



HAL
open science

Finite-time stability properties of Lur'e systems with piecewise continuous nonlinearities

Simone Mariano, Romain Postoyan, Luca Zaccarian

► **To cite this version:**

Simone Mariano, Romain Postoyan, Luca Zaccarian. Finite-time stability properties of Lur'e systems with piecewise continuous nonlinearities. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024, 69 (9), pp.6325-6332. <10.1109/TAC.2024.3383278>. <hal-04530198>

HAL Id: hal-04530198

<https://hal.science/hal-04530198v1>

Submitted on 3 Apr 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

Finite-time stability properties of Lur'e systems with piecewise continuous nonlinearities

S. Mariano, R. Postoyan, L. Zaccarian

Abstract—We analyze the stability properties of Lur'e systems with piecewise continuous nonlinearities by exploiting the notion of set-valued Lie derivative for Lur'e-Postnikov Lyapunov functions. We first extend an existing result of the literature to establish the global asymptotic stability of the origin under a more general sector condition. We then present the main results of this work, namely additional conditions under which output and state finite-time stability properties also hold for the considered class of systems. We highlight the relevance of these results by certifying the stability properties of two engineering systems of known interest: mechanical systems affected by friction and cellular neural networks.

I. INTRODUCTION

Defining conditions to ensure stability properties of continuous-time linear systems subject to cone-bounded nonlinear output feedback, namely, the so-called Lur'e problem, has been widely investigated in the literature see, e.g., [24], [27], [30], [45]. This class of systems is ubiquitously used in various engineering domains, such as mechanical engineering to describe dynamical systems affected by friction and/or unilateral constraints [11], electrical and electronic engineering to capture the behavior of electrical circuits with switches or electronic devices [1], [41], or neural networks [35]; see also [10].

A few existing works address the Lur'e problem with set-valued or discontinuous nonlinearities, and they focus on the case where the nonlinearities can be embedded in maximally monotone operators, as in [7], [12], [25], [39], or on classes of neural networks exhibiting a very specific structure, as for example in [18], [26]. A notable exception is [40] where input-to-state stability properties are established using trajectory-based arguments, and control design conditions are presented. Interestingly, none of these results provide finite-time stability properties, which are very natural when dealing with nonsmooth Lur'e systems. In fact, to the authors' best knowledge, very few results are available on the finite-time stability properties of Lur'e systems in general, see [36], which concentrates on cluster synchronization of networks of Lur'e systems.

Finite-time stability properties are gaining increasing attention due to their relevance in many applications such as high-order sliding mode algorithms [29], controllers for mechanical systems [6], spacecraft stabilization [43], observer design problems [2]; see [42] for additional examples. There is therefore a need for analytical tools to establish finite-time stability properties for this class of systems. In this context, we investigate the output and state finite-time stability properties of Lur'e system with piecewise continuous nonlinearities.

Historically, two different types of Lyapunov functions have been used to analyze the (absolute) stability of continuous-time Lur'e systems: quadratic functions of the state and the so-called Lur'e-Postnikov Lyapunov functions, which are the sum of a quadratic func-

tion of the state and a weighted sum of the integrals of the feedback nonlinearities [24]. Lur'e-Postnikov Lyapunov functions are generally used to draw less conservative sufficient stability conditions [45]. However, when the nonlinearities are piecewise continuous, as in, e.g., mechanical systems [11], neural networks [18], see also [10], the challenge is that Lur'e-Postnikov Lyapunov functions become only differentiable almost everywhere (being locally Lipschitz continuous) due to the discontinuity points of the nonlinearities. Indeed, when the system nonlinearities are piecewise continuous and a Lur'e-Postnikov Lyapunov function is considered, the standard tools used in the nonsmooth analysis, like Clarke's generalized directional derivatives, may lead to conservative algebraic Lyapunov conditions as we show in this paper; see also [31]. This limitation is overcome in [11], where trajectory-based arguments are used to prove an input-to-state (ISS) stability property, but no finite-time stability property is provided.

In this work, we first establish the global asymptotic stability of the origin for Lur'e systems with piecewise continuous nonlinearities under a more general condition than [11]. We resort for this purpose to a nonsmooth Lur'e-Postnikov Lyapunov function. We present algebraic Lyapunov decrease conditions by using the notion of set-valued Lie derivative [5], [15], [38]. The set-valued Lie derivative is the key to overcoming the conservatism that the customarily used Clarke's generalized directional derivative may give, as we illustrate in a dedicated example. The relevance of set-valued Lie derivative for Lyapunov analysis has already been shown in [15], [16], [22], [23], in the context of switched systems and differential inclusions. Regarding Lur'e systems, set-valued Lie derivatives are also used in [36], however, the Lyapunov function is quadratic there (thus continuously differentiable), which, as mentioned above, leads to more conservative conditions. On the other hand, while the absolute stability of Lur'e systems has been extensively studied within the input-output framework, as in e.g., [44], [45], the results presented in this manuscript rely on different, weaker, LMI-based conditions whose use in this work, and [11], ease the testing of the required conditions. Our proof technique not only allows us to extend the results in [11], but is key to establishing output and state finite-time stability properties for the considered Lur'e systems, which cannot be obtained with the trajectory-based approach of [11]. To illustrate the usefulness of our results we focus on two engineering applications, considered respectively in [11], [18] and that can be modeled as Lur'e systems. Indeed, we establish output finite-time and state-independent local asymptotic stability properties for mechanical systems subject to friction, which is a novelty compared to [11] and to the existing literature cast from the input-output framework, as in [44]. We certify that the cellular neural networks modeled as in [18] are state finite-time stable, thus retrieving the results in [18, Thm. 4] while coping with a more general class of Lur'e systems.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Notation and background material are given in Section II. The class of Lur'e systems under consideration is introduced in Section III. In Section IV, we address asymptotic stability characterizations with a novel algebraic Lyapunov proof. Finite-time stability results are given in Section V, while we discuss applications of these results in Section VI. In Section VII we give conclusions and some perspectives.

Work supported by the ANR grants HANDY ANR-18-CE40-0010 and OLYMPIA ANR-23-CE48-0006.

S. Mariano is with the University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia (e-mail: simone.mariano@unimelb.edu.au).

R. Postoyan is with the Université de Lorraine, CNRS, CRAN, F-54000 Nancy, France (e-mail: romain.postoyan@univ-lorraine.fr).

L. Zaccarian is with LAAS-CNRS, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, Toulouse, France and the Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Trento, Trento, Italy (e-mail: zaccarian@laas.fr).

II. NOTATION

Let \mathbb{R} be the set of real numbers, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} := [0, \infty)$, $\mathbb{R}_{> 0} := (0, \infty)$, $\mathbb{Z}_{> 0} := \{0, 1, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{Z}_{> 0} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Symbol \mathbb{B}_n denotes the closed unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n centered at the origin and we write \mathbb{B} when its dimension is clear from the context. We denote with \emptyset the empty set. Given a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote with x_ℓ its ℓ -th element, $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, with $|x|$ its Euclidean norm and with $|x|_\infty$ its infinity norm. Symbol $\mathbf{0}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector whose elements are all 0. I_n denotes the identity matrix of dimension $n \times n$ while O_n denotes the zero matrix of dimension $n \times n$. Given two vectors x_1, x_2 , we denote $(x_1, x_2) := [x_1^\top x_2^\top]^\top$. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, A_ℓ denotes its ℓ -th row, $|A|$ is its spectral norm while $\ker(A)$ stands for its kernel. $\text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ denotes a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Given a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$, $\overline{\text{co}}S$ is its closed convex hull. Given a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$, the domain of f is defined as $\text{dom } f = \{x \in X : f(x) \neq \emptyset\}$. A function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$ is radially unbounded if $f(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$. Let X and Y be two non-empty sets, $T : X \rightrightarrows Y$ denotes a set-valued map from X to Y . Class \mathcal{K} , \mathcal{K}_∞ and \mathcal{KL} functions are defined as in [19, Chap. 3]. A function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *piecewise continuous* if for any given interval $[a, b]$, with $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist a finite number of points $a \leq x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{k-1} < x_k \leq b$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that f is continuous on (x_{i-1}, x_i) for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and its one-sided limits exist as finite numbers. A function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *piecewise continuously differentiable* if f is continuous and for any given interval $[a, b]$, with $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a finite number of points $a \leq x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{k-1} < x_k \leq b$, with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that f is continuously differentiable on (x_{i-1}, x_i) for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and the one-sided limits $\lim_{s \rightarrow x_{i-1}^+} f'(s)$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow x_i^-} f'(s)$ exists for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Given a locally Lipschitz function $U : \text{dom } U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$, its Clarke's generalized gradient is defined as (see [13, page 11])

$$\partial U(x) := \text{co}\{\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nabla U(x_i) \mid x_i \rightarrow x, x_i \notin \mathcal{Z}, x_i \notin \Omega_U\}, \quad (1)$$

where Ω_U is the set (of Lebesgue measure zero) where U is not differentiable, and \mathcal{Z} is any other set of Lebesgue measure zero. A locally Lipschitz function $U : \text{dom } U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$, is *non-pathological* [5], [38] if, given any absolutely continuous function $\phi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \text{dom } U$, we have that, for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, there exists $a_t \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\langle u, \dot{\phi}(t) \rangle = a_t$ for all $u \in \partial U(\phi(t))$.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider the system of the form

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu, \quad y = Cx, \quad u = -\psi(y), \quad (2)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $u, y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are respectively the input and the output and A, B and C are real matrices of appropriate dimensions. The function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is decentralized, or diagonal, namely for any $y = (y_1, \dots, y_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\psi(y) = (\psi_1(y_1), \dots, \psi_p(y_p))$. We suppose that ψ satisfies the next sector condition.

Assumption 1: For any $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, ψ_i is piecewise continuous and there exists $\zeta_i \in (0, +\infty]$ such that

$$\psi_i(y_i)(\psi_i(y_i) - \zeta_i y_i) \leq 0, \quad \forall y_i \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3)$$

□

When the nonlinearities satisfy the sector condition of Assumption 1 with $\zeta_i = +\infty$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, (3) reads

$$-\psi_i(y_i)y_i \leq 0, \quad \forall y_i \in \mathbb{R} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, p\}, \quad (4)$$

and coincide with the constraint in [11]. Therefore, if (3) is satisfied with some finite ζ_i , the nonlinearities are embedded in a tighter region than the one defined by (4), which allows defining less conservative stability conditions than the ones given in [11]. Assumption 1 characterizes a so-called Lur'e system [24, Ch. 7], [45].

In view of Assumption 1, system (2) may have a discontinuous right-hand side. Therefore, when we refer to the solutions to system (2), we consider its so-called (generalized) Krasovskii solutions, which coincide with the solutions obtained by the Krasovskii regularization [20] of (2), that is

$$\dot{x} \in F(x) := Ax - B\Psi(Cx), \quad y = Cx, \quad (5)$$

where, consistently with [20], $\Psi(y) = \bigcap_{s>0} \overline{\text{co}}\psi(y + s\mathbb{B})$ and \mathbb{B} is the Euclidean unit ball. The following result simplifies the expression of Ψ under Assumption 1.

Lemma 1: For any ψ satisfying Assumption 1, it holds that Ψ in (5) can be expressed as $\Psi(y) = \Psi_1(y_1) \times \dots \times \Psi_p(y_p)$, whose components $\Psi_i(y_i) := \bigcap_{s>0} \overline{\text{co}}\psi_i(y_i + s\mathbb{B})$, $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, are the Krasovskii regularization of the components ψ_i of ψ . □

Proof: Pick any $y = (y_1, \dots, y_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Since ψ has piecewise continuous components, assume without loss of generality that ψ_i is continuous at y_i for the first $1 \leq \nu \leq p$ components, and discontinuous for the remaining ones. Denoting $\mathbb{B}_\infty := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^p : |\xi|_\infty \leq 1\}$, due to the existence of the left and right limits of ψ_i at any y_i , we may write

$$\bigcap_{s>0} \overline{\text{co}}\psi(y + s\mathbb{B}_\infty) = \{\psi_1(y_1)\} \times \dots \times \{\psi_\nu(y_\nu)\} \\ \times ([\underline{\psi}_{\nu+1}(y_{\nu+1}), \overline{\psi}_{\nu+1}(y_{\nu+1})]) \times \dots \times ([\underline{\psi}_p(y_p), \overline{\psi}_p(y_p)]).$$

where $\underline{\psi}_k(y_k) = \min(\{\lim_{\mu \rightarrow y_k^-} \psi_k(\mu), \lim_{\mu \rightarrow y_k^+} \psi(\mu)\})$ and $\overline{\psi}_k(y_k) = \max(\{\lim_{\mu \rightarrow y_k^-} \psi_k(\mu), \lim_{\mu \rightarrow y_k^+} \psi(\mu)\})$ for all $k \in \{\nu+1, \dots, p\}$. Recalling the equivalence among norms, giving $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{B}_\infty \subset \sqrt{p}\mathbb{B}$, we have that $\bigcap_{s>0} \overline{\text{co}}\psi(y + s\mathbb{B}) = \bigcap_{s>0} \overline{\text{co}}\psi(y + s\mathbb{B}_\infty)$, which can be combined with the definition of Ψ after (5) to get

$$\Psi(y) = \{\psi_1(y_1)\} \times \dots \times \{\psi_\nu(y_\nu)\} \\ \times ([\underline{\psi}_{\nu+1}(y_{\nu+1}), \overline{\psi}_{\nu+1}(y_{\nu+1})]) \times \dots \times ([\underline{\psi}_p(y_p), \overline{\psi}_p(y_p)]) \\ = \Psi_1(y_1) \times \dots \times \Psi_\nu(y_\nu) \times \Psi_{\nu+1}(y_{\nu+1}) \times \dots \times \Psi_p(y_p),$$

where the last equality trivially follows from the fact that each component ψ_i of ψ is a scalar function. ■

Remark 1: In view of Lemma 2.8 of [20], the Krasovskii regularization of $Ax - B\psi(Cx)$ in (5) coincides with the Filippov regularization. We choose here to adopt the Krasovskii regularization because it is associated with a simpler notation. □

Observe that, by Assumption 1, F is outer semicontinuous and locally bounded on \mathbb{R}^n and $F(x)$ is convex for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, thus local existence of solutions to (5) is guaranteed by Theorem 3 in [4, Ch. 2.1]. Moreover, by definition, each $\Psi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ is set-valued only on a set of isolated points, therefore it is locally integrable: a property that will be exploited in the following.

We analyze the stability properties of system (5) in the sequel, thereby ensuring the same stability properties for the Krasovskii solutions of (2) under the following assumption.

Assumption 2: There exist matrices $\Gamma > 0$ diagonal, $P = P^\top > 0$ and a scalar $\eta > 0$ such that

$$M := \begin{bmatrix} PA + A^\top P + \eta I_n & PB - (C + \Gamma CA)^\top \\ B^\top P - (C + \Gamma CA) & -2Z - \Gamma CB - (\Gamma CB)^\top \end{bmatrix} \leq 0, \quad (6)$$

where $Z := \text{diag}(\zeta_1^{-1}, \dots, \zeta_p^{-1})$ with¹ $\zeta_i \in (0, +\infty]$ in Assumption 1. \square

The linear matrix inequality (6) in Assumption 2 can be tested numerically by relying on several existing solvers whose efficiency is becoming increasingly high. Nevertheless, models with a large number of states might still pose a challenge for numerically testing (6), therefore several alternative tools are available in the literature, such as the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov lemma [24, Lemma 6.3], the results in Section 2.2.2 of [45], the equivalent conditions given in [9, Ch. 3.1] for minimal realizations or the results surveyed in [9, Ch. 3.3] for nonminimal ones, to cite a few.

IV. ASYMPTOTIC STABILITY

A. Nonsmooth Lur'e-Postnikov Lyapunov functions

Inspired by [11], [24] where Lur'e systems with continuous nonlinearities are considered, we study stability of the origin for system (5) with a Lur'e-Postnikov Lyapunov function V given by

$$V(x) := \frac{1}{2}x^\top Px + \sum_{i=1}^p \gamma_i \int_0^{C_i x} \psi_i(\sigma) d\sigma, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (7)$$

where P comes from Assumption 2. Function V may provide less conservative stability conditions as compared to simpler (and smooth) Lyapunov functions, such as quadratic forms. However, the price to be paid is that function V is nonsmooth, but only locally Lipschitz: there are points where its gradient is not defined. A standard tool to circumvent this is Clarke's generalized directional derivative, defined for each direction $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$ at each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as [13, page 11]

$$V^\circ(x; f) := \max\{\langle v, f \rangle : v \in \partial V(x)\},$$

where $\partial V(x)$ denotes Clarke's generalized gradient of V at x . By the definition in (1) and following parallel derivations to those in Lemma 1, we may characterize

$$\partial V(x) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid v \in Px + C^\top \Gamma(\Psi(Cx))\}, \quad (8)$$

where Ψ is the set-valued map introduced in (5). The Lyapunov analysis of system (5) using Clarke's generalized directional derivative of V is often too conservative to establish asymptotic stability of the origin. Roughly speaking, for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}_n\}$ there may exist a selection $f_{\text{bad}} \in F(x)$ that is never viable for any solution to (5) and such that $V^\circ(x, f_{\text{bad}}) > 0$, thereby preventing to prove that the origin of the system is globally asymptotically stable, as illustrated in the next example.

Example 1: Consider system (5) with $n = 2$, $p = 1$ (SISO case),

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = [1 \quad 0],$$

and where Ψ is the Krasovskii regularization of $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\frac{1}{4}, 1]$, defined as $\psi(s) = 1$ if $s > 0$, $\psi(s) = -\frac{1}{4}$ if $s < 0$, and $\psi(s) = 0$ if $s = 0$; hence $\Psi(0) = [-1/4, 1]$. Function ψ satisfies Assumption 1 with $\zeta_1 = +\infty$ (namely (4)). Consider V as in (7) with $P = I_2$ and $\Gamma = \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Furthermore, given matrices A , B , C and P , Assumption 2 is satisfied when it is chosen $\gamma = 1$, for example. Function (7) in this case is given by $V(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x_1^2 + x_2^2) + \gamma \int_0^{x_1} \psi(\sigma) d\sigma$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We have that V is positive definite and radially unbounded. Furthermore, V is not differentiable at $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$. By following [14, Ch. 4] as summarized in [31, Ch. 2.4.2], to analyze the stability of the origin for the considered system, we study at any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the maximum of $V^\circ(x; f)$ over all

allowable directions $f \in F(x)$ with F as in (5). In this regard, consider $x = (0, \frac{\gamma}{4})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{f \in F(0, \frac{\gamma}{2})} V^\circ((0, \frac{\gamma}{2}); f) &= \max \left\{ \langle v, f \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. v \in [-\frac{\gamma}{4}, \gamma] \times \{\frac{\gamma}{4}\}, f \in [-1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}, \frac{1}{4} - \frac{\gamma}{4}] \times \{-\frac{\gamma}{4}\} \right\} \\ &= \frac{\gamma}{4} > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

With this positive upper bound, in view of [31, Def. 2.16], we cannot establish asymptotic stability of the origin² [31, Thm. 2.18] for any γ . Nevertheless a direct inspection shows that V strictly decreases along all solutions outside the origin. The issue is overcome in the following by exploiting the notion of set-valued Lie derivative of V [5], [15], [16], [22], [23], [38]. \square

In [11], the authors overcame the limitations discussed in Example 1 by using *trajectory-based* Lyapunov arguments when Assumption 1 holds with $\zeta_i = +\infty$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. In the next theorem, we establish global asymptotic stability of the origin for system (5). Compared to [11], the result relies on the more general sector condition in (3), and, importantly for the sequel, its proof uses *algebraic* Lyapunov arguments.

Theorem 1: Consider system (5) and suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then the origin is GAS, i.e., there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ such that all solutions x satisfy

$$|x(t)| \leq \beta(|x(0)|, t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (10)$$

\square

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section IV-B, where we use the concept of set-valued Lie derivative that we now recall.

B. Set-valued Lie derivative and its properties

The set-valued Lie derivative of V with respect to F in (5) at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as [5], [38]

$$\dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) := \{a \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists f \in F(x) : \langle v, f \rangle = a, \forall v \in \partial V(x)\}, \quad (11)$$

with $\partial V(x)$ given in (8). Note that $\dot{\bar{V}}_F(x)$ is a subset of $\{\langle v, f \rangle \mid v \in \partial V(x), f \in F(x)\}$ and that, by definition, at any x where V is differentiable, so that $\partial V(x)$ is a singleton, this reduces to the set of all standard directional derivatives of V in any direction of $f \in F(x)$. Notice that $\dot{\bar{V}}_F(x)$ may be the empty set as illustrated later in Example 2. The next lemma provides an intuitive upper bound on the set-valued Lie derivative of V in (7) along dynamics (5), allowing us to take the same selection of u of the multi-valued component of Ψ in f and ∂V , as one does in the single-valued case, instead of needing to check all the values of v and f in (11).

Lemma 2: Given function V in (7) and F in (5),

$$\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) \leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} ((x^\top P - u^\top \Gamma C)(Ax + Bu)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (12)$$

where we use the convention $\sup \emptyset = -\infty$ for the left-hand side when $\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) = \emptyset$. \square

Proof: For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and each element $f = Ax + Bu \in F(x)$ with $u \in -\Psi(Cx)$, as in (5), denote $\rho(x, f) := Px - C^\top \Gamma u$ and note that $\rho(x, f) \in \partial V(x)$. Notice that ρ and f are defined by selecting the same $u \in -\Psi(Cx)$. In view of Lemma 8 in [28], exploiting this selection we have that $\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) \leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} (\rho(x, f)^\top f)$, thus concluding the proof. \blacksquare

²The Ryan's invariance principle [32] is also not applicable to guarantee asymptotic stability of the origin for this example.

¹When $\zeta_i = +\infty$ we use the convention $\zeta_i^{-1} = 0$.

Exploiting (11) and Lemma 2, we can establish the next algebraic Lyapunov conditions for system (5).

Proposition 1: Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then there exist $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that function V in (7) satisfies

$$\alpha_1(|x|) \leq V(x) \leq \alpha_2(|x|), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (13)$$

$$\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) \leq -\alpha_3(V(x)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (14)$$

for F in (5). \square

Proof: From (3) and (7), V is positive definite, continuous on \mathbb{R}^n and radially unbounded. Therefore, (13) holds by [24, Lemma 4.3]. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have from Lemma 2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) &\leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} \left[(x^\top P - u^\top \Gamma C)(Ax + Bu) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - u^\top (-Zu - Cx) - \frac{\eta}{2}|x|^2 + u^\top (-Zu - Cx) + \frac{\eta}{2}|x|^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

with Z as in Assumption 2. Therefore,

$$\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) \leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ u \end{bmatrix}^\top M \begin{bmatrix} x \\ u \end{bmatrix} + u^\top (Zu + Cx) \right) - \frac{\eta}{2}|x|^2, \quad (16)$$

with M as in (6). In view of Assumption 1, it holds that $u^\top (Zu + Cx) \leq 0$ for all $u \in -\Psi(Cx)$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, as $\Psi(Cx)$ is convex. Moreover, $M \leq 0$ in view of Assumption 2. Therefore, we have from (16)

$$\begin{aligned} \sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) &\leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} (u^\top (Zu + Cx)) - \frac{\eta}{2}|x|^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{\eta}{2}|x|^2 \leq -\frac{\eta}{2}(\alpha_2^{-1}(V(x)))^2 =: -\alpha_3(V(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

with $\alpha_3 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, which shows (14) and the proof is complete. \blacksquare

Proposition 1 is key for giving an algebraic proof of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let x be any solution to (5). In view of [28, Prop. 4] and [31, Lemma 2.20], V is non-pathological, and thus [31, Lemma 2.23] ensures that $\frac{d}{dt}V(x(t)) \in \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x(t))$ for almost all $t \in \text{dom } x$. Hence, in view of (14) in Proposition 1, we have that

$$\dot{V}(x(t)) \leq -\alpha_3(V(x(t))), \quad \text{for almost all } t \in \text{dom } x. \quad (18)$$

Following the steps of the proof of [33, Lemma A.4], we have that $\text{dom } x = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and there exists $\bar{\beta} \in \mathcal{KL}$ (independent of x) such that

$$V(x(t)) \leq \bar{\beta}(V(x(0)), t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (19)$$

Equations (13) and (19) imply $|x(t)| \leq \alpha_1^{-1}(V(x(t))) \leq \alpha_1^{-1}(\bar{\beta}(\alpha_2(|x(0)|), t)) =: \beta(|x(0)|, t)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, with $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$, thus concluding the proof. \blacksquare

With the help of Theorem 1, we can now establish that the origin of the system in Example 1 is GAS.

Example 2: The system in Example 1 satisfies both Assumptions 1 and 2 with the given selections of $Z, \Gamma = 1$ and P . As a result $x = \mathbf{0}_2$ is GAS in view of Theorem 1. It is instructive to see how the notion of set-valued Lie derivative helps overcoming the issue highlighted in Example 1. In particular, the set-valued Lie derivative of V with respect to F at $x = (0, \frac{\gamma}{4})$ is the empty set. Indeed, for each $f \in F(0, \frac{\gamma}{4})$ and any two different directions $v_1, v_2 \in \partial V(0, \frac{\gamma}{4})$ with $v_1 \neq v_2$, we have $\langle f, v_1 \rangle \neq \langle f, v_2 \rangle$, thus there exists no $a \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the condition in (11). More specifically, given $F(0, \frac{\gamma}{4}) = [-1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}, -\frac{\gamma}{4}] \times \{-\frac{\gamma}{4}\}$ and $\partial V(0, \frac{\gamma}{4}) = [-\frac{1}{4}, 1] \times \{\frac{\gamma}{4}\}$, by selecting $v_1, v_2 \in \partial V(0, \frac{\gamma}{4})$ with $v_1 \neq v_2$, and $f \in F(0, \frac{\gamma}{4})$ we have that $\langle f, v_1 \rangle = f_1 v_{1,1} - \frac{\gamma^2}{16}$ and $\langle f, v_2 \rangle = f_1 v_{2,1} - \frac{\gamma^2}{16}$ with $f_1 \in [-1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}, -\frac{\gamma}{4}]$ and $v_{1,1} \neq v_{2,1} \in [-\frac{1}{4}, 1]$. Therefore, $\langle f, v_1 \rangle = \langle f, v_2 \rangle$ if and only if $f_1(v_{1,1} - v_{2,1}) = 0$, which is impossible for the specified selection of f, v_1 and v_2 . Hence, there

exists no $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in F(0, \frac{\gamma}{4})$ such that $\langle f, v \rangle = a$ for all $v \in \partial V(0, \frac{\gamma}{4})$, thus implying that $\dot{\bar{V}}_F(0, \frac{\gamma}{4}) = \emptyset$. Besides this specific illustrative analysis, by exploiting Lemma 2 we may actually show that $\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) < 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}_2\}$. Indeed, we have that $\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) \leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(x_1)} (-x_1^2 + 2ux_1 - x_2^2 + ux_2 - u^2) =$

$\sup_{u \in -\Psi(x_1)} \left(-x_1^2 + 2ux_1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}x_2 - u\right)^2 - \frac{3}{4}x_2^2 \right) < 0$, because Assumption 1 implies $ux_1 < 0$. We, therefore, obtain that the supremum of the set-valued Lie derivative of V with respect to $F(x)$ is strictly negative outside the origin, which was not possible to prove using the conservative upper bound (9). \square

Remark 2: Since V in (7) is non-pathological, then given any solution to (5), for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ there exists $a_t \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\langle v, \dot{x}(t) \rangle = a_t$, for all $v \in \partial \dot{V}(x(t))$, with $\partial \dot{V}$ as in (8). Hence, in view of (11), there exist no $t_1 > t_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that, for every $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, $\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x(t)) = \emptyset$. \square

C. Extension under special properties of plant (2)

We illustrate here how the conditions of Theorem 1 can be extended to cases where inequality (6) does not hold but additional structural properties of matrices A, B and C in (5) can be exploited.

Property 1: The following holds for system (5).

- (i) Assumption 1 is satisfied.
- (ii) There exist matrices $\Gamma > 0$ diagonal, $P = P^\top > 0$ and a scalar $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\bar{M} := \begin{bmatrix} PA + A^\top P + \eta I_n & PB \\ B^\top P & -2Z - \Gamma CB - (\Gamma CB)^\top \end{bmatrix} \leq 0. \quad (20)$$

- (iii) There exist $H := \text{diag}(h_1, \dots, h_p)$ such that $\Gamma CA = HC$ and, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, either $h_i \leq -1$ holds, or $h_i \leq 0$ and $Z = O_p$ holds, with Z as in Assumption 2. \square

The conditions in items (ii) and (iii) in Property 1 impose extra properties of the matrices C and A (item (ii)) and a different matrix inequality compared to (6) (item (iii)), indeed as the off-diagonal terms of \bar{M} differ from those in M in (6). We show in the next lemma that Property 1 implies GAS of the origin for system (5). We will invoke this extension in Section VI to analyze the stability properties of the neural networks studied in [18].

Lemma 3: Suppose that system (5) satisfies items (i)-(iii) of Property 1. Then the origin is GAS for system (5). \square

Proof: Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and consider V in (7). We have from Lemma 2 that, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) &\leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} \left[(x^\top P - u^\top \Gamma C)(Ax + Bu) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - u^\top Zu - \frac{\eta}{2}|x|^2 + u^\top Zu + \frac{\eta}{2}|x|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

with Z as in Assumption 2. Therefore,

$$\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) \leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ u \end{bmatrix}^\top \bar{M} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ u \end{bmatrix} + u^\top (Zu - HCx) \right) - \frac{\eta}{2}|x|^2. \quad (22)$$

We note that, in view of Assumption 1, it holds that $u^\top (Zu - HCx) \leq 0$ for all $u \in -\Psi(Cx)$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Indeed, because each entry of $\Psi(y) = \Psi(Cx)$ is convex for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, by (3) it holds that $\alpha_i u_i y_i \leq -\frac{\alpha_i}{\zeta_i} u_i^2$, and $u_i y_i + \frac{1}{\zeta_i} u_i^2 + \alpha_i u_i y_i - \alpha_i u_i y_i \leq 0$, for any $\alpha_i \geq 0$, $u \in -\Psi(Cx)$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Therefore, we have $\frac{1}{\zeta_i} u_i^2 + (1 + \alpha_i) u_i y_i \leq \alpha_i u_i y_i \leq -\frac{\alpha_i}{\zeta_i} u_i^2 \leq 0$. When $h_i \leq -1$, taking $\alpha_i = -1 - h_i \geq 0$, we deduce that, for any $u \in -\Psi(Cx)$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $\frac{1}{\zeta_i} u_i^2 - h_i u_i y_i \leq 0$ and thus

$u^\top(Zu - HCx) \leq 0$ for all $u \in -\Psi(Cx)$. In the particular case where $Z = O_p$, $-u^\top HCx \leq 0$ is true for any negative semidefinite matrix diagonal H by (4), for all $u \in -\Psi(Cx)$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Moreover, we assumed $\bar{M} \leq 0$ in item (ii) of Lemma 3. Therefore, similar to (17), from (22) we have

$$\sup \dot{\bar{V}}_F(x) \leq -\frac{\eta}{2}|x|^2 \leq -\frac{\eta}{2}(\alpha_2^{-1}(V(x)))^2 =: -\bar{\alpha}_3(V(x)), \quad (23)$$

with $\bar{\alpha}_3 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. Then, as anticipated, by exploiting (13) and (23), and following similar steps of those in the proof of Theorem 1, we conclude that the origin is GAS for system (5). ■

V. FINITE-TIME STABILITY

A. Definitions and assumptions

We provide here conditions to guarantee output and state finite-time stability properties for system (5). In particular, we consider the next finite-time and asymptotic stability notions, see [34], [46].

Definition 1: Consider system (5). If its solutions are all forward complete (namely their domain is unbounded [3]), then we say that the system is:

- (i) *output globally asymptotically stable* (oGAS) if there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ such that for any solution x

$$|y(t)| \leq \beta(|x(0)|, t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0};$$

- (ii) *state-independent output locally asymptotically stable* (SIoLAS) if there exist $r > 0$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ such that for all solution x ,

$$|x(0)| < r \Rightarrow |y(t)| \leq \beta(|y(0)|, t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0};$$

- (iii) *output finite-time stable* (OFTS) if it is oGAS and for each solution x there exists $0 \leq T < +\infty$ such that $y(t) = \mathbf{0}_p$ for all $t \geq T$;
- (iv) *state finite-time stable* (SFTS) if the origin is GAS and for each solution x there exists $T \geq 0$ such that $x(t) = \mathbf{0}_n$, $\forall t \geq T$. □

To be able to prove the output stability properties in Definition 1, we make the next assumption.

Assumption 3: The following holds.

- (i) Matrix CB is *Lyapunov diagonally stable* (LDS) [21, Def. 5.3], i.e., there exists a diagonal matrix $\bar{\Gamma} > 0$ of appropriate dimensions such that $\bar{\Gamma}CB + (CB)^\top \bar{\Gamma} > 0$.
- (ii) The origin is GAS for system (5).
- (iii) Each ψ_i , with $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, is discontinuous at the origin and both its left and right limits are non-zero, i.e., for any $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \psi_i(s) > 0$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^-} \psi_i(s) < 0$. □

Item (i) of Assumption 3 imposes extra conditions on the matrices C and B of system (2). Sufficient conditions to ensure item (ii) of Assumption 3 are provided in Theorem 1 and Lemma 3. Finally, item (iii) of Assumption 3 requires each ψ_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, to be non-zero at the origin and to have non-zero left and right limit at zero as well. Examples of engineering systems satisfying Assumption 3 (as well as Assumptions 1 and 2) are provided in Section VI.

B. Output and state finite-time stability

We are now ready to present the main result of this section, whose proof is given in Section V-C.

Theorem 2: Consider system (5) and suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 hold, then system (5) is OFTS and SIoLAS. □

Theorem 2 establishes output finite-time stability properties for system (5). A natural question is then whether *state* finite-time

stability properties can also be guaranteed. An answer to this question is given in the next theorem which establishes that, whenever Assumptions 1 and 3 are satisfied, system (5) is SFTS if and only if C is invertible.

Theorem 3: Consider system (5) and suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 are verified. Then the system is SFTS if and only if matrix C is invertible. □

Proof: We start by proving that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, for any $\xi \in \ker(C) \cap \varepsilon \mathbb{B}_n$, $u = -(CB)^{-1}CA\xi$ belongs to $\Psi(\mathbf{0}_p)$ and $CA\xi + CBu = \mathbf{0}_p$. First, note that CB is invertible as it is LDS by item (ii) of Assumption 3. Hence, for any $\xi \in \ker(C) \cap \varepsilon \mathbb{B}_n$, $u = -(CB)^{-1}CA\xi$ is well-defined and $CA\xi + CBu = \mathbf{0}_p$. Secondly, in view of item (iii) of Assumption 3 there exists $\psi_o \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $[-\psi_o, \psi_o]^p \subseteq \Psi(\mathbf{0}_p)$. Therefore, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, for any $\xi \in \ker(C) \cap \varepsilon \mathbb{B}_n$ and any $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $|((CB)^{-1}CA)_i \xi| \leq \psi_o$, thus implying $u = -(CB)^{-1}CA\xi \in [-\psi_o, \psi_o]^p \subseteq \Psi(\mathbf{0}_p)$, as to be proven.

Now we are ready to prove the necessary and sufficient conditions of Theorem 3. The sufficient condition in Theorem 3 is a direct consequence of Theorem 2. We proceed by contradiction to prove the necessary condition in Theorem 3. We thus assume that C is not invertible and consider $\varepsilon > 0$ as at the beginning of this proof. Since for any $x \in \ker(C) \cap \varepsilon \mathbb{B}_n$ we can select $u = -(CB)^{-1}CAx$ that belongs to $\Psi(\mathbf{0}_p)$, we consider below solutions to (5) satisfying

$$\dot{x} = Ax - B(CB)^{-1}CAx, \quad x \in \ker(C) \cap \varepsilon \mathbb{B}_n, \quad (24)$$

which implies

$$\dot{y} = C\dot{x} = (CA - CB(CB)^{-1}CA)x = \mathbf{0}_p, \quad x \in \ker(C) \cap \varepsilon \mathbb{B}_n. \quad (25)$$

We now exploit (25) to attain a contradiction. By item (ii) of Assumption 3, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that any solution starting in $\delta \mathbb{B}_n$ does not leave $\varepsilon \mathbb{B}_n$ for all times. Let x_p be a nonzero solution starting in $\ker(C) \cap \delta \mathbb{B}_n$, with output $y_p = Cx_p$, which evolves according to (24) and (25). Then $y_p(0) = Cx_p(0) = \mathbf{0}_p$ and equation (25) imply $y_p(t) = Cx_p(t) = \mathbf{0}_p$ and $\dot{x}_p(t) = (A - B(CB)^{-1}CA)x_p(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. As a consequence, x_p exponentially converges to the origin but does not converge in finite-time. Such a solution establishes a contradiction, thus completing the proof. ■

We can now analyze the finite-time stability property of the system in Example 1 in light of Theorems 2 and 3.

Example 3: Consider the system in Example 1. Assumption 3 holds with $\bar{\Gamma} = 1$. As a result, the system is OFTS and SIoLAS. We also know from Theorem 2 that the system is not SFTS as C is not invertible. Another way to see it is to consider $x(0) \in X := \{0\} \times [-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]$. A possible solution to (5) is $x_p(t) = (0, x_2(0)e^{-t})$, which belongs to the set X for all $t \geq 0$. Moreover, we have that $y_p(t) = 0$ and $\dot{y}_p(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Clearly, x_p converges exponentially to the origin, but not in finite-time. □

Remark 3: In the framework of sliding mode of Lur'e systems with discontinuous nonlinearities, under Assumptions 1 and 3, Theorem 2 certifies that all the solutions to (5) converge in finite-time to the sliding surface $\mathcal{S} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Cx = 0\}$. Furthermore, Theorem 3 proves that there exists no control input discontinuous at $y = 0$ that can drive all the solutions to the origin in finite time when C is not invertible. Compared to the nonglobal results in [37, Theorem 2.1] and the conditions in (2.5.10) discussed in [37, §2.5], Theorems 2 and 3 provide global results and also studies the OFTS property, SFTS (or the lack of it), SI-oLAS, oGAS and GAS, not studied in [37], where the focus is on sliding phenomena. □

C. Proof of Theorem 2

The proof of Theorem 2 relies on the next lemma and proposition.

Lemma 4: Under Assumption 1 and item (iii) of Assumption 3, there exist $\nu > 0$ and $c > 0$, such that

$$|u| \geq c, \quad \forall u \in -\Psi(y), \quad \forall y \in \nu\mathbb{B}_p \setminus \{\mathbf{0}_p\}. \quad (26)$$

□

Proof: In view of item (iii) of Assumption 3, there exist positive parameters ν_o and c such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, ψ_i is continuous in the intervals $[-\nu_o, 0)$ and $(0, \nu_o]$, and $\min(|\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \psi_i(s)|, |\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^-} \psi_i(s)|) \geq 2c$. Hence, there exists $\nu \in (0, \nu_o]$ such that, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $s \in [-\nu, 0) \cup (0, \nu]$, $|\psi_i(s)| \geq c$. Therefore, we have that for any $y \in \nu\mathbb{B}_p \setminus \{\mathbf{0}_p\}$ there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that $|u| \geq |u_i| \geq c$ for all $u \in -\Psi(y)$ thus concluding the proof. ■

We also invoke the next proposition, which states algebraic properties of a piecewise continuously differentiable function,

$$W(Cx) := 2 \sum_{i=1}^p \bar{\gamma}_i \int_0^{C_i x} \psi_i(\sigma) d\sigma, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (27)$$

where $\bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_p > 0$ are positive parameters selected such that $\bar{\Gamma}CB + (CB)^\top \bar{\Gamma} > 0$, with $\bar{\Gamma} = \text{diag}(\bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_p)$, which exist by item (i) of Assumption 3. Function W enjoys the following properties.

Proposition 2: Suppose that Assumption 1 and items (i) and (iii) of Assumption 3 hold. Given function W in (27), there exist $\mu \in (0, \nu]$, with ν as in Lemma 4, and $\alpha_4, \alpha_5 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that

$$\alpha_4(|Cx|) \leq W(Cx) \leq \alpha_5(|Cx|), \quad \forall x \in \mu\mathbb{B}_n, \quad (28)$$

$$\sup \dot{\bar{W}}_F(Cx) \leq -c\omega, \quad \forall x \in \mu\mathbb{B}_n \setminus \ker(C), \quad (29)$$

with c as in Lemma 4, $\omega := \lambda_1(c - 2\mu\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}) > 0$, λ_1 is the smallest eigenvalue of $\bar{\Gamma}CB + (CB)^\top \bar{\Gamma}$, and $\lambda_2 := |\bar{\Gamma}CA|$. □

Proof: From (27) and Lemma 4, for any $x \in \mu\mathbb{B}_n \setminus \ker(C)$, $W(Cx) > 0$ while $W(Cx) = 0$ for any $x \in \ker(C) \cap \mu\mathbb{B}_n$. Moreover, we have that W is continuous on $\mu\mathbb{B}_n$. Therefore, (28) holds in view of [24, Lemma 4.3]. Let $x \in \mu\mathbb{B}_n \setminus \ker(C)$, from Lemma 2, by imposing $P = 0$ and $\Gamma = \bar{\Gamma}$ in (12), we have

$$\sup \dot{\bar{W}}_F(Cx) \leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} (-2u^\top \bar{\Gamma}C(Ax + Bu)). \quad (30)$$

Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup \dot{\bar{W}}_F(Cx) &\leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} (-u^\top (\bar{\Gamma}CB + (CB)^\top \bar{\Gamma})u \\ &\quad + 2|\bar{\Gamma}CA||x||u|). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Thus, in view of item (i) of Assumption 3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup \dot{\bar{W}}_F(Cx) &\leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} (-\lambda_1|u|^2 + 2|\bar{\Gamma}CA||x||u|), \\ &= \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} (-(\lambda_1|u| - 2|\bar{\Gamma}CA||x|)|u|), \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} \left(-\lambda_1(|u| - 2\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}|x|)|u| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Hence, in view of Lemma 4, by selecting $\mu \in (0, \nu]$ we have that $\sup \dot{\bar{W}}_F(Cx) \leq \sup_{u \in -\Psi(Cx)} (-\omega|u|) \leq -c\omega$, where

$\omega = \lambda_1(c - 2\frac{\lambda_2\mu}{\lambda_1}) > 0$, thus concluding the proof. ■

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2. To prove the OFTS property of system (5), we proceed by steps. We first show that, for solutions to (5) initialized in a neighborhood of the origin, the corresponding

output converges to the origin in finite time and then, leveraging the GAS property of the origin for (5), we prove OFTS of (5).

Proof of Theorem 2. We start by proving that solutions initialized sufficiently close to the origin converge to $\ker(C)$ in finite time by integrating (29). To do so, we recall that, by the GAS property of the origin, there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that solutions starting in $\kappa\mathbb{B}$ will not leave $\mu\mathbb{B}$, with μ as in Proposition 2 and we note that the set $\mu\mathbb{B}_n \cap \ker(C)$ is forward invariant for any solution starting $\kappa\mathbb{B}_n \cap \ker(C)$. Indeed, suppose that there exists a solution x_{bad} to (5) such that $x_{\text{bad}}(0) \in \kappa\mathbb{B}_n \cap \ker(C)$ and $x_{\text{bad}}(t^*) \notin \mu\mathbb{B}_n \cap \ker(C)$ for some $t^* > 0$ with $t^* \in \text{dom } x_{\text{bad}}$. Since x_{bad} is continuous with respect to the time, we can choose $t^* > 0$ such that $x_{\text{bad}}(t) \in \kappa\mathbb{B}_n \cap \ker(C)$ for all $t \in [0, t^*)$ and $x_{\text{bad}}(t^*) \in \mu\mathbb{B}_n \setminus \ker(C)$. Hence, from (27) and (29), and from the fact that W is positive definite on $\mu\mathbb{B}_n$ and non-pathological, we have $0 = W(Cx_{\text{bad}}(t)) < W(Cx_{\text{bad}}(t^*))$, for all $t \in [0, t^*)$, which establishes a contradiction by the continuity property of W . Consequently, solutions cannot leave $\mu\mathbb{B}_n \cap \ker(C)$ after reaching the set $\kappa\mathbb{B}_n \cap \ker(C)$. Therefore, by combining (29) with the fact that W is non-pathological, and the forward invariance of $\mu\mathbb{B}_n \cap \ker(C)$ for solutions starting in $\kappa\mathbb{B}_n \cap \ker(C)$, for any solution x initialized so that $x(0) \in \kappa\mathbb{B}_n \setminus \ker(C)$, we obtain by integration for any $t \in \text{dom } x$ such that $x(t) \in \mu\mathbb{B}_n \setminus \ker(C)$

$$W(Cx(t)) \leq -c\omega t + W(Cx(0)), \quad (33)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} W(Cx(t)) &\leq \max(-c\omega t + W(Cx(0)), 0), \\ \forall x(0) &\in \kappa\mathbb{B}_n, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Thus, in view of (34) and by the GAS property of the origin, we conclude that, for any solutions starting in $\kappa\mathbb{B}$, there exists a T_y , depending on κ , such that $x(t) \in \kappa\mathbb{B} \cap \ker(C)$ for any $t \geq T_y$. We now leverage the GAS property of the origin to prove that (5) is OFTS. We recall that, for any solution x to (5), by the GAS property of the origin there exists a time $T_\kappa \geq 0$ such that $x(t) \in \kappa\mathbb{B}$ for all $t \geq T_\kappa$. Therefore, we conclude that $y(t) = \mathbf{0}_p$ for all $t \geq T := T_\kappa + T_y$. We have proved that, for any solution x , there exists $T \geq 0$ such that $y(t) = \mathbf{0}_p$, for all $t \geq T$. Moreover, system (5) is oGAS because it is GAS from item (i) of Assumption 3 and because $|y| \leq |C||x|$. Therefore, system (5) is OFTS.

Finally, we prove that system (5) is also SiOLAS. Indeed, combining (28) and (34) yields, for any solution x with $x(0) \in \kappa\mathbb{B}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t)| &\leq \alpha_4^{-1}(\max(-c\omega t + \alpha_5(Cx(0)), 0)) \\ &=: \beta_o(|y(0)|, t), \quad \forall x(0) \in \kappa\mathbb{B}_n, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

with $\beta_o \in \mathcal{KL}$, thus ending the proof. ■

VI. APPLICATIONS

A. Mechanical system affected by friction [11]

Consider the rotor dynamic system with friction system given in [11, Sec. 5], i.e.,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\alpha} \\ \dot{\omega}_u \\ \dot{\omega}_\ell \end{bmatrix} \in \begin{bmatrix} \omega_u - \omega_\ell \\ -\frac{k_\theta}{J_u} \alpha - \frac{b}{J_u}(\omega_u - \omega_\ell) - \frac{1}{J_u} T_{fu}(\omega_u) + \frac{k_u}{J_u} v \\ \frac{k_\theta}{J_\ell} \alpha + \frac{b}{J_\ell}(\omega_u - \omega_\ell) - \frac{1}{J_\ell} T_{f\ell}(\omega_\ell) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

with $x = (\alpha, \omega_u, \omega_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where α is the angular mismatch between two rotating discs connected by an angular spring and an angular dumper, and ω_u and ω_ℓ are the angular velocities of these two discs. Scalars $J_u, J_\ell, k_u, k_\theta$ and b are positive system parameters whose values are reported in Table VI-A. The control input $v \in \mathbb{R}$ is

b	[Nm ² /rad s]	0
$f_{u,\circ}$	[N m]	0.38
Δf_u	[N m]	-0.006
$f_{\ell,\circ}$	[N m]	0.0009
Δf_ℓ	[N m]	0.68
J_u	[kg m ²]	0.4765
J_ℓ	[kg m ²]	0.035
k_u	[N m/V]	4.3228
k_θ	[N m/rad]	0.075
q_1	[kg m ² /rad s]	2.4245
q_2	[kg m ² /rad s]	-0.0084
q_3	[s/rad]	0.05
q_4	[kg m ² /rad s]	0.26

TABLE I

PARAMETERS IDENTIFYING THE SYSTEM GIVEN IN [11, SEC. 5].

used for state-feedback stabilization, while the set-valued maps T_{f_u} and T_{f_ℓ} in (36) are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_{f_u}(s) &:= \begin{cases} f_u(s)\text{sign}(s), & \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \\ [-f_{u,\circ} + \Delta f_u, f_{u,\circ} + \Delta f_u], & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\
 f_u(s) &:= f_{u,\circ} + \Delta f_u \text{sign}(s) + q_1|s| + q_2s, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \\
 T_{f_\ell}(s) &:= \begin{cases} f_\ell(s)\text{sign}(s), & \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \\ [-f_{\ell,\circ}, f_{\ell,\circ}], & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\
 f_\ell(s) &:= f_{\ell,\circ} + (\Delta f_\ell - f_{\ell,\circ})e^{-q_3|s|} + q_4|s|, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R},
 \end{aligned}$$

for suitable positive scalars $f_{u,\circ}$, $f_{\ell,\circ}$, Δf_u , Δf_ℓ , q_1 , q_2 , q_3 and q_4 we give in Table VI-A and with function $\text{sign} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ defined as $\text{sign}(s) = 1$ if $s > 0$, $\text{sign}(s) = -1$ if $s < 0$, and $\text{sign}(s) = 0$ if $s = 0$, and for which we have that (3) is satisfied with $\zeta_1 = \zeta_2 = \infty$.

Like in [17, Ch. 6], by considering the selection $v = v_p + v_{\text{lin}}$ in (36), where $v_{p1} := Kx$, $K = [k_1, k_2, k_3] \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$ and $v_{\text{lin}} := \frac{1}{k_u} T_{f_u}(\omega_u)$, we obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \omega_u \\ \omega_\ell \end{bmatrix} \in \begin{bmatrix} \omega_u - \omega_\ell \\ -\frac{k_\theta}{J_u} \alpha - \frac{b}{J_u} (\omega_u - \omega_\ell) + \frac{k_u}{J_u} (k_1 \alpha + k_2 \omega_u + k_3 \omega_\ell) \\ \frac{k_\theta}{J_\ell} \alpha + \frac{b}{J_\ell} (\omega_u - \omega_\ell) - \frac{1}{J_\ell} T_{f_\ell}(\omega_\ell) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

which can be written in the Lur'e form (5), with $n = 3$ and $p = 1$, and $A = A_{\text{free}} + H_1 K + H_2$,

$$A_{\text{free}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -\frac{k_\theta}{J_u} & -\frac{b}{J_u} & \frac{b}{J_u} \\ \frac{k_\theta}{J_\ell} & \frac{b}{J_\ell} & -\frac{b}{J_\ell} \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_1 K = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{k_u k_1}{J_u} & \frac{k_u k_2}{J_u} & \frac{k_u k_3}{J_u} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$H_2 = \text{diag}(0, 0, \frac{m}{J_u})$ and $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $B = (0, 0, \frac{1}{J_\ell})$, $C = [0, 0, 1]$ and $\Psi(Cx) = \Psi(\omega_\ell) = T_{f_\ell}(\omega_\ell) + m\omega_\ell$.

Inequality (6) in Assumption 2 is satisfied with the selection $m = 0.052$, $\Gamma = \gamma_1 = 10$, $\eta = 8.492$, $K = [-12.8282, 3.7216, -8.4816]$ and

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5636 & 0.0340 & 0.3793 \\ 0.0340 & 0.0062 & 0.0186 \\ 0.3793 & 0.0186 & 0.2642 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since Assumption 1 is also satisfied, Theorem 1 implies that the origin is GAS for (5), thus retrieving the result originally presented in [11]. In addition, because Assumption 3 holds for the considered system, we establish here, from Theorem 2, that system (5) is OFTS and SiOLAS, which is a novelty compared to [11].

B. Cellular neural networks from [18]

In [18], cellular neural networks are modeled by system (2) (see [18, eq. (N1)-(N2)]), where the system data satisfies the next property according to [18, Prop. 3 and 4].

Property 2: The following holds for system (2).

- (i) A is a diagonal, negative definite matrix.
- (ii) B is LDS (as per Assumption 3).
- (iii) $C = I_n$.
- (iv) For any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, function ψ_i is nondecreasing, i.e., for any $a > b \in \text{dom } \psi_i$ it holds that $\psi_i(a) \geq \psi_i(b)$, is piecewise continuous and satisfies Assumption 1 with $\zeta_i = +\infty$ and item (iii) of Assumption 3. \square

Property 2 trivially implies Assumption 1 and items (i) and (iii) of Assumption 3. We show below that it also implies item (ii) of Assumption 3 so that we can invoke Theorems 1 and 2 to prove GAS of the origin for system (5) and that system (5) is SFTS, thus providing alternative proofs of the stability results given in [18, Thm. 3 and 4]. Indeed, we recall that, by proving stability properties for system (5), we ensure the same stability properties for the Krasovskii solutions of (2).

Lemma 5: Suppose that system (2) satisfies Property 2. Then the origin is GAS for system (5), and system (5) is SFTS. \square

Proof: We prove below that there exist matrices $\Gamma > 0$ diagonal, $P = P^\top > 0$ and a scalar $\eta > 0$ satisfying (20). Since B is LDS, there exists a $\Gamma > 0$ diagonal such that $\Gamma B + (\Gamma B)^\top =: \Sigma > 0$ and such that $\Gamma A \leq -I_n$. With this selection, we can rewrite matrix \bar{M} in (20) as,

$$\bar{M} = \begin{bmatrix} PA + A^\top P & PB \\ B^\top P & -\Sigma \end{bmatrix} + \text{diag}(\eta I_n, \mathbf{0}_n), \quad (38)$$

noting that Z is the null matrix due to item (iv) of Property 2. Define

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{M} &:= \begin{bmatrix} PA + A^\top P & PB \\ B^\top P & -\Sigma \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & I_n \end{bmatrix} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} SA^\top + AS & B \\ B^\top & -\Sigma \end{bmatrix}}_{=: N} \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & I_n \end{bmatrix},
 \end{aligned}$$

where $S = P^{-1}$. Since A is Hurwitz by item (i) of Property 2, there exists $S_o = S_o^\top > 0$ such that $S_o A^\top + AS_o = \Pi < 0$. Therefore, by selecting $S = \alpha S_o$ with $\alpha > 0$, to be chosen, we have that

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \Pi & B \\ B^\top & -\Sigma \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad \forall \alpha > \alpha^*, \quad (39)$$

where $\alpha^* > 0$ satisfies $-\alpha^* \lambda_\Pi > |B \Sigma B^\top|$, with $\lambda_\Pi > 0$ denoting the smallest eigenvalue of Π . Hence, with the given selection of α and P , matrix N and thus \tilde{M} are negative definite. Therefore, by selecting $0 < \eta < -|\tilde{M}|$ we have that $\bar{M} \leq 0$ thus proving (20) and item (ii) of Property 1. Consider now item (iii) of Property 1 and note that matrix $H = \Gamma A < 0$ is diagonal negative definite and satisfies $\Gamma C A = \Gamma A = H = H C$. Since $Z = O_p$ due to item (iv) of Property 2, then item (iii) of Property 1 holds and we can invoke Lemma 3 to certify that the origin is GAS for system (5) and render Property 2. Furthermore, since Assumptions 1 and 3 hold, then, by Theorem 3, system (5) is also SFTS because C is invertible. \blacksquare

We envision applying our results to a broader class of neural networks with piecewise continuous activation functions. Due to the short length of a technical note submission, we do not pursue such generalizations here and we regard them as future work.

VII. CONCLUSION

We have analyzed the stability of the origin for Lur'e systems with piecewise continuous nonlinearities. We have first established the global asymptotic stability of the origin under a milder sector condition compared to [11] and by relying on a different, algebraic

Lyapunov proof based on the concept of set-valued Lie derivative. We have then presented conditions under which finite-time stability properties can or cannot be established for the considered class of systems. These results have been applied to two engineering systems of interest: mechanical systems with friction and cellular neural networks.

Future research directions may include: systems affected by exogenous disturbances; weak stability analysis for the considered class of systems in the sense that only some solutions exhibit the desired stability properties; as well as the synchronization of interconnected Lur'e systems with piecewise continuous nonlinearities following the path of paved by [8], [36].

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Acary and B. Brogliato. *Numerical Methods for Nonsmooth Dynamical Systems: Applications in Mechanics and Electronics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [2] V. Andrieu and S. Tarbouriech. LMI sufficient conditions for contraction and synchronization. In *IFAC Symposium for Nonlinear Control*, pages 616–621, 2019.
- [3] D. Angeli and E.D. Sontag. Forward completeness, unboundedness observability, and their Lyapunov characterizations. *Systems & Control Letters*, 38(4-5):209–217, 1999.
- [4] J.P. Aubin and A. Cellina. *Differential Inclusions: Set-valued Maps and Viability Theory*, volume 264. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [5] A. Bacciotti and F. Ceragioli. Stability and stabilization of discontinuous systems and nonsmooth Lyapunov functions. *ESAIM: COCV*, 4:361–376, 1999.
- [6] G. Bartolini, A. Pisano, E. Punta, and E. Usai. A survey of applications of second-order sliding mode control to mechanical systems. *International Journal of Control*, 76(9-10):875–892, 2003.
- [7] B. Brogliato. Dissipative dynamical systems with set-valued feedback loops: Well-posed set-valued Lur'e dynamical systems. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 42(3):93–114, 2022.
- [8] B. Brogliato and W.P.M.H. Heemels. Observer design for Lur'e systems with multivalued mappings: A passivity approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(8):1996–2001, 2009.
- [9] B. Brogliato, R. Lozano, B. Maschke, and O. Egeland. *Dissipative Systems Analysis and Control*. Springer, 2007.
- [10] B. Brogliato and A. Tanwani. Dynamical systems coupled with monotone set-valued operators: Formalisms, applications, well-posedness, and stability. *SIAM Review*, 62(1):3–129, 2020.
- [11] J.C.A. De Bruin, Doris A., N. van de Wouw, W.P.M.H. Heemels, and H. Nijmeijer. Control of mechanical motion systems with non-collocation of actuation and friction: A Popov criterion approach for input-to-state stability and set-valued nonlinearities. *Automatica*, 45(2):405–415, 2009.
- [12] M.K. Camlibel and J.M. Schumacher. Linear passive systems and maximal monotone mappings. *Mathematical programming*, 157:397–420, 2016.
- [13] F.H. Clarke. *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*. Classics in Applied Mathematics vol. 5, SIAM, Philadelphia, U.S.A., 1990.
- [14] F.H. Clarke, Y.S. Ledyaev, R.J. Stern, and P.R. Wolenski. *Nonsmooth Analysis and Control Theory*, volume 178. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- [15] M. Della Rossa, A. Tanwani, and L. Zaccarian. Max–min Lyapunov functions for switched systems and related differential inclusions. *Automatica*, 120:109123, 2020.
- [16] M. Della Rossa, A.I. Tanwani, and L. Zaccarian. Nonpathological ISS-Lyapunov functions for interconnected differential inclusions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(8):3774–3789, 2022.
- [17] A. Doris. *Output-feedback design for non-smooth mechanical systems: Control synthesis and experiments*. PhD Thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands, 2007.
- [18] M. Forti and P. Nistri. Global convergence of neural networks with discontinuous neuron activations. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 50(11):1421–1435, 2003.
- [19] R. Goebel, R.G. Sanfelice, and A.R. Teel. *Hybrid Dynamical Systems: Modeling, Stability, and Robustness*. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [20] O. Hájek. Discontinuous differential equations, I. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 32(2):149–170, 1979.
- [21] D. Hershkowitz. Recent directions in matrix stability. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 171:161–186, 1992.
- [22] R. Kamalapurkar, W.E. Dixon, and A.R. Teel. On reduction of differential inclusions and Lyapunov stability. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 26:24, 2020.
- [23] R. Kamalapurkar, J.A. Rosenfeld, A. Parikh, A.R. Teel, and W.E. Dixon. Invariance-like results for nonautonomous switched systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 64(2):614–627, 2018.
- [24] H.K. Khalil. *Nonlinear Systems, 3rd Edition*. Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [25] B.K. Le. On a class of Lur'e dynamical systems with state-dependent set-valued feedback. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 28:537–557, 2020.
- [26] X. Liu, J.H. Park, N. Jiang, and J. Cao. Nonsmooth finite-time stabilization of neural networks with discontinuous activations. *Neural Networks*, 52:25–32, 2014.
- [27] I. Lur'e and V.N. Postnikov. On the theory of stability and control systems. *Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, 8(3), 1944.
- [28] S. Mariano, R. Bertollo, R. Postoyan, and L. Zaccarian. Hybrid coupling rules for leaderless heterogeneous oscillators: Uniform global asymptotic and finite-time synchronization. *Automatica*, 159:111324, 2024.
- [29] A. Polyakov, D. Efimov, and W. Perruquetti. Finite-time and fixed-time stabilization: Implicit Lyapunov function approach. *Automatica*, 51:332–340, 2015.
- [30] V.M. Popov. On absolute stability of nonlinear automatic control systems. *Automatika i Telemekhanika*, 22(8):961–979, 1961.
- [31] M. Della Rossa. *Non-Smooth Lyapunov Functions for Stability Analysis of Hybrid Systems*. PhD Thesis, University of Toulouse, France, 2020.
- [32] E.P. Ryan. An integral invariance principle for differential inclusions with applications in adaptive control. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 36(3):960–980, 1998.
- [33] E.D. Sontag and Y. Wang. On characterizations of the input-to-state stability property. *Systems and Control Letters*, 24(1):351–359, 1995.
- [34] E.D. Sontag and Y. Wang. Lyapunov characterizations of input to output stability. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 39(1):226–249, 2000.
- [35] J.A.K. Soykens, J. Vandewalle, and B. De Moor. Lur'e systems with multilayer perceptron and recurrent neural networks: absolute stability and dissipativity. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 44(4):770–774, 1999.
- [36] Z. Tang, J. H. Park, and H. Shen. Finite-time cluster synchronization of Lur'e networks: A nonsmooth approach. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 48(8):1213–1224, 2017.
- [37] V.V. Utkin, J. Guldner, and J. Shi. *Sliding mode control in electro-mechanical systems*. CRC press, 2017.
- [38] M. Valadier. Entraînement unilatéral, lignes de descente, fonctions Lipschitziennes non pathologiques. *CRAS Paris*, 308:241–244, 1989.
- [39] N. van de Wouw and R.I. Leine. Stability and control of Lur'e-type measure differential inclusions. In *Dynamics And Control Of Hybrid Mechanical Systems*, pages 129–151. World Scientific, 2010.
- [40] Na. van de Wouw, A. Doris, J.C.A. de Bruin, W.P.M.H. Heemels, and H. Nijmeijer. Output-feedback control of Lur'e-type systems with set-valued nonlinearities: a Popov-criterion approach. In *2008 American Control Conference*, pages 2316–2321. IEEE, 2008.
- [41] F. Vasca, L. Iannelli, M. K. Çamlıbel, and R. Frasca. A new perspective for modeling power electronics converters: Complementarity framework. *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, 24(2):456–468, 2009.
- [42] V.I. Vorotnikov. *Partial Stability and Control*. Springer, 1998.
- [43] V.I. Vorotnikov. Partial stability, stabilization and control: some recent results. In *15th IFAC Triennial World Congress*, 2002.
- [44] V.A. Yakubovich. Popov's method and its subsequent development. *European Journal of Control*, 8(3):200–208, 2002.
- [45] V.A. Yakubovich, G.A. Leonov, and A.K. Gelig. *Stability of Stationary Sets in Control Systems with Discontinuous Nonlinearities*, volume 14. World Scientific Singapore, 2004.
- [46] K. Zimenko, D. Efimov, A. Polyakov, and A. Kremlev. On necessary and sufficient conditions for output finite-time stability. *Automatica*, 125:109427, 2021.