

# On continuation and convex Lyapunov functions

Wouter Jongeneel and Roland Schwan\*

Date: January 26, 2023, date of first upload: January 14, 2023

## Abstract

Given any two continuous dynamical systems on Euclidean space such that the origin is globally asymptotically stable and assume that both systems come equipped with—possibly different—convex smooth Lyapunov functions asserting the origin is indeed globally asymptotically stable. We show that this implies those two dynamical systems are homotopic through qualitatively equivalent dynamical systems. It turns out that relaxing the assumption on the origin to any compact convex set or relaxing the convexity assumption to geodesic convexity does not alter the conclusion. Imposing the same convexity assumptions on control Lyapunov functions leads to a Hautus-like stabilizability test. These results ought to find applications in optimal control and reinforcement learning.

**Keywords**— (geodesic) convexity, homotopy theory, (control) Lyapunov functions, topology

**AMS Subject Classification (2020)**— 26B25, 37C15, 55P10, 93D05

## 1 Introduction

Motivated by advances in the learning community [AXK17; KM19], we discuss in this note the ramifications of assuming (control) Lyapunov functions—as pioneered by Artstein [Art83] and Sontag [Son89]—to be convex. A secondary contribution of this note is to address—in arguably the most simple setting—continuation questions as posed by Conley [Con78] and later Kvalheim [Kva22]. Overall, this note is in the spirit of the work by Zabczyk [Zab89], Reineck [Rei91], Sepulchre & Aeyels [SA96], Coron [Cor07, Chapter 11], Byrnes [Byr08] and Cieliebak & Eliashberg [CE12, Chapter 9].

We start by introducing Lyapunov functions for the dynamical control systems at hand. Then, in Section 2 we highlight topological properties of levelsets of Lyapunov functions. These observations are the motivation for Section 3 where we infer continuation results by considering several notions of convexity. This note is concluded in Section 4.

**Notation** Let  $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , then,  $C^r(U; V)$  denotes the set of  $C^r$ -smooth functions from some set  $U$  to  $V$ . The inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_2 = 1\}$  is the embedded unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The Lie derivative of a smooth function  $h$  over some open set  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  with respect to a smooth vector field  $X$  over the same set  $U$  is denoted by  $L_X h$  and is defined pointwise by  $L_X h(p) := \langle \nabla h(p), X(p) \rangle$  for any  $p \in U$  [Lee12, Proposition 12.32]. By  $\text{cl}(W)$  we denote the closure of a set  $W$  and by  $\text{int}(W)$  we denote its interior. The identity map  $x \mapsto x$  on a space  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$  and tangent spaces of appropriately defined sets  $M$  are denoted by  $T_p M$ , for  $p \in M$ , with  $TM$  denoting the corresponding tangent bundle [Lee12, p. 65].

---

\*WJ is with the Risk Analytics and Optimization Chair (EPFL). RS is with the Automatic Control Lab (EPFL) and the Risk Analytics and Optimization Chair (EPFL). Both authors are supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under the NCCR *Automation*, grant agreement 51NF40\_180545. Contact: {wouter.jongeneel, roland.schwan}@epfl.ch

## 2 1 Introduction

**1.1 Dynamical control systems** We study *dynamical systems* over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}x(t) = F(x(t)) : \begin{cases} F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow T\mathbb{R}^n \\ \pi \circ F = \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^n}, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $F$  is  $C^r$ -smooth with  $r \geq 0$ ,  $\pi : T\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  defined by  $(x, v) \mapsto \pi(x, v) = x$  is the canonical projection and for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we have with some abuse of notation  $F(x) \in T_x\mathbb{R}^n$ . Evidently,  $T\mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , but (1.1) is useful to keep in mind when comparing objects to assess if generalizations beyond  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are possible. When  $r \geq 1$ , *integral curves* of (1.1) are differentiable curves  $t \mapsto \xi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\dot{\xi}(t) = F(\xi(t))$  for all  $t \in \text{dom}(\xi)$ , which is non-empty by the assumption on  $r$ . We will not go into further regularity conditions and always assume for simplicity that  $r = 0$  and that the vector field is *complete*, i.e., a global flow (see below) is induced, such that we are allowed to make global statements<sup>1</sup>, for further information we point the reader to [Son98; Hal09].

Going beyond *descriptions*, when aiming to *prescribe* the dynamics of a system we consider (time-invariant) *dynamical control systems* over  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$  of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}x(t) = f(x(t), u) : f(x, u) \in T_x\mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathbb{R}^n \forall (x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $x$  and  $u$  denote the state and input, respectively. Again, with some abuse of notation, we will assume that  $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m; \mathbb{R}^n)$ , but again omit integrability discussions. Input functions are of the form  $t \mapsto \mu(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , e.g., a state feedback is of the form  $t \mapsto \mu(x(t))$ . Note, we use  $\mu$  instead of  $u$  to differentiate between the function and the point. A subclass of (1.2) of interest are the so-called *control affine* systems of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}x(t) = f(x(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^m g_i(x(t))u_i, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $u_i$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  element of  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and again  $f, g_i \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  [NS90]. Based on the control system at hand, one might say more about the space of allowable inputs  $t \mapsto \mu(t)$ , e.g., one might consider *absolutely integrable* ( $L^1_{\text{loc}}$ ) or *essentially bounded* ( $L^\infty_{\text{loc}}$ ) function spaces [Son98, Appendix C].

**1.2 Stability** Let  $F$  parametrize a dynamical system of the form (1.1). By our standing completeness and smoothness assumptions,  $F$  will give rise to a continuous *flow*<sup>2</sup>  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , with its evaluation denoted by  $\varphi^t(x_0) := \varphi(t, x_0)$ , which is understood to describe a solution to (1.1) at time  $t$  starting at time 0 from  $x_0$ . A point  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is an *equilibrium point* of  $F$  when  $F(x^*) = 0$ , w.l.o.g. we set  $x^* = 0$ . Then, 0 is said to be *globally asymptotically stable* (GAS) (with respect to  $F$ ) if

- (s-i) 0 is *Lyapunov stable*, that is, for any open neighbourhood  $U_\varepsilon \ni 0$  there is an open set  $U_\delta \subseteq U_\varepsilon$  such that a solution (with respect to  $F$ ) starting in  $U_\delta$  stays in  $U_\varepsilon$ ;
- (s-ii) 0 is *globally attractive*, that is,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \varphi^t(x_0) = 0$  for all  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

We will not further digress into solutions and stability and refer to [Son98]. In general it is not straightforward to capture if 0 is GAS or not. A fruitful tool that *does* allow for conclusions of this form has been devised by Lyapunov in the late 1800s [Lia92]. A function  $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$  is said to be a (smooth, strict and proper) *Lyapunov function* (with respect to  $F$  and 0) when

<sup>1</sup>We remark that *completeness* is the important property here as we will appeal to a global flow, *smoothness* of  $F$  (going beyond  $C^0$ ), on the other hand, is rarely exploited. The only reason to potentially keep smoothness is that one can naturally relax completeness and make some local statements. Without completeness, global statements can break down, consider  $\dot{x} = x^2$ . However, as the emphasis of this note is on *global asymptotic stability*, examples of that form are somewhat obsolete.

<sup>2</sup>Flows satisfy: (1) the *identity*  $\varphi^0 = \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ ; and (2) *group* property  $\varphi^{s+t} = \varphi^s \circ \varphi^t \forall s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

(V-i)  $V(x) > 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  and  $V(0) = 0$ ;

(V-ii)  $\langle \nabla V(x), F(x) \rangle < 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ ;

(V-iii) and  $V$  is *radially unbounded*, that is,  $V(x) \rightarrow +\infty$  for  $\|x\| \rightarrow +\infty$ .

Property (V-iii) implies sublevelset compactness and is sometimes referred to as *weak coercivity*. Now, based on work by Massera, Kurzweil and others [Kur63; FP19], we will exploit the celebrated theorem stating that 0 is GAS if and only if there is a (corresponding) smooth Lyapunov function [BR05, Theorem 2.4]. Note, we dropped the adjective “*strict and proper*” as we exclusively look at Lyapunov functions of that form. See also that, given that  $V$  satisfies Property (V-i), then  $\langle \nabla V(x), F(x) \rangle \leq -V(x)$  implies Property (V-ii).

For further references on Lyapunov stability theory we point the reader to [BS70; Son98; BR05].

Now, given a control system (1.2), when it comes to the task of *globally asymptotically stabilizing* 0 (we will exclusively focus on stabilization by means of state feedback<sup>3</sup>), the Lyapunov function paradigm can be adjusted. Given our stabilization goal, we seek a function  $t \mapsto \mu(x(t))$  such that under  $f(x, \mu(x)) =: F(x)$  the origin is GAS. Then, analogously to the definition of a Lyapunov function, one can define **control Lyapunov functions** (CLFs), yet, Property (V-ii) is now replaced by asking that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  the following holds

$$\inf_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m} \langle \nabla V(x), f(x, u) \rangle < 0. \quad (1.4)$$

It is not evident that a choice of input function based on (1.4) can result in a continuous—let alone smooth—feedback. The next section elaborates on this problem.

**1.3 On control Lyapunov functions** Consider a dynamical control affine system with scalar input of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}x(t) = f(x(t)) + g(x(t))u, \quad (1.5)$$

Then, for  $V$  to be a smooth CLF for (1.5), we must have that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  there exists a  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $L_f V(x) + uL_g V(x) < 0$ . However, the existence of a *smooth control*-Lyapunov function is topologically strong in the sense that it generally implies (see below) that an asymptotically stabilizing *continuous* feedback exists [Son98, Chapter 5]. Indeed, the controller attributed to Sontag is

$$\mu_s(x) := \begin{cases} -\frac{L_f V(x) + \sqrt{(L_f V(x))^2 + (L_g V(x))^4}}{L_g V(x)} & \text{if } L_g V(x) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

*e.g.*, see [Son98, p. 249]. Although (1.6) appears singular,  $\mu_s(x)$  can be shown to be continuous under the following condition; we speak of the *small control property* when for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  satisfies  $\|x\| < \delta$ , then, there is a  $u$  such that  $\|u\| < \varepsilon$  and  $L_f V(x) + L_g V(x)u < 0$  [Son89, p. 247]. As such, the existence of a *smooth* CLF is strictly stronger than being (globally) asymptotically controllable<sup>4</sup>, *e.g.*, continuous feedback can be easily obstructed for globally controllable systems that even admit smooth CLFs<sup>5</sup>. To add, the small control property does not always hold and it is well-known that CLF-based-controllers can be singular, and ever since their inception so-called “*desingularization techniques*” emerged [Cor07,

<sup>3</sup>Considering more general input functions, *e.g.*, of the form  $t \mapsto \mu(t, x(t))$ , integral curves of the corresponding closed-loop system are generally understood to be absolutely continuous curves  $\xi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that the differential relation  $\dot{\xi}(t) = F(\xi(t), \mu(t, \xi(t))) =: F'(t, \xi(t))$  holds for almost all  $t \in I$ , in the sense of Lebesgue. This requires rethinking some concepts, *e.g.*, global asymptotic stability and what a closed-loop *vector field* really is.

<sup>4</sup>See for example [Rif02, Section 2] and references therein for more on this notion.

<sup>5</sup>A well-known example attributed to Ledyaev & Sontag is of the form  $\dot{x}_1 = u_2 u_3$ ,  $\dot{x}_2 = u_1 u_3$ ,  $\dot{x}_3 = u_1 u_2$  cf. [LS99].

## 4 2 Topological perspective on levelsets and singularities

Section 12.5.1]. For instance, under structural assumptions a backstepping approach to handle CLF singularities is studied in [LK97] and a PDE reformulation to avoid singularities is presented in [YI00].

Nevertheless, in case the dynamical control system is affine in the input  $u$  and  $u$  is constrained to a compact convex set, then the *existence* of a  $C^\infty$  CLF is equivalent to the existence of a  $C^0$  (on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ ) stabilizing feedback [Art83]. Indeed, the work by Sontag aimed at making the *construction* of such a feedback transparent. Further relaxing regularity of a CLF, it can be shown that the existence of a so-called “proximal CLF” is equivalent to asymptotic controllability. These proximal CLFs are  $C^r$ -smooth with  $r \in [0, 1)$ , *e.g.*, see [Cla10] for more on non-smooth CLFs. Better yet, it can be shown that global asymptotic controllability implies the existence of a—possibly discontinuous—feedback [Cla+97]. Even more, Rifford showed that when the control system is globally asymptotically controllable, a—possibly nonsmooth—semiconcave<sup>6</sup> CLF always exists. Exploiting this structure, for control affine systems, Rifford could extend Sontag’s formula (1.6) to this setting [Rif02, Theorem 2.7] and *get* again an explicit feedback.

The existence of a smooth CLF is not only topologically strong, it implies there exists a *robustly* stabilizing feedback [LS99].

**1.4 On learning-based stabilization** Neural networks are becoming increasingly popular in the context of controller synthesis [Jin+20; GZY21; Muk+22; ZZL22]. A principled approach, however, that guarantees some form of stability is largely lacking. Progress has been made when it comes to handling side-information [AEK20], obtaining statistical stability guarantees [Bof+21], in the context of input-state stability under CTRNN modelling assumptions [Yan+22], in the context of input-output stability by exploiting the Hamilton-Jacobi inequality [OK22], by exploiting contraction theory [Rez+22] and by exploiting Koopman operator theory [ZB22], to name a few. As these methods are data-driven, errors inevitably slip in and great care must be taken when one aims to mimic CLF-based controllers, *i.e.*, if  $L_g V(x) = 0 \implies L_f V(x) < 0$  holds for the estimated system, does it hold for the real system and what happens if it does not? In particular, recall (1.6). Moreover, in this setting the underlying dynamical control system is frequently unknown and a function class for  $V$  needs to be chosen *a priori*, what does this choice imply? These questions motivate this note. We also point out that these methods continue a long history of research on computational methods for Lyapunov functions, *e.g.*, see [GH15] for a review.

## 2 Topological perspective on levelsets and singularities

We start by detailing (recalling) how levelsets of smooth Lyapunov functions, with respect to points, look like topologically. This result has some ramifications and provides for motivation in the next section. For simplicity, we momentarily focus on (1.5).

Section 1.4 discussed why one might be interested in studying terms of the form  $L_g V(x)^{-1} = \langle \nabla V(x), g(x) \rangle^{-1}$  *cf.* (1.6). In this section we show that for practical purposes, the properties of  $V$  frequently obstruct this term to be well-behaved. Indeed, singularities are studied and shown to be unavoidable when  $g(x) := g$  for some  $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

To start, consider a  $C^0$  dynamical system of the form (1.1) on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $n \geq 2$ , and assume that  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is globally asymptotically stable (and hence isolated). This implies that there is a (strict)  $C^\infty$  Lyapunov function  $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . In particular, this implies that  $V$  is also a Lyapunov function for the  $C^\infty$  auxiliary system

$$\frac{d}{dt} z(t) = -\nabla V(z(t)). \quad (2.1)$$

Hence,  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is also GAS under (2.1). By a classical topological result largely<sup>7</sup> due to Kras-

<sup>6</sup>A continuous function  $f$  is said to be *semiconcave* when there is a  $C > 0$  such that  $x \mapsto f(x) - C\|x\|_2^2$  is concave.

<sup>7</sup>Earlier comments can be found in [BK74].

nosel'skiĭ & Zabreĭko [KZ84, Section 52] this directly implies that the corresponding *vector field index* (with respect 0) satisfies

$$\text{ind}_0(-\nabla V) = (-1)^n \neq 0.$$

As the vector field index is the (oriented) degree of the “normalizing” map  $v : \partial U \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  for any open neighbourhood  $U$  of 0 containing no other equilibrium points in its closure [Mil65, Section 6], [GP10, Chapter 3], this can only be true if

$$v : \partial U \ni z \mapsto \frac{-\nabla V(z)}{\|\nabla V(z)\|_2}$$

is surjective. As  $U$  is arbitrary, it follows that the (normalized) gradient of  $V$  along any non-trivial levelset hits any vector in  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . Differently put, fix any  $g \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  then, for any  $c > 0$  there is always a  $z \in V^{-1}(c) =: V_c \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\langle \nabla V(z), g \rangle = 0$ . Indeed, this is why we assumed  $n \geq 2$ , otherwise the claim is not true *cf.* [Son89, p. 121]. Summarizing, we have shown the following—which is attributed to Wilson [WJ67] and Byrnes [Byr08, Theorem 4.1].

**Proposition 2.1** (Levelsets of smooth Lyapunov functions (Wilson, Byrnes)). *Let  $n \geq 2$  and fix some  $g \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . Then, for any levelset  $V_c$ , with  $c > 0$ , of any  $C^\infty$ -smooth Lyapunov function  $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , asserting  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  to be GAS under some dynamical system (1.1), there is a  $x \in V_c$  such that  $\langle \nabla V(x), g \rangle = 0$ .*

Note, Proposition 2.1 implicitly assumes that  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the only equilibrium point as we assume the origin is *globally* asymptotically stable. If desired, one can adapt the statement and work with the domain of attraction. Also note that the discussion above detailed that the normalized vector  $\nabla V(x)$  will hit *any* vector in  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , our focus on  $\langle \nabla V(x), g \rangle$  being equal to 0 at some point is purely application-driven. Moreover, we see that the set of points that render the inner product zero is of codimension 1.

Indeed, Proposition 2.1 is itself classical as this result can also be understood more intuitively by directly appealing to work by Wilson. Namely, due to the work by Wilson and later Perelman we know that the levelsets of (strict and proper)  $C^\infty$  Lyapunov functions  $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  are homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  [WJ67; Sti12]. Although we might assume that these levelsets  $V_c$  and  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  come equipped with a smooth structure, this does not immediately imply the manifolds are diffeomorphic, *e.g.*, consider Milnor’s *exotic spheres* [Mil56]. Nevertheless, one expects that the gradient of  $V$  along  $V_c$  hits any direction as seen as a vector in  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , as indeed succinctly shown above. Visualizations can be found in [Son99] and further comments of this nature are collected by Byrnes in [Byr08], in particular, the diffeomorphism question is addressed.

The ramifications for smooth CLFs are immediate as one observes that the argument with respect to the auxiliary system (2.1) extends *mutatis mutandis*.

This note was motivated by renewed interest in CLFs from the neural network community. The following example highlights some work that arguably would benefit from Proposition 2.1.

**Example 2.2** ((Almost) Singular CLF-based controllers). *In [KYK22, Section IV] the authors consider a dynamical control system of the form  $\dot{x} = f(x) + gu$  with  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ ,  $g \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ . Their to-be-learned control Lyapunov function is of the form  $V(x) = \sigma_k(\gamma(x) - \gamma(0)) + \varepsilon \|x\|^2$  for  $\sigma_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$   $C^\infty$ -smooth ReLU functions and  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  being an input-convex neural network. Hence,  $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ . Indeed, the authors report that the learned CLF leads to large control values (under a Sontag-type controller (1.6)), they do not detail why. The above discussion provides a topological viewpoint.*

One can also interpret Proposition 2.1 through the lens of feedback linearization. Consider some input-output system  $\Sigma$  of the form

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}x(t) = f(x(t)) + gu \\ y(t) = h(x(t)) \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

### 6 3 On convexity and continuation

for the output function  $h$  given by the CLF  $V$  (with respect to  $f$  and  $g$ ). Let the desired output be  $y_d \equiv 0$  such that  $e(t) = y(t) - y_d(t) = y(t)$ . Hence,  $\dot{e} = \dot{V}$ . Now the standard (relative degree 1) feedback linearizing controller for (2.2) is of the form  $u = (L_g V)^{-1}(v - L_f V)$  with  $v$  denoting the new auxiliary input [Isi85; NS90]. Indeed, under the choice

$$v = -\sqrt{(L_f V)^2 + (L_g V)^4}$$

one recovers Sontag's controller (1.6). Now Proposition 2.1 tells us that the *decoupling* term  $(L_g V)^{-1}$  must be singular in any sufficiently small neighbourhood of 0, *i.e.*, the relative degree assumption fails to hold.

**Remark 2.3** (Generalizations). *To go beyond input vector fields of the form  $g(x) := g \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we look at two scenarios.*

(g-i) (*Dependency on  $x$* ): Introduce the function class

$$\mathcal{G}_n := \{g \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n) : g(x) = g_1 + g_2(x), g_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} g_2(x) = 0\}.$$

*Indeed, for any  $g \in \mathcal{G}_n$ , with  $n > 1$ , it follows that for sufficiently small  $c > 0$  there is a  $x \in V_c$  such that  $\langle \nabla V(x), g(x) \rangle = 0$ . The reason being that since  $g \in \mathcal{G}_n$  there are always  $x_1, x_2 \in V_c$  such that  $\langle \nabla V(x_1), g(x_1) \rangle < 0$  while  $\langle \nabla V(x_2), g(x_2) \rangle > 0$ . Then the claim follows from standing regularity assumptions and the intermediate value theorem.*

(g-ii) (*Multidimensional input*): Assume that  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $1 < m < n$  and let the dynamical control system be of the form  $\dot{x} = f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m g_i u_i$  (dependence on  $x$  can be generalized as above). Then, as  $\text{span}\{g_1, \dots, g_m\} \neq \mathbb{R}^n$  there is a nonzero  $v \in \text{span}\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}^\perp$ .

Exploiting the remark from above, we recover a slightly weaker version of a well-known result *cf.* [Blo15, Proposition 6.1.4].

**Corollary 2.4** (Obstruction for nonholonomic systems). *Assume that  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $1 < m < n$  and let the dynamical control system be of the form  $\dot{x} = \sum_{i=1}^m g_i u_i$ , then, there is no smooth CLF with respect to  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .*

*Proof.* Indeed this result follows for example Brockett's condition [Bro83]. However, from Proposition 2.1 we know there is a point  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\nabla V(x') \perp \text{span}\{g^1, \dots, g^m\}$ . This implies that  $L_f V(x') < 0$  must hold for  $V$  to be a CLF. As  $f := 0$ , this is impossible and no smooth CLF can exist.  $\square$


In a similar vein, using  $\mathcal{G}_n$ , one recovers (locally) a slightly weaker version of the highly influential obstruction to continuous asymptotic stabilization of Brockett's nonholonomic integrator *e.g.*, see [Son98, Example 5.9.16].

## 3 On convexity and continuation

The previous section illustrated why levelsets of Lyapunov functions are topological spheres. As such, this motivates the hope that all those Lyapunov functions can be transformed—in some sense—to the canonical Lyapunov function  $V(x) = \frac{1}{2}\langle x, x \rangle$ . We start this study of transformations by looking at *convex* Lyapunov functions, as this class is particularly simple to handle. Better yet, by exploiting this structure, it follows that any convex Lyapunov function also asserts stability of the “*canonical*” inward pointing vector field on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  indeed, which we will denote with some abuse of notation by the map  $-\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ . Exactly this observation will be formalized and further studied below.

Convexity in the context of Lyapunov stability theory has been an active research area. For example, convexity in linear optimal control [LR95], convexity in the dual density formulation due





(a)  $\alpha = -0.2, \beta = 1/100, \gamma = 10$  and  $p = (0.3, 0.3)$     (b)  $\alpha = -0.1, \beta = 1/100, \gamma = 10$  and  $p = (0.5, 0.5)$

**Figure 3.1:** Example 3.3: integral curves of a smooth dynamical systems that obstruct the existence of a *convex* Lyapunov function. The figures are made with Python.

to Rantzer [PPR04] and convexity of the set of Lyapunov functions due to Moulay [Mou10]. We are, however, interested in understanding convexity of Lyapunov functions themselves. It is known that simple asymptotically stable dynamical systems do not always admit polynomial Lyapunov functions. For instance

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} x_1(t) \\ x_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -x_1(t) + x_1(t)x_2(t) \\ -x_2(t) \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

does not admit a polynomial Lyapunov function [AKP11], but one can show that  $V(x) = \log(1 + x_1^2) + x_2^2$  checks out as a Lyapunov function asserting  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is GAS. Indeed,  $V$  is smooth, yet *not* convex. We will come back to this several times below. Similar obstructions can be found for analytic or rational Lyapunov functions [BR05; AEK18].

The (computational) assumption to look for *convex* Lyapunov functions is a popular one in the learning community, *e.g.*, propelled by [AXK17; KM19]. However, this assumption evidently restricts the problem class that can be handled. The ramifications of assuming Lyapunov functions to be convex are understood in the context of linear systems, linear differential inclusions even [Goe+06], but not in the  $C^0$  nonlinear setting. Indeed, in our setting, for  $n > 1$ , one can construct vector field examples  $\dot{x} = F(x)$  over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $0$  is globally asymptotically stable,  $F$  is smooth, yet no smooth convex Lyapunov function exists. To see why, for the sake of contradiction, one can exploit that by convexity we must have

$$\langle \nabla V(x), x \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

and due to the stability assumption we have

$$\langle \nabla V(x), F(x) \rangle < 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$$

such that the function  $V$  must satisfy  $\langle \nabla V(x), F(x) - x \rangle < 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . Hence, if there is a non-zero fixed point<sup>8</sup> of  $F$ , we contradict the existence of such a  $V$ . For a visual example, see Figure 3.1 for phase portraits illustrating dynamical systems with such a fixed point that obstruct the existence of a *smooth convex* Lyapunov function. As one will be able to infer from the results below,  $F$  cannot point (radially) outward. Indeed, it is known that for *homogeneous* Lyapunov functions this can also not be true [SA96, Proposition 1].

We will now formalize this observation.

<sup>8</sup>Note, here we heavily exploit the underlying vector space structure to be able to compare  $x$  and  $F(x)$ .

### 8 3 On convexity and continuation

**Theorem 3.1** (Convex Lyapunov functions). *Let  $F \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$  give rise to  $\dot{x} = F(x)$  with  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  globally asymptotically stable (GAS) under  $F$ . Then, if there is a convex  $C^\infty$  Lyapunov function asserting  $0$  is GAS, the vector field  $F$  is straight-line homotopic to  $-\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$  such that  $0$  is GAS throughout the homotopy.*

*Proof.* By construction there is a  $C^\infty$  Lyapunov function  $V$  such that  $\langle \nabla V(x), F(x) \rangle < 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . By the convexity of  $V$  we also know that

$$V(y) \geq V(x) + \langle \nabla V(x), y - x \rangle, \quad \forall y, x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (3.2)$$

In particular, (3.2) must hold for  $y = 0$ , which yields  $\langle V(x), -x \rangle \leq -V(x)$ , that is,  $V$  is also a Lyapunov function for  $\dot{x} = -x$ . Alternatively, construct the (Legendre-Fenchel) conjugate of  $V$ , that is

$$V^*(y) := \sup\{\langle y, x \rangle - V(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $V^*(y) \geq 0 \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  follows from selecting  $x = 0$ . Now, by convexity and smoothness of  $V$  we have that  $V^*(\nabla V(x)) + V(x) = \langle \nabla V(x), x \rangle$  [RW09, Proposition 11.3]. Exploiting (3.3) and  $V(x) > 0 \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ , this implies that  $\langle V(x), -x \rangle < 0 \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . Regardless of the approach, we find that  $0$  is also GAS under  $sF(x) - (1-s)x$  for all  $s \in [0, 1]$  since for any such  $s$

$$\langle \nabla V(x), sF(x) - (1-s)x \rangle < 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}.$$

Simultaneously, this parameterization in  $s$  provides the desired homotopy.  $\square$

To illustrate the homotopy resulting from Theorem 3.1, two vector fields  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $0$  is GAS—asserted via possibly different smooth convex Lyapunov functions—are homotopic through a continuous map  $H : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  of the form

$$H(s, x) = \begin{cases} -2sx + (1-2s)F_1(x) & s \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \\ -(2-2s)x + (2s-1)F_2(x) & s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]. \end{cases}$$

A variety of known topological conditions capture the existence of a (local) homotopy (in far more general settings), but not that *along* the homotopy stability is preserved *cf.* [Kva22].

Similar statements can be made about *control* Lyapunov functions.

**Corollary 3.2** (Convex control Lyapunov functions). *Let  $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m; \mathbb{R}^n)$  give rise to the control system  $\dot{x} = f(x, u)$ . If there is a convex control Lyapunov function (CLF)  $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$  for this control system with respect to  $0$ , then,  $V$  is a CLF for any control system on the straight-line homotopy between  $f$  and the map  $(x, u) \mapsto -x$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is identical to that of Theorem 3.1, yet, now we start from  $V$  satisfying

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \exists u \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle V(x), f(x, u) \rangle < 0.$$

and again exploit convexity of  $V$  to conclude.  $\square$

In conclusion, we see from Theorem 3.1 that a necessary condition for  $\dot{x} = F(x)$  to admit a smooth convex Lyapunov function, asserting  $0$  is GAS, is that

$$F(x) \neq \lambda x \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}. \quad (3.4a)$$

Differently put, if  $V$  is a Lyapunov function for  $\dot{x} = F(x)$ , it is also a Lyapunov function for  $\dot{x} = F(x) - \lambda x$ , with  $\lambda \geq 0$ . The next example shows we can find families of dynamical systems that do not obey Condition (3.4a).



**Example 3.3** (Necessarily nonconvex). *The systems as shown in Figure 3.1 can be made explicit. Consider a  $C^\infty$  dynamical system of the form (1.1) on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  as given by*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} x_1(t) \\ x_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 1 \\ -1 & \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1(t) \\ x_2(t) \end{pmatrix} + \gamma \exp(-\beta \|x(t) - p\|_2^2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} - \gamma \exp(-\beta \|p\|_2^2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.4b)$$

where  $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , and for instance  $\alpha = -0.2$ ,  $\beta = 1/100$ ,  $\gamma = 10$  and  $p = (0.3, 0.3) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  correspond to  $F_1$  in Figure 3.1a. Indeed, as eigenvectors of the linear part are never of the form  $(1, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , only  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is an equilibrium point of this dynamical system. Note, (3.4b) can also be understood as a stabilizable linear system under a (bounded) nonlinear feedback. We can look at another example when we change  $\alpha$  and  $p$  to  $\alpha = -0.1$  and  $p = (0.5, 0.5) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , then, regarding our necessary condition for convexity, we find, for instance, that  $x = (0.51, 0.45) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\lambda = 0.0629$  provide for a (numerical) invalidation of (3.4a) indeed. This setting corresponds to  $F_2$  as shown in Figure 3.1b.

**Remark 3.4** (A nonconvex conic structure). *Let  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be GAS under  $\dot{x} = F(x)$ , then  $0$  is also GAS under  $\dot{x} = \theta F(x)$  for any  $\theta > 0$ , e.g., consider  $\langle \nabla V(x), F(x) \rangle$  and  $\langle \nabla V(x), \theta F(x) \rangle$  for some Lyapunov function  $V$  with respect to  $F$ . Hence, by Theorem 3.1, all  $\theta F$  are straight-line homotopic to  $-\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ . However, convexity breaks down as already the set of Hurwitz stable matrices is nonconvex, e.g.,*

$$s \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 10 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + (1-s) \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 10 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

becomes unstable (not all eigenvalues lie in  $\mathbb{C}_{\Re < 0}$ ) for  $s = \frac{1}{2}$ .

Similarly, from Corollary 3.2 we see that the control system  $\dot{x} = f(x, u)$  admits a smooth convex CLF only when

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \exists u \in \mathbb{R}^m : f(x, u) \neq \lambda x \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (3.4c)$$

Indeed, one can replace  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  in (3.4) by  $\lambda(x) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , for example,  $\lambda \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$  cf. [SA96].

**Example 3.5** (Linear dynamical systems). *Consider the linear dynamical system  $\dot{x} = Ax$  for some matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Theorem 3.1 implies that for a convex Lyapunov function to exist (asserting  $0$  is GAS) the expression  $sAx - (1-s)x$  cannot vanish for some  $s \in [0, 1]$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . Reformulating, we get (3.4a), i.e.,  $Ax = \lambda x$  cannot have a solution for some  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . However, this is precisely stating that  $A$  cannot have an unstable eigenvalue of the form  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . Indeed, for globally asymptotically stable linear systems a convex (quadratic) Lyapunov function of the form  $V(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Px, x \rangle$  always exists [Son98, Theorem 18].*

**Remark 3.6** (On sufficiency). *Example 3.3 showed that for dynamical systems of the form (3.4b) no convex Lyapunov function can exist. Going back to (3.1), the provided Lyapunov function is nonconvex. Concurrently, one can check that (3.4a) holds, so a convex Lyapunov function is not ruled out. We come back to this below. As discussed above in Example 3.5, in the linear case Condition 3.4a is, however, necessary and sufficient for a convex Lyapunov function to exist.*

To elaborate on Example 3.5, for controllable linear systems, e.g., of the form  $\dot{x} = Ax + Bu$ , one can always parameterize a quadratic Lyapunov function for the LQ optimally controlled closed-loop system by the positive definite solution to the corresponding Riccati equation (for any appropriate cost) [Son98, Theorem 42, Exercise 8.5.4].

**Example 3.7** (Linear dynamical control systems and Hautus' test). *A celebrated condition largely attributed to Hautus (and Belevitch and Popov) states that a linear dynamical control system of the form  $\dot{x} = Ax + Bu$ , is stabilizable when*

$$\text{rank} \left( \begin{pmatrix} A - \lambda I_n & B \end{pmatrix} \right) = n \quad \forall \lambda \in \sigma(A) \cap \mathbb{C}_{\Re \geq 0}, \quad (3.5)$$

### 10 3 On convexity and continuation

where  $\sigma(A)$  denotes the spectrum of  $A$ . See for instance [TSH12, Chapter 3]. Now, elementary algebraic arguments show that Hautus' condition (3.5) implies that (3.4c) holds, as it should for linear control systems.

Using the above, one can readily verify that for example

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} x_1(t) \\ x_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1(t)u \\ x_1(t)x_2(t)u \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.6)$$

does not admit a smooth convex CLF. Indeed, for (3.6), controllability is lost at  $(0, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ .

Example 3.5 and Example 3.7 show that conditions (3.4a) and (3.4c) are to some extent generalizations of known conditions for linear systems, yet, lifted to nonlinear systems under convexity assumptions. These conditions are, however, weak.

A stronger set of conditions one can derive from Theorem 3.1 is of the form:  $\dot{x} = f(x, u)$  admits a smooth convex CLF only if  $\dot{x} = f(x, u) - \lambda(x)x$  does, for any  $\lambda \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ . We are not the first to observe something of this form, *e.g.*, Sepulchre & Aeyels [SA96, Section 4.1] look at homogeneous CLFs and recover a similar condition.

**3.1 On compact convex sets** We briefly show that without too much effort the results extend from  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  being GAS under some dynamical system parametrized by  $F \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$  to a compact convex set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  being GAS<sup>9</sup> under  $F$ . As  $0$  and  $A$  are (straight-line) homotopy equivalent this is perhaps not surprising. Define the projection operator by

$$\Pi_A(x) := \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in A} \|x - y\|_2.$$

We have the following.

**Corollary 3.8** (Convex Lyapunov functions for convex compact sets). *Let  $F \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$  give rise to  $\dot{x} = F(x)$  with a compact convex set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  being globally asymptotically stable (GAS) under  $F$ . Then, if there is a convex  $C^\infty$  Lyapunov function asserting  $A$  is GAS, the vector field  $F$  is straight-line homotopic to  $\Pi_A - \operatorname{id}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus A$  such that  $A$  is GAS throughout the homotopy.*

*Proof.* The Lyapunov function is such that  $V(x) = 0 \iff x \in A$ , hence for the convexity condition  $V(y) \geq V(x) + \langle \nabla V(x), y - x \rangle$  we pick  $y = \Pi_A(x)$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus A$  we have  $\langle \nabla V(x), \Pi_A(x) - x \rangle < 0$ . We can conclude.  $\square$

Some comments are in place, we do not need  $F(A) = 0$ ,  $A$  merely needs to be invariant<sup>10</sup>. This is why we cannot say anything about the homotopy on  $A$  itself. Moreover, settings like these easily obstruct  $V \in C^\omega(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$  (real-analyticity), not to contradict real-analytic function theory (bump functions cannot be analytic). Also, when  $A$  is not convex,  $\Pi_A$  is potentially set-valued, obstructing our vector field construction and perhaps  $\Pi_A - \operatorname{id}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$  is not the expected “canonical” inward vector field (due to the non-scaled offset  $-x$ ). At last, we point out that although  $V$  is smooth, this does not imply that  $\partial A$  must be a smooth manifold. For instance, consider  $V(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 - x_2)^2(x_1 + x_2)^2$  (although here,  $V_0$  is clearly not convex).

We direct the reader to [FP19] and references therein for more on general (converse) Lyapunov theory with respect to sets.

<sup>9</sup>For more on the generalization of stability notions from points to sets we point the reader to [Hur82] for a topological treatment.

<sup>10</sup>Let  $\varphi$  be the flow corresponding to  $F$ , then  $A$  is said to be invariant (under  $\varphi$ ) when  $\varphi(\mathbb{R}, A) = A$ .

**3.2 Geodesic convexity** To go beyond convexity, we follow [Udr13, Chapter 3], [Bou22, Chapter 11] and show how the situation is hardly different in the context of *geodesic* convexity. We will be brief, for the details on geodesic convexity we point the reader to the references above and for background information on Riemannian geometry we suggest [Lee97].

Let  $(\mathbb{R}^n, g)$  be a  $C^\infty$  Riemannian manifold for some Riemannian metric  $g$ . One can think of  $g$  as inducing a change of coordinates via the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_g$ , in particular, this metric has an effect on gradients, that is, the (Riemannian) gradient of a differentiable function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , with respect to  $g$ , satisfies  $Df(x)[v] = \langle \text{grad } f(x), v \rangle_g$  for any  $(x, v) \in T\mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $Df(x)[v]$  being the directional derivative in the direction  $v \in T_x\mathbb{R}^n$ . For example, let  $g$  be parametrized by a symmetric positive definite matrix  $P$ , that is,  $\langle v, w \rangle_g := \langle Pv, w \rangle$  for any  $v, w \in T_x\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then,  $\text{grad } f(x) = P^{-1}\nabla f(x)$ . Indeed, for a practical application of this in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we point the reader to a discussion of Newton’s method as used in second-order optimization [BV04, Section 9.5]. The metric  $g$  also has ramifications for “straight lines”, a  $C^1$  curve  $[0, 1] \ni s \mapsto \gamma(s)$  is a *geodesic*, with respect to  $g$ , when it is an *extremal* of the energy functional  $E(\gamma) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{[0,1]} \langle \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau) \rangle_g d\tau$ . This implies geodesics are *locally* minimizing length and in that sense they generalize straight lines. As this statement is local, geodesics are by no means always unique. Then, a subset  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is called *geodesically convex* ( $g$ -convex) when for all points  $x, y \in U$  there is an *unique*<sup>11</sup> geodesic  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  (with respect to  $g$ ) connecting  $x$  to  $y$  such that  $\gamma([0, 1]) \subseteq U$ . A function  $f : U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , over some  $g$ -convex domain  $U$ , is said to be **geodesically convex** ( $g$ -convex) when

$$f(\gamma(t)) \leq tf(x) + (1-t)f(y) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1] \tag{3.7}$$

for  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  a geodesic, with  $\gamma([0, 1]) \subseteq U$  connecting the point  $x$  to  $y$ . Indeed, (3.7) generalizes the standard  $C^0$  definition of convexity. A  $C^1$  condition is now given by

$$f(\text{Exp}_x(tv)) \geq f(x) + t\langle \text{grad } f(x), v \rangle_g \quad \forall t \in [0, 1],$$

where  $v \in T_x\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\text{Exp}_x$  is the (Riemannian) *exponential map* at  $x \in U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\text{grad } f(x)$  is the *Riemannian gradient* of  $f$ . Here, the exponential map is defined, locally, by  $\text{Exp}_x(v) = \gamma(1)$  for  $\gamma$  the unique geodesic with  $\gamma(0) = x$  and  $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v$ .

Similarly, for a  $C^2$  condition, a function  $f$  is  $g$ -convex when the *Riemannian Hessian* satisfies  $\text{Hess } f(x) \succeq 0$  for all  $x \in U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ . The interest in  $g$ -convex functions stems from the fact that local minima are again global minima, as with standard convex functions.

We are now equipped to generalize Theorem 3.1.

**Theorem 3.9** (Geodesically convex Lyapunov functions). *Let  $(\mathbb{R}^n, g)$  be a Riemannian manifold and let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be open and  $g$ -convex. Let  $F \in C^0(U; \mathbb{R}^n)$  give rise to  $\dot{x} = F(x)$  with  $0 \in U$  globally asymptotically stable (GAS) (on  $U$ ) under  $F$ . Then, if there is a  $g$ -convex  $C^\infty$  Lyapunov function asserting  $0$  is GAS, the vector field  $F$  is straight-line homotopic to  $\text{Exp}^{-1}(0)$  such that  $0$  is GAS throughout the homotopy.*

In Theorem 3.9,  $\text{Exp}^{-1}(0)$  should be understood as the map being defined by  $x \mapsto \text{Exp}_x^{-1}(0) \in T_x\mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* By assumption, there is a  $C^\infty$  Lyapunov function  $V$  such that  $\langle \nabla V(x), F(x) \rangle < 0$  for all  $x \in U \setminus \{0\}$ . By the  $g$ -convexity of  $V$  we also know that for any  $(x, v) \in TU$

$$V(\text{Exp}_x(tv)) \geq V(x) + t\langle \text{grad } V(x), v \rangle_g = V(x) + t\langle \nabla V(x), v \rangle \quad \forall t \in [0, 1],$$

where we removed the dependency on the metric  $g$  by identifying both inner products with the directional derivative  $DV(x)[v]$ . We consider  $t = 1$  and pick  $v := \text{Exp}_x^{-1}(0)$ . This map is always

<sup>11</sup>See the discussion in [Bou22, Section 11.3] on various slightly different definitions of *geodesic convexity* and their implications.

## 12 3 On convexity and continuation

well-defined since our manifold  $(\mathbb{R}^n, g)$  is geodesically complete by construction and all geodesics are unique, implying that the exponential map  $\text{Exp}_x : T_x\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  must be a global diffeomorphism. Now we proceed exactly as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 and conclude.  $\square$

Indeed, we recover Theorem 3.1 for the identity metric on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $U = \mathbb{R}^n$ . In particular, in that case we can define our Riemannian exponential map as  $\text{Exp}_x(v) = x + v$  for (sufficiently small)  $v \in T_xU$ . Hence, the tangent vector  $v$  such that  $\text{Exp}_x(v) = 0$  is simply  $-x$  (now seen as a tangent vector), *i.e.*,  $\text{Exp}_x^{-1}(0) = -x$ . Recall, formally speaking,  $-\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$  should be understood as  $x \mapsto (x, -x) \in TU$  while ignoring the first component of the image. With this in mind we can again understand  $\text{Exp}^{-1}(0)$  as the canonical “inward” vector field, yet now on a subset of  $(\mathbb{R}^n, g)$ .

Generalizing to compact manifolds and so forth (beyond contractible sets) is somewhat nonsensical as no smooth function with a single critical point exists on those spaces. This restriction comes from the demand that our geodesics are unique, obstructing nontrivial topologies. See [Udr13, Chapter 4] for more pointers.

A similar generalization can be achieved through the lens of *contraction analysis* [LS98]. See in particular [WS20] for a relation between  $g$ -convexity and contraction metrics.

We end this section by returning to Remark 3.6, the Lyapunov function with respect to (3.1) is nonconvex, yet the dynamical system satisfies the necessary condition (3.4a). Indeed, the function *is*  $g$ -convex<sup>12</sup> (under quadrant-wise exponential geodesics), and the necessary condition effectively extends (as inferred from Theorem 3.9).

**3.3 Continuation** The existence of a mere homotopy is not immediately informative. Often, only when the homotopy itself satisfies certain properties, one can draw nontrivial conclusions. In our case the homotopies as detailed in Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.2, Corollary 3.8 and Theorem 3.9 all preserve qualitative properties of the underlying dynamical system. More formally, this construction provides a *continuation* in the sense of Conley, albeit from a different perspective. Again, we are decidedly brief, but we point the reader to [Con78; MM02] for more details on Conley index theory and suggest [Hat02] as a reference on algebraic topology.

Recall that under our standing assumptions a dynamical system of the form (1.1) gives rise to a global flow  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an *isolated invariant set* (with respect to  $\varphi$ ), that is,

$$S = \text{Inv}(M, \varphi) := \{x \in M : \varphi(\mathbb{R}, x) \subseteq M\} \subseteq \text{int}(M)$$

for some compact set  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Note that not every invariant set is isolated, *e.g.* consider an equilibrium point of the *center*-type. Then, a pair of compact sets  $(N, L) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  is an *index pair* for  $S$  when

(I-i)  $S = \text{Inv}(\text{cl}(N \setminus L), \varphi)$  and  $N \setminus L$  is a neighbourhood of  $S$ ;

(I-ii)  $L$  is positively invariant in  $N$ ;

(I-iii)  $L$  is an exit set for  $N$  (a trajectory that leaves  $N$ , must leave through  $L$ ).

Now, the (homotopy) *Conley index* of  $S$  is the homotopy type of the pointed (quotient) space  $(N/L, [L])$ , *e.g.*, for  $N = \mathbb{B}^n$ ,  $L = \partial\mathbb{B}^n = \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , we have that  $N/L \simeq \mathbb{S}^n$  such that  $(N/L, [L])$  is the pointed  $n$ -sphere. As this object is hard to computationally work with, let  $H^k(A, B; \mathbb{Z})$  denote the  $k^{\text{th}}$  singular cohomology group of  $A$  relative to  $B \subseteq A$ , then, the *homological Conley index* defined as  $\text{CH}^k(S, \varphi) := H^k(N/L, [L]; \mathbb{Z})$  is of larger interest, *e.g.*, as computational tools are available [KMM04]. Going back to our setting, assume for that moment that  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a GAS

<sup>12</sup>In fact, the function  $x \mapsto \log(1 + x^2)$  is also semiconcave.

hyperbolic fixed point of the flow  $\varphi$ . By hyperbolicity (local linearity), we can pick  $N = \varepsilon\mathbb{B}^n$  (a sufficiently small closed ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) and  $L = \emptyset$ . Now see that

$$\text{CH}^k(0, \varphi) = H^k(\varepsilon\mathbb{B}^n/\emptyset, [\emptyset]; \mathbb{Z}) \simeq H^k(\varepsilon\mathbb{B}^n; \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z} & \text{if } k = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

since  $\varepsilon\mathbb{B}^n$  is homotopic to a point. If 0 is not hyperbolic, pick  $N$  to be a sublevelset of a smooth Lyapunov function that asserts 0 is GAS, this set is compact by Property (V-iii). Indeed, constructions like these provide for topological obstructions [MH11].

Now, if some  $N$  can be chosen to be an isolating neighbourhood *throughout* a homotopy, then the Conley index is preserved along that homotopy [Mro94, Theorem 1.10]. Simply put, we speak in this case of a **continuation** between the dynamical system at the beginning and the end of the homotopy. A question asked by Conley concerns the opposite [Con78, p. 83], to what extent do equivalent Conley indices relate to the existence of such a continuation. See also the discussion in [MRS00; Kva22]. Indeed, we see that if there is a homotopy through flows  $[0, 1] \ni \lambda \mapsto \varphi_\lambda$  such that 0 is GAS along the homotopy, then  $\text{CH}^k(0, \varphi_0) \simeq \text{CH}^k(0, \varphi_1)$ .

For the other direction, based on the above we have the following. One can extend the statement to compact convex sets or  $g$ -convexity if desired.

**Corollary 3.10** (On continuation and convex Lyapunov functions). *Let  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be GAS under two dynamical systems of the form (1.1) parametrized by  $F_0$  and  $F_1$ , giving rise to the flows  $\varphi_0$  and  $\varphi_1$ . Assume that 0 being GAS is asserted by—possibly different—smooth convex Lyapunov functions  $V_0$  and  $V_1$ . Then 0 (with respect to  $\varphi_0$ ) and 0 (with respect to  $\varphi_1$ ) are related by continuation where  $N$  can be chosen to be of the form  $N = N_0 \cup N_1$  (based on sublevelsets of  $V_0$  and  $V_1$ ).*

A further study of this observation is the topic of future work.

To return to similarities pointed out in the introduction, the work by Reineck [Rei91] and the proof of [Cor07, Theorem 11.4] provide the homotopy (preserving the Conley index) between  $F$  and the (a) negative gradient flow  $-\nabla V$ . However, how to link—if at all—multiple dynamical systems is unclear. The book by Cieliebak & Eliashberg does contain results in this direction, yet under  $C^k$ -nearness assumptions [CE12, Chapter 9], not in general.

Then, this work alludes to convexity being a simple structural ingredient to actually link several dynamical systems together via some canonical dynamical system.

## 4 Conclusion

To return to Section 1.4, the space of dynamical systems over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with 0 being GAS subject to the existence of a convex Lyapunov function is path-connected and in that sense practically convenient.

To elaborate, the necessary conditions as set forth in Section 3 allow one to check if a problem at hand is at least not infeasible, *e.g.*, when searching for  $g$ -convex (control) Lyapunov functions. In the context of policy optimization, when starting with a pre-stabilized system (a controller that at least “works”), one likes to be sure that the pre-stabilized system can be safely transformed to the optimally controlled system throughout the optimization/learning process. Indeed, this desire boils down to the initial and final system being homotopic through qualitatively equivalent systems. There is work in this area in the context of linear optimal control [Bu+19; JK21], but further extensions are largely lacking.

This work focused on the complete(d)  $C^0$  setting with the emphasis on Euclidean space, future work aims at studying dynamical control systems under weaker regularity assumptions in more general spaces.

Also, this work focused on the exploitation of a  $g$ -convex structure, however, more general structures have been proposed and studied, *e.g.*, a compositional structure [Grü21]. It seems worthwhile to study more structural assumptions along the lines of this note and previous work by Aeyels & Sepulchre [SA96].

**Acknowledgements** The authors are grateful to Matthew Kvalheim and Matteo Tacchi for their feedback.

## Bibliography

- [AEK18] A. A. Ahmadi and B. El Khadir. “A globally asymptotically stable polynomial vector field with rational coefficients and no local polynomial Lyapunov function”. *Syst. Control Lett.* 121 (2018), pp. 50–53.
- [AEK20] A. A. Ahmadi and B. El Khadir. “Learning dynamical systems with side information”. *Learning for Dynamics and Control*. 2020, pp. 718–727.
- [AKP11] A. A. Ahmadi, M. Krstic, and P. A. Parrilo. “A globally asymptotically stable polynomial vector field with no polynomial Lyapunov function”. *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*. 2011, pp. 7579–7580.
- [Art83] Z. Artstein. “Stabilization with relaxed controls”. *Nonlinear Anal.-Theor.* 7.11 (1983), pp. 1163–1173.
- [AXK17] B. Amos, L. Xu, and J. Z. Kolter. “Input convex neural networks”. *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.* 2017, pp. 146–155.
- [BK74] N. Bobylev and M. Krasnosel’skiĭ. “Deformation of a system into an asymptotically stable system”. *Autom. Remote Control* 35.7 (1974), pp. 1041–1044.
- [Blo15] A Bloch. *Nonholonomic Mechanics and Control*. New York: Springer, 2015.
- [Bof+21] N. Boffi, S. Tu, N. Matni, J.-J. Slotine, and V. Sindhvani. “Learning stability certificates from data”. *Conf. Robot Learning*. 2021, pp. 1341–1350.
- [Bou22] N. Boumal. *An Introduction to Optimization on Smooth Manifolds*. To appear with Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 2022. URL: <http://www.nicolasboumal.net/book>.
- [BR05] A. Bacciotti and L. Rosier. *Liapunov functions and stability in control theory*. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [Bro83] R. W. Brockett. “Asymptotic stability and feedback stabilization”. *Differential Geometric Control Theory*. Boston: Birkhäuser, 1983, pp. 181–191.
- [BS70] N. P. Bhatia and G. P. Szegő. *Stability theory of dynamical systems*. Berlin: Springer, 1970.
- [Bu+19] J. Bu, A. Mesbahi, M. Fazel, and M. Mesbahi. “LQR through the lens of first order methods: Discrete-time case”. *arXiv e-prints* (2019). eprint: [1907.08921](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.08921).
- [BV04] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [Byr08] C. I. Byrnes. “On Brockett’s Necessary Condition for Stabilizability and the Topology of Liapunov Functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ”. *Commun. Inf. Syst.* 8.4 (2008), pp. 333–352.
- [CE12] K. Cieliebak and Y. Eliashberg. *From Stein to Weinstein and back: symplectic geometry of affine complex manifolds*. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 2012.
- [Cla10] F. Clarke. “Discontinuous feedback and nonlinear systems”. *IFAC Proc. Vol.* 43.14 (2010), pp. 1–29.
- [Cla+97] F. H. Clarke, Y. S. Ledyaev, E. D. Sontag, and A. I. Subbotin. “Asymptotic controllability implies feedback stabilization”. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.* 42.10 (1997), pp. 1394–1407.
- [Con78] C. C. Conley. *Isolated invariant sets and the Morse index*. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 1978.
- [Cor07] J.-M. Coron. *Control and Nonlinearity*. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 2007.
- [FP19] A. Fathi and P. Pageault. “Smoothing Lyapunov functions”. *T. Am. Math. Soc.* 371.3 (2019), pp. 1677–1700.
- [GH15] P. Giesl and S. Hafstein. “Review on computational methods for Lyapunov functions”. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* 20.8 (2015), p. 2291.
- [Goe+06] R. Goebel, A. R. Teel, T. Hu, and Z. Lin. “Conjugate convex Lyapunov functions for dual linear differential inclusions”. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.* 51.4 (2006), pp. 661–666.
- [GP10] V. Guillemin and A. Pollack. *Differential Topology*. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [Grü21] L. Grüne. “Computing Lyapunov functions using deep neural networks”. *J. Comput. Dyn.* 8.2 (2021), pp. 131–152.
- [GZY21] N. Gaby, F. Zhang, and X. Ye. “Lyapunov-net: A deep neural network architecture for Lyapunov function approximation”. *arXiv e-prints* (2021). eprint: [2109.13359](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.13359).
- [Hal09] J. K. Hale. *Ordinary Differential Equations*. New York: Dover Publications, 2009.
- [Hat02] A. Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.



- [Hur82] M. Hurley. “Attractors: persistence, and density of their basins”. *T. Am. Math. Soc.* 269.1 (1982), pp. 247–271.
- [Isi85] A. Isidori. *Nonlinear Control Systems: an Introduction*. Berlin: Springer, 1985.
- [Jin+20] W. Jin, Z. Wang, Z. Yang, and S. Mou. “Neural certificates for safe control policies”. *arXiv e-prints* (2020). eprint: [2006.08465](#).
- [JK21] W. Jongeneel and D. Kuhn. “On Topological Equivalence in Linear Quadratic Optimal Control”. *European Control Conference*. 2021, pp. 2002–2007.
- [KM19] J. Z. Kolter and G. Manek. “Learning stable deep dynamics models”. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.* 2019, pp. 11126–11134.
- [KMM04] T. Kaczynski, K. M. Mischaikow, and M. Mrozek. *Computational homology*. New York: Springer, 2004.
- [Kur63] J. Kurzweil. “On the inversion of Ljapunov’s second theorem on stability of motion”. *AMS Transl. Ser.* 2 24 (1963), pp. 19–77.
- [Kva22] M. D. Kvalheim. “Obstructions to Asymptotic Stabilization”. *To appear in SIAM J. Contr. Optim. arXiv e-prints* (2022). eprint: [2205.07840](#).
- [KYK22] K. Kashima, R. Yoshiuchi, and Y. Kawano. “Learning Stabilizable Deep Dynamics Models”. *arXiv e-prints* (2022). eprint: [2203.09710](#).
- [KZ84] A. Krasnosel’skiĭ and P. P. Zabreiko. *Geometrical methods of nonlinear analysis*. Berlin: Springer, 1984.
- [Lee12] J. M. Lee. *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*. New York: Springer, 2012.
- [Lee97] J. M. Lee. *Riemannian Manifolds*. New York: Springer, 1997.
- [Lia92] A. Liapunov. “A general task about the stability of motion”. dissertation. University of Kharkov, 1892.
- [LK97] Z.-H. Li and M. Krstić. “Maximizing regions of attraction via backstepping and CLFs with singularities”. *Syst. Control Lett.* 30.4 (1997), pp. 195–207.
- [LR95] P. Lancaster and L. Rodman. *Algebraic Riccati Equations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- [LS98] W. Lohmiller and J.-J. E. Slotine. “On contraction analysis for non-linear systems”. *Automatica* 34.6 (1998), pp. 683–696.
- [LS99] Y. S. Ledyaev and E. D. Sontag. “A Lyapunov characterization of robust stabilization”. *Nonlinear Anal. Theory Methods Appl.* 37.7 (1999), pp. 813–840.
- [MH11] E. Moulay and Q. Hui. “Conley index condition for asymptotic stability”. *Nonlinear Anal.-Theor.* 74.13 (2011), pp. 4503–4510.
- [Mil56] J. Milnor. “On Manifolds Homeomorphic to the 7-Sphere”. *Ann. Math.* 64.2 (1956), pp. 399–405.
- [Mil65] J. Milnor. *Topology from the Differentiable Viewpoint*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- [MM02] K. Mischaikow and M. Mrozek. “Conley index”. *Handbook of dynamical systems*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2002, pp. 393–460.
- [Mou10] E. Moulay. “Some properties of Lyapunov function sets”. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* 138.11 (2010), pp. 4067–4073.
- [Mro94] M. Mrozek. “Shape index and other indices of Conley type for local maps on locally compact Hausdorff spaces”. *Fundam. Math.* 145.1 (1994), pp. 15–37.
- [MRS00] M. Mrozek, J. Reineck, and R. Srzednicki. “The Conley index over a base”. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 352.9 (2000), pp. 4171–4194.
- [Muk+22] S. Mukherjee, J. Drgoňa, A. Tuor, M. Halappanavar, and D. Vrabie. “Neural Lyapunov Differentiable Predictive Control”. *arXiv e-prints* (2022). eprint: [2205.10728](#).
- [NS90] H. Nijmeijer and A. van der Schaft. *Nonlinear Dynamical Control Systems*. New York: Springer, 1990.
- [OK22] Y. Okamoto and R. Kojima. “Learning Deep Input-Output Stable Dynamics”. *arXiv e-prints* (2022). eprint: [2206.13093](#).
- [PPR04] S. Prajna, P. A. Parrilo, and A. Rantzer. “Nonlinear control synthesis by convex optimization”. *IEEE T. Automat. Contr.* 49.2 (2004), pp. 310–314.
- [Rei91] J. F. Reineck. “Continuation to gradient flows”. *Duke Math. J.* 64.2 (1991), pp. 261–269.
- [Rez+22] N. Rezazadeh, M. Kolarich, S. S. Kia, and N. Mehr. “Learning Contraction Policies from Offline Data”. *IEEE Robot. Autom. Lett.* 7.2 (2022), pp. 2905–2912.
- [Rif02] L. Rifford. “Semiconcave control-Lyapunov functions and stabilizing feedbacks”. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 41.3 (2002), pp. 659–681.

- [RW09] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets. *Variational analysis*. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [SA96] R. Sepulchre and D. Aeyels. “Homogeneous Lyapunov functions and necessary conditions for stabilization”. *Math. Control. Signals, Syst.* 9.1 (1996), pp. 34–58.
- [Son89] E. D. Sontag. “A ‘universal’ construction of Artstein’s theorem on nonlinear stabilization”. *Syst. Control Lett.* 13.2 (1989), pp. 117–123.
- [Son98] E. D. Sontag. *Mathematical control theory: deterministic finite dimensional systems*. New York: Springer, 1998.
- [Son99] E. D. Sontag. “Stability and stabilization: discontinuities and the effect of disturbances”. *Nonlinear Analysis, Differential Equations and Control*. Dordrecht: Springer, 1999, pp. 551–598.
- [Sti12] J. Stillwell. “Poincaré and the early history of 3-manifolds”. *B. Am. Math. Soc.* 49.4 (2012), pp. 555–576.
- [TSH12] H. L. Trentelman, A. A. Stoorvogel, and M. Hautus. *Control Theory for Linear Systems*. London: Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [Udr13] C. Udriste. *Convex functions and optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds*. Vol. 297. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [WJ67] F. W. Wilson Jr. “The structure of the level surfaces of a Lyapunov function”. *J. Differ. Equ.* 3.3 (1967), pp. 323–329.
- [WS20] P. M. Wensing and J.-J. Slotine. “Beyond convexity—Contraction and global convergence of gradient descent”. *Plos one* 15.8 (2020), e0236661.
- [Yan+22] A. Yang, J. Xiong, M. Raginsky, and E. Rosenbaum. “Input-to-State Stable Neural Ordinary Differential Equations with Applications to Transient Modeling of Circuits”. *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*. 2022, pp. 663–675.
- [YI00] Y. Yamashita and A. Isidori. “Global output regulation through singularities”. *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*. Vol. 2. 2000, pp. 1295–1300.
- [Zab89] J. Zabczyk. “Some comments on stabilizability”. *Appl. Math. Opt.* 19.1 (1989), pp. 1–9.
- [ZB22] V. Zinage and E. Bakolas. “Neural Koopman Lyapunov Control”. *arXiv e-prints* (2022). eprint: [2201.05098](#).
- [ZZL22] J. Zhang, Q. Zhu, and W. Lin. “Neural Stochastic Control”. *arXiv e-prints* (2022). eprint: [2209.07240](#).