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Abstract

A nonlinear control system is said to be weakly contractive in the control if the flow that it generates is non-expanding (in the sense that the distance between two trajectories is a non-increasing function of time) for some fixed Riemannian metric independent of the control. We prove in this paper that for such systems, local asymptotic stabilizability implies global asymptotic stabilizability by means of a dynamic state feedback. We link this result and the so-called Jurdjevic and Quinn approach.
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1 Main result

1.1 Statement of the result

Consider the following nonlinear continuous-time control system:

\[ \dot{x} = f(x, u) = f_u(x), \quad f(0, 0) = 0, \]  

where \( x \) lives in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( u \) is the control input taking values in an open subset \( \mathcal{U} \) of \( \mathbb{R}^m \) containing zero. We assume that \( f_u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \) for all \( u \in \mathcal{U} \), \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U}, \mathbb{R}^n) \) and \( f(x, \cdot) \) is locally Lipschitz for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

Definition 1 (Static stabilizability). System (1) is said to be locally (resp. globally) asymptotically stabilizable by a static state feedback if there exists a locally Lipschitz mapping \( \lambda : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \) such that

\[ \dot{x} = f(x, \lambda(x)) \]  

is locally (resp. globally) asymptotically stable at the origin.

Local asymptotic stabilizability is usually obtained by investigating first order or homogeneous approximations of the dynamical system around the origin. Yet obtaining global stabilizability from local stabilizability is not an easy task and may fail in general.

However, there are classes of system for which we know how to bridge the gap between local and global asymptotic stabilizability. This is obviously the case if the feedback law \( \lambda \) is such that \( x \mapsto
Also, by definition of the Riemannian gradient, for all vectors $\mathbf{d}$

$$\mathbf{d} = \nabla_g \ell(\gamma) = \langle \partial_{\mathbf{x}} d^2_g(x, \hat{x}), \mathbf{d} \rangle$$

for all $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which yields

$$\nabla_g(x, \hat{x}) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad x = \hat{x}.$$
Assume that $f$ is $C^1$. If $\tilde{f}$ is a weakly contractive vector field, then for all $C^1$ control $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ the time-varying vector field $f_u$ generates a non-expanding flow in the sense that, if $x_1$ and $x_2$ satisfy $\dot{x}_i = f_u(x_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then the distance $d_f(x_1, x_2)$ between the two trajectories is a non-increasing function of time. We give in appendix a short proof of this well-known statement to be self-contained.

The following theorem is the main result of the paper.

**Theorem 4.** Let $g$ be a $C^2$ complete Riemannian metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $d_g^2$ is a $C^2$ function. Assume that $\tilde{f}$ is weakly contractive with respect to $g$, and $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{U}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. If $\tilde{f}$ is locally asymptotically stabilizable by a static state feedback $\lambda \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{U})$, then it is also globally asymptotically stabilizable by a dynamic state feedback given by

$$\dot{x} = f(x, \lambda(x)), \quad \dot{x} = f(\dot{x}, \lambda(x)) + k(x, \dot{x})$$

where

$$k(x, \dot{x}) = -\alpha(x, \dot{x})\nabla d_g^2(x, \dot{x})$$

in which the function $\alpha$ has to be selected sufficiently small.

### 1.2 Discussion on the result

The idea of the proof is somehow counter-intuitive. Indeed, the feedback depends only on $\dot{x}$. By selecting $\alpha$ sufficiently small, we make sure that $\dot{x}$ remains in the basin of attraction of the origin for the vector field associated to the state feedback. On the other hand, the correction terms $k$ acting on $\dot{x}$ forces $x$ to converge to $\dot{x}$ which implies that $x$ goes to zero.

An interesting aspect of our approach is that no structural constraints is imposed on the local asymptotic stabilizer. This one can be designed for qualitative purposes and can be for instance bounded by a static state feedback given by

$$\lambda \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{U})$$

This technique offers another approach to solve the global asymptotic stabilization with local optimal behavior as for instance studied in [2] or [4]. The main difference with these studies being that the local optimal behavior is reproduced asymptotically in time (as $x$ converges to $\dot{x}$).

To construct the feedback law one needs to compute $\nabla d_g^2(x, \dot{x})$ which may be difficult to obtain analytically in general (except in some simple cases, e.g., if the metric is constant). Some ways of constructing similar correction terms may be obtained following observer designs based on Riemannian approaches as in [1, 3]. In particular in [3, Lemma 3.6], the authors introduced a “distance-like” function $\delta$, that is of crucial importance in the construction of the correction term.

### 1.3 Proof

Let $\lambda$ be a $C^1$ locally asymptotically stabilizing feedback law. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the basin of attraction of the origin for the vector field $x \mapsto f(x, \lambda(x))$, which is a non-empty open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

According to the converse Lyapunov theorem [10] (based on the previous works of [4, 8, 10]) there exists a proper function $V \in C^\infty(\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that $V(0) = 0$ and

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(x)f(x, \lambda(x)) \leq -V(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{9}$$

For all $r > 0$, set $D(r) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid V(x) \leq r \}$ which is a compact subset of $\mathcal{D}$. Let $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the positive and locally Lipschitz function given by

$$\alpha(x, \dot{x}) = \frac{-\max\{V(\dot{x}), 1\}}{2 \left( 1 + \left| \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(\dot{x}) \right| \right) \left( 1 + \left| \nabla d_g^2(x, \dot{x}) \right| \right)} \tag{10}$$

It yields

$$|k(x, \dot{x})| \leq \frac{\max\{V(\dot{x}), 1\}}{2 \left( 1 + \left| \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(\dot{x}) \right| \right)}, \quad \forall (x, \dot{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{D}. \tag{11}$$

We prove Theorem 4 in three steps.
Step 1: the \( \hat{x} \)-component of semi-trajectories of (5) remain in a compact subset of \( \mathcal{D} \). For all \((x, \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{D}\), it follows from (4) and (11) that
\[
\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(\hat{x})[f(\hat{x}, \lambda(\hat{x})) + k(x, \hat{x})] \leq -V(\hat{x}) + \left| \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(\hat{x}) \right| \frac{\max\{V(\hat{x}), 1\}}{2 (1 + \frac{|\partial V}{\partial x}(\hat{x})|)}
\]
\[
\leq -V(\hat{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \max\{V(\hat{x}), 1\}.
\]

Hence, if \( \hat{x} \in \mathcal{D} \setminus D(1) \),
\[
\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(\hat{x})(f(\hat{x}, \lambda(\hat{x})) + k(x, \hat{x})) \leq -\frac{1}{2} V(\hat{x}).
\]
(12)

For all initial conditions \((x_0, \hat{x}_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{D}\), the solution \((x, \hat{x})\) of the closed-loop system (5) satisfies
\[
V(\hat{x}(t)) \leq \max\{V(\hat{x}_0), 1\},
\]
for all \( t \geq 0 \), in the time domain of existence of the solution. In other words, \( \hat{x}(t) \in D(1) \cup D(V(\hat{x}_0)) \) which is a compact subset of \( \mathcal{D} \).

Step 2: the distance between \( \hat{x} \) and \( x \) is non-increasing and has limit zero. System (5) can be rewritten as
\[
\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{\hat{x}} \end{bmatrix} = F(x, \hat{x}) + K(x, \hat{x})
\]
(13)

by setting \( F(x, \hat{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} f(x, \lambda(\hat{x})) \\ f(\hat{x}, \lambda(\hat{x})) \end{bmatrix} \) and \( K(x, \hat{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\alpha(x, \hat{x}) \nabla g(\hat{x}) d_g^2(x, \hat{x}) \end{bmatrix} \).

Since (1) is weakly contractive with respect to \( g \), the result proved in appendix applied to the control \( u = \lambda(\hat{x}) \) shows that
\[
L_F d_g^2(x, \hat{x}) \leq 0.
\]

Thus, by (7),
\[
L_{F+K} d_g^2(x, \hat{x}) \leq -\alpha(x, \hat{x}) \left| \nabla g(\hat{x}) d_g^2(x, \hat{x}) \right|^2 g(\hat{x}).
\]
(14)

Hence, for all \((x_0, \hat{x}_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{D}, t \mapsto d_g(x(t), \hat{x}(t))\) is non-increasing and for all \( t \geq 0 \) on the time domain of existence of the solution we have
\[
(x(t), \hat{x}(t)) \in \Gamma(x_0, \hat{x}_0),
\]
where
\[
\Gamma(x_0, \hat{x}_0) = \left\{ (\xi, \hat{\xi}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{D} \mid \hat{\xi} \in D(1) \cup D(V(\hat{x}_0)), d_g(\xi, \hat{\xi}) \leq d_g(x_0, \hat{x}_0) \right\}.
\]

Moreover, \( g \) is a complete metric. Then, according to the Hopf-Rinow theorem, \( \Gamma(x_0, \hat{x}_0) \) is compact. Hence, solutions of (5) are complete in positive time.

Given \((x_0, \hat{x}_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{D}, \) let \( \kappa : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) be the function defined by
\[
\kappa(s) = \min_{(\xi, \hat{\xi}) \in \Gamma(x_0, \hat{x}_0) | d_g(\xi, \hat{\xi}) = s} \alpha(\xi, \hat{\xi}) \left| \nabla g(\hat{\xi}) d_g^2(\xi, \hat{\xi}) \right|^2 g(\hat{\xi}).
\]

Note that if \( x_0 \neq \hat{x}_0 \), then, for all \( s > 0 \), \( \kappa(s) > 0 \) since \( \alpha \) takes positive values and (10) holds. Hence, (14) leads to
\[
\frac{d}{dt} d_g^2(x(t), \hat{x}(t)) \leq -\kappa(d_g^2(x(t), \hat{x}(t))), \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\]
(15)

Thus \( \lim_{t \to \infty} d_g(x(t), \hat{x}(t)) = 0 \).

Step 3: attractiveness and local asymptotic stability of the origin. Given \((x_0, \hat{x}_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{D}, \) let \( \mu : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) be the function defined by
\[
\mu(s) = \max_{(\xi, \hat{\xi}) \in \Gamma(x_0, \hat{x}_0) | d_g(\xi, \hat{\xi}) \leq s} \left| \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}(\hat{\xi}) \right| k(\xi, \hat{\xi}).
\]
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Then \( \mu \) is non-decreasing, continuous and \( \mu(0) = 0 \). Moreover, the solution \((x, \dot{x})\) of (8) initialized at \((x_0, \dot{x}_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times D\) satisfies

\[
\frac{d}{dt} V(\dot{x}(t)) \leq -V(\dot{x}(t)) + \mu(d_g(x(t), \dot{x}(t)).
\]

From this inequality and Step 2 we conclude that \( \lim_{t \to +\infty} (x(t), \dot{x}(t)) = (0, 0) \).

Inequalities (14) and (16) being true for all solutions starting in \( \Gamma(x_0, \dot{x}_0) \), this implies also stability of \((0, 0) \).

### 2 Link with Jurdjevic and Quinn approach

#### 2.1 Jurdjevic and Quinn result

The next result follows from the work of Jurdjevic and Quinn in [6]. The version that we state here is a direct corollary of [11, Theorem II.1]

**Theorem 5** (Jurdjevic and Quinn approach). Consider the control system

\[
\dot{x} = a(x) + b(x, u)u,
\]

with \( a \) and \( b \) two \( C^1 \) functions. Assume that there exists a \( C^1 \) positive definite proper function \( V : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that

\[
L_a V \leq 0.
\]

If the only solution of the system

\[
\dot{x} = a(x), \quad L_{b(\cdot,0)}V(x) = 0, \quad L_a V(x) = 0
\]

is \( x \equiv 0 \), then (17) is globally asymptotically stabilizable by a static state feedback.

In the context of weakly contractive control systems, the Jurdjevic and Quinn approach leads to the following corollary.

**Corollary 6.** Let \( g \) be a complete Riemannian metric on \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Assume that (11) is weakly contractive with respect to \( g \) and that \( f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U, \mathbb{R}^n) \). If the only solution of the system

\[
\dot{x} = f(x,0), \quad (L_{b(\cdot,0)}d_{g}(\cdot,0))(x) = 0, \quad L_{f,0,d_{g}}(x,0) = 0
\]

where \( b(\cdot,0) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot,0) \) is \( x \equiv 0 \), then (11) is globally asymptotically stabilizable by a static state feedback.

To prove this corollary, it is sufficient to apply Theorem 5 with \( V : x \mapsto d_{g}(x,0)^2 \), \( a : x \mapsto f(x,0) \) and \( b : (x, u) \mapsto \int_0^1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(x,su)ds \).

#### 2.2 Link with our result

Note that the Jurdjevic-Quinn approach guarantees the existence of a static state feedback, contrarily to our main Theorem 4 which builds a dynamic state feedback. However, the feedback obtained by their approach is implicit, while our dynamic state feedback is explicitly given by (8).

Moreover, our feedback law differs strongly from the one given in Jurdjevic-Quinn approach. Indeed, in their approach the feedback is designed small enough to make sure that it acts in a good direction related to the Lyapunov function. In our framework, this is no more a small feedback approach but more a small correction term for an observer approach.

Let us consider the particular case in which

\[
f(x, u) = Ax + b(x)u.
\]

where \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) and \( b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \). Then (19) is weakly contractive with respect to some constant metric \( g \) if and only if \( L_A g \leq 0 \) and \( L_b g = 0 \). Moreover, the pair \((A, b(0))\) is controllable if and only

\[\text{It is easy to check that it is the case if and only if } b(x) = b(0) + Jx \text{ with } L_{A} g = 0.\]
if $19$ is locally asymptotically stabilizable by a static feedback. Then, if all these hypotheses hold, a dynamic globally stabilizing state feedback is given by Theorem $4$.

We can also show under the same hypotheses that the Jurdjevic and Quinn approach of Corollary $6$ remains an open question.

Indeed, the system in Corollary $6$ is equivalent to

$$\dot{x} = Ax, \quad (LbA\delta^2(\cdot,0))(x) = 0, \quad Ld\delta^2(x,0) = 0$$

which implies that $x \equiv 0$ when the pair $(A,b(0))$ is controllable. Then, according to Corollary $6$ $19$ is globally asymptotically stabilizable by a static state feedback. However, it is not clear in general that both contexts are equivalent, and finding an example fitting in the framework of Theorem $4$ but in which the Jurdjevic and Quinn approach of Corollary $6$ remains an open question.

## Appendix on weakly contractive vector fields

For all $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \to U$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, denote by $t \mapsto X_u(x,t)$ the solution of (1) with initial condition $x$. Let $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \to U$ be such that $X_u$ is well-defined and $C^2$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+$.

Let $(x_1,x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\gamma : [s_1,s_2] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a $C^2$ path between the points $x_1 = \gamma(s_1)$ and $x_2 = \gamma(s_2)$. For all $(s,t) \in [s_1,s_2] \times \mathbb{R}_+$, set $\Gamma(s,t) = \Gamma_u(\gamma(s),t)$ and $\rho(s,t) = |\partial\Gamma/\partial s(s,t)|^2_{\gamma(s,t)}$. Then $\rho$ is $C^1$ and

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t}(s,t) = L_{f,g}(\Gamma(s,t)) \left( \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial s}(s,t), \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial s}(s,t) \right) \leq 0,$$

which yields

$$\frac{d\ell(\Gamma(\cdot,t))}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \rho(s,t)ds = \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\rho(s,t)}} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t}(s,t)ds \leq 0.$$

Hence $d_\rho(X_u(x_1,t),X_u(x_2,t)) \leq \ell(\Gamma(\cdot,t)) \leq \ell(\gamma)$. Choosing a sequence of paths $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\ell(\gamma_n) \to d_\rho(x_1,x_2)$ and passing to the limit we get

$$d_\rho(X_u(x_1,t),X_u(x_2,t)) \leq d_\rho(x_1,x_2).$$

Since this inequality is true for any control input $u$, $t \mapsto d_\rho(X_u(x_1,t),X_u(x_2,t))$ is non-increasing for all control $u$ and all points $x_1, x_2$.
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