

# Extending First-order Motion Planners to Second-order Dynamics

Mayur Sawant and Abdelhamid Tayebi

**Abstract**—This paper extends first-order motion planners to robots governed by second-order dynamics. Two control schemes are proposed based on the knowledge of a scalar function whose negative gradient aligns with a given first-order motion planner. When such a function is known, the first-order motion planner is combined with a damping velocity vector with a dynamic gain to extend the safety and convergence guarantees of the first-order motion planner to second-order systems. If no such function is available, we propose an alternative control scheme ensuring that the error between the robot’s velocity and the first-order motion planner converges to zero. The theoretical developments are supported by simulation results demonstrating the effectiveness of the proposed approaches.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Autonomous robot navigation involves steering a robot to a desired target location while avoiding obstacles. A widely explored class of methods for this task is based on artificial potential fields [1], where an attractive vector field directs the robot toward the target, while a repulsive vector field ensures obstacle avoidance. However, these methods can suffer from the presence of undesired local minima in certain obstacle configurations. The navigation function (NF)-based approach [2] restricts the influence of the repulsive field within a neighborhood of the obstacle by means of a properly tuned parameter, ensuring almost<sup>1</sup> global convergence to the target. While the NF-based approach in [2] is applicable in sphere world environments, its applicability has been extended to more general settings, including convex and star-shaped obstacles using diffeomorphic transformations [3], [4] and sufficiently curved obstacles [5], [6].

The authors in [7] proposed a reactive feedback control design, based on the separating hyperplanes approach, for autonomous navigation in unknown environments with convex obstacles satisfying some curvature conditions. In [8], the authors relax the curvature restrictions imposed in [6] and [7] for environments with ellipsoidal obstacles by constructing a repulsive vector field that pushes the robot away from the center of the obstacle, rather than from the closest point on its boundary

Despite their effectiveness in navigating around obstacles with complex geometries, most of these navigation strategies

assume that the robot motion is governed by a velocity-controlled first-order model. However, many practical robotic systems are modeled by second-order dynamics. Some research works have proposed navigation strategies directly applicable to second-order systems [9]–[12], but these approaches are often restricted in terms of the types of obstacle geometries they can handle.

In [9], a control barrier function-based method is introduced for multi-robot navigation in two-dimensional environments with circular obstacles, focusing on robots governed by second-order dynamics. In [10], the NF framework is extended to enable safe navigation for robots governed by uncertain second-order dynamics in known sphere worlds. Similar to [1], the proposed NF grows unbounded as the robot approaches the obstacle boundaries, and its negative gradient, combined with adaptive control techniques, is used to design a feedback control law that guarantees a safe almost global convergence of the robot to the desired location. In [11], a second-order robotic system with the target as a unique globally asymptotically stable equilibrium is modified in the presence of known obstacles, modelled as three-dimensional superellipsoids, by an additive signal whose design is based on the prescribed performance control methodology. However, the introduction of this additive signal, similar to [1], can lead to undesired local minima in certain obstacle configurations. Recently, in [12], the authors proposed a feedback control design for autonomous navigation of a robot governed by second-order dynamics in environments with sufficiently separated obstacles that satisfy some specific curvature conditions.

Although these approaches directly apply to second-order systems, their applicability is often limited by the types of obstacle geometries they can handle. In contrast, first-order motion planners, such as those in [5], [8], can ensure safe navigation in environments with obstacles of complex geometries. This highlights the need for a control scheme that extends the applicability of first-order motion planners to robots governed by second-order dynamics.

In [13], the authors used the reference governor architecture to extend the applicability of first-order motion planners to robots modeled by second-order dynamics. The system is composed of three state variables: the robot’s position, velocity, and a virtual governor variable. The dynamics of governor variable are influenced by the first-order motion planner and the system’s total energy. The robot tracks this governor variable, which guides it to the desired target location while ensuring obstacle avoidance. Recently, in [14], the reference governor architecture was used to extend the applicability of first-order motion planners to robots governed by  $n$ -th order

This work was supported by the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), under the grants RGPIN-2020-06270, RGPIN-2020-0644 and RGPIN-2020-04759.

M. Sawant and A. Tayebi are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, ON P7B 5E1, Canada. (e-mail: msawant, atayebi@lakeheadu.ca).

<sup>1</sup>Almost global convergence here refers to the convergence from all initial conditions except a set of zero Lebesgue measure.

dynamics. In both [13] and [14], the reference governor-based navigation scheme requires executing the first-order motion planner at the virtual governor state rather than the robot's physical location. This approach necessitates access to either a global map of the first-order motion planner or additional computation to transform the robot-centered sensor measurements into measurements relative to the virtual governor.

In this paper, two control schemes are proposed based on the knowledge of a scalar function whose negative gradient aligns with a given first-order motion planner. When such a function is known, the first-order motion planner is combined with a damping velocity vector with a dynamic gain to extend the safety and convergence guarantees of the first-order motion planner to second-order systems. If no such function is available, an alternative control scheme ensures that the error between the robot's velocity and the first-order motion planner converges to zero, provided that the first-order motion planner is continuously differentiable. The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- 1) The proposed control schemes extend the safety and convergence guarantees of the first-order motion planners such as [8] to second-order systems, enabling navigation in environments with complex obstacle geometries (e.g., ellipsoidal obstacles that are either very close to the target location or have an extremely flattened shape), that existing second-order motion planners [1], [12] cannot handle.
- 2) Unlike [1] and [10], the proposed control schemes guarantee safety and almost global asymptotic stability of the target state for robots with second-order dynamics, without requiring the artificial potential function (APF) to tend to infinity as the robot approaches the obstacle boundaries.
- 3) The reference-governor-based solutions proposed in [13] and [14] impose restrictions on the robot's initial velocity, which depend on its proximity to nearby obstacles and the virtual governor state. In contrast, the present work does not impose any such restrictions on the initial velocity of the robot and guarantees its safety and almost global asymptotic stability of the target state.

## II. NOTATIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

The sets of real numbers, non-negative real numbers, positive real numbers and natural numbers are denoted by  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ , and  $\mathbb{N}$ , respectively. Bold lowercase letters are used to represent vector quantities. Given a complex number  $z = a \pm bj$ , where  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $j = \sqrt{-1}$ , the absolute value of  $z$  is given by  $|z| = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$ . Additionally, we use  $\mathbf{Re}(z)$  and  $\mathbf{Im}(z)$  to denote the real and imaginary parts of  $z$ , respectively. Given a vector  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the closed Euclidean ball of radius  $r > 0$  with its center at  $\mathbf{a}$  is given by  $\mathcal{B}_r(\mathbf{a}) = \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a}\| \leq r\}$ , where  $\|\cdot\|$  represents the Euclidean norm. The set of  $n$ -dimensional unit vectors is defined as  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|\mathbf{a}\| = 1\}$ . The identity matrix and the zero matrix of dimension  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  are denoted by  $\mathbf{I}_n$  and  $\mathbf{0}_n$ , respectively. The Frobenius norm of a matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is

defined as  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\mathbf{F}} = \sqrt{\sum_i \sum_k a_{ik}^2}$ , where  $a_{ik}$  denotes the element in the  $i$ -th row and  $k$ -th column of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

For sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the relative complement of  $\mathcal{B}$  with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  is given by  $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A} \mid \mathbf{a} \notin \mathcal{B}\}$ . Given a set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the symbols  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{A}^\circ, \mathcal{A}^c$ , and  $\partial\mathcal{A}$  represent the closure, interior, complement and the boundary of  $\mathcal{A}$ , where  $\partial\mathcal{A} = \bar{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}^\circ$ . Given  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the cardinality of  $\mathcal{A}$  is denoted by  $\text{card}(\mathcal{A})$ . The Minkowski sum of two sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{B}$ , and it is defined as  $\mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}\}$ . The dilation of a set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  by  $r > 0$  is given as  $\mathcal{D}_r(\mathcal{A}) := \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{B}_r(\mathbf{0})$ . Given  $r > 0$  and  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the  $r$ -neighbourhood of  $\mathcal{A}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{N}_r(\mathcal{A})$ , and is given by  $\mathcal{N}_r(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{D}_r(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \bar{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Given a vector  $\mathbf{p} = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and a vector-valued function  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}) = [f_1(\mathbf{p}), f_2(\mathbf{p}), \dots, f_n(\mathbf{p})]^\top$  with  $f_i(\mathbf{p})$  being a continuously differentiable mapping  $f_i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , with  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the gradient of  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})$  with respect to  $\mathbf{p}$  is evaluated as

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}) = [\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} f_1, \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} f_2, \dots, \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} f_n],$$

where  $\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} f_i = \left[ \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial p_1}, \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial p_2}, \dots, \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial p_n} \right]^\top$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Given a twice continuously differentiable function  $g : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the Hessian of  $g$  at  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}$  is given by  $\nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^2 g(\mathbf{p}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} (\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} g(\mathbf{p}))^\top$ .

### A. Distance to a set

The distance between a point  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and a closed set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A})$  and is evaluated as

$$d(\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}) := \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{A}} \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|.$$

The set  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A})$ , which is defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}) := \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{A} \mid \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\| = d(\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A})\},$$

contains all points in the set  $\mathcal{A}$  that are at a distance  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A})$  from  $\mathbf{a}$ . When  $\text{card}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A})) = 1$ , the element in the set  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A})$ , which represents the unique closest point in  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathbf{a}$ , is denoted by  $\Pi(\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A})$ .

### B. Geometric sets

1) *Hyperplane*: The hyperplane passing through  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and perpendicular to  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) := \{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{p} = 0\}. \quad (1)$$

The closed positive half-space and the closed negative half-space, denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_{\geq}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\leq}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ , respectively, are obtained by replacing '=' on the right in (1) with ' $\geq$ ' and ' $\leq$ ', respectively. We also use the notations  $\mathcal{H}_{>}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{<}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$  to denote the open positive and the open negative half-spaces such that  $\mathcal{H}_{>}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \mathcal{H}_{\geq}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \setminus \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{<}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \mathcal{H}_{\leq}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \setminus \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ .

## III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

We are interested in extending first-order motion planners to second-order systems while preserving safety and stability

properties. In other words, we aim at designing a feedback control law  $\mathbf{u}$  for the second-order system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathbf{v}, \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}} &= \mathbf{u},\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

guaranteeing safety and asymptotic stability of the equilibrium ( $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ ), knowing that the first-order system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d$  guarantees safety and asymptotic stability of the target location  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_d$ , where  $\mathbf{v}_d$  is referred to as the first-order motion planner. The vectors  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  denote the vehicle's position, velocity and control input, respectively.

We assume that the workspace  $\mathcal{W}$  is a pathwise connected subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , containing  $n$ -dimensional compact obstacles  $\mathcal{O}_i$ , where  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Collectively,  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}} := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \mathcal{O}_i$  represents the unsafe region, where  $\mathbb{I} := \{0, \dots, m\}$ , with  $\mathcal{O}_0 = (\mathcal{W}^c)^c$  being the region outside of  $\mathcal{W}$  with its boundary  $\partial\mathcal{W}$ .

The robot's body is contained within an  $n$ -dimensional sphere of radius  $r > 0$ , where  $r$  is the sum of the robot's radius and a safety distance. For collision-free navigation, the robot's center  $\mathbf{x}$  must always belong to the interior of the free space  $\mathcal{X}_r$ , where given  $p > 0$ , the set  $\mathcal{X}_p$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{X}_p = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{W} \mid \mathcal{B}_p(\mathbf{x}) \cap \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}}^c = \emptyset\}.$$

To ensure safe navigation to any desired target location  $\mathbf{x}_d$ , the free space  $\mathcal{X}_r$  must be pathwise connected. Additionally, as mentioned next in Assumption 1, we impose certain conditions on the unsafe region  $\mathcal{X}_r^c$ . These conditions are necessary to ensure that the gradient vector and the Hessian matrix of the distance function  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ , defined as

$$d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = d(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}}) - r, \quad (3)$$

are well-defined when the robot is close to the obstacles, *i.e.*, when  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  is small.

**Assumption 1.** The free space  $\mathcal{X}_r$  is pathwise connected, and there exists  $\delta_u > 0$  such that the unsafe region  $\mathcal{X}_r^c$  satisfies the following requirements:

- 1) The closest point to  $\mathbf{x}$  on  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}}$  is unique for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_u}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$  *i.e.*,  $\text{card}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}})) = 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_u}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ .
- 2) There exists  $H > 0$  such that  $\|\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\text{F}} \leq H$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_u}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , where  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}$ .
- 3) The Hessian matrix  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x})$  is symmetric for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_u}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ .

**Remark 1.** According to Assumption 1, there exists  $\delta_u > 0$  such that  $\text{card}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}})) = 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_u}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ . Therefore, as per [15, Lemma 4.2],  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  is continuously differentiable for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_u}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , and the gradient of  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\mathcal{N}_{\delta_u}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$  is given as

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} d_{\mathbf{x}} = \eta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{x} - \Pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}})}{\|\mathbf{x} - \Pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}})\|}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\Pi(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}})$  is the unique closest point to  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}}$ , as defined in Section II-A.

We assume that  $\mathbf{x}_d \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$  and the first-order motion planner  $\mathbf{v}_d : \mathcal{X}_r^o \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfies the following assumption:

**Assumption 2.** For the system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$ , the following properties hold:

- 1) The  $\omega$ -limit set over  $\mathcal{X}_r^o$  is given by  $\mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$ , where the set  $\mathcal{E}$ , which is defined as

$$\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^o \mid \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}_d\},$$

only contains isolated equilibrium points, and  $\omega$ -limit set is defined according to [16, pg 227].

- 2) The equilibrium point  $\mathbf{x}_d$  is almost globally asymptotically stable over  $\mathcal{X}_r^o$ .
- 3) For every  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$ , the matrix  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}^*)$  is continuous and has eigenvalues with non-zero real parts.
- 4) There exists  $\mu > 0$  and  $\delta_d > 0$  such that  $\delta_d \leq \delta_u$  and the inequality  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})^\top \eta(\mathbf{x}) \geq \mu$  holds for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_d}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , where the existence of  $\delta_u > 0$  is assumed in Assumption 1 and  $\eta(\mathbf{x})$  is defined in (4).
- 5) There exists  $D > 0$  such that  $\|\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})\| \leq D$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$ .

**Remark 2.** Note that when  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  is continuous and time-invariant, the existence of the set of undesired saddle equilibria  $\mathcal{E}$ , as implied from Conditions 1 and 2 of Assumption 2, is a direct consequence of the motion space topology, as proven in [2]. In contrast, if  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  ensures global asymptotic stability of  $\mathbf{x}_d$  for the system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  over  $\mathcal{X}_r^o$ , as demonstrated using hybrid control techniques in [17] and [18], then the set  $\mathcal{E}$  becomes empty. Since Condition 1 specifies that the set of equilibrium points,  $\mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$ , is exactly the  $\omega$ -limit set for  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  over  $\mathcal{X}_r^o$ , it inherently excludes the presence of non-equilibrium limit sets within  $\mathcal{X}_r^o$ .

Condition 3 of Assumption 2 ensures that there are no degenerate<sup>2</sup> equilibrium points in the set  $\mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$ . This enables the analysis of the stability properties of each equilibrium point in this set by studying the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix evaluated at this point for the system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$ , as discussed later in Section IV.

When the robot is close to the obstacles *i.e.*, when  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  is small, Condition 4 requires  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  to point towards the interior of the set  $\mathcal{X}_{r+d_{\mathbf{x}}}$ , which is equivalent to having  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{H}_{>}(\mathbf{0}, \eta(\mathbf{x}))$  when  $d_{\mathbf{x}} \in (0, \delta_d)$ . Consequently, Condition 4 ensures that  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  is not tangential to the set  $\partial\mathcal{X}_{r+d_{\mathbf{x}}}$  at  $\mathbf{x}$ , when  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_d}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ . This guarantees that when the robot is in the  $\delta_d$ -neighbourhood of the obstacles, the first-order motion planner always drives it away from them, and ensures forward invariance of  $\mathcal{X}_r^o$  for the closed-loop system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$ .

Two distinct problems are considered, characterized by additional properties of the first-order motion planner  $\mathbf{v}_d$ , alongside the general conditions specified in Assumption 2.

**Problem 1.** We assume that  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}) = -k_1 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x})$  satisfies Assumption 2, where  $k_1 > 0$  and  $\varphi : \mathcal{X}_r^o \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a known continuously differentiable scalar function that is positive

<sup>2</sup>For a dynamical system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  over  $\mathcal{X}_r^o$ , an equilibrium point  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$  is a non-degenerate equilibrium point if  $\det(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}^*)) \neq 0$ ; it is degenerate otherwise.

definite with respect to  $\mathbf{x}_d$ <sup>3</sup>. Additionally, we require  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  to be uniformly continuous for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ .

**Problem 2.** We assume knowledge of a continuously differentiable first-order motion planner  $\mathbf{v}_d : \mathcal{X}_r^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  that satisfies Assumption 2. Additionally, we require  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  to be bounded for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ .

**Remark 3.** Problem 1 requires knowledge of a scalar function  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  such that the first-order motion planner of the form  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}) = -k_1\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  satisfies Assumption 2, along with additional conditions discussed earlier. In a spherical workspace, the NFs proposed in [2] and [10] satisfy these requirements. For workspaces containing non-spherical obstacles that meet specific curvature conditions, the NFs described in [19] and [6] are suitable.

In contrast, Problem 2 does not assume knowledge of any scalar function  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  and requires the first-order motion planner to be continuously differentiable, with additional conditions. As a result, all aforementioned first-order planners that satisfy the requirements of Problem 1 are also applicable to Problem 2. Furthermore, the continuously differentiable first-order motion planner proposed in [8], which do not meet the requirements of Problem 1 due to the absence of a scalar function  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ , remain valid choices for Problem 2.

Given a first-order motion planner  $\mathbf{v}_d : \mathcal{X}_r^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  that satisfies Assumption 2 and additional requirements as mentioned earlier, the objective is to design a feedback control  $\mathbf{u}$  in (2) such that for the resulting closed-loop system the following statements hold:

- 1) The set  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is forward invariant.
- 2) The equilibrium point  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is almost globally asymptotically stable over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ .

#### IV. FEEDBACK CONTROL DESIGN

If the first-order planner  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  is applied to the second order system (2) without incorporating damping, the  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectory of the resulting closed-loop system may exhibit an overshoot. This overshoot may lead the system into unsafe regions, potentially resulting in collisions with obstacles. To avoid such overshoots, a damping vector of the form  $-k\mathbf{v}$ , with a sufficiently high gain  $k > 0$ , can be introduced. However, excessively high damping significantly reduces the robot's velocity, leading to slow convergence to the desired target state.

To address this trade-off, we propose a dynamic damping gain that adapts based on the robot's proximity to obstacles. Specifically, the damping gain remains low when the robot is far from obstacles, allowing for fast motion, and increases as the robot approaches obstacle boundaries. This mechanism ensures safety by reducing the robot's velocity near obstacles while maintaining efficient progress toward the target in obstacle-free regions.

<sup>3</sup>If  $\varphi : \mathcal{X}_r^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is positive definite function with respect to  $\mathbf{x}_d$ , then  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}_d) = 0$  and  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ \setminus \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$ .

#### A. Feedback control law for Problem 1

The proposed dynamic damping feedback (DDF) control  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$  is given by

$$\mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = -k_1\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x}) - k_d\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}})\mathbf{v}, \quad (5)$$

where  $k_1 > 0$ ,  $k_d > 0$  and  $d_{\mathbf{x}} = d(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{W}}) - r$ . The known scalar function  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  satisfies the properties mentioned in Problem 1. Given  $p \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , the scalar function  $\beta : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  is defined as

$$\beta(p) = \begin{cases} 1, & p \geq \epsilon_2, \\ \phi(p), & \epsilon_1 \leq p \leq \epsilon_2, \\ p^{-1}, & 0 < p \leq \epsilon_1, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $\epsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\epsilon_2 > \epsilon_1$  and  $\phi(p) : [\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2] \rightarrow [1, \epsilon_1^{-1}]$  is a continuous, monotonically decreasing function such that  $\phi(\epsilon_1) = \epsilon_1^{-1}$  and  $\phi(\epsilon_2) = 1$ .<sup>4</sup>

According to (5) and (6), the damping gain remains constant when the robot is at least  $\epsilon_2$  units away from obstacles. However, when the robot is within  $\epsilon_2$  units of the obstacles and moves toward them, the damping gain increases. This increase in damping reduces the robot's velocity, eventually causing it to move in the direction of  $-k_1\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ . According to Condition 4 of Assumption 2, when  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  is small, the vector  $-k_1\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  always belongs to the open half-space  $\mathcal{H}_>(\mathbf{0}, \eta(\mathbf{x}))$  and points away from nearby obstacles, ensuring that the robot eventually moves away from them. These observations are summarized in the following lemma:

**Lemma 1.** Consider the closed-loop system (2)-(5), under Assumptions 1 and 2. If  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(0) > 0$ , then the following statements hold:

- 1)  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .
- 2)  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \neq 0$ .
- 3)  $\mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix A.

Now, we show that the DDF input (5) ensures almost global asymptotic stability of the target state  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  for the closed-loop system (2)-(5) over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Theorem 1.** For the closed-loop system (2)-(5), under Assumptions 1 and 2, the following statements hold:

- 1) The set  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is forward invariant.
- 2) The set of equilibrium points is given by  $\mathcal{S} \cup (\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$ , where the set  $\mathcal{S}$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{S} := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \{\mathbf{0}\} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{E}\}. \quad (7)$$

- 3) If  $k_d > \frac{|g_{\max}|}{\sqrt{|r_{\max}|}}$ , then  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is almost globally asymptotically stable over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , where

$$g_{\max} = \max_i \mathbf{Im}(g_i), \quad r_{\max} = \max_i \mathbf{Re}(g_i), \quad (8)$$

and  $g_i$ , with  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , are the eigenvalues of  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}_d)$ .

<sup>4</sup>Since  $\epsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$ , it follows that  $1/\epsilon_1 > 1$ . Therefore, simplest expression for the monotonically decreasing function  $\phi(p)$  over  $[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$  would be the equation of the line segment joining the points  $(\epsilon_1, 1/\epsilon_1)$  and  $(\epsilon_2, 1)$ , which is given by  $\phi(p) = \frac{\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1^2 + (\epsilon_1 - 1)p}{\epsilon_1(\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1)}$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix B.

**Remark 4.** In most research works, such as [2], [6], and [10], the first-order motion planners  $\mathbf{v}_d$  resemble  $-\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_d)$  when  $\mathbf{x}$  belongs to the neighborhood of  $\mathbf{x}_d$ , where  $\mathbf{P}$  is a positive definite matrix. Consequently, for such first-order motion planners,  $g_{\max}$ , as evaluated in (8), is zero. Therefore, when implementing them in (5), one can set  $k_d > 0$  to ensure almost global asymptotic stability of  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  for the proposed closed-loop system (2)–(5) over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ .

The DDF control input  $\mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$ , as defined in (5), requires knowledge of a scalar function  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  such that the first-order motion planner of the form  $-k_1 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x})$  satisfies Assumption 2, along with other conditions stated in Problem 1. However, ensuring the existence and knowledge of such scalar functions whose negative gradient with respect to  $\mathbf{x}$  would align with a given first-order motion planner  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  is a challenging task. Consequently, in the next section, we propose an alternative feedback control input design for Problem 2, where the knowledge of  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  is not required.

### B. Feedback control law for Problem 2

The proposed velocity tracking feedback (VTF) control  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$  is given by

$$\mathbf{u}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = -k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}})(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{v}, \quad (9)$$

where  $k_d > 0$ . The first-order motion planner  $\mathbf{v}_d : \mathcal{X}_r^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfies Assumption 2 and additional requirements mentioned in Problem 2. The scalar function  $\beta(\cdot)$  is defined in (6).

According to (6) and (9), similar to (5), the proposed feedback control input in (9) is undefined when  $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{X}_r^c}$ . However, if  $\mathbf{x}$  is initialized in the interior of the free space  $\mathcal{X}_r$  i.e., if  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , then  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and it does not approach the boundary of the unsafe region  $\partial \mathcal{X}_r^c$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , as stated in the next lemma.

**Lemma 2.** Consider the closed-loop system (2)–(9), under Assumptions 1 and 2. If  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(0) > 0$ , then the following statements hold:

- 1)  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .
- 2)  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \neq 0$ .
- 3)  $\mathbf{u}_d(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix C.

The VTF control input (9) ensures monotonic decrease in the magnitude of the difference between the robot's velocity  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  and the first-order motion planner  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . This enables us to establish the almost global asymptotic stability of the target state  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  for the closed-loop system (2)–(9) over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , as stated in the next theorem.

**Theorem 2.** For the closed-loop system (2)–(9), under Assumptions 1 and 2, the following statements hold:

- 1) The set  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is forward invariant.
- 2) The norm  $\|\mathbf{v}(t) - \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))\|$  is monotonically decreasing for all  $t \geq 0$ .
- 3) The set of equilibrium points is given by  $\mathcal{S} \cup (\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$ , where the set  $\mathcal{S}$  is defined in (7).

- 4) The equilibrium point  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is almost globally asymptotically stable over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix D.

## V. SIMULATION RESULTS

For the first two simulations, we consider the NF-based first-order motion planner, as described in [6]. The workspace  $\mathcal{W}$  is a sphere centered at  $\mathbf{c}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with radius  $r_0 > 0$  and contains spherical and ellipsoidal obstacles  $\mathcal{O}_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Furthermore, we assume that the distance between any two obstacles, as well as the distance between any obstacle and the workspace boundary, is greater than  $2r$ . In other words, we assume that for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{I}$ ,  $i \neq j$ ,

$$d(\mathcal{O}_i, \mathcal{O}_j) > 2r,$$

where  $d(\mathcal{O}_i, \mathcal{O}_j) := \min_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{O}_i, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{O}_j} \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|$ .

We define an NF  $\varphi : \mathcal{X}_r \rightarrow [0, 1]$  of the following form:

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{(f(\mathbf{x})^\kappa + h(\mathbf{x}))^{1/\kappa}}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\kappa > 0$ . The scalar convex function  $f(\mathbf{x})$  with global minimum at  $\mathbf{x}_d$  is defined as

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \delta_1 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_d\|^2, \quad (11)$$

where  $\delta_1 > 0$ . The obstacle proximity function  $h(\mathbf{x})$  is given by

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{I}} h_i(\mathbf{x}), \quad (12)$$

where, for each  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , the twice continuously differentiable scalar function  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$  is associated with obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_i$  and satisfies

$$\mathcal{O}_i = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0\}.$$

It is shown in [6, Theorem 3] that if the robot can pass between any pair of obstacles and the obstacles satisfy certain curvature conditions, then there exists  $\kappa_{\min} > 0$  such that for all  $\kappa \geq \kappa_{\min}$ , the first-order motion planner  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}) = -k_1 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x})$  satisfies Assumption 2.

For the first simulation, we consider a planar, unbounded workspace  $\mathcal{W}$  containing a single circular obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_1$  with center  $\mathbf{c}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and radius  $r_1 > 0$ , as illustrated in Fig. 1. The obstacle proximity function  $h(\mathbf{x})$ , defined according to (12), is given by

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \delta_2 (\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_1\|^2 - r_1^2),$$

where  $\delta_2 = 0.01$ . The parameters are defined as  $r = 0.5$  m,  $\epsilon_1 = 0.25$  m,  $\epsilon_2 = 0.75$  m,  $\delta_1 = 0.01$ , and  $\kappa = 6$ . The control gains are set to  $k_1 = 2$  and  $k_d = 1$ . The target location  $\mathbf{x}_d$  is set to  $[0, 0]^\top$  m. The robot's center is initialized at  $[-8, 0]^\top$  m with an initial velocity of  $[2, -1]^\top$  m/s.

In Fig. 1, the red-colored  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectory is obtained for the system (2) with  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$ , where  $\mathbf{u}_f$  is given by

$$\mathbf{u}_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = -k_1 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) - k_d \mathbf{v}. \quad (13)$$

The blue-colored and the magenta-colored  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectories are obtained using the DDF control (5) and the VTF control (9),





Fig. 1: Robot  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectories under the DDF control law (blue curve), the VTF control law (magenta curve), and the fixed damping control law (red curve) which are defined in (5), (9), and (13), respectively.

respectively. It can be noticed that the  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectory obtained using the fixed damping control (13) enters in the unsafe region indicating collision between the robot and obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_1$ . In contrast, the robot controlled using the proposed control schemes safely avoids  $\mathcal{O}_1$  and asymptotically converges to  $[\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}]^\top$ .



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
DDF	8.79	8.17	7.15	6.28	5.00	6.18	6.30
VTF	8.66	8.01	7.11	6.22	4.99	6.17	6.26

(b)

Fig. 2: (a) Robot  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectories under the DDF control law and the VTF control law, represented using solid curves and dashed curves, respectively. (b) Path lengths of  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectories in meters.

For the second simulation, we consider a circular workspace

$\mathcal{W}$  with 8 elliptical obstacles as shown in Fig. 2a. The obstacle proximity function  $h(\mathbf{x})$  is given by (12), where for each  $i \in \mathbb{I} \setminus \{0\}$ , the scalar function  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$  associated with obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_i$  with center  $\mathbf{c}_i \in \mathcal{W}$  is given by

$$h_i(\mathbf{x}) = \delta_2((\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i)^\top \mathbf{S}_i (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_i) - 1),$$

where  $\delta_2 > 0$ , and the  $2 \times 2$  positive definite matrix  $\mathbf{S}_i$  determines the shape and the orientation of  $\mathcal{O}_i$ . For  $i = 0$ , the scalar function  $h_0(\mathbf{x}) = \delta_2(r_0^2 - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{c}_0\|^2)$ .

The point robot is initialized at seven different locations which are marked by diamond symbols in Fig. 2a, with initial velocities set to  $[0, 0]^\top$  m/s. The target location is  $\mathbf{x}_d = [4, 0]^\top$  m. The parameters are set as  $\epsilon_1 = 0.5$  m,  $\epsilon_2 = 1.5$  m,  $\delta_1 = 0.01$ ,  $\delta_2 = 0.01$ , and  $\kappa = 25$ . The control gains are chosen as  $k_1 = 5$  and  $k_d = 1$ .

In Fig. 2a, solid curves represent the robot's  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectories under the DDF control input (5), while dashed curves show trajectories obtained using the VTF control input (9). All trajectories successfully avoid obstacles and asymptotically converge to  $\mathbf{x}_d$ . Since the VTF control input (9) ensures a monotonic decrease in the magnitude of the difference between  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  and  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , as stated in Theorem 2, the robot's trajectory resembles the  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectory of the first-order system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  as  $t$  increases. Consequently, the path length under VTF control is generally shorter than that under DDF control, as shown in Table 2b.

For the next simulation, we consider the modified version of the first-order motion planner proposed in [8], with modifications discussed later in Remark 5. The workspace  $\mathcal{W}$  is a convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and contains spherical and ellipsoidal obstacles  $\mathcal{O}_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , which are separated from one another and from the workspace boundary by a distance greater than  $2r$ . The modified version of the first-order motion planner proposed in [8] is given by the following equation:

$$\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}) = k_1 \left[ \frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{\kappa} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} g_i(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i) - h(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}) \right], \quad (14)$$

where  $k_1 > 0$ ,  $\kappa > 0$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is a fixed point belonging to obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_i$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$ .

The scalar function  $f(\mathbf{x})$  is given by (11). The obstacle proximity function  $h(\mathbf{x})$  is defined according to (12), where for each  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , the scalar function  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$  is defined as

$$h_i(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} d(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_i) - r, & d(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_i) - r \leq \epsilon_1, \\ \phi_1(d(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_i) - r), & \epsilon_1 \leq d(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_i) - r \leq \epsilon_2, \\ 1, & d(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{O}_i) - r \geq \epsilon_2, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

with  $\epsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$  and  $\epsilon_2 > \epsilon_1$ . For a given  $p \in \mathbb{R}$ , the mapping  $\phi_1 : [\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2] \rightarrow [\epsilon_1, 1]$  is continuously differentiable and monotonically increasing, such that  $\phi_1(\epsilon_1) = \epsilon_1$ ,  $\phi_1(\epsilon_2) = 1$ ,  $\phi_1'(\epsilon_1) = 1$ , and  $\phi_1'(\epsilon_2) = 0$ .

In (14), for  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , the scalar function  $g_i(\mathbf{x})$  is given by

$$g_i(\mathbf{x}) = (1 - h_i(\mathbf{x})) \bar{h}_i(\mathbf{x}), \quad (16)$$

and for  $i = 0$ ,  $g_0(\mathbf{x}) = (h_0(\mathbf{x}) - 1)\bar{h}_0(\mathbf{x})$ , where

$$\bar{h}_i(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j \in \mathbb{I}, j \neq i} h_j(\mathbf{x}), \quad (17)$$

for every  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ . Similar to [8, Theorem 1], it can be shown that there exists  $\kappa_{\min} > 0$  such that for  $\kappa \geq \kappa_{\min}$ , the first-order motion planner in (14) satisfies Assumption 2.

**Remark 5.** In comparison with the first-order motion planner proposed in [8, Section 3.1] (hereafter referred to as the *original* planner), the first-order motion planner defined in (14) (hereafter referred to as the *modified* planner) introduces the following modifications:

- 1) In the *original* planner, the definition of  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$  requires global information about obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_i$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ . Additionally, the definition of  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$  in [8, Assumption 3] is such that the value of  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$  strictly increases as the robot moves away from obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_i$ . As a result, as the number of obstacles increases, the value of  $h(\mathbf{x})$ , defined according to (12), becomes very large, which increases the magnitude of the *original* planner. This can make it challenging to implement the *original* planner with sufficiently large step sizes. Therefore, the normalized version of the *original* planner, as implemented in [8, Section 5], is often preferred. On the other hand, in the *modified* planner, according to (12) and (15), the value of  $h(\mathbf{x}) \in [0, 1]$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r$ . Additionally, for any  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , the definition of  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$  in (15) only requires the distance between the robot and obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_i$  which can be obtained using range-bearing sensor measurements.
- 2) In the *original* planner,  $g_i(\mathbf{x})$  in (14) is replaced by  $\bar{h}_i(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , where  $\bar{h}_i(\mathbf{x})$  is defined in (17). Therefore, even when the robot is far from the obstacles, its trajectory is influenced by the repulsive vector field components of the *original* planner. Furthermore, as the number of obstacles increases, higher values of the tuning parameter  $\kappa$  must be chosen to mitigate the effects of these combined repulsive vector field components far away from obstacles. In contrast, in the *modified* planner, since, according to (15),  $h_i(\mathbf{x}) \in [0, 1]$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r$  and for every  $i \in \mathbb{I}$ , the use of  $g_i(\mathbf{x})$ , as defined in (16), ensures that when the robot is more than  $\epsilon_2$  units away from obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_i$ , the repulsive vector field component associated with  $\mathcal{O}_i$  in (14) vanishes. This guarantees that when the robot is more than  $\epsilon_2$  units away from any obstacle, the repulsive vector field component of the *modified* planner vanishes.

It is a challenging task to design a scalar function  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  whose negative gradient with respect to  $\mathbf{x}$  is  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$ , as defined in (14). Therefore, implementing the DDF control defined in (5) is not feasible. However, it can be verified that the *modified* planner  $\mathbf{v}_d$  in (14) is continuously differentiable for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r$ , and that  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  is bounded for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r$ . Consequently, since the *modified* planner satisfies Assumption 2 and the additional requirements in Problem 2, we can implement the VTF control defined in (9).

We consider a planar, bounded workspace  $\mathcal{W}$  containing 10 obstacles, as shown in Fig. 3. The robot is initialized at 9




Fig. 3: Robot  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectories obtained using the VTF control law (9).




Fig. 4: Evolution of  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ , which is evaluated according to (3).

different locations, indicated by the diamond symbols, and is equipped with a range sensor of sensing radius  $R_s = 2$  m. The target location  $\mathbf{x}_d$  is set to  $[0, 0]^T$  m. For each trajectory, the robot's initial velocity is randomly chosen from the standard normal distribution. The parameters are defined as  $r = 0.1$  m,  $\epsilon_1 = 0.5$  m,  $\epsilon_2 = 1.5$  m,  $\delta_1 = 0.5$ , and  $\kappa = 10$ . The control gains are set to  $k_1 = 0.5$  and  $k_d = 0.5$ . We assume that when the robot enters in the  $\epsilon_2$ -neighborhood of any obstacle  $\mathcal{O}_i$ , where  $i \in \mathbb{I} \setminus \{0\}$ , it can identify the location of the fixed point  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , used in (14). Since  $\mathbf{x}_d \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , the location  $\mathbf{x}_0$  associated with  $\mathcal{O}_0$  is set to  $\mathbf{x}_d$ .

Figure 3 illustrates the robot's  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectories from 9 different initial positions, each with a randomly chosen initial velocity. The results show that all  $\mathbf{x}$ -trajectories asymptotically converge to the desired target location  $\mathbf{x}_d$ . The robot's safety can be inferred from the evolution of  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ , shown in Fig. 4, which remains positive for all time, ensuring that the robot does not collide with obstacles. In Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, each trajectory is associated with the robot trajectory of the same color in Fig. 3. Interestingly, the VTF control (9) ensures a monotonic decrease in the magnitude of the difference between the robot's velocity  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  and the first-order motion planner  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , as established earlier in Claim 2 of Theorem 2, and is also illustrated in Fig. 5.




Fig. 5: Monotonic decrease in the magnitude of the difference between  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  and  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))$ .

## VI. CONCLUSION

The problem of extending first-order motion planners to the robot governed by second-order dynamics is considered. When a given first-order motion planner is derived as the negative gradient of a scalar function, as assumed in Problem 1, the DDF control design in (5) ensures safety and guarantees almost global asymptotic stability of  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  for the resulting closed-loop system over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . If no such function is available, the VTF control design (9) ensures a monotonic decrease in the magnitude of the difference between the robot's velocity and the first-order motion planner, as illustrated in Fig. 5, provided that the first-order motion planner is continuously differentiable. This guarantees almost global asymptotic stability of  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  for the resulting closed-loop system over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  while ensuring obstacle avoidance. The effectiveness of the proposed control schemes is validated through simulation studies.

## APPENDIX

### A. Proof of Lemma 1

1) *Proof of Claim 1:* The proof is inspired by the proof of Claim 1 of [20, Lemma 1]. We proceed by contradiction. Assume that there exists finite  $T > 0$  such that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(T) = 0$ . This implies the existence of  $t_1 \geq 0$  such that  $t_1 < T$ ,  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1) \in (0, \rho]$ , and  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) < 0$  over the interval  $[t_1, T)$ , with  $\rho = \min\{\delta_d, \epsilon_1\}$ , where the existence of  $\delta_d > 0$  is assumed in Condition 4 of Assumption 2 and  $\epsilon_1$  is defined in (6).

Since, according to Assumption 2,  $\delta_d \leq \delta_u$ ,  $\rho \in (0, \delta_d]$ , and  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$  for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ , one has

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \mathbf{v}(t), \quad (18)$$

for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ , where  $\eta(\mathbf{x})$  is defined in (4). Taking the time derivative of (18) and using (5), one obtains

$$\ddot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = -k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)) \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) - k_1 \eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}(t)) + \mathbf{v}(t)^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}(t)) \mathbf{v}(t), \quad (19)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ . Since, according to (6),  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) = d_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , it follows that

$$k_d \frac{\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t)}{d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)} = -\ddot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) - k_1 \eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}(t)) + \mathbf{v}(t)^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}(t)) \mathbf{v}(t). \quad (20)$$

Integrating (20) with respect to time from  $t_1$  to  $t$ , one obtains

$$k_d (\ln(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \ln(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1))) = \dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1) - \dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) - k_1 \int_{t_1}^t \eta(\mathbf{x})^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) d\tau + \int_{t_1}^t \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v} d\tau. \quad (21)$$

As  $t \rightarrow T$ , the left-hand side of (21) approaches  $-\infty$ . We proceed to analyze the right-hand side of (21) as  $t \rightarrow T$ .

Since  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) < 0$  for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ ,  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  either is bounded from below or tends to  $-\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow T$ . Additionally, since  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$  for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ , by Condition 4 of Assumption 2, the inequality  $-\eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}(t)) > 0$  holds for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ . Now, if one shows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{t_1}^t \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v} d\tau \neq -\infty$ , then it will imply that the right-hand side of (21) either remains bounded or tends to  $\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow T$ , thereby leading to a contradiction.

Now, we evaluate  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{t_1}^t \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v} d\tau$ . Define  $V_p = k_1 \varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2$ , where  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  is a known positive definite function with respect to  $\mathbf{x}_d$ , as defined in Problem 1. Taking the time derivative of  $V_p$  and using (5), one gets

$$\dot{V}_p = -k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) \|\mathbf{v}\|^2. \quad (22)$$

Since, according to (6),  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) \geq 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , and  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}})$  is undefined only if  $d_{\mathbf{x}} = 0$ , it is true that  $\dot{V}_p \leq 0$  as long as  $d_{\mathbf{x}} > 0$ . Therefore, since  $d_{\mathbf{x}} > 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , and  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(\mathcal{X}_r^c) \subset \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$  for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  is bounded for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ . Additionally, according to Assumption 1,  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ .

Consequently, since  $T$  is finite,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{t_1}^t \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v} d\tau \neq -\infty$ , and the proof of Claim 1 of Lemma 1 is complete.

2) *Proof of Claim 2:* Let  $\sigma = \min\left\{\rho, \frac{k_d}{D} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{|\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}|}}\right\}$ , where the existence of the positive scalar parameters  $\mu$  and  $D$  is assumed in Assumption 2,  $\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x})$  over  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , and  $\rho = \min\{\delta_d, \epsilon_1\}$ . The existence  $\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}$  is implied by Assumption 1 and the fact that  $\sigma \leq \rho \leq \delta_d \leq \delta_u$ , where the relation  $\delta_d \leq \delta_u$  is assumed in Condition 4 of Assumption 2. If  $\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min} = 0$ , then we set  $\sigma = \rho$ .

In light of Claim 1 of Lemma 1, there are two possible cases: either there exists  $t_\sigma \geq 0$  such that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \in (0, \sigma]$  for all  $t \geq t_\sigma$ , or no such  $t_\sigma$  exists. In the latter case, it follows trivially that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \neq 0$ . Therefore, we proceed by considering the former case. To do so, we first establish the following fact:

**Fact 1.** Consider the closed-loop system (2)-(5) under Assumptions 1 and 2. If, for any  $\sigma > 0$ , there exists  $t_\sigma \geq 0$  such that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \in (0, \sigma]$  for all  $t \geq t_\sigma$ , then there exists  $t_\sigma^{\mathbf{v}} \geq t_\sigma$  such that  $\mathbf{v}(t) \in \mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0})$  for all  $t \geq t_\sigma^{\mathbf{v}}$ , where  $\gamma(\sigma) = \frac{D}{k_d \beta(\sigma)}$ .






Fig. 6: Illustration of the evolution of  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  for  $t \geq t_{\sigma}^v$ , where, after  $t_2$ , the green-colored portion of the trajectory is feasible, while the dashed portions are infeasible.

*Proof.* Define  $L_p = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2$ . Taking the time derivative and using (5), one obtains

$$\dot{L}_p = -k_1 \mathbf{v}^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) - k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) \|\mathbf{v}\|^2. \quad (23)$$

Since  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \in (0, \sigma]$  for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ , it is clear that  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{X}_r^{\circ}$  for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ . Therefore, using Condition 5 of Assumption 2, one can ensure that  $k_1 \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}(t))\| \leq D$  for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ . Additionally, since  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \in (0, \sigma]$  for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ , according to (6),  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)) \geq \beta(\sigma)$  for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ . It follows that

$$\dot{L}_p(t) \leq D \|\mathbf{v}(t)\| - k_d \beta(\sigma) \|\mathbf{v}(t)\|^2. \quad (24)$$

for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ . Therefore,  $\dot{L}_p(t) < 0$  whenever  $\mathbf{v}(t) \notin \mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0})$ , for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ . As a result, if  $\|\mathbf{v}(t_1)\| > \gamma(\sigma)$  for some  $t_1 \geq t_{\sigma}$ , then the inequality  $\dot{L}_p(t) < 0$  holds after  $t_1$  until  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  enters in the set  $\mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0})$ . This ensures the existence of  $t_{\sigma}^v \geq t_1$  such that  $\mathbf{v}(t_{\sigma}^v) \in \mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0})$ . Additionally, according to (24),  $\dot{L}_p(t) \leq 0$  for all  $(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{X}_r^c) \times \partial \mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0})$  when  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ . Consequently, since  $\mathbf{v}(t_{\sigma}^v) \in \mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0})$ ,  $t_{\sigma}^v \geq t_1 \geq t_{\sigma}$  and  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$  for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ , it is true that  $\mathbf{v}(t) \in \mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0})$  for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}^v$ , and the proof is complete.

Assuming the existence of  $t_{\sigma} \geq 0$  such that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \in (0, \sigma]$  for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}$ , Fact 1 guarantees the existence of  $t_{\sigma}^v \geq t_{\sigma}$  such that  $\mathbf{v}(t) \in \mathcal{B}_{\gamma(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0})$  for all  $t \geq t_{\sigma}^v$ . Now, if we establish the existence of  $t_s \geq t_{\sigma}^v$  for some  $\sigma_0 \in (0, \sigma)$  such that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \notin (0, \sigma_0)$  for all  $t \geq t_s$ , then it follows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \neq 0$ .

Let  $t_1 \geq t_{\sigma}^v$  such that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1) \in (0, \sigma]$  and  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1) < 0$ . The remaining proof is separated in two parts as follows:

**Part 1:** We show that after  $t_1$ ,  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  does not strictly decrease and does not converge to 0. In other words, we prove that  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  cannot remain negative for all  $t \geq t_1$ . This implies that there exists  $t_2 > t_1$  such that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_2) \in (0, \sigma)$  and  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_2) = 0$ , as depicted in Fig. 6.

The proof of the first part is similar to the proof of Claim 1 of Lemma 1, wherein  $T$  is replaced by  $\infty$ . From (21), one has

$$k_d (\ln(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \ln(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1))) = \dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1) - \dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) - k_1 \int_{t_1}^t \eta(\mathbf{x})^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) d\tau + \int_{t_1}^t \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v} d\tau. \quad (25)$$

We proceed by contradiction. Assume  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) < 0$  for all  $t \geq t_1$ . This implies that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  strictly decreases for all  $t \geq t_1$  and converges to 0 as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, the left-hand side of (25) approaches  $-\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . We proceed to analyze the right-hand side of (25) as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

Since  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) < 0$  for all  $t \geq t_1$ ,  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  either is bounded from below or tends to  $-\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Additionally, since  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1) \in (0, \sigma]$ , having  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) < 0$  for all  $t \geq t_1$  implies that  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$  for all  $t \in [t_1, \infty)$ . Therefore, since  $\sigma \leq \delta_d$ , using Condition 4 of Assumption 2 one can confirm that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{t_1}^t -k_1 \eta(\mathbf{x})^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) d\tau = \infty. \text{ Finally, we show that } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{t_1}^t \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v} d\tau \neq -\infty.$$

Since, according to Assumption 1, the matrix  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x})$  is symmetric and bounded for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_u}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ ,  $\delta_d \leq \delta_u$  as per Condition 4 of Assumption 2, and  $\sigma \leq \rho \leq \delta_d$ , one has

$$\int_{t_1}^t \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v} d\tau \geq \frac{|\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}|}{k_d} \int_{t_1}^t -k_d \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 d\tau,$$

where  $\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x})$  over  $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ . Using (6) and (22), it follows that

$$\int_{t_1}^t \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v} d\tau \geq \frac{|\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}|}{k_d} (V_p(t) - V_p(t_1)),$$

with  $V_p = k_1 \varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{v}\|^2$ , where  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  is a known positive definite function with respect to  $\mathbf{x}_d$ , as defined in Problem 1.

Therefore,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{t_1}^t \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v} d\tau \neq -\infty$ . Consequently, one can conclude that the right-hand side of (25) approaches  $\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , leading to a contradiction. As a result,  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  cannot remain negative for all  $t \geq t_1$ , implying the existence of  $t_2 > t_1$  such that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_2) \in (0, \sigma)$  and  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_2) = 0$ . This completes the proof of the first part.

**Part 2:** We prove that after  $t_2$ ,  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \geq 0$  as long as  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ . In other words,  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  does not decrease after time  $t_2$  as long as  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  belongs to region  $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , as illustrated using the green-colored curve in Fig. 6. This will imply that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \notin (0, d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_2))$  for all  $t \geq t_2$ , thus ensuring  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \neq 0$ .

We now proceed to show that after  $t_2$ ,  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \geq 0$  as long as  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ . Specifically, we aim to prove that if  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_s) = 0$  and  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_s) \in (0, \sigma]$  for any  $t_s \geq t_2$ , then  $\ddot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_s) \geq 0$ . As a result, since  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_2) \in (0, \sigma)$  and  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_2) = 0$ , it will imply that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  does not decrease after  $t_2$  as long as  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , as represented using the green-colored curve in Fig. 6, and the proof of Claim 2 will be complete.

Let  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_s) = 0$  and  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_s) \in (0, \sigma]$  for some  $t_s \geq t_2$ . According to (19), one has

$$\ddot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_s) = -k_1 \eta(\mathbf{x}(t_s))^\top \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x}(t_s)) + \mathbf{v}(t_s)^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}(t_s)) \mathbf{v}(t_s).$$

Since  $\sigma \leq \rho \leq \delta_d \leq \delta_u$ , using Assumptions 1 and 2, one can verify that

$$\ddot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_s) \geq \mu - |\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}| \|\mathbf{v}(t_s)\|^2, \quad (26)$$

where  $\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x})$  over  $\mathcal{N}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ . Since  $t_s \geq t_2 > t_1 \geq t_{\sigma}^v$ ,  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_s) \in (0, \sigma]$  and  $\sigma \leq \rho \leq \epsilon_1$ , as per Fact 1 and (6), one has  $\|\mathbf{v}(t_s)\|^2 \leq \frac{D^2 \sigma^2}{k_d^2}$ . Additionally,

since  $\sigma = \min \left\{ \rho, \frac{k_d}{D} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{|\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}|}} \right\}$ , it follows that  $\|\mathbf{v}(t_s)\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu}{|\lambda_{\mathbf{H}}^{\min}|}$ . Consequently, using (26), it follows that  $\ddot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_s) \geq 0$ , and the proof of the second part is complete.

3) *Proof of Claim 3:* According to (22),  $\dot{V}_p = -k_d\beta(d_x)\|\mathbf{v}\|^2$ , where  $V_p = k_1\varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{v}\|^2$  and  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  is a known positive definite function with respect to  $\mathbf{x}_d$ , as defined in Problem 1. According to (6), we know that  $\beta(d_x) \geq 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$  and  $\beta(d_x)$  is undefined only if  $d_x = 0$ . Since  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , Claims 1 and 2 of Lemma 1 imply that  $\beta(d_x(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . It follows that

$$\dot{V}_p(t) \leq -k_d\|\mathbf{v}(t)\|^2 \leq 0, \quad (27)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ . Consequently,  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . Furthermore, according to Condition 5 of Assumption 2,  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  is bounded for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ . Additionally, since  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , according to Claim 1 of Lemma 1,  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x}(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . As a result, if  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , then  $\mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$ , defined in (5), is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ .

### B. Proof of Theorem 1

In the light of Lemma 1, the forward invariance of  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  for the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(5) is straightforward to establish.

1) *Proof of Claim 2:* For the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(5), by setting  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{0}$ , and using Assumption 2, one can verify that the set of equilibrium points is  $\mathcal{S} \cup (\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is defined in (7).

2) *Proof of Claim 3:* The proof is separated into two parts as follows:

**Part 1:** We show that the set  $\mathcal{S} \cup (\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is globally attractive for the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(5) over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . Specifically, we show that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ .

Since, according to Lemma 1, if  $d_x(0) > 0$ , then  $d_x(t) > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_x(t) \neq 0$ , it follows that  $\beta(d_x(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . Therefore, if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \beta(d_x(t))\mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ . Consequently, using Claim 2 of Theorem 1, one can verify that if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)) \in \mathcal{S} \cup (\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$ .

We proceed to prove the  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ . According to (27), one has

$$\dot{V}_p(t) \leq -k_d\|\mathbf{v}(t)\|^2 \leq 0,$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ , where  $V_p = k_1\varphi(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{v}\|^2$  and  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  is a known positive definite function with respect to  $\mathbf{x}_d$ , as defined in Problem 1. Therefore,  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ , and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}(\tau)\|^2 d\tau$  exists. Furthermore, since  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , as per Claim 3 of Lemma 1,  $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . This ensures uniform continuity of  $\|\mathbf{v}(t)\|^2$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Consequently, by the virtue of Barbalat's lemma, one has  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ .

Next, to show that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ , we make use of the extension of Barbalat's lemma [21, Lemma 1], which is restated as follows:

**Lemma 3.** Let  $f(t)$  and  $g(t)$  be two function from  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $f$  is differentiable and  $g$  is uniformly continuous

on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . If  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t) = c$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\dot{f}(t) - g(t)) = 0$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{f}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t) = 0$ , where  $c$  is a constant.

Note that Lemma 3, which is applicable to scalar-valued functions, is being applied elementwise to the vector-valued functions  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  and  $-k_1\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x}(t))$ . According to Lemma 1, if  $d_x(0) > 0$ , then  $d_x(t) > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_x(t) \neq 0$ . Therefore,  $\beta(d_x(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . Consequently,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$  implies that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \beta(d_x(t))\mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ . Moreover, since  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is forward invariant for the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(5), and  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  is assumed to be uniformly continuous for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , it follows that  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\varphi(\mathbf{x}(t))$  is uniformly continuous for all  $t \geq 0$ . Therefore, according to Lemma 3,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ , and the proof of the first part is complete.

**Part 2:** We show that for the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(5), every point in  $\mathcal{S}$  is an undesired saddle equilibrium, and  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is an asymptotically stable equilibrium point.

To analyze the properties of the equilibrium points in  $\mathcal{S} \cup (\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$ , we examine the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrices of the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(5) at these points. The Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$  is given by

$$\mathbf{J}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{I}_n \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = -k_1\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2\varphi(\mathbf{x}) - k_d\mathbf{v}\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\beta(d_x)^\top,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \mathbf{v}} = -k_d\beta(d_x)\mathbf{I}_n.$$

For  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0}) \in \mathcal{S} \cup (\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$ , the Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}_p(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0})$  is given by

$$\mathbf{J}_p(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{I}_n \\ -k_1\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2\varphi(\mathbf{x}^*) & -k_d\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*})\mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $d_{\mathbf{x}^*} = d(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathcal{O}_W) - r$ .

Let  $\lambda$  denote the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{J}_p(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0})$ . The matrix  $\mathbf{J}_{p\lambda} = \mathbf{J}_p - \lambda\mathbf{I}_n$  is given by

$$\mathbf{J}_{p\lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda\mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{I}_n \\ -k_1\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2\varphi(\mathbf{x}^*) & -(\lambda + k_d\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*}))\mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

To proceed with the proof, we use [22, Fact 2.14.13], which is restated as a fact below:

**Fact 2.** If  $\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , and  $\mathbf{AC} = \mathbf{CA}$ , then

$$\det(\mathbf{M}) = \det(\mathbf{AD} - \mathbf{CB}).$$

Using Fact 2, one can verify that

$$\det(\mathbf{J}_{p\lambda}) = (-1)^n \det(-k_1\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2\varphi(\mathbf{x}^*) - \theta\mathbf{I}_n),$$

where  $\theta = \lambda(\lambda + k_d\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*}))$ . Equating  $\det(\mathbf{J}_{p\lambda}) = 0$  indicates that the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{J}_p(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0})$  satisfy the following quadratic equation:

$$\lambda^2 + k_d\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*})\lambda - \theta = 0, \quad (28)$$

where  $\theta$  represents the eigenvalues of  $-k_1 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varphi(\mathbf{x}^*)$ , with  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$ . The expression for  $\lambda$  is given by

$$\lambda = \frac{-k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*}) \pm \sqrt{k_d^2 \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*})^2 + 4\theta}}{2}. \quad (29)$$

According to Condition 3 of Assumption 2, all eigenvalues of  $-k_1 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varphi(\mathbf{x}^*)$  have non-zero real parts when  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$  i.e.,  $\mathbf{Re}(\theta) \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . Additionally, according to Condition 2 of Assumption 2,  $\mathbf{x}_d$  is almost globally asymptotically stable for the system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = -k_1 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \varphi(\mathbf{x})$  over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ . Therefore, all eigenvalues of  $-k_1 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varphi(\mathbf{x}_d)$  have negative real parts. As a result, since  $k_d > |g_{\max}|/\sqrt{|r_{\max}|}$ , and  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) \geq 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , using (29), one can verify through straightforward calculations that all eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{J}_p(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  have negative real parts. Consequently,  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is an asymptotically stable equilibrium point for the closed-loop system (2)-(5).

On the other hand, for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{E}$ , the matrix  $-k_1 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \varphi(\mathbf{x})$  has at least one eigenvalue with a positive real part and no eigenvalue with a zero real part. Therefore, according to (29), one can verify that when  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{E}$ , the matrix  $\mathbf{J}_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0})$  has at least one eigenvalue with a positive real part, at least one eigenvalue with a negative real part, and no eigenvalue with a zero real part. As a result, every point in  $\mathcal{S}$  is a saddle equilibrium for the closed-loop system (2)-(5). This completes the proof of the second part.

The second part of the proof ensures that the set of initial conditions in  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  from which every solution to the closed-loop system (2)-(5) converges to one of the equilibria in  $\mathcal{S}$  has zero Lebesgue measure. Thus, it follows from the first part that  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is almost globally asymptotically stable for the closed-loop system (2)-(5) over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , and the proof of Claim 3 of Theorem 1 is complete.

### C. Proof of Lemma 2

1) *Proof of Claim 1:* The proof is inspired by the proof of Claim 1 of [20, Lemma 1]. We proceed by contradiction. Assume that there exists finite  $T > 0$  such that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(T) = 0$ . This implies the existence of  $t_1 \geq 0$  such that  $t_1 < T$ ,  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1) \in (0, \rho]$ , and  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) < 0$  over the interval  $[t_1, T)$ , with  $\rho = \min\{\delta_d, \epsilon_1\}$ , where the existence of  $\delta_d > 0$  is assumed in Condition 4 of Assumption 2 and  $\epsilon_1$  is defined in (6).

Since, according to Assumption 2,  $\delta_d \leq \delta_u$ ,  $\rho \in (0, \delta_d]$ , and  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$  for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ , one has

$$\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \mathbf{v}(t), \quad (30)$$

for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ , where  $\eta(\mathbf{x})$  is defined in (4). Taking the time derivative of (30) and using (9), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= -k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)) \dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) + k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)) \eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)) \\ &\quad + \alpha(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^2 d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  and

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)) = \eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \dot{\mathbf{v}}_d(t) + \mathbf{v}(t)^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}(t)) \mathbf{v}(t). \quad (31)$$

Since, according to (6),  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) = d_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , it

follows that

$$\begin{aligned} k_d \frac{\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t)}{d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)} &= -\ddot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) + \frac{k_1}{d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)} \eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)) \\ &\quad + \alpha(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Integrating (32) with respect to time from  $t_1$  to  $t$ , one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} k_d (\ln(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t)) - \ln(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1))) &= \dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t_1) - \dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) \\ &\quad + k_1 \int_{t_1}^t \frac{\eta(\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})}{d_{\mathbf{x}}} d\tau + \int_{t_1}^t \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

As  $t \rightarrow T$ , the left-hand side of (33) approaches  $-\infty$ . We proceed to analyze the right-hand side of (33) as  $t \rightarrow T$ .

Since  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t) < 0$  for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ ,  $\dot{d}_{\mathbf{x}}(t)$  either is bounded from below or tends to  $-\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow T$ . Additionally, since  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$  for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ , by Condition 4 of Assumption 2, the inequality  $\eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)) > 0$  holds for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ . Now, if one shows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{t_1}^t \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\tau \neq -\infty$ , then it will imply that the right-hand side of (33) either remains bounded or tends to  $\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow T$ , thereby leading to a contradiction.

Now, we evaluate  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{t_1}^t \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\tau$ . Define  $V_d = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z}\|^2$ , where  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$ . Taking the time derivative and using (9), one gets

$$\dot{V}_d = -k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) \|\mathbf{z}\|^2. \quad (34)$$

Since, according to (6),  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) \geq 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , and  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}})$  is undefined only if  $d_{\mathbf{x}} = 0$ , it is true that  $\dot{V}_d \leq 0$  as long as  $d_{\mathbf{x}} > 0$ . Additionally, according to Condition 5 of Assumption 2,  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  is bounded for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ . Consequently, since  $d_{\mathbf{x}} > 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , and  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_\rho(\mathcal{X}_r^c) \subset \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$  for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  is bounded for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ . Furthermore, by Assumption 1,  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ . Moreover, since  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  is assumed to be bounded for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , one has  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))$  bounded for all  $t \in [t_1, T)$ .

Therefore, since  $T$  is finite,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \int_{t_1}^t \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) d\tau \neq -\infty$ , and the proof of Claim 1 of Lemma 2 is complete.

2) *Proof of Claim 2:* To proceed with the proof of Claim 2, we require the following fact:

**Lemma 4.** Consider the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(9), under Assumptions 1 and 2. Let  $V_d(t) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{z}(t)\|^2$ , where  $\mathbf{z}(t) = \mathbf{v}(t) - \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))$ , then the following statements hold:

- 1) If  $V_d(0) > 0$ , then  $V_d(t)$  is strictly decreasing for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V_d(t) = 0$ .
- 2) If  $V_d(0) = 0$ , then  $V_d(t) = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* Taking the time derivative of  $V_d$  and using (9), one obtains

$$\dot{V}_d = -k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) \|\mathbf{z}\|^2.$$

According to (6),  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}) \geq 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$  and  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}})$  is undefined only if  $d_{\mathbf{x}} = 0$ . Since  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{X}_r^\circ$ , using Claim 1 of Lemma 2 and (3), one can confirm that  $d_{\mathbf{x}}(t) > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $\beta(d_{\mathbf{x}}(t))$  is defined for all  $t \geq 0$ . It follows that

$$\dot{V}_d(t) \leq -2k_d V_d(t) \leq 0, \forall t \geq 0.$$




Fig. 7: Diagrammatic representation of a scenario where  $\mathbf{v}(t) \in \mathcal{B}_s(\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))) \subset \mathcal{B}_\mu(\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)))$  for some  $s \in (0, \mu)$  and  $t \geq t_s$ .

Consequently, one has

$$0 \leq V_d(t) \leq V_d(0)e^{-2k_d t}, \forall t \geq 0.$$

From this, the claims follows, completing the proof.  $\square$

According to Condition 4 Assumption 2, there exist  $\mu > 0$  and  $\delta_d > 0$  such that  $\eta(\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}) \geq \mu$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_d}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ . Since  $\eta(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{B}_\mu(\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\geq}(\mathbf{0}, \eta(\mathbf{x}))$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_d}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , as shown in Fig. 7. According to Lemma 4, for any  $s \in (0, \mu)$ , there exists  $t_s \geq 0$  such that  $\mathbf{v}(t) \in \mathcal{B}_s(\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))) \subset \mathcal{B}_\mu(\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)))$  for all  $t \geq t_s$ , as illustrated in Fig. 7. Therefore, after  $t_s$ , whenever  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_d}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , one has  $\eta(\mathbf{x}(t))^\top \mathbf{v}(t) > 0$ . Since  $\delta_d \leq \delta_u$ , it is true that  $\dot{d}_x = \eta(\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{v}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_d}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ , as discussed earlier in Remark 1. In other words, there exists a time  $t_s \geq 0$  such that after  $t_s$ , the inequality  $\dot{d}_x(t) > 0$  holds whenever  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_d}(\mathcal{X}_r^c)$ . Consequently, one can conclude that if  $d_x(0) > 0$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_x(t) \neq 0$ , and the proof of Claim 2 of Lemma 2 is complete.

3) *Proof of Claim 3:* According to Claim 1 of Lemma 2, if  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$ , then  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Therefore, using condition 5 of Assumption 2, one can confirm that  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . As a result, according to Lemma 4,  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . Furthermore, since  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$ , according to Claims 1 and 2 of Lemma 2, it follows that  $\beta(d_x(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . Finally, since  $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  is assumed to be bounded for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$ , it is clear that  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . As a result, if  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{X}_r^o$ , then  $\mathbf{u}_d(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$ , defined in (9), is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ .

#### D. Proof of Theorem 2

In the light of Lemma 2, the forward invariance of  $\mathcal{X}_r^o \times \mathbb{R}^n$  for the closed-loop system (2)-(9) is straightforward to establish. The monotonic decrease of  $\|\mathbf{v}(t) - \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t))\|$  for all  $t \geq 0$  follows directly from Lemma 4.

1) *Proof of Claim 3:* For the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(9), by setting  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{0}$ , and using Assumption 2, one can verify that the set of equilibrium points is  $\mathcal{S} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is defined in (7).

2) *Proof of Claim 4:* The proof is separated into two parts as follows:

**Part 1:** We show that the set  $\mathcal{S} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}\}$  is globally attractive for the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(9) over  $\mathcal{X}_r^o \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . Specifically, we show that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)) \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}\}$ .

Lemma 4 indicates that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) - \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \mathbf{0}$ . Additionally, as mentioned earlier,  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . Since  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}$ , boundedness of  $\mathbf{v}(t)$  implies that  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  cannot grow unbounded in finite time. Furthermore, according to Condition 1 of Assumption 2, the set  $\mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$  is globally attractive for the system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  over  $\mathcal{X}_r^o$ . Consequently, since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) - \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \mathbf{0}$ , it follows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$ . We also know that  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$ . Therefore,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$  implies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \mathbf{0}$ . Since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) - \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \mathbf{0}$ , it follows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ . Since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ , by using (7), it follows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)) \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}\}$ , and the proof of the first part is complete.

**Part 2:** We show that for the closed-loop system (2)-(9), every point in  $\mathcal{S}$  is an undesired saddle equilibrium, and  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is an asymptotically stable equilibrium point.

To analyze the properties of the equilibrium points in  $\mathcal{S} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}\}$ , we examine the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrices of the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(9) at these points. The Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})$  is given by

$$\mathbf{J}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{I}_n \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = k_d \beta(d_x) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})^\top - k_d (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \beta(d_x)^\top,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \mathbf{v}} = -k_d \beta(d_x) \mathbf{I}_n + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})^\top.$$

According to Condition 1 of Assumption 2, for all  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0}) \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}\}$ , one has  $\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{0}$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{J}_d(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0})$  is given by

$$\mathbf{J}_d(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_n & \mathbf{I}_n \\ k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*}) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top & \mathbf{D}^* \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $d_{\mathbf{x}^*} = d(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathcal{O}_W) - r$  and the matrix  $\mathbf{D}^*$  is given by

$$\mathbf{D}^* = -k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*}) \mathbf{I}_n + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top.$$

Let  $\lambda$  denote the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{J}_d(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0})$ . The matrix  $\mathbf{J}_{d\lambda} = \mathbf{J}_d - \lambda \mathbf{I}_n$  is given by

$$\mathbf{J}_{d\lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda \mathbf{I}_n & \mathbf{I}_n \\ k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*}) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top & \mathbf{D}^* - \lambda \mathbf{I}_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using Lemma 2, one can verify that

$$\det(\mathbf{J}_{d\lambda}) = (-1)^n (\lambda + k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*}))^n \det(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top - \lambda \mathbf{I}_n).$$

Equating  $\det(\mathbf{J}_{d\lambda}) = 0$  reveals that the eigenvalues of  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top$  form a subset of the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{J}_d(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0})$ , with the remaining eigenvalue being  $-k_d \beta(d_{\mathbf{x}^*})$ , with algebraic multiplicity  $n$ , where  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d\}$ .

According to Condition 3 of Assumption 2, for all  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , the matrix  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}^*)^\top$  has eigenvalues with non-zero real parts. Therefore, for each  $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0}) \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}\}$ , the eigenvalues

of Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}_d(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{0})$  have non-zero real parts.

As per Condition 2 of Assumption 2,  $\mathbf{x}_d$  is almost globally asymptotically stable for the system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}_d$ . Therefore, for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{E}$ , at least one of the eigenvalues of  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x})$  has a positive real part. Consequently, every point in  $\mathcal{S}$  is a saddle equilibrium point for the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(9). On the contrary, all eigenvalues of  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{v}_d(\mathbf{x}_d)$  have negative real parts. Therefore,  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is an asymptotically stable equilibrium point for the proposed closed-loop system (2)-(9). This completes the proof of the second part.

The second part of the proof ensures that the set of initial conditions in the set  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$  from which every solution to the closed-loop system (2)-(9) converges to one of the equilibria in  $\mathcal{S}$  has zero Lebesgue measure. Thus, it follows from the first part that  $(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0})$  is almost globally asymptotically stable for the closed-loop system (2)-(9) over  $\mathcal{X}_r^\circ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , and the proof of Claim 4 of Theorem 2 is complete.

## REFERENCES

- [1] O. Khatib, "Real-time obstacle avoidance for manipulators and mobile robots," in *Autonomous robot vehicles*. Springer, 1986, pp. 396–404.
- [2] D. E. Koditschek and E. Rimon, "Robot navigation functions on manifolds with boundary," *Advances in applied mathematics*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 412–442, 1990.
- [3] D. Koditschek and E. Rimon, "Exact robot navigation using artificial potential functions," *IEEE Trans. Robot. Automat.*, vol. 8, pp. 501–518, 1992.
- [4] C. Li and H. G. Tanner, "Navigation functions with time-varying destination manifolds in star worlds," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 35–48, 2018.
- [5] I. F. Filippidis and K. J. Kyriakopoulos, "Navigation functions for everywhere partially sufficiently curved worlds," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2012, pp. 2115–2120.
- [6] S. Paternain, D. E. Koditschek, and A. Ribeiro, "Navigation functions for convex potentials in a space with convex obstacles," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 2944–2959, 2017.
- [7] O. Arslan and D. E. Koditschek, "Sensor-based reactive navigation in unknown convex sphere worlds," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 38, no. 2-3, pp. 196–223, 2019.
- [8] H. Kumar, S. Paternain, and A. Ribeiro, "Navigation of a quadratic potential with ellipsoidal obstacles," *Automatica*, vol. 146, p. 110643, 2022.
- [9] L. Wang, A. D. Ames, and M. Egerstedt, "Safety barrier certificates for collisions-free multirobot systems," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 661–674, 2017.
- [10] C. K. Verginis and D. V. Dimarogonas, "Adaptive robot navigation with collision avoidance subject to 2nd-order uncertain dynamics," *Automatica*, vol. 123, p. 109303, 2021.
- [11] S. Stavridis, D. Papageorgiou, and Z. Doulgeri, "Dynamical system based robotic motion generation with obstacle avoidance," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 712–718, 2017.
- [12] L. Smaili, Z. Tang, S. Berkane, and T. Hamel, "Dissipative avoidance feedback for reactive navigation under second-order dynamics," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02903*, 2024.
- [13] O. Arslan and D. E. Koditschek, "Smooth extensions of feedback motion planners via reference governors," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 4414–4421.
- [14] A. İşleyen, N. Van De Wouw, and Ö. Arslan, "From low to high order motion planners: Safe robot navigation using motion prediction and reference governor," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 9715–9722, 2022.
- [15] J. Rataj and M. Zähle, *Curvature measures of singular sets*. Springer, 2019.
- [16] L. Pontryagin, *Ordinary Differential Equations*. Pergamon, 1962.
- [17] S. Berkane, A. Bisoffi, and D. V. Dimarogonas, "Obstacle avoidance via hybrid feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 512–519, 2021.
- [18] M. Sawant, I. Polushin, and A. Tayebi, "Hybrid feedback for three-dimensional convex obstacle avoidance," *arXiv:2403.11279*, 2024.
- [19] I. Filippidis and K. J. Kyriakopoulos, "Navigation functions for focally admissible surfaces," in *American Control Conference*, 2013, pp. 994–999.
- [20] Z. Tang, R. Cunha, T. Hamel, and C. Silvestre, "Constructive barrier feedback for collision avoidance in leader-follower formation control," in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 368–374.
- [21] A. Micaelli and C. Samson, "Trajectory tracking for unicycle-type and two-steering-wheels mobile robots," Ph.D. dissertation, Inria, 1993.
- [22] D. S. Bernstein, *Matrix mathematics: theory, facts, and formulas*. Princeton university press, 2009.