

Compositional Synthesis of Finite State Abstractions

Rupak Majumdar, Kaushik Mallik, Anne-Kathrin Schmuck

Abstract—Controller synthesis techniques for continuous systems with respect to temporal logic specifications typically use a finite-state symbolic abstraction of the system model. Constructing this abstraction for the entire system is computationally expensive, and does not exploit natural decompositions of many systems into interacting components. We describe a methodology for compositional symbolic abstraction to help scale controller synthesis for temporal logic to larger systems.

We introduce a new relation, called (approximate) *disturbance bisimulation*, as the basis for compositional symbolic abstractions. Disturbance bisimulation strengthens the standard approximate alternating bisimulation relation used in control, and extends naturally to systems which are composed of sub-components possibly connected in feedback; disturbance bisimulation handles the feedback signals as disturbances. After proving this composability of disturbance bisimulation for metric systems, we show how one can construct finite-state abstractions compositionally for each component, so that the abstractions are simultaneously disturbance bisimilar to their continuous counterparts. Combining these two results, we can compositionally abstract a network system in a modular way while ensuring that the final composed abstraction is disturbance bisimilar to the original system.

We discuss how we get a compositional controller synthesis methodology for networks of such systems against local temporal specifications as a by-product of our construction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Symbolic models for continuous dynamical systems enable powerful automata-theoretic techniques for controller design for ω -regular specifications to be applied to continuous systems. In this methodology, one starts with a continuous dynamical system and an approximation factor ε , and constructs a finite-state abstraction whose trajectories are guaranteed to be within a distance of ε to the original system and vice versa [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. The approximation is usually formalized using ε -approximate alternating bisimulation relation, which has the property that controller synthesized for the abstraction can be automatically refined into controller for the original system. Under the assumption of incremental input-to-state stability, one can algorithmically construct a finite-state discrete system which is ε -approximately alternatingly bisimilar to the original continuous system. Since one can also algorithmically synthesize controllers for ω -regular properties for discrete systems (see, e.g., [6], [7]), this provides an automatic controller synthesis technique for continuous systems. The methodology is integrated into controller synthesis tools [8], [9], and has been recently applied to large case studies in adaptive cruise control [10] and bipedal robots [11]. It has also been extended to systems with disturbance [12], [13] or to stochastic systems [14], [15], [16].

The computational bottleneck of this approach is the expensive abstraction step (typically exponential in the dimension)

which limits its applicability to real systems. However, in practice, many systems are designed using interacting networks of smaller dynamically coupled components. One would imagine that each component can be abstracted separately, in an environment consisting, abstractly, of the other components.

Very recently some efforts have been made in this direction. Rungger and Zamani [17] presented a compositional approach for approximate abstraction which performs a model order reduction from one continuous system to another *continuous* system with fewer state variables. Pola et al. [18], [19] proposed a compositional abstraction technique for networked continuous systems based on approximate bisimulation. Unfortunately, the use of bisimulation introduces unrealistic assumptions between components in the compositional construction of abstractions, as shown in Ex. 4. Furthermore, Dallal et al. [20] proposed a compositional abstraction algorithm for discrete-time systems based on a small-gain-theorem and rely-guarantee techniques [21], [22], [23]. They only treat persistence specifications and no notion of ε -closedness is employed. Hence synthesized abstract controller may not be refined to the original continuous system.

In this paper, we take a different approach towards compositional abstraction for networks of interacting continuous-state dynamical systems. We assume that each component has its own state and an external control input, but in addition, its dynamics depends on the states of the neighboring components in the network. When reasoning compositionally about one component, we make no assumptions about the state of the other components; thus, we model the state of the neighboring components as disturbance signals.

Unfortunately, a naive application of ε -approximate alternating bisimulation relations to construct abstractions of each individual component in isolation does not work for a subtle reason. In the abstraction procedure, each abstract component does not see the precise disturbance signal (the states of the other components), but the *discrete abstraction* of the disturbance signal. Thus, in constructing the ε -approximate alternating bisimulation, each matching step introduces an additional error, $\tilde{\varepsilon}$, which is the difference between the actual disturbance and its abstraction. Since the dynamics of the systems are coupled through the network, these errors can compound over time. To bound these errors in the abstraction we introduce a stronger relation, called *disturbance bisimulation* over two approximation parameters $(\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon})$.

Disturbance bisimulation is tailored to relate systems with different disturbance signals whose mismatch is bounded by $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ and strengthens the standard approximate alternating bisimulation relation used in control. As its main feature, it extends naturally to systems which are composed of sub-components possibly connected in feedback and is therefore perfectly suited for compositional abstraction. A similar approach was

All authors are with MPI-SWS, Kaiserslautern, Germany. {rupak, kmallik, akschmuck}@mpi-sws.org

recently taken in [24] for solving a continuous compositional abstraction synthesis problem using ideas from dissipativity theory; their joint storage functions use the same quantifier alternation as our disturbance bisimulation.

In this paper we first show that for networks of interacting metric systems, disturbance bisimulation naturally extends from components to their compositions. We furthermore provide conditions on the parameters $(\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i)$ for each component such that they are *simultaneously* disturbance bisimilar to their respective abstractions. By combining these two results we show that there exist parameters $(\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon})$ s.t. the composition of the original components is *disturbance bisimilar* to the composition of their *locally* disturbance bisimilar abstractions.

As our notion of disturbance bisimulation strengthens the notion of ε -approximate alternating bisimulation, our approach leads naturally to a decentralized methodology for controller synthesis in networked systems. We can compute local abstract controller for each component's abstraction against local temporal logic specification over the abstract state space. Our notion of relation allows us to then refine these local controllers, connect them to the original subsystems, and it is guaranteed that the composition of all local closed loops will satisfy the conjunction of all local specifications (up to the approximation error). Thus, we get a compositional controller synthesis algorithm as a by-product of our construction.

II. SYSTEMS

A. Control Systems

We use control systems as our underlying system model.

Definition 1. A control system $\Sigma = (X, U, \mathcal{U}, W, \mathcal{W}, f)$ consists of a state space X , an input space U , a disturbance space W , a set of input signals \mathcal{U} , a set of disturbance signals \mathcal{W} , and a continuous state transition function $f : X \times U \times W \rightarrow X$. We assume $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, and $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ are compact subsets of normed Euclidean spaces (of appropriate dimensions) containing the origins, sets \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{W} consist of measurable essentially bounded functions $\mu : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow U$ and $\nu : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow W$, respectively, and f satisfies the following Lipschitz assumption: there exists a constant $L > 0$ s.t. $\|f(x, u, w) - f(y, u, w)\| \leq L\|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in X$, $u \in U$, and $w \in W$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm.

A trajectory $\xi : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ associated with the control system Σ and signals $\mu \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{W}$ is an absolutely continuous curve satisfying:

$$\dot{\xi}(t) = f(\xi(t), \mu(t), \nu(t)) \quad (1)$$

for almost all $t \in (a, b)$. Although we define trajectories over open intervals, we talk about trajectories $\xi : [0, \tau] \rightarrow X$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, with the understanding that ξ is the restriction to $[0, \tau]$ of some trajectory defined on an open interval containing $[0, \tau]$. We write $\xi_{x\mu\nu}(t)$ for the state reached by the trajectory ξ starting from the initial condition x and with input and disturbance signals μ and ν , respectively. A control system Σ is forward complete¹ if every trajectory is defined on an interval of the form (a, ∞) .

¹Sufficient and necessary conditions for a system to be forward complete can be found in [25].

B. Metric Systems

In this paper we restrict our attention to norm-induced metric systems that are defined over an euclidean vector space and are time sampled w.r.t. a time sampling parameter² $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. We point out that our results can be readily extended to general metric systems at the cost of more complex notation.

Definition 2. A metric system $S = (X, U, \mathcal{U}_\tau, W, \mathcal{W}_\tau, \delta)$ consists of a (possibly infinite) set of states $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ naturally equipped with the (euclidean) norm induced metric $d(x, x') = \|x - x'\|$, a set of piecewise constant inputs \mathcal{U}_τ of duration τ taking values in the set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{U}_\tau = \{\mu : [0, \tau] \rightarrow U \mid \forall t_1, t_2 \in [0, \tau] . \mu(t_1) = \mu(t_2)\},$$

a set of piecewise constant disturbances \mathcal{W}_τ taking values in the set $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{W}_\tau = \{\nu : [0, \tau] \rightarrow W \mid \forall t_1, t_2 \in [0, \tau] . \nu(t_1) = \nu(t_2)\},$$

and a transition function $\delta : X \times \mathcal{U}_\tau \times \mathcal{W}_\tau \rightarrow X$. If $\delta(x, \mu, \nu) = x'$, we write $x \xrightarrow{\mu, \nu} x'$. If X , \mathcal{U}_τ and \mathcal{W}_τ are finite (resp. countable), S is called finite (resp. countable).³ We denote the unique value of $\mu \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{W}$ over $[0, \tau]$ by $u_\mu \in U$ and $w_\nu \in W$, respectively.

In addition to a single-valued metric which is used to define metric systems we also need vector-valued metrics in this paper. For this, we let the relations $<, \leq, \geq, >$ be defined component-wise in \mathbb{R}^n , i.e., $a < b$ iff $a_i < b_i$ for all $i \in [1, n]$. Then, for any given n -dimensional space A , a mapping $\mathbf{d} : A \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a *vector-valued metric* on A if for all $a, b \in A$ holds (i) $\mathbf{d}(a, b) \geq 0_n$, where 0_n is the origin in \mathbb{R}^n , (ii) $\mathbf{d}(a, b) = 0_n$ implies $a = b$, (iii) $\mathbf{d}(a, b) = \mathbf{d}(b, a)$, and (iv) $\mathbf{d}(a, b) \leq \mathbf{d}(a, c) + \mathbf{d}(c, b)$ for all $c \in A$.

III. SYSTEM COMPOSITION

In this section we introduce a network of interconnected systems by allowing states of one system to be fed back to other systems, which are treated as disturbances. We furthermore define how to generate composed systems from such networks. To do so we first define a network of systems as follows.

Let I be an index set (e.g., $I = \{1, \dots, N\}$ for some natural number N) and let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq I \times I$ be a binary *connectivity relation* on I . Furthermore, let $I' \subseteq I$ be a subset of systems with $\mathcal{I}' = (I' \times I') \cap \mathcal{I}$. For $i \in I$ we define $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i) = \{j \mid (j, i) \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and extend this notion to subsets of systems $I' \subseteq I$ as $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I') = \{j \mid \exists i \in I'. j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)\}$. Intuitively, a set of systems can be imagined to be the set of vertices $\{1, 2, \dots, |I|\}$ of a directed graph \mathcal{G} , and \mathcal{I} to be the corresponding adjacency relation. Given any vertex i of \mathcal{G} , the set of incoming (resp. outgoing) edges are the inputs (resp. outputs) of a subsystem i , and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)$ is the set of neighboring vertices from which the incoming edges originate.

²We only use one single time sampling parameter called τ everywhere in this paper and therefore usually only implicitly assume that it is given.

³Often, metric systems are defined with an additional output space and an output map from states to the output space. We omit the output space for notational simplicity; for us, the state and the output space coincide, and the output map is the identity function.

A. Control Systems

Let $\Sigma_i = (X_i, U_i, \mathcal{U}_i, W_i, \mathcal{W}_i, f_i)$, for $i \in I$, be a control system. We say that the set of control systems $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ are *compatible for composition* w.r.t. the interconnection relation \mathcal{I} , if for each $i \in I$, we have $W_i = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{X_j\}$, i.e., the disturbance input space of Σ_i is the same as the cartesian product of the state spaces of all the neighbors in $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)$. As I' is a subset of all systems in the network, we divide the set of disturbances W_i for any $i \in I'$ into the sets of coupling and external disturbances, defined by $W_i^c = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{X_j\}$ and $W_i^e = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')}(i) \{X_j\}$, respectively.

If $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ are compatible, we define the *composition* of any subset $I' \subseteq I$ of systems as the control system $[\Sigma_i]_{i \in I'} = (X, U, \mathcal{U}, W, \mathcal{W}, f)$ where $X = \prod_{i \in I'} \{X_i\}$, $U = \prod_{i \in I'} \{U_i\}$, and $W = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')}(i) \{X_j\}$. Furthermore, \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{W} are defined as the sets of functions $\mu : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow U$ and $\nu : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow W$, such that the projection μ_i of μ on to U_i (written $\mu_i = \mu|_{U_i}$) belongs to \mathcal{U}_i , and the projection ν_i^e of ν on to W_i^e belongs to \mathcal{W}_i^e . The composed transition function is then defined as $f(\prod_{i \in I'} \{x_i\}, \prod_{i \in I'} \{u_i\}, w) = \prod_{i \in I'} \{f_i(x_i, u_i, w_i^c \times w_i^e)\}$, where $w_i^c = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{x_j\}$ and $w_i^e = w|_{W_i^e}$. If $I' = I$, then W and \mathcal{W} are both \emptyset , and the transition function simplifies to $f : X \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow X$. It is easy to see that $[\Sigma_i]_{i \in I'}$ is again a control system.

Intuitively, the composition of a set of compatible control systems gives the joint dynamics of the network. When we pick a subset of systems $I' \subseteq I$, the incoming edges from $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')$ become external disturbances for the composed subsystem. Observe that our approach is modular. We can first compose different sets of subsystems before composing the resulting systems together. Our definition of system composition is illustrated by the following example.

Example 1. Consider the following three systems


$$\Sigma_1 : \dot{x}_1 = f_1(x_1, u_1) \quad (2)$$

$$\Sigma_2 : \dot{x}_2 = f_2(x_2, u_2, w_2) \quad (3)$$


$$\Sigma_3 : \dot{x}_3 = f_3(x_3, u_3, w_3) \quad (4)$$

with states $x_1 \in X_1$, $x_2 \in X_2$, $x_3 \in X_3$, control inputs $u_1 \in U_1$, $u_2 \in U_2$, $u_3 \in U_3$ and disturbances $w_2 \in W_2$ and $w_3 \in W_3$. The index set and the interconnection relation are given by $I = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (3, 2)\}$, respectively, and the sets of neighbors are defined by $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(1) = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(2) = \{1, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(3) = \{1\}$. The systems $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ are compatible for composition w.r.t. I if $W_1 = \emptyset$, $W_2 = X_1 \times X_3$ and $W_3 = X_1$. In this case the schematic representation of this network of systems is given in Figure 1(a).

Now assume that $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ are compatible and consider the composition of system Σ_1 and Σ_2 , i.e. $[\Sigma_i]_{i \in \{1,2\}} = (X, U, \mathcal{U}, W, \mathcal{W}, f)$. This composition has the interconnection relation $\mathcal{I}' = \{(1, 2)\}$ and the global set of neighbors $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I') = \{3\}$. The coupling and external disturbance spaces are given by $W_1^c = \emptyset$, $W_1^e = \emptyset$, $W_2^c = X_1$ and $W_2^e = X_3$. The remaining sets are given by $X = X_1 \times X_2$, $U = U_1 \times U_2$, and $W = X_3$. Given some $x = (x_1, x_2) \in X$, $u = (u_1, u_2) \in U$ and $w = x_3 \in W$, the transition relation is given by $f(x, u, w) = (f_1(x_1, u_1, \emptyset), f_2(x_2, u_2, (x_1, x_3)))$. By



(a) The full network consisting of the compatible control systems $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in \{1,2,3\}}$ discussed in Example 1.



(b) Resulting network when replacing control systems Σ_1 and Σ_2 in Figure 1(a) by their composition $[\Sigma_i]_{i \in \{1,2\}}$.

Fig. 1. Network of systems discussed in Example 1; in general the network could have cycles.

substituting system Σ_1 and Σ_2 by its composition $[\Sigma_i]_{i \in \{1,2\}}$ we obtain the network shown in Figure 1(b).

B. Metric Systems

Let $S_i = (X_i, U_i, \mathcal{U}_{\tau,i}, W_i, \mathcal{W}_{\tau,i}, \delta_i)$, for $i \in I$, be a metric system. Then we can extend compatibility to metric systems in a straight forward manner. Hence, we say that $\{S_i\}_{i \in I}$ are *compatible for composition* w.r.t. the interconnection relation \mathcal{I} , if for each $i \in I$, we have $W_i = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{X_j\}$. With this, we extend the metric d_i on X_i to the vector valued metric $e : W_i \times W_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)|}$ s.t.

$$e(w_i, w'_i) := \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{d_j(x_j, x'_j)\} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{\|x_j - x'_j\|\}. \quad (5)$$

Intuitively, $e(w, w')$ is a vector with dimension $|\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)|$, where the j -th entry measures the mismatch of the respective state vector of the j -th neighbor of i .

Using the same notation as for control systems, for $I' \subseteq I$, the *subset composition* $[\mathcal{S}_i]_{i \in I'} = (X, U, \mathcal{U}_{\tau}, W, \mathcal{W}_{\tau}, \delta)$ is defined s.t. $X = \prod_{i \in I'} \{X_i\}$, equipped with norm induced metric d , $U = \prod_{i \in I'} \{U_i\}$, and $W = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')}(i) \{X_j\}$, where \mathcal{U}_{τ} and \mathcal{W}_{τ} are defined over U and W , respectively, as in Def. 2. Now recall that for any constant signal $\nu \in \mathcal{W}_{\tau}$ we denote by w_{ν} its unique value $\nu(t)$ for all $t \in [0, \tau]$. Using this notation the composed transition function is defined as $\delta_{\tau}(x, \mu, \nu) = \prod_{i \in I'} \{\delta_i(x_i, \mu_i, \nu_i^c \times \nu_i^e)\}$ where $x = \prod_{i \in I'} \{x_i\}$, $\mu = \prod_{i \in I'} \{\mu_i\}$, $w_{\nu}^c = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{x_j\}$ and $\nu_i^e = \nu|_{W_i^e}$. It follows immediately from this construction that the composed system $[\mathcal{S}_i]_{i \in I'}$ is again a metric system. We extend the metric e to the set W by substituting $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)$ by $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')$ in (5).

IV. DISTURBANCE BISIMULATION

In this section, we introduce a new binary relation, called *disturbance bisimulation*, as the basis for our compositional symbolic abstractions.

Definition 3. Let S_1 and S_2 be two metric systems, with state-spaces $X_1, X_2 \subseteq X$ and disturbance sets $W_1, W_2 \subseteq W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$. Furthermore, let X admits the metric $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and W admits the vector-valued metric $\mathbf{e} : W \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$, $1 \leq r \leq p$. A binary relation $R \subseteq X_1 \times X_2$ is a disturbance bisimulation with parameters $(\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon})$ where $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$, iff for each $(x_1, x_2) \in R$:

- (a) $d(x_1, x_2) \leq \varepsilon$;
- (b) for every $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1$ there exists a $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2$ such that for all $\nu_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2$ and $\nu_1 \in \mathcal{W}_1$ with $\mathbf{e}(w_{\nu_1}, w_{\nu_2}) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}$, we have that $(\delta_1(x_1, \mu_1, \nu_1), \delta_2(x_2, \mu_2, \nu_2)) \in R$; and
- (c) for every $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2$ there exists a $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1$ such that for all $\nu_1 \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and $\nu_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2$ with $\mathbf{e}(w_{\nu_1}, w_{\nu_2}) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}$, we have that $(\delta_1(x_1, \mu_1, \nu_1), \delta_2(x_2, \mu_2, \nu_2)) \in R$.

Two systems S_1 and S_2 are said to be disturbance bisimilar with parameters $(\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon})$ if there is a disturbance bisimulation relation R between S_1 and S_2 with parameters $(\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon})$.

Disturbance bisimulation can be intuitively understood as a two-player game between the systems S_1 and S_2 , where the players take turns in picking and matching inputs as follows: in the first round, S_1 (conversely, S_2) picks a control input independently, and S_2 (S_1) tries to match by picking another control input. In the second round, it is S_2 's (S_1 's) turn to make an independent choice for picking disturbance inputs both for herself and S_1 (S_2), such that the disturbances are close to each other. Thus, in contrast to alternating bisimulation relation introduced in [12], the control never goes back to the starting player at the end of the second round. Having this intuition in mind, it is easy to see that disturbance bisimulation is a stronger relation than alternating bisimulation. Hence, if two systems are disturbance bisimilar with parameters $(\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon})$ they are also ε -approximately alternatingly bisimilar to each other.

As our first main result we show in the following theorem that disturbance bisimulation naturally extends from related components in a network to subsystems composed from them.

Theorem 1. Let $\{S_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{\hat{S}_i\}_{i \in I}$ be sets of compatible metric systems, s.t. for all $i \in I$, S_i and \hat{S}_i are disturbance bisimilar w.r.t. parameters $(\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i)$ where

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_i := \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{\varepsilon_j\}. \quad (6)$$

Then for any given $I' \subseteq I$, the relation

$$R_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} = \{([\hat{q}_1 \dots \hat{q}_{|I'|}]^T, [q_1 \dots q_{|I'|}]^T) \in \hat{X}_{I'} \times X_{I'} \mid (\hat{q}_i, q_i) \in R_{\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i}, \forall i \in I'\} \quad (7)$$

is a disturbance bisimulation relation between $\llbracket S_i \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$ and $\llbracket \hat{S}_i \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$ with parameters

$$\varepsilon = \|\prod_{i \in I'} \{\varepsilon_i\}\| \text{ and } \tilde{\varepsilon} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')} \{\varepsilon_j\}.$$

Proof. We prove all three parts of Def. 3 separately.

- (a) We pick a related state tuple $(\hat{q}, q) \in R_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}}$ with $q =$

$[q_1 \dots q_{|I'|}]^T$ and $\hat{q} = [\hat{q}_1 \dots \hat{q}_{|I'|}]^T$. Then (7) implies for all i , $(\hat{q}_i, q_i) \in R_{\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i}$, which in turn gives $\|\hat{q}_i - q_i\| \leq \varepsilon_i$. This immediately gives $d(\hat{q}, q) = \|\hat{q} - q\| = \|\prod_{i \in I'} \{\|\hat{q}_i - q_i\|\}\| \leq \|\prod_{i \in I'} \{\varepsilon_i\}\| = \varepsilon$.

(b) We pick the same related state tuple $(\hat{q}, q) \in R_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}}$. Note that the choice of (\hat{q}, q) automatically fixes the coupling disturbances for the individual subsystems ν_i^c and $\hat{\nu}_i^c$ s.t. $w_{\nu_i^c} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}'}(i)} \{q_j\}$ and $w_{\hat{\nu}_i^c} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}'}(i)} \{\hat{q}_j\}$. As $(\hat{q}_j, q_j) \in R_{\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i}$ it follows from Def. 3 that $\|\hat{q}_j - q_j\| \leq \varepsilon_j$. Using the definition of \mathbf{e} in (5) we therefore have $\mathbf{e}(w_{\nu_i^c}, w_{\hat{\nu}_i^c}) \leq \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}'}(i)} \{\varepsilon_j\}$. Now pick $\mu = [\mu_1 \dots \mu_{|I'|}]^T \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{I}'}$, and $\nu \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}'}$, $\hat{\nu} \in \hat{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ s.t. $\mathbf{e}(w_{\nu}, w_{\hat{\nu}}) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}$. Recall from the definition of the composed metric systems $\llbracket S_i \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$ and $\llbracket \hat{S}_i \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$ that we have $w_{\nu} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')} \{x_j\}$ and $w_{\hat{\nu}} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')} \{\hat{x}_j\}$ with $x_j \in X_j$ and $\hat{x}_j \in \hat{X}_j$ for $j \in I \setminus I'$. Using (5) we therefore have

$$\mathbf{e}(w_{\nu}, w_{\hat{\nu}}) = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')} \{\|x_j - \hat{x}_j\|\} \leq \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(I')} \{\varepsilon_j\} = \tilde{\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, using $w_{\nu_i^e} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}'}(i)} \{x_j\}$ and $w_{\hat{\nu}_i^e} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}'}(i)} \{\hat{x}_j\}$, we have $\mathbf{e}(w_{\nu_i^e}, w_{\hat{\nu}_i^e}) \leq \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}'}(i)} \{\varepsilon_j\}$. Hence

$$\mathbf{e}(w_{\nu_i}, w_{\hat{\nu}_i}) = \mathbf{e} \left(\begin{bmatrix} w_{\nu_i^c} \\ w_{\nu_i^e} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} w_{\hat{\nu}_i^c} \\ w_{\hat{\nu}_i^e} \end{bmatrix} \right) \leq \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{\varepsilon_j\} =: \tilde{\varepsilon}_i,$$

where the last equality follows from (6). Using these local disturbance vectors and the fact that S_i and \hat{S}_i are disturbance bisimilar w.r.t. $(\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i)$ it follows immediately from Def. 3 (b) that for any local control input μ_i there exists $\hat{\mu}_i$ such that $(\delta_i(\hat{q}_i, \hat{\mu}_i, \hat{\nu}_i), \delta_i(q_i, \mu_i, \nu_i)) \in R_{\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i}$ for $i \in I'$. Then by (7), it immediately follows that $(\delta_i(\hat{q}, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\nu}), \delta_i(q, \mu, \nu)) \in R_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}}$. (c) This can be shown based on the same reasoning as for part (b) and is therefore omitted. \square

It should be noted that in Thm. 1 no small gain type condition (see e.g. [26]) is needed to guarantee disturbance bisimilarity of the two composed metric systems $\llbracket S_i \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$ and $\llbracket \hat{S}_i \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$. This is in contrast to similar results using other types of simulation relations, as e.g. in [17]. Intuitively, the composability of disturbance bisimilar metric systems into disturbance bisimilar composed metric systems relies on the particular choice of the set $\{\tilde{\varepsilon}_i\}_{i \in I}$ in (6). However, when using Thm. 1 for compositional abstraction, as discussed later in Sec. VI, it must be ensured that given a set of precisions $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i \in I}$ one can actually calculate the set $\{\hat{S}_i\}$ of individual disturbance bisimilar abstractions w.r.t. the parameters $(\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i)$, where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i$ depends on the precisions of all neighboring systems. We will come back to this fact in Thm. 3 and Remark 1.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the proof of Thm. 1 solely relies on the fact that there exist disturbance bisimulation relations between all the subsystems and their respective abstractions (which are metric systems) w.r.t. a specific choice of all involved parameters. This implies that Thm. 1 can be applied in a modular fashion, i.e., first subsystems can be abstracted before they are combined into a larger composition.

V. MONOLITHIC ABSTRACTION

To effectively use the results in Thm. 1 for compositional abstraction, we first show in this section how to construct a disturbance bisimilar abstraction of a monolithic control system. The abstraction technique uses the notion of incremental input-to-state Lyapunov functions, which we introduce first.

A. Input-to-state Lyapunov functions

A continuous function $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is said to belong to class \mathcal{K}_∞ if it is strictly increasing, $\gamma(0) = 0$, and $\gamma(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. A continuous function $\beta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is said to belong to class \mathcal{KL} if, for each fixed s , the map $\beta(r, s)$ belongs to class \mathcal{K}_∞ with respect to r and, for each fixed nonzero r , the map $\beta(r, s)$ is decreasing with respect to s and $\beta(r, s) \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Let $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be a piecewise continuous function which is also essentially bounded to a region $B \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. We define the supremum norm $\|f\|_\infty$ of f as $\|f\|_\infty := \max\{|s| \mid \exists r \in (a, b). f(r) = s \wedge s \in B\}$.

Definition 4. Given a control system Σ , a smooth function $V : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be a δ -ISS Lyapunov function for Σ if there exist $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and \mathcal{K}_∞ functions $\underline{\alpha}$, $\bar{\alpha}$, σ_u , and σ_d s.t. for any $x, x' \in X$, $u, u' \in U$, and $w, w' \in W$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha}(\|x - x'\|) &\leq V(x, x') \leq \bar{\alpha}(\|x - x'\|) \quad \text{and} \quad (8) \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} f(x, u, w) + \frac{\partial V}{\partial x'} f(x', u', w') &\leq \\ &- \lambda V(x, x') + \sigma_u(\|u - u'\|) + \sigma_d(\|w - w'\|). \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

In this case we say that the control system Σ admits a Lyapunov function V , witnessed by λ , $\underline{\alpha}$, $\bar{\alpha}$, σ_u , and σ_d .

A control system Σ is *incrementally globally input-to-state stable* (δ -ISS) if it is forward complete and there exist a \mathcal{KL} function β and two \mathcal{K}_∞ functions ρ_u and ρ_d s.t. for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, any $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and any $\mu, \mu' \in \mathcal{U}$, the following inequality is satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi_{x\mu\nu}(t) - \xi_{x'\mu'\nu'}(t)\| &\leq \beta(\|x - x'\|, t) \\ &+ \rho_u(\|\mu - \mu'\|_\infty) + \rho_d(\|\nu - \nu'\|_\infty). \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

Under mild assumptions, e.g., that $f(0, 0, 0) = 0$, and U and W are compact and *convex* sets, the existence of a δ -ISS Lyapunov function is equivalent to δ -ISS stability [27], [1].

B. Disturbance Bisimilar Metric Systems induced by Σ

Starting from a given control system Σ we define a metric system as a time-sampled version of the former with piecewise-constant input and disturbance signals.

Definition 5. Given a control system $\Sigma = (X, U, \mathcal{U}, W, \mathcal{W}, f)$, and a time-sampling parameter $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, the discrete-time metric system induced by Σ is defined by $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma) = (X, U, \mathcal{U}_\tau, W, \mathcal{W}_\tau, \delta_\tau)$ s.t. \mathcal{U}_τ and \mathcal{W}_τ are defined over U and W , respectively, as in Def. 2 and $\delta_\tau(x, \mu, \nu) = \xi_{x\mu\nu}(\tau)$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{U}_\tau$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{W}_\tau$. We equip X with the metric $d(x, x') := \|x - x'\|$.

Next, we show how to define a countable metric system $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta\omega}(\Sigma)$ which is disturbance bisimilar to $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma)$. To do so we need some notation to discretize the state, input, and disturbance spaces of $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma)$. For any $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\eta > 0$, we define $[A]_\eta := \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A \mid a_i = k \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \eta, k \in \mathbb{Z}, i = 1, \dots, n\}$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda > 0$, let $\mathbb{B}_\lambda(x)$ denote the closed ball centered at x and of radius λ . Note that for any $\lambda \geq \eta$, the collection of sets $\{\mathbb{B}_\lambda(q)\}_{q \in [\mathbb{R}^n]_\eta}$ is a covering of \mathbb{R}^n , that is, $\mathbb{R}^n \subseteq \cup\{\mathbb{B}_\lambda(q) \mid q \in [\mathbb{R}^n]_\eta\}$.

Definition 6. Let $\Sigma = (X, U, \mathcal{U}, W, \mathcal{W}, f)$ be a control system and $\widetilde{W} \subseteq W$ be a countable set⁴ equipped with the (possibly vector-valued) metric $\mathbf{e} : W \times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$, $1 \leq r \leq p$ s.t.

$$\forall w \in W. \exists \tilde{w} \in \widetilde{W}. \mathbf{e}(w, \tilde{w}) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon} \wedge \|w - \tilde{w}\| \leq \|\mathbf{e}(w, \tilde{w})\| \quad (11)$$

for some vector $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$. Given three constants $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, the countable metric system induced by Σ and \widetilde{W} is defined by $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta\omega}(\Sigma, \widetilde{W}) = (X_{\tau\eta\omega}, [U]_\omega, \mathcal{U}_{\tau\eta\omega}, \widetilde{W}, \mathcal{W}_{\tau\eta\omega}, \delta_{\tau\eta\omega})$ s.t. $X_{\tau\eta\omega} = [X]_\eta$, $\mathcal{U}_{\tau\eta\omega}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\tau\eta\omega}$ are defined over $[U]_\omega$ and \widetilde{W} , respectively, as in Def. 2 and $\delta_{\tau\eta\omega}(x, \mu, \nu) = \{x' \in X_{\tau\eta\omega} \mid \|\xi_{x\mu\nu}(\tau) - x'\| \leq \eta\}$. We equip $X_{\tau\eta\omega}$ with the metric $d(x, x') := \|x - x'\|$.

This construction leads us to our second main result.

Theorem 2. [Symbolic Abstraction] Let Σ be a control system, admitting a δ -ISS Lyapunov function V witnessed by λ , $\underline{\alpha}$, $\bar{\alpha}$, σ_u , and σ_d , and let γ be a \mathcal{K}_∞ function s.t. for any $x, x', x'' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it holds that

$$V(x, x') - V(x, x'') \leq \gamma(\|x' - x''\|). \quad (12)$$

Fix $\tau > 0$ and $\widetilde{W} \subseteq W$ s.t. (11) holds and let $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta\omega}(\Sigma, \widetilde{W})$ be the countable metric system induced by Σ and \widetilde{W} . If

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \leq \min \{ \gamma^{-1} [(1 - e^{-\lambda\tau}) \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon) - \lambda^{-1} \sigma_u(\omega) \\ - \lambda^{-1} \sigma_d(\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|)], (\bar{\alpha})^{-1} \circ \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon) \} \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

then the relation

$$R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}} = \{(\hat{q}, q) \in X_{\tau\eta\omega} \times X_\tau \mid V(\hat{q}, q) \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon)\} \quad (14)$$

is a disturbance bisimulation relation with parameters $(\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon})$ between $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta\omega}(\Sigma, \widetilde{W})$ and $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma)$.

Proof. First note that (13) and (8) imply $\eta \leq (\bar{\alpha})^{-1} \circ \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon) \leq (\bar{\alpha})^{-1}(\bar{\alpha}(\varepsilon)) = \varepsilon$ giving that $\eta \leq \varepsilon$, hence ensuring that $R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ is surjective. Furthermore, observe that $X_{\tau\eta\omega} \subset X_\tau$, hence the metric d on X_τ is also a metric on $X_{\tau\eta\omega}$. Now we prove the three parts of Def. 3 separately.

(a) By definition of $R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ in (14), $(\hat{q}, q) \in R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ implies $V(\hat{q}, q) \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon)$. Using (8) this implies $\underline{\alpha}(\|\hat{q} - q\|) \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon)$ and it follows from $\underline{\alpha}$ being a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function that $d(\hat{q}, q) = \|\hat{q} - q\| \leq \varepsilon$.

(b) Given a pair $(\hat{q}, q) \in R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}}$, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{U}_\tau$, observe that there exists a $\hat{\mu} \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau\eta\omega}$ s.t. $\|u_{\hat{\mu}} - u_\mu\| \leq \omega$ holds. Given any

⁴For the results in this section one can simply pick $\widetilde{W} = [W]_\varepsilon$ and the single-valued metric $\mathbf{e}(w, w') = \|w - w'\|$.

$\hat{\nu} \in \mathcal{W}_{\tau\eta\omega}$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{W}_\tau$ s.t. $\mathbf{e}(w_{\hat{\nu}}, w_\nu) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}$ holds, observe that $\|w_{\hat{\nu}} - w_\nu\| \leq \|\mathbf{e}(w_{\hat{\nu}}, w_\nu)\| \leq \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|$ from (11). Now we can apply transitions $q \xrightarrow{\frac{\mu, \nu}{\tau}} q'$ and $\hat{q} \xrightarrow{\frac{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\nu}}{\tau}} z$ and observe that there exists $\hat{q}' \in X_{\tau\eta\omega}$ s.t. $\|\hat{q}' - z\| \leq \eta$ and hence $\hat{q} \xrightarrow{\frac{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\nu}}{\tau\eta\omega}} \hat{q}'$. Now consider the following derivation:

$$\begin{aligned} & V(\hat{q}', q') \\ & \leq V(z, q') + \gamma(\|z - \hat{q}'\|) \\ & \leq e^{-\lambda\tau} V(\hat{q}, q) + \frac{\sigma_u(\|u_{\hat{\mu}} - u_\mu\|)}{\lambda} + \frac{\sigma_d(\|w_{\hat{\nu}} - w_\nu\|)}{\lambda} + \gamma(\eta) \\ & \leq e^{-\lambda\tau} \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon) + \frac{\sigma_u(\omega)}{\lambda} + \frac{\sigma_d(\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|)}{\lambda} + \gamma(\eta) \leq \underline{\alpha}(\varepsilon) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Hence by Eqn. (14), $(\hat{q}', q') \in R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}}$.

(c) Given a pair $(\hat{q}, q) \in R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}}$, for any $\hat{\mu} \in \mathcal{U}_{\tau\eta\omega}$, observe that we can choose $\mu \in \mathcal{U}_\tau$ s.t. $\mu = \hat{\mu}$, i.e., $\|u_{\hat{\mu}} - u_\mu\| = 0$. Given any $\nu \in \mathcal{W}_\tau$ and $\hat{\nu} \in \mathcal{W}_{\tau\eta\omega}$ s.t. $\mathbf{e}(w_{\hat{\nu}}, w_\nu) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}$, we get $q \xrightarrow{\frac{\mu, \nu}{\tau}} q'$ and $\hat{q} \xrightarrow{\frac{\hat{\mu}=\mu, \hat{\nu}}{\tau}} z$. Now observe that there exists $\hat{q}' \in X_{\tau\eta\omega}$ s.t. $\|\hat{q}' - z\| \leq \eta$ and hence $\hat{q} \xrightarrow{\frac{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\nu}}{\tau\eta\omega}} \hat{q}'$. With a very similar derivation as in (15) it follows from Eqn. (14) that $(\hat{q}', q') \in R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}}$. \square

VI. COMPOSITIONAL ABSTRACTION

We now extend the abstraction procedure presented in the previous section to compositions of control systems.

A. Simultaneous Approximation

Using the results in Thm. 2, we first show how to pick state, input, and disturbance quantization parameters for each component in a composed control system $\llbracket \Sigma_i \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$, such that we can simultaneously construct local abstractions $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)$ using Def. 6 which are disturbance bisimilar with parameters $(\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i)$ to their respective discrete-time metric system $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)$.

Theorem 3. *Let I be an index set and $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ a set of compatible control systems, each admitting a δ -ISS Lyapunov function V_i witnessed by λ_i , $\underline{\alpha}_i$, $\bar{\alpha}_i$, $\sigma_{u,i}$, and $\sigma_{d,i}$. Let γ_i be a \mathcal{K}_∞ function s.t. for any $x_i, x'_i, x''_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it holds that*

$$V_i(x_i, x'_i) - V_i(x_i, x''_i) \leq \gamma_i(\|x'_i - x''_i\|). \quad (16)$$

Let $\{\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)\}_{i \in I}$ be the set of discrete-time metric systems induced by $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$. Furthermore, let $\varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be parameters for every subsystem $i \in I$ which define $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i$ as in (6), and $\eta_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ s.t. the following relation holds

$$0 < \eta_i \leq \min \left\{ \gamma_i^{-1} \left[(1 - e^{-\lambda_i\tau}) \underline{\alpha}_i(\varepsilon_i) - \lambda_i^{-1} \sigma_{u,i}(\omega_i) - \lambda_i^{-1} \sigma_{d,i}(\|\tilde{\varepsilon}_i\|) \right], (\bar{\alpha}_i)^{-1} \circ \underline{\alpha}_i(\varepsilon_i) \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Finally, let $\{\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)\}_{i \in I}$ be the set of countable metric systems⁵ induced by $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\tilde{W}_i = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{[X_j]_{\eta_j}\}$. Then the relation

$$R_{\varepsilon_i\tilde{\varepsilon}_i} = \{(\hat{q}_i, q_i) \in X_{i,\tau\eta_i\omega_i} \times X_{i,\tau} \mid V_i(\hat{q}_i, q_i) \leq \underline{\alpha}_i(\varepsilon_i)\}$$

⁵In the context of composed systems we always assume $\tilde{W}_i = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{[X_j]_{\eta_j}\}$ and omit the dependency of $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)$ from \tilde{W}_i for notational convenience.

is a disturbance bisimulation relation with parameters $(\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i)$ between $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)$ and $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)$.

Proof. We show that (11) holds for the metric defined in (5). Pick any $i \in I$, $w_i \in W_i$ and observe that $w_i = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{x_j\}$. By the choice of $X_{j,\tau\eta_j\omega_j}$ as $[X_j]_{\eta_j}$ we furthermore know that for any x_j there exists \hat{x}_j s.t. $\|x_j - \hat{x}_j\| \leq \eta_j \leq \varepsilon_j$. Now recall that $\tilde{W}_i = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{X_{j,\tau\eta_j\omega_j}\} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{[X_j]_{\eta_j}\}$. Using the definition of $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i$ in (6) and \mathbf{e} in (5) we therefore know that for any $w_i \in W_i$ there exists $\tilde{w}_i \in \tilde{W}_i$ s.t. $\mathbf{e}(w_i, \tilde{w}_i) = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{\|x_j - \hat{x}_j\|\} \leq \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{\varepsilon_j\} = \tilde{\varepsilon}_i$. Furthermore, $\|w_i - \tilde{w}_i\| = \|\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{x_j - \hat{x}_j\}\| = \|\prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{I}}(i)} \{\|x_j - \hat{x}_j\|\}\| = \|\mathbf{e}(w_i, \tilde{w}_i)\|$. Hence (11) holds for all $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i$. The rest follows from Thm. 2. \square

Remark 1. Note that in a given network of control systems, it is not true that for any given sets $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i \in I}$, $\{\omega_i\}_{i \in I}$ and τ , one can always find a set $\{\eta_i\}_{i \in I}$ s.t. (17) holds. However, one can usually solve an optimization problem to calculate a set of variables $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i \in I}$ ⁶ given a maximum permissible overall error ε for the overall network, with a set of constraints $\eta_i > 0$ for all i . A relevant objective function would be to minimize the total size of the symbolic state space of the abstractions. Whenever we talk about a network of control systems from now on, we assume that a solution to such an optimization problem was already computed.

We now illustrate Thm. 3 by an example.

Example 2. Let us assume that the systems in Fig. 1 be:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 : \dot{x}_1 &= -x_1 + u_1 \\ \Sigma_2 : \dot{x}_2 &= x_1 - 2x_2 + x_3 + u_2 \\ \Sigma_3 : \dot{x}_3 &= x_1 - 3x_3 + u_3 \end{aligned}$$

where $x_1 \in [-0.2, 3]$, $x_2 \in [-0.1, 2.4]$, $x_3 \in [0, 1.8]$, and $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in [-0.2, 0.2]$. Suppose that we want to construct the abstractions $\tilde{\Sigma}_1$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}_2$ for a given set of parameters $\varepsilon_1 = 1$, $\varepsilon_2 = 1.5$, $\varepsilon_3 = 1$, $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0.01$ and $\tau = 1.5$.

First we start with Σ_1 . We choose the Lyapunov function as $V_1(x_1) = \sqrt{10}|x_1|$ ⁷. This choice of V_1 gives us the following parameters: $\underline{\alpha}_1 = \bar{\alpha}_1 = \gamma_1 = \sigma_{u,1} = 3.1623$, $\sigma_{d,1} = 0$ and $\lambda_1 = 1$. Then by Thm. 3 we get the bound $\eta_1 \leq 0.7759$. Let us arbitrarily pick $\eta_1 = 0.75$. This gives the symbolic state space as $\hat{X}_1 = \{0, 1.5, 3\}$ with the simulation relation $R_{\varepsilon_1\tilde{\varepsilon}_1} = \{0 \times [-0.2, 1], 1.5 \times [0.5, 2.5], 3 \times [2, 3]\}$. The symbolic transition system in shown in Fig. 2(a).

We continue with Σ_2 and Σ_3 . For a choice of Lyapunov function $V_2(x_2) = \sqrt{5}|x_2|$ and $V_3(x_3) = \sqrt{3.33}|x_3|$, we get $\underline{\alpha}_2 = \bar{\alpha}_2 = \gamma_2 = \sigma_{u,2} = 2.2361$, $\sigma_{d,2} = 3.1623$, $\lambda_2 = 2$ and $\underline{\alpha}_3 = \bar{\alpha}_3 = \gamma_3 = \sigma_{u,3} = \sigma_{d,3} = 1.8257$, $\lambda_3 = 3$, which give $\eta_2 \leq 0.4248$ and $\eta_3 \leq 0.6552$ (by Thm. 3). We arbitrarily pick $\eta_2 = 0.4$ and $\eta_3 = 0.6$, which

⁶One can also optimize the variables $\{\omega_i\}_{i \in I}$ and τ , which will give extra degrees of freedom.

⁷Lyapunov function of a linear system has the form $V : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which satisfies for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ the inequality $V(x - x') - V(x - x'') \leq \gamma\|x' - x''\|$ for any $x, x', x'' \in X$, and the \mathcal{K}_∞ functions $\underline{\alpha}$, $\bar{\alpha}$, σ_u and σ_d in Def. 4 are replaced by positive real constants, usually represented by the same symbols respectively [1, Def. 10.3, Prop. 10.5].




Fig. 2. Symbolic Abstractions of the systems in Ex. 2; for brevity, back-and-forth arrows with same input labels are combined into single two-sided arrow, and the set of all possible inputs is represented by the label \star .

gives us the symbolic state spaces $\hat{X}_2 = \{0, 0.8, 1.6, 2.4\}$ and $\hat{X}_3 = \{0, 1.2\}$, with the simulation relations $R_{\varepsilon_2\tilde{\varepsilon}_2} = \{0 \times [-0.1, 1.5], 0.8 \times [0, 2.3], 1.6 \times [0.1, 2.4], 2.4 \times [0.9, 2.4]\}$ and $R_{\varepsilon_3\tilde{\varepsilon}_3} = \{0 \times [0, 1], 1.2 \times [0.2, 2]\}$. The symbolic transition system $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ is shown in Fig. 2(b).

B. Composition of Approximations

Consider a set of compatible control systems $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I'}$, a subset composition $\llbracket \Sigma_i \rrbracket_{i \in I'} = (X, U, \mathcal{U}, W, \mathcal{W}, f)$, and a global time-sampling parameter τ . Then we can apply Def. 5 and Def. 6 to each control system Σ_i to construct the corresponding metric systems $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i) = (X_i, U_i, \mathcal{U}_{\tau,i}, W_i, \mathcal{W}_{\tau,i}, \delta_{\tau,i})$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i) = (X_{i,\tau\eta_i\omega_i}, [U_i]_{\omega_i}, \mathcal{U}_{i,\tau\eta_i\omega_i}, [W_i]_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_i}, \mathcal{W}_{i,\tau\eta_i\omega_i}, \delta_{i,\tau\eta_i\omega_i})$. Now it immediately follows that for any $I' \subseteq I$, the sets $\{\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)\}_{i \in I'}$ and $\{\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)\}_{i \in I'}$ of metric systems are again compatible. Therefore, combining the results from Thm. 1 and Thm. 3 leads to the following obvious corollary.

Corollary 1. *Given the preliminaries of Thm. 3 and $I' \subseteq I$, let $\llbracket \mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i) \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$ and $\llbracket \mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i) \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$ be systems composed from the sets $\{\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)\}_{i \in I'}$ and $\{\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)\}_{i \in I'}$, respectively. Then the relation*

$$R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}} = \{(\llbracket \hat{q}_1 \dots \hat{q}_{|I'|} \rrbracket^T, [q_1 \dots q_{|I'|}]^T) \in X_{\tau\eta\omega} \times X_\tau \mid (\hat{q}_i, q_i) \in R_{\varepsilon_i\tilde{\varepsilon}_i}, \forall i \in I'\} \quad (18)$$

is a disturbance bisimulation relation between $\llbracket \mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i) \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$ and $\llbracket \mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i) \rrbracket_{i \in I'}$ with parameters

$$\varepsilon = \|\prod_{i \in I'} \{\varepsilon_i\}\| \text{ and } \tilde{\varepsilon} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}_X(I')} \{\varepsilon_j\}.$$

Example 3. Consider the systems in Ex. 2 and their abstractions. It follows from Corollary 1 that the composition $\llbracket \mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i) \rrbracket_{i \in \{1,2\}}$, given by the product automaton of the symbolic abstractions $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_1\omega_1}(\Sigma_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\omega_2}(\Sigma_2)$, is disturbance bisimilar to the composed system $\llbracket \mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i) \rrbracket_{i \in \{1,2\}}$ with parameters $\varepsilon = \|[1 \ 1.5]^T\| = 1.8028$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon_3 = 1$.

Recall that in the special case $I' = I$ the composed system replaces the overall network without extra external disturbances, i.e. $W = \emptyset$. In this case it is easy to see that

the relation in Corollary 1 simplifies to a usual bisimulation relation.

Corollary 2. *Given the premises of Corollary 1 and that $I' = I$, the relation $R_{\varepsilon\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ in (18) is an ε -approximate bisimulation relation between $\llbracket \mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i) \rrbracket_{i \in I}$ and $\llbracket \mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i) \rrbracket_{i \in I}$.*

VII. RELATED SIMILARITY NOTIONS

An alternate approach to compose related metric systems, as developed in [18], uses approximate bisimulation instead of disturbance bisimulation. Intuitively, when using approximate bisimulation, one uses a co-operative assumption on the disturbance inputs. However, this assumption is very unrealistic in our setting, where one system is unable to influence the states of other subsystems, as illustrated in the following example.

Example 4. Consider two control systems connected in a network:

$$\Sigma_1 : \dot{x}_1 = -x_1 + u_1, \quad (19)$$

$$\Sigma_2 : \dot{x}_2 = -x_1 - 2x_2 + u_2 \quad (20)$$

where $[x_1 \ x_2]^T \in X_1 \times X_2 = [-1, 2] \times [0, 4]$, $[u_1 \ u_2]^T \in U_1 \times U_2 = [-1, 2] \times [0.8, 5.2]$, and the input signals are constant curves. We assume that the sets X_1 and X_2 are invariant for Σ .

First we construct bisimilar symbolic abstractions Σ_1 and Σ_2 , and then demonstrate how the abstract trajectories fail to represent the concrete trajectories. Let us begin with Σ_2 . Note that bisimilar abstraction models treat disturbances as cooperative inputs rather than adversarial ones. So we treat x_1 in Eqn. (20) as a cooperative input. It can be shown that by choosing $P_2 = 1$, the function $V_2(x_2) = \sqrt{x_2^T P_2 x_2} = |x_2|$ is a valid ISS Lyapunov function of Σ_2 . The associated constants are $\underline{\alpha}_2 = \bar{\alpha}_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$, $\lambda_2 = 2$, and $\sigma_2 = 1$. Then, given a precision $\varepsilon_2 = 1.35$, time quantization $\tau = 1.2$ and input quantization $\omega_2 = 0.01$, we apply [1, Thm. 11.14] and choose $\eta_2 = 1$, s.t. $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\omega_2}(\Sigma_2)$ are ε_2 -approximately bisimilar to each other.

Similarly for subsystem Σ_1 , we can choose $P_1 = 1$ s.t. $V_1(x_1) = \sqrt{x_1^T P_1 x_1} = |x_1|$, $\underline{\alpha}_1 = \bar{\alpha}_1 = \gamma_1 = 1$, $\lambda_1 = 1$, $\sigma_1 = 1$, and for given $\varepsilon_1 = 0.8$, $\tau = 1.2$, $\omega_1 = 0.01$, we choose $\eta_1 = 0.5$ s.t. $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_1\omega_1}(\Sigma_1)$ are ε_1 -approximately bisimilar to each other. The symbolic models for $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_1\omega_1}(\Sigma_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\omega_2}(\Sigma_2)$ are shown in Fig. 3. The simulation relations are given by $R_{\varepsilon_1\tilde{\varepsilon}_1} = \{-1 \times [-1, -0.2], 0 \times [-0.8, 0.8], 1 \times [0.2, 1.8], 2 \times [1.2, 2]\}$ and $R_{\varepsilon_2\tilde{\varepsilon}_2} = \{0 \times [0, 1.35], 2 \times [0.65, 3.35], 4 \times [2.65, 4]\}$.

Suppose our goal is to synthesize controllers that ensure Σ satisfies $\square(x_1 \leq 0) \wedge \square\heartsuit(x_2 < 1)$. The specification decomposes into two requirements, one for each component. We can easily control for the specification on the symbolic abstractions of Fig. 3: the strategy of controller 1 for $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_1\omega_1}(\Sigma_1)$ is “never take transitions $a_{0,1}, a_{-1,1}$,” and the strategy of controller 2 for $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\omega_2}(\Sigma_2)$ is “if the symbolic states 2 and 4 appear in the infinite run, then take $b_{1,0}$ and/or $b_{2,0}$ infinitely often.” As each constructed abstraction is bisimilar to the respective original system, we can refine these abstract controllers to ones that are




Fig. 3. Approximate bisimilar abstractions of Σ_1 and Σ_2 .

applicable to original systems s.t. the individual specifications are satisfied (see [1] for details).

Essentially each transition in $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\omega_2}(\Sigma_2)$ translates to a pair of inputs for the original system: the control input u_2 and the output (same as state in this example) of $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_1\omega_1}(\Sigma_1)$ given by x_1 . Out of many possibilities, two such pairs corresponding to $b_{1,0}$ are: $(u_2 = 0.8, x_1 = 1)$ and $(u_2 = 3, x_1 = 1)$ i.e., given any state $x_2 \sim 2$ ⁸, the following holds:

$$x_2 \xrightarrow[\tau]{0.8,1} x_2' \sim 0 \quad x_2 \xrightarrow[\tau]{3,1} x_2'' \sim 0$$

However, note that x_1 can never be equal to 1 if the closed loop system satisfies its specification $\square(x_1 \leq 0)$. Given this restriction on x_1 , consider the following situation: $x_1 = -0.5$ and $x_2 = 2 \in [0.65, 3.35]$ simulated by symbolic state 2 as before. Then

$$2 \xrightarrow[\tau]{0.8,-0.5} 0.772 \sim 0 \quad 2 \xrightarrow[\tau]{3,-0.5} 1.772 \sim 2$$

Clearly $u_2 = 0.8$ is a more robust choice than $u_2 = 3$ for the given control objective: but this assertion could not be made without an explicit analysis of the first system's behavior. Since the refined local controller for $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_2)$ has to pick u_2 without seeing x_1 , it is possible that the controller keeps picking $u_2 = 3$ over $u_2 = 0.8$ all the time, and the control objective is never met. This is avoidable if the controllers treat other connected subsystems as adversaries, and their outputs as disturbances. \square

Motivated by similar situation as in Ex. 4, approximately alternating bisimilar abstraction was introduced in [12] as

⁸ $x \sim q$ indicates $(x, q) \in R_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$, when $R_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}$ is clear from the context.

an improvement over approximately bisimilar abstractions. Unfortunately, a naive way of generating approximate alternatingly bisimilar symbolic abstractions of each subsystem in a network does not result in a sound overall abstraction in our setting. Contrary to the single system case of Thm. 4.6 in [12], where the disturbance is identical in the original system and its abstraction, there is a potential mismatch between those signals in our composition. As each subsystem's disturbance is actually a state trajectory of another subsystem, the disturbance to its abstraction is given by the abstract state trajectory. Hence, the disturbance signals applied to the original system and its abstraction have an initial mismatch of less than ε which can lead to deviations in the respective state trajectories. This can jeopardize the state relation between a given system and its abstraction even if the latter is approximately alternatingly bisimilar to the former, as shown in the next example.

Example 5. Consider the control systems Σ_1 and Σ_2 given by Eqn. (19) and Eqn. (20), and let there already exists an approximate alternatingly bisimilar abstraction of Σ_1 with precision $\varepsilon_1 = 3$. We now construct the approximate alternatingly bisimilar symbolic model, represented by $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\eta_2}(\Sigma_2)$ (see [1, Def. 11.17]), for subsystem $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_2)$ (using the procedure in [1, Sec. 11.4]), without taking into account the potential mismatch between the disturbance signals for $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\eta_2}(\Sigma_2)$. For constructing the latter we use the same Lyapunov function $V_2(x_2) = |x_2|$ and the same associated constants $\underline{\alpha}_2 = \bar{\alpha}_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$ as in Example 4. For the same given precision $\varepsilon_2 = 1.35$ and the same time quantization $\tau = 1.2$, the allowable value of η_2 ⁹ is given by $\eta_2 \leq 0.4092$. We choose $\eta_2 = 0.4$. The resulting simulation relation is given by $R'_{\varepsilon_2\varepsilon_2} = \{0 \times [0, 1.35], 0.8 \times [0, 2.15], 1.6 \times [0.25, 2.95], 2.4 \times [1.05, 3.75], 3.2 \times [1.85, 4]\}$.




Fig. 4. $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\eta_2}(\Sigma_2)$: approximate alternating bisimilar abstraction of Σ_2 . For brevity, the input labels are suppressed and bidirectional arrows are used whenever transitions in both direction are possible (not necessarily using the same input).

Now consider a pair of related states $(x_2, 1.6) \in R'_{\varepsilon_2\varepsilon_2}$ for subsystem 2 with $x_2 = 1.3$ and suppose that a symbolic controller connected to $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\eta_2}(\Sigma_2)$ picks the input $\hat{u}_2 = 3.2$ which is refined to the same value and applied to $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_2)$, giving $u_2 = 3.2$. If we assume that subsystem 1 is in state $x_1 = 1.9$ we have $w_2 = x_1 = 1.9$ and the following transition takes place in $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_2)$:

$$1.3 \xrightarrow[\tau]{3.2,1.9} 0.709.$$

⁹Thm. 11.18 of [1] gives a condition on η s.t. $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta\eta}(\Sigma)$ is ε -approximately alternatingly bisimilar to $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma)$ for any given Σ .

As the abstraction of Σ_1 was constructed with precision $\varepsilon_1 = 3$, we now assume that the disturbance applied to $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\eta_2}(\Sigma_2)$ is given by $\tilde{w}_2 = -1$ (with $\|\tilde{w}_2 - w_2\| < 3$). This leads to the transition

$$1.6 \xrightarrow[\tau\eta_2\omega_2]{3.2, -1} 2.4$$

in $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\eta_2}(\Sigma_2)$ as $1.6 \xrightarrow[\tau\eta_2\eta_2]{3.2, -1} 2.055$ and $\|2.055 - 2.4\| < \eta_2$. Now it is easy to see that $(0.709, 2.4) \notin R_{\varepsilon_2\tilde{\varepsilon}_2}$, hence the successor states of $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_2\eta_2}(\Sigma_2)$ are not related even though both systems are approximate alternatingly bisimilar, due to the mismatching disturbance signals generated by $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_1)$ and its abstraction, respectively. \square

In contrast to both approximate bisimulation and approximate alternating bisimulation, our definition of disturbance bisimulation is tailored to relate systems with different disturbance signals whose mismatch is bounded by $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ but which are otherwise arbitrary. With this notion we are able to solve the issues pointed out above.

VIII. DECENTRALIZED CONTROLLERS

Finally, we sketch how our compositional approach leads to a decentralized controller synthesis methodology.

Consider a set $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ of compatible control systems, the associated time-sampled versions $\{\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)\}_{i \in I}$, and finite state abstractions $\{\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)\}_{i \in I}$. Consider a set of local specifications $\{S_{spec,i}\}_{i \in I}$, where each $S_{spec,i}$ is a metric transition system over the abstract state space $X_{i,\tau\eta_i\omega_i}$.

Then one can solve local simulation games (see [1, Sec. 6.5]) using iterative techniques [7] to synthesize finite state controllers $\{C_i\}_{i \in I}$ which ensure that the feedback composition of $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)$ and C_i (see [1, Def. 11.9]) is simulated by the specification $S_{spec,i}$ in an exact way. Intuitively this means that all trajectories generated by the controlled abstraction $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i) \times_{\mathcal{CL}} C_i$ are contained in the set of trajectories the transition system $S_{spec,i}$ can generate. Now recall that it is guaranteed by the simultaneous approximation theorem (Thm. 3) that each $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)$ is related to $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)$ via a disturbance bisimulation with parameters $(\varepsilon_i, \tilde{\varepsilon}_i)$. It can be easily observed from Def. 3 that this implies that $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)$ ε_i -approximately simulates $\mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)$. Therefore we can apply [1, Prop. 11.10] and use $C'_i = C_i \times_{\mathcal{CL}} \mathcal{P}_{\tau\eta_i\omega_i}(\Sigma_i)$ as a local controller for the sampled time system $\mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)$ and obtain a closed loop $C'_i \times_{\mathcal{CL}} \mathcal{P}_\tau(\Sigma_i)$ which satisfies $S_{spec,i}$ with an error¹⁰ $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_i$. Finally, by our composition results (Thm. 1, Cor. 1), we can compute an ε so that the composed system satisfies the conjunction of the specifications with an error of $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Tabuada, *Verification and control of hybrid systems: a symbolic approach*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [2] A. Girard, "Approximately bisimilar finite abstractions of stable linear systems," in *Proceedings of 10th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, vol. 4416, pp. 231–244, 2007.
- [3] A. Girard and G. J. Pappas, "Approximation metrics for discrete and continuous systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 782–798, 2007.
- [4] P. Tabuada and G. J. Pappas, "Linear time logic control of discrete-time linear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 1862–1877, 2006.
- [5] G. Pola, A. Girard, and P. Tabuada, "Approximately bisimilar symbolic models for nonlinear control systems," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 10, pp. 2508–2516, 2008.
- [6] E. A. Emerson and C. S. Jutla, "Tree automata, mu-calculus and determinacy," in *Proceedings of 32th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 368–377, 1991.
- [7] O. Maler, A. Pnueli, and J. Sifakis, "On the synthesis of discrete controllers for timed systems," in *STACS'95*, ser. LNCS. Springer, 1995, vol. 900, pp. 229–242.
- [8] M. Mazo Jr., A. Davitian, and P. Tabuada, "PESSOA: A tool for embedded controller synthesis," in *CAV 2010*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6174. Springer, 2010, pp. 566–569.
- [9] M. Rungger and M. Zamani, "SCOTS: A tool for the synthesis of symbolic controllers," in *Hybrid Systems Computation and Control, HSCC 2016*. ACM, 2016, pp. 99–104.
- [10] P. Nilsson, O. Hussien, A. Balkan, Y. Chen, A. D. Ames, J. W. Grizzle, N. Ozay, H. Peng, and P. Tabuada, "Correct-by-construction adaptive cruise control: Two approaches," *IEEE Trans. Contr. Sys. Techn.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 1294–1307, 2016.
- [11] A. D. Ames, P. Tabuada, B. Schürmann, W. Ma, S. Kolathaya, M. Rungger, and J. W. Grizzle, "First steps toward formal controller synthesis for bipedal robots," in *Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control, HSCC'15*. ACM, 2015, pp. 209–218.
- [12] G. Pola and P. Tabuada, "Symbolic models for nonlinear control systems: Alternating approximate bisimulations," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 719–733, 2009.
- [13] A. Borri, G. Pola, and M. D. D. Benedetto, "Symbolic models for nonlinear control systems affected by disturbances," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 85, no. 10, pp. 1422–1432, 2012. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00207179.2012.686672>
- [14] M. Zamani, P. M. Esfahani, R. Majumdar, A. Abate, and J. Lygeros, "Symbolic control of stochastic systems via approximately bisimilar finite abstractions," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 3135–3150, 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2014.2351652>
- [15] M. Zamani, A. Abate, and A. Girard, "Symbolic models for stochastic switched systems: A discretization and a discretization-free approach," *Automatica*, vol. 55, pp. 183–196, 2015.
- [16] M. Zamani, M. Rungger, and P. M. Esfahani, "Construction of approximations of stochastic control systems: A compositional approach," in *Conference on Decision and Control, CDC 2015*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 525–530.
- [17] M. Rungger and M. Zamani, "Compositional construction of approximate abstractions," in *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*. ACM, 2015, pp. 68–77.
- [18] G. Pola, P. Pepe, and M. D. Benedetto, "Symbolic models for networks of discrete-time nonlinear control systems," in *American Control Conference, ACC 2014*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 1787–1792.
- [19] G. Pola, P. Pepe, and M. Di Benedetto, "Symbolic models for networks of control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2016, to appear.
- [20] E. Dallal and P. Tabuada, "On compositional symbolic controller synthesis inspired by small-gain theorems," in *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 6133–6138.
- [21] J. Misra and K. Chandy, "Proofs of networks of processes," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. SE-7, no. 4, pp. 417–426, 1981.
- [22] C. Jones, "Tentative steps toward a development method for interfering programs," *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, vol. 5(4), pp. 596–619, 1983.
- [23] M. Abadi and L. Lamport, "Composing specifications," in *Stepwise Refinement of Distributed Systems: Models, Formalism, Correctness*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 430, J. de Bakker, W.-P. de Roever, and G. Rozenberg, Eds. Springer-Verlag, 1990, pp. 1–41.
- [24] M. Zamani and M. Arcak, "Compositional abstraction for networks of control systems: A dissipativity approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.01590*, 2016.
- [25] D. Angeli and E. D. Sontag, "Forward completeness, unboundedness observability, and their lyapunov characterizations," *Systems and Control Letters*, vol. 38, pp. 209–217, 1999.
- [26] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1996.

¹⁰Note that the reduction of ε by $\frac{1}{2}$ comes from the particular way a feedback composition is defined in [1] and might change for other interconnections.

- [27] D. Angeli, "A Lyapunov approach to incremental stability properties," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 410–421, 2002.