

Towards optimal space-time discretization for reachable sets of nonlinear control systems

Janosch Rieger and Kyria Wawryk

Abstract

Reachable sets of nonlinear control systems can in general only be approximated numerically, and these approximations are typically very expensive to compute. In this paper, we explore a strategy for choosing the temporal and spatial discretizations of Euler's method for reachable set computation in a non-uniform way to improve the performance of the method.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 93B03, 65L50.

Keywords: Reachable sets of control systems; Numerical approximation; Efficient discretization; Euler's method.

1 Introduction

The reachable set of a control system or, equivalently, a differential inclusion, is the set of all states the system can be steered into at a given time. Reachable sets are particularly interesting in applications where they support decision-making, see e.g. [15, 21], where some controls model external disturbances that need to be taken into account, see e.g. [17, 20, 23], or where the reachable set models a spatial object to be controlled, see e.g. [11, 12]. Since explicit formulas for reachable sets are usually not available, they have to be approximated by numerical methods.

Numerical methods for the approximation of reachable sets are computationally expensive. They evolve an entire set according to a flow that is multivalued at every point in time and space, and because of the wrapping effect, a very fine spatial discretization is required to achieve a tolerable global error. In addition, standard tools for complexity reduction like a posteriori error estimation are not available in this context. Currently, the only measure of quality for the approximate reachable sets at our disposal is the a priori error bound.

Reachable sets of linear control systems can be approximated by polytopes, and they interact with the flow of the system in a relatively straightforward way. For this reason, theoretically sound and well-performing algorithms are available in this setting, see [3, 16, 30] for efficient computations in zonotope representation, see [5, 6] for methods based on the Pontryagin maximum principle, and see [31] for an application of Benson’s algorithm.

In the context of nonlinear control systems, it is less obvious how the reachable sets can be discretized and evolved most efficiently. There are several schools of thought that advance their ideas independently.

Numerical methods for linear systems are applied to local linearizations of nonlinear systems. This results in an overapproximation of the reachable set by a collection of simple shapes on which the linearization errors are tolerable, see e.g. [1, 2, 18, 28]. These algorithms are reported to perform very well when the system is only mildly nonlinear, and to have difficulties in the presence of strong nonlinearity, see the discussion in [28].

Runge-Kutta methods for nonlinear differential equations are generalized to reachable set computation in a straightforward way. Their order of convergence in terms of the step-size cannot, in general, exceed 2, see [33]. Since second-order convergence requires very strong assumptions on the control system, see [34, 35], most effort has been directed towards the refinement of first-order methods. Some work focuses on explicit time discretizations and their properties in the absence of spatial discretization, see e.g. [7, 13, 14, 29]. Implicit methods, which are preferable in the context of stiff systems, were investigated in [10, 22, 25]. When implemented, the discrete reachable sets are usually represented as subsets of grids, see e.g. [9, 19, 26, 27].

Algorithms based on optimal control, see e.g. [8, 24], reduce the computational complexity of the problem by eliminating spatial discretizations in intermediate time-steps. The speedup achieved by these methods is significant, but unlike in the linear case, they do not necessarily converge.

In this paper, we make a contribution to the class of Runge-Kutta methods for reachable set computation by reducing the complexity of Euler’s method with an approach in the spirit of adaptive refinement: Given an Euler approximation of the reachable tube with a relatively coarse space-time discretization, we can estimate the a priori unknown complexity of Euler’s scheme for other space-time discretizations. Using this estimate, we determine a cost-effective finer discretization using a greedy local refinement strategy and compute the corresponding approximate reachable tube. We repeat this process until the a priori error reaches a given tolerance.

Our primary goal is to prove that this algorithm terminates in finite time. The analysis of the greedy refinement strategy is complicated by the effect the local refinement of the space-time discretization on one time-interval has on the computational complexity of Euler's scheme on adjacent time-intervals – an effect that does not occur in classical iterative refinement schemes such as adaptive quadrature.

Numerical experiments shown in the final section of the paper suggest that our algorithm has the potential to outperform the state-of-the art Euler scheme with uniform discretization. The new method seems to be particularly effective when the volume of the reachable set grows fast in time, because it is able to balance propagated local errors and local computational complexity by adjusting its discretization.

2 Notation

We consider the space \mathbb{R}^d equipped with the max norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. For $r > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the ball of radius r by

$$B_r(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - y\|_\infty \leq r\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{KC}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the collections of all nonempty and compact subsets and all nonempty, compact and convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^d , respectively. The Hausdorff distance $\text{dist}_H : \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is given by

$$\text{dist}_H(A, B) = \max\{\sup_{a \in A} \inf_{b \in B} \|a - b\|_\infty, \sup_{b \in B} \inf_{a \in A} \|a - b\|_\infty\}.$$

A set-valued function $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{KC}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is called L -Lipschitz for $L \geq 0$ if

$$\text{dist}_H(F(x), F(y)) \leq L\|x - y\|_\infty \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

For any $\rho > 0$, we define the projector

$$\pi_\rho : \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow 2^{\rho\mathbb{Z}^d} \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \pi_\rho(A) := (A + B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(0)) \cap \rho\mathbb{Z}^d.$$

It is easy to see that $\pi_\rho(A)$ is indeed nonempty for all $A \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and that

$$\text{dist}_H(A, \pi_\rho(A)) \leq \frac{\rho}{2} \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (1)$$

For any finite set A , we denote its cardinality by $\#A$. We abbreviate

$$[m, n] := \{m, m + 1, \dots, n - 1, n\} \subset \mathbb{N}$$

when delimiting indices, we denote

$$\mathbb{R}_+^d := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i \geq 0 \forall i\}, \quad \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i > 0 \forall i\},$$

and for every $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the cumulative sums

$$\Sigma_+ h \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \quad (\Sigma_+ h)_k = \sum_{j=1}^k h_j \quad \forall k \in [0, n].$$

3 Euler's method with non-uniform discretization

We consider the differential inclusion

$$\dot{x}(t) \in F(x(t)) \text{ for a.e. } t \in (0, T), \quad x(0) \in X_0, \quad (2)$$

where $X_0 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{KC}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is L -Lipschitz and satisfies the uniform bound

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{f \in F(x)} \|f\|_\infty \leq P. \quad (3)$$

It is well-known that sufficiently regular control systems of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= f(x(t), u(t)) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, T), \\ u(t) &\in U \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, T), \\ x(0) &\in X_0 \end{aligned}$$

with control set $U \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and initial set $X_0 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ can be equivalently reformulated as differential inclusions of the form (2) with

$$F(x) := \text{conv}(\cup_{u \in U} f(x, u)),$$

see [32, Theorem 2.3] and [4, Theorem 2 in Section 2.4.2]. Since many related papers on reachable set approximation use the representation (2) for technical reasons, we adopt this convention in this paper.

Definition 3.1. *The solution set and the reachable sets of inclusion (2) are*

$$\begin{aligned} S^F(T) &:= \{x(\cdot) \in W^{1,1}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d) : x(\cdot) \text{ solves inclusion (2)}\}, \\ R^F(t) &:= \{x(t) : x(\cdot) \in S^F(T)\}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $X_0 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and because of the properties of the mapping F , it follows from [32, Corollary 4.5] that $R^F(t) \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

We approximate the solution set and the reachable sets of inclusion (2) by a fully discrete Euler scheme.

Definition 3.2. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ with $\sum_{j=1}^n h_j = T$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$, we define the discrete solution set and reachable sets

$$\begin{aligned} S_{h,\rho}^F(T) &:= \{(y_k)_{k=0}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d : y_0 \in \pi_{\rho_0}(X_0), \\ &\quad y_{k+1} \in \pi_{\rho_{k+1}}(y_k + h_{k+1}F(y_k)) \forall k \in [0, n-1]\}, \quad (4) \\ R_{h,\rho}^F(k) &:= \{y_k : y \in S_{h,\rho}^F(T)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $X_0 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, it follows directly from the properties of the mapping F and the projector π_ρ that $R_{h,\rho}^F(k) \in 2^{\rho_k \mathbb{Z}^d} \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $k \in [0, n]$. For uniform discretizations, the construction of the discrete reachable sets in (4) coincides with the scheme presented in [9] and [19].

The proof of the following error bound is very similar to proofs presented in [9] and [19] for uniform discretizations. In the uniform case, Theorem 3.3 reduces to the corresponding error estimates given in the literature.

Theorem 3.3. *The exact reachable sets of inclusion (2) with property (3) and the discrete reachable sets (4) satisfy*

$$\text{dist}_H(R^F(t_k), R_{h,\rho}^F(k)) \leq e^{LT} \frac{\rho_0}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^k e^{L(T-t_j)} (e^{Lh_j} - 1) \left(Ph_j + \frac{\rho_j}{2} + \frac{\rho_j}{2Lh_j} \right)$$

for all $k \in [0, n]$, where $t = \Sigma_+ h$.

We restate the algorithm from [9] and [19] in Algorithm 1 for reference. Given an error tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$, it determines the coarsest uniform discretization of the form

$$h = \frac{T}{n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n}, \quad t = \Sigma_+ h, \quad \rho = \frac{T^2}{n^2} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}},$$

so that the error from Theorem 3.3 is at most ε , and then computes the discrete reachable sets as in (4).

4 Efficient space-time discretization

The quality of a discretization

$$(h, t, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$$

Algorithm 1: Euler scheme with optimal uniform discretization

Input: Error tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$.

Output: Discretization $(h, t, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$,

Reachable sets $\mathcal{R}_{h,\rho}^F(k)$, $k = 0, \dots, n$.

- 1 $n = \min\{m \in \mathbb{N} : m^2\varepsilon - m(e^{LT} - 1)(PT + \frac{T}{2L}) - T^2(e^{LT} - \frac{1}{2}) \geq 0\}$;
 - 2 $h \leftarrow \frac{T}{n} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$; $t \leftarrow \Sigma_+ h$; $\rho \leftarrow \frac{T^2}{n^2} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$;
 - 3 $R_{h,\rho}^F(0) \leftarrow \pi_{\rho_0}(X_0)$;
 - 4 **for** $k \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**
 - 5 $R_{h,\rho}^F(k) \leftarrow \emptyset$;
 - 6 **for** $x \in R_{h,\rho}^F(k-1)$ **do**
 - 7 $R_{h,\rho}^F(k) \leftarrow R_{h,\rho}^F(k) \cup \pi_{\rho_k}(x + h_k F(x))$;
-

is determined by the error bound

$$E(h, t, \rho) := \sum_{j=0}^n \mathcal{E}_j(h, t, \rho), \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_j(h, t, \rho) := \begin{cases} e^{LT} \frac{\rho_0}{2}, & j = 0, \\ e^{L(T-t_j)} (e^{Lh_j} - 1) \left(Ph_j + \frac{\rho_j}{2} + \frac{\rho_j}{2Lh_j} \right), & j \in [1, n], \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

from Theorem 3.3 and the computational complexity

$$\hat{C}(h, t, \rho) := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_j(h, t, \rho), \quad (7)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_j(h, t, \rho) := \sum_{x_j \in R_{h,\rho}^F(j)} \#\pi_{\rho_{j+1}}(x_j + h_{j+1} F(x_j)), \quad (8)$$

which is only known exactly after the reachable sets have been computed. The need for an estimator of \hat{C} suggests the iterative procedure implemented in Algorithm 2: Given

- i) a discretization $(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n^{(m)}} \times \mathbb{R}_+^{n^{(m)}+1} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n^{(m)}+1}$,
- ii) approximate reachable sets $R_{h^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}}^F(j)$ for $j \in [0, n^{(m)}]$ and
- iii) the complexities $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_j(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)})$ for $j \in [0, n^{(m)} - 1]$,

Algorithm 2: Iterative refinement based on Euler's scheme.

For the definitions of E , ΔE and ΔC see (5), (16) and (21).

Input: Error thresholds $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 > \dots > \varepsilon_{\ell_{\max}} > 0$.

Output: Discretization $(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n_m} \times \mathbb{R}_+^{n_m+1} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n_m+1}$,

Reachable sets $R_{h^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}}^F(k) \subset \rho_k^{(m)} \mathbb{Z}^d$, $k = 0, \dots, n_m$.

```

1  $(h^{(0)}, t^{(0)}, \rho^{(0)}) \leftarrow ((T), (0, T), (2LPT^2, 2LPT^2));$ 
2  $(n_0, m, \ell) \leftarrow (1, 0, 0);$ 
3 while  $\ell \leq \ell_{\max}$  do
4   if  $m = 0$  or  $E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) \leq \varepsilon_\ell$  then
5      $R_{h, \rho}^F(0) \leftarrow \pi_{\rho_0}(X_0);$ 
6      $\hat{v}_{R,0}^{(m)} \leftarrow (\#R_{h, \rho}^F(0))\rho_0^{d_R};$ 
7     for  $k \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
8        $R_{h, \rho}^F(k) \leftarrow \emptyset;$ 
9        $\hat{v}_{F, k-1}^{(m)} \leftarrow 0;$ 
10      for  $x \in R_{h, \rho}^F(k-1)$  do
11         $R_{h, \rho}^F(k) \leftarrow R_{h, \rho}^F(k) \cup \pi_{\rho_k}(x + h_k F(x));$ 
12         $\hat{v}_{F, k-1}^{(m)} \leftarrow \hat{v}_{F, k-1}^{(m)} + (\#\pi_{\rho_k}(x + h_k F(x)));$ 
13       $\hat{v}_{R, k}^{(m)} \leftarrow (\#R_{h, \rho}^F(k))\rho_k^d;$ 
14       $\hat{v}_{F, k-1}^{(m)} \leftarrow \frac{\rho_k^d}{h_k^d} \frac{\hat{v}_{F, k-1}^{(m)}}{\#R_{h, \rho}^F(k-1)};$ 
15       $v_R^{(m)} \leftarrow [\text{linear spline}](t^{(m)}, \hat{v}_R^{(m)});$ 
16       $\hat{v}_{F, n}^{(m)} \leftarrow \hat{v}_{F, n-1}^{(m)}; v_F^{(m)} \leftarrow [\text{linear spline}](t^{(m)}, \hat{v}_F^{(m)});$ 
17       $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1;$ 
18    else
19       $k_m \leftarrow \arg \max_j \frac{-\Delta E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; j)}{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}, v_R^{(m)}, v_F^{(m)}; j)};$ 
20      if  $k_m = 0$  then
21         $n_{m+1} \leftarrow n_m;$ 
22      else
23         $n_{m+1} \leftarrow n_m + 1;$ 
24       $(h^{(m+1)}, t^{(m+1)}, \rho^{(m+1)}) \leftarrow \psi[h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m]$ 
25       $(v_R^{(m+1)}, v_F^{(m+1)}) \leftarrow (v_R^{(m)}, v_F^{(m)});$ 
26       $m \leftarrow m + 1;$ 

```

we compute the surrogate volumes

$$\hat{v}_{R,j}^{(m)} := [\#R_{h^{(m)},\rho^{(m)}}^F(j)](\rho_j^{(m)})^{d_R}, \quad j \in [0, n^{(m)}], \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{v}_{F,j}^{(m)} := \begin{cases} \frac{\hat{\mathcal{C}}_j(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)})}{\#R_{h^{(m)},\rho^{(m)}}^F(j)} \left(\frac{\rho_{j+1}^{(m)}}{h_{j+1}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F}, & j \in [0, n^{(m)} - 1], \\ \hat{v}_{F, n^{(m)}-1}^{(m)}, & j = n^{(m)}, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

of the reachable sets and the images of F , where

$$d_R := \max_{t \in [0, T]} \dim R^F(t), \quad d_F := \max_{t \in [0, T]} \max_{x \in R^F(t)} \dim F(x).$$

We interpolate the data $(t_j^{(m)}, \hat{v}_{R,j}^{(m)})_{j=0}^{n^{(m)}}$ and $(t_j^{(m)}, \hat{v}_{F,j}^{(m)})_{j=0}^{n^{(m)}}$ with piecewise linear splines

$$v_R^{(m)}, v_F^{(m)} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

and use the estimated numbers

$$C(h, t, \rho; v_R^{(m)}, v_F^{(m)}) := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{C}_j(h, t, \rho; v_R^{(m)}, v_F^{(m)}), \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_j(h, t, \rho; v_R^{(m)}, v_F^{(m)}) := \frac{v_R^{(m)}(t_j)}{\rho_j^{d_R}} \frac{v_F^{(m)}(t_j) h_{j+1}^{d_F}}{\rho_{j+1}^{d_F}}, \quad (12)$$

of grid points to be computed by iteration (4) with a finer discretization (h, t, ρ) . (When there is no potential for misunderstandings, we omit the arguments $v_R^{(m)}$ and $v_F^{(m)}$ of C and \mathcal{C}_j .) Based on error bound (5) and the complexity estimator (11), Algorithm 2 refines the discretization $(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)})$ according to the rule

$$\psi[h, t, \rho; j] = (\psi_h[h, j], \psi_t[t, j], \psi_\rho[\rho, j]) \quad (13)$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_h[h, j] &:= \begin{cases} h, & j = 0, \\ (h_1, \dots, h_{j-1}, h_j/2, h_j/2, h_{j+1}, \dots, h_n), & j \in [1, n], \end{cases} \\ \psi_t[t, j] &:= \begin{cases} t, & j = 0, \\ (t_0, \dots, t_{j-1}, t_j - h_j/2, t_j, t_{j+1}, \dots, t_n), & j \in [1, n], \end{cases} \\ \psi_\rho[\rho, j] &:= \begin{cases} (\rho_0/4, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_n), & j = 0, \\ (\rho_0, \dots, \rho_{j-1}, \rho_j/4, \rho_j/4, \rho_{j+1}, \dots, \rho_n), & j \in [1, n], \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

choosing the index j that promises maximal error decrease per projected cost increase, until the error estimate (5) reaches a certain threshold. Then the recursion (4) is carried out, the exact cost (7) is updated, and a new iteration can begin.

Remark 4.1. *When $j \in [1, n]$, the rules (14) subdivide the j -th time-interval and adjust the spatial mesh in such a way that the local errors induced by the temporal and spatial discretization are balanced, see [9, Remark 3] and Lemma 4.2 below.*

The purpose of this section is to prove the convergence of Algorithm 2. We first collect some technical preliminaries.

The following lemma quantifies how the subdivision rules (14) affect the components $\mathcal{E}_n^j(h, t, \rho)$ from (6).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $h \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$ with*

$$t = \Sigma_+ h \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_j = 2LP(h_j)^2 \quad \forall j \in [1, n]. \quad (15)$$

Then for any $k \in [0, n]$, the quantity

$$\Delta E(h, t, \rho; k) := E(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) - E(h, t, \rho) \quad (16)$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E(h, t, \rho; k) &= \begin{cases} -\frac{3e^{LT}}{8}\rho_0, & k = 0, \\ -e^{L(T-t_k)}(e^{Lh_k} - 1)\left(Ph_k + \frac{3LP^2h_k^2}{4}\right), & k \in [1, n], \end{cases} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_0(h, t, \rho), & k = 0, \\ -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_k(h, t, \rho), & k \in [1, n]. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. In the following computations, all addends that are not affected by the interval subdivision cancel out. When $k = 0$, we observe that

$$\mathcal{E}_j(\psi[h, t, \rho; 0]) = \mathcal{E}_j(h, t, \rho) \quad \forall j \in [1, k],$$

so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E(h, t, \rho; 0) &= E(\psi[h, t, \rho; 0]) - E(h, t, \rho) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n \mathcal{E}_j(\psi[h, t, \rho; 0]) - \sum_{j=0}^n \mathcal{E}_j(h, t, \rho) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_0(\psi[h, t, \rho; 0]) - \mathcal{E}_0(h, t, \rho) \\ &= e^{LT}\frac{\rho_0}{8} - e^{LT}\frac{\rho_0}{2} = -\frac{3e^{LT}}{8}\rho_0 \leq -\frac{e^{LT}}{4}\rho_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_0(h, t, \rho). \end{aligned}$$

When $k \in [1, n]$, we observe that

$$\mathcal{E}_j(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_j(h, t, \rho), & j \in [0, k-1], \\ \mathcal{E}_{j-1}(h, t, \rho), & j \in [k+2, n+1], \end{cases}$$

so, using the rules (13) and (14), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E(h, t, \rho; k) &= E(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) - E(h, t, \rho) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \mathcal{E}_j(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) - \sum_{j=0}^n \mathcal{E}_j(h, t, \rho) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_k(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) + \mathcal{E}_{k+1}(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) - \mathcal{E}_k(h, t, \rho) \\ &= e^{L(T-t_k)}(e^{Lh_k} - 1) \left(-\frac{1}{2}Ph_k - \frac{3}{8}\rho_k - \frac{1}{4}\frac{\rho_k}{Lh_k} \right) \\ &= -e^{L(T-t_k)}(e^{Lh_k} - 1) \left(Ph_k + \frac{3}{4}LP h_k^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the final step is due to the second part of statement (15). In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E(h, t, \rho; k) &= -e^{L(T-t_k)}(e^{Lh_k} - 1) \left(Ph_k + \frac{3}{4}LP h_k^2 \right) \\ &\leq -e^{L(T-t_k)}(e^{Lh_k} - 1) \left(Ph_k + \frac{1}{2}LP h_k^2 \right) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_k(h, t, \rho). \end{aligned}$$

□

The facts listed in Lemma 4.3 can be deduced from the subdivision rules (14) in a straightforward induction.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_1$, and let the sequences $(h^{(m)})_{m=0}^N$, $(t^{(m)})_{m=0}^N$, $(\rho^{(m)})_{m=0}^N$, $(k_m)_{m=0}^N$, and $(n_m)_{m=0}^N$ be generated by Algorithm 2. Then for all $m \in [0, N]$, the vectors $h^{(m)}$, $t^{(m)}$ and $\rho^{(m)}$ satisfy*

$$(\forall j \in [1, n_m]) (\exists \ell_j^{(m)} \in \mathbb{N}) (h_j^{(m)} = 2^{-\ell_j^{(m)}} T), \quad (17)$$

$$\rho_j^{(m)} = 2LP \left(h_j^{(m)} \right)^2 \quad \forall j \in [1, n_m], \quad (18)$$

$$(\forall j \in [0, n_m]) (\exists i_j^{(m)} \in \mathbb{N}) (t_j^{(m)} = i_j^{(m)} h_j^{(m)}). \quad (19)$$

$$t^{(m)} = \Sigma_+ h^{(m)}, \quad (20)$$

Now we quantify how the subdivision rules (14) affect the components $\mathcal{C}_j(h, t, \rho)$ from (12).

Lemma 4.4. *Consider functions $v_R, v_F : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and a discretization $(h, t, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$ satisfying $T = \Sigma_+ h$ and equation (18).*

Then for any $k \in [0, n]$, the quantity

$$\Delta C(h, t, \rho; k) := C(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) - C(h, t, \rho) \quad (21)$$

with ψ as defined in equation (13), with C as defined in statement (11), and with

$$v(t) := v_R(t) v_F(t), \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$$

satisfies

$$\Delta C(h, t, \rho; k) = \begin{cases} v(0) \left(\frac{4^{d_R-1}}{\rho_0^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_1}{\rho_1} \right)^{d_F}, & k = 0, \\ v\left(T - \frac{h_n}{2}\right) \left(\frac{2h_k}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_R} \\ \quad + v(t_{n-1}) \left(\frac{2^{d_F-1}}{\rho_{k-1}^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_k}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_F}, & k = n, \\ v\left(t_k - \frac{h_k}{2}\right) \left(\frac{2h_k}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_R} \\ \quad + v(t_k) \left(\frac{4^{d_R-1}}{\rho_k^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_{k+1}}{\rho_{k+1}} \right)^{d_F} \\ \quad + v(t_{k-1}) \left(\frac{2^{d_F-1}}{\rho_{k-1}^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_k}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_F}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Denoting

$$V_L := \inf_{t \in [0, T]} v(t) \quad \text{and} \quad V_U := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} v(t),$$

we find the inclusion

$$\Delta C(h, t, \rho; k) \in [V_L, V_U] \begin{cases} \left(\frac{4^{d_R-1}}{\rho_0^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_1}{\rho_1} \right)^{d_F}, & k = 0, \\ \left(\frac{2h_k}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_R} \\ \quad + \left(\frac{2^{d_F-1}}{\rho_{k-1}^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_k}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_F}, & k = n, \\ \left(\frac{2h_k}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_R} \\ \quad + \left(\frac{4^{d_R-1}}{\rho_k^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_{k+1}}{\rho_{k+1}} \right)^{d_F} \\ \quad + \left(\frac{2^{d_F-1}}{\rho_{k-1}^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_k}{\rho_k} \right)^{d_F}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Proof. We only display the proof of equation (22) and inclusion (23) for the case $k \in [1, n-1]$, because the cases $k = 0$ and $k = n$ are similar. By definition of ψ_h , ψ_t , ψ_ρ and \mathcal{C}_j , we have

$$\mathcal{C}_j(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{C}_j(h, t, \rho), & j \in [0, k-2], \\ \mathcal{C}_{j-1}(h, t, \rho), & j \in [k+2, n+1]. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

In the following computation, we use the definition (11) of the cost estimator C , statement (24), which allows us to cancel all but five addends, the definition (12) of \mathcal{C}_j , and the definitions (14) and (13) of ψ_h , ψ_t , ψ_ρ , and ψ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta C(h, t, \rho; k) &= C(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) - C(h, t, \rho) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n \mathcal{C}_j(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{C}_j(h, t, \rho) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{k-1}(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) + \mathcal{C}_k(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{C}_{k+1}(\psi[h, t, \rho; k]) - \mathcal{C}_{k-1}(h, t, \rho) - \mathcal{C}_k(h, t, \rho) \\ &= \frac{v_R((\psi_t[t, k])_{k-1}) v_F((\psi_t[t, k])_{k-1}) (\psi_h[h, k])_{k-1}^{d_F}}{(\psi_\rho[\rho, k])_{k-1}^{d_R}} \frac{v_F((\psi_t[t, k])_{k-1}) (\psi_h[h, k])_{k-1}^{d_F}}{(\psi_\rho[\rho, k])_k^{d_F}} \\ &\quad + \frac{v_R((\psi_t[t, k])_k) v_F((\psi_t[t, k])_k) (\psi_h[h, k])_{k+1}^{d_F}}{(\psi_\rho[\rho, k])_k^{d_R}} \frac{v_F((\psi_t[t, k])_k) (\psi_h[h, k])_{k+1}^{d_F}}{(\psi_\rho[\rho, k])_{k+1}^{d_F}} \\ &\quad + \frac{v_R((\psi_t[t, k])_{k+1}) v_F((\psi_t[t, k])_{k+1}) (\psi_h[h, k])_{k+2}^{d_F}}{(\psi_\rho[\rho, k])_{k+1}^{d_R}} \frac{v_F((\psi_t[t, k])_{k+1}) (\psi_h[h, k])_{k+2}^{d_F}}{(\psi_\rho[\rho, k])_{k+2}^{d_F}} \\ &\quad - \frac{v_R(t_{k-1}) v_F(t_{k-1}) h_k^{d_F}}{\rho_{k-1}^{d_R} \rho_k^{d_F}} - \frac{v_R(t_k) v_F(t_k) h_{k+1}^{d_F}}{\rho_k^{d_R} \rho_{k+1}^{d_F}} \\ &= v(t_{k-1}) \left(\frac{(2^{d_F-1}) h_k^{d_F}}{\rho_{k-1}^{d_R} \rho_k^{d_F}} \right) + v(t_k) \left(\frac{(4^{d_R-1}) h_{k+1}^{d_F}}{\rho_k^{d_R} \rho_{k+1}^{d_F}} \right) \\ &\quad + v\left(t_k - \frac{h_k}{2}\right) \left(2^{d_F+2d_R} \frac{h_k^{d_F}}{\rho_k^{d_F} \rho_k^{d_R}} \right) \\ &\in [V_L, V_U] \left(\frac{(2^{d_F-1}) h_k^{d_F}}{\rho_{k-1}^{d_R} \rho_k^{d_F}} + \frac{(4^{d_R-1}) h_{k+1}^{d_F}}{\rho_k^{d_R} \rho_{k+1}^{d_F}} + 2^{d_F+2d_R} \frac{h_k^{d_F}}{\rho_k^{d_F} \rho_k^{d_R}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The final step of the above computation is justified because all factors are positive. \square

Now we begin to collect evidence for the convergence of Algorithm 2, which we will prove by contradiction.

Lemma 4.5. *Assume that Algorithm 2 does not terminate, and that it generates the sequences $(h^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(t^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(\rho^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(k_m)_{m=0}^\infty$, and $(n_m)_{m=0}^\infty$. Then we have*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Delta E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m) = 0, \quad (25)$$

as well as

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{k_m}^{(m)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\substack{m \rightarrow \infty \\ k_m \neq 0}} h_{k_m}^{(m)} = 0. \quad (26)$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\Delta E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m) \leq 0 \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N},$$

and by construction, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -E(h^{(0)}, t^{(0)}, \rho^{(0)}) &\leq E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) - E(h^{(0)}, t^{(0)}, \rho^{(0)}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \Delta E(h^{(j)}, t^{(j)}, \rho^{(j)}; k_j), \end{aligned}$$

which implies statement (25). Using Lemma 4.2, the identity (6) and the fact that $e^{Ls} \geq (1 + Ls)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m) &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}_{k_m}(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \begin{cases} e^{LT \frac{\rho_{k_m}}{2}}, & k_m = 0, \\ e^{L(T-t_{k_m})} (e^{Lh_{k_m}} - 1) \left(Ph_{k_m} + \frac{\rho_{k_m}}{2} + \frac{\rho_{k_m}}{2Lh_{k_m}} \right), & k_m \in [1, n] \end{cases} \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \begin{cases} e^{LT \frac{\rho_{k_m}}{2}}, & k_m = 0, \\ e^{L(T-t_{k_m})} \frac{\rho_{k_m}}{2}, & k_m \in [1, n] \end{cases} \leq -\frac{1}{4} \rho_{k_m}^{(m)}, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with statement (25), implies the first part of statement (26). Finally, the first part of statement (26), combined with Lemma 4.3 then provides the second part of statement (26). \square

The following technical lemma states that Algorithm 2 relabels, but never discards any previously computed nodes $t_j^{(m)}$. It can be proven using a straightforward induction on m .

Lemma 4.6. *Assume that Algorithm 2 does not terminate, and that it generates the sequences $(h^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(t^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(\rho^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(k_m)_{m=0}^\infty$, and $(n_m)_{m=0}^\infty$. Then for every $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in [0, n_{m_0}]$, there exists a monotone increasing sequence $(j_m)_{m=m_0}^\infty$ with $j_m \in [0, n_m]$ for all $m \in [m_0, \infty)$ and*

$$t_j^{(m_0)} = t_{j_m}^{(m)} \quad \forall m \in [m_0, \infty).$$

Next, we show that if the maximal step-size $\|h^{(m)}\|_\infty$ in Algorithm 2 does not converge to zero, then there exists a subinterval $[\tau_-, \tau_+] \subset [0, T]$ that is never subdivided.

Proposition 4.7. *Assume that Algorithm 2 does not terminate, and that it generates the sequences $(h^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(t^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(\rho^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(k_m)_{m=0}^\infty$, and $(n_m)_{m=0}^\infty$. If we have*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|h^{(m)}\|_\infty \neq 0, \quad (27)$$

then there exist $\tau_-, \tau_+ \in [0, T]$ and $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tau_- < \tau_+$ and, for all $m \geq m_0$, there exists $j_m \in [1, n_m]$ with

$$\tau_- = t_{j_m-1}^{(m)} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_+ = t_{j_m}^{(m)}.$$

Proof. Since $n_m < \infty$, by statement (17) in Lemma 4.3, there exist $\ell_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\|h^{(m)}\|_\infty = 2^{-\ell_m} T \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N},$$

and by construction of $h^{(m)}$, the sequence $(\ell_m)_m$ is monotone increasing. By assumption (27), there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\ell_m = \ell_{m_0} \quad \forall m \in [m_0, \infty),$$

and hence for every $m \in [m_0, \infty)$, there exists an index $j_m \in [1, n_m]$ such that $h_{j_m}^{(m)} = 2^{-\ell_{m_0}} T$. By Lemma 4.3, there exist integers $i_m \in [1, 2^{\ell_{m_0}}]$ with

$$t_{j_m}^{(m)} = i_m h_{j_m}^{(m)} = 2^{-\ell_{m_0}} T i_m \quad \forall m \in [m_0, \infty).$$

Since $[1, 2^{\ell_{m_0}}]$ is finite, there exist $i^* \in [1, 2^{\ell_{m_0}}]$ and a subsequence $\mathbb{N}' \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$i_m = i^* \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}'.$$

We define

$$\tau_- := 2^{-\ell_{m_0}} T (i^* - 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_+ := 2^{-\ell_{m_0}} T i^*.$$

It follows that

$$\tau_- = t_{j_{m-1}}^{(m)} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_+ = t_{j_m}^{(m)} \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}' \cap [m_0, \infty). \quad (28)$$

Let $m'_0 := \min(\mathbb{N}' \cap [m_0, \infty))$. By Lemma 4.6, there exist sequences $(j_m^-)_{m=m'_0}^\infty$ and $(j_m^+)_{m=m'_0}^\infty$ with

$$\tau_- = t_{j_m^-}^{(m)} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_+ = t_{j_m^+}^{(m)} \quad \forall m \in [m'_0, \infty).$$

Now we show that

$$j_m^- + 1 = j_m^+ \quad \forall m \in [m'_0, \infty),$$

which completes the proof. Otherwise, there exist integers $\hat{m} \in [m'_0, \infty)$ and $\hat{j}_{\hat{m}} \in (j_{\hat{m}}^-, j_{\hat{m}}^+)$ with

$$\tau_- = t_{j_{\hat{m}}^-}^{(\hat{m})} < t_{\hat{j}_{\hat{m}}}^{(\hat{m})} < t_{j_{\hat{m}}^+}^{(\hat{m})} = \tau_+.$$

But then, Lemma 4.6 yields that for

$$m''_0 := \min(\mathbb{N}' \cap [\hat{m}, \infty)),$$

there exists $\hat{j}_{m''_0} \in [1, n_{m''_0}]$ with $t_{\hat{j}_{m''_0}}^{(m''_0)} = t_{\hat{j}_{\hat{m}}}^{(\hat{m})}$. It follows that

$$\tau_- = t_{j_{m''_0}^-}^{(m''_0)} < t_{\hat{j}_{m''_0}}^{(m''_0)} < t_{j_{m''_0}^+}^{(m''_0)} = \tau_+,$$

which forces $j_{m''_0}^- + 1 < j_{m''_0}^+$ and hence contradicts statement (28). \square

Now we show that Algorithm 2 terminates in finite time.

Theorem 4.8. *For any $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 > \dots > \varepsilon_{\ell_{\max}} > 0$, Algorithm 2 returns a discretization $(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)})$ with*

$$E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) \leq \varepsilon_{\ell_{\max}}$$

after a finite number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ of iterations.

Proof. Assume throughout that Algorithm 2 does not terminate, and that it generates the sequences $(h^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(t^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(\rho^{(m)})_{m=0}^\infty$, $(k_m)_{m=0}^\infty$, and $(n_m)_{m=0}^\infty$. Since $\ell_{\max} < \infty$ there exists $\hat{m} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$v_R^{(m)} = v_R^{(\hat{m})} \quad \text{and} \quad v_F^{(m)} = v_F^{(\hat{m})} \quad \forall m \in [\hat{m}, \infty). \quad (29)$$

Since $X_0 \neq \emptyset$, we have $R_{h^{(\hat{m})}, \rho^{(\hat{m})}}^F(k) \neq \emptyset$ for all $k \in [0, n_{\hat{m}}]$ by construction.

Hence $\hat{v}_R^{(\hat{m})}, \hat{v}_F^{(\hat{m})} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n_{\hat{m}}}$, see Algorithm 2 and equations (9) and (10), which implies that the product

$$v^{(\hat{m})} := v_R^{(\hat{m})} v_F^{(\hat{m})}$$

of the linear splines $v_R^{(\hat{m})}$ and $v_F^{(\hat{m})}$ satisfies

$$0 < V_L := \min_{t \in [0, T]} v^{(\hat{m})}(t) \leq \max_{t \in [0, T]} v^{(\hat{m})}(t) =: V_U < \infty.$$

Since Algorithm 2 does not terminate, we have

$$E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) > \varepsilon_{\ell_{\max}} > 0 \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (30)$$

If we show that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|h^{(m)}\|_{\infty} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \rho_0^{(m)} = 0, \quad (31)$$

then the computation

$$\begin{aligned} & E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) \\ &= \frac{\rho_0^{(m)}}{2} e^L + P \sum_{j=1}^{n_m} e^{L(1-t_j^{(m)})} \left(e^{Lh_j^{(m)}} - 1 \right) \left(2h_j^{(m)} + L \left(h_j^{(m)} \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq e^L \left(\frac{\rho_0^{(m)}}{2} + PT(2 + LT) \left(e^{L\|h^{(m)}\|_{\infty}} - 1 \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

contradicts statement (30), and the proof is complete. We only prove the first statement in (31). The proof of the second statement is very similar.

We split the indirect proof of statement (31) into three parts.

Step 1: The difference $\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m)$ increases slowly in m .

If statement (31) is false, then by Proposition 4.7 there exist points $\tau_-, \tau_+ \in [0, T]$ and $m_0 \in [\hat{m}, \infty)$ such that

$$(\forall m \in [m_0, \infty)) (\exists i_m \in [1, n_m]) (\tau_- = t_{i_m-1}^{(m)} \text{ and } \tau_+ = t_{i_m}^{(m)}).$$

By Lemma 4.3, we have

$$h_{i_m}^{(m)} = t_{i_m}^{(m)} - t_{i_m-1}^{(m)} = \tau_+ - \tau_- = t_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)} - t_{i_{m_0}-1}^{(m_0)} = h_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)}, \quad (32)$$

$$\rho_{i_m}^{(m)} = 2LP \left(h_{i_m}^{(m)} \right)^2 = 2LP \left(h_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)} \right)^2 = \rho_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)} \quad (33)$$

for all $m \in [m_0, \infty)$. In particular, we have

$$k_m \neq i_m \quad \forall m \in [m_0, \infty),$$

and by line 19 of Algorithm 2, we have

$$\frac{-\Delta E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m)}{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m)} \leq \frac{-\Delta E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m)}{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m)} \quad \forall m \in [m_0, \infty).$$

After rearranging the above inequality, we use statements (32) and (33) together with Lemma 4.2, and then Lemma 4.5 to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m)}{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m)} &\leq \frac{-\Delta E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m)}{-\Delta E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m)} \\ &= \frac{\Delta E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m)}{\Delta E(h^{(m_0)}, t^{(m_0)}, \rho^{(m_0)}; i_{m_0})} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Step 2: We have $k_m \neq 0$ and $h_{k_m}^{(m)} = \min_{j \in [1, n_m]} h_j^{(m)}$ along a subsequence.

We claim that the set

$$\mathbb{N}' := \{m \geq m_0 : k_m \neq 0\}$$

is infinite. Otherwise, we set $\tilde{m} := \max(\mathbb{N}' \cup \{m_0\}) + 1$ and observe that

$$k_m = 0 \quad \forall m \in [\tilde{m}, \infty). \quad (35)$$

Then for all $m \in [\tilde{m}, \infty)$, equations (14), (22) and (29) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta C(h^{(m+1)}, t^{(m+1)}, \rho^{(m+1)}; k_{m+1}) &= v^{(\tilde{m})}(0) \frac{4^{d_R-1}}{(\rho_0^{(m+1)})^{d_R}} \left(\frac{h_1^{(m+1)}}{\rho_1^{(m+1)}} \right)^{d_F} \\ &= 4^{d_R} v^{(\tilde{m})}(0) \frac{4^{d_R-1}}{(\rho_0^{(m)})^{d_R}} \left(\frac{h_1^{(m)}}{\rho_1^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F} = 4^{d_R} \Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

At the same time, for all $m \in [\tilde{m}, \infty)$, we have $i_{m+1} = i_m$ and a computation that is similar to the one above yields that

$$\Delta C(h^{(m+1)}, t^{(m+1)}, \rho^{(m+1)}; i_{m+1}) \leq 4^{d_R} \Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m). \quad (37)$$

Equations (36) and (37) imply that

$$\frac{\Delta C(h^{(m+1)}, t^{(m+1)}, \rho^{(m+1)}; k_{m+1})}{\Delta C(h^{(m+1)}, t^{(m+1)}, \rho^{(m+1)}; i_{m+1})} \geq \frac{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m)}{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m)} \quad \forall m \in [\tilde{m}, \infty),$$

and hence, by recursion, that

$$\frac{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m)}{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m)} \geq \frac{\Delta C(h^{(\tilde{m})}, t^{(\tilde{m})}, \rho^{(\tilde{m})}; k_{\tilde{m}})}{\Delta C(h^{(\tilde{m})}, t^{(\tilde{m})}, \rho^{(\tilde{m})}; i_{\tilde{m}})} > 0, \quad \forall m \in [\tilde{m}, \infty),$$

contradicting equation (34). This means that \mathbb{N}' must be infinite.

Now we claim that the set

$$\mathbb{N}'' := \{m \in \mathbb{N}' : h_{k_m}^{(m)} = \min_{j \in [1, n_m]} h_j^{(m)}\}$$

is infinite. Otherwise, we take $\tilde{m} := \max(\mathbb{N}'' \cup \min(\mathbb{N}')) + 1$ and find that

$$h_{k_m}^{(m)} > \min_{j \in [1, n_m]} h_j^{(m)} \quad \forall m \in [\tilde{m}, \infty) \cap \mathbb{N}'. \quad (38)$$

We assert by induction that this implies

$$\min_{j \in [1, n_m]} h_j^{(m)} = \min_{j \in [1, n_{\tilde{m}}]} h_j^{(\tilde{m})} \quad \forall m \in [\tilde{m}, \infty). \quad (39)$$

The statement is clearly true for $m = \tilde{m}$. Now assume that it holds for some $m \in [\tilde{m}, \infty)$. If $m \in \mathbb{N}'$, then it follows from (38) and (17) that

$$h_{k_m}^{(m)} \geq 2 \min_{j \in [1, n_m]} h_j^{(m)}.$$

In view of (14), this implies (39) with $m + 1$. If $m \notin \mathbb{N}'$, then $k_m = 0$, and (14) implies (39) with $m + 1$ directly. All in all, statement (39) is verified.

However, statement (39) contradicts statement (26) of Lemma 4.5. Hence the set \mathbb{N}'' is indeed infinite.

Step 3: The results of steps 1 and 2 lead to a contradiction.

For every $m \in \mathbb{N}''$, we have $k_m \neq 0$, and hence equations (18) and (23) provide

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m) &\geq V_L \left(\frac{2h_{k_m}^{(m)}}{\rho_{k_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_{k_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_R} \\ &= \frac{2^{d_R} V_L}{(LP)^{d_F + d_R}} \frac{1}{(h_{k_m}^{(m)})^{d_F + 2d_R}}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Similarly, since $i_m \neq 0$ and $h_{k_m}^{(m)} = \min_{j \in [1, n_m]} h_j^{(m)}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}''$, equation (23) and Lemma 4.3 imply for all $m \in \mathbb{N}''$ the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m) \\ & \leq V_U \begin{cases} \left(\frac{2h_{i_m}^{(m)}}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_R} \\ \quad + \left(\frac{2^{d_F-1}}{(2LP)^{d_R} (h_{i_m-1}^{(m)})^{2d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_{i_m}^{(m)}}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F}, & i_m = n, \\ \left(\frac{2h_{i_m}^{(m)}}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_R} \\ \quad + \left(\frac{4^{d_R-1}}{(\rho_{i_m}^{(m)})^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2LP h_{i_m+1}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F} \\ \quad + \left(\frac{2^{d_F-1}}{(2LP)^{d_R} (h_{i_m-1}^{(m)})^{2d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_{i_m}^{(m)}}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and hence that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m) \\ & \leq V_U \left(\frac{2h_{i_m}^{(m)}}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_R} + V_U \left(\frac{4^{d_R-1}}{(\rho_{i_m}^{(m)})^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2LP h_{k_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F} \\ & \quad + V_U \left(\frac{2^{d_F-1}}{(2LP)^{d_R} (h_{k_m}^{(m)})^{2d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_{i_m}^{(m)}}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Inequality (41) provides that for every $m \in \mathbb{N}''$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m) \left(h_{k_m}^{(m)} \right)^{d_F+2d_R} \\ & \leq V_U \left(\frac{2h_{i_m}^{(m)}}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_R} \left(h_{k_m}^{(m)} \right)^{d_F+2d_R} \\ & \quad + V_U \left(\frac{4^{d_R-1}}{(\rho_{i_m}^{(m)})^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2LP} \right)^{d_F} \left(h_{k_m}^{(m)} \right)^{2d_R} \\ & \quad + V_U \left(\frac{2^{d_F-1}}{(2LP)^{d_R}} \right) \left(\frac{h_{i_m}^{(m)}}{\rho_{i_m}^{(m)}} \right)^{d_F} \left(h_{k_m}^{(m)} \right)^{d_F}, \end{aligned}$$

and so, using equations (32) and (33), and noting that $h_{k_m}^{(m)} \leq T$ for all

$m \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain that for every $m \in \mathbb{N}''$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m) \left(h_{k_m}^{(m)}\right)^{d_F+2d_R} \\ & \leq V_U \left(\frac{2h_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)}}{\rho_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)}}\right)^{d_F} \left(\frac{4}{\rho_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)}}\right)^{d_R} T^{d_F+2d_R} + V_U \left(\frac{4^{d_R}-1}{(\rho_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)})^{d_R}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2LP}\right)^{d_F} T^{2d_R} \\ & \quad + V_U \left(\frac{2^{d_F}-1}{(2LP)^{d_R}}\right) \left(\frac{h_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)}}{\rho_{i_{m_0}}^{(m_0)}}\right)^{d_F} T^{d_F}, \end{aligned}$$

which is constant. Combining the above statement with inequality (40), we find that, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}''$,

$$\frac{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; k_m)}{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m)} \geq \frac{\frac{2^{d_R} V_L}{(LP)^{d_F+d_R}}}{\Delta C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}; i_m) \left(h_{k_m}^{(m)}\right)^{d_F+2d_R}} > 0.$$

This contradicts equation (34), and so (31) holds. □

5 Numerical results

We compare the performance of our Algorithm 2 with generic parameters $\varepsilon_0, \dots, \varepsilon_{\ell_{\max}}$ with the previous standard Algorithm 1 in two examples. We measure the quality of a numerical solution in terms of the a priori error bound (5) and the complexity of Algorithms 1 and 2 in terms of the number of grid points computed, see (7) and (8). The time taken by Algorithm 2 to determine discretizations is negligible, see Table 1.

We first provide a detailed study of a simple model problem.

Example 5.1. Let $T = 1$ and $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and consider the differential inclusion in \mathbb{R}^d given by

$$\dot{x}_i \in [0.9, 1.0]Lx_i \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad x(0) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^d}. \quad (42)$$

The exact reachable sets are

$$R^F(t) = [\exp(0.9Lt), \exp(Lt)]^d, \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad (43)$$

and we have $d_F = d_R = d$ and $P = Le^L$.

In the following, we examine the qualitative behavior of Algorithms 1 and 2 when applied to system (42) with

$$d = 2, \quad L = 4, \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon = 4. \quad (44)$$

Note that $\|R^F(1)\| = \exp(4) \approx 54$, so $\varepsilon = 4$ corresponds to roughly a 7% relative error.

Table 1 shows how the time taken by Algorithm 2 is distributed. The time taken for the refinement of discretizations is negligible, and the vast majority of the complexity is caused by the computation of the final reachable sets returned to the user.

The discretizations of the reachable sets returned by Algorithms 1 and 2 are shown in Figure 1. Algorithm 1 chooses a uniform discretization by default, while the step-sizes h_j of Algorithm 2 increase with j in recognition of the sizes of the reachable sets and the way the terms \mathcal{E}_j from (6) contribute to the global error E .

Figure 2 shows the effect of the uniform discretization of Algorithm 1 and the adaptive discretization of Algorithm 2 on the cumulative normalized error (dashed line) and cost (solid line) of Algorithms 1 and 2 given by

$$[\sigma_E(h, t, \rho)]_i := \frac{1}{E(h, t, \rho)} \sum_{j=0}^i \mathcal{E}_j(h, t, \rho), \quad i = 0, \dots, n_m, \quad (45)$$

$$[\sigma_C(h, t, \rho)]_i := \frac{1}{\hat{C}(h, t, \rho)} \sum_{j=0}^i \hat{C}_j(h, t, \rho), \quad i = 0, \dots, n_m. \quad (46)$$

Algorithm 1 has a significant disparity between the local increase in error and the work invested, while Algorithm 2 achieves a much better balance.

From now on, we test Algorithms 1 and 2 on inclusion (42) with several different combinations of parameters.

Table 2 shows the performance of Algorithms 1 and 2 when applied to inclusion (42) with Lipschitz constants $L = 1, 2, 3, 4$, dimensions $d = 1, 2$, and several different error tolerances $\varepsilon > 0$. Algorithm 2 outperforms Algorithm 1 drastically, as expected. The differences become more pronounced for larger L and d .

In Figure 3, we plot the relative error

$$\delta_C(h, t, \rho) := \frac{1}{\hat{C}(h, t, \rho)} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left| C_j(h, t, \rho) - \hat{C}_j(h, t, \rho) \right| \quad (47)$$

ℓ	11	12	13	14	15
ε_ℓ	6.4E1	3.2E1	1.6E1	8.0E0	4.0E0
time [s] for reachable set computation (lines 5-17)	4.4E-1	2.7E0	7.0E1	2.8E3	2.4E5
time [s] for refinement of discretization (lines 19-26)	7.0E-4	1.4E-3	4.3E-3	1.4E-2	8.0E-2

Table 1: Time to run Algorithm 2 for system (42) with parameters (44) and $\ell_{\max} = 15$ split based on use.




Figure 1: Step-sizes for system (42) with parameters (44). Discretization produced by Algorithm 1 shown in the dashed line, and Algorithm 2 in the solid line.




Figure 2: Cumulative contributions σ_E (dashed line) and σ_C (solid line) from (45) and (46) for system (42) with parameters (44).

L=1	ϵ	2.50E-1	1.25E-1	6.25E-2	3.13E-2	1.56E-2
d=1	Alg1	5.8E3	8.3E4	1.2E6	2.0E7	3.1E8
	Alg2	1.7E3	1.9E4	2.5E5	3.6E6	5.4E7
d=2	Alg1	2.7E6	2.8E8	3.3E10	4.1E12	5.1E14
	Alg2	1.1E5	6.2E6	5.5E8	5.7E10	6.6E12

L=2	ϵ	2.00E0	1.00E0	5.00E-1	2.50E-1	1.25E-1
d=1	Alg1	1.8E6	2.9E7	4.7E8	7.6E9	1.2E11
	Alg2	4.1E3	5.0E4	6.1E5	8.7E6	1.3E8
d=2	Alg1	1.7E11	2.3E13	3.1E15	4.0E17	5.1E19
	Alg2	2.5E5	1.7E7	1.4E9	1.4E11	1.5E13

L=3	ϵ	1.60E1	8.00E0	4.00E0	2.00E0	1.00E0
d=1	Alg1	9.4E7	1.6E9	2.6E10	4.3E11	6.9E12
	Alg2	2.6E3	2.9E4	3.3E5	4.2E6	5.8E7
d=2	Alg1	4.2E14	6.1E16	8.4E18	1.1E21	1.5E23
	Alg2	1.5E5	3.9E6	2.8E8	2.3E10	2.2E12

L=4	ϵ	6.40E1	3.20E1	1.60E1	8.00E0	4.00E0
d=1	Alg1	3.8E10	6.4E11	1.0E13	1.7E14	2.7E15
	Alg2	1.2E4	1.1E5	1.2E6	1.5E7	2.1E8
d=2	Alg1	3.5E19	4.9E21	6.6E23	8.7E25	1.1E28
	Alg2	6.6E5	2.8E7	1.7E9	1.3E11	1.3E13

Table 2: Number of grid points computed by Algorithms 1 and 2 to achieve error tolerance (5) when applied to system (42). The high complexity of Algorithm 1 forced us to infer the values in the cells coloured in red using a workaround.

of the estimator C from (11) and (12) against the error bound E from equation (5) for every experiment with Algorithm 2 in Table 2. Every curve represents one experiment with $L \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and every data point represents one execution of lines 5-17 of Algorithm 2. We see that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \delta_C(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} E(h^{(m)}, t^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}) = 0,$$

which confirms that the estimator C is designed appropriately.




Figure 3: Relative error δ_C from (47) plotted against error E from (5) when Algorithm 2 is applied to system (42). Values for $L = 1, 2, 3, 4$ marked using circles, squares, triangles and diamonds, respectively.

Now we consider a more complex control system from biochemistry.

Example 5.2. We consider the reduced Michaelis-Menten system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= -k_1 e_0 x_1 + (k_1 x_1 + k_{-1}) x_2, \\ \dot{x}_2 &\in k_1 e_0 x_1 - (k_1 x_1 + k_{-1} + [k_2^-, k_2^+]) x_2 \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

with dimensions $d_R = 2$ and $d_F = 1$, with parameters $e_0 = 0.6$, $k_{-1} = 0.05$ and $k_1 = 0.5$, with an uncertainty specified by the parameters $k_2^- = 1.8$ and $k_2^+ = 2.0$, and with initial conditions $x_1(0) = 0.75$ and $x_2(0) = 0.25$ on the time-interval $[0, 1]$. In the relevant region, we have $L \leq 3.0$ and $P \leq 0.61$.

We examine Algorithms 1 and 2 when applied to system (48) with error tolerance $\varepsilon = 2^{-7}$.

Figure 4 shows the evolution of the approximate reachable sets generated by Algorithm 2. The sets, progressing from the top right corner to the bottom left corner of the figure, are snapshots of the reachable set taken at times $t \in \{\frac{j}{16} : 0 \leq j \leq 16\}$.




Figure 4: Reachable sets generated by Algorithm 2 applied to system (48) with $\varepsilon_{\ell_{max}} = 2^{-7}$. Resolution adjusted for printing purposes.




Figure 5: Stepsizes for system (48) with $\varepsilon = 2^{-7}$. Discretization produced by Algorithm 1 shown in the dashed line, and Algorithm 2 in the solid line.




Figure 6: Cumulative contributions σ_E (dashed line) and σ_C (solid line) from (45) and (46) for system (48) with $\varepsilon = 2^{-7}$.

ε	1.25E-1	6.25E-2	3.13E-2	1.56E-2	7.81E-3
Algorithm 1	7.8E5	3.3E7	1.9E9	1.1E11	7.0E12
Algorithm 2	9.6E4	4.8E6	1.6E8	8.4E9	4.6E11

Table 3: Number of grid points computed by Algorithms 1 and 2 to achieve error tolerance ε for system (48).

Figures 5 and 6 are the equivalents of Figures 1 and 2 from Example 5.1. The differences between Algorithms 1 and 2 are not as pronounced as in Example 5.1, because the reachable sets do not vary as much in size.

Table 3 shows the performance of Algorithms 1 and 2 when applied to system (48) for varying error tolerance ε . Again, Algorithm 2 is more efficient, but the speedup is less pronounced than in Example 5.1.

References

- [1] T. Alamo, J.M. Bravo, and E.F. Camacho. Guaranteed state estimation by zonotopes. *Automatica J. IFAC*, 41(6):1035–1043, 2005.
- [2] M. Althoff, O. Stursberg, and M. Buss. Reachability analysis of nonlinear systems with uncertain parameters using conservative linearization. In *Proceedings of the 47th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 4042–4048. IEEE, 2008.
- [3] M. Althoff, O. Stursberg, and M. Buss. Computing reachable sets of hybrid systems using a combination of zonotopes and polytopes. *Nonlinear Anal. Hybrid Syst.*, 4(2):233–249, 2010.
- [4] J.-P. Aubin and A. Cellina. *Differential inclusions*, volume 264. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 1984.
- [5] R. Baier. Mengenwertige Integration und die diskrete Approximation erreichbarer Mengen [set-valued integration and the discrete approximation of attainable sets]. *Bayreuth. Math. Schr.*, (50), 1995. Dissertation, Universität Bayreuth, Bayreuth, 1995.
- [6] R. Baier, C. Büskens, I.A. Chahma, and M. Gerds. Approximation of reachable sets by direct solution methods for optimal control problems. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, 22(3):433–452, 2007.

- [7] R. Baier, I.A. Chahma, and F. Lempio. Stability and convergence of Euler’s method for state-constrained differential inclusions. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 18(3):1004–1026, 2007.
- [8] R. Baier, M. Gerdts, and I. Xausa. Approximation of reachable sets using optimal control algorithms. *Numer. Algebra Control Optim.*, 3(3):519–548, 2013.
- [9] W.-J. Beyn and J. Rieger. Numerical fixed grid methods for differential inclusions. *Computing*, 81(1):91–106, 2007.
- [10] W.-J. Beyn and J. Rieger. The implicit euler scheme for one-sided lipschitz differential inclusions. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 14(2):409–428, 2010.
- [11] R.M. Colombo, T. Lorenz, and N. Pogodaev. On the modeling of moving populations through set evolution equations. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(1):73–98, 2015.
- [12] R.M. Colombo and N. Pogodaev. On the control of moving sets: positive and negative confinement results. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 51(1):380–401, 2013.
- [13] T. Donchev and E. Farkhi. Stability and Euler approximation of one-sided Lipschitz differential inclusions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 36(2):780–796, 1998.
- [14] A.L. Dontchev and E. Farkhi. Error estimates for discretized differential inclusions. *Computing*, 41(4):349–358, 1989.
- [15] M. Gerdts and I. Xausa. Avoidance trajectories using reachable sets and parametric sensitivity analysis. In *System modeling and optimization*, volume 391 of *IFIP Adv. Inf. Commun. Technol.*, pages 491–500. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [16] A. Girard, C. Le Guernic, and O. Maler. Efficient computation of reachable sets of linear time-invariant systems with inputs. In *Hybrid systems: computation and control*, volume 3927 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 257–271. Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [17] E. Goubault and S. Putot. Robust under-approximations and application to reachability of non-linear control systems with disturbances. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 4(4):928–933, 2020.

- [18] N. Kochdumper and M. Althoff. Sparse polynomial zonotopes: a novel set representation for reachability analysis. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 66(9):4043–4058, 2021.
- [19] V.A. Komarov and K.È. Pevchikh. A method for the approximation of attainability sets of differential inclusions with given accuracy. *Zh. Vychisl. Mat. i Mat. Fiz.*, 31(1):153–157, 1991.
- [20] E. Lakatos and M.P.H Stumpf. Control mechanisms for stochastic biochemical systems via computation of reachable sets. *R. Soc. open sci.*, 4(8):160790, 2017.
- [21] Y. Meng, Z. Qiu, M.T.B. Waez, and C. Fan. Case studies for computing density of reachable states for safe autonomous motion planning. In *NASA Formal Methods: 14th International Symposium, NFM 2022, Pasadena, CA, USA, May 24–27, 2022, Proceedings*, pages 251–271. Springer, 2022.
- [22] B.S. Mordukhovich and Y. Tian. Implicit Euler approximation and optimization of one-sided Lipschitzian differential inclusions. In *Nonlinear analysis and optimization*, volume 659 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 165–188. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2016.
- [23] F. Parise, M.E. Valcher, and J. Lygeros. Computing the projected reachable set of stochastic biochemical reaction networks modeled by switched affine systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 63(11):3719–3734, 2018.
- [24] W. Riedl, R. Baier, and M. Gerdts. Optimization-based subdivision algorithm for reachable sets. *J. Comput. Dyn.*, 8(1):99–130, 2021.
- [25] J. Rieger. Semi-implicit euler schemes for ordinary differential inclusions. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 52(2):895–914, 2014.
- [26] J. Rieger. Robust boundary tracking for reachable sets of nonlinear differential inclusions. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 15(5):1129–1150, 2015.
- [27] J. Rieger. The Euler scheme for state constrained ordinary differential inclusions. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 21(8):2729–2744, 2016.
- [28] M. Rungger and M. Zamani. Accurate reachability analysis of uncertain nonlinear systems. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on hybrid systems: Computation and control (part of CPS week)*, pages 61–70, 2018.

- [29] M. Sandberg. Convergence of the forward euler method for non-convex differential inclusions. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 47(1):308–320, 2008.
- [30] M. Serry and G. Reissig. Overapproximating reachable tubes of linear time-varying systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 67(1):443–450, 2022.
- [31] L. Shao, F. Zhao, and Y. Cong. Approximation of convex bodies by multiple objective optimization and an application in reachable sets. *Optimization*, 67(6):783–796, 2018.
- [32] G.V. Smirnov. *Introduction to the theory of differential inclusions*, volume 41 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [33] V. Veliov. Discrete approximations of integrals of multivalued mappings. *C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci.*, 42(12):51–54, 1989.
- [34] V. Veliov. Second order discrete approximations to strongly convex differential inclusions. *Systems Control Lett.*, 13(3):263–269, 1989.
- [35] V. Veliov. On the time-discretization of control systems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 35(5), 1997.