A Homotopy Theorem for Incremental Stability

Thomas Chaffey, Andrey Kharitenko, Fulvio Forni, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Rodolphe Sepulchre, *Fellow, IEEE*

***Abstract*—A theorem is proved to verify incremental stability of a feedback system via a homotopy from a known incrementally stable system, making no assumptions on the existence of an extended space, well-posedness, or causality. A first corollary of that result is that incremental stability may be verified by separation of scaled relative graphs, correcting two assumptions in (Chaffey et al., 2023, Thm. 2). Necessity of this correction is demonstrated by example. A second corollary provides an incremental version of the classical integral quadratic constraint stability theorem. Finally it is shown how to relax assumptions of incremental boundedness on the operators.**

***Index Terms*—incremental input/output stability, nonlinear systems, scaled relative graphs.**

I. Introduction

There are two standard approaches to verifying absolute stability of a feedback interconnection: the first, introduced by Zames [2], is to work in an extended space, which includes unstable signals, and show that all signals are, in fact, stabilized by the feedback. The second, pioneered by Megretski and Rantzer [3], is based upon a *homotopy* argument: it is shown that a known stable system can be perturbed continuously to produce the desired feedback interconnection, in such a way that stability is never lost. Such an argument has two ingredients: first, one shows that a system remains stable under a small perturbation, provided a gain bound is satisfied. Second, one must verify such a gain bound along the entire path of perturbations. In the original theorems of Megretski and Rantzer [3] and Rantzer and Megretski [4], it was shown that perturbations which were small in the gap metric [5] preserved stability, and (soft) *integral quadratic constraints (IQCs)* were used to verify gain bounds.

In this article, we offer an alternative approach: an *incremental* homotopy argument is developed (Theorem 2), where gain bounds are replaced by incremental gain bounds, and the gap metric is replaced by a minor modification of the incremental small gain theorem (Theorem 1). In a similar vein to the incremental versions of the small gain theorem [6], the stronger assumption of incremental gain allows well-posedness and causality assumptions to be weakened. While in a standard homotopy argument, well-posedness and causality of the feedback interconnection must be assumed along the entire path, requiring reference to an extended space, in the incremental setting, only incremental boundedness of the operators must be assumed, which may be verified without any extended space. The setting of Theorem 2 is more general than the typical IQC setting, as neither operator is assumed to be linear nor time-invariant.



Fig. 1. Negative feedback interconnection of H_1 and H_2.

Theorem 2 is a standalone and corrected version of an incremental stability theorem recently proved by Chaffey et al. [1], in the context of a graphical stability criterion based on the *scaled relative graph (SRG)*, a graphical representation of an operator introduced by Ryu et al. [7]. In [1], it was shown that the SRG generalizes the Nyquist diagram of an LTI operator to an arbitrary nonlinear operator, and a generalization of the Nyquist criterion was given in [1, Thm. 2]. As a first corollary of Theorem 2, we reprove [1, Thm. 2], correcting two technical assumptions. This theorem has also been recently generalized by Chen et al. [8], removing a technical assumption; however, that generalization relies on an extended space and assumptions of well-posedness and causality, which are not required here. For examples of the application of Theorem 2 and detailed comparisons with other methods of stability verification, we refer the reader to the examples of [1].

As a second corollary to Theorem 2, we obtain an incremental version of the IQC stability theorem of [3]. This corollary is closely related to [9, Thm. 7.40], but does not make any assumptions of causality, nor rely on an extended space. It has been shown that incremental gain bounds can be verified using closely related *differential* IQCs [10]. Incremental IQCs are used in the study of periodic solutions by Jonsson et al. [11], in the study of neural networks by Gronqvist and Rantzer [12], and in system identification by van Waarde and Sepulchre [13]. It has recently been shown that well-posedness and causality assumptions can be relaxed in the nonincremental setting [14], [15].

The rest of this note is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce necessary notation and preliminary results. In Section III, we prove our main result (Theorem 2), a general incremental homotopy theorem. In Section IV, it is shown how incremental stability may be verified using separation of SRGs. In Section V, an incremental IQC stability theorem is given. Finally, in Section VI, it is shown how assumptions of incremental boundedness may be relaxed in exchange for well-posedness and causality, giving a middle ground between

Received 13 May 2025; accepted 2 November 2025. Date of publication 13 November 2025; date of current version 31 March 2026. The work of the Thomas Chaffey was supported by Pembroke College, University of Cambridge. This work was supported by the European Research Council through the Advanced ERC Grant Agreement Spiky-Control under Grant 101054323. Recommended by Associate Editor J. Zhou. *(Corresponding author: Thomas Chaffey.)*

Thomas Chaffey was with the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2008, Australia. He is now with the Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, CB2 1PZ, U.K. (e-mail: thomas.chaffey@sydney.edu.au).

Andrey Kharitenko is with the Optimization and Decision Intelligence Group, Department of Computer Science, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zürich (ETHZ), 8092 Zürich, Switzerland (e-mail: akharitenko@ethz.ch).

Fulvio Forni is with the Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, CB2 1PZ Cambridge, U.K. (e-mail: f.forni@eng.cam.ac.uk).

Rodolphe Sepulchre is with the Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, CB2 1PZ Cambridge, U.K., and also with the Department of Electrical Engineering (STADIUS), KU Leuven, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium (e-mail: r.sepulchre@eng.cam.ac.uk).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2025.3632433

1558-2523 © 2025 IEEE. All rights reserved, including rights for text and data mining, and training of artificial intelligence and similar technologies. Personal use is permitted, but republication/redistribution requires IEEE permission. See https://www.ieee.org/publications/rights/index.html for more information.

Authorized licensed use limited to: KU Leuven University Library. Downloaded on May 26,2026 at 13:01:19 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.

the incremental approach of Theorem 2 and standard nonincremental arguments.

II. Preliminaries

A. Signals and Systems

Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the space of all functions mapping the interval $[0,\infty)$ into $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let L_2^n be the space of equivalence classes of trajectories $u \in \mathcal{F}$ and satisfying

$$\|u\| := \left(\int_0^\infty u(t)^\top u(t)\mathrm{d}t\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$$

under the equivalence $u \sim y \iff \|u-y\| = 0$. We will abuse terminology in the usual way and say that a trajectory $u \in \mathcal{F}$ *belongs to* L_2^n when it belongs to an equivalence class in L_2^n. For the remainder of this note, we will drop the dimension n, and simply denote L_2^n by L_2, where n is arbitrary. Given an element $x \in L_2$, we let $\hat{x}$ denote its Fourier transform.

By an *operator* on a domain $D \subseteq L_2$, we will mean a single-valued map $H : D \to L_2$. The domain D will also be denoted $\mathrm{dom}(H)$. We will associate an operator H with its *relation* or *graph*, defined as $\{(u,y)|y = H(u)\} \subseteq L_2 \times L_2$, and denote the two in the same way. Scalar multiplication, summation, and inversion of relations are defined as follows:

$$\alpha H := \{(u,\alpha y)|y = H(u)\} \tag{1}$$

$$H_1 + H_2 := \{(u, y+z)|y = H_1(u), z = H_2(u)\} \tag{2}$$

$$H^{-1} := \{(y,u)|y = H(u)\}. \tag{3}$$

We note that the inverse of an operator may be multivalued, and therefore not necessarily an operator. However, these relational operations are always well defined.

Given an operator $H : L_2 \to L_2$, we define the *gain* of H on L_2, denoted $\|H\|$, to be the smallest $\gamma > 0$ such that there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all inputs $u \in L_2$

$$\|H(u)\| \le \gamma \|u\| + \beta. \tag{4}$$

If the gain of an operator is finite, then the operator is said to be *bounded*. If $\beta = 0$, then the operator is said to have *finite gain with zero offset*.

The *incremental gain* of H on L_2 is defined to be

$$\sup_{u_1,u_2 \in L_2, u_1 \neq u_2} \frac{\|H(u_1) - H(u_2)\|}{\|u_1 - u_2\|}. \tag{5}$$

If the incremental gain of an operator is finite, then the operator is said to be *incrementally bounded* or *incrementally stable*. If an operator derives from a dynamical system, then incremental boundedness is equivalent to asymptotic stability of any input/output trajectory, under reachability and observability assumptions [16].

Consider the negative feedback interconnection of two operators, H_1 and H_2, defined by the following equations:

$$e = u - H_2(y) \tag{6}$$

$$y = H_1(e) \tag{7}$$

and illustrated in Fig. 1. We make the standing assumption that this negative feedback interconnection defines a (single-valued) operator from some (possibly empty) domain $D \subseteq L_2$ to L_2, mapping u to y. We denote the relation of this operator by $[H_1, H_2] := \{(u,y)|$there exists a unique e s.t. (6) and (7) are satisfied$\}$.

We will make use of the following two technical lemmas.

Lemma 1: Given operators $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$

$$[H_1, H_2] = (H_1^{-1} + H_2)^{-1}.$$

Proof: Adopting the notation of Fig. 1 and applying the definitions of relational inverse and sum gives

$$H_1^{-1} = \{(y,e)|y = H_1(e)\}$$

$$H_1^{-1} + H_2 = \{(y, e+z)|y = H_1(e), z = H_2(y)\}$$

$$(H_1^{-1} + H_2)^{-1} = \{(e+z, y)|y = H_1(e), z = H_2(y)\}.$$

Setting $u = e + z$, we arrive at the definition of $[H_1, H_2]$. □

Lemma 2: Given $\tau, \nu \ge 0$ and operators $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$

$$[H_1, (\tau+\nu)H_2] = [[H_1, \tau H_2], \nu H_2]. \tag{8}$$

Proof: Note that $(H^{-1})^{-1} = H$, and, given a single-valued operator, $(\tau+\nu)H = \tau H + \nu H$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}[H_1, (\tau+\nu)H_2] &= (H_1^{-1} + (\tau+\nu)H_2)^{-1} \\ &= (H_1^{-1} + \tau H_2 + \nu H_2)^{-1} \\ &= ((H_1^{-1} + \tau H_2)^{-1})^{-1} + \nu H_2)^{-1} \\ &= [[H_1, \tau H_2], \nu H_2].\end{aligned}$$

□

The following theorem is a modified version of the classical incremental small gain theorem [6, Thm. 30, p. 184]. It differs from the classical statement of the theorem in that the operators are defined only on L_2, rather than an extended space, and are not required to map 0 to 0. It is closely related to the incremental gap robustness result of [5, Thm. 1].

Theorem 1 (Incremental small gain theorem): Let $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$ be operators with incremental gain bounds of γ_1 and γ_2, respectively. If $\gamma_1\gamma_2 < 1$, then for any $u \in L_2$, there exist unique $e, y \in L_2$ satisfying the feedback interconnection (6) and (7).

Proof: Fix $u \in L_2$. Substituting (7) into (6) gives $e = u - H_2(H_1(e))$. Define $K_u(x) := u - H_2(H_1(x))$. Since $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$ and $K_u : L_2 \to L_2$. We claim that K_u is a contraction on L_2. Indeed, letting $x, \bar{x} \in L_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|K_u(x) - K_u(\bar{x})\| &= \|u - H_2(H_1(x)) - u + H_2(H_1(\bar{x}))\| \\ &= \|H_2(H_1(\bar{x}) - H_2(H_1(x))\| \\ &\le \gamma_1 \|H_2(\bar{x}) - H_2(x)\| \\ &\le \gamma_1\gamma_2 \|x - \bar{x}\|.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the Banach fixed point theorem, there exists a unique solution to $e = K_u(e)$ for each $u \in L_2$. Furthermore, we have $y = H_1(e)$, so existence and uniqueness of y are guaranteed. □

B. Scaled Relative Graphs (SRG)

The SRG is a graphical representation of the gain and phase of an operator. Phase is given by the angle between two signals treated as vectors. For $u, y \in L_2$, this is defined as

$$\angle(u,y) := \arccos \frac{\mathrm{Re}\,\langle u, y\rangle}{\|u\|\,\|y\|} \in [0,\pi]. \tag{9}$$

We define the SRG for an arbitrary relation, allowing us to talk about the SRG of an operator and its relational inverse on an equal footing. Let $R \subseteq L_2 \times L_2$. We write $u \in R(y)$ if $(u,y) \in R$. Given $u_1, u_2 \in L_2$, $u_1 \neq u_2$, define the set of complex numbers $z_R(u_1,u_2)$ by

$$z_R(u_1,u_2) : \left\{ \frac{\|y_1 - y_2\|}{\|u_1 - u_2\|} e^{\pm j\angle(u_1-u_2, y_1-y_2)} \right. \tag{10}$$

Authorized licensed use limited to: KU Leuven University Library. Downloaded on May 26,2026 at 13:01:19 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.

$$\left| y_1 \in R(u_1), y_2 \in R(u_2) \right\}. \tag{11}$$

If $u_1 = u_2$ and there are corresponding outputs $y_1 \neq y_2$, then $z_R(u_1, u_2)$ is defined to be $\{\infty\}$. If R is single valued at u_1, then $z_R(u_1, u_1)$ is the empty set. The SRG of R is then given by

$$\mathrm{SRG}\,(R) := \bigcup_{u_1, u_2 \in L_2} z_R(u_1, u_2). \tag{12}$$

The SRG of an operator $H : L_2 \to L_2$ is defined to be the SRG of its relation. We refer the reader to [1] for the relationship between the SRG, the Nyquist diagram of a transfer function, and the incremental disc of a static nonlinearity, and to [17] for the relationship to the numerical range of a linear operator.

The incremental gain of an operator (on its domain) is the maximum radius of its SRG. Letting $|z|$ denote the magnitude of $z \in \mathbb{C}$, we have the following lemma, the proof of which is immediate from the definition of the SRG.

Lemma 3: Given an operator $H : D \to L_2$

$$\sup_{u_1, u_2 \in D} \frac{\|H(u_1) - H(u_2)\|}{\|u_1 - u_2\|} = \sup_{z \in \mathrm{SRG}\,(H)} |z|.$$

Given an interconnection of operators, the SRG of the interconnection can be bounded by applying graphical operations to the SRGs of the individual operators. We recall a couple of necessary results in the following lemma, and refer the reader to [7] for the full theory. These graphical operations will be used in the proof of Lemma 5 in Section IV.

An SRG $\mathcal{G}$ is said to satisfy the *chord property* if, for each $z \in \mathcal{G}$, $\lambda z + (1 - \lambda)\bar{z} \in \mathcal{G}$ for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Lemma 4: Given $A, B \subseteq L_2 \times L_2$, we have the following.

1) $\mathrm{SRG}\,(A^{-1}) = \{z^{-1} | z \in \mathrm{SRG}\,(A)\}$.
2) If $\bar{A} \supseteq \mathrm{SRG}\,(A)$ is any set satisfying the chord property, then $\mathrm{SRG}\,(A + B) \subseteq \bar{A} + \mathrm{SRG}\,(B)$.

Proof: Property 1 is proved in [7, Thm. 5]. The proof of Property 2 proceeds as follows. Let $(u_1, y_A), (u_2, z_A) \in A$ and $(u_1, y_B), (u_2, z_B) \in B$. Then, $(u_1, y_A + y_B), (u_2, z_A + z_B) \in A + B$, and

$$w = \frac{\|y_A + y_B - z_A - z_B\|}{\|u_1 - u_2\|}$$

$$\exp(j\angle(y_A + y_B - z_A - z_B, u_1 - u_2)) \in \mathrm{SRG}\,(A + B)$$

$$w_A = \frac{\|y_A - z_A\|}{\|u_1 - u_2\|} \exp(j\angle y_A - z_A, u_1 - u_2) \in \mathrm{SRG}\,(A)$$

$$w_B = \frac{\|y_B - z_B\|}{\|u_1 - u_2\|} \exp(j\angle y_B - z_B, u_1 - u_2) \in \mathrm{SRG}\,(B).$$

Then, by direct calculation, $\mathrm{Re}(w) = \mathrm{Re}(w_A) + \mathrm{Re}(w_B)$ and $\mathrm{Im}(w_B) - \mathrm{Im}(w_A) \leq \mathrm{Im}(w) \leq \mathrm{Im}(w_B) + \mathrm{Im}(w_A)$, that is, $w \in w_B + [w_A, \overline{w_A}]$. Since $[w_A, \overline{w_A}] \subseteq \bar{A}$, the claim follows. □

III. Incremental Homotopy

The following theorem gives a method for verifying finite incremental gain of a feedback interconnection using a homotopy from a known incrementally bounded operator. The proof proceeds by using the incremental small gain theorem to show small perturbations in the feedback preserve stability, and applies this idea inductively to scale the feedback from 0 to 1.

Theorem 2 (Incremental homotopy): Let $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$ be operators such that the following holds:

i) H_1 and H_2 have finite incremental gain;
ii) there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that, for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$ and all $u_1, u_2 \in \mathrm{dom}([H_1, \tau H_2])$, we have

$$\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq \gamma \|u_1 - u_2\|$$

where $y_i = [H_1, \tau H_2](u_i), i = 1, 2$.

Then, $\mathrm{dom}([H_1, H_2]) = L_2$ and $[H_1, H_2]$ has an incremental gain bound of γ.

Proof: Let γ_1 and γ_2 be incremental gain bounds for H_1 and H_2, respectively. We begin by showing that there exists $\nu > 0$ such that $\mathrm{dom}([H_1, \nu H_2]) = L_2$. Indeed, setting $\nu < 1/(\gamma_1 \gamma_2)$, we have that $\nu\gamma_1\gamma_2 < 1$, so it follows from Theorem 1 that $\mathrm{dom}([H_1, \nu H_2]) = L_2$.

By assumption, γ is an incremental gain bound for $[H_1, \nu H_2]$. It then follows from Theorem 1 that, for all $\tau \in [0, 1/\gamma\gamma_2)$, $\mathrm{dom}([[H_1, \nu H_2], \tau H_2]) = L_2$. From Lemma 2, $[[H_1, \nu H_2], \tau H_2] = [H_1, (\nu + \tau) H_2]$. Again, by assumption, this operator has an incremental gain bound of γ.

Proceeding inductively, we have that $\mathrm{dom}([H_1, (\nu + k\tau) H_2]) = L_2$ for all $\tau \in [0, 1/\gamma\gamma_2)$ and positive integers k such that $\nu + k\tau \leq 1$, so, in particular, $\mathrm{dom}([H_1, H_2]) = L_2$. The incremental gain bound of γ then follows from condition (ii) in the theorem statement. □

We note that (ii) implies single-valuedness of $[H_1, \tau H_2]$ for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, we note that τ must be independent of u_1 and u_2. Necessity of this condition is demonstrated in Example 1. Condition (ii) may be relaxed to allow unstable systems in the loop, for example, by encapsulating the unstable operator in a stabilizing loop transform as in classical IQC analysis [4]. In the nonincremental setting, such homotopy arguments are known to guarantee a strong "quadratic" form of topological graph separation. Topological graph separation is a necessary and sufficient condition for feedback stability [18]; enforcing the stronger quadratic separation introduces some conservatism but allows computational methods, such as IQC analysis to be applied [4]. We expect such relationships to be true in the nonincremental setting also, but the details remain a question for future research. Closely related results in the differential setting are presented in [19].

Theorem 2 allows incremental stability of a feedback interconnection to be verified using only information about L_2 signals, without any reference to an extended space containing unbounded signals. This is useful as it allows the use of operator theoretic tools to verify the incremental gain bound of condition (ii). In the following section, we show this may be done graphically using the SRG, and in Section V we verify the incremental gain bound using IQCs.

IV. SRG Separation

Given an SRG $\mathcal{G}$, let $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ denote the smallest SRG containing $\mathcal{G}$ and satisfying the chord property. We begin with a graphical condition, which guarantees finite incremental gain of a feedback interconnection, on its domain (which may not, in general, be all of L_2). Given two regions X_1 and X_2 in the extended complex plane, we let $\mathrm{dist}(X_1, X_2)$ denote $\inf_{x_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2} |x_1 - x_2|$.

Lemma 5: Let H_1 and H_2 be operators, and suppose there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\mathrm{dist}(\mathrm{SRG}\,(H_1)^{-1}, -\overline{\mathrm{SRG}\,(H_2)}) \geq 1/\gamma$. Then, for any $u_i \in \mathrm{dom}([H_1, H_2])$ and $y_i = (H_1^{-1} + H_2)^{-1}(u_i)$, we have $\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq \gamma \|u_1 - u_2\|$.

Proof: Since $\overline{\mathrm{SRG}\,(H_2)^{-1}}$ satisfies the chord property by construction, we can apply the SRG sum rule (Lemma 4, Property 2) to obtain a bounding region for $\mathrm{SRG}\,(H_1^{-1} + H_2)$, according to the geometry in the left and middle plots below. The result then follows by applying the

Authorized licensed use limited to: KU Leuven University Library. Downloaded on May 26,2026 at 13:01:19 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.

inversion rule (Lemma 4, Property 1) to obtain an SRG with bounded magnitude, illustrated in the right plot below.



□

The separation condition of Lemma 5 guarantees that the feedback interconnection of two operators has an incremental gain bound on its domain. In other words, condition (ii) of Theorem 2 is satisfied for $\tau = 1$. However, this alone does not guarantee stability, as we also must verify that the domain of the feedback interconnection is L_2. Guaranteeing that the domain is L_2 requires a stronger separation property: the SRGs must remain separated as the feedback is gradually increased from zero. We formalize this separation property as follows.

Definition 1: Two operators H_1 and H_2 are said to have *strictly separated SRGs with margin* $r_{\min} > 0$ if $\mathrm{dist}(\mathrm{SRG}\,(H_1)^{-1}, -\tau\overline{\mathrm{SRG}\,(H_2)}) \geq r_{\min}$ for all $\tau \in (0, 1]$. ⌟

The following corollary is proved by showing that strict separation of the SRGs implies the existence of an incremental gain bound on the feedback interconnection, which is uniform in the gain τ.

Corollary 1: Suppose $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$ have bounded incremental gain and strictly separated SRGs. Then, the feedback interconnection $[H_1, H_2]$ maps L_2 to L_2 and has bounded incremental gain.

Proof: It follows from strict separation of the SRGs of H_1 and H_2, and Lemma 5, that $1/r_{\min}$ is an incremental gain bound for $[H_1, \nu H_2]$. The result then follows from Theorem 2. □

Corollary 1 corrects the assumptions of [1, Thm. 2, Corollary 1, Corollary 2] in two ways: in [1], only H_1 was assumed to be incrementally bounded, and the separation of the SRGs was not required to be strict. Strict separation must also be assumed in [1, Thm. 1]. The additional assumptions are satisfied in all the examples of [1], and we refer the reader to those examples for illustrations of the application of Theorem 2, and for comparisons with other stability verification methods. The following example illustrates why strict separation of the SRGs is required to guarantee incremental boundedness.

Example 1: Consider the operator $N : L_2 \to L_2$ given by

$$(Nu)(t) = \phi(u(t))$$

where $\phi(x) = -\arctan(x)$. ϕ is 1-Lipschitz continuous, so N has an incremental gain bound of 1. It follows that its SRG is contained in the closed unit disc. We now observe the following: the SRG of N is, in fact, contained in the open unit disc $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in |z| < 1\}$, and therefore does not contain the point -1. However, the operator formed by putting N in unity gain negative feedback has infinite incremental gain.

To see that $\mathrm{SRG}\,(N) \subseteq \mathbb{D}$, suppose that there exist $u_1, u_2 \in L_2$, $u_1 \neq u_2$, such that

$$\frac{\|N(u_1) - N(u_2)\|}{\|u_1 - u_2\|} = 1. \tag{13}$$

Since $u_1 \neq u_2$, the set $E = \{t \in \mathbb{R} | u_1(t) \neq u_2(t)\}$ has positive measure. Equation (13) implies

$$\int_E |u_1(t) - u_2(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t = \int_E |\phi(u_1(t)) - \phi(u_2(t))|^2 \mathrm{d}t$$
$$= \int_E \left| \frac{\phi(u_1(t)) - \phi(u_2(t))}{u_1(t) - u_2(t)} \right|^2 |u_1(t) - u_2(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t$$

or equivalently

$$\int_E \left(1 - \left| \frac{\phi(u_1(t)) - \phi(u_2(t))}{u_1(t) - u_2(t)} \right|^2\right) |u_1(t) - u_2(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t = 0.$$

Hence, we must have

$$\left| \frac{\phi(u_1(t)) - \phi(u_2(t))}{u_1(t) - u_2(t)} \right| = 1$$

for almost all $t \in E$. But this is impossible, since

$$\left| \frac{\phi(x) - \phi(y)}{x - y} \right| < 1$$

for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x \neq y$. Thus, indeed $\mathrm{SRG}\,(N) \subseteq \mathbb{D}$.

We now show the $(N^{-1} + I)^{-1}$ does not have a finite incremental gain. Indeed, on its domain, we have

$$(N^{-1} + I)^{-1}(u)(t) = \psi^{-1}(u(t))$$

where $\psi(x) = x - \tan(x)$. However, the function ψ^{-1} is not Lipschitz continuous at $x = 0$, since $\psi'(0) = 0$ so $(\psi^{-1})'(0)$ does not exist. The ratio

$$\frac{\|(N^{-1} + I)^{-1}(u_1) - (N^{-1} + I)^{-1}(u_2)\|}{\|u_1 - u_2\|}$$

can be made arbitrarily large, for example, by taking $u_1(t) = au(t)$ and $u_2(t) = u(t)$ for $a, b \neq 0$ small enough, where

$$u(t) := \begin{cases} 1, & t \in [0, 1] \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$ ⌟

V. Incremental IQCs

In this section, we give a second method of verifying condition (ii) of Theorem 2: satisfaction of an incremental IQC. This gives an incremental version of the classical IQC stability theorem [3, Thm. 1]. Our theorem is closely related to [9, Thm. 7.40], but does not rely on an extended space or assumptions of causality. The developments closely follow the nonincremental theory of [4] and [14].

Corollary 2: Let $H_1 : L_2 \to L_2$ be a bounded linear, time invariant (LTI) operator, and $H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$ be incrementally bounded. Let $\Pi : j\mathbb{R} \to n \times n$ be a Hermitian-valued function with L_∞ entries. Given $y_1, y_2 \in L_2$, define $\Delta\hat{y}(j\omega) := \hat{y}_1(j\omega) - \hat{y}_2(j\omega)$ and $\Delta\hat{H}_2(y)(j\omega) := \hat{H}_2(y_1)(j\omega) - \tau\hat{H}_2(y_2)(j\omega)$. Suppose that, for every $\tau \in [0, 1]$ and every $y_1, y_2 \in L_2$, we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta\hat{y}(j\omega) \\ \tau\Delta\hat{H}_2(y)(j\omega) \end{pmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{pmatrix} \Delta\hat{y}(j\omega) \\ \tau\Delta\hat{H}_2(y)(j\omega) \end{pmatrix} \mathrm{d}\omega \geq 0 \tag{14}$$

and that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{H}_1(j\omega) \\ I \end{pmatrix}^* \Pi(j\omega) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{H}_1(j\omega) \\ I \end{pmatrix} \leq -\varepsilon I \tag{15}$$

for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, $[H_1, H_2]$ maps L_2 to L_2 and has bounded incremental gain.

Equations (14) and (15) state that the graph of H_2 and the inverse graph of $-H_1$, respectively, satisfy the incremental IQC described by Π. In contrast to [3, Thm. 1], Corollary 2 does not require any well-posedness assumptions along the homotopy path. Before giving the proof of Corollary 2, we make a technical definition and prove two lemmas, on which the proof relies.

Definition 2: A functional $\sigma : L_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *quadratically continuous* if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\sigma(y) \leq \sigma(x) + \varepsilon \|x\|^2 + C \|x - y\|^2$$

Authorized licensed use limited to: KU Leuven University Library. Downloaded on May 26,2026 at 13:01:19 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.

for all $x, y \in L_2$. ⌟

The class of quadratically continuous functionals that we will use is characterized in the following lemma, which is a special case of [14, Lemma 3.18].

Lemma 6: Let $\Pi : j\mathbb{R} \to n \times n$ be a Hermitian-valued function with L_∞ entries. Then, the functional $\sigma : L_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\sigma(x) := \langle x, x \rangle_\Pi$$
$$\langle x, y \rangle_\Pi := \operatorname{Re} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{x}^*(j\omega)\Pi(j\omega)\hat{y}(j\omega)\mathrm{d}\omega$$

is quadratically continuous.

Proof: Note that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Pi$ defines a bounded Hermitian form

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(x) - \sigma(y) &= \langle y, y \rangle_\Pi - \langle x, x \rangle_\Pi \\
&= \langle y, y \rangle_\Pi - \langle x, y \rangle_\Pi + \langle x, y \rangle_\Pi - \langle x, x \rangle_\Pi \\
&= \langle y - x, y \rangle_\Pi - \langle x, y - x \rangle_\Pi \\
&= \langle y - x, y \rangle_\Pi - \langle y - x, x \rangle_\Pi \\
&\quad + \langle y - x, y \rangle_\Pi + \langle x, y - x \rangle_\Pi \\
&= \langle y - x, y - x \rangle_\Pi + \langle y - x, x \rangle_\Pi + \langle x, y - x \rangle_\Pi .
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Pi$ is bounded, there exists $M \geq 0$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle \leq M\|x\|\|y\|$ for all $x, y \in L_2$. We, therefore, have

$$\sigma(x) - \sigma(y) \leq \quad M \|x - y\|^2 + 2M \|x\| \|x - y\| . \tag{16}$$

Furthermore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(M \|x - y\| - \varepsilon \|x\|\right)^2 =$$
$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} M^2 \|x - y\|^2 - 2M \|x\| \|x - y\| + \varepsilon \|x\|^2 \geq 0$$
$$\text{so} \quad 2M \|x\| \|x - y\| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} M^2 \|x - y\|^2 + \varepsilon \|x\|^2 .$$

Combining with (16), we have

$$\sigma(x) - \sigma(y) \leq \left(M + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} M^2\right) \|x - y\|^2 + \varepsilon \|x\|^2 . \qquad \square$$

We now show that a quadratically continuous functional can be used to verify incremental boundedness.

Lemma 7: Consider $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$ and assume H_1 has an incremental gain bound of λ. Let $\sigma : L_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be quadratically continuous with constant C. For $u_i \in L_2$, let $y_i \in [H_1, H_2](u_i)$ and e_i denote $u_i - H_2(y_i)$. Suppose that, for all $u_1, u_2 \in \operatorname{dom}([H_1, H_2])$, we have

$$\sigma(h_1) \leq -2\varepsilon \|h_1\|^2 \tag{17}$$
$$\sigma(h_2) \geq 0 \tag{18}$$

where $h_1 := (y_1 - y_2, e_1 - e_2)$ and $h_2 := (y_1 - y_2, H_2(y_1) - H_2(y_2))$. Then, there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that, for all u_1, u_2, we have

$$\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{C}{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\lambda^2}{1 + \lambda^2}\right)} \|u_1 - u_2\| .$$

Proof: Given two signals x_1 and x_2, let $\Delta x := x_1 - x_2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \leq\ & \sigma(h_2) \\
\leq\ & \sigma(h_1) + \varepsilon \|h_1\|^2 + C \|h_2 - h_1\|^2 \\
\leq\ & -\varepsilon \|h_1\|^2 + C \|h_2 - h_1\|^2 \\
=\ & -\varepsilon(\|\Delta y\|^2 + \|\Delta e\|^2) + C(\|\Delta H_2(y) - \Delta e\|^2) \\
=\ & -\varepsilon(\|\Delta y\|^2 + \|\Delta e\|^2) + C \|\Delta u\|^2 \\
\leq\ & -\varepsilon \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\right) \|\Delta y\| + C \|\Delta u\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

from which the result follows. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 2: Define $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Pi$ as in Lemma 6. It follows from that lemma that $\sigma(x) := \langle x, x \rangle_\Pi$ is quadratically continuous. Equation (14) gives condition (18) of Lemma 7. We now show that (15) gives condition (17). Indeed, premultiplying and postmultiplying with $\hat{u}^*(j\omega)$ and $\hat{u}(j\omega)$, respectively, and integrating over ω, gives

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{H}_1(j\omega)\hat{u}(j\omega) \\ \hat{u}(j\omega) \end{pmatrix}^* \Pi(\omega) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{H}_1(j\omega)\hat{u}(j\omega) \\ \hat{u}(j\omega) \end{pmatrix} \mathrm{d}\omega \leq -\varepsilon \|\hat{u}\|^2 .$$

Now let $\alpha > 0$ be a gain bound for H_1. Then, we can write $-\varepsilon\|u\|^2 \leq -2\bar{\varepsilon}(\|u\|^2 + \|H_1(u)\|^2)$ for some $\bar{\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon/(2(1 + \alpha))$. Since H_1 is LTI, this nonincremental condition is then equivalent to the incremental condition (17).

We finally note that the gain bound given by Lemma 7 depends only on σ and the incremental gain of H_1, and not on τ. The conclusions of the corollary then follow from Theorem 2. $\square$

VI. Relaxing the Assumption of Incremental Boundedness

Much of the existing stability literature focuses on the verification of nonincremental stability, and assumes weaker nonincremental boundedness properties for the components. In exchange, systems must be assumed to be well-posed, in the sense of causality and existence of solutions in an appropriate ambient space, containing L_2 but allowing unbounded signals. In this section, we show that incremental stability can also be verified under these weaker assumptions, subject to the same well-posedness assumptions as in a typical nonincremental analysis. We begin by introducing the extended L_2 space.

Given $T > 0$, denote by $P_T : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}$ the truncation operator

$$P_T(u)(t) := \begin{cases} u(t), & t < T \\ 0, & t \geq T. \end{cases}$$

The *extended* L_2 *space*, L_{2e}, is defined as the subset of $\mathcal{F}$ such that $P_T u \in L_2$ for all T. An operator $H : L_2 \to L_2$, or $H_e : L_{2e} \to L_{2e}$, is said to be *causal* if $P_T H P_T = P_T H$ for all $T > 0$.

A negative feedback interconnection is said to be *well-posed* if, for any $u \in L_{2e}$, there exist unique $e, y \in L_{2e}$ satisfying (6) and (7).

Theorem 3: Suppose the following holds:

i) $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$ have finite gain with zero offset and are causal;
ii) $[H_1, \tau H_2]$ is well-posed and causal for all $\tau \in (0, 1]$;
iii) there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that, for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$ and all $u_1, u_2 \in \operatorname{dom}([H_1, \tau H_2])$, we have

$$\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq \gamma \|u_1 - u_2\|$$

where $y_i = [H_1, \tau H_2](u_i), i = 1, 2$.

Then, $[H_1, H_2]$ maps L_2 to L_2 and has finite incremental gain.

This theorem provides a middle ground between the incremental Theorem 2 and classical homotopy results, such as [3, Thm. 1].

Proof of Theorem 3: The proof mirrors that of Theorem 2, but replacing the incremental small gain theorem with its nonincremental version—see, for example, [6, Thm. 1, p. 41], with the modified condition suggested in (8c) on the same page. $\square$

As in the case of Theorem 2, condition (iii) of Theorem 3 can be verified using SRG separation or incremental IQCs. In the case of SRG separation, we have the following result, the proof of which is similar to Corollary 1. The corresponding result for IQCs is similar to Corollary 2 but incorporates the assumptions of Theorem 3.

Authorized licensed use limited to: KU Leuven University Library. Downloaded on May 26,2026 at 13:01:19 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.

Corollary 3: Suppose $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$ have finite gain with zero offset. Suppose that H_1 and H_2 have strictly separated SRGs. Then, the feedback interconnection $[H_1, H_2]$ maps L_2 to L_2 and has bounded incremental gain. Suppose the following holds:

i) $H_1, H_2 : L_2 \to L_2$ have finite gain with zero offset and are causal;
ii) $[H_1, \tau H_2]$ is well-posed and causal for all $\tau \in (0, 1]$;
iii) H_1 and H_2 have strictly separated SRGs.

Then, $[H_1, H_2]$ maps L_2 to L_2 and has finite incremental gain.

Nonincremental finite gain can be verified using separation of (nonincremental) Scaled Graphs, as shown in [20, Thm. 4].

REFERENCES

[1] T. Chaffey, F. Forni, and R. Sepulchre, "Graphical nonlinear system analysis," in *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 10, pp. 6067–6081, Oct. 2023. doi: 10.1109/TAC.2023.3234016.

[2] G. Zames, "On the input-output stability of time-varying nonlinear feedback systems part one: Conditions derived using concepts of loop gain, conicity, and positivity," in *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 228–238, Apr. 1966, doi: 10.1109/tac.1966.1098316.

[3] A. Megretski and A. Rantzer, "System analysis via integral quadratic constraints," in *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 819–830, Jun. 1997, doi: 10.1109/9.587335.

[4] A. Rantzer and A. Megretski, "System analysis via integral quadratic constraints Part II," Lund Inst. Technol., ISRN LUTFD, Lund, Sweden, Tech. Rep. TFRT-7559-SE, 1997.

[5] T. T. Georgiou and M. C. Smith, "Robustness analysis of nonlinear feedback systems: An input-output approach," in *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 42, no. 9, pp. 1200–1221, Sep. 1997, doi: 10.1109/9.623082.

[6] C. A. Desoer and M. Vidyasagar, *Feedback Systems: Input–Output Properties*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier, 1975, doi: 10.1016/b978-0-12-212050-3.x5001-4.

[7] E. K. Ryu, R. Hannah, and W. Yin, "Scaled relative graphs: Nonexpansive operators via 2D Euclidean geometry," in *Math. Program.*, vol. 194, pp. 569–619, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10107-021-01639-w.

[8] C. Chen, S. Z. Khong, and R. Sepulchre, "Soft and hard scaled relative graphs for nonlinear feedback stability," 2025, *arXiv.2504.14407*.

[9] C. Scherer and S. Weiland, "Linear matrix inequalities in control," 2015. [Online]. Available: https://www.imng.uni-stuttgart.de/mst/files/LectureNotes.pdf

[10] R. Wang and I. R. Manchester, "Robust contraction analysis of nonlinear systems via differential IQC," in *Proc. IEEE 58th Conf. Decis. Control.*, Nice, France, Dec. 2019, pp. 6766–6771, doi: 10.1109/CDC40024.2019.9029867.

[11] U. T. Jonsson, C.-Y. Kao, and A. Megretski, "A semi-infinite optimization problem in harmonic analysis of uncertain systems," in *Proc. 2001 Amer. Control Conf.*, 2001, vol. 4, pp. 3029–3034, doi: 10.1109/ACC.2001.946379.

[12] J. Gronqvist and A. Rantzer, "Integral quadratic constraints for neural networks," in *Proc. 2022 Eur. Control Conf.*, London, U.K., Jul. 2022, pp. 1864–1869, doi: 10.23919/ECC55457.2022.9838065.

[13] H. J. van Waarde and R. Sepulchre, "Kernel-based models for system analysis," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 9, pp. 5317–5332, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2022.3218944.

[14] R. A. Freeman, "On the role of well-posedness in homotopy methods for the stability analysis of nonlinear feedback systems," in *Trends in Nonlinear and Adaptive Control: A Tribute to Laurent Praly for His 65th Birthday*, (Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences Series), Z.-P. Jiang, C. Prieur, and A. Astolfi, Eds. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2022, pp. 43–82, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-74628-5_3.

[15] C. W. Scherer, "Dissipativity and integral quadratic constraints: Tailored computational robustness tests for complex interconnections," *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 115–139, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.1109/MCS.2022.3157117.

[16] V. Fromion, S. Monaco, and D. Normand-Cyrot, "A link between input-output stability and Lyapunov stability," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 243–248, Apr. 1996, doi: 10.1016/0167-6911(95)00046-1.

[17] R. Pates, "The scaled relative graph of a linear operator," 2021, *arXiv:2106.05650*.

[18] A. R. Teel, "On graphs, conic relations, and input-output stability of nonlinear feedback systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 702–709, May 1996, doi: 10.1109/9.489206.

[19] T. T. Georgiou, "Differential stability and robust control of nonlinear systems," *Math. Control, Signals Syst.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 289–306, Dec. 1993, doi: 10.1007/BF01211498.

[20] S. van den Eijnden, T. Chaffey, T. Oomen, and W. P. M. H. Heemels, "Scaled graphs for reset control system analysis," *Eur. J. Control*, vol. 80, 2024, Art. no. 101050, doi: 10.1016/j.ejcon.2024.101050.

Authorized licensed use limited to: KU Leuven University Library. Downloaded on May 26,2026 at 13:01:19 UTC from IEEE Xplore. Restrictions apply.