

# Non-Euclidean Contractivity of Recurrent Neural Networks

Alexander Davydov, Anton V. Proskurnikov, and Francesco Bullo

**Abstract**—Critical questions in dynamical neuroscience and machine learning are related to the study of recurrent neural networks and their stability, robustness, entrainment, and computational efficiency. These properties can all be established through the development of a comprehensive contractivity theory for neural networks.

This paper makes three sets of contributions. First, regarding  $\ell_1/\ell_\infty$  logarithmic norms, we establish quasiconvexity with respect to positive diagonal weights, monotonicity results for principal submatrices, and closed-form worst-case expressions over certain matrix polytopes. Second, regarding nonsmooth contraction theory, we show that the one-sided Lipschitz constant of a Lipschitz vector field equals the essential supremum of the logarithmic norm of its Jacobian. Third, we apply these general results to classes of recurrent neural circuits, including Hopfield, firing rate, Persidskii, Lur’e and other models. For each model, we compute the optimal contraction rate and weighted non-Euclidean norm via a linear program or, in some special cases, via a Hurwitz condition on Metzler majorant of the synaptic matrix. Our non-Euclidean analysis establishes also absolute and total contraction.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**Motivation from dynamical neuroscience and machine learning:** Tremendous progress made in neuroscience research has produced new understanding of biological neural processes. Similarly, machine learning has become a key technology in modern society, with remarkable progress in numerous computational tasks. Among numerous valuable directions, ongoing research focuses on artificial learning systems inspired by neuroscience that (i) generalize better, (ii) learn from fewer examples, and (iii) are increasingly energy-efficient. We argue that further progress in these disciplines hinges upon modeling, analysis and computational challenges, some of which we highlight via the indicator (C) in what follows.

In **dynamical neuroscience**, several recurrent neural network (RNN) models are widely studied, including membrane potential models such as the Hopfield neural network [16] and firing-rate models [26]. Clearly, such models are simplifications of complex neural dynamics. For example, if  $f(x)$  is an RNN model of a neural circuit, the true dynamics is better estimated by

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t)) + g(x(t), x(t - \tau)), \quad (1)$$

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. 2139319.

Alexander Davydov and Francesco Bullo are with the Department of Mechanical Engineering and the Center for Control, Dynamical Systems, and Computation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 93106-5070, USA. {davydov, bullo}@ucsb.edu.

Anton V. Proskurnikov is with the Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy. anton.p.1982@ieee.org.

where  $g$  captures model uncertainty and time-delays. In other words, (C1): to account for uncertainty in the system, the nominal dynamics  $f(x)$  must exhibit robust stability with respect to unmodeled dynamics and delay.

Central pattern generators (CPGs) are biological neural circuits that generate periodic signals, in the absence of periodic input. CPGs are the source of rhythmic motor behaviors including walking, swimming, and breathing. To properly model CPGs in RNNs, a computational neuroscientist would need to ensure that, (C2): if an RNN is interconnected with a CPG, then entrainment takes place and the trajectories of the RNN converge to a unique stable limit cycle.

In **machine learning**, there has been increasing interest in discrete-time RNNs for pattern recognition and analysis of sequential data. Efficient training algorithms are an integral component of designing high-performance RNN models. In particular, training implicit RNNs [20], [18] corresponds to computing fixed-points of the form

$$x = \Phi(Ax + Bu + b), \quad (2)$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are synaptic weights,  $b$  is a bias term,  $u$  is the input,  $x$  is the state variable, and  $\Phi$  is a suitable activation function. (Note that the fixed point in equation 2 is the equilibrium point of a corresponding RNN differential equation.) Additionally, the training problem requires the ability to efficiently compute gradients of a given loss function with respect to model parameters; this computation amounts to an implicit differentiation problem, where gradients may again be computed via a fixed-point equation. In other words, in the design of implicit RNNs, it is essential to pick model weights in such a way that (C3): fixed-point equations have unique solutions for all possible inputs and activation functions, and (C4): fixed-points and corresponding gradients can be computed efficiently.

Finally, an additional challenge facing machine learning scientists is the design of artificial neural networks that are robust in the face of adversarial perturbations. Indeed, it is well-known [38] that artificial deep neural networks are sensitive to adversarial perturbations: small input changes may lead to large output changes and corresponding loss in pattern recognition accuracy. One proposed remedy is to characterize the Lipschitz constants of these networks and use them as regularizers in the training process. This remedy leads to certifiable robustness bounds with respect to adversarial perturbations [33], [11]. In short, (C5): there is a need to compute tight estimates of the Lipschitz constant of an RNN, e.g., in the context of the fixed-point equation (2).

### Contraction theory and the objective of this paper

The objective of this paper is the development of a unified theory for the robust stability analysis of continuous-time

RNNs and for the optimization of discrete-time RNN models in machine-learning. Serendipitously, both these objectives can be simultaneously achieved through a contraction analysis for the RNN dynamics — corresponding to a monotone operator analysis for the corresponding discrete-time RNN.

Infinitesimally contracting dynamics enjoy highly ordered *transient* and *asymptotic* behaviors which address the aforementioned challenges: **(C1)** initial conditions are forgotten, and monotonic decrease (no overshoot) in distance between trajectories [24], **(C3)** for time-invariant dynamics, there exists a unique globally exponentially stable equilibrium with two natural Lyapunov functions (distance from the equilibrium and norm of the vector field) [24], **(C2)** for periodic dynamics, there exists a unique globally exponentially stable periodic solution or, for systems with periodic inputs, each solution entrains to the periodic input [34], **(C1)** and **(C5)** contracting vector fields enjoy highly robust behavior, e.g., see [7], including (a) input-to-state stability, (b) finite input-state gain, (c) contraction margin with respect to unmodeled dynamics, and (d) input-to-state stability under delayed dynamics. Hence, the contraction rate is a natural measure/indicator of robust stability. Paraphrasing [30], contracting systems are in many ways similar to stable linear systems, although the superposition principle does not hold.

With regards to **(C4)**, our recent work [5], [18] shows how to design efficient fixed-point computation schemes for contracting systems (with respect to arbitrary norms) in the style of monotone operator theory [35]. Specifically, for contracting dynamics with respect to a diagonally-weighted  $\ell_1$  or  $\ell_\infty$  norm, optimal step-sizes and convergence factors are given in [18, Theorem 2]. These results are directly applicable to the computation of fixed-points in implicit neural networks, as in equation (2). These step-sizes, however, depend on the contraction rate. Therefore, optimizing the contraction rate of the dynamics directly improves the convergence factor of the corresponding discrete algorithm.

**Literature review:** The dynamical properties of RNN models have been studied for a few decades. Shortly after Hopfield’s original work [16], an early notable contribution is [25]. [21], [13], [14] obtain various version of the following result: Lyapunov diagonal stability of the synaptic matrix is sufficient, and in some cases necessary, for the existence, uniqueness, and global asymptotic stability of the equilibrium. Notably, [10] is the earliest reference on the application of logarithmic norms to Hopfield neural networks and provides results on  $\ell_p$  logarithmic norms of the Jacobian for networks with smooth activation functions. [2] proposes a “quasi-dominance” condition on the synaptic matrix (in lieu of Lyapunov diagonal stability) and discusses its connection with so-called  $H$ -matrices. [31] proposes the notion of nonlinear measure of a map; this notion is closely related to the  $\ell_1$  one-sided Lipschitz constant of the map and helps obtain sufficient conditions for global asymptotic stability. A comprehensive survey is [40].

Recently, the non-Euclidean contraction of monotone Hopfield neural networks is studied in [17]; see also [6] for the interplay between Metzler matrices and non-

Euclidean logarithmic norms. Also recently, [28] studies linear-threshold rate neural dynamics, where activation functions are piecewise-affine; it is shown that the dynamics have a unique equilibrium if and only if the synaptic matrix is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -matrix. Since checking this condition is NP-hard, more conservative convex conditions are provided as well.

Finally, contractivity of RNNs with respect to the  $\ell_2$  norm has been studied, e.g., see the early reference [10], the related discussion in [32], and the recent work [23].

**Contributions:** Our contributions are as follows. First, we obtain novel logarithmic norm results including (i) the quasicconvexity of the  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$  logarithmic norms with respect to diagonal weights and provide novel optimization techniques to compute optimal weights which yield larger contraction rates, (ii) logarithmic norm properties of principal submatrices of a matrix with respect to monotonic norms, and (iii) explicit formulas for the  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$  logarithmic norms under multiplicatively-weighted uncertainty, resulting in a maximization of the logarithmic norm over a matrix polytope. The formulas in (iii) generalize previous results [10, Theorem 3.8], [15, Lemma 3] and [18, Lemma 8].

Motivated by our non-Euclidean logarithmic norm results, we define  $M$ -Hurwitz matrices, i.e., matrices whose Metzler majorant is Hurwitz. We compare  $M$ -Hurwitz matrices and with other well-studied classes of matrices including quasidominant,  $H$ -matrices, totally Hurwitz, and Lyapunov diagonally stable matrices.

Second, we provide a nonsmooth extension to contraction theory. We show that, for locally Lipschitz vector fields, the one-sided Lipschitz constant is equal to the essential supremum of the logarithmic norm of the Jacobian. This equality allows us to use our novel logarithmic norm results and apply them to RNNs that have nonsmooth activation functions such as ReLU.

Third and finally, we consider multiple models of recurrent neural circuits and nonlinear dynamical models, including Hopfield, firing rate, Persidskii, Lur’e, and others. We consider activation functions that are weakly increasing and Lipschitz (thus more general than the class of piecewise-affine activation functions). For each model, we propose a linear program to characterize the optimal contraction rate and corresponding weighted non-Euclidean  $\ell_1$  or  $\ell_\infty$  norm. In some special cases, we show that the linear program reduces to checking an  $M$ -Hurwitz condition on the synaptic matrix. Our results simplify the computation of a common Lyapunov function over a polytope with  $2^n$  vertices to a simple 2 vertices or, in some cases, all the way to a closed form expression.

For each model, we demonstrate that the dynamics enjoy strong, absolute and total contractivity properties. In the spirit of absolute stability, absolute contractivity means that the dynamics are contracting independently of the choice of activation function. Total contractivity means that if the synaptic matrix  $A$  is  $M$ -Hurwitz and is replaced by any principal submatrix of  $A$ , the principle submatrix is also  $M$ -Hurwitz. In turn, this property implies that, should any node of the network be removed, the remaining dynamics remain

contracting with rate greater than or equal to the rate of the original system. The process of replacing the nominal RNN with a subsystem RNN is referred to as “pruning” both in neuroscience and in machine learning.

**Paper organization:** Section II reviews preliminary topics. Section III provides novel logarithmic norms results. Section IV studies nonsmooth contraction theory. Section V establishes conditions for the contractivity of classes of neural dynamics. In the interest of brevity, we omit proofs and refer to a forthcoming technical report.

## II. REVIEW OF RELEVANT MATRIX ANALYSIS

First, we review some useful notation. For two matrices (or vectors)  $A, B$ , we let  $A \circ B$  and  $A \oslash B$  be entrywise multiplication and division, respectively. Vector inequalities of the form  $x \leq (\geq) y$  are entrywise. For a vector  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we define  $[\eta] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  to be the diagonal matrix with diagonal entries equal to  $\eta$ . We let  $\mathbb{1}_n, \mathbb{0}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be the all-ones and all-zeros vectors, respectively. We say a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is *monotonic* if for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|x| \leq |y| \implies \|x\| \leq \|y\|$ , where the absolute value is applied entrywise. For a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , its *spectral abscissa* is  $\alpha(A) = \max\{\Re(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \text{spec}(A)\}$ . A matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is *Metzler* if  $(M)_{ij} \geq 0$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Additionally, a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is an *M-matrix* if  $-M$  is Metzler and  $M$  is positive semi-definite.

Let  $\|\cdot\|$  be a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and its corresponding induced norm on  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . The *logarithmic norm* of a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is

$$\mu(A) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|I_n + hA\| - 1}{h}. \quad (3)$$

The logarithmic norm is also referred to as matrix measure or, in what follows, log norm. We refer to [8] for a list of properties of log norms, which include subadditivity, positive homogeneity, convexity, and  $\alpha(A) \leq \mu(A)$ . For an  $\ell_p$  norm,  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and for invertible  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , we define the  $R$ -weighted  $\ell_p$  norm by  $\|x\|_{p,R} = \|Rx\|_p$ . It is known that the corresponding log norm is then  $\mu_{p,R}(A) = \mu_p(RAR^{-1})$ . For diagonally weighted  $\ell_1, \ell_\infty$ , and  $\ell_2$  norms, it is known [1], [9] that

$$\mu_{1,[\eta]}(A) = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} a_{ii} + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_i} |a_{ji}|, \quad (4)$$

$$\mu_{\infty,[\eta]^{-1}}(A) = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} a_{ii} + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_i} |a_{ij}|, \quad (5)$$

$$\mu_{2,[\eta]^{1/2}}(A) = \min\{b \in \mathbb{R} \mid [\eta]A + A^\top[\eta] \preceq 2b[\eta]\}. \quad (6)$$

The following result is due to [37], see also [29, Lemma 3].

**Lemma 1** (Optimal diagonally-weighted log norms for Metzler matrices). *Given a Metzler matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , and  $\delta > 0$ , define  $\eta_{M,p,\delta} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  by*

$$\eta_{M,p,\delta} = \left( \frac{w_1^{1/p}}{v_1^{1/q}}, \dots, \frac{w_n^{1/p}}{v_n^{1/q}} \right), \quad (7)$$

where  $q \in [1, \infty]$  is defined by  $1/p + 1/q = 1$  (with the convention  $1/\infty = 0$ ) and where  $v$  and  $w \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  are the right and left dominant eigenvectors of the irreducible

Metzler matrix  $M + \delta \mathbb{1}_n \mathbb{1}_n^\top$  (whose existence is guaranteed by the Perron-Frobenius Theorem). Then for each  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

- (i)  $\alpha(M) \leq \mu_{p,[\eta_{M,p,\delta}]}(M) \leq \alpha(M) + \epsilon$ ,
- (ii) if  $M$  is irreducible, then  $\alpha(M) = \mu_{p,[\eta_{M,p,0}]}(M)$ .

*Note:* for  $M$  irreducible and  $p = 1$ ,  $\eta_{M,p,0} = w$ , that is, the left dominant eigenvector of  $M$ . For  $p = \infty$ ,  $\eta_{M,p,0} = \mathbb{1}_n \oslash v$ , that is, the entrywise reciprocal of the right dominant eigenvector of  $M$ .

Lemma 1 also ensures that for Metzler matrices  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $\inf_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} \mu_{p,[\eta]}(M) = \alpha(M)$  for every  $p \in [1, \infty]$ .

Given a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , its *Metzler majorant*  $[A]_{\text{Mzr}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is defined by  $([A]_{\text{Mzr}})_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_{ii}, & \text{if } i = j \\ |a_{ij}|, & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$ .

The matrix  $A$  is

- (i) *Hurwitz stable*, denoted by  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ , if  $\alpha(A) < 0$ ,
- (ii) *totally Hurwitz*, denoted by  $A \in \mathcal{TH}$ , if all principal submatrices of  $A$  are Hurwitz stable,
- (iii) *Lyapunov diagonally stable (LDS)*, denoted by  $A \in \mathcal{LDH}$ , if there exists a  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  such that  $\mu_{2,[\eta]^{1/2}}(A) < 0$ , and
- (iv) *M-Hurwitz stable*, denoted by  $A \in \mathcal{MH}$ , if  $\alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) < 0$ .

**Remark 2** (Other classes of matrices). (i) From [27], recall that a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is *quasidominant* if there exists a vector  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  such that

$$\eta_i a_{ii} > \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \eta_j |a_{ij}|, \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

This is equivalent to  $[-A]_{\text{Mzr}} \eta < \mathbb{0}_n$ , which is equivalent to (see, for example, [4, Theorem 15.17])  $\alpha([-A]_{\text{Mzr}}) < 0$ , i.e.,  $-A \in \mathcal{MH}$ .

- (ii)  $A$  is an *H-matrix* if its comparison matrix  $M(A)$  is a nonsingular M-matrix where  $(M(A))_{ii} = |a_{ii}|$  and  $(M(A))_{ij} = -|a_{ij}|$  for all  $i \neq j$ . This implies  $\alpha(-M(A)) < 0$ . Therefore, if  $A \in \mathcal{MH}$ , both  $A$  and  $-A$  are H-matrices.

The following results are essentially known in the literature, but not collected in a unified manner.

**Lemma 3** (Inclusions for classes of matrices).  $(A \in \mathcal{MH})$  implies  $(A \in \mathcal{LDH})$  implies  $(A \in \mathcal{TH})$  implies  $(A \in \mathcal{H})$ .

We show that the counter-implications in Lemma 3 do not hold.

**Example 4.** (i)  $(A \in \mathcal{LDH}) \not\Rightarrow (A \in \mathcal{MH})$  The matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 2 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ satisfies } \mu_2(A) = -0.5, \text{ so } A \in \mathcal{LDH}.$$

However,  $\alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) = \sqrt{2} - 1 > 0$ , so  $A \notin \mathcal{MH}$ .

- (ii)  $(A \in \mathcal{TH}) \not\Rightarrow (A \in \mathcal{LDH})$  is proved in [3, Remark 4].

- (iii)  $(A \in \mathcal{H}) \not\Rightarrow (A \in \mathcal{TH})$  The matrix  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -4 & -3 \end{bmatrix}$  satisfies  $\alpha(A) = -1$ , so  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ . However,  $A \notin \mathcal{TH}$  since it has a positive diagonal entry.

$$\max_{d \in [d_{\min}, d_{\max}]^n} \mu_{\infty, [\eta]}([c] + [d]A) = \max \{ \mu_{\infty, [\eta]}([c] + d_{\min}A), \mu_{\infty, [\eta]}([c] + d_{\max}A) \}, \quad (8)$$

$$\max_{d \in [d_{\min}, d_{\max}]^n} \mu_{1, [\eta]}([c] + A[d]) = \max \{ \mu_{1, [\eta]}([c] + d_{\min}A), \mu_{1, [\eta]}([c] + d_{\max}A) \}, \quad (9)$$

$$\max_{d \in [d_{\min}, d_{\max}]^n} \mu_{\infty, [\eta]}([c] + A[d]) = \max \{ \mu_{\infty, [\eta]}([c] + d_{\max}A), \mu_{\infty, [\eta]}([c] + d_{\max}A - (d_{\max} - d_{\min})(I_n \circ A)) \}, \quad (10)$$

$$\max_{d \in [d_{\min}, d_{\max}]^n} \mu_{1, [\eta]}([c] + [d]A) = \max \{ \mu_{1, [\eta]}([c] + d_{\max}A), \mu_{1, [\eta]}([c] + d_{\max}A - (d_{\max} - d_{\min})(I_n \circ A)) \} \quad (11)$$

Fig. 1. Closed-form expressions for the diagonally-weighted  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$  log norms of matrices multiplied by a diagonally weighted uncertainty and shifted by an additive diagonal matrix. We let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $0 \leq d_{\min} \leq d_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ . Recall that the log norm is a convex function. It is known that the maximum value of a convex function over a polytope is achieved at one of the vertices of the polytope; formulas (8)-(11) ensure that one only needs to check 2 vertices of the polytope, rather than  $2^n$ .



Fig. 2. Inclusion relationships between the subsets of Hurwitz matrices.

### III. NOVEL LOG NORM RESULTS

Next, we provide novel results on optimizing diagonal weights for  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$  log norms and provide computational methods to capture these weights.

**Theorem 5** (Quasiconvexity of  $\mu$  with respect to diagonal weights). *For fixed  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , consider the maps from  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &\mapsto \mu_{1, [\eta]}(A), \\ \eta &\mapsto \mu_{\infty, [\eta]^{-1}}(A). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Then

- (i) The maps in (12) are quasiconvex and their sublevel sets are polytopes.
- (ii) Minimizing the maps in (12) may be executed via the optimization problems

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} \quad & b \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & [A]_{\text{Mzr}}^\top \eta \leq b\eta, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

for  $\mu_{1, [\eta]}(A)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} \quad & b \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & [A]_{\text{Mzr}} \eta \leq b\eta, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

for  $\mu_{\infty, [\eta]^{-1}}(A)$ .

**Remark 6.** The optimization problems in (13) and (14) may be modified such that  $\eta \in [\varepsilon, \infty]^n$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small so that the inf becomes a min. Then the problems may be solved by a bisection on  $b$ , where each step of the algorithm is a linear program (LP) in  $\eta$ .

**Lemma 7** (Log norm inequalities under multiplicative scalings). *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $0 \leq d_{\min} \leq d_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ . Then the formulas in Figure 1 hold.*

**Corollary 8.** *Let  $A, c, d_{\min}$ , and  $d_{\max}$  be as in Lemma 7. Then for  $\mu_{[\eta]}(\cdot)$  denoting either  $\mu_{1, [\eta]}(\cdot)$  or  $\mu_{\infty, [\eta]^{-1}}(\cdot)$  the*

*minimax problems*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\eta \in [\varepsilon, \infty]^n} \quad & \max_{d \in [d_{\min}, d_{\max}]^n} \mu_{[\eta]}([c] + [d]A), \\ \min_{\eta \in [\varepsilon, \infty]^n} \quad & \max_{d \in [d_{\min}, d_{\max}]^n} \mu_{[\eta]}([c] + A[d]), \end{aligned}$$

*may each be solved by a bisection algorithm, each step of which is an LP.*

**Theorem 9** (Monotonicity of  $\alpha$  and  $\mu$ ). *For any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$*

- (i)  $\alpha(A) \leq \alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}})$ ,
- (ii) for all  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ , we have  $\mu_{p, [\eta]}(A) \leq \mu_{p, [\eta]}([A]_{\text{Mzr}})$ , with equality holding for  $p \in \{1, \infty\}$ .
- (iii) For  $p \in \{1, \infty\}$ ,

$$\inf_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} \mu_{p, [\eta]}(A) = \alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) \geq \alpha(A).$$

**Remark 10.** *Theorem 9(iii) demonstrates that using diagonally-weighted  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$  log norms, the best bound one can achieve on  $\alpha(A)$  is  $\alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}})$ , which may be conservative. In the following example, we show that the  $\ell_2$  norm does not have the same conservatism. Despite the conservatism, Theorem 5 demonstrates that optimizing diagonal weights is computationally efficient, being an LP at every step of the bisection, while optimizing weights for the  $\ell_2$  norm is an LMI at every step, which is computationally more challenging than an LP of similar dimension.*

**Example 11.** *The matrix  $A_* = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  has eigenvalues  $\{1 + i, 1 - i\}$  whereas  $[A_*]_{\text{Mzr}}$  has eigenvalues  $\{2, 0\}$ . Therefore,  $\alpha(A_*) = 1 < 2 = \alpha([A_*]_{\text{Mzr}})$ . Additionally,  $(A_* + A_*^\top)/2 = I_2 \implies \mu_2(A_*) = 1$  and  $\mu_2([A_*]_{\text{Mzr}}) = 2$ .*

**A. Log norms of principal submatrices**

Given a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and a non-empty index set  $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ , let  $A_{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}| \times |\mathcal{I}|}$  denote the principal submatrix obtained by removing the rows and columns of  $A$  which are not in  $\mathcal{I}$ . Next, given a non-empty  $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ , define the zero-padding map  $\text{pad}_{\mathcal{I}} : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  as follows:  $\text{pad}_{\mathcal{I}}(y)$  is obtained by inserting zeros among the entries of  $y$  corresponding to the indices in  $\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{I}$ . For example, with  $n = 3$  and  $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 3\}$ , we define  $\text{pad}_{\{1, 3\}}(y_1, y_2) = (y_1, 0, y_2)$ . Then it is straightforward to see that given a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and non-empty  $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ , the map  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{I}} : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  defined by  $\|y\|_{\mathcal{I}} = \|\text{pad}_{\mathcal{I}}(y)\|$  is a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ .

**Lemma 12** (Norm and log norm of principal submatrices). Assume  $\|\cdot\|$  is monotonic, let  $\mu$  and  $\mu_{\mathcal{I}}$  denote the log norms associated to  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{I}}$  respectively. Any matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  satisfies

- (i)  $\|A_{\mathcal{I}}\|_{\mathcal{I}} \leq \|A\|$ ,
- (ii)  $\mu_{\mathcal{I}}(A_{\mathcal{I}}) \leq \mu(A)$ ,
- (iii) if  $\mu(A) < 0$ , then  $A \in \mathcal{TH}$ .

**Remark 13.** For a related discussion see [19]. Note that if a matrix  $A$  is totally Hurwitz, then  $-A$  is known to be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -matrix (i.e., a matrix all of whose principal minors are positive), see [12].

**Corollary 14** (Submatrices of  $\mathcal{MH}$  matrix). Suppose  $A \in \mathcal{MH} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . Then for every non-empty  $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $A_{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{MH}$ .

#### IV. ONE-SIDED LIPSCHITZ MAPS AND NONSMOOTH CONTRACTION THEORY

##### A. Review of one-sided Lipschitz functions

We review weak pairings and one-sided Lipschitz maps as introduced in [7]; see also the earlier works [36], [1].

**Definition 15** (Weak pairing). A weak pairing on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is a map  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying:

- (i) (Subadditivity and continuity in its first argument)  $\llbracket x_1 + x_2, y \rrbracket \leq \llbracket x_1, y \rrbracket + \llbracket x_2, y \rrbracket$ , for all  $x_1, x_2, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  is continuous in its first argument,
- (ii) (Weak homogeneity)  $\llbracket \alpha x, y \rrbracket = \llbracket x, \alpha y \rrbracket = \alpha \llbracket x, y \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket -x, -y \rrbracket = \llbracket x, y \rrbracket$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\alpha \geq 0$ ,
- (iii) (Positive definiteness)  $\llbracket x, x \rrbracket > 0$  for all  $x \neq 0_n$ ,
- (iv) (Cauchy-Schwarz)  $|\llbracket x, y \rrbracket| \leq \llbracket x, x \rrbracket^{1/2} \llbracket y, y \rrbracket^{1/2}$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Additionally, we say a weak pairing satisfies Deimling's inequality if  $\llbracket x, y \rrbracket \leq \|y\| \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|y + hx\| - \|y\|}{h}$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $\|\cdot\| = \llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket^{1/2}$  is the norm compatible with the weak pairing.

Deimling's inequality is well-defined since  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket^{1/2}$  defines a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Conversely, if  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is equipped with a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  then there exists a (possibly non-unique) weak pairing  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  such that  $\|\cdot\| = \llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket^{1/2}$ ; see [7, Theorem 16]. Henceforth, we will assume that every weak pairing satisfies Deimling's inequality.

We establish the relationship between weak pairings and log norms in the following lemma.

**Lemma 16** (Lumer's equality [7, Theorem 18]). Let  $\|\cdot\|$  be a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with compatible weak pairing  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$ . Then for all  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$

$$\mu(A) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq 0_n} \frac{\llbracket Ax, x \rrbracket}{\|x\|^2}. \quad (15)$$

**Definition 17** (One-sided Lipschitz functions [7, Definition 26]). Consider  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  where  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be open and connected. We say  $f$  is one-sided Lipschitz with respect to a weak pairing  $\llbracket \cdot, \cdot \rrbracket$  if there exists  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\llbracket f(x) - f(y), x - y \rrbracket \leq b \|x - y\|^2, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in U. \quad (16)$$

We say  $b$  is a one-sided Lipschitz constant of  $f$ . Moreover, the minimal one-sided Lipschitz constant of  $f$  is

$$\text{osL}(f) := \sup_{x, y \in U, x \neq y} \frac{\llbracket f(x) - f(y), x - y \rrbracket}{\|x - y\|^2}. \quad (17)$$

If  $f$  is continuously differentiable and  $U$  is convex, it can be shown that  $\text{osL}(f) = \sup_{x \in U} \mu(Df(x))$ .

A vector field  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying  $\text{osL}(f) \leq -c < 0$  is said to be *strongly infinitesimally contracting* with rate  $c$ . Any two trajectories  $x(\cdot), y(\cdot)$  satisfying  $\dot{x} = f(x)$  additionally satisfy  $\|x(t) - y(t)\| \leq e^{-ct} \|x(0) - y(0)\|$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Moreover, if  $f$  is continuous, then all solutions converge to a unique equilibrium.

##### B. Nonsmooth contraction theory

In this section we consider locally Lipschitz  $f$  and show that in this case, the definition of  $\text{osL}$  does not depend on the weak pairing and instead depends only on the norm through the log norm.

**Theorem 18** ( $\text{osL}$  simplification for locally Lipschitz  $f$ ). For  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  locally Lipschitz on an open convex set  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  the following statements are equivalent:

- (i)  $\text{osL}(f) \leq c$ ,
- (ii)  $\text{ess sup}_{x \in U} \mu(Df(x)) \leq c$ .

**Remark 19.** (i) Note that  $\text{ess sup}_{x \in U} \mu(Df(x))$  is well-defined for locally Lipschitz  $f$  since  $Df(x)$  is defined almost everywhere by Rademacher's theorem.

(ii) Theorem 18 demonstrates that locally Lipschitz  $f$  enjoy a similar simplification in the  $\text{osL}$  definition as do continuously differentiable functions.

In neural network models, nonsmooth activation functions such as ReLU, LeakyReLU, and saturation functions are prevalent and Theorem 18 allows us to use standard log norm results to analyze these models.

#### V. CONTRACTING NEURAL DYNAMICS

We consider several models of neural circuits and characterize their one-sided Lipschitz constants and therefore their strong infinitesimal contractivity.

##### A. Hopfield neural network

We start with the continuous-time Hopfield neural network model, first introduced in [16]:

$$\dot{x} = -Cx + A\Phi(x) + u =: f_H(x), \quad (18)$$

where  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a positive semi-definite diagonal matrix,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is arbitrary,  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a (possibly time-varying) input, and  $\Phi$  is a diagonal activation function. In other words,  $\Phi(x) = [\phi_1(x_1), \dots, \phi_n(x_n)]$ , where each  $\phi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz and satisfies the slope-restricted constraint

$$0 \leq d_{\min} \leq \frac{\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(y)}{x - y} \leq d_{\max}, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (19)$$

In other words, this ensures that  $\phi'_i(x) \in [d_{\min}, d_{\max}]$  for almost all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Many common activation functions satisfy these constraints including ReLU, tanh and sigmoids.

**Theorem 20** (One-sided Lipschitzness of Hopfield neural network). *Consider the Hopfield neural network model (18) with irreducible  $[A]_{\text{Mzr}}$  and constant  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then*

- (i)  $\text{osL}_{1, [\eta]}(f_{\text{H}}) = \max \{ \mu_{1, [\eta]}(-C + d_{\min}A), \mu_{1, [\eta]}(-C + d_{\max}A) \}$ , for arbitrary  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ .
- (ii) *The choice of  $\eta$  minimizing  $\text{osL}_{1, [\eta]}(f_{\text{H}})$  is the solution to*

$$\inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} b$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (-C + d_{\min}[A]_{\text{Mzr}}^{\top})\eta \leq b\eta,$$

$$(-C + d_{\max}[A]_{\text{Mzr}}^{\top})\eta \leq b\eta.$$
- (iii) *if  $C = cI_n$ , then, with  $w_A \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  being the left dominant eigenvector of  $[A]_{\text{Mzr}}$ ,*

$$\inf_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} \text{osL}_{1, [\eta]}(f_{\text{H}}) = \text{osL}_{1, [w_A]}(f_{\text{H}}) = -c + \max \{ d_{\min} \alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}), d_{\max} \alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) \}. \quad (20)$$

- (iv) *if  $d_{\min} = 0$  and  $C \succ 0$ , then, with  $w_* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  being the left dominant eigenvector of  $-C + d_{\max}[A]_{\text{Mzr}}$ ,*

$$\inf_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} \text{osL}_{1, [\eta]}(f_{\text{H}}) = \text{osL}_{1, [w_*]}(f_{\text{H}}) = \max \{ \alpha(-C), \alpha(-C + d_{\max}[A]_{\text{Mzr}}) \}. \quad (21)$$

As an immediate consequence of this theorem, let  $b^*, \eta^*$  be the optimal solution for the LP in statement (ii). If  $b^* < 0$ , then the Hopfield neural network (18) is strongly infinitesimally contracting with rate  $|b^*|$  with respect to  $\| \cdot \|_{1, [\eta^*]}$ . For  $C = I_n$ ,  $d_{\min} = 0$ ,  $d_{\max} = 1$ , then  $b^* = -1 + \max \{ 0, \alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) \}$ . Note that this theorem is based upon equation (9); we postpone to future works an  $\ell_{\infty}$  version of this theorem based upon equation (10).

In the event that  $[A]_{\text{Mzr}}$  is reducible, the results from Theorem 20 still provide tests for contraction of the Hopfield model. Consider, for example, case (iii) above. The model is strongly infinitesimally contracting provided that  $\text{osL}(f_{\text{H}}) < 0$ , and if  $[A]_{\text{Mzr}}$  is reducible, by Lemma 1 for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  such that  $\mu_{1, [\eta]}([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) \leq \alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) + \epsilon$ . Thus, if (20) is negative, then  $-c + \max \{ d_{\max}(\alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) + \epsilon), d_{\min}(\alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) + \epsilon) \}$  may be made negative as well by taking  $\epsilon$  small enough.

### B. Firing-rate neural network model

A related model, which is frequently used in the machine learning literature and is closely-related to the Hopfield neural network model is the model

$$\dot{x} = -Cx + \Phi(Ax + u) =: f_{\text{FR}}(x), \quad (22)$$

which we refer to as the *firing-rate model*. The interpretation for this name is that if  $\Phi(x)$  is nonnegative for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  (as is ReLU), then the positive orthant is forward-invariant and  $x$  is interpreted as a vector of firing-rates, while in the Hopfield model,  $x$  can be negative and is thus interpreted as a vector of membrane potentials.

In [26], it is shown that the models (18) and (22) are equivalent and display the same set of behaviors. In alignment with these results, we show that while the Hopfield model

is naturally one-sided Lipschitz with respect to a diagonally-weighted  $\ell_1$  norm, the firing-rate model is naturally one-sided Lipschitz with respect to a diagonally-weighted  $\ell_{\infty}$  norm.

**Theorem 21** (One-sided Lipschitzness of firing-rate model). *Consider the firing-rate model (22) with irreducible  $[A]_{\text{Mzr}}$  and constant  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then*

- (i)  $\text{osL}_{\infty, [\eta]^{-1}}(f_{\text{FR}}) = \max \{ \mu_{\infty, [\eta]^{-1}}(-C + d_{\min}A), \mu_{\infty, [\eta]^{-1}}(-C + d_{\max}A) \}$ , for arbitrary  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$
- (ii) *The choice of  $\eta$  minimizing  $\text{osL}_{\infty, [\eta]^{-1}}(f_{\text{FR}})$  is the solution to*

$$\inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} b$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (-C + d_{\min}[A]_{\text{Mzr}})\eta \leq b\eta,$$

$$(-C + d_{\max}[A]_{\text{Mzr}})\eta \leq b\eta.$$

- (iii) *if  $C = cI_n$ , then, with  $v_A \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  being the right dominant eigenvector of  $[A]_{\text{Mzr}}$ ,*

$$\inf_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} \text{osL}_{\infty, [\eta]}(f_{\text{FR}}) = \text{osL}_{\infty, [v_A]^{-1}}(f_{\text{FR}}) = -c + \max \{ d_{\min} \alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}), d_{\max} \alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}}) \}. \quad (23)$$

- (iv) *if  $d_{\min} = 0$  and  $C \succ 0$ , then, with  $v_* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$  being the right dominant eigenvector of  $-C + d_{\max}[A]_{\text{Mzr}}$ ,*

$$\inf_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n} \text{osL}_{\infty, [\eta]}(f_{\text{FR}}) = \text{osL}_{\infty, [v_*]^{-1}}(f_{\text{FR}}) = \max \{ \alpha(-C), \alpha(-C + d_{\max}[A]_{\text{Mzr}}) \}. \quad (24)$$

### C. Other related models

We apply Theorem 20 and the log norm results in Lemma 7 to the following related neural circuit models.

**Theorem 22** (Contractivity of special Hopfield models). (i) *If  $A \in \mathcal{MH}$ , and  $d_{\min} > 0$ , the Persidskii-type model*

$$\dot{x} = A\Phi(x)$$

*in [22, Definition 3.2.1] is strongly infinitesimally contracting with respect to  $\| \cdot \|_{1, [w_A]}$  with rate  $d_{\min} |\alpha([A]_{\text{Mzr}})|$ .*

- (ii) *If  $-C + d_{\max}A \in \mathcal{MH}$ , the Hopfield neural network  $f_{\text{H}}$  with  $d_{\min} = 0$  and positive diagonal  $C$  is strongly infinitesimally contracting with respect to  $\| \cdot \|_{1, [w_*]}$  with rate  $-\max \{ \alpha(-C), \alpha(-C + d_{\max}[A]_{\text{Mzr}}) \} > 0$ .*

**Theorem 23.** *From [22, Theorem 3.2.4], consider*

$$\dot{x} = Ax - C\Phi(x),$$

*with diagonal  $C \succeq 0$ . If  $A - d_{\min}C \in \mathcal{MH}$  with corresponding dominant left eigenvector  $w_{**}$ , then this model is strongly infinitesimally contracting with respect to  $\| \cdot \|_{1, [w_{**}]}$  with rate  $\alpha([A - d_{\min}C]_{\text{Mzr}})$ .*

**Theorem 24.** *From [22, Theorem 3.2.10], consider*

$$\dot{x}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \phi_{ij}(x_j)$$

*or equivalently  $\dot{x} = (A \circ \Phi(x)) \mathbb{1}_n$ , with  $(\Phi(x))_{ij} = \phi_{ij}(x_j)$  and with each  $\phi_{ij}$  Lipschitz and slope-restricted in  $[d_{\min}, d_{\max}]$ . If  $d_{\min} > 0$  and*

$$B := d_{\max}A - (d_{\max} - d_{\min})(I_n \circ A) \in \mathcal{MH},$$

with corresponding dominant left and right eigenvectors  $w_B, v_B$ , respectively, then this model is strongly infinitesimally contracting with rate  $\alpha(\lceil B \rceil_{\text{Mzr}})$  with respect to both  $\|\cdot\|_{1, [w_B]}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, [v_B]^{-1}}$ .

**Theorem 25** (Contractivity of Lur'e system). *From [22, Theorem 3.2.7], consider the Lur'e system*

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= Ax + v\phi(y), \\ y &= w^\top x,\end{aligned}$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz and slope-restricted in  $[d_{\min}, d_{\max}]$ . Consider the following two optimization problems:

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{b \in \mathbb{R}, \eta \in [\varepsilon, \infty]^n} \quad & b \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & [A + d_{\min}vw^\top]_{\text{Mzr}}^\top \eta \leq b\eta, \\ & [A + d_{\max}vw^\top]_{\text{Mzr}}^\top \eta \leq b\eta,\end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{c \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in [\varepsilon, \infty]^n} \quad & c \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & [A + d_{\min}vw^\top]_{\text{Mzr}} \xi \leq c\xi, \\ & [A + d_{\max}vw^\top]_{\text{Mzr}} \xi \leq c\xi,\end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

and let  $b^*, \eta^*$  be optimal parameters for (25) and  $c^*, \xi^*$  be optimal parameters for (26). Then

- (i) if  $b^* < 0$ , then the closed-loop dynamics are strongly infinitesimally contracting with rate  $|b^*|$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_{1, [\eta^*]}$ .
- (ii) if  $c^* < 0$ , then the closed-loop dynamics are strongly infinitesimally contracting with rate  $|c^*|$  with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, [\xi^*]^{-1}}$ .

**Theorem 26** (Multivariable Lur'e system). *Consider the multivariable Lur'e system*

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= Ax + B\Phi(y), \\ y &= Cx,\end{aligned}$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , and  $\Phi$  is diagonal and is slope-restricted in  $[d_{\min}, d_{\max}]$  with  $d_{\min} \geq 0$ . Define  $(\cdot)_+$  and  $(\cdot)_-$  by  $(x)_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$  and  $(x)_- = \min\{x, 0\}$ . Define  $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  componentwise by

$$\begin{aligned}F_{ii} &= A_{ii} + d_{\max} \sum_{j=1}^m (B_{ij}C_{ji})_+ + d_{\min} \sum_{j=1}^m (B_{ij}C_{ji})_-, \\ F_{ij} &= |A_{ij}| + d_{\max} \max \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m (B_{ik}C_{kj})_+, - \sum_{k=1}^m (B_{ij}C_{ji})_- \right\} \\ &\quad - d_{\min} \min \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m (B_{ik}C_{kj})_+, - \sum_{k=1}^m (B_{ij}C_{ji})_- \right\},\end{aligned}$$

for  $i \neq j$ . Then, if  $F \in \mathcal{MH}$  with corresponding dominant left and right eigenvectors  $w_F, v_F$ , the closed-loop dynamics are strongly infinitesimally contracting with rate  $\alpha(\lceil F \rceil_{\text{Mzr}})$  with respect to both  $\|\cdot\|_{1, [w_F]}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, [v_F]^{-1}}$ .

Theorems 25 and 26 serve as non-Euclidean versions of the classic absolute stability results on the Lur'e system presented by Yakubovich in [39].

## D. A clarification on absolute and total contractivity

In this section we clarify that our results in Theorems 20–26 indeed establish absolute and total contraction, in the following sense.

First, in the spirit of the classic work on absolute stability, by *absolute contraction* we mean dynamical systems that are contracting for all choices of activation functions in a given class. (The class of activation function in this paper is all weakly increasing Lipschitz functions.)

Second, if each component of the state  $x$  corresponds to a single neuron, the removal of some neurons corresponds to *pruning* the neural network. However, by Corollary 14, if  $A \in \mathcal{MH}$ , then any principal submatrix of  $A$  is also in  $\mathcal{MH}$ . In other words, if any neurons are removed from the neural network, the resulting neural network is guaranteed to still remain stable and contracting. We refer to this property as *total contraction*, because of the analogy with the property of totally Hurwitz matrices.

## VI. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we present novel non-Euclidean log norm results and a non-smooth contraction theory simplification and we apply these results to study the contractivity of RNN models, primarily focusing on the Hopfield and firing-rate models. We provide efficient algorithms for computing the optimal non-Euclidean contraction rate and corresponding norm. Our approach is robust with respect to activation function and additional unmodeled dynamics and, more generally, establishes the strong contractivity property which, in turn, implies strong robustness properties.

As a first direction of future research, we plan to investigate contractivity under conditions such as Lyapunov diagonal stability (LDS) of the synaptic matrix. LDS is known to imply exponential stability of Hopfield neural networks, however, it is not known to imply contractivity (with respect to a constant norm). As second related direction, we comment that our current neural-network contractivity tests are based upon weighted diagonal dominance. The tests do capture inhibitory vs excitatory relationships between neurons in a potentially conservative manner. Future analytic and computational research will focus on least conservative conditions for contractivity.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank Saber Jafarpour for stimulating conversations about contraction theory and neural networks.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Aminzare and E. D. Sontag. Contraction methods for nonlinear systems: A brief introduction and some open problems. In *IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pages 3835–3847, December 2014. doi:10.1109/CDC.2014.7039986.
- [2] S. Arik. A note on the global stability of dynamical neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 49(4):502–504, 2002. doi:10.1109/81.995665.
- [3] G. P. Barker, A. Berman, and R. J. Plemmons. Positive diagonal solutions to the Lyapunov equations. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 5(4):249–256, 1978. doi:10.1080/03081087808817203.

- [4] F. Bullo. *Lectures on Network Systems*. Kindle Direct Publishing, 1.5 edition, September 2021, ISBN 978-1986425643. URL: <http://motion.me.ucsb.edu/book-lns>.
- [5] F. Bullo, P. Cisneros-Velarde, A. Davydov, and S. Jafarpour. From contraction theory to fixed point algorithms on Riemannian and non-Euclidean spaces. In *IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, December 2021. To appear (Invited Tutorial Session). URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2110.03623>.
- [6] S. Coogan. A contractive approach to separable Lyapunov functions for monotone systems. *Automatica*, 106:349–357, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.automatica.2019.05.001.
- [7] A. Davydov, S. Jafarpour, and F. Bullo. Non-Euclidean contraction theory for robust nonlinear stability. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, July 2021. Submitted. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.12263>.
- [8] C. A. Desoer and H. Haneda. The measure of a matrix as a tool to analyze computer algorithms for circuit analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Circuit Theory*, 19(5):480–486, 1972. doi:10.1109/TCT.1972.1083507.
- [9] M. Di Bernardo, D. Fiore, G. Russo, and F. Scafuli. Convergence, consensus and synchronization of complex networks via contraction theory. In J. Lü, X. Yu, G. Chen, and W. Yu, editors, *Complex Systems and Networks: Dynamics, Controls and Applications*, pages 313–339. Springer, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-47824-0\_12.
- [10] Y. Fang and T. G. Kincaid. Stability analysis of dynamical neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 7(4):996–1006, 1996. doi:10.1109/72.508941.
- [11] M. Fazlyab, M. Morari, and G. J. Pappas. Safety verification and robustness analysis of neural networks via quadratic constraints and semidefinite programming. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2020. doi:10.1109/TAC.2020.3046193.
- [12] M. Fiedler and V. Ptak. On matrices with non-positive off-diagonal elements and positive principal minors. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 12(3):382–400, 1962. doi:10.21136/CMJ.1962.100526.
- [13] M. Forti, S. Manetti, and M. Marini. Necessary and sufficient condition for absolute stability of neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 41(7):491–494, 1994. doi:10.1109/81.298364.
- [14] M. Forti and A. Tesi. New conditions for global stability of neural networks with application to linear and quadratic programming problems. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 42(7):354–366, 1995. doi:10.1109/81.401145.
- [15] W. He and J. Cao. Exponential synchronization of chaotic neural networks: a matrix measure approach. *Nonlinear Dynamics*, 55:55–65, 2009. doi:10.1007/s11071-008-9344-4.
- [16] J. J. Hopfield. Neurons with graded response have collective computational properties like those of two-state neurons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 81(10):3088–3092, 1984. doi:10.1073/pnas.81.10.3088.
- [17] S. Jafarpour, A. Davydov, and F. Bullo. Non-Euclidean contraction theory for monotone and positive systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, September 2021. Submitted. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.01321>.
- [18] S. Jafarpour, A. Davydov, A. V. Proskurnikov, and F. Bullo. Robust implicit networks via non-Euclidean contractions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, May 2021. To appear. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.03194>.
- [19] C. R. Johnson. Two submatrix properties of certain induced norms. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards - B. Mathematical Sciences*, 79:97–102, 1975. URL: [https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/jres/79B/jresv79Bn3-4p97\\_A1b.pdf](https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/jres/79B/jresv79Bn3-4p97_A1b.pdf).
- [20] A. Kag, Z. Zhang, and V. Saligrama. RNNs incrementally evolving on an equilibrium manifold: A panacea for vanishing and exploding gradients? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HylpqA4FwS>.
- [21] E. Kaszkurewicz and A. Bhaya. On a class of globally stable neural circuits. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 41(2):171–174, 1994. doi:10.1109/81.269055.
- [22] E. Kaszkurewicz and A. Bhaya. *Matrix Diagonal Stability in Systems and Computation*. Springer, 2000, ISBN 978-0-8176-4088-0.
- [23] L. Kozachkov, M. Ennis, and J.-J. E. Slotine. Recursive construction of stable assemblies of recurrent neural networks, 2021. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.08928>.
- [24] W. Lohmiller and J.-J. E. Slotine. On contraction analysis for nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 34(6):683–696, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0005-1098(98)00019-3.
- [25] A. N. Michel, J. A. Farrell, and W. Porod. Qualitative analysis of neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems*, 36(2):229–243, 1989. doi:10.1109/31.20200.
- [26] K. D. Miller and F. Fumarola. Mathematical equivalence of two common forms of firing rate models of neural networks. *Neural Computation*, 24(1):25–31, 2012. doi:10.1162/NECO\_a\_00221.
- [27] P. J. Moylan. Matrices with positive principal minors. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 17(1):53–58, 1977. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795(77)90040-4.
- [28] E. Nozari and J. Cortés. Hierarchical selective recruitment in linear-threshold brain networks—part I: Single-layer dynamics and selective inhibition. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(3):949–964, 2021. doi:10.1109/TAC.2020.3004801.
- [29] O. Pastravanu and M. Voicu. Generalized matrix diagonal stability and linear dynamical systems. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 419(2):299–310, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2006.04.021.
- [30] A. Pavlov and N. Van de Wouw. Convergent systems: nonlinear simplicity. In N. van de Wouw, E. Lefeber, and A. I. Lopez, editors, *Nonlinear Systems*, pages 51–77. Springer, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-30357-4\_3.
- [31] H. Qiao, J. Peng, and Z.-B. Xu. Nonlinear measures: A new approach to exponential stability analysis for Hopfield-type neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 12(2):360–370, 2001. doi:10.1109/72.914530.
- [32] M. Revay, R. Wang, and I. R. Manchester. Lipschitz bounded equilibrium networks. 2020. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.01732>.
- [33] M. Revay, R. Wang, and I. R. Manchester. A convex parameterization of robust recurrent neural networks. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5(4):1363–1368, 2021. doi:10.1109/LCSYS.2020.3038221.
- [34] G. Russo, M. Di Bernardo, and E. D. Sontag. Global entrainment of transcriptional systems to periodic inputs. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 6(4):e1000739, 2010. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000739.
- [35] E. K. Ryu and W. Yin. *Large-Scale Convex Optimization via Monotone Operators*. Cambridge, 2021.
- [36] G. Söderlind. The logarithmic norm. History and modern theory. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 46(3):631–652, 2006. doi:10.1007/s10543-006-0069-9.
- [37] J. Stoer and C. Witzgall. Transformations by diagonal matrices in a normed space. *Numerische Mathematik*, 4:158–171, 1962. doi:10.1007/BF01386309.
- [38] C. Szegedy, W. Zaremba, I. Sutskever, J. Bruna, D. Erhan, I. Goodfellow, and R. Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6199>.
- [39] V. A. Yakubovich. Method of matrix inequalities in theory of nonlinear control systems stability. I. Forced oscillations absolute stability. *Avtomatika i Telemekhanika*, 25(7):1017–1029, 1964. (In Russian). URL: <http://mi.mathnet.ru/eng/at11685>.
- [40] H. Zhang, Z. Wang, and D. Liu. A comprehensive review of stability analysis of continuous-time recurrent neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 25(7):1229–1262, 2014. doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2014.2317880.