

OBSTRUCTIONS TO ASYMPTOTIC STABILIZATION

MATTHEW D. KVALHEIM

ABSTRACT. Necessary conditions for asymptotic stability and stabilizability of subsets of dynamical and control systems are obtained. The main necessary condition is homotopical and is in turn used to obtain a homological one. Certain extensions are ruled out. Questions are posed.

1. INTRIGUE

The following statement is a simplification of Corollary 1, which follows from the main result of this paper (Theorem 1).

Corollary. Let X, Y be smooth vector fields on a manifold M with a compact set $A \subset M$ asymptotically stable for both. There is an open set $U \supset A$ such that $X|_{U \setminus A}, Y|_{U \setminus A}$ are homotopic through nowhere-zero vector fields.

Motivation is given in sections 2 and 3. Briefly, Corollary 1 for *dynamical* systems yields feedback stabilizability “tests” for *control* systems generalizing and/or strengthening some in the literature. Theorem 1 enables further such tests via Theorem 2 or obstruction theory [Ste99, Part III].

The obstruction theory connection is explained but not fleshed out and the author hopes topologically-minded readers might view this as an invitation of sorts. Separate questions are posed in section 6.

2. INTRODUCTION

In control theory one studies ordinary differential equations

$$(1) \quad \frac{dx}{dt} = f(x, u)$$

depending on a control parameter u where x lives in a smooth manifold M and $f(x, u) \in T_x M$ for all x and u . Given a compact subset A of M , the **feedback stabilization problem** concerns proving (non)existence and ideally constructing a **feedback law** $x \mapsto u(x)$ of suitable regularity such that A is asymptotically stable for the **closed-loop vector field** $x \mapsto f(x, u(x))$. This paper merely considers proving nonexistence. Noncompact sets A are considered later (Theorems 1 and 2).

In the special case that A is a point and M is a Euclidean space, **Brockett’s necessary condition** says in particular that the existence of a C^1 feedback law solving the feedback stabilization problem implies that the image of the map $(x, u) \mapsto f(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ contains a neighborhood of 0 [Bro83, Thm 1.(iii)]. (Here f is viewed as \mathbb{R}^n -valued via the usual tangent bundle identification $T\mathbb{R}^n \approx \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$.) To achieve this, Brockett derived a necessary condition satisfied by a stabilizing

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA, USA
E-mail address: kvalheim@seas.upenn.edu.

closed-loop vector field—a *dynamical* system—and parlayed this into one for *control* systems (1). This technique is used in later work and in this paper, where the main result for dynamics (Theorem 1) implies one for control (Theorem 2).

The monograph by Krasnosel’skiĭ and Zabreĭko appeared around the same time as Brockett’s paper and has been influential in this area. It contains necessary conditions for asymptotic stability of an equilibrium point of a vector field involving its index [KZ84, sec. 52]. This result was used in part by Zabczyk to give an alternative proof and extension of Brockett’s necessary condition [Zab89]. Further necessary conditions for feedback stabilizability have since been discovered for the case that A is a point [Cor90, CMJ22] or a closed submanifold of a Euclidean space [Man07, Man10] or a compact subset of a smooth manifold [KK21].¹

Such necessary conditions yield practical “tests” relieving the expenditure of time and resources searching for stabilizing feedback laws that do not exist. These tests are easy to apply in a variety of concrete instances of (1), and the author hopes that the homological tests among these ([Cor90, Man07, Man10], Theorem 2) might be usefully numerically automatable [KMM04]. The purpose of the present paper is to introduce necessary conditions providing more general and/or stronger tests.

This is done in section 3. The main result is proved in section 4. A counterexample related to Theorem 1 is in section 5. Some questions are posed in section 6.

3. RESULTS

A C^0 vector field will be called **uniquely integrable** if it has unique maximal integral curves. Such vector fields generate C^0 local flows (see [KK21, App. A.1] for details). Standard examples are C^∞ or C^1 or even locally Lipschitz vector fields.

To reduce clutter, the notation $M_A := M \setminus A$ and $U_A := U \setminus A$ will be used from here on. The result below is a corollary of Theorem 1 as will be explained.

Corollary 1. Let X, Y be uniquely integrable C^0 vector fields on a C^∞ manifold M with a compact set $A \subset M$ asymptotically stable for both. There is an open set $U \supset A$ such that $X|_{U_A}, Y|_{U_A}$ are homotopic through nowhere-zero vector fields.

Note. U admits an explicit description here and in Theorem 1 (see Remark 2).

When A is a point, Corollary 1 specializes to a known result [KZ84, p. 340], [Zab89, p. 7] shown to imply Brockett’s necessary condition in the latter reference.

Corollary 1 is obtained from the following Theorem 1 by taking A to be compact and $\mathcal{D} = TM_A$. For the statement, “regular C^1 distribution” is synonymous with “ C^1 vector subbundle”, involutivity is in the sense of the Frobenius theorem, and the definition of uniform asymptotic stability can be found in [Wil69, p. 423]. When A is compact and asymptotically stable, A is uniformly asymptotically stable with respect to every Riemannian metric on M . For an explanation of why *uniform* asymptotic stability is needed when A is noncompact, see [Wil69, p. 425–426].

Theorem 1. Let X, Y be uniquely integrable C^0 vector fields on a C^∞ Riemannian manifold M with a closed set $A \subset M$ uniformly asymptotically stable for both. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset TM_A$ be an involutive C^1 regular distribution such that $X|_{M_A}, Y|_{M_A}$ are \mathcal{D} -valued. There is an open set $U \supset A$ such that $X|_{U_A}, Y|_{U_A}$ are homotopic through $(\mathcal{D} \setminus 0)$ -valued vector fields.

¹Exponential [GJKM18], global [Byr08, Bar21], time-varying [Cor92], and discontinuous [CLSS97] variants of the feedback stabilization problem are not considered in the present paper.

Note. The hypothesis that \mathcal{D} is involutive cannot be removed (section 5).

When A is known to be uniformly asymptotically stable for Y , Theorem 1 can be used to test whether A is also so for X by using obstruction theory [Ste99, Part III]. If A is compact (this can be relaxed) and M_A is orientable and the fiber dimension of \mathcal{D} is $(k+1)$, the obstructions to $X|_{U_A}, Y|_{U_A}$ being homotopic through $(\mathcal{D} \setminus 0)$ -valued vector fields lie in certain cohomology groups with coefficients in the homotopy groups of the k -sphere [DW72, Thm 1.1].

Alternatively, Theorem 1 directly implies the following homological result that can also be used to test if A is uniformly asymptotically stable for X assuming it is so for Y . This result will be used to formulate a necessary condition for feedback stabilizability of control systems in Theorem 2.

Lemma 1. Let X, Y be uniquely integrable C^0 vector fields on a C^∞ Riemannian manifold M with a closed set $A \subset M$ uniformly asymptotically stable for both. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset TM_A$ be an involutive C^1 regular distribution such that $X|_{M_A}, Y|_{M_A}$ are \mathcal{D} -valued. For all sufficiently small open $U \supset A$, the induced graded homomorphisms

$$(X|_{U_A})_*, (Y|_{U_A})_* : H_\bullet(U_A) \rightarrow H_\bullet(\mathcal{D}|_{U_A} \setminus 0)$$

on singular homology coincide.

Control systems will now be defined more formally than in section 2. The definitions here are somewhat less general than in [KK21, sec. 3] (continuity assumptions are added on E, p, u). Brockett's definition [Bro77] motivates the following one used in this paper: a **control system** is a tuple (E, M, p, f) of a topological space E , a C^∞ Riemannian manifold M , a continuous surjection $p: E \rightarrow M$, and a fiber-preserving map $f: E \rightarrow TM$ (i.e. $q \circ f = p$ where $q: TM \rightarrow M$ is the tangent bundle projection). The standard example in control theory is $E = M \times \mathbb{R}^m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $p(x, u) = x$. In this paper a **feedback law** $u: M \rightarrow E$ is a continuous section of p (i.e. $p \circ u = \text{id}_M$) such that the C^0 vector field $f \circ u$ is uniquely integrable. Note: $f \circ u$ is indeed a vector field on M since $q \circ f \circ u = p \circ u = \text{id}_M$.

Lemma 1 implies the next result by taking $X = f \circ u$ and using $X_* = f_* \circ u_*$.

Theorem 2. Let A be a closed subset of a C^∞ Riemannian manifold M , $\mathcal{D} \subset TM_A$ be an involutive C^1 regular distribution, and (E, M, p, f) be a control system such that $f(p^{-1}(M_A)) \subset \mathcal{D}$. Assume there is *some* uniquely integrable C^0 vector field Y on M for which A is uniformly asymptotically stable and $Y|_{M_A}$ is \mathcal{D} -valued. Assume there is a feedback law u such that A is uniformly asymptotically stable for $f \circ u$. For all sufficiently small open sets $U \supset A$,

$$Y_* H_\bullet(p^{-1}(U_A)) \subset f_* H_\bullet(p^{-1}(U_A)) \subset H_\bullet(\mathcal{D}|_{U_A} \setminus 0),$$

where Y_*, f_* are the induced graded homomorphisms on singular homology.

Remark 1. Theorem 2 generalizes results of Coron [Cor90, Thm 2] and Mansouri [Man07, Thm 4] [Man10, Thm 2.3] in a few ways. E.g. Coron assumes A is a point, Mansouri assumes A is a compact boundaryless submanifold, both assume $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, and both assume $\mathcal{D} = TM_A$. These assumptions are not made here. However, the conclusions of Coron's and Mansouri's theorems are more explicit.

Theorem 1 is not always very informative in spite of Remark 1. For example, if A is the image of a periodic orbit with the same orientation for smooth vector fields X and Y , the conclusion of Theorem 1 is satisfied regardless of whether A is attracting

or repelling or neither for X or Y . Since Theorem 1 is stronger than Theorem 2, neither result provides any information on stability in this case. This is related to the fact that the Euler characteristic of a circle is zero (cf. [Man07, Man10, KK21]).

This motivates a search for conclusions stronger than that of Theorem 1 given vector fields X, Y satisfying its hypotheses. For example, can the homotopy of Theorem 1 be taken through vector fields stabilizing A ? This question is related to one of Conley and not answered in this paper but see section 6 for additional thoughts. Alternatively, if X, Y stabilize A and also have additional structure, one can ask if the homotopy of Theorem 1 can be taken through vector fields preserving this structure. For example, if X, Y are gradient vector fields stabilizing A , can the homotopy of Theorem 1 be taken through gradient vector fields?

A complete answer is not given here. However, the following proposition provides a disappointing partial answer. In the setting of Theorem 1 specialized to $\mathcal{D} = TM_A$ (e.g. Corollary 1), the answer is “yes” but does not yield a stronger conclusion since the proposition says that gradients on an open set are always homotopic through nowhere-zero gradients if they are homotopic through nowhere-zero vector fields.

Proposition (Gromov). Let W be an open subset of a C^∞ Riemannian manifold M , and let $F, G: W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be C^1 functions such that $\nabla F, \nabla G$ are homotopic through nowhere-zero vector fields. Then there is also a C^1 homotopy from F to G through functions whose gradients are nowhere-zero.

Note. When $W = U_A$, the homotopy of the proposition need not be through functions whose gradients “point toward” A (cf. [EM02, Fig. 4.1] and the question about homotopies through stabilizing vector fields above and in section 6).

To explain why the proposition is true, smooth approximation techniques [Hir94] imply that the submersions F, G are homotopic through C^1 submersions to C^∞ submersions. By taking metric duals the assumptions (and smooth approximation techniques again) imply that the differentials of these C^∞ submersions are C^∞ homotopic through nowhere-zero differential one-forms. Since W is open and submersions satisfy Gromov’s h -principle for open $\text{Diff}(W)$ -invariant differential relations [Gro69] (lucidly explained in [EM02, Thm 7.2.3]), the C^∞ submersions are C^∞ homotopic through submersions (which have nowhere-zero gradients by definition).

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Theorem 1. Let X, Y be uniquely integrable C^0 vector fields on a C^∞ Riemannian manifold M with a closed set $A \subset M$ uniformly asymptotically stable for both. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset TM_A$ be an involutive C^1 regular distribution such that $X|_{M_A}, Y|_{M_A}$ are \mathcal{D} -valued. There is an open set $U \supset A$ such that $X|_{U_A}, Y|_{U_A}$ are homotopic through $(\mathcal{D} \setminus 0)$ -valued vector fields.

Remark 2. The proof yields an explicit description of one such U . Let $B_X, B_Y \subset M$ denote the basins of attraction of A with respect to X, Y . Then U can be taken to be the largest subset of $B_X \cap B_Y$ such that all forward X -orbits with initial condition in U are contained in B_Y . Equivalently, U is the basin of attraction of A for $X|_{B_Y}$, so U is open in B_Y and hence also in M .

Proof. Without loss of generality M is redefined to be the basin of attraction of A for Y . Let U be the basin of attraction for X . Let $V_X: U \rightarrow [0, \infty), V_Y: M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be proper C^∞ Lyapunov functions for $A = V_X^{-1}(0) = V_Y^{-1}(0)$ and X, Y [Wil69,

Thm 3.2], [FP19, sec. 6]. Only the restrictions $X|_{M_A}, Y|_{M_A}$ matter now. It may be assumed that $Y|_{M_A} \in C^1$ after a straight-line homotopy to the orthogonal projection of $(-\nabla V_Y)|_{M_A}$ to \mathcal{D} . Let $\Phi_X \in C^0$ and $\Phi_Y \in C^1$ be the local flow and flow of $X|_{M_A}$ and $Y|_{M_A}$, respectively.

The properties of V_X and V_Y [Wil69, pp. 423–424] imply that, for each $m \in U_A$, there is $t_m > 0$ and an open subset $U_m \ni m$ of U_A such that $\Phi_X^{[t_m, \infty)}(z) \cap \Phi_Y^{(-\infty, 0]}(z) = \emptyset$ for all $z \in U_m$. Let $(\psi_m)_{m \in U_A}$ be a C^∞ partition of unity subordinate to the open cover $(U_m)_{m \in U_A}$ of U_A and define the C^∞ function $\tau: U_A \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by $\tau(z) := \sum_{m \in U_A} t_m \psi_m(z)$. Then τ , to be used later, satisfies

$$(2) \quad \Phi_X^{[\tau(m), \infty)}(m) \cap \Phi_Y^{(-\infty, 0]}(m) = \emptyset \text{ for all } m \in U_A.$$

Next, fix any $c \in (0, \infty)$ and define $N := V_Y^{-1}(c)$. Then (cf. [Wil67, Thm 3.2])

$$(3) \quad \Phi_Y|_{\mathbb{R} \times N}: \mathbb{R} \times N \approx M_A \text{ is a } C^1 \text{ diffeomorphism pushing forward } Y \text{ to } 1 \times 0.$$

Since $Y|_{M_A}$ takes values in the involutive distribution \mathcal{D} , $T\Phi_Y^t(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{D}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Defining the involutive C^1 distribution $\mathcal{D}_N := \mathcal{D} \cap TN$ on N , this and (3) imply

$$(4) \quad \Phi_Y|_{\mathbb{R} \times N}: \mathbb{R} \times N \approx M_A \text{ pushes forward } T\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{D}_N \text{ to } \mathcal{D}.$$

By (3) and (4) it may be assumed from here on that $M_A = \mathbb{R} \times N$, $Y = 1 \times 0$, and $\mathcal{D} = T\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{D}_N$.

The set of sprays on N is convex [Lan72, BJ82], so a partition of unity can be used to construct a C^1 spray $Z_N: TN \rightarrow T(TN)$ on N that is tangent to \mathcal{D}_N .²

Let $Z_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the Euclidean geodesic spray and Z be the C^1 spray $Z := Z_{\mathbb{R}} \times Z_N$ on $M_A = \mathbb{R} \times N$. Then the exponential maps of these sprays [Lan72, BJ82] satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \exp^Z &:= \pi \circ \Phi_Z^1 = (\pi_{\mathbb{R}} \times \pi_N) \circ (\Phi_{Z_{\mathbb{R}}}^1 \times \Phi_{Z_N}^1) = (\pi_{\mathbb{R}} \circ \Phi_{Z_{\mathbb{R}}}^1) \times (\pi_N \circ \Phi_{Z_N}^1) \\ &=: \exp^{Z_{\mathbb{R}}} \times \exp^{Z_N}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi_Z, \Phi_{Z_{\mathbb{R}}}, \Phi_{Z_N}$ are the local flows of $Z, Z_{\mathbb{R}}, Z_N$ and $\pi: TM_A \rightarrow M_A, \pi_{\mathbb{R}}: T\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \pi_N: TN \rightarrow N$ are the tangent bundle projections. Clearly $(\pi_{\mathbb{R}}, \exp^{Z_{\mathbb{R}}}): T\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a diffeomorphism, and $(\pi_N, \exp^{Z_N}): TN \rightarrow N^2$ maps a neighborhood of 0_{TN} diffeomorphically onto its image by a standard argument (see [BJ82, p. 121]).

It follows that $(\pi, \exp^Z): TM_A \rightarrow M_A^2$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism from a neighborhood U_0 of $T\mathbb{R} \times 0_{TN}$ onto its open image U_1 . Moreover, Z is tangent to \mathcal{D} since Z_N is tangent to \mathcal{D}_N , so \exp^Z maps the fiber \mathcal{D}_m over each $m \in M_A$ into the leaf \mathcal{F}_m through m of the C^1 foliation $\{\mathcal{F}_m\}_{m \in M_A}$ integrating \mathcal{D} [PSW97, p. 541]. Additionally, $Z = Z_{\mathbb{R}} \times Z_N$ implies that $\exp^Z(tY(m)) = \exp_m^Z(t \times 0) = \Phi_Y^t(m)$ for every $m \in M_A$.

Define $\Phi_{\tilde{X}}, \Phi_{\tilde{Y}}$ to be the local flows of $\tilde{X} := (0 \times X), \tilde{Y} := (0 \times Y)$ on M_A^2 . By the previous paragraph, (π, \exp^Z) maps \mathcal{D} into $S := \bigcup_{m \in U_A} \{m\} \times \mathcal{F}_m$. Since $S \subset U_A \times M_A$ is a leaf of the C^1 foliation integrating the involutive C^1 distribution $TU_A \times \mathcal{D}$ [PSW97, p. 541], it follows that S is a C^1 immersed submanifold such that all C^1 maps $Q \rightarrow U_A \times M_A$ with image contained in S are C^1 as maps into S (Q is arbitrary; cf. [Lee13, Thm 19.17]). Defining the open subsets $W_0 := U_0 \cap \mathcal{D}|_{U_A} \subset TU_A$ and $W_1 := U_1 \cap S \subset U_A \times M_A$, this and the previous paragraph imply that

$$(5) \quad \text{Exp} := (\pi, \exp^Z)|_{W_0}: W_0 \rightarrow W_1 \text{ is a } C^1 \text{ diffeomorphism.}$$

²Alternatively, the dynamics of an unforced classical mechanical system with configuration space N equipped with a Riemannian kinetic energy metric and nonholonomic constraint distribution \mathcal{D}_N is generated by a spray having this property [BC98, Lew98].

Defining $\Delta := \{(m, m) : m \in U_A\} \subset W_1 \subset S$, (3) and the corresponding result for X imply that $\Phi_{\tilde{Y}}^{(-\infty, 0]}(\Delta)$ and $\bigcup_{m \in U_A} \Phi_{\tilde{X}}^{[\tau(m), \infty)}(m, m)$ are disjoint closed subsets of S , so there is a C^0 function $\alpha : S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ equal to 0 on neighborhoods of the latter subset and $S \setminus W_1$, and equal to 1 on a neighborhood of $\Phi_{\tilde{Y}}^{(-\infty, 0]}(\Delta)$. Define the C^∞ function $\beta : [0, 1] \times U_A \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $\beta(t, m) := \alpha(\Phi_{\tilde{X}}^{t\tau(m)}(m, m))$. Then (2) and (5) imply that

$$H : [0, 1] \times U_A \rightarrow \mathcal{D} \setminus 0,$$

$$H(t, m) := \begin{cases} X(m), & t = 0 \\ \frac{\beta(t, m)}{t\tau(m)} \text{Exp}^{-1}(\Phi_{\tilde{X}}^{t\tau(m)}(m, m)) + (1 - \beta(t, m))Y(m), & 0 < t \leq 1 \\ Y(m), & \beta(t, m) = 0. \end{cases}$$

is a well-defined homotopy from $X|_{U_A}$ to $Y|_{U_A}$ through $(\mathcal{D} \setminus 0)$ -valued vector fields. \square

5. COUNTEREXAMPLE

In this section an example is given showing that the hypothesis that \mathcal{D} is involutive cannot be removed from Theorem 1, even if A is a compact boundaryless submanifold and everything is analytic and \mathcal{D} is a distribution on M rather than M_A (reminder: $M_A := M \setminus A$ and $U_A := U \setminus A$).

Consider the 2-torus \mathbb{T}^2 viewed as the square $[0, 2\pi]^2$ with opposite boundary faces identified and angular coordinates $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R} \bmod 2\pi$. Define $M := \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ with coordinates (θ_1, θ_2, z) where $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Define $A := \{z = 0\} \subset M$ and $\mathcal{D} := \ker(dz + z d\theta_1 + z \cos \theta_1 d\theta_2) \subset TM$. Note that \mathcal{D} is not involutive. Consider the following \mathcal{D} -valued vector fields on M :

$$X := \partial_{\theta_1} - z \partial_z, \quad Y := \cos \theta_1 \partial_{\theta_2} - \sin \theta_1 \partial_{\theta_1} + (\sin \theta_1 - \cos^2 \theta_1) z \partial_z.$$

For every $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $X|_{\{z=c\}}$ is not homotopic to $Y|_{\{z=c\}}$ through $(\mathcal{D} \setminus 0)$ -valued vector fields since this would imply that the vector fields $X_0 := \partial_{\theta_1}$ and $Y_0 := \cos \theta_1 \partial_{\theta_2} - \sin \theta_1 \partial_{\theta_1}$ on \mathbb{T}^2 are homotopic without passing through zero. But (using the identification $T\mathbb{T}^2 \approx \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ to view X_0, Y_0 as \mathbb{R}^2 -valued) the restrictions

$$X_0|_{\{\theta_2=0\}}, Y_0|_{\{\theta_2=0\}} : \{\theta_2 = 0\} \approx \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$$

have different winding numbers (0 and -1) with respect to $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and this implies a contradiction. Hence for every neighborhood $U \subset M$ of $A = \{z = 0\}$, $X|_{U_A}$ is not homotopic to $Y|_{U_A}$ through $(\mathcal{D} \setminus 0)$ -valued vector fields.

On the other hand, A is asymptotically stable for both X and Y . Indeed, letting dots denote derivatives with respect to t , the X -integral curves $(\theta_1, \theta_2, z)(t)$ satisfy

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}_1 &= 1 \\ \dot{\theta}_2 &= 0 \\ \dot{z} &= -z \end{aligned}$$

and the Y -integral curves satisfy

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}_1 &= -\sin \theta_1 \\ \dot{\theta}_2 &= \cos \theta_1 \\ \dot{z} &= (\sin \theta_1 - \cos^2 \theta_1) z. \end{aligned}$$

Since (6) implies that $z(t) = e^{-t}z(0)$, A is asymptotically stable for X . Next, (7) and linear ODE theory imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (8) \quad z(t) &= e^{\int_0^t \sin \theta_1(s) - \cos^2 \theta_1(s) ds} z(0) = e^{-\int_0^t \dot{\theta}_1(s) + \cos^2 \theta_1(s) ds} z(0) \\
 &= e^{(\theta_1(0) - \theta_1(t) - \int_0^t \cos^2 \theta_1(s) ds)} z(0) \\
 &\leq e^{(\pi - \int_0^t \cos^2 \theta_1(s) ds)} z(0) \leq e^\pi z(0).
 \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds since (7) implies that $t \mapsto \theta_1(t)$ is either constant or a heteroclinic trajectory from π to 0. The first inequality implies that A is attracting since (7) implies that $\int_0^t \cos^2 \theta_1(s) ds \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for every initial condition. The second inequality implies that A is Lyapunov stable for Y .

Hence A is asymptotically stable for both X and Y , which implies (since A is compact) that A is uniformly asymptotically stable with respect to every Riemannian metric on M . On the other hand, $X|_{U_A}$ and $Y|_{U_A}$ are *not* homotopic through $(\mathcal{D} \setminus 0)$ -valued vector fields for every neighborhood $U \subset M$ of A , as was discussed.

Thus, this example establishes the claim that the “involutive” hypothesis of Theorem 1 cannot be removed, even when A ($\approx \mathbb{T}^2$ here) is a compact boundaryless submanifold and everything is analytic and \mathcal{D} is a distribution on all of M .

6. QUESTIONS

In this section some remaining questions are posed and discussed.

Does Corollary 1 or, more generally, Theorem 1 hold under attractivity assumptions weaker than (uniform) asymptotic stability, as considered in [Zab89]? Can the assumption that trajectories are unique be removed, as in [OPM03]?

Is Theorem 1 still true if \mathcal{D} is merely assumed to be a generalized subbundle (singular distribution) rather than a vector subbundle (regular distribution) [Lew14]?

Motivated by Theorem 1, in the context of the proposition in section 3, what can be said if the gradient vector fields take values in a distribution \mathcal{D} ? And in the context of the discussion motivating the proposition, can anything analogous be said for other special classes of vector fields which might be useful for strengthening the conclusions of Theorem 1 or Corollary 1 under more specific hypotheses?

It was asked after Remark 1 whether the homotopy of Theorem 1 can be taken through vector fields rendering A uniformly asymptotically stable. It seems to the author that, using the s -cobordism theorem due to Barden-Mazur-Stallings [Bar63, Maz63, Sta65], some sufficient conditions for this can be given when $\dim M \geq 6$ under certain hypotheses on fundamental groups related to Whitehead torsion [Mil66]. However, this would only provide a partial answer to the question.

It will now be explained how the question just mentioned relates to one asked by Conley. In his monograph Conley defined what is now called the Conley index and showed that isolated invariant sets related by continuation (defined in [Con78]) have “the same” Conley index. Conley asked to what extent the converse is true [Con78, Sec. IV.8.1.A]. Simple examples show that isolated invariant sets with the same Conley index need not be related by continuation [MRS00, pp. 1–2], as Conley surely knew, but one can still ask whether a converse holds in certain situations. One such situation is when the pair of isolated invariant sets are the same asymptotically stable set but for two different vector fields; a homotopy of these through stabilizing vector fields would induce a continuation of their flows, and this

explains the relationship of Conley’s question with that of the previous paragraph. Reineck has already investigated Conley’s question using techniques related to the h -cobordism theorem (special case of the s -cobordism theorem) [Rei92].

Finally, from the view of the present paper, it seems to the author that the ultimate question is the following. Is there a “universal” necessary *and* sufficient condition for stabilizability which can be used to actually *construct* smooth stabilizing feedbacks via numerical means? It seems to the author that a negative answer to this question would also be interesting.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was funded by ONR N000141612817 held by D. E. Koditschek. The author gratefully acknowledges Yu. Baryshnikov, B. A. Christopherson, J. Gould, R. Gupta, D. E. Koditschek, B. S. Mordukhovich, and T. O. Rot for helpful conversations and insights and references.

REFERENCES

- [Bar63] D Barden, *The structure of manifolds*, Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1963.
- [Bar21] Yu Baryshnikov, *Topological perplexity in feedback stabilization*, 2021, preprint on webpage at <http://publish.illinois.edu/ymb/files/2021/08/tp.pdf>.
- [BC98] A M Bloch and P E Crouch, *Newton’s law and integrability of nonholonomic systems*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **36** (1998), no. 6, 2020–2039. MR 1638936
- [BJ82] T Bröcker and K Jänich, *Introduction to differential topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1982, Translated from the German by C. B. Thomas and M. J. Thomas. MR 674117
- [Bro77] R W Brockett, *Control theory and analytical mechanics*, Geometric Control Theory, Lie Groups: History, Frontiers and Applications (1977), 1–46.
- [Bro83] ———, *Asymptotic stability and feedback stabilization*, Differential geometric control theory **27** (1983), no. 1, 181–191.
- [Byr08] C I Byrnes, *On Brockett’s necessary condition for stabilizability and the topology of Liapunov functions on \mathbb{R}^n* , Communications in Information and Systems **8** (2008), no. 4, 333–352.
- [CLSS97] F H Clarke, Y S Ledyaev, E D Sontag, and A I Subbotin, *Asymptotic controllability implies feedback stabilization*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control **42** (1997), no. 10, 1394–1407. MR 1472857
- [CMJ22] B A Christopherson, B S Mordukhovich, and F Jafari, *Continuous feedback stabilization of nonlinear control systems by composition operators*, ESAIM: Control, Optimization and Calculus of Variations (to appear) (2022).
- [Con78] C C Conley, *Isolated invariant sets and the Morse index*, no. 38, American Mathematical Society, 1978.
- [Cor90] J-M Coron, *A necessary condition for feedback stabilization*, Systems & Control Letters **14** (1990), no. 3, 227–232.
- [Cor92] ———, *Global asymptotic stabilization for controllable systems without drift*, Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems **5** (1992), no. 3, 295–312.
- [DW72] A Davis and F W Wilson, Jr., *Vector fields tangent to foliations. I. Reeb foliations*, J. Differential Equations **11** (1972), 491–498. MR 309127
- [EM02] Y Eliashberg and N Mishachev, *Introduction to the h -principle*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 48, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002. MR 1909245
- [FP19] A Fathi and P Pageault, *Smoothing Lyapunov functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **371** (2019), no. 3, 1677–1700. MR 3894031
- [GJKM18] R Gupta, F Jafari, R J Kipka, and B S Mordukhovich, *Linear openness and feedback stabilization of nonlinear control systems*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S **11** (2018), no. 6, 1103–1119. MR 3815134

- [Gro69] M L Gromov, *Stable mappings of foliations into manifolds*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **33** (1969), 707–734. MR 0263103
- [Hir94] M W Hirsch, *Differential topology*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 33, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994, Corrected reprint of the 1976 original. MR 1336822
- [KK21] M D Kvalheim and D E Koditschek, *Necessary conditions for feedback stabilization and safety*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.00215 (2021).
- [KMM04] T Kaczynski, K Mischaikow, and M Mrozek, *Computational homology*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 157, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004. MR 2028588
- [KZ84] M A Krasnosel'skiĭ and P. P. Zabreiko, *Geometrical methods of nonlinear analysis*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 263, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984, Translated from the Russian by Christian C. Fenske. MR 736839
- [Lan72] S Lang, *Differential manifolds*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., 1972. MR 0431240
- [Lee13] J M Lee, *Introduction to smooth manifolds*, 2 ed., Springer-Verlag, 2013.
- [Lew98] A D Lewis, *Affine connections and distributions with applications to nonholonomic mechanics*, vol. 42, 1998, Pacific Institute of Mathematical Sciences Workshop on Non-holonomic Constraints in Dynamics (Calgary, AB, 1997), pp. 135–164. MR 1656279
- [Lew14] Andrew D Lewis, *Generalised subbundles and distributions: A comprehensive review*, <https://mast.queensu.ca/~andrew/notes/pdf/2011a.pdf> (2014).
- [Man07] A-R Mansouri, *Local asymptotic feedback stabilization to a submanifold: topological conditions*, Systems Control Lett. **56** (2007), no. 7-8, 525–528. MR 2332004
- [Man10] ———, *Topological obstructions to submanifold stabilization*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control **55** (2010), no. 7, 1701–1703. MR 2675835
- [Maz63] B Mazur, *Relative neighborhoods and the theorems of Smale*, Ann. of Math. (2) **77** (1963), 232–249. MR 150786
- [Mil66] J. Milnor, *Whitehead torsion*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **72** (1966), 358–426. MR 196736
- [MRS00] M Mrozek, J F Reineck, and R Srzednicki, *The Conley index over a base*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **352** (2000), no. 9, 4171–4194. MR 1466953
- [OPM03] R Orsi, L Praly, and I Mareels, *Necessary conditions for stability and attractivity of continuous systems*, International Journal of Control **76** (2003), no. 11, 1070–1077.
- [PSW97] C Pugh, M Shub, and A Wilkinson, *Hölder foliations*, Duke Math. J. **86** (1997), no. 3, 517–546. MR 1432307
- [Rei92] J F Reineck, *Continuation to the minimal number of critical points in gradient flows*, Duke Math. J. **68** (1992), no. 1, 185–194. MR 1185822
- [Sta65] J R Stallings, *On infinite processes leading to differentiability in the complement of a point*, Differential and Combinatorial Topology (A Symposium in Honor of Marston Morse), Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1965, pp. 245–254. MR 0180983
- [Ste99] N Steenrod, *The topology of fibre bundles*, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1999, Reprint of the 1957 edition, Princeton Paperbacks. MR 1688579
- [Wil67] F W Wilson, Jr., *The structure of the level surfaces of a Lyapunov function*, J. Differential Equations **3** (1967), 323–329. MR 0231409
- [Wil69] ———, *Smoothing derivatives of functions and applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **139** (1969), 413–428. MR 0251747
- [Zab89] J Zabczyk, *Some comments on stabilizability*, Applied Mathematics and Optimization **19** (1989), no. 1, 1–9.