Title
Robust Global Stabilization of the DC-DC Boost Converter via Hybrid Control

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6n05q3kq

Journal
IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I Regular Papers, 62(4)

ISSN
1057-7130

Authors
Theunisse, Thomas AF
Chai, Jun
Sanfelice, Ricardo G
et al.

Publication Date
2015-04-01

DOI
10.1109/tcsi.2015.2413154

Peer reviewed
Abstract—In this paper, we consider the modeling and (robust) control of a DC-DC boost converter. In particular, we derive a mathematical model consisting of a constrained switched differential inclusion that includes all possible modes of operation of the converter. The obtained model is carefully selected to be amenable for the study of various important robustness properties. For this model, we design a control algorithm that induces robust, global asymptotic stability of a desired output voltage value. The guaranteed robustness properties ensure proper operation of the converter in the presence of noise in the state, unmodeled dynamics, and spatial regularization to reduce the high rate of switching. The establishment of these properties is enabled by recent tools for the study of robust stability in hybrid systems. Simulations illustrating the main results are included.

Index Terms—Boost converter, DC-DC converters, hybrid control, stability, robustness, stability.

I. INTRODUCTION

The increasing number of renewable energy sources and distributed generators requires new strategies for the operation and management of the electricity grid in order to maintain, and even to improve, the reliability and quality the power supplied. Power electronics play a key role in distributed generation and in integration of renewable sources into the electric grid [2]. A recent challenge for these systems is the unavoidable variability of the power obtained from renewable resources, which, in turn, demands conversion technology that robustly adapts to changes in the supplies and demands.

One type of converter that is widely used in energy conversion is the DC-DC Boost converter. This converter draws power from a DC voltage source and supplies power to a load at a higher DC voltage value. Different approaches have been employed in the literature for the analysis and the design of such converters. Arguably, the most popular method used to control such converters is Pulse-Width Modulation (PWM). In PWM-based controllers, the switch in the circuit is turned on at the beginning of each switching period and is turned off when the reference value is lower than a certain carrier signal [3]. The analysis and design of a PWM controller is typically carried out by averaging the two steady state configurations of the circuit, leading to a single differential equation model, see, e.g., [4]. More recently, a renewed interest in power converters has originated from the rise of switching/hybrid modeling paradigms [3, 5–13], and new perspectives on their control were proposed, including time-based switching, state-event triggered control, and optimization-based control.

In this paper, motivated by the need of converters that robustly adapt to changes in renewable energy systems, we consider the modeling and robust control of a DC-DC Boost converter. As a difference to previous approaches, in which models only capture steady state modes of operation (see, e.g., [6, 7]), we propose a model that includes all possible modes of operation of the converter, including the discontinuous conduction mode. In this way, our model captures both transient behavior and every possible state of the system. Our proposed model consists of a switching differential inclusion with constraints. Using hybrid systems tools, we study the properties induced by a controller that triggers switches of the differential inclusion based on the value of the internal current and output voltage of the converter as well as on the value of the discrete state of the controller (a logic variable).

We formally prove that the controller we employ, which is inspired by the one first proposed in [7] and that was studied by simulations therein, induces robust, global asymptotic stability of a desired output voltage value. The robustness properties guarantee proper operation of the converter in the presence of small noise in the state, unmodeled dynamics, and spatial regularization to relax the rate of switching. To the best of our knowledge, these properties of the Boost converter have not been previously established in the literature. The recently developed tools for robust stability in hybrid systems [14] form the enabling techniques to achieve these important results.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. After introducing notation, the principles of operation of the Boost converter are discussed and our mathematical model is presented in Section II. A switching control law is presented in Section III. In Section IV, global asymptotic stability for the closed-loop system is proven. In addition, the results on robustness are also presented in Section V. In Section VI, simulations are performed to illustrate our results. Finally, concluding remarks are presented in Section VII.

Notation: $\mathbb{R}$ denotes the set of real numbers. $\mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the $n$-dimensional Euclidean space. $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ denotes the set of nonnegative real numbers, i.e., $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} = [0, \infty)$. $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the set of natural numbers including 0, i.e., $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \ldots\}$. $\mathbb{B}$ denotes the closed unit ball in a Euclidean space centered at the origin. Given a set $S$, $\partial S$ denotes its boundary. Given a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|x|$ denotes its Euclidean vector norm, i.e., $|x| = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2}$. Given a set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the distance from $x$ to the set $K$ is denoted by $|x|_K := \inf_{y \in K} |x - y|$. We use the notation $\overline{B}$ to denote the closed
convex hull of a set. For \( l \) vectors \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, 2, \ldots, l \), we denote the vector obtained by stacking all the vectors in one (column) vector \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( n = n_1 + n_2 + \ldots + n_l \) by \((x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l)\), i.e., \( (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1^T \ x_2^T \ \ldots \ x_l^T \end{bmatrix}^T \). A function \( \alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) is said to be of class \( K \) if it is continuous, zero at zero and strictly increasing. It is said to be of class \( K^{\infty} \) if it is of class \( K \) and it is unbounded. A function \( \beta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) is said to be of class \( K^L \) if \( \beta(s, t) \) is of class \( K \) for each fixed \( t \geq 0 \) and \( \beta(s, t) \) is nonincreasing and satisfies \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \beta(s, t) = 0 \) for each fixed \( s \geq 0 \).

## II. Modeling

In this section, we describe the principles of operation of the DC-DC Boost converter. Afterwards, we present a model covering all possible system modes.

### A. Principles of operation

The DC-DC Boost converter is shown in Figure 1. The Boost circuit consists of a capacitor \( c \), an ideal diode \( d \), a DC voltage source \( E \), an inductor \( L \), a resistor \( R \), and an ideal switch \( S \). The voltage across the capacitor is denoted \( v_c \), and the current through the inductor is denoted \( i_L \). The purpose of the circuit is to draw power from the DC voltage source, and supply power to the load at a higher DC voltage value. This task is accomplished by first closing the switch to store energy in the inductor, and then opening the switch to transfer that energy to the capacitor, where it is available to the load.

![Fig. 1. Schematic representation of the DC-DC Boost converter.](image)

The presence of switching elements \((d \text{ and } S)\) causes the overall system to be of a switching/hybrid nature. Depending on the (discrete) state of the diode and of the switch, one can distinguish four modes of operation (1):

- **mode 1:** \((S = 0, d = 1)\)
- **mode 2:** \((S = 1, d = 0)\)
- **mode 3:** \((S = 0, d = 0)\)
- **mode 4:** \((S = 1, d = 1)\)

The circuits associated to each mode are shown in Figure 2. When the system is in mode 1, in which the switch is open \((S = 0)\) and the diode is conducting \((d = 1)\), the inductor is charged by the input source, which, also offloads power to the resistor. In mode 2, in which the switch is closed \((S = 1)\) and the diode is blocking \((d = 0)\), the inductor is charged by the input source and the capacitor is offloading its charge to the load. In mode 3, the capacitor offloads its charge to the load. Finally, mode 4, in which the switch is closed, the diode is conducting and the voltage in the capacitor is zero, hence only the inductor is charging. Using the ideal diode model:

- **conducting** \((d = 1)\): \(i_d \geq 0, v_d = 0\)
- **blocking** \((d = 0)\): \(i_d = 0, v_d \leq 0\)

and the ideal switch model:

- **conducting** \((S = 1)\): \(v_S = 0\)
- **blocking** \((S = 0)\): \(i_S = 0\)

The differential equations for each mode, along with the specific values of \( S \) and \( d \), are given by

\[
1: \begin{cases} S = 0 \\ d = 1 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dv_c}{dt} = -\frac{1}{RC}v_c + \frac{1}{L}i_L \\ \frac{di_L}{dt} = -\frac{v_c}{L} + \frac{E}{L} \end{cases} \quad 2: \begin{cases} S = 1 \\ d = 0 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dv_c}{dt} = -\frac{1}{RC}v_c \\ \frac{di_L}{dt} = \frac{E}{L} \end{cases} \quad 3: \begin{cases} S = 0 \\ d = 0 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dv_c}{dt} = -\frac{1}{RC}v_c \\ \frac{di_L}{dt} = 0 \end{cases} \quad 4: \begin{cases} S = 1 \\ d = 1 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dv_c}{dt} = 0 \\ \frac{di_L}{dt} = 0 \end{cases}
\]

In addition to the differential equations indicated above, the inequalities present in the ideal diode model impose further algebraic conditions on the states \( i_L \) and \( v_c \) for each individual mode. These mode-dependent conditions can be derived by inspecting for which states \( i_L \) and \( v_c \) a flow can take place in the mode over a time interval of positive length. This leads to the following conditions:

- For the diode to stay conducting while in mode 1, since \( i_d = i_L \), we need \( i_L > 0 \), or \((v_c \leq E, i_L = 0)\).

**Note that the ideal diode model being used implies that during this mode we should have \( v_d = 0 \).**

- For the diode to stay blocking during mode 2, since \( v_d = -v_c \), we should have \( v_c \geq 0 \).

**Note that in this mode \( i_L \) is unconstrained.**

- For the diode to be blocking during mode 3, we should have \( v_d \leq 0 \). Since for the configuration in mode 3, we have \( v_d = E - v_c \), then this implies \( v_c > E \).

Moreover, since the diode is blocking and the switch is open, we shall have \( i_L = 0 \).

- For the diode to stay conducting in mode 4 (which requires \( v_d = 0 \)) since \( v_d = -v_c \), we have \( v_c = 0 \).

Since the diode is grounding the capacitor, no current can circulate through the diode, hence \( i_d = 0 \).

Combining the conditions above with the differential equations for each mode, the resulting constrained algebraic differential equations for each mode are given in terms of \((S, v_c, i_L)\) as follows:

\[
1: \begin{cases} S = 0 \\ d = 1 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dv_c}{dt} = -\frac{1}{RC}v_c + \frac{1}{L}i_L \\ \frac{di_L}{dt} = -\frac{v_c}{L} + \frac{E}{L} \end{cases} \quad 2: \begin{cases} S = 1 \\ d = 0 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dv_c}{dt} = -\frac{1}{RC}v_c \\ \frac{di_L}{dt} = \frac{E}{L} \end{cases} \quad 3: \begin{cases} S = 0 \\ d = 0 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dv_c}{dt} = -\frac{1}{RC}v_c \\ \frac{di_L}{dt} = 0 \end{cases} \quad 4: \begin{cases} S = 1 \\ d = 1 \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dv_c}{dt} = 0 \\ \frac{di_L}{dt} = 0 \end{cases}
\]
B. Mathematical model

the modes of operation derived so far.

is only allowed when \( x \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_3 \). Therefore, to avoid such resets, our controller will allow \( S = 0 \) only when \( i_L \geq 0 \), and \( S = 1 \) only when \( v_c \geq 0 \).

Although, a full model with resets can be derived, see \([11]\), for practical operation of the converter it is clearly undesirable that such resets occur as they may damage the circuit. Therefore, to avoid such resets, our controller will allow \( S = 0 \) only when \( i_L \geq 0 \), and \( S = 1 \) only when \( v_c \geq 0 \).

In Section III-A we propose a controller that guarantees that after every switch of \( S \), the algebraic conditions of the subsequent mode are satisfied.

For convenience, we define \( x := (v_c, i_L) \) and the algebraic constraints for the modes above in terms of sets as follows:

\[
\mathcal{M}_1 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : i_L > 0 \} \cup \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : v_c \leq E, i_L = 0 \},
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}_2 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : v_c \geq 0 \},
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}_3 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : v_c > E, i_L = 0 \}
\]

Hence, \( S = 0 \) is only allowed when \( x \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_3 \) and \( S = 1 \) is only allowed when \( x \in \mathcal{M}_2 \). Using these restrictions, we can derive a switched differential inclusion encompassing all the modes of operation derived so far.

B. Mathematical model

In this section, we define a mathematical model of the Boost converter in which the differential equations in each mode define the continuous dynamics. Since the vector field associated with mode 1 is

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{v}_c \\
\dot{i}_L
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
-E & 0 \\
0 & E
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{x}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

and the vector field associated with mode 3 is

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{v}_c \\
\dot{i}_L
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
-E & 0 \\
0 & E
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{x}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

the resulting vector field for \( S = 0 \) is discontinuous. To establish robust asymptotic stability of the upcoming closed-loop system, a Krasovskii regularization\(^1\) of the vector field will be performed following the ideas in \([17], [18]\). The system will take the form of a switched differential inclusion with constraints, namely

\[
\dot{x} \in F_S(x), \quad x \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_S
\]

where \( S \in \{0, 1\} \) is the position of the switch \( S \), and for each \( S \in \{0, 1\}, F_S(x) \) is the Krasovskii regularization of the vector fields and \( \bar{\mathcal{M}}_S \) is the corresponding regularization of the sets capturing the regions of validity for each mode.

Following \([18]\), the regularization of \( \bar{\mathcal{M}}_S \) for \( S = 0 \) is

\[
\bar{\mathcal{M}}_0 = \mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_3 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : i_L \geq 0 \},
\]

and \( \bar{\mathcal{M}}_S \) for \( S = 1 \) is

\[
\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_1^+ = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : v_c \geq 0 \}.
\]

Note that for \( x \in \mathcal{M}_3 \), \( f_a \) and \( f_b \) reduce to

\[
\begin{align*}
 f_a(x) &= \begin{pmatrix}
 -\frac{1}{R}v_c \\
 -\frac{1}{L}v_c + \frac{1}{L}E
\end{pmatrix}, \\
 f_b(x) &= \begin{pmatrix}
 -\frac{1}{R}v_c \\
 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]

Then, we have the discontinuous vector field for mode 1 and mode 3 as

\[
\begin{align*}
 f_0(x) &= \begin{cases}
 f_a(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{M}_1; \\
 f_b(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{M}_3.
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

The regularization of \( f_0 \) at each \( x \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_0 \) is given by

\[
F_0(x) := \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \mathcal{C} \left( (x + \delta B) \cap \bar{\mathcal{M}}_0 \right)
\]

(2)

\[
= \left\{ f_0(x) \right\}
\]

\[
\bigcap_{\mathcal{C}} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix}
 -\frac{1}{R}v_c \\
 -\frac{1}{L}v_c + \frac{1}{L}E
\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}
 -\frac{1}{R}v_c \\
 0
\end{pmatrix} \right\}
\]

(3)

(4)

Since the vector field for mode 2’ is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
 f_1(x) &= \begin{pmatrix}
 -\frac{1}{R}v_c \\
 -\frac{1}{L}v_c + \frac{1}{L}E
\end{pmatrix}, \\
 f_2(x) &= \begin{pmatrix}
 -\frac{1}{R}v_c \\
 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]

The model (1) is a constrained switched differential inclusion. This is a key difference with previous modeling approaches (see, e.g. [6], [7]) where the third mode is omitted. Based on this complete model, we propose a controller that induces robust, global asymptotic stability of desired (output voltage) setpoints in the next section. As we will see, the hybrid systems approach proposed here is the enabling tool to achieve this result.

III. STATE-DEPENDENT SWITCHING LAW

In this section, a switching control law for the model (1) of the Boost converter is proposed. In Section IV we will

\(^1\)A Krasovskii regularization of this vector field is used due to the fact that the discontinuity occurs on a set of measure zero. A Filippov regularization would not account for discontinuities on such sets and would yield an incomplete mapping for mode 1 and mode 3. In fact, the Filippov regularization would yield a singleton set \( f_a \) on \( \bar{\mathcal{M}}_1 \).
establish that this control law induces a robust and global asymptotic stability property. Besides that, we determine various robustness properties of the closed-loop system. To propose the control law, we will use a control Lyapunov function (CLF) approach, see [19].

A. Control Lyapunov function

Given a desired set-point voltage \( v_c^* > 0 \) and current \( i_L^* > 0 \), let \( x^* = (v_c^*, i_L^*) \) and consider the CLF candidate

\[
V(x) = (x - x^*)^T P(x - x^*)
\]

where \( P = \begin{bmatrix} p_{11} & 0 \\ p_{21} & p_{22} \end{bmatrix} > 0 \). To establish that the function \( V \) is indeed a CLF [19], we need to show that for each state \( x = (v_c, i_L) \) of relevance there exists a choice of \( S \in \{0, 1\} \) such that the derivative of \( V \) along \( \dot{x} \) is negative. To do so, we compute the inner product between the gradient of \( V \) and the directions belonging to the (set-valued) map \( F_S \) in \( \mathcal{M}_3 \).

- For \( S = 0 \) and each \( x \in \mathcal{M}_3 \), we get

\[
\nabla V(x) \cdot F_0(x) = (\nabla V(x), f_0(x)) = 2p_{11}(v_c - v_c^*) \left( \frac{1}{R_c} v_c + \frac{1}{c} i_L \right) + 2p_{22}(i_L - i_L^*) \left( -\frac{v_c + E}{L} \right)
\]

- For \( S = 1 \) and each \( x \in \mathcal{M}_3 \), we get

\[
\nabla V(x) \cdot F_1(x) = (\nabla V(x), f_1(x)) = 2p_{11}(v_c - v_c^*) \left( \frac{1}{R_c} v_c \right) + 2p_{22}(i_L - i_L^*) \left( \frac{E}{L} \right)
\]

Define for each \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \)

\[
\gamma_0(x) := 2p_{11}(v_c - v_c^*) \left( \frac{1}{R_c} v_c + \frac{1}{c} i_L \right) + 2p_{22}(i_L - i_L^*) \left( -\frac{v_c + E}{L} \right)
\]

\[
\gamma_1(x) := 2p_{11}(v_c - v_c^*) \left( \frac{1}{R_c} v_c \right) + 2p_{22}(i_L - i_L^*) \left( \frac{E}{L} \right)
\]

Combining (5)–(7) and observing that the expressions in (5) and (6) are equal, for each \( S \in \{0, 1\} \) and \( x \in \mathcal{M}_S \) we get

\[
\max_{\xi \in F_S(x)} \langle \nabla V(x), \xi \rangle = \begin{cases} \gamma_0(x) & \text{if } S = 0 \\ \gamma_1(x) & \text{if } S = 1 \end{cases}
\]

The sign of the functions \( \gamma_0, \gamma_1 \) will be used to define a state-dependent switching control law assigning the control input \( S \). Let \( \mathcal{A}_x = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : v_c = v_c^*, i_L = i_L^* \} \)

\[
\text{define the isolated point to be stabilized, namely, the point (ve,iL) = x* = (v_c^*, i_L^*)}. \]

The following lemma establishes a property of the functions \( \gamma_0, \gamma_1 \) that will be instrumental in our stability result in Section IV-A and, in fact, shows that \( V \) is a CLF [19] for \( \mathcal{M}_3 \).

Lemma III.1. Let \( R, E, p_{11}, p_{22} > 0, \frac{p_{11}}{R_c} = \frac{p_{22}}{E}, v_c^* > E, \) and \( i_L^* = \frac{v_c^*}{R_c} \). Then, for each \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_x \), there exists \( S \in \{0, 1\} \) such that

\[
\gamma_S(x) < 0
\]

Moreover, \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \gamma_S(x) = 0, S \in \{0, 1\} \} = \mathcal{A}_x \).

Proof. Consider the functions \( \gamma_S, S \in \{0, 1\} \), using the relationship \( \frac{p_{11}}{R_c} = \frac{p_{22}}{E} \), we can rewrite (8) and (9) as

\[
\gamma_0(x) = 2(A_0 v_c^2 + B_0 v_c + C_0 i_L + D_0)
\]

\[
\gamma_1(x) = 2(A_1 v_c^2 + B_1 v_c + C_1 i_L + D_1)
\]

where the coefficients, \( A_0 \) through \( D_0 \) and \( A_1 \) through \( D_1 \) are defined as

\[
A_0 = -\frac{p_{11}}{R_c} \quad A_1 = \frac{p_{11}}{R_c}
\]

\[
B_0 = \frac{p_{11} v_c^*}{R_c} + \frac{p_{22} i_L^*}{L} \quad B_1 = \frac{p_{11} v_c^*}{R_c} \quad C_0 = \frac{p_{11} v_c^*}{E} + \frac{p_{22} E}{L} \quad C_1 = \frac{p_{22} E}{L}
\]

\[
D_0 = -\frac{p_{22} E}{L} \quad D_1 = -\frac{p_{22} E}{L}
\]

To guarantee that for every \((v_c, i_L) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_x\) there exists an \( S \in \{0, 1\} \) such that \( \gamma_S(x) < 0 \) and that \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \gamma_S(x) = 0, S \in \{0, 1\} \} = \mathcal{A}_x \), we consider the sets \( \Gamma_S := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \gamma_S(x) < 0 \} \) for \( S \in \{0, 1\} \), which are parabolas. We first derive explicit expressions for \( \Gamma_S, S \in \{0, 1\} \), next.

(i) For \( x \in \Gamma_0 \), we have \( A_0 v_c^2 + B_0 v_c + C_0 i_L + D_0 < 0 \). Substituting the coefficients \( A_0 \) through \( D_0 \), using \( \frac{p_{11}}{R_c} = \frac{p_{22}}{E} \) and \( v_c^* > E \) gives

\[
i_L > \frac{1}{E - v_c^*} \left( \frac{1}{R_c} v_c^2 - \left( \frac{v_c^*}{R_c} \right) + i_L^* E \right)
\]

(ii) For \( x \in \Gamma_1 \), we have \( A_1 v_c^2 + B_1 v_c + C_1 i_L + D_1 < 0 \). Substituting the coefficients \( A_1 \) through \( D_1 \), using again \( \frac{p_{11}}{R_c} = \frac{p_{22}}{E} \) gives

\[
i_L < \frac{1}{E - v_c^*} \left( \frac{1}{R_c} v_c^2 - \left( \frac{v_c^*}{R_c} \right) + i_L^* E \right)
\]

This gives the expressions

\[
\Gamma_0 = \left\{ (v_c, i_L) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : i_L > \frac{1}{E - v_c^*} \left( \frac{1}{R_c} v_c^2 - \left( \frac{v_c^*}{R_c} \right) + i_L^* E \right) \right\}
\]

\[
\Gamma_1 = \left\{ (v_c, i_L) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : i_L < \frac{1}{E - v_c^*} \left( \frac{1}{R_c} v_c^2 - \left( \frac{v_c^*}{R_c} \right) + i_L^* E \right) \right\}
\]

and similar ones for \( \Omega_S, S \in \{0, 1\} \). Both parabolas \( \Omega_S, \)}
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Fig. 3. An example of a possible sign distribution for the two
parabolas γ0(x) = 0 and γ1(x) = 0.
To show that Ω0 ∩ Ω1 = Ax, we observe that if (vc, iL) ∈
Ω0 ∩ Ω1 we must satisfy the right-hand sides of (16) and
which are equal, which leads to
\[ \frac{1}{R}i^2 + \left( \frac{v^2}{R} + i^*_L \right) v_c - i^*_LE = \frac{1}{E - v^*_c} \]
Since i^*_L = v^*_c^2/RE, we have
\[ -\frac{1}{RE}v^2 + \frac{v^2}{RE}v_c - i^*_L \]
which has a unique solution v_c = v^*_c, and implies that Ω0 ∩ Ω1
is indeed \{v^*_c, i^*_L\}. This completes the proof.

The property in Lemma III.1 shows indeed that V is a CLF-
like function in the sense that
\[ \min_{S \in \{0, 1\}} \max_{\xi \in P_S(x)} \langle \nabla V(x), \xi \rangle < 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus A_x \] (20)
This condition can be used to derive a suitable stabilizing
control law, as will be done next.

B. Proposed control law

The condition obtained in (20) naturally leads to the fol-
lowing selection of the input S, which is a nonlinear system
with discontinuous right-hand side (i.e., as we forget for a moment
the constraints on the switching in (1)):
\[ S = \arg\min_{S \in \{0, 1\}} \max_{\xi \in P_S(x)} \langle \nabla V(x), \xi \rangle \] (21)

The control law, which we will propose below, will take
advantage of this observation. However, the direct application
of (21) as the switching law, leads to a discontinuous control
law and results in chattering (sliding motions; see (17)), which
is undesirable in practice. Therefore, we will propose a modif-
ed logic-based control law (and a corresponding regularized
closed-loop system), which is practically feasible. In fact,
for the resulting (regularized) controller various robustness
properties can be derived and proved mathematically based on
the hybrid system setup particularly chosen for this purpose
(see Section IV below).

Let q ∈ \{0, 1\} be a logic state indicating the value of the
actual input S. The envisioned logic-based control law will
select the input according to the current active input q and
the value of the state, namely, when certain well-designed
functions \( \tilde{\gamma}_q \) become zero. These functions \( \tilde{\gamma}_q \) are control
design parameters that are related to the functions \( \gamma_q \) in (13)
and (14) and will be chosen as in the following lemma.

Remark III.2. The functions \( \tilde{\gamma}_q \) are not chosen exactly equal
to \( \gamma_q \), because mode 1 would have an equilibrium \( v_c, i_L = (E, \frac{E}{R}) \)
exactly at \( \gamma_0(x) = 0 \). This would prevent to achieve
global asymptotic stability of the desired setpoint.

Lemma III.3. Let \( R, E, p_{11}, p_{22} > 0 \), \( \frac{p_{11}}{E} = \frac{p_{22}}{E} \), \( v_c > E \),
and \( i^*_L = v^*_c^2/RE \). For each q ∈ \{0, 1\}, let \( \tilde{\gamma}_q \) be given for x ∈ \( \mathbb{R}^2 \)
as \( \tilde{\gamma}_0(x) = \gamma_0(x) + K_0 (v_c - v^*_c)^2 \) (22)
and \( \tilde{\gamma}_1(x) = \gamma_1(x) + K_1 (v_c - v^*_c)^2 \) (23)

and \( K_0 \in (0, \frac{2p_{11}}{RE}), K_1 \in (0, \frac{2p_{22}}{RE}) \). The following hold:

(a) For \( q \in \{0, 1\} \) and \( x \not\in A_x \) we have that \( \tilde{\gamma}_q(x) \geq 0 \)
implies \( \tilde{\gamma}_{1-q}(x) < 0 \);
(b) For \( q \in \{0, 1\} \) and \( x \not\in A_x \) we have that \( \tilde{\gamma}_q(x) \leq 0 \)
implies \( \tilde{\gamma}_{1-q}(x) < 0 \);
(c) For \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) it holds that
\[ \lim_{K_0 \to 2p_{11}/RE} \tilde{\gamma}_0(x) = \lim_{K_1 \to 2p_{22}/RE} \tilde{\gamma}_1(x) = \frac{2v^*_c}{E}v_c + 2i_L \]
\[ \lim_{K_0 \to 0} \tilde{\gamma}_0(x) = \gamma_0(x), \lim_{K_1 \to 0} \tilde{\gamma}_1(x) = \gamma_1(x). \]

The proof is given in Appendix A.

Based on the properties derived in the lemma above we can
define an appropriate (robustly) stabilizing control law. In
fact, the control law makes sure that for the current value of
q and x it holds that \( \tilde{\gamma}_q(x) \leq 0 \), which implies by property
(b) that as long as \( x \not\in A_x \), we have that \( \tilde{\gamma}_q(x) < 0 \), which, in
turn, implies that the CLF V in (14) is decreasing. Once \( \tilde{\gamma}_q(x) \)
becomes 0, a switch occurs from q to \( 1-q \), and, due to property
(a) in the above lemma, we have then that \( \tilde{\gamma}_{1-q}(x) < 0 \)
if \( x \not\in A_x \), and hence, the switching is well defined. The
constants \( K_0 \) and \( K_1 \) control the shape and position of the
switching boundaries, which are parabolas in the \( (v_c, i_L) \)
plane. In fact, according to property (c) of Lemma III.3 as
\( K_0 \) and \( K_1 \) approach zero, the switching boundary approaches
the zero level set of \( \gamma_0(x) \) and \( \gamma_1 \), respectively. Moreover, as
\( K_0 \) and \( K_1 \) approach \( \frac{2p_{11}}{RE} \), the switching boundaries approach
the line given by the points x such that \( \frac{2v^*_c}{E}v_c + 2i_L = 0 \).

S is assigned to q, namely, \( S = q \), and combining this with
the constraints in (1), leads to the hybrid system \( \mathcal{H} \) given by

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{q} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F_q(x) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} =: F(x, q) \quad (x, q) \in C \] (24)

where
\[ C = \left\{ (x, q) : x \in \tilde{M}_0, \tilde{\gamma}_0(x) \leq 0, q = 0 \right\} \cup \left\{ (x, q) : x \in \tilde{M}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_1(x) \leq 0, q = 1 \right\} \]
\[ D = \left\{ (x, q) : x \in \tilde{M}_0, \tilde{\gamma}_0(x) = 0, q = 0 \right\} \cup \left\{ (x, q) : x \in \tilde{M}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_1(x) = 0, q = 1 \right\} \]
and, for each \((x, q) \in \mathbb{R}^3\), \(G_q\) is continuous and at points \((x, q) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0, 1\}\) is given by
\[
G_q(x) = \begin{cases} 
\{1\} & \text{if } q = 0 \\
\{0\} & \text{if } q = 1 
\end{cases}
\]

The flow map \(F\) of the hybrid system \(\mathcal{H}\) is constructed by stacking the map \(F_q\) (with \(S = q\)) of (1) and zero, while the flow set enforces the constraints in (1) as well as those of the switching mechanism of the proposed controller. In this way, the continuous evolution of \(x\) is according to (1) under the effect of the proposed controller, while \(q\) does not change during flows. The jump map \(G\) is such that \(x\) does not change at jumps and \(q\) is toggled at jumps, while the jump set enforces the jumps of \(G_q(x)\) within the constraints of (1), as we will prove below (see Proposition IV.2).

Sample contour plots and switching boundaries \(\gamma_q(x) = 0\) and \(\tilde{\gamma}_q(x) = 0\) of the proposed controller for a particular set of parameters \((x^* = (7.327), E = 5V, R = 3\Omega, c = 0.1F, L = 0.2H, p_{11} = \frac{1}{2}, p_{22} = L,\) and varying \(K_0\) and \(K_1\)) are shown in Figure 4. By varying the constants \(K_0 \in (0, \frac{2p_{11}}{RL})\) and \(K_1 \in (0, \frac{2p_{22}}{RL})\), the shape and the position of the switching boundaries can be controlled. Some examples are shown in Figure 4. Note that the switching boundaries can also be modified by changing system parameters \(R\) and \(E\) (because of uncertainties in supply and demand of renewable energy sources).

In the next section we derive important properties of the resulting closed-loop system \(\mathcal{H}\).

IV. STABILITY AND ROBUSTNESS PROPERTIES

To prove closed-loop properties of the hybrid system \(\mathcal{H}\) regarding stability and robustness, we first recall some preliminaries.

A. Preliminaries on hybrid systems

Depending on the flow and the jump dynamics, solutions to the closed-loop system \(\mathcal{H}\) evolve either continuously or discretely. Following [20], we treat the number of jumps as an independent variable \(j\) next to the usual time and we parameterize the hybrid time by \((t, j)\). Solutions to \(\mathcal{H}\) will be given on hybrid time domains, which are defined next.

First, a set \(S \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}\) is a compact hybrid time domain if
\[
S = \bigcup_{j=0}^{J-1} \{([t_j, t_{j+1}), j) \}
\]
for some finite sequence of times \(0 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \cdots \leq t_J\). A set \(S \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}\) is a hybrid time domain if for all \((T, J) \in S\), \(S \cap ([0, T] \times \{0, 1, \ldots, J\})\) is a compact hybrid time domain. A hybrid arc, as defined in [13], is a function \(x\) defined on \(dom x\) that is locally absolutely continuous in \(t\) on \(dom x \cap ([0, T] \times \{j\})\) for each \(j \in \mathbb{N}\). For hybrid arcs \(x\), we will use the following definitions regarding its domain:

- \(\sup_{dom x} = \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+: \exists j \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } (t, j) \in dom x\}\)
- \(\sup_{dom x} = \sup\{j \in \mathbb{N}: \exists t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ such that } (t, j) \in dom x\}\)
- \(\sup_{dom x} = (\sup_{dom x}, \sup_{dom x})\)

Then, solutions (or trajectories) to the general hybrid system
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} & \in F(x), \\
\xi & \in C, \\
\xi^+ & = G(\xi), \\
\xi & \in D
\end{align*}
\]
with state \(\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n\) are defined as follows: a hybrid arc \(\chi: dom \chi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\) is a solution to the hybrid system (25) if \((0, 0) \in C \cup D\)

(S1) For all \(j \in \mathbb{N}\),
\[
\chi(t, j) \in C \quad \text{for all } t \quad \chi(t, j) \in F(\chi(t, j)) \quad \text{for almost all } t
\]
such that \((t, j) \in dom \chi\).

(S2) For all \((t, j) \in dom x\) such that \((t, j+1) \in dom x\),
\[
\chi(t, j) \in D, \quad \chi(t, j+1) = G(\chi(t, j))
\]
A solution \(\chi\) is said to be maximal if there does not exist a solution \(\chi'\) such that \(\chi\) is a truncation of \(\chi'\) to some proper subset of \(dom \chi\). A solution is called nontrivial if \(dom \chi\) contains at least one point different from \((0, 0)\). A solution is said to be complete if \(dom \chi\) is unbounded.

We will use [14, Proposition 6.10] to prove the existence and completeness of solutions to the proposed system. For self-containment, we recall [14, Proposition 6.10] next.

Proposition IV.1. Let \(\mathcal{H} = (C, F, D, G)\) satisfy the hybrid basic conditions, i.e., its data \((C, F, D, G)\) is such that

(A1) \(C\) and \(D\) are closed sets;

(A2) \(F: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3\) is outer semicontinuous and locally bounded relative to \(C, C \subset dom F,\) and \(F(x)\) is nonempty and convex for all \(x \in C;\)

(A3) \(G: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3\) is continuous and \(D \subset dom G.\)

A set-valued map \(S: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m\) is outer semicontinuous at \(x \in \mathbb{R}^m\) if for each sequence \((x_i)_{i=1}^\infty\) converging to a point \(x \in \mathbb{R}^m\) and each sequence \((y_i)_{i=1}^\infty\) converging to a point \(y\), it holds that \(y \in S(x);\) see [21, Definition 5.4]. Given a set \(X \subset \mathbb{R}^n,\) it is outer semicontinuous relative to \(X\) if the set-valued mapping from \(\mathbb{R}^n\) to \(\mathbb{R}^m\) defined by \(S(x)\) for \(x \in X\) and \(\emptyset\) for \(x \notin X\) is outer semicontinuous at each \(x \in X.\) It is locally bounded if, for each compact set \(K \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) there exists a compact set \(K' \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) such that \(S(K) := \bigcup_{x \in K} S(x) \subset K'.\)
Take an arbitrary $\xi \in C \cup D$. If $\xi \in D$, or

$$F(x) \cap TC_c(x) \neq \emptyset$$

then there exists a nontrivial solution $\phi$ to $H$ with $\phi(0, 0) = \xi$. If (VC) holds for every $\xi \in C \setminus D$, then there exists a nontrivial solution to $H$ from every initial point in $C \cup D$, and every $\phi \in S_H$, where $S_H$ denotes the set of solutions of the compact hybrid system $H$, satisfies exactly one of the following conditions:

(a) $\phi$ is complete;
(b) $\text{dom} \phi$ is bounded and the interval $(0, \gamma)$, where $J = \sup \xi_1 \text{dom} \phi$, has nonempty interior and $t \mapsto \phi(t, J)$ is a maximal solution to $\dot{z} \in F(z)$, in fact $\lim_{t \to -\infty} \phi(t, J) = \infty$, where $T = \sup \text{dom} \phi$ (finite escape time);
(c) $\text{dom} \phi(T, J) \notin C \cup D$, where $(T, J) = \sup \text{dom} \phi$.

Furthermore, if $G(D) \subset C \cup D$, then (c) above does not occur.

The following result establishes that every solution to the closed-loop system is complete.

B. Completeness of trajectories

**Proposition IV.2.** (Properties of solutions) For each $\xi \in C \cup D$, every maximal solution $\chi = (x, q)$ to the hybrid system $H = (C, F, D, G)$ in (24) with $\chi(0, 0) = \xi$ is complete.

The proof is given in Appendix B.

C. Closed-loop stability

Our goal is to show that the compact set $A$ in (11) is asymptotically stable. To this end, we employ the following stability notion for general hybrid systems [14].

**Definition IV.3 (Stability).** A compact set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be

- stable if for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that each solution $\chi$ with $|\chi(0, 0)|_A \leq \delta$ satisfies $|\chi(t, J)|_A \leq \varepsilon$ for all $(t, J) \in \text{dom} \chi$;
- attractive if there exists $\mu > 0$ such that every maximal solution $\chi$ with $|\chi(0, 0)|_A \leq \mu$ is complete and satisfies $\lim_{t \to +\infty} \chi(t, J)|_A = 0$;
- asymptotically stable if $A$ is stable and attractive;
- globally asymptotically stable if the attractivity property holds for every point in $C \cup D$.

The following result on the structural properties of $H$ in (24) is key for robust stability, see [14].

**Lemma IV.4.** The closed-loop system $H$ given by (24) satisfies the hybrid basic conditions given by (A1)-(A3) in [12, Proposition 6.5].

**Proof.** (A1) follows from the continuity of $\tilde{\gamma}_S$ for each $S \in \{0, 1\}$ and the closedness of $M_0$ and $M_1$. Next, (A2) follows from the Krasovskii regularization. Lastly, (A3) follows from the fact that the jump map is continuous.

Using these properties, we are now ready to establish the following theorem, which states global asymptotic stability of the compact set $A$ for the hybrid system $H$.

**Theorem IV.5.** Consider the hybrid system $H$ in (24) with $c, L, R, E, K_0, K_1 > 0$. Given a desired set-point voltage and current $(v^*_c, i^*_L)$, where $v^*_c > E$ and $i^*_L = \frac{v^2_c}{R^2}$, then the compact set

$$A = A_c \times \{0, 1\}$$

is globally asymptotically stable for $H$.

**Proof.** Consider the function $V$ given in (4) and define $\tilde{V}(x, q) = V(x)$ for all $(x, q) \in C \cup D$. Note that $\tilde{V}(x, q) = 0$ when $x \in A_c$ and $\tilde{V}(x, q) > 0$ for all $(x, q) \in (\mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0, 1\}) \setminus A_c$. From the computation of the inner product between $\nabla V$ and the direction belonging to $F_S$ in (10), for each $(x, q) \in C$ (see Lemma III.1), we have

$$u_d(x, q) := \max_{\xi \in F(x,q)} \tilde{V}(\xi) = \tilde{V}(x, q) = 0$$

Then, by [14, Theorem 3.18], the set (25) is stable.

To show attractivity, we apply the invariance principle in [22, Theorem 4.7]. To this end, we compute the zero level set of $u_c$ and $u_d$ defined above. It follows that

$$u_c^{-1}(0) = \{ (x, q) \in C : u_c(x, q) = 0 \} = D$$

and

$$u_d^{-1}(0) = \{ (x, q) \in D : u_d(x, q) = 0 \} = D$$

Then, each complete and bounded solution $(x, q)$ to $H$ converges to the largest weakly invariant subset of the set

$$\{ (x, q) \in C \cup D : \tilde{V}(x, q) = r \} \cap (u_c^{-1}(0) \cup (u_d^{-1}(0) \cap G(u_d^{-1}(0))))$$

for some $r > 0$. With the definitions above, the set of points (28) reduces to

$$\{ (x, q) \in C \cup D : V(x) = r \} \cap D$$

Note that the only invariant set for $H$ within (29) is $A$ since solutions cannot stay in (29) unless $v_c = v^*_c$ and $i_L = i^*_L$ (i.e., $r = 0$). In fact, solutions to the hybrid systems $H$ in (24) cannot stay in a constant level set of $V$ since the equilibrium points of the vector field $F$ do not belong to $C \cap D$ and, for points in $C \setminus D$, the derivative of $V$ is negative for each $q \in \{0, 1\}$.

D. Robustness to general perturbations

The construction of the controller in Section III-A is such that the closed-loop system $H$ has data satisfying the properties in Lemma IV.3. With these properties, we have that the asymptotic stability property asserted by Theorem IV.5 is robust to small perturbations. We consider the following model of the (regularized) plant in (11) with perturbations:

$$\dot{x}_f = F'_S(x + d_1) + d_2$$

3For the set of hybrid trajectories $S$, the set $M \subset O$ is said to be weakly invariant (with respect to $S$) if it is both weakly forward invariant and weakly backward invariant; see [22, Definition 3.1]. It is weakly forward invariant (with respect to $S$) if for each $x^0 \in M$, there exists at least one complete hybrid trajectory $x \in S(x^0)$ with $x(t, j) \in M$ for all $(t, j) \in \text{dom} x$. It is weakly backward invariant (with respect to $S$) if for each $q \in M$, $N^* > 0$, there exist $x^0 \in M$ and at least one hybrid trajectory $x \in S(x^0)$ such that some $(t^*, j^*) = q$ and $x(t, j) \in M$ for all $(t, j) \leq (t^*, j^*)$, $(t, j) \in \text{dom} x$. 
where $d_1$ corresponds to state noise and $d_2$ captures unmodeled dynamics. Then, defining $\tilde{d}_1 = (d_1, 0)$, the closed-loop system $\mathcal{H}$ results in the perturbed hybrid system, which is denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, with state $\tilde{x} := (x, q)$ and dynamics

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\tilde{x}} & \in F(\tilde{x} + \tilde{d}_1) + d_2 \quad \chi + \tilde{d}_1 \in \tilde{C} \\
\tilde{x}^+ & \in G(\chi) \quad \chi + \tilde{d}_1 \in \tilde{D}
\end{align*}
\]

The following result establishes a nominal robustness property of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$.

**Theorem IV.6.** Under the assumptions of Theorem IV.5 there exists $\tilde{\beta} \in \mathcal{KL}$ such that, for each $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ and each compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, there exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ such that for any two measurable functions $\tilde{d}_1, \tilde{d}_2 : [0, \tilde{\varepsilon}] \to \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$, every solution $\tilde{x} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{q})$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\tilde{x}(0, 0) \in K \times \{0, 1\}$ is such that its $\tilde{x}$ component, namely, $(v_c, i_L)$, satisfies

\[
|\tilde{x}(t, j)|_{A_x} \leq \tilde{\beta}(|\tilde{x}(0, 0)|_{A_x}, t+j) + \tilde{\varepsilon} \quad \forall (t, j) \in \text{dom } \tilde{x}
\]

**Proof.** Since $A$ is asymptotically stable for $\mathcal{H}$, by Theorem 6.5, there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ such that all solutions $x$ to $\mathcal{H}$ satisfy $|x(t, j)|_{A_x(0, 1)} \leq \beta(|x(0, 0)|_{A_x(0, 1)}, t+j)$ for all $(t, j) \in \text{dom } x$. Consider the perturbed hybrid system $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. Since $d_1(t), d_2(t) \in \mathcal{B}$ for all $t \geq 0$, the closed-loop system $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ can be written as

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\tilde{x}} & \in F(\tilde{x} + \tilde{d}_1(t)) + d_2(t) \quad \tilde{x} + \tilde{d}_1(t) \in \tilde{C} \\
\tilde{x}^+ & \in G(\tilde{x}) \quad \tilde{x} + \tilde{d}_1(t) \in \tilde{D}
\end{align*}
\]

This hybrid system corresponds to an outer perturbation of $\mathcal{H}$ that satisfies (C1), (C2), (C3), and (C4) in [23] (see Example 5.3 in [23] for more details). Then, the claim follows by Theorem 6.6 in [23] since, for each compact set $K$ of the space state and each $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$, there exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ such that for each $\delta \in (0, \tilde{\delta}^*)$, every solution $\tilde{x}$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ satisfies, for all $(t, j) \in \text{dom } \tilde{x}$, $|\tilde{x}(t, j)|_{A_x} \leq \beta(|\tilde{x}(0, 0)|_{A_x}, t+j) + \tilde{\varepsilon}$. This establishes the result since $|\tilde{x}(0, 0)|_{A_x} = |\tilde{x}||_{A_x}$. \qed

Unlike previous results in the literature, this robustness property implies that our controller is robust to small measurement noise and unmodeled dynamics. In addition to the robustness to general perturbations shown above, the asymptotic stability of $A$ is robust to slow variations of the system parameters, such as input voltage $E$ and load $R$. Such a result follows from a direct application of [13] Corollary 7.27.

**E. Robustness to spatial regularization**

When the system reaches its desired steady state using the controller in Section IV.A arbitrarily fast switching may occur. To alleviate this problem, spatial regularization is performed to the closed-loop system $\mathcal{H}$ (at the controller level). More precisely, $\gamma_0$ and $\gamma_1$ are modified by using a constant factor $\rho$, with $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. The regularized system will be denoted as $\mathcal{H}^\rho$, and its flow map is given by the same equation as $\mathcal{H}$, i.e.,

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{z} \\
\dot{q}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
F_q(x) \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \quad (x, q) \in C_{\rho}
\]

where, now, the flow set is replaced by

\[
C_{\rho} = \left\{ (x, q) : x \in \tilde{M}_0, \gamma_0(x) \leq \rho, q = 0 \right\} \cup \left\{ (x, q) : x \in \tilde{M}_1, \gamma_1(x) \leq \rho, q = 1 \right\}
\]

Furthermore, the jump map is given by

\[
x^+ = x, \quad q^+ = G_q(x) \quad (x, q) \in D_{\rho}
\]

where, now, the jump set is given by

\[
D_{\rho} = \left\{ (x, q) : x \in \tilde{M}_0, \gamma_0(x) = \rho, q = 0 \right\} \cup \left\{ (x, q) : x \in \tilde{M}_1, \gamma_1(x) = \rho, q = 1 \right\}
\]

and

\[
G_q(x) = \begin{cases}
\{1\} & \text{if } q = 0, \gamma_0(x) \geq \rho \\
\{0\} & \text{if } q = 1, \gamma_1(x) \geq \rho
\end{cases}
\]

**Theorem IV.7.** Under the assumptions of Theorem IV.5 there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ such that, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and each compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, there exists $\rho^* > 0$ guaranteeing the following property: for each $\rho \in (0, \rho^*)$ every solution $x = (x, q)$ to $\mathcal{H}^\rho$ with $\chi(0, 0) \in K \times \{0, 1\}$ is such that its $x$ component satisfies

\[
|x(t, j)|_{A_x} \leq \beta(|x(0, 0)|_{A_x}, t+j) + \varepsilon \quad \forall (t, j) \in \text{dom } x
\]

The proof follows analogously to the proof of Theorem IV.6. The property asserted by Theorem IV.7 will be illustrated numerically in Section V.C. A similar result can be obtained using temporal regularization.

For the spatially regularized control algorithm, no Zeno behavior occurs and certainly no “eventually discrete” solutions (in the sense of the solution that after some time $t$ only jumps) exist due to the uniformly finite (nonzero) separation between the flow and jump sets—this property follows from [22, Lemma 2.7] since the closed-loop system satisfies the properties listed in Proposition IV.2.

**V. SIMULATION RESULTS**

In this section, we present several simulation results. First, in Section V.A the closed-loop system $\mathcal{H}$ is simulated. Afterwards, the closed-loop system with general perturbations is simulated in Section V.B. Next, due to undesirable chattering, the spatially regularized system $\mathcal{H}^\rho$ is simulated in Section V.C. Afterwards, in Section V.D simulations are performed to show how the system can enter the discontinuous conductance mode. In Section V.E simulations are performed with changes in supply and demand of the Boost converter. The simulations are performed using $E = 5V$, $R = 3\Omega$, $c = 0.1F$, $L = 0.2\mu H$, $P = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}$, and $x^* = (v_{c*}, i_{L*})$, unless noted otherwise. We used the Hybrid Equations Toolbox [24] for performing the simulations.

**A. Simulating the closed-loop system**

The simulation results for the closed-loop system $\mathcal{H}$ with initial conditions $x_0 = (0.5)$ and $x_0 = (5.0)$, for $K_0 = 0.05$ and $K_1 = 0.12$ are shown in Figure 5. As can be seen, the solutions converge from both initial conditions to the set $A$ in correspondence with Theorem IV.5.

If we now change the desired setpoint $x^* = (v_{c*}, i_{L*})$, which is only a parameter chance, the CLF and its derivative change...
acordingly, and therefore also the control law. A simulation for the system with initial condition \( x_0 = (3, 0) \), \( K_0 = 0.12 \), \( K_1 = 0.08 \), and desired output \( v^*_{c} = 9V \) and \( i^*_L = 5.4A \) is shown in Figure 5.

As mentioned at the end of Section IV.B, the closed-loop system is robust to slowly varying parameters. To illustrate this, a simulation is performed with a dynamically changing set point \( x^* \) and adapting the CLF according to the changing set-point (the control law is modified accordingly). Initially, \( x^* = (7, 3.27) \), but when this value is reached, we linearly increase \( x^* \) from \( (7, 3.27) \) to \( (10, 6.67) \). This simulation is shown in Figure 7. As it can be seen, the CLF can adapt to slow changes in the setpoint. Furthermore, the Boost converter follows the reference well and eventually reaches the final setpoint \( x^* = (10, 6.67) \).

To provide insight on the results in Theorem IV.6 more simulations are performed in order to find a relationship between the maximal perturbation parameter \( \delta \) (for the indicated sinusoidal perturbation, and where \( (d_1, 0), (d_2, 0) \in \delta \beta \) and the ball radius \( \varepsilon \), which is defined as the size of the ball where the steady state values converge to (for \( v_c \) and \( i_L \)), see (31) in Theorem IV.6. Note that in this simulation \( \delta \) is used to find a value of \( \varepsilon \). The value of \( \varepsilon \) is approximated for various initial conditions (and the same sinusoidal perturbation using different values of \( d_1 \)) using

\[
\varepsilon = \lim_{t \to \infty} \sup \sqrt{(v_c(t,j) - v^*_{c})^2 + (i_L(t,j) - i^*_L)^2} \tag{34}
\]

In particular here Theorem IV.6 indicates \( \delta \) exists.

### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \delta )</th>
<th>( v_c(t,j) )</th>
<th>( i_L(t,j) )</th>
<th>( \varepsilon )</th>
<th>( \varepsilon/\delta^{0.3} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>6.483</td>
<td>3.025</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5.682</td>
<td>2.890</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5.152</td>
<td>2.438</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.808</td>
<td>2.313</td>
<td>2.391</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.116</td>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the simulation results shown in Table I where \( v_c(t,j) \) and \( i_L(t,j) \) denote typical values observed for large \( t \) and \( j \) where the system reached its steady state behavior, the relation between \( \delta \) and \( \varepsilon \) can now be approximated specifically for \( x^* = (7, 3.27) \), as

\[
\varepsilon \approx 3\delta^{0.3}
\]

#### C. Simulating the spatially regularized closed-loop system

Now, the spatially regularized closed-loop system \( \mathcal{H}^\rho \) is simulated. The results for initial conditions \( x_0 = (0, 5), q_0 = 1 \) and \( x_0 = (5, 0), q_0 = 0 \) for \( K_0 = 0.28 \) and \( K_1 = 0.12 \) are shown in Figure 9. To validate Theorem IV.7, more simulations are performed (using \( K_0 = 0.7 \) and \( K_1 = 0.1 \)) in order to find a relationship between the regularization parameter \( \rho \) and the deviation from the equilibrium given by \( \varepsilon \) in Theorem IV.7 (similarly as in section VI.B, see (34)).
Fig. 9. Simulation results for the spatially regularized closed-loop system $H^\rho$ with $\rho = 0.2$, $K_0 = 0.28$, and $K_1 = 0.12$ for initial conditions $x_0 = (0, 5)$, $q_0 = 1$ and $q_0 = (5, 0)$, $q_0 = 0$, and where $S$ is only drawn for the simulation using $x_0 = (5, 0)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>$v_c(t, j)$</th>
<th>$i_L(t, j)$</th>
<th>$\varepsilon$</th>
<th>$\varepsilon/\rho$</th>
<th>#SWs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>6.989</td>
<td>3.259</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>6.951</td>
<td>3.232</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.926</td>
<td>3.164</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6.717</td>
<td>3.026</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.520</td>
<td>2.977</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the simulation results shown in Table II, the relationship between $\rho$ and $\varepsilon$, specifically for $x^* = (7, 3.27)$, can now be approximated as $\varepsilon \approx 1.3\rho$. The last column of the table shows the number of switches per second over the same time horizon when a neighborhood of the set $\mathcal{A}$ is reached. As can be seen, the switching rate is reduced significantly by increasing the spatial regularization parameter $\rho$.

Simulations for different values of $\rho$ and different initial conditions are shown in Figure 10. As it can be seen, the larger the spatial regularization (the larger $\rho$) the larger the steady state error will be, as expected. Furthermore, the switching rate is reduced significantly by increasing the spatial regularization parameter $\rho$. Eventually, when $\rho$ becomes too large, the controller may not be able to stabilize (a small region around) the desired point $x^*$ any longer.

D. Simulating the discontinuous conduction mode

In the next simulation we show how the system can enter the discontinuous conduction mode, thereby illustrating the relevance of the employed model including this mode explicitly; see [25]. The system parameters are now $E = 3V$, $R = 3\Omega$, and $x^* = (4, 1.78)$. In Figure 11, the simulation results for $\rho = 0.1$, $K_0 = 0.22$, and $K_1 = 0.13$ are shown. As can be seen, the system starts in mode 1 until $i_L$ becomes zero, whereafter the system switches to mode 3. Next, the system remains in mode 3 until it hits the boundary $\gamma_0(x) = \rho$ and switches to mode 2. Afterwards, switching between mode 1 and mode 2 occurs and a neighborhood of the point $x^*$ is reached. Note that the closed-loop system works for a certain time period in the discontinuous conduction mode, showing the importance to include this mode in the overall model and global stability analysis.

E. Robustness to changes in supply and demand

The input voltage $E$ and load $R$ are now varied to assess the robustness of the spatially regularized control strategy to such changes. During the next simulation, the controller is observing the changes in $E$ and $R$ and is adapting accordingly, i.e., $i_L$, $E$ and $R$ are now time-varying in the CLF. Figure 12 shows a simulation where $E$ is increased after 2 seconds from 2.5V to 5V and $R$ is decreased after 4 seconds from 3$\Omega$ to 2$\Omega$, the switching boundaries for the three different situations are shown as well. As it can be seen, a neighborhood of $v_c^*$ is reached in all three situations, which means that the controller is able to cope with variations in the supply $E$ and demand $R$.

In the next simulation, again input voltage $E$ and load $R$ are varied, but now the CLF/controller is not observing these variations, consequently, the controller is based on a constant $E = 5V$ and $R = 3\Omega$. During the simulation, $E$ is decreased after 2 seconds from 5 to 4V, and after 4 seconds back to 4V, $R$ is decreased after 6 seconds from 3 to 2.5$\Omega$, and after 8 seconds increased to 3$\Omega$ again. As can be seen in Figure 13, the solutions converge to a neighborhood of the set $\mathcal{A}$, however the performance decreases when the $E$ and $R$ are not identical to the parameters used for the CLF. Hence, adapting the controller to measured fluctuations in supply $E$ and demand $R$ is certainly beneficial.

VI. Conclusions

In this paper, a hybrid system approach to the control of the Boost converter was presented. First of all, a constrained switched system model with discontinuous right-hand side for all the modes was derived (including the discontinuous
III.1. First define given by $\bar{\Omega}_q := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \tilde{\gamma}_q(x) = 0 \}$ for $q \in \{0, 1\}$, which are parabolas. Now define $\bar{\Gamma}_0$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_1$ by deriving (35) and (36) in similar forms as in (17) and (18)

$$\bar{\Gamma}_0 = \left\{ (v_c, i_L) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : i_L > \frac{1}{E - v_c^*} \left( \frac{1}{R} v_c^2 - \left( \frac{v_c^*}{R} + i_L^* \right) v_c + i_L^* E + K_0 \delta_0(v_c) \right) \right\}$$

(37)

and similar ones for $\bar{\Omega}_q$, $q \in \{0, 1\}$. Both parabolas $\bar{\Omega}_q$, $q \in \{0, 1\}$, have their axis of symmetry parallel to the $i_L^*$ axis. Then, because $\frac{1}{E - v_c^*} < 0$, $K_0 \delta_0(v_c) > 0$, and $\Omega_0$ is a “downward” parabola, we know that $\bar{\Omega}_0$ is also a “downward” parabola (it has a maximum in $i_L^*$-direction) and $\bar{\Gamma}_0$ is the region above it.

To show that $\bar{\Omega}_0 \cap \bar{\Omega}_1 = \mathcal{A}_c$, we find out the $v_c, i_L$ value for the intersection of the two curves $\Omega_0$ and $\Omega_1$. When the right-hand-side of the inequalities in (37) and (39) equals to each other, we get a similar expression to (19):

$$\frac{1}{E - v_c^*} \left( \frac{1}{R} v_c^2 - \left( \frac{v_c^*}{R} + i_L^* \right) v_c + i_L^* E + K_0 \delta_0(v_c) \right) = \frac{1}{RE} v_c^2 - \frac{v_c^*}{RE} v_c + i_L^* + \frac{K_1 \delta_1(v_c)}{E}.$$  

(39)

Then, we can rewrite (39) in quadratic form, and find its simplified discriminant $\Delta$ to be $(\frac{v_c^*}{RE})^2 - \frac{i_L^*}{E}$, which equals to zero because $i_L^* = \frac{v_c^*}{E}$. Therefore (39) has a unique solution. We can find the unique solution by solving $v_c$ from (39), and the result is

$$v_c = \left( \frac{RE - v_c^*}{RE - \frac{1}{R} - K_0 + \frac{K_1 (E - v_c^*)}{E}} \right) v_c^* + \frac{K_1 \delta_1(v_c)}{E} = v_c^*$$

while $i_L = i_L^*$. This implies that $\bar{\Omega}_0 \cap \bar{\Omega}_1$ is the set-point $\{(v_c^*, i_L^*)\}$ and therefore completes the proof of property (a).

Property (c) can be shown by explicitly computing the limits. For finding the limit of the first two equations, we can rewrite the formulation of $\gamma_q(x)$ with $q \in \{0, 1\}$ as

$$\gamma_q(x) = (1 - q) \gamma_0(x) + q \gamma_1(x)$$

$$= -\alpha (v_c - v_c^*)^2 + (\beta q + C_0) \left( -\frac{2i_L^*}{v_c^*} v_c + 2i_L \right)$$

where $\alpha = \frac{2v_c^*}{RE}$, $\beta = \frac{E v_c^*}{RE}$ and $C_0$ is given in the proof for Lemma III.1. Then, we get an expression

$$\tilde{\gamma}_q(x) = (K_q - \alpha)(v_c - v_c^*)^2 + (\beta q + C_0) \left( -\frac{2i_L^*}{v_c^*} v_c + 2i_L \right)$$

(40)

We discuss the following cases when $K_q \to \alpha$.
• if \( q = 0 \), we have the limit of \( 40 \) expression as
  \[
  \lim_{k_0 \to \infty} \tilde{\gamma}_q(x) = C_0 \left( -2 \frac{\gamma}{v_e^0} v_c + 2i_L \right).
  \]

• if \( q = 1 \), we have the limit of \( 40 \) expression as
  \[
  \lim_{k_1 \to \infty} \tilde{\gamma}_q(x) = (\beta + C_0) \left( -2 \frac{\gamma}{v_e^0} v_c + 2i_L \right)
  = \frac{p_{11}E}{c} \left( -2 \frac{\gamma}{v_e^0} v_c + 2i_L \right)
  = C_1 \left( -2 \frac{\gamma}{v_e^0} v_c + 2i_L \right).
  \]

Thus, we complete the proof for the first two limits, and the last two limits follow naturally from the expression \( \tilde{\gamma}_q(x) = \gamma_q(x) + K_q(v_c - v_e^0)^2 \).

**APPENDIX B**

**Proof of Proposition [IV.2]**

**Proof.** We apply Proposition [IV.1]. First we check the viability condition \((VC)\), which requires verifying that for each \((x, q) \in C \setminus D\), there exists a neighborhood \( U \) of \((x, q)\) such that

\[
F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{q}) \cap T_C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{q}) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{q}) \in U \cap C \tag{41}
\]

In fact, note that if \((x, q) \in C \setminus D\), then for any sufficiently small neighborhood \( U \) of \((x, q)\), it holds that \((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{q}) \in U \cap C\) implies \((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{q}) \in C \setminus D\) due to continuity of \(\tilde{\gamma}_S\), \(S \in \{0, 1\}\). Therefore, it suffices to show that (dropped the bars in \(\tilde{\gamma}\))

\[
F(x, q) \cap T_C(x, q) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall (x, q) \in C \setminus D \tag{42}
\]

To do so, we will first compute the tangent cones \(T_C(x, q)\) for the set \( C \) as defined just below \((24)\) for \((x, q) \in C \setminus D\):

1. If \( q = 0, i_L > 0 \): \(T_C(x, q) = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}\)
2. If \( q = 0, i_L = 0 \): \(T_C(x, q) = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \{0\}\)
3. If \( q = 1, v_c > 0 \): \(T_C(x, q) = \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}\)
4. If \( q = 1, v_c = 0 \): \(T_C(x, q) = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \{0\}\)

Using these calculations, we have the following:

1) For \((x, q) \in C \setminus D\) such that \( q = 0, i_L > 0 \), \((41)\) trivially holds.
2) For \((x, q) \in C \setminus D\) such that \( q = 0, i_L = 0 \), we have to distinguish two cases based on different set-valued vector fields in \((22)\) depending on \( x \in M_1 \setminus M_2 \) (i.e. \( v_c < E \)) or \( x \in M_2 \) (i.e. \( v_c \geq E \)).
   a) If \( x \in M_1 \setminus M_2 \) and \( v_c < E \), we have the vector field
      \[
      \left( f_a(x) \right)_0 = \left( -\frac{\gamma}{v_e^0} v_c + \frac{1}{v_e^0} i_L \right) \in T_C(x, q)
      \]
      because \( -\frac{\gamma}{v_e^0} v_c + \frac{1}{v_e^0} i_L > 0 \).
   b) When \( x \in M_2 \) and thus \( v_c > E \), we have a set-valued vector field (see \((23)\)) given by
      \[
      \left\{ -\frac{1}{Rc} v_c \times \left[ -\frac{1}{E} v_c + \frac{E}{L}, 0 \right] \times \{0\} \right\}
      \]
      Since \( -\frac{1}{Rc} v_c, 0, 0 \) is an element of the set above and also lies in \( T_C(x, q) \), \((43)\) holds.
3) For \((x, q) \in C \setminus D\) such that \( q = 1, v_c > 0 \), \((41)\) trivially holds.

4) For \((x, q) \in C \setminus D\) such that \( q = 1, v_c = 0 \), the vector field is given by \( F_1(x) \times \{0\} \) that only contains the element \( \left( 0, \frac{E}{L}, 0 \right) \) (see \((3)\)), which lies in \( T_C(x, q) = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \{0\} \). Hence, \((42)\) holds.

In summary, for each \( \xi \in C \setminus D\), there exists a neighborhood \( U \) of \( \xi \) such that \((41)\) holds. Thus, according to Proposition [IV.1], there exists a nontrivial solution \( \chi \) in \( H \) for points in \( C \cup D \).

Now, to show that every maximal solution \( \chi \) is complete, we prove that cases (b) and (c) in Proposition [IV.1] cannot hold, and hence, only case (a) can be true.

Case (b) (finite escape time) cannot happen due to the fact that every maximal solution \( \chi \) is bounded. Indeed, using Lemma [III.1] and property (b) of Lemma [III.2], the function \( V \) in \((4)\), along a maximal solution \( \chi \), has non-positive derivative for flows and non-positive changes at jumps. Since \( V \) is quadratic it upper bounds the norm of the state (relative to the desired set point) and has compact sub-level sets. Therefore, \( \lim_{t \to \infty} |\chi(t, j)| \leq M < \infty \) for some constant \( M \) and \( T \) is sup \( \text{dom} \chi \).

Case (c) (solutions jumping outside \( C \cup U \)) can be excluded as well, because below we will show that \( G(D) \subseteq C \), and thus \( G(D) \subseteq C \cup D \).

In fact, to complete the proof we establish now that \( G(D) \subseteq C \) and we consider two situations: I. \( x \in D \) and \( q = 0 \), and II. \( x \in D \) and \( q = 1 \).

**I.** Let \( x \in D \) and \( q = 0 \), and thus \( \tilde{\gamma}_0(x) = 0 \) and \( x \in \tilde{\Omega}_0 \) (i.e. \( i_L \geq 0 \)). We will first show that this implies that \( x \in M_1 \) (i.e. \( v_c \geq 0 \)), i.e.

\[
\frac{\gamma}{v_e^0}(x) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad v_c \geq 0 \tag{43}
\]

This latter implication will follow from the fact that \( \tilde{\Omega}_0 := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \tilde{\gamma}_0(x) = 0 \} \) is a downward parabola and the fact that the minimal root \( \min \{ v_c \mid x \in \tilde{\Omega}_0, i_L = 0 \} \) is non-negative. Indeed, since \( \tilde{\Omega}_0 \) is a downward parabola, these two facts would give

\[
\min \{ v_c \mid x \in \tilde{\Omega}_0, i_L \geq 0 \} = \min \{ v_c \mid x \in \tilde{\Omega}_0, i_L = 0 \} \geq 0
\]

which is equivalent to \((43)\).

To compute the minimal root, we can use the expression in \((22)\), showing that the points \( x = (v_c, i_L) \) with \( \tilde{\gamma}_0(x) = 0 \) are \( x \in \tilde{\Omega}_0 \) and \( i_L = 0 \) satisfy

\[
i_L = -\frac{A_0}{c_0} v_e^2 - \frac{B_0}{c_0} v_e - \frac{D_0}{c_0} = 0
\]

where \( A_0 = A_0 + \frac{D_0}{E^2}, B_0 = B_0 - K_0 v_e^2 \), and \( D_0 = D_0 + \frac{E^2}{A_0} v_e^2 \), which can be rewritten as

\[
\left( v_c - \left( \frac{B_0}{2A_0} \right) \right)^2 = -\frac{D_0}{A_0} + \left( \frac{B_0}{2A_0} \right)^2
\]

Then, the roots \( v_{c1,2} \) of the function \( \tilde{\gamma}_0(x)|_{i_L=0} \) are given

\footnote{Note that flowing outside \( C \cup D \) is not possible due to the closedness of \( C \) and \( D \) as formulated in the hybrid basic conditions.}
II. Let $x \in \mathbb{D}$ and $q = 1$, and thus $\gamma_1(x) = 0$ and $x \in \mathcal{M}_1$ (i.e. $v_c \geq 0$). Similar to case I, we will first show that this implies that $x \in \mathcal{M}_0$ (i.e. $i_L \geq 0$, i.e. $v_c \geq 0$). To show this we compute $\min\{i_L \mid \gamma_1(x) = 0, v_c \geq 0\}$ and show it is nonnegative. First we observe that $\Omega_1 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \gamma_1(x) = 0\}$ is an upward parabola. Using the expression in (23), the points $x = (v_c, i_L)$ satisfying $\gamma_1(x) = 0$ are given by

$$i_L = -\frac{\bar{A}_1}{C_1} - \frac{\bar{B}_1}{C_1} v_c - \frac{\bar{D}_1}{C_1}$$

where $\bar{A}_1 = A_1 + \frac{K}{R_c}$, $\bar{B}_1 = B_1 - K_1 v_c^*$, and $\bar{D}_1 = D_1 + \frac{K_1}{R_c} v_c^*$. The minimum value $i_{L,\min} := \min\{i_L \mid \gamma_1(x) = 0\}$ results in two cases, namely

$$i_{L,\min,1} = \frac{\bar{B}_1^2 - 4 \bar{A}_1 \bar{D}_1}{4 \bar{A}_1 C_1}, \quad i_{L,\min,2} = \frac{-\bar{D}_1}{C_1}$$

where $i_{L,\min}$ is found by either the vertex of the parabola or at $v_c = 0$ due to the constraint $v_c \geq 0$. Substituting the expressions of $\bar{A}_1, \bar{B}_1, \bar{D}_1$ into the right-hand side of (45) and (46), we have

$$i_{L,\min,1} = \frac{\bar{B}_1^2 - 4 \bar{A}_1 \bar{D}_1}{4 \bar{A}_1 C_1} = \frac{(6p_{11} - 4K_1 Rc) v_c^*}{4p_{11} RE (2p_{11} - K_1 Rc)}$$

$$i_{L,\min,2} = \frac{-\bar{D}_1}{C_1} = \frac{(2p_{11} - K_1 Rc) v_c^*}{2p_{11} \ RE}$$

Since $R, c, E, v_c^*, p_{11} > 0$, we obtain

$$i_{L,\min} > 0$$

and thus $\min\{i_L \mid \gamma_1(x) = 0, v_c \geq 0\} \geq \min\{i_L \mid \gamma_1(x) = 0\} = i_{L,\min} > 0$. This establishes (44). Using now property (a) of Lemma III.3 and $\gamma_1(x) = 0$, we know that $\gamma_0(x) \leq 0$ and thus $G(x, 0) = (x, 1) \in C$.

This completes the proof.
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