

# Unified stability criteria for perturbed LTV systems with unstable instantaneous dynamics

Shenyu Liu <sup>a</sup>,

<sup>a</sup>*Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, University of California, San Diego, USA*

---

## Abstract

In this work the stability of perturbed linear time-varying systems is studied. The main features of the problem are threefold. Firstly, the time-varying dynamics is not required to be continuous but allowed to have jumps. Also the system matrix is not assumed to be always Hurwitz. In addition, there is nonlinear time-varying perturbation which may be persistent. We first propose several mild regularity assumptions, under which the total variations of the system matrix and its abscissa are well-defined over arbitrary time interval. We then state our main result of the work, which requires the combined assessment of the total variation of the system matrix, the measure when the system is not sufficiently “stable” and the estimate of the perturbation to be upper bounded by a function affine in time. When this condition is met, we prove that the neighborhood of the origin, whose size depends on the magnitude of the perturbation, is uniformly globally exponentially stable for the system. We make several remarks, connecting our results with the known stability theory from continuous linear time-varying systems and switched systems. Finally, a numerical example is included to further illustrate the application of the main result.

*Key words:* Linear time-varying systems, Switched systems, Input-to-state stability, Lyapunov methods

---

## 1 Introduction

Due to the long-lasting importance of the design and analysis of adaptive controllers, the stability analysis for linear time-varying (LTV) systems has played an important role in control theory for decades [12]. The early study of stability of LTV systems can date back to the work [4]. Since then it is well-known that even if the instantaneous dynamics of the system is stable and the abscissa of the system matrix is uniformly upper-bounded by some negative number, an LTV system may still be unstable. In order to ensure global asymptotic stability, one needs the system to vary “slowly”, in the sense that either the time derivative of the system matrix is sufficiently small [3,1], or the variation of the system matrix is upper-bounded on average [11]. When the instantaneous dynamics is not necessarily always stable, the work [24,14] propose different sets of conditions under which the LTV systems are exponentially stable. However the assumptions in these results are fairly complex and not easily applied to real problems. Meanwhile, the recent works [30,2] based on indefinite Lyapunov function have nicer results which may be useful for concluding stability of LTV systems with possible unstable instantaneous dynamics.

Since the end of the 20th century, the study of switched systems has gradually gain its importance in control theory because of its wide application in modern engineering problems [17]. Switched systems are essentially a special class of time-varying systems, whose dynamics varies in a piecewise continuous manner. Similar to the feature of time-varying systems, stability of a switched system is not guaranteed either even if all its modes are stable. Researchers hence developed different criteria such as dwell-time condition, average dwell time condition [22,10] which bound the number of switches over an arbitrary time interval. Stability of a switched system can then be shown when its switching signal satisfies these criteria. When some modes of a switched system is unstable, criteria on the switching signal which bound the average activation time of the unstable modes can be used for proving its stability in [29,23]. A similar approach of using indefinite Lyapunov function is also used in [20] to study the stability of switched time-varying systems.

On the other hand, because of uncertainties, linearization, modeling error, external disturbance or other perturbation factors, no dynamical system is truly linear with the exact system matrix in the real world [5]. In this case, the dynamics of the true system can be modeled as the sum of a nominal LTV system and a pertur-

---

*Email address:* sh1055@ucsd.edu (Shenyu Liu).

bation term. While the nominal system can be shown stable via the various stability analysis approaches for LTV systems, different hypothesis are then imposed on the perturbation term in order to guarantee stability of the true system [26,15]. When the additive disturbance is treated as an external input, the equivalent characterizations of input-to-state stability for switched time-varying systems are studied in [7,8]. However in those works, no sufficient conditions on the switching signal as well as the time-varying nature is given so that the switched time-varying systems are input-to-state stable. Recently, exponential stability of LTV switched systems with perturbations in the form of delays is studied in [16]. In that work since the aimed stability property is uniform with respect to arbitrary switching, the concluded conditions under which the LTV switched systems are exponentially stable are conservative.

In this work we aim to study exponential stability of perturbed LTV systems. Compared with the aforementioned literature, the main features of this work are threefold. Firstly, the time-varying dynamics is not required to be continuous but allowed to have jumps. To the author's knowledge, such combination of continuous time-variation and switches are not studied together until the recent work [6], where a unified stability criteria based on total variation is proposed for such systems. Nevertheless in that work, the instantaneous dynamics is not allowed to be unstable. This brings the second feature of our work that the system matrix is not assumed to be always Hurwitz. In other words, the LTV system is allowed to have unstable instantaneous dynamics with positive measure. In addition, we assume the presence of nonlinear time-varying perturbation which may be persistent. Similar problems of stability of perturbed switched time-varying systems is studied in the works [19,21], where in the first work the perturbations are additive disturbance and delays, while in the second work the perturbations are impulses and errors due to linearization. In these works, the nominal systems are assumed to be uniformly exponentially stable, whereas in our work there is no such an assumption. Instead, in this work we propose a unified criteria based on the combined assessment of the total variation of the system matrix, the measure of the instantaneous dynamics when it is not sufficiently "stable" and the estimate of the perturbation. The main contribution of this work is the conclusion that when this combined assessment is upper bounded by a function affine in time, then the neighborhood of the origin, whose size depends on the magnitude of the persistent perturbation, is uniformly globally exponentially stable. In terms of methodology, we manage to find a monotonically decreasing Lyapunov function for the system with out persistent perturbation. Stability property is then directly concluded by Lyapunov's direct method. Compared with the other approaches used in similar works [27,6,20], where the value function needs to be estimated by cascading the changes over continuous flows and at jumps and hence is not monotonic, our

approach is more straightforward and easier to follow.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives the necessary notions and backgrounds for this work. Section 3 discusses the assumptions on the LTV systems and some technical results we need for proving our main theorem. Section 4 then states the main theorem, followed with its proof. In Section 5 we illustrate one numerical example on which our theorem can be applied to conclude its global exponential stability. Finally Section 6 concludes the paper.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $\mathbb{R}$  be the space of real numbers,  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} := [0, \infty)$  be the non-negative real line and  $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$  be the set of natural numbers. For  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , let  $\alpha(A)$  denote its spectrum abscissa; that is,

$$\alpha(A) = \max\{\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \det(\lambda I - A) = 0\}.$$

The matrix  $A$  is *Hurwitz* if and only if  $\alpha(A) < 0$ .

For a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we use  $|x|$  to denote its 2-norm and for a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , we use  $\|A\|$  to denote 2-norm induced norm. Given a matrix trajectory  $A(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , its total variation over an interval  $[t_a, t_b]$  is denoted by  $\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|dA\|$ , and is defined by

$$\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|dA\| := \sup_{p \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=0}^{n_P-1} \|A(t_{i+1}) - A(t_i)\| \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{D} := \{\{t_0, \dots, t_{n_P}\} : n_P \in \mathbb{N}, t_a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{n_P} = t_b\}$  is the collection of partitions of  $[t_a, t_b]$ . Notice that when the dimension of matrix  $n = 1$ , the definition of total variation of a matrix trajectory coincides with the definition of total variation of a real-valued function. Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a vector space and for any function  $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$  whose left limit exists everywhere, denote  $f(t^-) := \lim_{s \rightarrow t^-} f(s)$ .

Consider a *linear time-varying* (LTV) system with non-linear state-dependent, time-varying perturbation

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + g(t, x) \quad (2)$$

where  $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state,  $g(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the perturbation and  $A(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . The regularity assumptions of the matrix trajectories  $A(t)$  and  $g(t, x)$  will be discussed in the next section. For a given initial state  $x_0$  at time  $t_0$ , denote the solution of (2) at time  $t$  by  $x(t; t_0, x_0)$  and when the initial pair  $t_0, x_0$  is clear from the context, we use the abbreviation  $x(t)$  instead. We say that the system (2) has *unstable instantaneous dynamics* at time  $s$  if  $A(s)$  is non-Hurwitz; i.e., the time-invariant nominal system  $\dot{x}(t) = A(s)x(t)$  is unstable.

### 3 On the matrix trajectory $A(t)$ and perturbation $g(t, x)$

In this work we would like to study the stability of the aforementioned LTV system with perturbation (2) when the matrix trajectory  $A(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  “varies slowly” and the perturbation  $g(t, x) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$  is “small”.

#### 3.1 Regularity assumptions

We start with introducing two sets of regularity assumptions on  $A(t)$ . The first set of assumptions ensures that  $A(t)$  is in a compact set with its abscissa upper-bounded for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ :

**Assumption 1** *The matrix trajectory  $A(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  satisfies*

- (1) *There exists  $L > 0$  such that  $\|A(t)\| \leq L$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .*
- (2) *There exists  $\alpha_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\alpha(A(t)) \leq \alpha_{\max}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

Notice that we do not require  $\alpha_{\max}$  in Assumption 1.2 to be negative; in other words, the system (2) is allowed to have unstable instantaneous dynamics. We will later show in our main result (Theorem 9) that we need instantaneous dynamics of (2) not to be unstable too often in order for the system to have the desired stability properties.

The second set of assumptions describes how  $A(t)$  and  $\alpha(A(t))$  vary with respect to  $t$ :

**Assumption 2** *Given any  $t_b > t_a \geq 0$ , the matrix trajectory  $A(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  satisfies*

- (1)  *$A(t)$  is a Càdlàg function on  $[t_a, t_b]$ ; i.e., it is right continuous and has left limit everywhere on  $(t_a, t_b]$ .*
- (2)  *$A(t)$  has finitely many discontinuities on  $(t_a, t_b)$ ; i.e., denote*

$$\mathcal{D} := \{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : A(t) \neq A(t^-)\}, \quad (3)$$

*then the set  $\mathcal{D} \cap (t_a, t_b)$  has finite cardinality.*

- (3) *Let  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{p-1}$  be the elements of  $\mathcal{D} \cap (t_a, t_b)$  with the ordering that  $t_a =: t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{p-1} < t_p := t_b$ .  $A(t)$  is absolutely continuous on  $(t_i, t_{i+1})$  for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$ .*
- (4)  *$\alpha(A(t))$  is absolutely continuous on  $(t_i, t_{i+1})$  for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$ , where  $t_i$ 's are the same as defined earlier.*

Note that Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.2 allow  $A(t)$  to jump occasionally. In addition, the piecewise absolute continuity properties of  $A(t)$  and  $\alpha(A(t))$  in As-

sumption 2.3 and assumption 2.4 allow us to quantitatively characterize the “slow variation” nature of  $A(t)$ , which will be discussed later in Section 3.2.

**Remark 3** *Assumption 2.3 does not guarantee Assumption 2.4. To see this, consider the example where*

$$A(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \mu(t) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\mu(t) = \begin{cases} t^2 \sin^2(\frac{1}{t}) & \text{if } t \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

We first observe that  $\|\frac{d}{ds}A(t)\| = |\frac{d}{ds}\mu(t)|$ , and

$$\frac{d}{ds}\mu(t) = \begin{cases} 2s \sin^2(\frac{1}{t}) - \sin(\frac{1}{t}) \cos(\frac{1}{t}) & \text{if } t \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

Because the derivative exists everywhere on  $[0, 1]$  and it is bounded,  $A(t)$  is absolutely continuous on  $(0, 1)$ . However, we also observe that the eigenvalues of  $A(t)$  are  $\pm\sqrt{\mu(t)}$ , so

$$\alpha(A(t)) = |t \sin(\frac{1}{t})|$$

which is not absolutely continuous on  $(0, 1)$ .

Finally, we have one assumption with respect to the perturbation:

**Assumption 4** *The perturbation  $g(t, x) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$  is Lebesgue integrable in  $t$  for each fixed  $x$ , and locally Lipschitz in  $x$  for each fixed  $t$ . Moreover, there are non-negative continuous functions  $\gamma, \delta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  such that*

$$|g(t, x)| \leq \gamma(t)|x| + \delta(t) \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (5)$$

The inequality (5) is a standard assumption on the perturbation (c.f., [15, Equation (9.15)]). When  $\delta(t) \equiv 0$ , the perturbation is *vanishing* since the magnitude of the perturbation decreases to 0 when  $x$  approaches to the origin. Stable unmodeled dynamics belongs to this type of perturbation. On the other hand, when  $\delta(t) > 0$  but  $\gamma(t) \equiv 0$ , the perturbation is *persistent*. External disturbance belongs to this type of perturbation.

We also remark here that the assumptions on  $g(t, x)$  as stated in Assumption 4, together with the boundedness assumption of  $A(t)$  in Assumption 1.1 and the piece-wise continuity assumption of  $A(t)$  in Assumption 2.2 imply that the right-hand side of (2) satisfies the Carathéodory's condition for existence and uniqueness of local solutions for each initial pair  $t_0, x_0$  [9, page 30], and therefore our system (2) is well-defined under these assumptions.

### 3.2 Slowly varying by means of small total variation

Just as in the work [6], we quantify the slow time-varying nature of the system (2) by imposing bounds on the total variation of  $A(t)$  over an arbitrary interval  $[t_a, t_b]$ . Recall the definition of total variation in (1), which involves a supremum over an uncountable set and hence difficult to utilize. Nevertheless, as stated by [6, Lemma 1], Assumption 2.1 to Assumption 2.3 ensure that  $\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|dA\|$  is well-defined, and it is given by

$$\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|dA\| = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} A(t) \right\| dt + \sum_{i=1}^p \|A(t_i) - A(t_i^-)\|. \quad (6)$$

Since  $A(t)$  is only differentiable almost everywhere,  $\frac{d}{dt} A(t)$  in (6) needs to be understood in the sense of weak derivative. Because we have assumed  $A(t)$  to be absolutely continuous over  $(t_i, t_{i+1})$ ,  $\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} A(t) \right\| dt$  is well-defined.

On the other hand, because our system is allowed to have unstable instantaneous dynamics, the variation of  $\alpha(A(t))$  when it is not sufficiently negative also needs to be taken into account when defining the slow time-varying nature of (2) and showing its stability. To this end, we first define the ramp function  $f_{\text{ramp}}(s) : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  by  $f_{\text{ramp}}(s) = \max\{s, 0\}$ . For any  $\kappa > 0$ , Define  $\varphi_\kappa(A) : \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  by

$$\varphi_\kappa(A) := f_{\text{ramp}}(\alpha(A) + \kappa). \quad (7)$$

By this definition,  $\varphi_\kappa(A) = 0$  if  $\alpha(A) \leq -\kappa$ . We then study the total variation of  $\varphi_\kappa(A)$  over an arbitrary interval  $[t_a, t_b]$ , denoted by  $\int_{t_a}^{t_b} |d\varphi_\kappa(A)|$ . To see that  $\int_{t_a}^{t_b} |d\varphi_\kappa(A)|$  is also well-defined, we first realize that because  $\alpha(A)$  is continuous in  $A$ ,  $\varphi_\kappa(A)$  as defined in (7) through  $f_{\text{ramp}}$  is also continuous in  $A$ . Hence when  $t \mapsto A(t)$  is continuous, so is  $t \mapsto \varphi_\kappa(A(t))$ . In other words,  $\varphi_\kappa(A(t))$  also has finitely many discontinuities over  $(t_a, t_b)$ , and its discontinuity can only occur at a subset of  $\mathcal{D} \cap (t_a, t_b)$ . Meanwhile, since  $f_{\text{ramp}}$  is globally Lipschitz and  $\alpha(A(t))$  is assumed to be absolutely continuous on  $(t_i, t_{i+1})$ , the composition  $\varphi_\kappa(A(t)) = f_{\text{ramp}}(\alpha(A(t)) + \kappa)$  is also absolutely continuous on  $(t_i, t_{i+1})$ . Therefore  $\varphi_\kappa(A(t))$  shares the same regularity assumptions (Càdlàg, finite discontinuities and piecewise absolutely continuous) as for  $A(t)$ , and hence  $\int_{t_a}^{t_b} |d\varphi_\kappa(A)|$  is also well-defined and it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_a}^{t_b} |d\varphi_\kappa(A)| &= \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \varphi_\kappa(A(t)) \right| dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^p |\varphi_\kappa(A(t_i)) - \varphi_\kappa(A(t_i^-))|. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We can also study the slowly time-varying nature of (2) by considering the combined total variations of  $A(t)$  and  $\varphi_\kappa(A(t))$  instead of studying them separately. To do this, define the matrix trajectory  $\tilde{A}(t) : \mathbb{R}_p \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  by

$$\tilde{A}(t) := A(t) - \varphi_\kappa(A(t))I. \quad (9)$$

We have the following conclusion:

**Proposition 5** Consider a matrix trajectory  $A(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . For some  $\kappa > 0$ , let  $\varphi_\kappa$  be defined by (7) and  $\tilde{A}(t)$  be defined by (9). Under Assumption 2, the total variation of  $\tilde{A}(t)$  over the interval  $[t_a, t_b]$  is well-defined and satisfies

$$\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|d\tilde{A}\| \leq \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|dA\| + \int_{t_a}^{t_b} |d\varphi_\kappa(A)|, \quad (10)$$

where  $\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|dA\|$ ,  $\int_{t_a}^{t_b} |d\varphi_\kappa(A)|$  are given by (6), (8) respectively.

**PROOF.** Since  $\tilde{A}(t)$  is the difference between  $A(t)$  and  $\varphi_\kappa(A(t))I$ , it also satisfies the regularity assumptions (Càdlàg, finite discontinuities and piecewise absolute continuity) and hence it is well-defined. In addition,

$$\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|d\tilde{A}\| = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \tilde{A}(s) \right\| ds + \sum_{i=1}^p \|\tilde{A}(t_i) - \tilde{A}(t_i^-)\|. \quad (11)$$

Note when both  $A(t)$  and  $\varphi_\kappa(A(t))$  are differentiable,  $\tilde{A}(t)$  is differentiable and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{A}(t) \right\| &= \left\| \frac{d}{dt} A(t) - \frac{d}{dt} \varphi_\kappa(A(t))I \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{d}{dt} A(t) \right\| + \frac{d}{dt} |\varphi_\kappa(A(t))|. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{A}(t_i) - \tilde{A}(t_i^-)\| &= \|(A(t_i) - A(t_i^-)) - (\varphi_\kappa(A(t_i)) - \varphi_\kappa(A(t_i^-)))I\| \\ &\leq \|(A(t_i) - A(t_i^-))\| + |\varphi_\kappa(A(t_i)) - \varphi_\kappa(A(t_i^-))|. \end{aligned}$$

Plug these upper bounds for  $\left\| \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{A}(t) \right\|$ ,  $\|\tilde{A}(t_i) - \tilde{A}(t_i^-)\|$  into (11) and appeal to the expressions (6), (8), the inequality (10) is hence shown.

### 3.3 Other necessary technical results

Note that so far we have not fully utilized Assumption 1. In fact with Assumption 1 we have the following result:

**Lemma 6** Consider a matrix trajectory  $A(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . For some  $\kappa > 0$ , let  $\varphi_\kappa$  be defined by (7) and  $\tilde{A}(t)$  be defined by (9). Under Assumption 1, for any  $\beta \in (0, \kappa)$ , there exists  $c = c(L, \alpha_{\max}, \kappa, \beta) > 0$  such that

$$\|e^{s\tilde{A}(t)}\| \leq ce^{-\beta s} \quad \forall s, t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (12)$$

Meanwhile, the Lyapunov equation

$$\tilde{A}(t)^\top P + P\tilde{A}(t) + I = 0 \quad (13)$$

has a unique solution  $P(t)$  for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and

$$c_1 \leq \|P(t)\| \leq c_2 \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \quad (14a)$$

$$c_1 |z|^2 \leq z^\top P(t) z \leq c_2 |z|^2 \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \quad (14b)$$

with

$$c_1 := \frac{1}{2(L + f_{\text{ramp}}(\alpha_{\max} + \kappa))}, c_2 := \frac{c^2}{2\beta}. \quad (15)$$

In addition, If  $\tilde{A}(t)$  is differentiable at  $t$ , then

$$\left\| \frac{dP(t)}{dt} \right\| \leq 2c_2^2 \left\| \frac{d\tilde{A}(t)}{dt} \right\|. \quad (16)$$

**PROOF.** We have the following two bounds on both the norm of  $\tilde{A}(t)$  and the abscissa of  $\tilde{A}(t)$ :  $\|\tilde{A}(t)\| \leq \|A(t)\| + \varphi_\kappa(A(t)) \leq L + f_{\text{ramp}}(\alpha_{\max} + \kappa)$ ,  $\alpha(\tilde{A}(t)) = \alpha(A(t)) - \varphi_\kappa(A(t)) \leq -\kappa$ . The rest of the proof follows from the proof of [15, Lemma 9.9].

**Remark 7** Note that the parameter  $c_2$  depend on  $c$ , which is implicit. Nevertheless, it is seen in (14) that essentially  $c_1, c_2$  bounds the spectrum of  $P(t)$  and hence their values can be estimated via other approaches. Moreover, it follows from the proof of [15, Lemma 9.9] that as long as  $c_2$  is an upper bound on  $\|P(t)\|$ , the inequality (16) will hold.

We also need the following result which bounds the difference in  $P(t_a), P(t_b)$  in terms of  $\tilde{A}(t_a), \tilde{A}(t_b)$ :

**Lemma 8 ([6, Proposition 1])** Consider a matrix trajectory  $A(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ . For some  $\kappa > 0$ , let  $\varphi_\kappa$  be defined by (7) and  $\tilde{A}(t)$  be defined by (9). Assume Assumption 1 holds on  $A(t)$  and consider the function  $V(t, x) := x^\top P(t)x$  for each  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $P(t)$  is the solution to (13). Then, for any  $t_a, t_b \geq 0$ ,

$$\|P(t_b) - P(t_a)\| \leq 2c_2^2 \|\tilde{A}(t_b) - \tilde{A}(t_a)\|, \quad (17)$$

$$V(t_b, x) \leq e^{2c_2^2 c_1^{-1} \|\tilde{A}(t_b) - \tilde{A}(t_a)\|} V(t_a, x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (18)$$

where  $c_1, c_2$  come from Lemma 6.

## 4 Stability of slowly time-varying system

We now state our main result:

**Theorem 9** Consider an LTV system with perturbation (2) with Assumption 1, Assumption 2 and Assumption 4 satisfied. Let  $\kappa > 0$ . Then if there exist  $\lambda < \frac{c_1}{2c_2^2}$ ,  $\varrho > 0$ , such that for all  $t_b \geq t_a$ ,

$$c_1 \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \varphi_\kappa(A(\tau)) d\tau + c_2 \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \gamma(\tau) d\tau + c_2^2 \left( \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|d\tilde{A}\| \right) \leq \lambda(t_b - t_a) + \varrho \quad (19)$$

where  $c_1, c_2$  are defined via (15) in Lemma 6, then there exists  $k_1, k_2, k_3 > 0$  such that

$$|x(t; t_0, x_0)| \leq k_1 e^{-k_2(t-t_0)} |x_0| + k_3 \max_{\tau \in [t_0, t]} \delta(\tau). \quad (20)$$

### 4.1 Discussion of Theorem 9

We give some insights of Theorem 9 before we proceed to its proof.

We start with the discussion on the estimate (20) first. This result actually implies that the system (2) is uniformly *input-to-state stable* (ISS) with respect to the origin (see the definition of ISS in [25]), where the “input” is the persistent part of the perturbation  $\delta(t)$ . ISS also implies that the system (2) has the “convergent input convergent state” property, meaning that if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \delta(t) = 0$ , then the solutions of (2) will converge to the origin. When the perturbation is vanishing such that  $\delta(t) \equiv 0$ , (20) also shows that the system (2) is uniformly globally exponentially stable.

We then turn to the condition (19). The three terms in (19) on the left-hand side are essentially the total effect of unstable  $A(t)$ , the total estimate of perturbation-to-state ratio and the total variation of  $\tilde{A}$  over the interval  $[t_a, t_b]$ . We discuss some special cases here and compare them with the known results from the literature.

- Assume that  $A(t)$  is always Hurwitz and  $\alpha(A(t)) \leq -\kappa^*$  for some  $\kappa^* > 0$  and all  $t \geq t_0$ . In this case we can pick  $\kappa = \kappa^*$ , which implies that  $\varphi_\kappa(A(t)) \equiv 0$ . If in addition we assume that the system is unperturbed, i.e.,  $\gamma(t) \equiv 0$ , then (19) reduces to

$$\left( \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|d\tilde{A}\| \right) \leq \frac{\lambda}{c_2^2} (t_b - t_a) + \frac{\varrho}{c_2^2}.$$

Note that the upper-bound on  $\lambda$  stated in Theorem 9 implies that  $\mu := \frac{\lambda}{c_2^2} \leq \frac{c_1}{2c_2^2}$ . Thus we recover exactly



the same criteria as in [6, Theorem 3] for testing global exponential stability of LTV systems with bounded total variation. Furthermore, if  $A(t)$  is continuous, then this result becomes the same as [13, Theorem 3.4.11].

- Now we assume  $A(t) = A$  is a constant Hurwitz matrix. By picking  $\kappa = \alpha(A)$ , we have  $\varphi_\kappa(A(t)) \equiv 0$  and  $\tilde{A} = A$  so  $\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|d\tilde{A}\| = 0$ . Moreover, the time-invariant Lyapunov function  $V(x) := x^\top P x$  has the property that

$$\dot{V}(x) \leq -c_3|x|^2, \quad |\nabla V(x)| \leq c_4|x|$$

with the parameters  $c_3 = 1, c_4 = 2c_2$ . In the presence of perturbation, the condition (19) reduces to

$$\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \gamma(\tau) d\tau \leq \frac{\lambda}{c_2}(t_b - t_a) + \frac{\varrho}{c_2}.$$

Moreover, the upper-bound on  $\lambda$  implies  $\epsilon := \frac{\lambda}{c_2} \leq \frac{c_1}{2c_2^2} = \frac{c_1 c_3}{c_2 c_4}$ . This is exactly the same results as [15, Lemma 9.4 and Corollary 9.1] for showing global exponential stability with respect to a neighborhood of the origin for a perturbed system.

- Lastly, consider a switched system with linear subsystems

$$\dot{x}(t) = A_{\sigma(t)} x(t)$$

where  $\sigma(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathcal{P} := \{1, \dots, p\}$  is a piece-wise constant function. We assume that there exist  $\alpha_s, \alpha_u > 0$  and a partition  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_s \cup \mathcal{P}_u$  such that  $\alpha(A_i) \leq -\alpha_s$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{P}_s$  and  $\alpha(A_i) \leq \alpha_u$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{P}_u$ . In other words, not all subsystems are assumed to be stable. In this case we pick  $\kappa = \alpha_s$ . This implies that

$$\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \varphi_\kappa(A_{\sigma(\tau)}) d\tau = (\kappa_s + \kappa_u) \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(\tau) \in \mathcal{P}_u} d\tau,$$

where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the indicator function for  $\sigma(\tau) \in \mathcal{P}_u$ . On the other hand, since  $\tilde{A}_{\sigma(t)}$  is also a piece-wise constant function,

$$\int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|d\tilde{A}\| \leq \#(\mathcal{D} \cap [t_a, t_b])k,$$

where  $\#(\cdot)$  denotes the cardinality of a set and  $k := \max_{i,j \in \mathcal{P}} \|A_i - A_j\|$ . As a result, when the switched system is unperturbed, a sufficient condition for (19) to hold is

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(\kappa_s + \kappa_u) \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(\tau) \in \mathcal{P}_u} d\tau + \#(\mathcal{D} \cap [t_a, t_b])c_2^2 k \\ \leq \lambda(t_b - t_a) + \varrho. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that the two terms on the left-hand side of (21) take account of the total time that the switched system dwells in an unstable mode, and the total number of switches over an arbitrary time interval respectively.

Therefore, the condition (21) has a flavor of mixed average dwell-time and average activation time condition which is used to guarantee stability of switched systems [23, Theorem 2], [28, Theorem 1]. Due to the choice of Lyapunov functions, the quantifiers in the estimates may not be exactly the same as the ones used in the other results.

As illustrated by the aforementioned comparisons, our result is a generalization of the known results in the literature. Theorem 9 proposes unified criteria which bound the weighted sum of these three aspects by a term affine in time. This can also be interpreted that (19) essentially requires the sum

$$c_1 \varphi_\kappa(A(t)) + c_2 \gamma(t) + c_2^2 \|d\tilde{A}(t)\|$$

to be upper-bounded by  $\lambda$  on average.

As a final remark, we point out that when the matrix  $\tilde{A}$  is not directly accessible, thanks to Proposition 5, a sufficient condition for (19) to hold is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \varphi_\kappa(A(\tau)) d\tau + c_2 \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \gamma(\tau) d\tau \\ + c_2^2 \left( \int_{t_a}^{t_b} \|dA\| + \int_{t_a}^{t_b} |d\varphi_\kappa(A)| \right) \leq \lambda(t_b - t_a) + \varrho, \end{aligned}$$

where one only needs to evaluate  $A(t)$ ,  $\varphi_\kappa(A(t))$  and  $\gamma(t)$ .

#### 4.2 Proof of Theorem 9

The proof essentially contains two steps. In the first step we will define a function  $\xi(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  which traces the change of the left-hand side of (19) and show that it is always in a bounded set. In the second step we will use  $\xi(t)$  to construct a time-varying Lyapunov function which is monotonically decreasing when  $\delta(t) \equiv 0$ , and hence use it to show the desired property (20).

We start the first step of the proof by defining

$$\xi(t) := \inf_{s \in [0, t]} \chi(s) - \chi(t) + \varrho, \quad (22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(t) \\ := c_1 \int_0^t \varphi_\kappa(A(\tau)) d\tau + c_2 \int_0^t \gamma(\tau) d\tau + c_2^2 \int_0^t \|d\tilde{A}\| - \lambda t. \end{aligned}$$

By its definition,  $\xi(t) \leq \varrho$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . In addition, it follows from (19) that for any  $s \in [0, t]$ ,

$$\chi(s) - \chi(t) + \varrho = -c_1 \int_s^t \varphi_\kappa(A(\tau)) d\tau - c_2 \int_s^t \gamma(\tau) d\tau$$

$$-c_2^2 \int_s^t \|d\tilde{A}\| + \lambda(t-s) + \varrho \geq 0.$$

Therefore

$$0 \leq \xi(t) \leq \varrho. \quad (23)$$

We now recall the characterization of  $\int_s^t \|d\tilde{A}\|$  in (11) and the definition of  $\mathcal{D}$  in (3) which is the set of discontinuities of  $A(t)$ . Since  $\inf_{s \in [0, t]} \chi(s)$  is non-increasing, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}(t) &\leq -\dot{\chi}(t) \\ &= -c_1 \varphi_\kappa(A(t)) - c_2 \gamma(t) - c_2^2 \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{A}(t) \right\| + \lambda \quad \forall \text{ a.a. } t \notin \mathcal{D}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(t) - \xi(t^-) &\leq -(\chi(t) - \chi(t^-)) \\ &= -c_2^2 \|\tilde{A}(t) - \tilde{A}(t^-)\| \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Now we proceed to the second step of the proof. Define the function  $U(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  with  $U(t) := e^{\frac{2\xi(t)}{c_1}}$ , and two functions  $V(t, x), W(t, x) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $V(t, x) := x^\top P(t)x$  where  $P(t)$  is the solution to the Lyapunov equation (13), and  $W(t, x) := U(t)V(t, x)$ . We will show that  $W(t, x)$  is the desired time-varying Lyapunov function. It follows from (14) and (23) that

$$c_1 |x|^2 \leq W(t, x) \leq c_2 e^{\frac{2\varrho}{c_1}} |x|^2 \quad \forall (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (26)$$

We investigate the time derivative<sup>1</sup> of  $W(t, x)$  for  $t \notin \mathcal{D}$  and the jump of  $W(t, x)$  for  $t \in \mathcal{D}$  separately. To this end, it follows from (24) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} U(t) &= \frac{2}{c_1} U(t) \dot{\xi}(t) \\ &\leq \left( -2\varphi_\kappa(A(t)) - \frac{2c_2}{c_1} \gamma(t) - \frac{2c_2^2}{c_1} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{A}(t) \right\| + \frac{2\lambda}{c_1} \right) U(t). \end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate the time derivative of  $V(t, x(t))$ . For simplification we omit the argument  $t$  when it is unnecessary in the following derivation. Note that since  $\lambda < \frac{c_1}{2c_2}$ , there exists  $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{c_1}{c_2} - 2\lambda)$ . It then follows from (14), (16) and Assumption 4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} V(t, x(t)) &= (Ax + g(t, x))^\top Px + x^\top P(Ax + g(t, x)) \\ &\quad + x^\top \frac{dP(t)}{dt} x \end{aligned}$$

<sup>1</sup> The derivative of  $\xi(t)$  exists almost everywhere, by its definition (22) and the fact that  $\chi(t)$  is differentiable for all  $t \notin \mathcal{D}$ . In addition since  $\tilde{A}(t)$  is differentiable for almost all  $t \notin \mathcal{D}$ , (16) suggests that  $P(t)$  is differentiable for almost all  $t \notin \mathcal{D}$  as well. Hence by construction, the time derivative of  $W(t, x)$  exists for almost all  $t \notin \mathcal{D}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} &= x^\top (A^\top P + PA)x + 2x^\top Pg(t, x) + x^\top \frac{dP(t)}{dt} x \\ &\leq x^\top (-I + 2\varphi_\kappa(A)P)x + 2|x| \|P\| (\gamma(t)|x| + \delta(t)) \\ &\quad + 2c_2^2 \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{A}(t) \right\| |x|^2 \\ &= 2\varphi_\kappa(A)x^\top Px + 2|x| \|P\| \delta(t) \\ &\quad + \left( 2c_2^2 \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \tilde{A}(t) \right\| - 1 + 2\|P\| \gamma(t) \right) |x(t)|^2 \\ &\leq 2\varphi_\kappa(A)x^\top Px + \frac{c_2^2}{\epsilon} \delta(t)^2 \\ &\quad + \left( 2c_2^2 \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \tilde{A}(t) \right\| - 1 + 2c_2 \gamma(t) + \epsilon \right) |x(t)|^2 \\ &\leq \left( 2\varphi_\kappa(A) + \frac{2c_2^2}{c_1} \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{A}(t) \right\| - \frac{1}{c_2} + \frac{2c_2}{c_1} \gamma(t) + \frac{\epsilon}{c_1} \right) V \\ &\quad + \frac{c_2^2}{\epsilon} \delta(t)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using chain rule and plug the bounds on  $\frac{d}{dt} U$  and  $\frac{d}{dt} V$  in, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} W(t, x(t)) &= \left( \frac{d}{dt} U(t) \right) V(t, x(t)) + U(t) \left( \frac{d}{dt} V(t, x(t)) \right) \\ &\leq \left( \frac{2\lambda + \epsilon}{c_1} - \frac{1}{c_2} \right) W(t, x(t)) + \frac{c_2^2}{\epsilon} U(t) \delta(t)^2 \\ &\leq \left( \frac{2\lambda + \epsilon}{c_1} - \frac{1}{c_2} \right) W(t, x(t)) + \frac{c_2^2}{\epsilon} e^{\frac{2\varrho}{c_1}} \delta(t)^2. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, we conclude that

$$\frac{d}{dt} W(t, x(t)) \leq -aW(t, x(t)) + b|\omega(t)|^2 \quad \forall \text{ a.a. } t \notin \mathcal{D} \quad (27)$$

where  $a = \frac{1}{c_2} - \frac{2\lambda + \epsilon}{c_1} > 0$  and  $b = \frac{c_2^2}{\epsilon} e^{\frac{2\varrho}{c_1}}$ .

Now for all  $t \in \mathcal{D}$ , it follows from (25) that

$$U(t) \leq e^{-2c_2^2 c_1^{-1} \|\tilde{A}(t) - \tilde{A}(t^-)\|} U(t^-).$$

Meanwhile, since the solution is continuous,  $x(t) = x(t^-)$  and it follows from (18) in Lemma 8 that

$$V(t, x(t)) \leq e^{2c_2^2 c_1^{-1} \|\tilde{A}(t) - \tilde{A}(t^-)\|} V(t^-, x(t^-)).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} W(t, x(t)) &= U(t)V(t, x(t)) \leq U(t^-)V(t^-, x(t^-)) \\ &= W(t^-, x(t^-)) \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

From the estimates (27) and (28) we conclude that for any  $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$ ,

$$W(t, x(t)) \leq e^{-a(t-t_0)} W(t_0, x_0) + b \int_{t_0}^t e^{-a(t-\tau)} \delta(\tau)^2 d\tau$$

$$\leq e^{-a(t-t_0)}W(t_0, x_0) + \frac{b}{a} \max_{\tau \in [t_0, t]} \delta(\tau)^2.$$

Finally, it follows from (26) and the inequality  $\sqrt{a_1 + a_2} \leq \sqrt{a_1} + \sqrt{a_2}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} |x(t)| &\leq \sqrt{\frac{W(t, x(t))}{c_1}} \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{a}{2}(t-t_0)} \sqrt{\frac{W(t_0, x_0)}{c_1}} + \sqrt{\frac{b}{a}} \max_{\tau \in [t_0, t]} \delta(\tau) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{c_2}{c_1}} e^{\frac{\rho}{c_1} - \frac{a}{2}(t-t_0)} |x_0| + \frac{b}{a} \max_{\tau \in [t_0, t]} \delta(\tau) \end{aligned}$$

We thus achieve (20) with  $k_1 := \sqrt{\frac{c_2}{c_1}} e^{\frac{\rho}{c_1}}$ ,  $k_2 := \frac{a}{2}$  and  $k_3 := \sqrt{\frac{b}{a}}$ . This concludes the proof of Theorem 9.

## 5 Example

Consider a 2-dimensional periodic system with period  $2\pi$ . Over the time interval  $[0, 2\pi)$ , the dynamics is given by

$$\dot{x} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.1 \cos(\frac{t}{2}) + 0.1 \sin(t) - 1 & 0.1 \cos(t) + 1 \\ 0.1 \cos(t) - 1 & 1.1 \cos(\frac{t}{2}) + 0.1 \sin(t) - 1 \end{pmatrix} x. \quad (29)$$

We can re-write (29) in the form of (2), with

$$\begin{aligned} A(t) &:= \begin{pmatrix} 1.1 \cos(\frac{t}{2}) - 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1.1 \cos(\frac{t}{2}) - 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ g(t, x) &:= 0.1 \begin{pmatrix} \sin(t) & \cos(t) \\ \cos(t) & \sin(t) \end{pmatrix} x. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $A(t)$  is not continuous, since  $A(2\pi^-) = \begin{pmatrix} -2.1 & 1 \\ -1 & -2.1 \end{pmatrix}$  but  $A(2\pi) = A(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0.1 \end{pmatrix}$ . Moreover,  $\alpha(A(t)) = 1.1 \cos(\frac{t}{2}) - 1$ . Since  $\alpha(A(0)) = 0.1$ , the system (29) has unstable instantaneous dynamics.

To apply Theorem 9, we take  $\kappa = 1$ . Since the system is periodic, we will only investigate (19) over one period; i.e.,  $t_a = 0$  and  $t_b = 2\pi$ . It can be found that

$$\varphi_\kappa(A(t)) = \begin{cases} 1.1 \cos(\frac{t}{2}) & \text{for } t \in [0, \pi), \\ 0 & \text{for } t \in [\pi, 2\pi). \end{cases}$$

Therefore  $\int_0^{2\pi} \varphi_\kappa(A(t)) dt = 2.2$ . Meanwhile,  $\tilde{A}(t)$  changes from  $\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$  from time  $t = 0$  to  $\begin{pmatrix} -2.1 & 1 \\ -1 & -2.1 \end{pmatrix}$

when  $t \rightarrow 2\pi$  while  $\|\tilde{A}(t)\|$  keeps decreasing, and then jumps back to  $\begin{pmatrix} -2.1 & 1 \\ -1 & -2.1 \end{pmatrix}$  at time  $t = 2\pi$ . Hence

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \|d\tilde{A}\| = 2 \left\| \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} -2.1 & 1 \\ -1 & -2.1 \end{pmatrix} \right\| = 2.2.$$

In addition,  $|g(t, x)| \leq 0.1 \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \sin(t) & \cos(t) \\ \cos(t) & \sin(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\| |x| = 0.1(|\cos(t)| + |\sin(t)|)|x|$ . Hence the inequality (5) holds with  $\gamma(t) = 0.1(|\cos(t)| + |\sin(t)|)$  and  $\delta(t) \equiv 0$ . We thus have  $\int_0^{2\pi} \gamma(t) dt = 0.8$ . It can also be computed that  $c_1 = 0.2381$ ,  $c_2 = 0.5$ , with which the left-hand side of (19) gives 1.4738, while by picking  $\lambda = 0.238 < \frac{c_1}{2c_2}$  and  $\rho = 0$ , the right-hand side of (19) gives 1.4954. Finally we remark here that even if  $[t_a, t_b]$  is not a multiple of periods, the discrepancies in the integration can always be bounded by some positive  $\rho$ . Therefore (19) always holds. Because  $\delta(t) \equiv 0$ , we conclude from Theorem 9 that the system (29) is uniformly globally exponentially stable.

## 6 Discussion and conclusion

In this work the stability of perturbed LTV systems is studied. We considered different challenging features for the problem in this work, including the assumption that the dynamics of the system is discontinuous, the assumption that the instantaneous dynamics can be unstable and the assumption that the perturbation might be persistent. With the help of the characterization of bounded total variation of the matrix trajectory  $A(t)$ , and the construction of a special Lyapunov function which does not increase when  $A(t)$  jumps, we managed to propose unified criteria based on the total assessment of all the three aspects and show that when the criteria are met, the neighborhood of the origin, whose size depends on the magnitude of the persistent perturbation, is uniformly globally exponentially stable for the system.

Through the numerical example studied in this work, we realized that while theoretically our result is elegant, it might have some limitations in application. The condition (19) proposed in Theorem 9 can be conservative, because the parameters  $c_1, c_2$  might be overestimated. Since  $c_1, c_2$  depend on the matrix trajectory  $P(t)$  as seen in (14), we can alternatively consider time-varying parameters instead of constants in order to give tighter estimates. We can also consider better choices of  $P(t)$  in the future work, in which direction the recent work [18] may give an idea how to “smartly” choose  $P(t)$  by optimization. We will also actively look for practical problems where our theorem can be applied, and consequently improve our theoretical results through the application. In



the meantime, similar stability problems for nonlinear time-varying systems whose dynamics might be discontinuous and instantaneously unstable will also be investigated in the future work.

## References

- [1] F. Amato, G. Celentano, and F. Garofalo. New sufficient conditions for the stability of slowly varying linear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 38(9):1409–1411, 1993.
- [2] G. Chen and Y. Yang. New stability conditions for a class of linear time-varying systems. *Automatica*, 71:342–347, 2016.
- [3] W. A. Coppel. *Dichotomies in stability theory*. Springer-Verlag, 1978.
- [4] C. Desoer. Slowly varying system  $\dot{x} = a(t)x$ . *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 14(6):780–781, 1969.
- [5] G. Gaeta. Perturbation theory. In R. A. Meyers, editor, *Encyclopedia of Complexity and Systems Science*, pages 6625–6639. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2009.
- [6] X. Gao, D. Liberzon, J. Liu, and T. Başar. Unified stability criteria for slowly time-varying and switched linear systems. *Automatica*, 96:110–120, 2018.
- [7] H. Haimovich and J. L. Mancilla-Aguilar. A characterization of integral ISS for switched and time-varying systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(2):578–585, Feb 2018.
- [8] H. Haimovich and J. L. Mancilla-Aguilar. ISS implies iISS even for switched and time-varying systems (if you are careful enough). *Automatica*, 104:154 – 164, 2019.
- [9] J. K. Hale. *Ordinary differential equations*. R.E. Krieger Pub. Co., 1980.
- [10] J. P. Hespanha and A. S. Morse. Stability of switched systems with average dwell-time. In *Proceedings of the 38th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, volume 3, pages 2655–2660 vol.3, Dec 1999.
- [11] A. Ilchmann, D. Owens, and D. Prätzel-Wolters. Sufficient conditions for stability of linear time-varying systems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 9(2):157–163, 1987.
- [12] P. Ioannou and B. Fidan. *Adaptive Control Tutorial*. SIAM, 2006.
- [13] P. A. Ioannou and J. Sun. *Robust Adaptive Control*. PTR Prentice Hall, 1996.
- [14] L. Jetto and V. Orsini. Relaxed conditions for the exponential stability of a class of linear time-varying systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(7):1580–1585, 2009.
- [15] H. Khalil. *Nonlinear Systems, 3rd ed.* Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 2002.
- [16] Y. Li, Y. Sun, and F. Meng. New criteria for exponential stability of switched time-varying systems with delays and nonlinear disturbances. *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, 26:284–291, 2017.
- [17] D. Liberzon. *Switching in Systems and Control*. Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 2003.
- [18] S. Liu, S. Martínez, and J. Cortés. Average dwell-time minimization of switched systems via sequential convex programming. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 6:1076–1081, 2022.
- [19] X. Liu, Y. Yu, and H. Chen. Stability of perturbed switched nonlinear systems with delays. *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, 25:114–125, 2017.
- [20] L. Long. Integral ISS for switched nonlinear time-varying systems using indefinite multiple Lyapunov functions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 64(1):404–411, Jan 2019.
- [21] J. L. Mancilla-Aguilar and H. Haimovich. (integral-)ISS of switched and time-varying impulsive systems based on global state weak linearization, 2021. arXiv 2104.03772.
- [22] A. S. Morse. Dwell-time switching. In *Proceedings of the 2nd European Control Conference*, pages 176–181, 1993.
- [23] M. A. Müller and D. Liberzon. Input/output-to-state stability and state-norm estimators for switched nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 48(9):2029 – 2039, 2012.
- [24] V. Solo. On the stability of slowly time-varying linear systems. *Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems*, 7:331–350, 1994.
- [25] E. Sontag and Y. Wang. New characterizations of input-to-state stability. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 41(9):1283 – 1294, 1996.
- [26] M. Vidyasagar. *Nonlinear Systems Analysis*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, second edition, 2002.
- [27] L. Vu, D. Chatterjee, and D. Liberzon. Input-to-state stability of switched systems and switching adaptive control. *Automatica*, 43(4):639 – 646, 2007.
- [28] G. Yang and D. Liberzon. A Lyapunov-based small-gain theorem for interconnected switched systems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 78:47–54, 2015.
- [29] G. Zhai, B. Hu, K. Yasuda, and A. N. Michel. Stability analysis of switched systems with stable and unstable subsystems: An average dwell time approach. *International Journal of Systems Science*, 32(8):1055–1061, 2001.
- [30] B. Zhou. On asymptotic stability of linear time-varying systems. *Automatica*, 68:266–276, 2016.