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Abstract: In this paper we propose a convex programming based method for computing robust regions of attraction for state-constrained perturbed discrete-time polynomial systems. The robust region of attraction of interest is a set of states such that every possible trajectory initialized in it will approach an equilibrium state while never violating the specified state constraint, regardless of the actual perturbation. Based on a Bellman equation which characterizes the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction as the strict one sub-level set of its unique bounded and continuous solution, we construct a semi-definite program for computing robust regions of attraction. Under appropriate assumptions, the existence of solutions to the constructed semi-definite program is guaranteed and there exists a sequence of solutions such that their strict one sub-level sets inner-approximate the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction in measure. Finally, we demonstrate the method on one example.
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1. INTRODUCTION

A fundamental problem in control engineering consists of determining the robust region of attraction of an equilibrium state (Slotine et al., 1999), which is a set of states such that every trajectory starting from it will move towards this equilibrium state while never leaving a specified state-constraint set irrespective of the actual perturbation. Its applications include biology systems, e.g., the search of an optimal control strategy for cancer treatment by analyzing the tumor growth dynamics (Merola et al., 2008), and ecology systems, e.g., the study of the resilience of an ecological system (Ludwig et al., 1997), and among others. Computing robust regions of attraction has been the subject of extensive research over the past several decades, resulting in the emergence of a number of theories and corresponding computational approaches, e.g., Lyapunov function-based methods (Zubov, 1964; Salle and Lefschetz, 1961; Coutinho and de Souza, 2013; Genesio et al., 1985; Giesl, 2007; Giesl and Hafstein, 2014), trajectory reversing methods (Genesio et al., 1985) and so on.

Lyapunov-based methods are still dominant in estimating robust regions of attraction (Khalil, 2002). Generally, the search for Lyapunov functions is non-trivial for nonlinear systems due to the non-constructive nature of the Lyapunov theory, apart from some cases where the Jacobian matrix of the linearized system associated with the nonlinear system of interest is Hurwitz. However, with the advance of real algebraic geometry and polynomial optimization in the last decades, especially the sum-of-squares (SOS) decomposition technique (Parrilo, 2000), finding a Lyapunov function which is decreasing over a given state constraint set can be reduced to a convex programming problem for polynomial systems (Papachristodoulou and Prajna, 2002). This results in a large amount of findings which adopt convex optimization based approaches to the search for polynomial Lyapunov functions, e.g., (Anderson and Papachristodoulou, 2015). However, if we return to the problem of estimating robust domains of attraction, it resorts to addressing a bilinear semi-definite program, e.g., (Jarvis-Wloszek, 2003; Tan and Packard, 2008), which falls within the non-convex programming framework and is notoriously hard to solve. Also, the existence of polynomial solutions to (bilinear) semi-definite programs is not explored in the literature.

In this paper we propose a novel semi-definite programming based method for computing robust regions of attraction for state-constrained perturbed discrete-time polynomial systems with an equilibrium state, which is uniformly locally exponentially stable. It is worth remarking here that the semi-definite programming based method proposed in this paper can also be applied to the computation of robust regions of attraction for polynomial systems with an asymptotically stable equilibrium state, as highlighted in Remark 1. The semi-definite program is constructed by relaxing a modified Bellman equation which characterizes the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction as the strict one sub-level set of its unique bounded and continuous solution. It falls within the convex programming framework and can be solved efficiently in polynomial time via interior-point methods. Moreover, the existence of solutions to the constructed semi-definite program is guaranteed and there exists a sequence of solutions such that their strict one sub-level sets inner-approximate the interior of the maximal robust region.
of attraction in measure under appropriate assumptions. Finally, we demonstrate our method on one example.

The closely related works to the present work in spirit are (Xue et al., 2018a, 2019a,b). Semi-definite programming based methods were proposed in (Xue et al., 2018a, 2019a,b) for computing reachable sets for continuous-time systems by relaxing Hamilton-Jacobi partial differential equations. Reachable sets computation over finite time horizons was studied in (Xue et al., 2018a, 2019a,b) and robust invariant sets computation over the infinite time horizon was studied in (Xue et al., 2019b). The trajectories starting from the robust invariant set in (Xue et al., 2019b) are not required to approach an equilibrium. Moreover, the existence of solutions to the constructed semi-definite program in (Xue et al., 2019b) is not guaranteed. In contrast, the present work considers the computation of robust regions of attraction over the infinite time horizon for discrete-time systems by relaxing Bellman equations. The trajectories starting from the robust region of attraction are required to approach an equilibrium. Moreover, the existence of solutions to the constructed semi-definite program in the present work is guaranteed.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 basic notions and the problem of interest are introduced. After presenting our method for synthesizing robust regions of attraction in Section 6, we evaluate them on one example in Section 4. Finally, we conclude this paper in Section 5.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we describe the system of interest and the concept of robust regions of attraction.

The notions will be used in this paper: \( \mathbb{R}^n \) denotes the set of \( n \)-dimensional real vectors, \( \mathbb{R}^n \) denotes the ring of polynomials with real coefficients in variables given by the argument, \( \mathbb{R}_+^n \) denotes the vector space of real multivariate polynomials of total degree \( k \). Also, \( \Delta, \partial \Delta, \Delta \) and \( \Delta^c \) denote the interior, boundary, closure and complement of a set \( \Delta \), respectively. The space of continuous functions on a set \( X \) is denoted by \( C(X) \). The difference of two sets \( A \) and \( B \) is denoted by \( A \setminus B \). \( \mu(A) \) denotes the Lebesgue measure on \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \). \( N \) denotes the set of non-negative integers. \( \| x \| \) denotes the 2-norm, i.e., \( \| x \| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2} \), where \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^T \). \( B(0, r) \) denotes a ball of radius \( r > 0 \) and center \( 0 \), i.e., \( B(0, r) = \{ x \mid \| x \|^2 \leq r \} \). Vectors are denoted by boldface letters.

The state-constrained perturbed discrete-time system of interest in this paper is of the following form

\[
\dot{x}(j + 1) = f(x(j), d(j)), j \in \mathbb{N},
\]

where \( x(\cdot) : \mathbb{N} \to X, d(\cdot) : \mathbb{N} \to D, D = \{d \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \bigwedge_{i=1}^n [h_i^D(d) \leq 0] \} \) is a compact semi-algebraic subset in \( \mathbb{R}^m \) with \( h_i^D \in \mathbb{R}[d] \), \( f \in \mathbb{R}[x, d] \) with \( f(0, d) = 0 \) for \( d \in D \), and \( X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \bigwedge_{i=1}^n [h_i^X(x) < 1]\} \) is a bounded open set with \( h_i^X(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x] \). Also, \( h_i^X(x) > 0 \) for \( x \neq 0 \) and \( h_i^X(0) = 0 \), \( i = 1, \ldots, n_X \).

In order to define our problem succinctly, we present the definition of a perturbation input policy \( \pi \).

Definition 1. A perturbation input policy, denoted by \( \pi \), refers to a function \( \pi(j) : \mathbb{N} \to D \). In addition, we denote the set of all perturbation policies by \( \mathcal{D} \).

Given a perturbation input policy \( \pi \), a trajectory to system (1) is presented in Definition 2.

Definition 2. Given a perturbation input policy \( \pi \in \mathcal{D} \), a trajectory of system (1) initialized in \( x_0 \in X \) is denoted as \( x_\pi, 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \), where \( x_{\pi, 0} = x_0, T \in \mathbb{N} \) and

\[
\phi_{x_{\pi}}(j) = f(x_{\pi}(j), \pi(j)), \forall j \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, T],
\]

\[
\phi_{x_{\pi}}(j + 1) = f(x_{\pi}(j), \pi(j)), \forall j \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, T].
\]

We assume that \( 0 \) is uniformly locally exponentially stable for system (1).

Assumption 1. The equilibrium state \( 0 \) is uniformly locally exponentially stable for (1), i.e., there exist positive constants \( M > 0, r > 0 \) and \( 0 < \lambda < 1 \) such that

\[
\| \phi_{x_{\pi}}(k) \| \leq \lambda^k M \| x_0 \|, \forall x_0 \in B(0, r), \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D}, \forall k \in \mathbb{N},
\]

where \( B(0, r) \subset X \).

Assumption 1 implies the existence of a positive constant \( \tau \) such that \( B(0, \frac{r}{\tau}) \subset X \) and

\[
\phi_{x_{\pi}}(k) \in B(0, \frac{r}{\tau}), \forall x_0 \in B(0, r), \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D}, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D}.
\]

We present the concept of robust regions of attraction.

Definition 3. (Robust Regions of Attraction). The maximal robust region of attraction \( R \) is the set of states such that every possible trajectory of system (1) starting from it will approach the equilibrium state \( 0 \) while never leaving the state constraint set \( X \), i.e.,

\[
R = \{ x_0 \mid \phi_{x_{\pi}}(l) \in X, \forall l \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D}, \text{ and } \lim_{l \to \infty} \phi_{x_{\pi}}(l) = 0, \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D} \}.
\]

Correspondingly, a robust region of attraction is a subset of the maximal robust region of attraction \( R \).

3. ROBUST REGIONS OF ATTRACTION GENERATION

In this section we present our semi-definite programming based method for computing robust regions of attraction by relaxing a Bellman equation. Moreover, we show that there exists a sequence of solutions to the semi-definite program such that their strict one sub-level sets inner-approximate the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction in measure under appropriate assumptions.

3.1 Bellman Equations

In this section we introduce a modified Bellman equation, to which the strict one sub-level set of the unique bounded and continuous solution is equal to the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction.

Theorem 1. The interior of the maximal robust region of attraction \( R \) is equal to the strict one sub-level set of the unique bounded and continuous solution \( v(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, 1] \) to the Bellman equation

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{d \in D} \left\{ v - v(f) - g \cdot (1 - v) \right\}, \\
v - 1 + \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_X\}} \{v \cos((1 - h_i^X))\} = 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\end{align*}
\]

Given the current state \( x(0) = 0 \),
where \( g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is an non-negative polynomial satisfying that \( g(x) = 0 \) iff \( x = 0 \), and \( l(x) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) with

\[
l(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]

(7)

That is, \( \mathcal{R} = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid v(x) < 1 \} \).

The Bellman equation (6) in Theorem 1 is a discrete-time version of Zubov’s equation for state-constrained continuous-time systems in (Grüne and Zidani, 2015), and can be constructed by following the reasoning in (Grüne and Zidani, 2015). Its detailed derivation is shown in Appendix.

A direct consequence of Theorem 1 is that if a continuous function \( u(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) satisfies (6), then \( u(x) \) satisfies the constraints:

\[
\begin{cases}
 u - u(f) + g(yd) - g(y) \geq 0, & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall d \in D, \\
 u - 1 + e^{\ln((1-h_0^y))} \geq 0, & \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\
 j = 1, \ldots, M.
\end{cases}
\]

(8)

Corollary 1. Suppose a continuous function \( u(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is a solution to (8), then \( u(x) \geq v(x) \), where \( v(x) \) is the unique bounded and continuous solution to (6).

Thus, we have \( v(x) \leq u(x) \) for \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

From Corollary 1 we observe that a robust region of attraction can be found by solving (8) instead of (6).

3.2 Semi-definite Programming Relaxation

In this subsection we construct a semi-definite program to compute robust regions of attraction based on (8). We observe that \( u(x) \) is required to satisfy (8) over \( \mathbb{R}^n \), which is a strong condition. Regarding this issue, we further consider (8) on the set \( B(0, R) \), where \( B(0, R) \) is defined in Assumption 2. In addition, we introduce another set \( X_{\infty} \), which is also defined in Assumption 2.

Assumption 2. (a) \( X_\infty = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_{\infty}(x) < 1 \} \) is a robust region of attraction, where \( h_{\infty} \in \mathbb{R}[x] \).

(b) \( B(0, R) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_0(x) \leq R \} \), where \( h_0(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2, R \) is a positive constant such that \( \Omega(X) \subset B(0, R) \). \( \Omega(X) \) is the set of states being reachable from the set \( X \) within one step for system (1), i.e., \( \Omega(X) = \{ x \mid x = f(x_0, d), x_0 \in X, d \in D \} \cup X \).

\( X_\infty \subset X \) from Assumption 2. \( X_\infty \) satisfies Assumption 2 if \( h_{\infty} \) is a (local) Lyapunov function for system (1). There are many existing methods for computing \( h_{\infty} \), e.g., semi-definite programming based methods (Giesl and Hafstein, 2015) or linear programming based methods (Giesl and Hafstein, 2014). \( B(0, R) \) can be efficiently computed by solving a semi-definite programming as in (Magron et al., 2019). In this paper, we assume that \( X_{\infty} \) and \( B(0, R) \) were already given. Their computations are not the focus of this paper.

Based on \( B(0, R) \) and \( X_{\infty} \) in Assumption 2, we further relax constraint (8) and restrict the search for a continuous function \( u(x) \) in the compact set \( B(0, R) \). We obtain the following constraints:

\[
\begin{align*}
 u - u(f) - g(yd) &\geq 0, \forall x \in B(0, R) \setminus X_{\infty}, \forall d \in D, \\
u - 1 &\geq 0, \forall x \in B(0, R) \setminus X, \\
u - h_j^x &\geq 0, \forall x \in X, \\
j = 1, \ldots, M.
\end{align*}
\]

(14)

Obviously, \( v(x) \) in (6) satisfies (14).

When the solution to (14) is restricted to a polynomial, based on sum-of-squares decomposition for multivariate
polynomials, (8) could be reduced as the following sum-of-squares program, which is formulated in Alg. 1.

Algorithm 1 The Semi-definite programming Implementation for Solving (14)

\[
p_k^* = \inf_{w \cdot l} w \cdot l \quad \text{s.t.} \\
    u_k - u_k(f) - g \cdot (1 - u_k) = s_0 + s_1 \cdot (R - h_0) + s_2 \cdot (h_\infty - 1) - \sum_{i=1}^{m_D} s_{3,i} \cdot h_i^D, \\
    u_k - 1 = s_{4,j} + s_{5,j} \cdot (R - h_0) + s_{6,j} \cdot (h_j^X - 1), \\
    u_k - h_j^X = s_{7,j} + s_{8,j} \cdot (R - h_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} s_{9,i,j} \cdot (1 - h_i^X), \\
    j = 1, \ldots, n_X, \\
\]

where \( w \cdot l = \int_{B(0,R)} u_k(x) dx - \int_{X_\infty} u_k(x) dx \), \( l \) is the vector of the moments of the Lebesgue measure over \( B(0,R) \setminus X_\infty \) indexed in the same basis in which the polynomial \( u_k \) with coefficients \( w \) is expressed. The minimum is over polynomial \( u_k(x) \in R_k[x] \) and sum-of-squares polynomials \( s_i(x,d), i = 0, \ldots, 2, s_{3,i}(x,d), i = 1, \ldots, m_D, s_{4,j}(x), s_{5,j}(x), s_{6,j}(x), j = 4, \ldots, 8, j, l = 1, \ldots, n_X \).

Theorem 2. Under Assumption 2, if \( u(x) \in R_k[x] \) is a solution to (15), then \( \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \) is a robust region of attraction.

Proof. According to the second constraint in (15), we have \( u(x) \geq 1 \) for \( x \in B(0,R) \setminus X \). Therefore, \( \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \subset X \). Next we prove that every possible trajectory initialized in the set \( \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \) will approach the equilibrium state 0 eventually while never leaving the state constraint set \( X \).

Assume that there exists \( y_0 \in \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \) and a perturbation input policy \( \pi' \) such that \( \phi_{y_0}^{\pi}(l) \in X \) for \( l = 0, \ldots, l_0 \) and \( \phi_{y_0}^{\pi}(l_0 + 1) \notin X \). It is obvious that \( \phi_{y_0}^{\pi}(l) \in X \setminus X_\infty \) for \( l = 0, \ldots, l_0 \) since \( X_\infty \) is a robust region of attraction. Since \( \Omega(X) \subseteq B(0,R) \), where \( \Omega(X) \) is defined in Assumption 2, \( \phi_{y_0}^{\pi}(l_0 + 1) \in B(0,R) \setminus X \), thus we obtain that

\[
u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi}(l_0 + 1)) \geq 1. \quad (16)
\]

However, since \( \phi_{y_0}^{\pi}(l) \in B(0,R) \setminus X_\infty \) for \( l = 0, \ldots, l_0 + 1 \) and \( u(y_0) \leq 1 \), from the first constraint in (15), we have

\[
u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi}(l_0 + 1)) \geq 1,
\]

contradicting (16). Thus, every possible trajectory initialized in \( \{ x_0 \in B(0,R) \mid u(x_0) < 1 \} \) never leaves \( X \).

Lastly, we prove that every possible trajectory initialized in \( \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \) will approach the equilibrium state 0 eventually. Since every possible trajectory initialized in the set \( X_\infty \) will approach the equilibrium state 0 eventually, it is enough to prove that every possible trajectory initialized in the set \( \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \setminus X_\infty \) will enter the set \( X_\infty \) over finite time horizons. Assume that there exist \( y_0 \in \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \) and a perturbation input policy \( \pi' \) such that \( \phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l) \notin X_\infty, \forall l \in N \). Since \( \phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l) \in X \) for \( l \in N \) and \( u(x) \geq 0 \) for \( x \in X \) (The fact that \( u(x) \geq 0 \) for \( x \in X \) can be obtained from the third constraint in (15)),

\[
u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)) \geq 0, \forall l \in N.
\]

Moreover, \( u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)) < 1 \) holds for \( l \in N \). According to the first constraint in (15), we have

\[
u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)) = \nu(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l + 1)) \geq g(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)) \cdot (1 - u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)))
\]

for \( l \in N \). Therefore,

\[
u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l + 1)) \leq u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)) \geq g(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)) \cdot (1 - u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)))
\]

and thus

\[
u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)) \geq u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l + 1))
\]

for \( l \in N \). Since \( g(x) \in R[x] \) is positive over \( x \notin 0 \), we obtain that \( g(x) \) can attain a minimum over the compact set \( X \setminus X_\infty \). Let \( \epsilon' = \min_{x \in X \setminus X_\infty} g(x) \), it is obvious that \( \epsilon' > 0 \). Therefore, we have \( u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l + 1)) \leq u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l)) - \epsilon'(1 - u(y_0)) \) for \( l \in N \). Therefore,

\[
u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l + 1)) \leq u(y_0) - (l + 1)\epsilon'(1 - u(y_0)), \forall l \in N.
\]

Thus, we obtain that there exists \( l_0 \in N \) such that

\[
u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l_0)') < 0,
\]

contradicting the fact that \( u(\phi_{y_0}^{\pi'}(l_0)) \geq 0, \forall l \in N \). Therefore, every possible trajectory initialized in the set \( \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \setminus X_\infty \) will enter the set \( X_\infty \) over finite time horizons. Consequently, every possible trajectory initialized in the set \( \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \) will approach the equilibrium state 0.

Combining above arguments, we conclude that \( \{ x \in B(0,R) \mid u(x) < 1 \} \) is a robust region of attraction. \( \Box \)

Remark 1. Note that Theorem 2 still holds if the equilibrium 0 is asymptotically stable rather than uniformly locally exponentially stable. The proof of Theorem 2 did not require Assumption 1.

3.3 Theoretical Analysis

This section shows that there exists a sequence of solutions of (15) such that their strict one sub-level sets inner-approximate the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction in measure under appropriate assumptions.

Assumption 3. One of the polynomials defining the set \( D \) is equal to \( h_D \equiv \|d\|^2 - R_D \) for some constant \( R_D \geq 0 \).

Assumption 3 is without loss of generality since \( D \) is compact, and thus redundant constraint of the form \( R_D - \|d\|^2 \geq 0 \) can always be added to the description of \( D \) for sufficiently large \( R_D \).

Lemma 1. Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, there exists a sequence \( (u_{k,i}(x))'_{i=0} \) such that \( u_k(x) \) converges from above to \( v \) uniformly over \( B(0,R) \), where \( u_k(x) \in R_k[x] \) denotes the \( u \)-component of a solution to (15) and \( v \) is the continuous and bounded solution to (6).

Proof. Let

\[
\Omega(B(0,R)) = \{ y \in R^n \mid y = \phi_{x_0}^{\pi'}(i), i \in [0,1], x_0 \in B(0,R), \pi \in D \}.
\]

Since \( f \in R[x,d] \), and \( D \) and \( B(0,R) \) are compact, \( \Omega(B(0,R)) \) is bounded and consequently \( \Omega(B(0,R)) \) is
In this example we consider $X$ and $v$ satisfying (14) and $|v_t - v| \leq \epsilon$. Obviously, $v_t = v + \epsilon$ satisfies such requirement since

\[ v_t - v = g \left( 1 - v_t \right) \geq c_0, \forall x \in B, \forall d \in D, \]

\[ v_t - 1 \geq \epsilon, \forall x \in B(0, R) \setminus X_{\infty}, \]

\[ v_t - h^X \geq \epsilon, \forall x \in X, j = 1, \ldots, n_x, \]

where $c_0 = \inf \{ g(x) \mid x \in B(0, R) \setminus X_{\infty} \}$. Since $\Omega(B(0, R))$ is compact, according to Stone-Weierstrass theorem (Cotter, 1990), there exists a polynomial $u_k$ of a sufficiently high degree $k$ such that

\[ 0 < u_k - v < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \forall x \in \Omega(B(0, R)). \]

Thus, we have

\[ \epsilon < u_k - v < \epsilon + \frac{\epsilon}{2}c_0, \forall x \in \Omega(B(0, R)). \]  \hspace{1cm} (19)

According to the definition of $\Omega(B(0, R))$, i.e. (17), we have that $f(x, d) \in \Omega(B(0, R))$ holds for $x \in B(0, R)$ and $d \in D$. Therefore,

\[ \epsilon < u_k(f(x, d)) - v(f(x, d)) < \epsilon + \frac{\epsilon}{2}c_0 \]

holds for $x \in B(x_0, R)$ and $d \in D$. It is easy to check that $u_k$ satisfies

\[ u_k - u_k(f) - g(1 - u_k) > 0, \forall x \in B, \forall d \in D, \]

\[ u_k - 1 > 0, \forall x \in B(0, R) \setminus X, \]

\[ u_k - h^X > 0, \forall x \in X, j = 1, \ldots, n_x. \]  \hspace{1cm} (20)

From Putinar’s Positivstellensatz (Putinar, 1993) and arbitrariness of $\epsilon$, we obtain $u_k(x)$ converges from above to $v$ uniformly over $B(0, R)$ with i approaching infinity. \hfill \Box

Finally, we conclude that \{ $x \in B(0, R) \mid u_k(x) < 1$ \} converges to the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction with i approaching infinity.

**Theorem 3.** Let $u_k(x)$ satisfy the condition in Lemma 1. Then the set $R_{u_k} = \{ x \in B(0, R) \mid u_k(x) < 1 \}$ satisfies $R_{u_k} \subset R^\epsilon$ and

\[ \lim_{i \to \infty} \mu(R^\epsilon \setminus R_{u_k}) = 0. \]

**Proof.** $R_{u_k} \subset R^\epsilon$ is an immediate consequence of Lemma 1 since $u_k \geq \epsilon$ over $B(0, R)$ according to (19).

According to Theorem 1 as well as Theorem 3 in (Lasserre, 2015) and Lemma 1, we have $\lim_{i \to \infty} \mu(R^\epsilon \setminus R_{u_k}) = 0$. \hfill \Box

### 4. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

In this section we evaluate the semi-definite programming based method on one example. The computations were performed on an i7-P515 2.6GHz CPU with 4GB RAM running Windows 10. YALMIP (Loefberg, 2004) and Mostek (Mosek, Mostek, 2015) were used to implement (15).

**Example 1.** Consider the discrete-generation predator-prey model from (Halanay and Rasvan, 2000),

\[ \begin{align*}
    x(j+1) &= 0.5x(j) - x(j)y(j), \\
    y(j+1) &= -0.5y(j) + (d(j)+1)x(j)y(j),
\end{align*} \]

where $j \in N$.

In this example we consider $D = \{ d \in \mathbb{R} \mid d^2 - 0.01 \leq 0 \}$ and $X = \{ (x,y) \mid x^2 + y^2 - 1 \leq 0 \}$. The origin $0$ for this example is uniformly locally exponentially stable. $g(x, y) = x^2 + y^2$, $R = 1.6$, $h_0(x, y) = x^2 + y^2$ and $h_\infty(x, y) = 100(x^2 + y^2)$ are used to perform computations on the semi-definite program (15).

The function $h_\infty(x) = 100x^2 + 100y^2$ defining $X_\infty$ is a Lyapunov function such that $X_\infty \subset X$ is a robust region of attraction. This argument can be justified by first encoding the following constraint

\[ h_\infty(x) - h_\infty(f(x, d)) > 0, \forall x \in X_\infty \setminus \{ 0 \}, \forall d \in D \]

in the form of sum-of-squares constraints and then verifying the feasibility of the constructed sum-of-squares constraints, where $f(x, d) = (0.5x - xy; -0.5y + (d+1)xy)$. Assumption 2(a) is satisfied. $B(0, R) = \{ x \mid h_0(x, y) \leq 1.6 \}$, which is a set satisfying Assumption 2(b). Since $X_\infty \subset B(0, R)$, we just need to verify $\{ x \mid x = f(x_0, d), x_0 \in X, d \in D \}$. This argument is justified by first encoding the following constraint

\[ 1.6 - (0.5x + xy)^2 \leq 0, \forall (x, y) \in X, \forall d \in D \]

in the form of sum-of-squares constraints and then verifying its feasibility. Moreover, the function $d^2 - 0.01$ defining $D$ satisfies Assumption 3. Therefore, Lemma 1 holds, implying that the existence of solutions to the semi-definite program (15) is guaranteed.

Robust regions of attraction, which are computed via solving the semi-definite program (15) with approximating polynomials of degree 6 and 10 respectively, are illustrated in Fig.1. We observe from Fig. 1 that the robust region of attraction computed when $k = 10$ approximates the maximal robust region of attraction tightly by comparing with the maximal one estimated via simulation methods. A trajectory starting from the robust region of attraction computed when $k = 10$ is illustrated in Fig. 2. The trajectory is generated by extracting the perturbation input $d(j)$ from $D$ randomly for $j \in N$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$d_{s_1}$</th>
<th>$d_{s_3}$</th>
<th>$d_{s_5}$</th>
<th>$d_{s_9}$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Parameters of our implementation on Example 1. $k, d_{s_1}, d_{s_3}, d_{s_5}, d_{s_9}$: degree of polynomials $u_{s_i}, s_{3,i}, s_{5,j}, s_{9,j}$ in (15), respectively, $i_1 = 1, \ldots, m_P$, $i = 0, \ldots, 2$, $j = 4, \ldots, 8$, $j = 1, \ldots, n_X$, $l = 1, \ldots, n_X$, $T$: computation times (seconds).

**Fig. 1:** Estimations of $R$ for Example 1. Black and red curves denote the boundaries of robust regions of attraction computed when $k = 6$ and $k = 10$, respectively. Gray region denotes the maximal robust region of attraction estimated via simulation techniques.
Fig. 2: An illustration of a trajectory for Example 1. Red curve denotes the boundary of the robust region of attraction computed when $k = 10$. Red star and black stars denote the initial state and subsequent states, respectively. The dash blue line denotes the transition between states.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper we proposed a semi-definite programming based method for computing robust regions of attraction for state-constrained perturbed discrete-time polynomial systems. The semi-definite program was constructed based on a Bellman equation. There exists a sequence of solutions to the semi-definite program such that their strict one sub-level sets inner-approximate the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction in measure under appropriate assumptions. A predator-prey model demonstrated the performance of our approach.
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In this section we characterize $\mathcal{R}_0$ as the strict one sub-level set of the unique bounded and continuous solution to a modified Bellman equation. The derivation process follows that in Grün and Zidani (2015).

### 6.1 Robust Regions of Uniform Attraction

In this subsection we introduce the maximal robust region of uniform attraction, which is equal to the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction.

Let $D_{ad}(x_0) = \{ \pi \ | \ \phi^x_{\pi}(k) \in X, \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \}$. Denote the first hitting time $k'(x_0, \pi)$ of $B(0, r)$ as

$$k'(x_0, \pi) := \inf \{ k > 0 \ | \ \phi^x_{\pi}(k) \in B(0, r) \},$$

where $B(0, r)$ is defined in (4). The maximal robust region of attraction $\mathcal{R}$ can be characterized by $k'(x_0, \pi)$.

**Lemma 2.** Under Assumption 1, the maximal robust region of attraction $\mathcal{R}$ is equal to $\mathcal{R}'$, where

$$\mathcal{R}' = \left\{ x_0 \ | \ D_{ad}(x_0) = \mathcal{D} \text{ and } k'(x_0, \pi) < \infty \text{ for } \pi \in \mathcal{D} \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

**Proof.** Obviously, $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}$. Thus, we just prove $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{R}'$.

Assume that there exists $y_0 \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}'$. Obviously, $\phi^y_{\pi}(l) \in X$ for $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{D}$. Moreover, there exists a perturbation input policy $\pi'$ such that $\phi^y_{\pi'}(l) \notin B(0, r)$ for $l \in \mathbb{N}$, contradicting $\lim_{k \to \infty} \phi^y_{\pi}(k) = 0$ for $\pi \in \mathcal{D}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{R}'$.

Above all, we have $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}'$. \hspace{1cm} □

Now, we introduce the maximal robust region of uniform attraction. The maximal robust region of uniform attraction was first proposed in Grün and Zidani (2015) for state-constrained perturbed continuous-time systems. Let the Euclidean distance between a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be $\text{dist}(x, A) := \inf_{y \in A} \|x - y\|$, and the set of $\delta$-admissible perturbation input policies be

$$\mathcal{D}_{ad, \delta}(x_0) = \{ \pi \ | \ \text{dist}(\phi^x_{\pi}(k), X^c) > \delta \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N} \},$$

where $\delta > 0$. It is obvious that $\mathcal{D}_{ad, \delta}(x_0) = D_{ad}(x_0)$. The maximal robust region of uniform attraction $\mathcal{R}_0$ is then defined by

$$\mathcal{R}_0 := \left\{ x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \ | \ \text{there exists } \delta > 0 \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{D}_{ad, \delta}(x_0) \text{ is open} \right\}. \hspace{1cm} (23)$$

**Lemma 3.** Under Assumption 1, then

1. $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}'_0$, where

$$\mathcal{R}'_0 = \left\{ x_0 \ | \ \text{there exists } \delta > 0 \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{D}_{ad, \delta}(x_0) \text{ is open and } \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} k'(x_0, \pi) < \infty \right\}. \hspace{1cm} (24)$$

2. $\mathcal{R}_0$ is open.

3. $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}'_0$.

**Proof.** 1. Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_0$ and $K = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} k'(x_0, \pi) < \infty$. Then, for $k \geq K$ we have

$$\|\phi^x_{\pi}(k)\| \leq \beta(r, k) = \lambda^k M r,$$

where $r$ is defined in (3). Hence, for $k \geq K$ we can choose $\beta(k) = \beta(r, k)$. Since $\phi^x_{\pi}(k) \in X$ for $k \in [0, K]$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{D}$, and $X$ is bounded, there exists $M' \geq 0$ such that

$$\|\phi^x_{\pi}(k)\| \leq M', \forall k \in [0, K], \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D}. $$

Choosing $\beta(k) = M'$ for $k \in [0, K]$ then yields the function $\beta(k)$ with the desired properties. Thus,

$$x_0 \in \mathcal{R}'_0,$$

implying that $\mathcal{R}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_0$.

Conversely, let $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}'_0$ and $K > 0$, pick the corresponding $\delta > 0$ and $\beta(k)$ be such that

$$\beta(k) < r, \forall k \geq K$$

($K$ exists since $\lim_{k \to \infty} \beta(k) = 0$, where $\tau$ is defined in (4). Then we have

$$\|\phi^x_{\pi}(k)\| \leq \beta(k) < r, \forall k \geq K, \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D},$$

which implies

$$\phi^x_{\pi}(k) \in B(0, r), \forall k \geq K, \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D}.$$  

Hence, $k'(x_0, \pi) \leq K, \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D}$ and thus

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} k'(x_0, \pi) \leq K < \infty.$$  

Also, since $D_{ad, \delta} = \mathcal{D}$, we have that $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_0$, implying that $\mathcal{R}'_0 \subseteq \mathcal{R}_0$.

2. Since $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}'_0$, we prove the openness of $\mathcal{R}'_0$ instead. Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}'_0$ and consider the corresponding $\delta > 0$ and $\beta(k) : \mathbb{N} \to [0, \infty)$. Let $K > 0$ be such that $\beta(k) < \frac{r}{2}$ for $k \geq K$. Since $f \in \mathcal{R}[x, d]$, $f(x, d)$ is Lipschitz continuous over $x \in X$ uniformly over $d \in \mathcal{D}$, implying that there exists $B(x_0, \epsilon)$ such that for $y_0 \in B(x_0, \epsilon), \pi \in \mathcal{D}$ and $k \in [0, K]$,

$$\|\phi^x_{\pi}(k) - \phi^{y_0}_{\pi}(k)\| < \min \left\{ \frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\tau}{2} \right\}.$$  

This further implies that for $y_0 \in B(x_0, \epsilon), \pi \in \mathcal{D}$ and $k \in [0, K]$,

$$\text{dist}(\phi^{y_0}_{\pi}(k), X^c) > \frac{\delta}{2}$$

holds. Thus, $\phi^{y_0}_{\pi}(k) \in B(0, r), \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D}$. Hence

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} k'(x_0, \pi) \leq K.$$  

Together with (4) this implies

$$D_{ad, \min}(\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\tau}{2})(y_0) = \mathcal{D},$$

hence we conclude that $y_0 \in \mathcal{R}'_0$. Thus, $B(x_0, \epsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_0$ and consequently $\mathcal{R}_0$ is open.

3. Since $\mathcal{R}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{R}$, the inclusion $\mathcal{R}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{R}^c$ is clear and by 2 it implies $\mathcal{R}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{R}^c$.

Next we just need to prove that $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_0 \cup \mathcal{R}'_0$, let $x_0 \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_0$. Since $x_0 \notin \mathcal{R}_0$, by 1 either

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} k'(x_0, \pi) = \infty,$$

or

$$D_{ad, \delta}(x_0) \neq \mathcal{D}, \forall \delta > 0.$$
must hold. If the former holds, then we obtain \( x_0 \in \partial \mathcal{R} \) since in every neighborhood of \( x_0 \) there exist \( x'_0 \) and a perturbation input policy \( \pi \) such that \( k'(x'_0, \pi) = \infty \), contradicting \( x_0 \in \mathcal{R}^c \).

Hence assume
\[
K = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} k'(x_0, \pi) < \infty.
\]
Then we have the conclusion that
\[
\mathcal{D}_{ad, \delta}(x_0) \neq \mathcal{D}, \forall \delta > 0
\]
holds and thus there exists a sequence \( (\pi_n, k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) such that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \text{dist}(\phi_{x_0}^\pi(n_k), X^c) = 0.
\]
Since (4) and \( k'(x_0, \pi_n) \leq K \), we have that
\[
k_n \leq K, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]
Also, since \( f \) is polynomial over \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( d \in D \), \( x_n = \phi_{x_0}^\pi(n_k) \) is bounded. The fact that \( f \in \mathbb{R}[x, d] \) is locally Lipschitz continuous over \( \mathbb{R}^n \) yields that for every \( \epsilon > 0 \) the set
\[
\{ \phi_{x_0}^\pi(n_k) | \xi \in B(x_0, \epsilon) \}
\]
contains a ball \( B(x_0, \rho) \) with \( \rho > 0 \) independent of \( n \)(since \( k_n \leq K, \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \)). For sufficiently large \( n \) this implies \( B(x_0, \rho) \notin X \). This means that
\[
\pi_n \notin \mathcal{D}_{ad, 0}(z_n)
\]
for some \( z_n \in B(x_0, \epsilon) \) and consequently \( z_n \notin \mathcal{R} \). Since \( \epsilon > 0 \) is arbitrary, this implies \( x_0 \notin \partial \mathcal{R} \), again contradicting \( x_0 \in \mathcal{R}^c \). Hence, \( \mathcal{R}^c \setminus \mathcal{R} = \emptyset \), implying \( \mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_0 \). □

6.2 Bellman Equations

In this section we mainly infer the modified Bellman equation (6), to which the strict one sub-level set of the unique bounded and continuous solution is equal to the maximal robust region of uniform attraction \( \mathcal{R}_0 \). For this sake we first introduce a value function, whose strict one sub-level set is equal to the maximal robust region of uniform attraction \( \mathcal{R}_0 \). Then we reduce this value function to a continuous and bounded solution to (6).

We first introduce a semi-definite positive polynomial cost \( g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) satisfying that \( g(x) = 0 \) if \( x = 0 \). For the sake of simplicity, we denote \( \ln(g(\phi_{x_0}^\pi(i))) + 1 \) and \( \ln(l(1 - h_j^X(\phi_{x_0}^\pi(i)))) \) as \( g_i(x, \pi) \) and \( h_{j,i}(x, \pi) \) respectively, i.e.
\[
g_i(x, \pi) = \ln(g(\phi_{x_0}^\pi(i))) + 1,
\]
and
\[
h_{j,i}(x, \pi) = \ln(l(1 - h_j^X(\phi_{x_0}^\pi(i))))
\]
where
\[
l(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]
Besides, we define \( \ln 0 := -\infty \).

For \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we define the value function \( V : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\} \) as
\[
V(x) := \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x, \pi) - \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_X\}} h_{j,i}(x, \pi) \right\}
\]
and consider the Kruzhkov transformed optimal value function \( v : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, 1] \) given by
\[
v(x) := 1 - e^{-V(x)} = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{ 1 - e^{\tilde{V}} \},
\]
where
\[
\tilde{V} = - \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x, \pi) + \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_X\}} h_{j,i}(x, \pi).
\]

Theorem 4. Under Assumption 1, then

(1) \( \mathcal{R}_0 = \{ x | V(x) < \infty \} = \{ x | v(x) < 1 \} \).

(2) \( V(x) \) is continuous over \( \mathcal{R}_0 \) with \( \lim_{n \to \infty} V(x_n) = \infty \) if \( \lim_{n \to \infty} x_n \neq x \notin \mathcal{R}_0 \) or \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \|x_n\| = \infty \).

(3) \( v(x) \) is continuous over \( \mathcal{R}^n \).

Proof. In these proofs, \( \Omega(x_0, k) \) denotes the set of states visited by system (1) initialized at \( x_0 \) within \( k \geq 1 \) steps, i.e. \( \Omega(x_0, k) = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid y = \phi_{x_0}^\pi(i), \forall i \in \{0, k\} \cap \mathbb{N}, \forall \pi \in \mathcal{D} \} \).

1. Firstly, by (28), we obtain immediately the equality between the two sets \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid V(x) < \infty \} \) and \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid v(x) < 1 \} \). It remains to prove the first identity that \( \mathcal{R}_0 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid V(x) < \infty \} \).

Let \( x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_0 \). We first prove that
\[
\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi) < \infty.
\]

Let \( W(x_0) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi) \). According to Assumption 1, there exists \( K > 0 \) such that \( \phi_{x_0}^\pi(k) \in B(0, r) \) for \( k \geq K \) and \( \pi \in \mathcal{D} \). Also, the closure of the reachable set \( \Omega_{x_0, K} \) is compact. Thus for \( \pi \in \mathcal{D} \),
\[
W(x_0) \leq K \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \ln(g(x) + 1)
\]
\[
+ \sum_{i=1}^{K} L_i M r \lambda^{i-1} \leq C,
\]
where \( L_i \) is the Lipschitz constant of \( \ln(g(x) + 1) \) over \( x \in B(0, r) \). Therefore \( W(x_0) < \infty \). Next we prove that
\[
- \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi) < \infty.
\]

Since \( \| \phi_{x_0}^\pi(k) \| \leq \beta(k) \) for \( \pi \in \mathcal{D} \), the reachable set \( \Omega_{x_0, \infty} \) is bounded, hence \( \Omega_{x_0, \infty} \) is compact. Moreover, since \( D = D_{ad, \delta}(x_0) \) for some \( \delta > 0 \), we have that \( \Omega_{x_0, \infty} \subseteq X \). Also, since each \( h_j^X \), \( j = 1, \ldots, n_X \), is continuous over \( X \), it will attain a (finite) maximum on \( \Omega_{x_0, \infty} \) and thus
\[
\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \min_{k \in \mathbb{N}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi)
\]
will attain a finite minimum over \( \Omega_{x_0, \infty} \) according to (25). We prove the claim.

Let \( x_0 \notin \mathcal{R}_0 \). Then either the existence of \( \beta(k) \) or the existence of \( \delta \) in the definition of \( \mathcal{R}_0 \) \( (\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}_0^c) \) is not satisfied. For the first case, there exists a sequence \( (\pi_{j^*})_{j^*} \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \lim_{j^* \to \infty} k'(x_0, \pi_{j^*}) = \infty \). Then for any \( j^* \in \mathbb{N} \),
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi_{j^*}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi_{j^*}) \geq \ln(c_0 + 1) k'(x_0, \pi_{j^*}),
\]


where $c_0$ is a constant such that $\inf_{x \notin B(0,r)} g(x) \geq c_0$ (Such $c_0$ exists since $g(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ and $g(x) > 0$ for $x \neq 0$). It follows that $\lim_{y' \to \infty} W(x_0) = \infty$. Therefore, $V(x_0) = \infty$ since $V(x_0) \geq W(x_0)$.

In the second case, the non-existence of $\delta$ implies the existence of a sequence $(\pi_j, k_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{j \to \infty} \text{dist}(\phi_{x_0}^\pi(k_j), X^c) = 0$. Then either there exists $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi_{x_0}^\pi(k_{l_0}) \in X^c$ or there exists a subsequence $(x_{k_{l_{j'}}})_{j' \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to some $x \notin X$ (This is due to the fact that the sequence $(\phi_{x_0}^\pi(k_j))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ lies in the bounded set $X$), where $x_{k_{l_{j'}}} = \phi_{x_0}^\pi(k_{l_{j'}})$.

Both cases imply that
\[
\lim_{l \to \infty} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \left( - \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} h_{j,k_{l_{j'}}}(x_0, \pi) \right) = \infty.
\]

Also, since
\[
V(x_0) \geq \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} h_{j,k_{l_{j'}}}(x_0, \pi) \right),
\]
we obtain $V(x_0) = \infty$.

2. Let $x_0, y_0 \in \mathcal{R}_0$.
\[
|V(x_0) - V(y_0)| \leq |W(x_0) - W(y_0)| + \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \left( \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} h_{j,k_{l_{j'}}}(x_0, \pi) - \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} h_{j,k_{l_{j'}}}(y_0, \pi) \right).
\]

(32) where $W(x_0) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^\infty g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi)$. In the following we separately prove the continuity of $W(x_0)$ and
\[
\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} h_{j,k_{l_{j'}}}(x_0, \pi).
\]

Firstly, we prove that $W(x)$ is continuous on $B(0, \frac{\epsilon}{3\lambda})$.

Assume that $x_0 \in B(0, \frac{\epsilon}{3\lambda})$. Then
\[
\sum_{i=0}^\infty |\ln(g(\phi_{x_0}^\pi(i)) + 1)| \leq L_r \sum_{i=0}^\infty \|\phi_{x_0}^\pi(i)\| \leq L_r \sum_{i=0}^\infty \lambda^i \|x_0\| \leq M(1)\|x_0\|,
\]

where $L_r$ is the Lipschitz constant of $\ln(g(x) + 1)$ over $x \in B(0, r)$, $r$, $\lambda$ and $M$ are defined in (3).

For arbitrary but fixed $\epsilon > 0$, we can conclude from Assumption 1 that there exists $K > 0$ such that $M(1)\|x_0\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3\lambda}$ for $k \geq K$ and $x_0 \in B(0, \frac{\epsilon}{3\lambda})$. In addition, by Lipschitz continuity of $f$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that
\[
\|\phi_{x_0}^\pi(k) - \phi_{y_0}^\pi(k)\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3L_r(K+1)}
\]
for $k \in [0, K]$ and $y_0 \in \{x \in B(0, \frac{\epsilon}{3\lambda}) \mid \|x - x_0\| < \delta\}$. Then we have
\[
|W(x_0) - W(y_0)| \leq \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^\infty |\ln(g(\phi_{x_0}^\pi(i)) + 1)| - |\ln(g(\phi_{y_0}^\pi(i)) + 1)|
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \left( K \|\phi_{x_0}^\pi(i) - \phi_{y_0}^\pi(i)\| + M(1)\|x_0\| \right)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \leq \epsilon.
\]

Therefore, $W(x)$ is continuous over $B(0, \frac{\epsilon}{3\lambda})$.
Also since $V(x)$ is continuous over over $\mathbb{R}_0$, we have that $v(x)$ is continuous over $\mathbb{R}_0$.

We just need to prove that if $\lim_{x \to y} v(x) = v(y)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}_n \setminus \mathbb{R}_0$. According to (2) we have that $\lim_{x \to y} V(x) = \infty$ and consequently $\lim_{x \to y} v(x) = 1 = v(y)$.

Above all, we have that $v(x)$ is continuous over $\mathbb{R}_n$.

Theorem 4 indicates that the interior of the maximal robust region of attraction can be obtained by computing either the value function $V(x)$ in (27) or the value function $v(x)$ in (28). Below we show that they can be computed by solving Bellman equations. Firstly, we observe that $V(x)$ and $v(x)$ satisfy the dynamic programming principle.

**Lemma 4.** Under Assumption 1, the following assertions are satisfied:

1. For $x \in \mathbb{R}_n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:
   \[
   V(x) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x, \pi) + V(\phi_{\pi}(k)) \right\},
   \]
   \[
   \sup_{i \in [0,k-1]\cap \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x, \pi) - \min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x, \pi) \right\}.
   \]
   (39)

2. For $x \in \mathbb{R}_n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:
   \[
   v(x) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - v(\phi_{\pi}(k))}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} e^{g_{i-1}(x, \pi)}} \right\},
   \]
   \[
   \sup_{i \in [0,k-1]\cap \mathbb{N}} \left\{ 1 - e^{-V} \right\},
   \]
   (40)

   where $V = \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x, \pi) - \min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x, \pi)$.

**Proof.** 1. Let

\[
W(x_0, k) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi) + V(\phi_{\pi}(k)) \right\},
\]

\[
\sup_{i \in [0,k-1]\cap \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x_0, \pi) - \min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi) \right\}.
\]

(41)

We will prove that for all $\epsilon > 0$, $|W(x_0, k) - V(x_0)| \leq \epsilon$. According to (27), for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\pi \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

\[
V(x_0) \leq \epsilon + \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi) - \min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n_x\}} h_{j,k}(x_0, \pi) \right\}.
\]

(42)

We respectively define $\pi_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\pi_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ as follows: $\pi_1(i) = \pi(i)$ for $i = 0, \ldots, k$, and $\pi_2(i) = \pi(i + k)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $y = \phi_{\pi_0}(k)$. Then, obtain that

\[
W(x_0, k) \geq \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi) + V(y), \right\}
\]

\[
\sup_{i \in [0,k-1]\cap \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x_0, \pi) - \min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi) \right\},
\]

\[
\geq \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi_1) + \right\}
\]

\[
\sup_{i \in [l,k-1]\cap \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(y, \pi_2) - \min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n_x\}} h_{j,i-k}(y, \pi_2) \right\},
\]

\[
\sup_{i \in [0,k-1]\cap \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x_0, \pi_1) - \min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi_1) \right\}.
\]

(43)

Therefore, $V(x_0) \leq W(x_0, k) + \epsilon_1$. According to (41), for any $\epsilon_1 > 0$, there exists a perturbation input policy $\pi_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

\[
W(x_0, k) \leq \epsilon_1 + \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi_1) + V(\phi_{\pi_0}(k)), \right\}
\]

\[
\sup_{i \in [0,k-1]\cap \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x_0, \pi_1) - \min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi_1) \right\}.
\]

(44)

Also, by the definition of $V$, i.e. (27), for any $\epsilon_1$, there exists an input policy $\pi_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

\[
V(y) \leq \epsilon_1 + \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(y, \pi_2) - \min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n_x\}} h_{j,i}(y, \pi_2) \right\},
\]

(45)

where $y = \phi_{\pi_0}(k)$. We define $\pi$:

\[
\pi(i) = \begin{cases} \pi_1(i), & i \in [0,k) \cap \mathbb{N} \\ \pi_2(i-k), & i \in [k,\infty) \cap \mathbb{N} \end{cases}.
\]

(46)

Therefore, we infer that
$W(x_0, k) \leq \epsilon_1 + \max\{k \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi_1) + V(y)\}$

$$\sup_{i \in \{0, k-1\} \cap \mathbb{N}} \{i \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x_0, \pi_1) - \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi_1)\} \leq 2\epsilon_1 + \max\{k \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_{i-1}(x_0, \pi_1) +$$

$$\sup_{i \in \{0, k-1\} \cap \mathbb{N}} l-k \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(y, \pi_2) - \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_x\}} h_{j,i-k}(y, \pi_2),$$

$$\sup_{i \in \{0, k-1\} \cap \mathbb{N}} \{i \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x_0, \pi_1) - \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi_1)\} \leq 2\epsilon_1 +$$

$$\max\{\sup_{i \in \{0, k-1\} \cap \mathbb{N}} l-k \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x_0, \pi) - \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi)\},$$

$$\sup_{i \in \{0, k-1\} \cap \mathbb{N}} \{i \sum_{j=1}^{i} g_{j-1}(x_0, \pi) - \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_x\}} h_{j,i}(x_0, \pi)\} \leq V(x_0) + 2\epsilon_1.$$  (47)

Therefore, we finally have $|W - V| \leq \epsilon = 2\epsilon_1$, implying that $V = W$ since $\epsilon_1$ is arbitrary.

2. (40) can be obtained using the formula $v(x_0) = 1 - e^{-V(x_0)}$. □

Based on Lemma 4 we can infer that the value functions $V(x_0)$ and $v(x_0)$ are solutions to two generalized Bellman equations (48) and (49), respectively.

**Theorem 5.** Under Assumption 1, the value function $V$ is the unique continuous solution to the generalized Bellman equation

$$\min \{\sup_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \{V - V(f) - \ln(g + 1)\},$$

$$V + \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_x\}} \ln(l(1 - h_j^y))\} = 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{R}_0,$$

$$V(0) = 0.$$  (48)

The value function $v$ is the unique bounded and continuous solution to the Bellman equation

$$\min \{\inf_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \{v - v(f) - g \cdot (1 - v)\},$$

$$v - 1 + \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, n_x\}} e^{\ln(l(1 - h_j^y))}\} = 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$v(0) = 0.$$  (49)

**Proof.** The fact that the value functions $V(x)$ in (27) and $v(x)$ in (28) are solutions to (48) and (49) respectively can be verified when $k = 1$ in (39) and (40).

Here, we just prove the uniqueness of solutions to (49). The uniqueness of solution to (48) can be guaranteed by the one to one corresponding relationship between $V(x)$ and $v(x)$.

Assume that $\tilde{v}$ is a bounded and continuous solution to (49) as well, we need to prove that $v = \tilde{v}$ over $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $v < 1$ over $\mathcal{R}_0$ and $v = 1$ over $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{R}_0$. Assume that there exists $y_0$ such that $\tilde{v}(y_0) \neq v(y_0)$. First let’s assume $v(y_0) > \tilde{v}(y_0)$ and $v(y_0) > 1$. Obviously, $y_0 \neq 0$ and consequently $g(y_0) > 0$. Since $v$ is continuous over $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $v$ is continuous over $\mathbb{R}^n \times D$, there exists $d_k^y \in D$ such that $v(y_0) - v(f(y_0, d_k^y)) - g(y_0)(1 - v(y_0)) = 0$. Since $v(y_0) - \tilde{v}(y_0) - v(f(y_0, d_k^y)) - g(y_0)(1 - \tilde{v}(y_0)) \geq 0$, we obtain that $v(f(y_0, d_k^y)) - v(f(y_0, d_k^y)) \geq (v(y_0) - \tilde{v}(y_0))(1 + g(y_0))$.

(50)

Let $y_1 = \phi_{y_1}^y(1)$, where $\pi_1(0) = d_k^y$, then $v(y_0) > \tilde{v}(y_1)$. Also, we have $v(y_0) \leq v(y_1)$. Moreover, $y_1 \neq 0, g(y_1) > 0$. We continue the above deduction for $y_0$ to $y_1$ and obtain that there exists $d_k^y \in D$ such that $v(f(y_1, d_k^y)) - v(f(y_1, d_k^y)) \geq (v(y_1) - \tilde{v}(y_1))(1 + g(y_1))$.

(51)

Thus, we have $v(f(y_1, d_k^y)) - v(f(y_1, d_k^y)) \geq (v(y_1) - \tilde{v}(y_1))(1 + g(y_1))$.

(52)

Let $y_2 = \phi_{y_2}^{y_2}(1)$, where $\pi_2(0) = d_k^y$, then $v(y_2) > \tilde{v}(y_2)$. Also, $v(y_1) \leq v(y_2)$. Analogously, we deduce that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$v(f(y_k, d_k^{y_k+1})) - v(f(y_k, d_k^{y_k+1})) \geq (v(y_k) - \tilde{v}(y_k))(1 + g(y_k))$.

(53)

Moreover, let $y_{k+1} = \phi_{y_{k+1}}^{y_{k+1}}(1)$, then $v(y_{k+1}) \leq v(y_{k+1})$, where $\pi_{k+1}(0) = d_k^{y_{k+1}}$. This implies that $\lim_{k \to \infty} y_k \neq 0 \land \forall y \in B(0, \tau)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $B(0, \tau)$ is defined in (4). Assume that $c_0 = \inf \{g(x) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B(0, \tau)\}$. Obviously, $c_0 > 0$. Therefore,

$v(f(y_k, d_k^{y_k+1})) - v(f(y_k, d_k^{y_k+1})) \geq (v(y_k) - \tilde{v}(y_k))(1 + c_0)^{k+1}$.

(54)

implying that $\lim_{k \to \infty} v(y_k) = \infty$, which contradicts the fact that $v$ is bounded over $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Next, assume $v(y_0) > \tilde{v}(y_0)$ and $v(y_0) < 1$. According to Theorem 4, every possible trajectory starting from $y_0$ will eventually approach $0$. Also, we have $\inf_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \{v(y_0, d) - v(f(y_0, d)) - g(y_0)(1 - v(y_0))\} = 0$.

Following the deduction mentioned above, we have $v(y_k) - \tilde{v}(y_k) \geq v(y_0) - \tilde{v}(y_0), \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $\lim_{k \to \infty} \tilde{v}(y_k) = 0$, $\lim_{k \to \infty} v(y_k) \geq v(y_0) - \tilde{v}(y_0)$ holds, contradicting $\lim_{k \to \infty} v(y_k) = 0$.

For the case that $\tilde{v}(y_0) > v(y_0)$, we can obtain similar contradiction by following the proof procedure mentioned above with $v$ and $\tilde{v}$ reversed. □