)) > 0$ and, thus, that $\tilde{F}(p) \in R$. Combining the above, by Lemma 4(c) the sequence $\{p^s\}_{s=1}^\infty$ converges to p^* . \square

VII. CONCLUSION

This work provided theoretical guarantees for recent algorithms which efficiently and non-conservatively compute safety margins for vulnerability assessment. A function G was defined to be the reciprocal of the supremum over time of the norms of the trajectory sensitivities. Then, a characterization of the recovery boundary in terms of trajectory sensitivities was provided in terms of G . In particular, it was then shown that G is strictly positive over the recovery region, and for a generic parameter value p^* in the recovery boundary, $G(p^*) = 0$, G is continuous at p^* , and G extends to a C^2 function over a neighborhood of p^* .

Next, this characterization was used to show the following results under generic assumptions and for initial parameter values sufficiently close to the recovery boundary. Well-posedness and convergence guarantees were provided for algorithms which use G to find a point on the recovery boundary in one dimensional parameter space, and to numerically trace the recovery boundary in two dimensional parameter space. It was then shown that the closest point on the recovery boundary to a nominal parameter value exists, is unique, and depends smoothly on the nominal value. In turn, this was then used to provide well-posedness and convergence guarantees for an algorithm which uses G to find the closest point on the recovery boundary in arbitrary dimensional parameter space in order to compute the safety margin. These theoretical guarantees ensure that these recent algorithms can be successfully applied to a large class of nonlinear systems.

REFERENCES

[1] H.-D. Chiang, M. W. Hirsch, and F. F. Wu, "Stability regions of nonlinear autonomous dynamical systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 16–27, 1988.

[2] W. Tan and A. Packard, "Stability region analysis using polynomial and composite polynomial lyapunov functions and sum-of-squares programming," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 565–571, 2008.

[3] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*. Pearson Education, Inc., 3 ed., 2002.

[4] A. El-Guindy, D. Han, and M. Althoff, "Estimating the region of attraction via forward reachable sets," *American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 1263–1270, 2017.

[5] V. I. Zubov, *Methods of A. M. Lyapunov and their Application*. 1964.

[6] A. Vannelli and M. Vidyasagar, "Maximal lyapunov functions and domains of attraction for autonomous nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 69–80, 1985.

[7] F. Camilli, L. Grune, and F. Wirth, "A generalization of zubov's method to perturbed systems," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 496–515, 2001.

[8] A. Paice and F. Wirth, "Robustness analysis of domains of attraction of nonlinear systems," in *Proceedings of the Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, pp. 353–356, 1998.

[9] U. Topcu, A. K. Packard, P. Seiler, and G. J. Balas, "Robust region-of-attraction estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 137–142, 2010.

[10] G. Chesi, "Rational lyapunov functions for estimating and controlling the robust domain of attraction," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 1051–1057, 2013.

[11] M. W. Fisher and I. A. Hiskens, "Determining disturbance recovery conditions by inverse sensitivity minimization," 2025. Under review. Preprint available on arXiv.

[12] I. A. Hiskens and M. A. Pai, "Trajectory sensitivity analysis of hybrid systems," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems - I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 204–220, 2000.

[13] M. W. Hirsch, *Differential Topology*, vol. 33 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1976.

[14] J. M. Lee, *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, 2 ed., 2013.

[15] M. W. Fisher and I. A. Hiskens, "Stability of the nonwandering set in the region of attraction boundary under perturbations with application to vulnerability assessment," *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 3390–3430, 2023.

[16] M. W. Fisher and I. A. Hiskens, "Hausdorff continuity of region of attraction boundary under parameter variation with application to disturbance recovery," *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 327–365, 2022.

[17] G. R. Sell, "Smooth linearization near a fixed point," *American Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 107, no. 5, pp. 1035–1091, 1985.

[18] M. W. Fisher and I. A. Hiskens, "Numerical computation of critical system recovery parameter values by trajectory sensitivity maximization," *58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 8000–8006, 2019.

[19] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems*, vol. 54 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[20] M. W. Fisher and I. A. Hiskens, "Parametric dependence of large disturbance response for vector fields with event-selected discontinuities," *18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, pp. 166–173, 2019.

[21] R. T. Treinen, V. Vittal, and W. Kliemann, "An improved technique to determine the controlling unstable equilibrium point in a power system," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems - I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 313–323, 1996.

[22] W. Hurewicz and H. Wallman, *Dimension Theory*. Princeton University Press, 1948.

[23] J. Jacob Palis and W. de Melo, *Geometric Theory of Dynamical Systems*. Springer-Verlag, 1982.



Michael W. Fisher is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Waterloo, Canada. He was a postdoctoral researcher at ETH Zurich. He received his Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering: Systems at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. His research interests are in dynamics, control, and optimization of complex systems. He was a finalist for the 2017 Conference on Decision and Control (CDC) Best Student Paper Award and a recipient of the 2019 CDC Outstanding Student Paper Award.