



HAL
open science

Local Halanay's Inequality with Application to Feedback Stabilization *

Michael Malisoff, Frederic Mazenc

► **To cite this version:**

Michael Malisoff, Frederic Mazenc. Local Halanay's Inequality with Application to Feedback Stabilization *. Mathematical Control and Related Fields, 2024. hal-04621069

HAL Id: hal-04621069

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-04621069>

Submitted on 23 Jun 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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Local Halanay's Inequality with Application to Feedback Stabilization*

Michael Malisoff[†] and Frédéric Mazenc[‡]

Abstract. We provide a local version of an approach to proving asymptotic stability that is based on Halanay's inequality. Our results are applicable to a family of nonlinear systems that contain state and input delays. We determine input-to-state stability inequalities when the systems contain additive uncertainty. We combine the results with an observer and a Gramian approach, to solve an output feedback stabilization problem. Our numerical examples illustrate how our theorems lead to new basin of attraction estimates.

Key words. Stabilization, delayed systems, feedback control

MSC codes. 93D25, 93C23

1. Introduction. Since its introduction in [6], Halanay's inequality and its generalizations have been very useful in many cases to establish asymptotic stability properties for families of nonlinear systems. These results have been developed in several contributions, including [5], [7], [12], [13], [15], [16], and [17] for both continuous-time and discrete-time systems. In its basic form (e.g., [4, Lemma 4.2, p. 138]), Halanay's inequality calls for finding nonnegative valued differentiable functions v and constants $a > 0$, $b \in (0, a)$, and $T > 0$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad \dot{v}(t) \leq -av(t) + b \sup_{\ell \in [t-T, t]} v(\ell)$$

holds for all $t \geq T$, in order to prove that $v(t)$ exponentially converges to 0 as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. See also works such as [20] for generalizations where, instead of being constants, the a and b in (1.1) can depend on t , which include cases where there are t values such that $b(t) > a(t)$, and which explain the advantages of using Halanay's inequality approaches for stability analysis instead of standard Lyapunov function methods. However, to the best of our knowledge, they only apply to globally exponentially stable systems. On the other hand, in many cases, nonlinear systems are only locally exponentially stable, and in those cases, the global Halanay's results cannot be applied to establish global stability results. [Moreover, surprisingly perhaps, to the best of our knowledge, there is no general result ensuring that a nonlinear system with input or state delays whose linear approximation at the origin is exponentially stabilizable is an open loop locally exponentially stable system \(although substituting a feedback control may make the closed loop system locally exponentially stable\).](#) More generally, we think that the

*Submitted to the editors January 1, 2024. A 6 page summary of some of this work, including only one example and excluding systems with outputs, has been submitted as a conference paper to the Fourth IFAC Conference on Modelling, Identification and Control of Nonlinear Systems, to be held September 4-6, 2024, in Lyon, France.

Funding: This work was funded by US National Science Foundation Division of Mathematical Sciences Applied Mathematics Program Grants 2009659 and 2308282.

[†]Department of Mathematics, 303 Lockett Hall, 175 Field House Drive, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-4918 USA (malisoff@lsu.edu, <https://www.math.lsu.edu/~malisoff/>).

[‡]Inria EPI DISCO, L2S-CNRS-CentraleSupélec, 3 rue Joliot Curie, 91192, Gif-sur-Yvette, France (fred-eric.mazenc@centralesupelec.fr, <https://l2s.centralesupelec.fr/en/u/mazenc-frederic/>).

31 local stability or stabilization of delayed systems is an under-studied topic even if [1], [3], and
 32 [9] present results on this subject. This motivates the present work.

33 We establish a local version of the Halanay's inequality based stability result for functions
 34 that satisfy a nonlinear differential inequality in a suitable local sense. We apply it to systems
 35 that contain small bounded additive uncertainties, and we determine input-to-state-stability
 36 (or ISS) inequalities; see below for the definition of ISS. The results can be applied to nonlinear
 37 systems with delays, and enable us to estimate basins of attraction. In Section 4, we apply
 38 this result to a local output feedback exponential stabilization problem using an observer and
 39 an invertible Gramian approach. We revisit the main result of the paper [11], by considering
 40 systems with poorly known nonlinear terms that violate the usual linear growth conditions.

41 We state and prove our local Halanay's inequality result in Section 2, which we use to prove
 42 our local exponential stabilization result for state feedback in Section 3, and our generalization
 43 for systems with outputs in Section 4. Our work covers nonlinear systems with distributed
 44 state delays and time-varying input delays. We illustrate our results in Section 5 using a
 45 controlled version of van der Pol's equation, and a system with an output and a saturation,
 46 whose structures preclude using previous methods to prove global stabilization, but which are
 47 amenable to our results. This leads to our estimates for basins of attraction and sufficient
 48 conditions on the bounds for the uncertainties for our local stabilization estimates to hold.
 49 Then in Section 6, we provide our suggestions for future research.

We use standard notation which we simplify when no confusion would arise. The dimen-
 sions of our Euclidean spaces are arbitrary, unless indicated otherwise, and $|\cdot|$ is the usual
 Euclidean vector norm and corresponding matrix operator norm. For matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and
 $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we write $A \leq B$ provided $B - A$ is nonnegative definite, and I denotes the identity
 matrix. When r is a time variable, we use the standard notation $g_r(\ell) = g(r + \ell)$ for functions
 g and all $\ell \leq 0$ and $r \geq 0$ such that $r + \ell$ is in the domain of g . We also use the standard
 family of functions \mathcal{K}_∞ and the standard definitions of ISS [8, 19] and controllability [18]. Let
 us recall the definition of ISS systems. A system of the form

$$\dot{X}(t) = f(t, X_t, \delta(t))$$

with initial conditions in the set $C^0([-\bar{\tau}, 0])$ of all \mathbb{R}^n -valued continuous functions that are
 defined in the interval $[-\bar{\tau}, 0]$ and a delay $\tau(t)$ valued in $[0, \bar{\tau}]$ for all $t \geq 0$ for a given constant
 $\bar{\tau} \geq 0$ is ISS with respect to δ , where δ is a locally bounded piecewise continuous function,
 provided there are a function β of class \mathcal{KL} and a function α of class \mathcal{K} such that all the
 solutions of the system are such that

$$|X(t)| \leq \beta(|X_s|, t - s) + \alpha \left(\sup_{m \in [s, t]} |\delta(m)| \right)$$

50 for all $t \geq s$ and all $s \geq 0$.

51 **2. Local ISS Halanay's results.** Let $\alpha : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a continuous, nonnegative
 52 valued and nondecreasing function such that there are two constants $v_\star > 0$ and $a > 0$ such
 53 that

$$54 \quad (2.1) \quad \alpha(v_\star) = a.$$

55 Let $t_\star \geq 0$ and $b > 0$ be two constants. Let $\zeta : [t_\star, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a nondecreasing
56 function such that

$$57 \quad (2.2) \quad \zeta(t) < bv_\star$$

58 holds for all $t \geq t_\star$. Let $\mathcal{L}_0 \geq 0$ be a constant, and $\tau \in (t_\star, +\infty)$ or $\tau = +\infty$. Throughout this
59 section, we let $V : [t_\star - \mathcal{L}_0, \tau) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a C^1 function such that

$$60 \quad (2.3) \quad \sup_{m \in [t_\star - \mathcal{L}_0, t_\star]} V(m) < v_\star$$

61 and such that its time derivative \dot{V} satisfies the inequality

$$62 \quad (2.4) \quad \dot{V}(t) \leq -(a+b)V(t) + \alpha \left(\sup_{m \in [t-\mathcal{L}_0, t]} V(m) \right) \sup_{m \in [t-\mathcal{L}_0, t]} V(m) + \zeta(t)$$

63 for all $t \in [t_\star, \tau)$. Notice that if α is a positive constant, then the inequality (2.4) is a standard
64 Halanay's inequality. With the preceding notation, we then state and prove a result which is
65 instrumental in establishing our main result:

66 **Lemma 2.1.** *Consider the function V introduced above. Then the inequality $V(t) < v_\star$ is*
67 *satisfied for all $t \in [t_\star - \mathcal{L}_0, \tau)$.*

68 *Proof.* We prove this result by contradiction. Suppose that there were a $t_c \in [t_\star - \mathcal{L}_0, \tau)$
69 such that

$$70 \quad (2.5) \quad V(t_c) = v_\star$$

71 and $V(t) < v_\star$ for all $t \in [t_\star - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c)$. Then (2.3) gives $t_c > t_\star$, and (2.1), (2.2), and (2.4) give

$$72 \quad (2.6) \quad \dot{V}(t_c) < -(a+b)v_\star + \alpha(v_\star)v_\star + bv_\star = -av_\star + av_\star = 0.$$

73 From the inequality $\dot{V}(t_c) < 0$ and the continuity of V , we deduce that there is $t_d \in (t_\star, t_c)$
74 such that $V(t_d) > v_\star$. This contradicts the definition of t_c , so the lemma holds. \blacksquare

75 Since $a > 0$ and $b > 0$, there is a unique value $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$76 \quad (2.7) \quad \lambda = a + b - ae^{\lambda \mathcal{L}_0}.$$

77 Using this λ , we next state and prove the main result of this section.

78 **Theorem 2.2.** *Consider the function V introduced above, in the case where $\tau = +\infty$. Then*
79

$$80 \quad (2.8) \quad V(t) \leq \sup_{m \in [s-\mathcal{L}_0, s]} V(m)e^{-\lambda(t-s)} + \int_s^t e^{b(m-t)} \zeta(m) dm$$

81 holds for all $t \geq s$ and for all $s \geq t_\star$.

82 *Remark 2.3.* Two key differences between Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 3.2 in [15] are that
 83 (i) a disturbance is taken into account in Theorem 2.2 and (ii) Theorem 2.2 gives exponential
 84 stability when the disturbance is not present, whereas the [15, Theorem 3.2] establishes as-
 85 ymptotic stability. The specifics of the nonlinear functions involved in the nonlinear Halanay's
 86 inequality considered in [15] makes it possible to prove asymptotic stability of systems which
 87 are not exponentially stable. Proving a local ISS result for classes of systems that we will study
 88 below that are locally asymptotically stable but not exponentially stable when no disturbance
 89 is present is an interesting open problem. On the other hand, see [14] for results for systems
 90 of the form $\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + f(x(t), u(t))$ having Banach spaces as the state spaces and having
 91 controls u that are valued in a normed space, where A is the generator of a C_0 -semigroup.
 92 However, this class of systems from [14] do not include our main class of systems, where x_t
 93 can enter in a nonlinear way and which therefore include nonlinear delay systems; see (3.3)
 94 below. Moreover, we believe that the methods of [14] do not lend themselves to being adapted
 95 or extended to cover our general systems, because of the nonlinearity of our systems in x_t .
 96 See also [2, Theorem 21] for time invariant cases, for which asymptotic stability is shown to
 97 imply local ISS.

98 **Proof.** Since the function α is nondecreasing, Lemma 2.1 and (2.4) ensure that

$$99 \quad (2.9) \quad \dot{V}(t) \leq -(a+b)V(t) + \alpha(v_*) \sup_{m \in [t-\mathcal{L}_0, t]} V(m) + \zeta(t)$$

100 holds for all $t \geq t_*$. From (2.1), we deduce that

$$101 \quad (2.10) \quad \dot{V}(t) \leq -(a+b)V(t) + a \sup_{m \in [t-\mathcal{L}_0, t]} V(m) + \zeta(t)$$

102 holds for all $t \geq t_*$. Since $a > 0$ and $b > 0$, we can then apply Lemma A.1.1 in Appendix A.1
 103 below, to conclude. \square

104 *Remark 2.4.* The inequality (2.8) gives the ISS inequality

$$105 \quad (2.11) \quad V(t) \leq \sup_{m \in [s-\mathcal{L}_0, s]} V(m) e^{-\lambda(t-s)} + \frac{1}{b} \sup_{m \in [s, t]} \zeta(m)$$

106 for all $t \geq s$ and all $s \geq t_*$.

107 **3. Local exponential stabilization result.** We use Theorem 2.2 to solve a local stabiliza-
 108 tion problem for a class of nonlinear systems containing a small time-varying delay in the
 109 control law.

110 **3.1. Studied system and preliminary result.** Let $h : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a continuous
 111 function for which there is a constant $\bar{h} > 0$ such that

$$112 \quad (3.1) \quad 0 \leq h(t) \leq \bar{h}$$

113 for all $t \geq 0$. Let $\delta : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous function that admits a constant $\bar{\Delta}$ such
 114 that

$$115 \quad (3.2) \quad |\delta(t)| \leq \bar{\Delta}$$

116 for all $t \geq 0$. Consider the system

$$117 \quad (3.3) \quad \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t - h(t)) + \mathcal{F}(t, x_t) + \delta(t)$$

118 where x is valued in \mathbb{R}^n , the input u is valued in \mathbb{R}^p , and \mathcal{F} is locally Lipschitz with respect
119 to its second argument and piecewise continuous with respect to the first.

120 Throughout this paper, we assume that the dynamics satisfy the usual forward complete-
121 ness properties, with standard existence and uniqueness properties of solutions. Let $t_0 \geq 0$.
122 We consider initial functions $x_0 : [t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, and we introduce three assumptions:

123 **Assumption 1.** *The pair (A, B) is controllable.*

124 **Assumption 2.** *There is a continuous nondecreasing function $\rho : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ that
125 is not identically equal to zero such that*

$$126 \quad (3.4) \quad |\mathcal{F}(t, \phi)| \leq \sup_{m \in [-\bar{h}, 0]} |\phi(m)|^2 \rho(|\phi(m)|)$$

127 holds for all functions $\phi : [-\bar{h}, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $t \geq 0$.

128 It is well known that Assumption 1 provides a matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ such that the matrix

$$129 \quad (3.5) \quad H = A + BK$$

130 is Hurwitz, and so also a symmetric positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and constants $c > 0$
131 and $\bar{p} > 0$ such that

$$132 \quad (3.6) \quad PH + H^\top P \leq -cP$$

133 and

$$134 \quad (3.7) \quad I \leq P \text{ and } |P| \leq \bar{p},$$

135 e.g., by using the Pole-Shifting Theorem (as stated in [18, p.186]) to find K , and by then
136 solving the Riccati equation $PH + H^\top P = -I$ for P , and then choosing $c > 0$ small enough
137 such that $cP \leq I$ [18], and then scaling P by a big enough positive constant if needed to satisfy
138 our additional requirement that $P \geq I$. In what follows, we fix ρ , K , P , and \bar{p} satisfying the
139 preceding requirements, and we assume that $BK \neq 0$. Our last assumption is the following,
140 which can be viewed as a smallness condition on \bar{h} or on $\bar{\Delta}$:

141 **Assumption 3.** *There is a real value $s_\star > 0$ such that with the choice*

$$142 \quad (3.8) \quad \omega_0 = (2|A| + 2|BK| + 1 + 2\sqrt{s_\star} \rho(\sqrt{s_\star}))\bar{p},$$

143 the inequality

$$144 \quad (3.9) \quad \left(e^{2.1\omega_0\bar{h}} - 1 \right) \frac{\bar{p}\bar{\Delta}^2}{\omega_0} < s_\star$$

145 is satisfied.

146 In terms of the preceding notation and the positive definite quadratic function

$$147 \quad (3.10) \quad W(x) = x^\top P x,$$

148 where x is valued in \mathbb{R}^n , we start with a technical lemma, where Assumption 3 ensures that
149 (3.12) is satisfied when the initial function is valued in a small enough neighborhood of the
150 origin:

151 **Lemma 3.1.** *Let the system (3.3) satisfy Assumptions 1-3. With the preceding notation,*
152 *consider (3.3) in closed-loop with the feedback*

$$153 \quad (3.11) \quad u(t - h(t)) = Kx(t - h(t))$$

154 for all $t \geq t_0$. Let x be a solution of this system such that

$$155 \quad (3.12) \quad \sup_{m \in [t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0]} W(x(m)) e^{2.1\omega_0 \bar{h}} + \left(e^{2.1\omega_0 \bar{h}} - 1 \right) \frac{\bar{p}\bar{\Delta}^2}{\omega_0} < s_\star.$$

156 Then x is defined over $[t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0 + 2\bar{h}]$ and

$$157 \quad (3.13) \quad \sup_{m \in [t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0 + 2\bar{h}]} W(x(m)) \leq \sup_{m \in [t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0]} W(x(m)) e^{2.1\omega_0 \bar{h}} + \left(e^{2.1\omega_0 \bar{h}} - 1 \right) \frac{\bar{p}\bar{\Delta}^2}{\omega_0}$$

158 is satisfied.

159 *Proof.* Consider a solution $x(t)$ of this closed-loop system from the lemma such that (3.12)
160 holds. Let $[t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0 + t_\infty)$ be the domain of definition of $x(t)$. Then $0 < t_\infty < +\infty$ or $t_\infty = +\infty$.
161 The time derivative of W defined in (3.10) along this solution satisfies

$$162 \quad (3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{W}(t) &= 2x(t)^\top P [Ax(t) + BKx(t - h(t)) + \mathcal{F}(t, x_t) + \delta(t)] \\ &\leq 2\bar{p}|x(t)| \left[|A||x(t)| + |BK||x(t - h(t))| + \sup_{m \in [t - \bar{h}, t]} |x(m)|^2 \rho(|x(m)|) \right] \\ &\quad + 2|x(t)|\bar{p}\bar{\Delta} \end{aligned}$$

163 for all $t \in (t_0, t_0 + t_\infty)$, by (3.2), (3.4), (3.7), and the continuity of δ . Since ρ from Assumption
164 2 is nondecreasing, it follows from (3.7) that

$$165 \quad (3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{W}(t) &\leq \bar{p}(2|A| + 2|BK| + 1) \sup_{m \in [t - \bar{h}, t]} W(x(m)) \\ &\quad + 2\bar{p} \sup_{m \in [t - \bar{h}, t]} W(x(m))^{3/2} \rho \left(\sqrt{\sup_{m \in [t - \bar{h}, t]} W(x(m))} \right) + \bar{p}\bar{\Delta}^2 \end{aligned}$$

166 by applying the triangle inequality to upper bound the last right side term in (3.14), in order
167 to get $2|x(t)|\bar{p}\bar{\Delta} \leq \bar{p}|x(t)|^2 + \bar{p}\bar{\Delta}^2$. In terms of the function

$$168 \quad (3.16) \quad \bar{\omega}(s) = \bar{p}(2|A| + 2|BK| + 1) s + 2s^{3/2}\bar{p}\rho(\sqrt{s}),$$

169 we therefore have

$$170 \quad (3.17) \quad \dot{W}(t) \leq \bar{\omega} \left(\sup_{m \in [t-\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m)) \right) + \bar{p}\bar{\Delta}^2$$

171 for all $t \in (t_0, t_0 + t_\infty)$ and, according to the definition of ω_0 in (3.8), we have

$$172 \quad (3.18) \quad \bar{\omega}(s) \leq \omega_0 s$$

173 for all $s \in [0, s_\star]$. We apply now Lemma A.2.1 in Appendix A.2 below, with the choices

$$174 \quad (3.19) \quad W(x(t)), \bar{\omega}, \omega_0, \bar{p}^2 \bar{\Delta}^2, t_0, t_\infty, 2.1\bar{h}, \sup_{m \in [t_0-\bar{h}, t_0]} W(x(m)), s_\star, \text{ and } \bar{h}$$

175 playing the roles of $Z(t)$, Ψ , Ψ_0 , $\bar{\Delta}$, t_a , τ , q , \bar{Z} , ω and T , respectively. Assumption 3 ensures
176 that Assumption A.1 from Appendix A.2 (which is needed to apply Lemma A.2.1) is satisfied.
177 Also, (A.2.4) holds, since

$$178 \quad (3.20) \quad W(x(t)) \leq \sup_{m \in [t_0-\bar{h}, t_0]} W(x(m))$$

179 for all $t \in [t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0]$. Then inequality (3.12) ensures that the inequality (A.2.5) is satisfied.
180 Therefore, according to Lemma A.2.1, it follows that for all $t \in [t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0 + \min\{t_\infty, 2.1\bar{h}\}]$,
181 we have

$$182 \quad (3.21) \quad W(x(t)) \leq \sup_{m \in [t_0-\bar{h}, t_0]} W(x(m)) e^{2.1\omega_0 \bar{h}} + \left(e^{2.1\omega_0 \bar{h}} - 1 \right) \frac{\bar{p}\bar{\Delta}^2}{\omega_0}.$$

183 Therefore, the finite escape time phenomenon does not occur over $[t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0 + 2\bar{h}]$, which
184 implies that $t_\infty > 2\bar{h}$. ■

185 **3.2. ISS result.** Using the notation from Section 3.1, let us introduce the function

$$186 \quad (3.22) \quad \beta(m) = 2\bar{h}|PBK|(|A| + |BK|) + 2\sqrt{m}(\bar{h}|PBK| + |P|)\rho(\sqrt{m}).$$

187 We now add the following assumption, which can again be regarded as a smallness condition
188 on \bar{h} , where $c > 0$ is the positive constant from (3.6):

189 **Assumption 4.** *The bound $2\bar{h}|PBK|(|A| + |BK|) < c/4$ is satisfied.*

190 It follows that there is a constant $w_\star > 0$ such that

$$191 \quad (3.23) \quad \beta(w_\star) = \frac{c}{4}$$

192 and we fix a w_\star satisfying the preceding requirement in the rest of this subsection. We also
193 assume:

194 **Assumption 5.** *The inequality*

$$195 \quad (3.24) \quad \frac{4}{c}(|PBK|^2 \bar{h}^2 + |P|^2) \bar{\Delta}^2 \leq \frac{c w_\star}{4}$$

196 *holds.*

197 Assumption 5 can be viewed as a smallness condition on $\bar{\Delta}$. Let $\gamma > 0$ be the constant such
198 that

$$199 \quad (3.25) \quad \gamma = \frac{c}{2} - \frac{c}{4}e^{2\gamma\bar{h}}.$$

200 We are ready to state and prove the following result:

201 **Theorem 3.2.** *Let the system (3.3) satisfy Assumptions 1-5. Then, with the notation from*
202 *the preceding subsection, consider (3.3) in closed-loop with the control*

$$203 \quad (3.26) \quad u(t - h(t)) = Kx(t - h(t)).$$

204 Consider any maximal solution $x(t)$ of the closed-loop system such that

$$205 \quad (3.27) \quad \sup_{m \in [t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0]} W(x(m))e^{2.1\omega_0\bar{h}} + \left(e^{2.1\omega_0\bar{h}} - 1 \right) \frac{\bar{p}\bar{\Delta}^2}{\omega_0} < \min\{s_\star, w_\star\}$$

206 holds. Then, for each $s \geq t_0 + \bar{h}$, and with the choice

$$207 \quad (3.28) \quad \mathcal{H}(m) = \frac{4}{c}|PBK|^2\bar{h} \int_0^m |\delta(r)|^2 dr + \frac{4}{c}|P|^2 \sup_{\ell \in [\bar{h}, m]} |\delta(\ell)|^2,$$

208 the inequality

$$209 \quad (3.29) \quad |x(t)| \leq \sqrt{\bar{p} \sup_{m \in [s-2\bar{h}, s]} |x(m)|^2 e^{-\gamma(t-s)} + \int_s^t e^{\frac{c}{4}(m-t)} \mathcal{H}(m) dm}$$

210 holds for all $t \geq s$.

211 *Proof.* We consider a trajectory x of the closed-loop system satisfying the conditions of
212 Theorem 3.2. Let $[t_0 - \bar{h}, t_\infty)$ be the largest domain of definition of x . Notice for later use
213 that it follows from Lemma 3.1 that the solution is defined over $[t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0 + 2\bar{h}]$, and that the
214 inequality (3.13) holds. Then necessarily, $t_\infty > t_0 + 2\bar{h}$. From the definition of H in (3.5), we
215 deduce that

$$216 \quad (3.30) \quad \dot{x}(t) = Hx(t) - BK \int_{t-h(t)}^t \dot{x}(m) dm + \mathcal{F}(t, x_t) + \delta(t)$$

217 for all $t \in [t_0 + \bar{h}, t_\infty)$, since the integral in (3.30) is $x(t) - x(t - h(t))$. According to (3.6), the
218 time derivative of W along (3.30) satisfies

$$219 \quad (3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{W}(t) \leq & -cW(x(t)) - 2x(t)^\top PBK \int_{t-h(t)}^t \dot{x}(m) dm \\ & + 2x(t)^\top P\mathcal{F}(t, x_t) + 2x(t)^\top P\delta(t) \end{aligned}$$

220 for all $t \in [t_0 + \bar{h}, t_\infty)$.

221 Since $t_\infty > 2\bar{h}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
222 \quad (3.32) \quad \dot{W}(t) &\leq -cW(x(t)) \\
&+ 2|x(t)||PBK| \int_{t-h(t)}^t |Ax(m) + BKx(m-h(m)) + \mathcal{F}(m, x_m) + \delta(m)| dm \\
&+ 2x(t)^\top P\mathcal{F}(t, x_t) + 2x(t)^\top P\delta(t)
\end{aligned}$$

223 for all $t \in [t_0 + \bar{h}, t_\infty)$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
224 \quad (3.33) \quad \dot{W}(t) &\leq -cW(x(t)) + 2|PBK||x(t)| \int_{t-h(t)}^t |Ax(m)| dm \\
&+ 2|PBK||x(t)| \int_{t-h(t)}^t |BKx(m-h(m))| dm \\
&+ 2|PBK||x(t)| \int_{t-h(t)}^t |\mathcal{F}(m, x_m)| dm + 2x(t)^\top P\mathcal{F}(t, x_t) \\
&+ 2|PBK||x(t)| \int_{t-h(t)}^t |\delta(m)| dm + 2x(t)^\top P\delta(t)
\end{aligned}$$

225 for all $t \in [t_0 + \bar{h}, t_\infty)$. From our bound \bar{h} on h from (3.1), Assumption 2, and (3.7), we deduce
226 that

$$\begin{aligned}
227 \quad (3.34) \quad \dot{W}(t) &\leq -cW(x(t)) + 2\bar{h}|PBK||A| \sup_{m \in [t-\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m)) \\
&+ 2\bar{h}|PBK||BK| \sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m)) \\
&+ 2|PBK||x(t)| \int_{t-h(t)}^t \sup_{r \in [m-\bar{h}, m]} |x(r)|^2 \rho(|x(r)|) dm \\
&+ 2|x(t)||P| \sup_{m \in [t-\bar{h}, t]} |x(m)|^2 \rho(|x(m)|) \\
&+ 2|PBK||x(t)| \int_{t-h(t)}^t |\delta(m)| dm + 2|P||x(t)||\delta(t)|
\end{aligned}$$

228 for all $t \in [t_0 + \bar{h}, t_\infty)$. Since ρ is nondecreasing, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
229 \quad (3.35) \quad \dot{W}(t) &\leq -cW(x(t)) + 2\bar{h}|PBK|(|A| + |BK|) \sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m)) \\
&+ 2\bar{h}|PBK|\rho \left(\sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} \sqrt{W(x(m))} \right) \sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m))^{\frac{3}{2}} \\
&+ 2|P||x(t)||\delta(t)| \\
&+ 2|P| \sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m))^{\frac{3}{2}} \rho \left(\sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} \sqrt{W(x(m))} \right) \\
&+ 2|PBK||x(t)| \int_{t-h(t)}^t |\delta(m)| dm
\end{aligned}$$

230 for all $t \in [t_0 + \bar{h}, t_\infty)$. We next use the triangle inequality, Jensen's inequality, and (3.7), to
 231 get

$$232 \quad (3.36) \quad \begin{aligned} 2|PBK||x(t)| \int_{t-h(t)}^t |\delta(m)| dm &\leq \frac{c}{4}W(x(t)) + \frac{4}{c}|PBK|^2\bar{h} \int_{t-h(t)}^t |\delta(m)|^2 dm \text{ and} \\ 2|P||x(t)||\delta(t)| &\leq \frac{c}{4}W(x(t)) + \frac{4}{c}|P|^2|\delta(t)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

233 It follows from (3.35) that

$$234 \quad (3.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{W}(t) &\leq -\frac{c}{2}W(x(t)) + 2\bar{h}|PBK|(|A| + |BK|) \sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m)) \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{c}|PBK|^2\bar{h} \int_{t-h(t)}^t |\delta(m)|^2 dm \\ &\quad + 2(\bar{h}|PBK| + |P|) \sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m))^{\frac{3}{2}} \rho \left(\sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} \sqrt{W(x(m))} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{c}|P|^2|\delta(t)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

235 holds for all $t \in [t_0 + \bar{h}, t_\infty)$. Therefore, we have

$$236 \quad (3.38) \quad \dot{W}(t) \leq -\frac{c}{2}W(x(t)) + \beta \left(\sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m)) \right) \sup_{m \in [t-2\bar{h}, t]} W(x(m)) + \delta_{\#}(t)$$

237 for all $t \in [t_0 + \bar{h}, t_\infty)$, where β was defined in (3.22) and

$$238 \quad (3.39) \quad \delta_{\#}(t) = \frac{4}{c}|PBK|^2\bar{h} \int_{t-h(t)}^t |\delta(m)|^2 dm + \frac{4}{c}|P|^2|\delta(t)|^2.$$

239 Note that (3.2) implies that $|\delta_{\#}(t)| \leq \frac{4}{c}(|PBK|^2\bar{h}^2 + |P|^2)\bar{\Delta}^2$ for all $t \geq \bar{h}$. Hence, (3.24)
 240 gives

$$241 \quad (3.40) \quad |\delta_{\#}(t)| \leq \frac{cw_{\star}}{4}$$

242 for all $t \geq \bar{h}$. Then let us recall that (3.13) holds, by (3.27). Consequently (3.27) ensures that
 243

$$244 \quad (3.41) \quad \sup_{m \in [t_0 - \bar{h}, t_0 + 2\bar{h}]} W(x(m)) < w_{\star}$$

245 We can now apply Theorem 2.2 with $\lambda = \gamma$, and with

$$246 \quad (3.42) \quad \begin{aligned} V(t) &= W(x(t)), \quad a = b = c/4, \quad \alpha = \beta, \quad \zeta(t) = \sup_{\ell \in [\bar{h}, t]} |\delta_{\#}(\ell)|, \quad \mathcal{L}_0 = 2\bar{h}, \quad v_{\star} = w_{\star}, \\ \tau &= t_{\infty}, \quad \text{and } t_{\star} = t_0 + \bar{h}. \end{aligned}$$

247 Note that (3.23) ensures that (2.1) is satisfied. Then (3.40)-(3.41) ensure that (2.2)-(2.3) are
 248 satisfied. Using Lemma 2.1, we can prove that the finite escape time phenomenon does not
 249 occur, so $t_{\infty} = +\infty$, and Theorem 2.2 gives

$$250 \quad (3.43) \quad W(x(t)) \leq \sup_{m \in [s-2\bar{h}, s]} W(x(m))e^{-\gamma(t-s)} + \int_s^t e^{\frac{c}{4}(m-t)} \sup_{\ell \in [\bar{h}, m]} |\delta_{\#}(\ell)| dm$$

251 when $t \geq s \geq t_0 + \bar{h}$ where γ is the constant defined in (3.25), and where the sup was needed
 252 in (3.42) and in the integrand in (3.43) because Theorem 2.2 requires its function ζ to be
 253 nondecreasing. Hence, (3.7) gives

$$254 \quad (3.44) \quad |x(t)|^2 \leq \bar{p} \sup_{m \in [s-2\bar{h}, s]} |x(m)|^2 e^{-\gamma(t-s)} + \int_s^t e^{\frac{c}{4}(m-t)} \sup_{\ell \in [\bar{h}, m]} |\delta_{\sharp}(\ell)| dm$$

255 for all $t \geq s \geq t_0 + \bar{h}$. This allows us to conclude. ■

256 4. Output feedback local stabilization.

257 **4.1. Statement of result.** Consider the system

$$258 \quad (4.1) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t) + \mathcal{G}(x(t)) + \delta(t) \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) \end{cases}$$

259 with x valued in \mathbb{R}^n , the input u is valued in \mathbb{R}^p , the output y valued in \mathbb{R}^q , \mathcal{G} being a locally
 260 Lipschitz nonlinear function and δ being continuous. We introduce two assumptions:

261 **Assumption 6.** *The pair (A, C) is observable, the pair (A, B) is controllable, and the system*
 262 *(4.1) is forward complete for each continuous choice of $u : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$.*

263 **Assumption 7.** *There is a continuous, nondecreasing function $\kappa : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ that*
 264 *is not identically equal to the zero function such that*

$$265 \quad (4.2) \quad |\mathcal{G}(x)| \leq |x|^2 \kappa(|x|)$$

266 holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

267 Since (A, B) is controllable, we can argue as in Section 3.1 to find a matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, a
 268 symmetric and positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and constants $c > 0$ and $\bar{p} > 0$ such that

$$269 \quad (4.3) \quad PH + H^\top P \leq -cP$$

270 where

$$271 \quad (4.4) \quad H = A + BK$$

272 and

$$273 \quad (4.5) \quad I \leq P \quad \text{and} \quad |P| \leq \bar{p}.$$

274 Let $T > 0$ be a constant and set

$$275 \quad (4.6) \quad E = \int_{-T}^0 e^{A^\top s} C^\top C e^{As} ds.$$

276 Assumption 6 implies that the matrix E is invertible, e.g., by [18]. We also use the functions
 277 \hat{x} and μ that are defined by

$$278 \quad (4.7) \quad \hat{x}(t) = E^{-1} \int_{t-T}^t e^{A^\top(s-t)} C^\top y(s) ds + E^{-1} \int_{t-T}^t e^{A^\top(s-t)} C^\top C \int_s^t e^{A(s-m)} Bu(m) dm ds$$

279 for all $t \geq T$ and $\hat{x}(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0, T)$, and

$$280 \quad (4.8) \quad \mu(x_t) = E^{-1} \int_{t-T}^t e^{A^\top(s-t)} C^\top C \int_s^t e^{A(s-m)} \mathcal{G}(x(m)) dm ds,$$

281 which is defined for all $t \geq T$. We also fix any constant g such that

$$282 \quad (4.9) \quad g \geq \left(\int_{-T}^0 \int_s^0 \left| BKE^{-1} e^{A^\top s} C^\top C e^{A(s-m)} \right| dm ds \right)^2,$$

283 and, in terms of the function κ from Assumption 7, we use the function

$$284 \quad (4.10) \quad \gamma_0(u) = \frac{\underline{c}}{\bar{c}} \bar{p} (1+g) \kappa^2(\sqrt{u}) u.$$

285 From our assumption on κ , we then fix a constant $u_\star > 0$ such that

$$286 \quad (4.11) \quad \gamma_0(u_\star) = \frac{\underline{c}}{4}.$$

287 Using the preceding notation, our final assumption is the following smallness condition on the
288 δ_i 's:

289 **Assumption 8.** *There are a vector $M = [m_1, \dots, m_n]^\top \in [0, +\infty)^n$, a constant $\bar{\Delta} > 0$, and
290 a constant $d > 0$ such that*

$$291 \quad (4.12) \quad d \geq \left(1 + \int_{-T}^0 \int_s^0 \left| BKE^{-1} e^{A^\top s} C^\top C e^{A(s-m)} M \right| dm ds \right) |M|$$

292 *for which the conditions*

$$293 \quad (4.13) \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} |\delta_i(t)| \leq m_i \bar{\Delta} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n$$

294 *and*

$$295 \quad (4.14) \quad \bar{\Delta} < \frac{\underline{c}}{4d} \sqrt{\frac{u_\star}{\bar{p}}}$$

296 *are satisfied.*

297 We also use the function $\delta^\# : [T, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that is defined by

$$298 \quad (4.15) \quad \delta^\#(t) = \delta(t) - BKE^{-1} \int_{t-T}^t e^{A^\top(s-t)} C^\top C \int_s^t e^{A(s-m)} \delta(m) dm ds.$$

299 Let $\nu > 0$ be the constant such that

$$300 \quad (4.16) \quad \nu = \frac{\underline{c}}{2} - \frac{\underline{c}}{4} e^{\nu T}.$$

301 In terms of the preceding notation, our main result of this subsection is:

302 **Theorem 4.1.** Consider the system (4.1) in closed-loop with the output feedback

$$303 \quad (4.17) \quad u(t) = K\hat{x}(t).$$

304 Let Assumptions 6-8 hold. Consider any maximal solution $x(t)$ of this system such that

$$305 \quad (4.18) \quad \sup_{\ell \in [0, T]} x(\ell)^\top P x(\ell) < u_\star.$$

306 Then, for each $s \geq T$, the inequality

$$307 \quad (4.19) \quad |x(t)| \leq \sqrt{\bar{p}} \sqrt{\sup_{m \in [s-T, s]} |x(m)|^2 e^{-\nu(t-s)} + \frac{4}{c} \int_s^t e^{\frac{c}{4}(m-t)} \sup_{\ell \in [T, m]} |\delta^\sharp(\ell)|^2 dm}$$

308 holds for all $t \geq s$.

309 **Remark 4.2.** From the inequality (4.19) and the subadditivity of the square root, we can
 310 deduce a standard ISS inequality. A crucial difference between our result and the one of [11]
 311 is that we do not assume that the function \mathcal{G} is known. Instead, we assume that the function
 312 κ in Assumption 7 is known. Note that the observer \hat{x} is not present in the inequality (4.19)
 313 and the rate of convergence of $x(t)$ depends only on the choices of K and T . Therefore we can
 314 view \hat{x} as an ‘‘almost finite time observer’’. We have assumed that (4.1) is forward complete.
 315 This is a technical assumption, but we conjecture that it can be relaxed. Since $u_\star > 0$, one
 316 can often use continuous dependence arguments to check (4.18), e.g., when $\delta = 0$ because
 317 then the closed loop system admits a 0 equilibrium, which allows us to satisfy (4.18) in cases
 318 where $|\delta(t)|$ is known to be small enough for all values $t \in [0, T]$.

319 **4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.1.** The system (4.1) in closed loop with (4.17) is

$$320 \quad (4.20) \quad \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + BK\hat{x}(t) + \mathcal{G}(x(t)) + \delta(t).$$

321 By applying the method of variation of parameters to (4.20) on the interval $[s, t]$ for any
 322 $s \in [t - T, t]$, then left multiplying the result by $e^{A^\top(s-t)} C^\top C e^{A(s-t)}$ and then integrating the
 323 result over all $s \in [t - T, t]$, it follows that

$$324 \quad (4.21) \quad x(t) = \hat{x}(t) + \mu(x_t) + E^{-1} \int_{t-T}^t e^{A^\top(s-t)} C^\top C \int_s^t e^{A(s-m)} \delta(m) dm ds$$

325 for all $t \geq T$. By solving for \hat{x} in (4.21) and substituting the result into (4.20), it follows that

$$326 \quad (4.22) \quad \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + BK \left(x(t) - \mu(x_t) - E^{-1} \int_{t-T}^t e^{A^\top(s-t)} C^\top C \int_s^t e^{A(s-m)} \delta(m) dm ds \right) \\ + \mathcal{G}(x(t)) + \delta(t)$$

327 for all $t \geq T$. From the definitions of $H = A + BK$ from (4.4) and the δ^\sharp formula in (4.15), it
 328 follows that for all $t \geq T$, we obtain

$$329 \quad (4.23) \quad \dot{x}(t) = Hx(t) - BK\mu(x_t) + \mathcal{G}(x(t)) + \delta^\sharp(t).$$

330 Notice for later use that Assumption 8 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality imply that

$$331 \quad (4.24) \quad |\delta^\sharp(t)| \leq |M|\bar{\Delta} + |M| \int_{t-T}^t \int_s^t \left| BKE^{-1}e^{A^\top(s-t)}C^\top Ce^{A(s-m)}M \right| dm ds \bar{\Delta} \leq d\bar{\Delta}$$

332 for all $t \geq T$, where d was introduced in (4.12). Now, we introduce the Lyapunov function:

$$333 \quad (4.25) \quad U(x) = x^\top Px.$$

334 Its time derivative along all trajectories of (4.23) satisfies

$$335 \quad (4.26) \quad \dot{U}(t) = 2x(t)^\top P[Hx(t) - BK\mu(x_t) + \mathcal{G}(x(t)) + \delta^\sharp(t)]$$

336 for all $t \geq T$. From (4.3), it follows that

$$337 \quad (4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{U}(t) &\leq -cU(x(t)) + 2x(t)^\top P[-BK\mu(x_t) + \mathcal{G}(x(t)) + \delta^\sharp(t)] \\ &\leq -cU(x(t)) + 2 \left\{ x(t)^\top \sqrt{P} \right\} \left\{ \sqrt{P}[-BK\mu(x_t) + \mathcal{G}(x(t)) + \delta^\sharp(t)] \right\} \\ &\leq -\frac{c}{2}U(x(t)) + \frac{2}{c}[-BK\mu(x_t) + \mathcal{G}(x(t)) + \delta^\sharp(t)]^\top P[-BK\mu(x_t) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{G}(x(t)) + \delta^\sharp(t)] \end{aligned}$$

338 where the last inequality came from applying Young's inequality to get $2ab \leq \frac{c}{2}|a|^2 + \frac{2}{c}|b|^2$,
339 where a and b are the terms in curly braces in (4.27). Consequently, the Cauchy-Schwarz
340 inequality gives

$$341 \quad (4.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{U}(t) &\leq -\frac{c}{2}U(x(t)) + \frac{4}{c}\bar{p} \left[|-BK\mu(x_t) + \mathcal{G}(x(t))|^2 + |\delta^\sharp(t)|^2 \right] \\ &\leq -\frac{c}{2}U(x(t)) + \frac{8}{c}\bar{p} \left[|BK\mu(x_t)|^2 + |\mathcal{G}(x(t))|^2 \right] + \frac{4\bar{p}}{c}|\delta^\sharp(t)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

342 for all $t \geq T$. We can then use our choice (4.8) of μ to obtain

$$343 \quad (4.29) \quad \begin{aligned} |BK\mu(x_t)| &= \left| \int_{t-T}^t \int_s^t BKE^{-1}e^{A^\top(s-t)}C^\top Ce^{A(s-m)}\mathcal{G}(x(m))dm ds \right| \\ &\leq \int_{t-T}^t \int_s^t \left| BKE^{-1}e^{A^\top(s-t)}C^\top Ce^{A(s-m)} \right| |x(m)|^2 \kappa(|x(m)|) dm ds \end{aligned}$$

344 where the last inequality is a consequence of (4.2). Since κ is nondecreasing, it follows that

$$345 \quad (4.30) \quad \begin{aligned} &|BK\mu(x_t)| \\ &\leq \int_{t-T}^t \int_s^t \left| BKE^{-1}e^{A^\top(s-t)}C^\top Ce^{A(s-m)} \right| dm ds \sup_{r \in [t-T, t]} |x(r)|^2 \kappa \left(\sup_{r \in [t-T, t]} |x(r)| \right) \\ &= \int_{-T}^0 \int_s^0 \left| BKE^{-1}e^{A^\top s}C^\top Ce^{A(s-m)} \right| dm ds \sup_{r \in [t-T, t]} |x(r)|^2 \kappa \left(\sup_{r \in [t-T, t]} |x(r)| \right) \\ &\leq \int_{-T}^0 \int_s^0 \left| BKE^{-1}e^{A^\top s}C^\top Ce^{A(s-m)} \right| dm ds \sup_{r \in [t-T, t]} U(x(r)) \kappa \left(\sup_{r \in [t-T, t]} \sqrt{U(x(r))} \right) \end{aligned}$$

346 where the last inequality is a consequence of (4.5). We deduce that

$$347 \quad (4.31) \quad |BK\mu(x_t)|^2 \leq g \sup_{m \in [t-T, t]} U^2(x(m)) \kappa^2 \left(\sup_{m \in [t-T, t]} \sqrt{U(x(m))} \right)$$

348 with g defined in (4.9). Similarly, we have

$$349 \quad (4.32) \quad |\mathcal{G}(x)|^2 \leq U^2(x) \kappa^2 \left(\sqrt{U(x)} \right)$$

350 for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It follows that

$$351 \quad (4.33) \quad |BK\mu(x_t)|^2 + |\mathcal{G}(x(t))|^2 \leq (1+g) \sup_{m \in [t-T, t]} U^2(x(m)) \kappa^2 \left(\sup_{m \in [t-T, t]} \sqrt{U(x(m))} \right).$$

352 Consequently, for all $t \geq T$, (4.28) gives

$$353 \quad (4.34) \quad \dot{U}(t) \leq -\frac{c}{2}U(x(t)) + \gamma_0 \left(\sup_{m \in [t-T, t]} U(x(m)) \right) \sup_{m \in [t-T, t]} U(x(m)) + \frac{4\bar{p}}{c}|\delta^\sharp(t)|^2$$

354 with γ_0 defined in (4.10).

355 Now, let us apply Theorem 2.2 with $U(x(t))$ playing the role of $V(t)$, γ_0 playing the role
356 of α , $v_\star = u_\star$, $\mathcal{L}_0 = t_\star = T$, $\tau = +\infty$ and $a = b = \frac{c}{4}$. The inequality (4.14) gives

$$357 \quad (4.35) \quad \bar{\Delta}^2 < \frac{c^2}{16d^2\bar{p}}u_\star.$$

358 Then, according to (4.24),

$$359 \quad (4.36) \quad \frac{4\bar{p}}{c}|\delta^\sharp(t)|^2 < \frac{c}{4}u_\star$$

360 for all $t \geq T$. Consider any maximal solution $x(t)$ of the closed loop system satisfying (4.18).
361 Since (4.16) and (4.36) also hold, we deduce from Theorem 2.2 that $U(x(t))$ satisfies the ISS
362 inequality

$$363 \quad (4.37) \quad U(x(t)) \leq \sup_{m \in [s-T, s]} U(x(m)) e^{-\nu(t-s)} + \frac{4\bar{p}}{c} \int_s^t e^{\frac{c}{4}(m-t)} \sup_{\ell \in [T, m]} |\delta^\sharp(\ell)|^2 dm$$

364 if $t \geq s \geq T$. This inequality and (4.5) allow us to conclude.

365 5. Illustrations.

366 **5.1. Illustration of Theorem 3.2.** Consider the controlled van der Pol equation

$$367 \quad (5.1) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_1(t) &= x_2(t) \\ \dot{x}_2(t) &= -x_1(t) + \epsilon(1 - x_1^2)x_2 + u(t - h(t)) \end{cases}$$

368 for constants $\epsilon > 0$ and a continuous choice $h(t)$ of the delay; see, e.g., [8, Section 13.2] for
369 simpler cases with no delays. The dynamics are used to represent oscillations in vacuum tube

370 circuits, and provide a fundamental equation in nonlinear oscillation theory. The system has
 371 the form (3.3) with the choices

$$372 \quad (5.2) \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & \epsilon \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and } \mathcal{F}(t, x_t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\epsilon x_1^2(t)x_2(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

373 with $\delta = 0$. Using Mathematica [10], we can check that Assumption 1-2 hold with $\bar{\Delta} = 0$,
 374 $K = [-1, -2]$, $\rho(s) = \epsilon s$,

$$375 \quad (5.3) \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} 4.09112 & 0.722222 \\ 0.722222 & 1.17951 \end{bmatrix},$$

376 and $\epsilon = 0.01$, where P was found by first solving for a positive definite symmetric matrix
 377 $P_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ such that $P_1 H + H^\top P_1 = -I$ holds with $H = A + BK$, then choosing $c = 0.75$
 378 in order to satisfy $cP_1 \leq I$, and then multiplying P_1 by 3.25 to satisfy the requirement that
 379 $P \geq I$ with the choice $P = 3.25P_1$. Also, since $\bar{\Delta} = 0$, Assumptions 3 and 5 hold for any
 380 $s_* > 0$. We can then also use Mathematica to compute the basin of attraction from Theorem
 381 3.2. For instance, when the delay h is the zero function, we can check that we can satisfy
 382 the requirements of Theorem 3.2 with $w_* = s_* = 2.20049$ and all initial functions whose
 383 norms are bounded by 0.718677. If we instead use the delay bound $\bar{h} = 0.008$ and keep all
 384 other parameter values the same as before, then the basin of attraction consists of all initial
 385 functions that are bounded by 0.137212. This illustrates the trade-off that increasing the
 386 bound \bar{h} on the allowable input delays $h(t)$ can reduce the basin of attraction.

387 **5.2. Illustration of Theorem 4.1.** Consider the two dimensional system

$$388 \quad (5.4) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_1(t) &= \text{sat}(x_2(t)) + \delta_1(t) \\ \dot{x}_2(t) &= u(t) + \delta_2(t) \\ y(t) &= x_1(t) \end{cases}$$

389 where sat is the standard saturation that is defined by $\text{sat}(s) = s$ when $|s| \leq 1$, $\text{sat}(s) = 1$ if
 390 $s > 1$, and $\text{sat}(s) = -1$ if $s < -1$. We illustrate Theorem 4.1. To satisfy Assumption 7 with

$$391 \quad (5.5) \quad \mathcal{G}(x) = [\text{sat}(x_2) - x_2, 0]^\top,$$

392 we prove that

$$393 \quad (5.6) \quad |\mathcal{G}(x)| \leq |x|^2 \kappa(|x|)$$

394 for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where κ is defined by

$$395 \quad (5.7) \quad \kappa(r) = \max\{r - 1, 0\},$$

396 by considering two cases:

- 397 1) If $|x| \leq 1$, then $|x_2| \leq 1$. It follows that $\mathcal{G}(x) = 0$. Consequently, (5.6) is satisfied.
 398 2) If $|x| > 1$ and $|x_2| \leq 1$, then $\mathcal{G}(x) = 0$ which implies that (5.6) is satisfied. Next, consider
 399 the case where $x_2 > 1$. Then $|\mathcal{G}(x)| = x_2 - 1$. Thus (5.6) is satisfied if and only if $x_2 - 1 \leq$

400 $|x|^2\kappa(|x|)$, which is satisfied because $x_2 - 1 \leq x_2^2(x_2 - 1) = x_2^2\kappa(x_2)$. If $x_2 < -1$, then we get
 401 $|\mathcal{G}(x)| = -x_2 - 1$ and we obtain a similar result.

402 It follows that Assumptions 6-7 are satisfied, once we choose

$$403 \quad (5.8) \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } C = [1 \quad 0].$$

404 Since the preceding choices give

$$405 \quad (5.9) \quad e^{As} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

406 for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, our formulas (4.6)-(4.7) give

$$407 \quad (5.10) \quad E = \int_{-T}^0 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s \\ s & s^2 \end{bmatrix} ds = \begin{bmatrix} T & -\frac{T^2}{2} \\ -\frac{T^2}{2} & \frac{T^3}{3} \end{bmatrix}$$

408 and therefore also

$$409 \quad (5.11) \quad \hat{x}(t) = \frac{12}{T^3} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{T^2}{3} & \frac{T}{2} \\ \frac{T}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \int_{t-T}^t \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ s-t \end{bmatrix} y(s) ds \\ + \frac{12}{T^3} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{T^2}{3} & \frac{T}{2} \\ \frac{T}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \int_{t-T}^t \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ s-t \end{bmatrix} \int_s^t (s-m)u(m)dm ds$$

410 for all $t \geq T$. Let us choose

$$411 \quad (5.12) \quad K = [-1, -2].$$

412 We can then use Mathematica to check that our requirements are met with

$$413 \quad (5.13) \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix},$$

414 $c = 0.845$, $T = 0.1$, $g = 9.3218$, $\gamma_0(s) = 293.164\kappa^2(\sqrt{s})s$, and $u_* = 1.053$. Using the inequality
 415

$$416 \quad (5.14) \quad 2|x|^2 \leq x^\top Px$$

417 we obtain the value 0.592453 for the bound on the norm of the initial function from Theorem
 418 4.1. Moreover, the maximum allowable upper bound on $\bar{\delta}$ is 0.0309026 when $M = [1, 0]^\top$, and
 419 that the maximum allowable bound on $\bar{\delta}$ is 0.112342 when $M = [0, 1]^\top$.

420 **6. Conclusion.** We advanced the state of the art for stability analysis of nonlinear sys-
 421 tems, by providing a local version of Halanay's inequality that is conducive to proving local
 422 asymptotic stability properties for nonlinear systems that contain state or input delays and
 423 uncertainties. Our new results are significant, because of the well-known benefits of using
 424 global versions of Halanay's inequality to prove global asymptotic stability for systems with
 425 unknown delays, and because many significant systems are only locally asymptotically stable
 426 and therefore are beyond the scope of earlier global versions of Halanay's inequality. Another
 427 significant benefit of our work is that we allow the dynamics to contain unknown nonlinearities
 428 that violate the standard linear growth conditions and that can contain distributed state
 429 delays. We used our approach to prove a local feedback stabilization result for a large class of
 430 nonlinear systems with outputs. We illustrated how our methods provide new estimates for
 431 basins of attraction for a controlled Van der Pol equation and other cases that contain input
 432 delays and outputs. We hope to find analogs for discrete-time systems, and vector versions
 433 providing local analogs of the corresponding continuous-time Halanay's inequality results from
 434 [12].

435 **Appendices: Proofs of key lemmas.**

436 **A.1. ISS inequality.** We prove a key lemma that we used in our proof of Theorem 2.2.
 437 To this end, first let $t_\star \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_0 \geq 0$ be given constants. Consider a C^1 function $V : [t_\star - \mathcal{L}_0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, a nonnegative valued nondecreasing continuous function ζ , and constants $a > 0$ and $b > 0$ such that

$$440 \quad (\text{A.1.1}) \quad \dot{V}(t) \leq -(a+b)V(t) + a \sup_{m \in [t-\mathcal{L}_0, t]} V(m) + \zeta(t)$$

441 holds for all $t \geq t_\star$. Let $\lambda > 0$ be the constant defined as is (2.7). We then have the following
 442 result, where we can use the inequality (A.1.2) to easily deduce an ISS inequality:

443 **Lemma A.1.1.** *Consider the function V introduced in Section 2 above. The inequality*

$$444 \quad (\text{A.1.2}) \quad V(t) \leq \sup_{m \in [s-\mathcal{L}_0, s]} V(m)e^{-\lambda(t-s)} + \int_s^t e^{b(m-t)} \zeta(m) dm$$

445 *holds for all $t \geq s$ and all $s \geq t_\star$.*

446 **Proof.** Let $s \geq t_\star$ be a constant. Let us introduce the function

$$447 \quad (\text{A.1.3}) \quad \theta(t) = \int_s^{\max\{t, s\}} e^{b(m-t)} \zeta(m) dm.$$

448 Notice that $\dot{\theta}(t) = -b\theta(t) + \zeta(t)$ for all $t > s$. Using the nondecreasing property of ζ to get

$$449 \quad (\text{A.1.4}) \quad \theta(t) \leq \int_s^t e^{b(m-t)} dm \zeta(t) \leq \frac{1}{b} \zeta(t)$$

450 for all $t \geq s$, it follows that θ is nondecreasing over $[s, +\infty)$. Moreover, $\theta(t) = 0$ for all
 451 $t \in [s - \mathcal{L}_0, s]$. Hence,

$$452 \quad (\text{A.1.5}) \quad \dot{\theta}(t) = -(a+b)\theta(t) + a \sup_{m \in [t-\mathcal{L}_0, t]} \theta(m) + \zeta(t)$$

453 holds for all $t > s$. We next choose

$$454 \quad (\text{A.1.6}) \quad v_l = \sup_{m \in [s - \mathcal{L}_0, s]} V(m) \text{ and } \chi_\epsilon(t) = \theta(t) + v_l e^{-\lambda(t-s)} + \epsilon,$$

455 where $\epsilon > 0$ is a constant. Then

$$456 \quad (\text{A.1.7}) \quad \chi_\epsilon(t) > \theta(t) + v_l e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \geq v_l = \sup_{m \in [s - \mathcal{L}_0, s]} V(m)$$

457 holds for all $t \in [s - \mathcal{L}_0, s]$. Therefore,

$$458 \quad (\text{A.1.8}) \quad \chi_\epsilon(t) > V(t) \text{ for all } t \in [s - \mathcal{L}_0, s].$$

459 We next prove that

$$460 \quad (\text{A.1.9}) \quad \chi_\epsilon(t) > V(t)$$

461 holds for all $t \geq s - \mathcal{L}_0$. Let us start to prove this by observing that

$$462 \quad (\text{A.1.10}) \quad \dot{\chi}_\epsilon(t) = -(a+b)\theta(t) + a \sup_{m \in [t - \mathcal{L}_0, t]} \theta(m) + \zeta(t) - \lambda v_l e^{-\lambda(t-s)}$$

463 for all $t > s$. From (2.7), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\chi}_\epsilon(t) &= -(a+b)\theta(t) + a \sup_{m \in [t - \mathcal{L}_0, t]} \theta(m) + \zeta(t) \\ &\quad - (a+b - a e^{\lambda \mathcal{L}_0}) v_l e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \\ 464 \quad (\text{A.1.11}) \quad &= -(a+b) (\theta(t) + v_l e^{-\lambda(t-s)}) + a \left(\sup_{m \in [t - \mathcal{L}_0, t]} \theta(m) + v_l e^{-\lambda(t-s-\mathcal{L}_0)} \right) \\ &\quad + \zeta(t). \end{aligned}$$

465 Now, observe that

$$466 \quad (\text{A.1.12}) \quad \sup_{m \in [t - \mathcal{L}_0, t]} (\theta(m) + v_l e^{-\lambda(m-s)}) \leq \sup_{m \in [t - \mathcal{L}_0, t]} \theta(m) + v_l e^{-\lambda(t-s-\mathcal{L}_0)}.$$

467 As an immediate consequence,

$$468 \quad (\text{A.1.13}) \quad \dot{\chi}_\epsilon(t) \geq -(a+b) (\theta(t) + v_l e^{-\lambda(t-s)}) + a \sup_{m \in [t - \mathcal{L}_0, t]} (\theta(m) + v_l e^{-\lambda(m-s)}) + \zeta(t)$$

469 for all $t > s$. Using the definition of χ_ϵ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\chi}_\epsilon(t) &\geq -(a+b) (\chi_\epsilon(t) - \epsilon) + a \sup_{m \in [t - \mathcal{L}_0, t]} (\chi_\epsilon(m) - \epsilon) + \zeta(t) \\ 470 \quad (\text{A.1.14}) \quad &= -(a+b) \chi_\epsilon(t) + a \sup_{m \in [t - \mathcal{L}_0, t]} \chi_\epsilon(m) + \zeta(t) + b\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

471 We next proceed by contradiction. Bearing in mind (A.1.8), suppose that there were a
472 $t_c > s$ such that $\chi_\epsilon(t) > V(t)$ for all $t \in [s - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c)$ and $\chi_\epsilon(t_c) = V(t_c)$. Then (A.1.14) gives

$$473 \quad (\text{A.1.15}) \quad \dot{\chi}_\epsilon(t_c) \geq -(a+b)V(t_c) + a \sup_{m \in [t_c - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c]} \chi_\epsilon(m) + \zeta(t_c) + b\epsilon.$$

474 On the other hand (A.1.1) gives

$$475 \quad (\text{A.1.16}) \quad -\dot{V}(t_c) \geq (a+b)V(t_c) - a \sup_{m \in [t_c - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c]} V(m) - \zeta(t_c).$$

476 By adding (A.1.15) and (A.1.16), we obtain

$$477 \quad (\text{A.1.17}) \quad \dot{\chi}_\epsilon(t_c) - \dot{V}(t_c) \geq a \left[\sup_{m \in [t_c - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c]} \chi_\epsilon(m) - \sup_{m \in [t_c - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c]} V(m) \right] + b\epsilon.$$

The definition of t_c ensures that $\sup_{m \in [t_c - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c]} \chi_\epsilon(m) \geq V(t)$ for all $t \in [t_c - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c]$. It follows that

$$\sup_{m \in [t_c - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c]} \chi_\epsilon(m) - \sup_{m \in [t_c - \mathcal{L}_0, t_c]} V(m) \geq 0.$$

478 We deduce from (A.1.17) that $\dot{\chi}_\epsilon(t_c) - \dot{V}(t_c) > 0$. Since $\chi_\epsilon(t_c) - V(t_c) = 0$, we deduce
 479 that there is $t_d \in (s, t_c)$ such that $\chi_\epsilon(t_d) - V(t_d) < 0$. This contradicts the definition of
 480 t_c . Hence, $\chi_\epsilon(t) > V(t)$ holds for all $t \geq s - \mathcal{L}_0$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we deduce that
 481 $\theta(t) + v_l e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \geq V(t)$ for all $t \geq s - \mathcal{L}_0$. Therefore, the conclusion of the lemma follows.

482 **A.2. Technical result.** We prove the key lemma that we used in the proof of Lemma 3.1.
 483 We use constants $T > 0$, $q > 0$, $\Psi_0 > 0$, $\omega > 0$, $\tau > 0$, $\bar{\Delta} \geq 0$ and $t_a \geq 0$ and a continuous,
 484 nondecreasing function $\Psi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that

$$485 \quad (\text{A.2.1}) \quad \Psi(\ell) \leq \Psi_0 \ell$$

486 for all $\ell \in [0, \omega]$. Let $Z : [t_a - T, t_a + \tau) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a nonnegative valued function of class
 487 C^1 such that

$$488 \quad (\text{A.2.2}) \quad \dot{Z}(t) \leq \Psi \left(\sup_{\ell \in [t-T, t]} Z(\ell) \right) + \bar{\Delta}$$

489 for all $t \in [t_a, t_a + \tau)$. We use the following assumption:

490 **Assumption A.1.** *The inequality*

$$491 \quad (\text{A.2.3}) \quad (e^{\Psi_0 q} - 1) \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0} < \omega$$

492 *is satisfied.*

493 In the following lemma, the existence of values $\bar{Z} > 0$ such that (A.2.5) is satisfied follows
 494 from (A.2.3):

495 **Lemma A.2.1.** *Let Assumption A.1 be satisfied. Let Z be such that*

$$496 \quad (\text{A.2.4}) \quad Z(\ell) \leq \bar{Z} \text{ for all } \ell \in [t_a - T, t_a]$$

497 *where $\bar{Z} \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that*

$$498 \quad (\text{A.2.5}) \quad \bar{Z} e^{\Psi_0 q} + (e^{\Psi_0 q} - 1) \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0} < \omega.$$

499 *Then*

$$500 \quad (\text{A.2.6}) \quad Z(t) \leq \bar{Z} e^{\Psi_0 q} + (e^{\Psi_0 q} - 1) \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0}$$

501 *holds for all $t \in [t_a - T, t_a + \min\{\tau, q\})$.*

502 *Proof.* We first prove that $Z(t) < \omega$ for all $t \in [t_a - T, t_a + \min\{\tau, q\})$. To prove this,
 503 we proceed by contradiction. Note that (A.2.4)-(A.2.5) imply that $Z(t) < \omega$ for all $t \in$
 504 $[t_a - T, t_a]$, and let us suppose that there were a $t_c \in [0, \min\{\tau, q\})$ such that $Z(t) < \omega$ for all
 505 $t \in [t_a - T, t_a + t_c)$ and $Z(t_a + t_c) = \omega$. Then

$$506 \quad (\text{A.2.7}) \quad \dot{Z}(t) \leq \Psi_0 \sup_{\ell \in [t-T, t]} Z(\ell) + \bar{\Delta}$$

507 for all $t \in [t_a, t_a + t_c]$, by the bounds (A.2.1) and (A.2.2). Now, let us introduce the function

$$508 \quad (\text{A.2.8}) \quad \xi_\epsilon(t) = (\bar{Z} + \epsilon)e^{(\Psi_0 + \epsilon)(t-t_a)} + [e^{(\Psi_0 + \epsilon)(t-t_a)} - 1] \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0 + \epsilon}$$

509 with $\epsilon > 0$. Let us observe that $Z(t_a) \leq \bar{Z} < \bar{Z} + \epsilon \leq \xi_\epsilon(t_a)$. We next show that $Z(t) < \xi_\epsilon(t)$
 510 for all $t \in [t_a, t_a + t_c]$. We argue by contradiction. Suppose there were a $t_f \in [t_a, t_a + t_c]$ such
 511 that

$$512 \quad (\text{A.2.9}) \quad Z(t) < \xi_\epsilon(t) \text{ for all } t \in [t_a, t_f) \text{ and } Z(t_f) = \xi_\epsilon(t_f).$$

513 Simple calculations based on the formula (A.2.8) then give

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}_\epsilon(t) &= (\Psi_0 + \epsilon)(\bar{Z} + \epsilon)e^{(\Psi_0 + \epsilon)(t-t_a)} + e^{(\Psi_0 + \epsilon)(t-t_a)} \bar{\Delta} \\ 514 \quad (\text{A.2.10}) \quad &= (\Psi_0 + \epsilon) \left[\xi_\epsilon(t) + (-e^{(\Psi_0 + \epsilon)(t-t_a)} + 1) \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0 + \epsilon} \right] + e^{(\Psi_0 + \epsilon)(t-t_a)} \bar{\Delta} \\ &= (\Psi_0 + \epsilon)\xi_\epsilon(t) + \bar{\Delta} \end{aligned}$$

515 for all $t > t_a$. On the other hand, (A.2.7) and (A.2.9) give $\dot{Z}(t_f) \leq \Psi_0 \xi_\epsilon(t_f) + \bar{\Delta}$, by our
 516 choice of ξ_ϵ . Consequently, (A.2.10) gives

$$517 \quad (\text{A.2.11}) \quad \dot{Z}(t_f) < \dot{\xi}_\epsilon(t_f),$$

518 which we can combine with (A.2.9) to deduce that there is a $t_g \in [t_a, t_f)$ such that

$$519 \quad (\text{A.2.12}) \quad \xi_\epsilon(t_g) < Z(t_g).$$

520 This yields a contradiction with the definition of t_f . We deduce that

$$521 \quad (\text{A.2.13}) \quad Z(t) < \xi_\epsilon(t) \text{ for all } t \in [t_a, t_a + t_c].$$

522 Since ϵ is an arbitrary positive number, we deduce that

$$523 \quad (\text{A.2.14}) \quad Z(t) \leq \bar{Z}e^{\Psi_0(t-t_a)} + (e^{\Psi_0(t-t_a)} - 1) \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0} \text{ for all } t \in [t_a, t_a + t_c].$$

524 Since $t_c < q$, it follows that

$$525 \quad (\text{A.2.15}) \quad Z(t_a + t_c) \leq \bar{Z}e^{\Psi_0 q} + (e^{\Psi_0 q} - 1) \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0}.$$

526 Since $Z(t_a + t_c) = \omega$, we obtain

$$527 \quad (\text{A.2.16}) \quad \omega \leq \bar{Z}e^{\Psi_0 q} + (e^{\Psi_0 q} - 1) \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0}.$$

528 This contradicts (A.2.5). Hence,

$$529 \quad (A.2.17) \quad Z(t) < \omega \text{ for all } t \in [t_a - T, t_a + \min\{\tau, q\}).$$

530 It follows from (A.2.1) that

$$531 \quad (A.2.18) \quad \dot{Z}(t) \leq \Psi_0 \sup_{\ell \in [t-T, t]} Z(\ell) + \bar{\Delta}$$

532 for all $t \in [t_a, t_a + \min\{\tau, q\})$. Arguing as in (A.2.7)-(A.2.13) except with t_c replaced by
533 $\min\{\tau, q\}$, we obtain $Z(t) \leq \xi_\epsilon(t)$ for all $t \in [t_a, t_a + \min\{\tau, q\})$ which implies that

$$534 \quad (A.2.19) \quad Z(t) \leq \bar{Z}e^{\Psi_0(t-t_a)} + (e^{\Psi_0(t-t_a)} - 1) \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0}$$

535 for all $t \in [t_a, t_a + \min\{\tau, q\})$. Since

$$536 \quad (A.2.20) \quad Z(t) \leq \bar{Z} \leq \bar{Z}e^{\Psi_0 q} + (e^{\Psi_0 q} - 1) \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\Psi_0}$$

537 for all $t \in [t_a - T, t_a]$, we can conclude. ■

538

REFERENCES

- 539 [1] E. BERETTA AND D. BREDÀ, *Discrete or distributed delay? Effects on stability of population growth*,
540 *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*, 13 (2016), pp. 19–41.
- 541 [2] A. CHAILLET, I. KARAFYLLIS, P. PEPE, AND Y. WANG, *The ISS framework for time-delay systems: a*
542 *survey*, *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, 35 (2023), pp. 237–306.
- 543 [3] Y. CHEN, Z. WANG, B. SHEN, AND Q. L. HAN, *Local stabilization for multiple input-delay systems*
544 *subject to saturating actuators: The continuous-time case*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*,
545 67 (2022), pp. 3090–3097.
- 546 [4] E. FRIDMAN, *Introduction to Time-Delay Systems*, Birkhauser, Boston, MA, 2014.
- 547 [5] M. GRIFA AND P. PEPE, *On stability analysis of discrete-time systems with constrained time-delays via*
548 *nonlinear Halanay-type inequality*, *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5 (2021), pp. 869–874.
- 549 [6] A. HALANAY, *Differential Equations: Stability, Oscillations, Time Lags*, Academic Press, New York, NY,
550 1966.
- 551 [7] R. KATZ AND E. FRIDMAN, *Sampled-data finite-dimensional boundary control of 1D parabolic PDEs under*
552 *point measurement via a novel ISS Halanay’s inequality*, *Automatica*, 135 (2022).
- 553 [8] H. KHALIL, *Nonlinear Systems, Third Edition*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2002.
- 554 [9] H. LHACHEMI AND R. SHORTEEN, *On the derivation of stability properties for time-delay systems without*
555 *constraint on the time-derivative of the initial condition*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*,
556 66 (2020), pp. 1558–2523.
- 557 [10] MATHEMATICA, *The world’s definitive system for modern technical computing*, 2015. Wolfram Research,
558 <http://www.wolfram.com/mathematica/>.
- 559 [11] F. MAZENC AND M. MALISOFF, *Almost finite-time observers for a family of nonlinear continuous-time*
560 *systems*, *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 6 (2022), pp. 2593–2598.
- 561 [12] F. MAZENC, M. MALISOFF, AND M. KRSTIC, *Vector extensions of Halanay’s inequality*, *IEEE Transac-*
562 *tions on Automatic Control*, 67 (2022), pp. 1453–1459.
- 563 [13] F. MAZENC, M. MALISOFF, AND H. OZBAY, *Stability and robustness analysis for switched systems with*
564 *time-varying delays*, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 56 (2018), pp. 158–182.
- 565 [14] A. MIRONCHENKO, *Local input-to-state stability: Characterizations and counterexamples*, *Systems & Con-*
566 *trol Letters*, 87 (2016), pp. 23–28.
- 567 [15] P. PEPE, *A nonlinear version of Halanay’s inequality for the uniform convergence to the origin*, *Mathe-*
568 *matical Control and Related Fields*, 12 (2022), pp. 789–811.

- 569 [16] P. PEPE AND E. FRIDMAN, *On global exponential stability preservation under sampling for globally lip-*
570 *schütz time-delay systems*, Automatica, 82 (2017), pp. 295–300.
- 571 [17] A. SELIVANOV AND E. FRIDMAN, *Distributed event-triggered control of transport-reaction systems*, IFAC-
572 *PapersOnLine*, 48 (2015), pp. 593–597.
- 573 [18] E. SONTAG, *Mathematical Control Theory, Second Edition*, Springer, New York, 1998.
- 574 [19] E. SONTAG, *The ISS philosophy as a unifying framework for stability-like behavior*, in *Nonlinear Control*
575 *in the Year 2000 Volume 2*, London, 2001, Springer London, pp. 443–467.
- 576 [20] X. ZHAO AND F. DENG, *Time-varying Halanay inequalities with application to stability and control of*
577 *delayed stochastic systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 67 (2022), pp. 1226–1240.