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Abstract. The paper studies the dynamics near periodic orbits in dynamical systems with relays (switches) that switch only after a fixed delay. As a motivating application, we study the problem of stabilizing an unstable equilibrium by feedback control in the presence of a delay in the control loop. We show that saddle-type equilibria can be stabilized to a periodic orbit by a switch even if this switch is subject to an arbitrarily large delay. This is in contrast to linear static feedback control, which fails when the delay is larger than a problem-dependent critical value. Our analysis is based on the reduction of the return map near a generic periodic orbit to a finite-dimensional map. This map is smooth if the periodic orbit satisfies two genericity conditions. A violation of any of these two conditions causes a discontinuity-induced bifurcation of the periodic orbit. We derive asymptotic formulas for the piecewise smooth return map for each of these two codimension-one bifurcations. This analysis shows that the introduction of a small delay into the switching decision can induce chaos in a relay system that had a single stable periodic orbit without delay. This small-delay behaviour is fundamentally different from smooth dynamical systems.

AMS classification scheme numbers: 37G15, 34K18, 34K35

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with dynamical systems with delayed relays. Relay systems follow two different smooth vector fields in two different regions of their physical space. Specifically, we consider the effects of a time delay in the decision when to switch from one vector field to the other. As an initial motivation let us consider the problem of stabilizing an unstable equilibrium by feedback in the presence of delay in the feedback loop, which is a typical situation in applications. For example, a controlled inverted (massless and frictionless) pendulum on a cart, as shown in figure 1, is governed by the equation

\[ \ddot{\theta} = \sin \theta + F \cos \theta. \]

(1)

In (1), the dependent variable \( \theta \) is the inclination angle of the pendulum. The force \( F \) is applied as a feedback to the cart with the goal of stabilizing the unstable upright position \( \theta = 0 \); see figure 1. Time has been rescaled to units of \( \sqrt{2L/(3g)} \) in (1) where \( L \) is the length of the pendulum and \( g \) describes the gravitational acceleration. This implies that a fixed reaction time in the application of the feedback force \( F(\theta, \dot{\theta}) \) gives a delay \( \tau \) in the arguments of \( F \) which increases for decreasing \( L \). The inverted pendulum is a prototype for balancing tasks in robotics and biomechanics [1, 2], and
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Figure 1. Sketch of the setup for the controlled inverted pendulum on a cart.

a textbook example in control theory [3] and the study of delay effects [4]. Let us consider the following question:

**Problem 1 (Balancing)** Given a potentially large delay $\tau > 0$. Find a function $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the feedback law $F(\theta(t-\tau), \dot{\theta}(t-\tau))$ inserted into (1) is able to stabilize the upright position $\theta = 0$.

For linear $F$ this is impossible as soon as the delay $\tau$ exceeds a certain critical value $\tau_c$. The critical delay $\tau_c = \sqrt{2}$ is derived in the textbook [4] for the classical PD control law $F(\theta(t-\tau), \dot{\theta}(t-\tau)) = -a\theta(t-\tau) - b\dot{\theta}(t-\tau)$. The works [5, 6] have found critical delays also for other specific linear control laws. Reference [7] presents a complete stabilisability analysis for two-dimensional linear systems with static feedback subject to time-delay, giving the critical delay in dependence of all relevant system parameters. The references [8, 9] include small oscillations and other nonlinear phenomena, which occur for delays close the critical value, into their study. A conclusion of [6] is that, even if one accepts small stable oscillations around the upright position as successful balancing, the restriction on the delay cannot be relaxed substantially beyond the critical value obtained from the linear theory.

In order to overcome this fundamental restriction, we consider a relay switch in (1) of the form

$$F = -\varepsilon \text{sgn}[g(\theta(t-\tau), \dot{\theta}(t-\tau))]$$

(2)

where $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth or piecewise affine function dividing $\mathbb{R}^2$ into two simple domains $G_1 = \{g < 0\}$ and $G_2 = \{g \geq 0\}$. A feedback of the form (2) can never stabilize the equilibrium $\theta = 0$ perfectly but will, at best, admit small stable oscillations that switch back and forth between $F = \varepsilon$ and $F = -\varepsilon$ [10]. If we accept small oscillations as successful balancing then we can indeed construct a stabilizing feedback $F$ of the form (2) for any given delay $\tau$, thus, removing any restriction on the delay. In section 5 we will give a geometric illustration how to construct the switching function $g$ for a given delay $\tau$ for the inverted pendulum (1) and prove the following general result:

**Theorem 2 (Existence of stable periodic orbits)** Let $\dot{x} = f(x, u(x))$, where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, be a smooth system which has a saddle equilibrium $x_0$ for $u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ identically $0$. Given an arbitrarily large delay $\tau > 0$. If the pair $(\partial_x f(x_0, 0), \partial_u f(x_0, 0))$ is controllable then there exists a smooth function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\dot{x} = f(x, \varepsilon \text{sgn}[g(x(t-\tau))])$$

has a stable periodic orbit arbitrarily close to $x_0$ for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. 
The only condition on \((\partial_x f(x_0,0), \partial_u f(x_0,0))\), apart from the saddle type of \(x_0\), is controllability (which is a genericity condition), which is obviously necessary. The key point of Theorem 2 is that controllability is also sufficient.

A crucial ingredient in the proof of Theorem 2 is a precise description of the dynamics near periodic orbits of a general \(n\)-dimensional system of differential equations of the form

\[
\dot{x}(t) = \begin{cases} f_1(x(t)) & \text{if } g(x(t - \tau)) < 0 \\ f_2(x(t)) & \text{if } g(x(t - \tau)) \geq 0 \end{cases} \tag{3}
\]

where \(\tau > 0\) is the delay in the switching decision. The presence of the delay in (3) gives rise to an infinite-dimensional phase space, the space of continuous functions on the history interval \([-\tau, 0]\). However, if a periodic orbit \(\tilde{x}(\cdot)\) of (3) switches only finitely often per period and satisfies two genericity conditions then the dynamics of (3) near \(\tilde{x}(\cdot)\) is described by a smooth finite-dimensional local return map. In short, the genericity conditions are that

(i) all intersections of the periodic orbit \(\tilde{x}(\cdot)\) with the switching manifold \(\{g = 0\}\) are transversal, and

(ii) along the periodic orbit \(\tilde{x}(\cdot)\) none of the delayed switching events coincides with a crossing of the switching manifold \(\{g = 0\}\) (that is, if \(g(\tilde{x}(s)) = 0\) then \(g(\tilde{x}(s + \tau)) \neq 0\) for all \(s \in \mathbb{R}\)).

We will derive a precise relation between the dimension of the image of the return map and the location of the switching times of the orbit \(\tilde{x}(\cdot)\). In particular, this dimension is \(n - 1\) (where \(n\) is the dimension of the physical space of (3)) if all switching times along \(\tilde{x}(\cdot)\) are separated by more than the delay time \(\tau\). This kind of the periodic orbits is called slowly oscillating. The finite-dimensionality of the local return maps of periodic orbits is in contrast to the situation in smooth delay differential equations (DDEs) where periodic orbits typically have infinitely many non-zero Floquet multipliers [11].

The second main result of the paper gives a complete description of possible discontinuity-induced bifurcations of codimension one for a slowly oscillating periodic orbit \(\tilde{x}(\cdot)\). Each of these bifurcations corresponds to a violation of one of the genericity conditions (i) and (ii). Violation of condition (i) implies generically that \(\tilde{x}\) grazes (touches) the switching manifold \(\{g = 0\}\) quadratically. This induces a return map for \(\tilde{x}\) that is asymptotically linear on one side of the grazing manifold and square-root like on the other side. This square-root asymptotics implies that the introduction of a small delay into the switching decision of a relay system can change the dynamics drastically. In particular, it can introduce chaos into a system that, without delay, has a stable periodic orbit as its only attractor. This small-delay limit behaviour is fundamentally different from the case of smooth DDEs and will be illustrated with a more detailed example in section 6.3. The violation of condition (ii) corresponds to a corner collision and gives rise to a piecewise asymptotically linear return map near the colliding periodic orbit \(\tilde{x}\). This reduction to piecewise smooth finite-dimensional maps links the local bifurcation theory of periodic orbits in delayed relay systems to the well-established results of the bifurcation theory for piecewise smooth maps [12, 13, 14, 15].

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines how the results of this paper relate to previous and recent studies on the dynamics of piecewise smooth ordinary and delay differential equations, and how the result of Theorem 2 relates to common delay compensation techniques in control theory and engineering. Section 3 revisits some
common notation for the definition of the forward evolution of DDEs, also pointing out
the differences to the case of smooth DDEs. Section 4 shows under which conditions
the local return map of a periodic orbit reduces to a finite dimensional smooth map.
Section 5 first shows how one can construct a switching law $g$ in (2) that gives rise to
a stable periodic orbit for the inverted pendulum in the presence of an arbitrary delay.
This construction reveals already the main ideas of the proof for the general result
in Theorem 2. The section also lists the main differences between the illustrating
example and the general $n$-dimensional case. The detailed proof of Theorem 2 can be
found in Appendix C. Section 6 studies the two codimension-one bifurcations of slowly
oscillating periodic orbits, stating secondary non-degeneracy conditions and deriving
asymptotic expressions for the return maps. The sections 4, 5 and 6, which contain
technical material and general theoretical results, include also simple but instructive
examples illustrating the main concepts and ideas. More technical parts of the proofs
for statements in the sections 4, 5 and 6 are given in separate appendices.

2. Background

Piecewise smooth dynamical systems model many problems in control engineering
[16, 17], in mechanics (for example in systems with dry friction [18] or impacts [19]),
in electrical systems with switches [20], or in biological systems with threshold effects
[21]. In these situations one observes an evolution that is governed by different smooth
vector fields in different regions of the phase space, which are separated by switching
manifolds. These hybrid systems are an attractive subject of study as they can
generate complex dynamics even if all of the vector fields and switching manifolds
are simple enough (for example linear) to study them analytically. Moreover, they
show phenomena such as chaotic attractors robustly, which are often non-hyperbolic
and, thus, extremely subtle, in smooth maps and vector fields. This feature allows one
to ‘engineer’ particular dynamics such as chaos [15]. In control theory piecewise linear
systems are used to approximate nonlinear systems to understand the global dynamics
and guarantee global stability [16]. See [13] for a survey on the active development of
general bifurcation theory for piecewise smooth dynamical systems.

Whenever the non-smoothness of the dynamical system is induced by the
implementation of a switch one can expect that the actual switch is subject to a delay,
giving rise to delayed relay models such as (3). In applications this delay is often
artificially increased (or hysteresis is introduced) since otherwise so-called ‘sliding’
along the switching manifold can occur, which would involve are large number of
switchings in a short time interval [17].

The works [10, 22] studied one-dimensional prototype examples of the form
\[ \dot{x} = \kappa x - \text{sgn}(x(t - \tau)), \quad (\kappa > 0), \quad (4) \]
and found that this type of system typically admits periodic orbits that switch back
and forth between the two vector fields. Moreover, they have classified all possible
dynamics of system (4) completely and also studied its behaviour with respect to
perturbations, including periodic forcing. The references [23, 24, 25] have studied other
simple piecewise linear systems (typically with a two-dimensional physical space). In
contrast to the studies of (4) these investigations have found a huge variety of different
dynamics such as chaos [25] or a complex network of periodic orbits [23, 24]. The
different regimes are connected by grazing or collision events that show similarities to
those in impacting or dry-friction systems [13]. However, even the behaviour of simple prototype systems such as studied in [23, 24, 25] is far from classified completely.

In this paper we adopt a different approach. We consider a general system of form (3) and assume that it has a periodic orbit \( \tilde{x}(t) \) \(( t \in [-p, 0])\) that has a finite number of switchings between the vector fields. Then we study the dynamics near this periodic orbit and its bifurcations. In this way the results of our paper will be more general than studies of specific classes of examples such as [10, 23, 24, 25] but all statements are valid only locally. The consideration of only two vector fields in (3) is not really a restriction when one studies the local dynamics near a particular periodic orbit.

A further motivation for the study of the general system (3) is its connection with smooth delay differential equations (DDEs) with steep nonlinearities. Often one can start from (3) as a limiting case where the existence of stable periodic orbits is easy to prove and then deduce the persistence of these orbits for smooth DDEs close to (3) [26]. Reference [23] also continued periodic orbits of (3) approximately by standard numerical software for smooth DDEs after ‘smoothing’ the discontinuity in (3). The limit turns out to be well-behaved if the periodic orbit is not close to one of the bifurcations discussed in section 6.

Finally, let us put Problem 1 and Theorem 2 into perspective compared to classical delay compensation techniques in control theory and engineering. The studies [5, 7, 6, 4] and Theorem 2 restrict to static feedback. That is, the feedback law (for example \( F \) in (1)) is only a function of a single instance of the delayed state. Classical delay compensation techniques that can cope with an arbitrarily large delay rely on dynamic feedback where the feedback depends on a predictor, obtained by a real-time solution of a functional equation (see, for example, [27, 28]). The fact that the basin of attraction of the periodic orbit in Theorem 2 will, in general, be exponentially small for large delay \( \tau \) is only formally a difference to classical dynamic feedback schemes. Even though methods based on functional predictors can be globally asymptotically stable on the linear level, they have exponentially large transients if the initial condition is not already exponentially close to the equilibrium. See also [29] for a survey on implementation problems of functional predictors and how to overcome them. In the case of small delays polynomial forward prediction, such as used in substructuring [30, 31] in civil and mechanical engineering, is often successful and easier to implement in real-time.

3. Fundamental properties of delayed relay systems — definition of forward evolution

We define a delayed relay system as a dynamical system governed by a differential equation of the form (3) where \( \tau > 0 \), and \( f_1, f_2 : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \) are Lipschitz continuous. We assume that the switching function \( g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is a piecewise smooth Lipschitz continuous function. Furthermore, we assume that the gradient \( g'(x) \) is non-zero whenever it exists and \( g(x) \) is zero. These assumptions on \( g \) imply that the set \{ \( x : g(x) = 0 \) \} constitutes a piecewise smooth \((n-1)\)-dimensional submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^n \), which we call the switching manifold.

We denote the \( n \)-dimensional flow corresponding by \( f_j \) \(( j = 1, 2) \) by \( \Phi_j \). That is, the time-\( t \) map generated by \( \dot{x} = f_j(x) \) is \( \Phi_j(t; \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \).

When solving differential equations where the right-hand-side depends also on the state in the past one typically has to keep track of the solution history along the
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trajectory [11]. Thus, the natural phase space, also for a system of the form (3), is the space $C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ of continuous functions on the closed interval $[-\tau, 0]$. This section is concerned with the definition of the forward evolution $E(t; \cdot)$ for (3), which maps an initial value $x_0 \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ to its time-$T$ image $E(T; x_0) \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$.

In the case of a single delayed argument with a fixed delay $\tau$ as in (3) an intuitive way to define $E(T; x_0)$ is the method of steps [11, 32]: treat the past $x_0(t) \ (t \in [-\tau, 0])$ as an inhomogeneity, solve the ensuing ordinary differential equation (ODE) for all times up to $\tau$, and then shift the history and repeat the process.

For example, consider an initial history segment $x_0 \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ that intersects the switching manifold only finitely many times, that is, $g(x_0(t - \tau)) = 0$ only for $t = t_1, \ldots, t_\mu \in [0, \tau]$. This divides the interval $[0, \tau]$ into $\mu + 1$ subintervals $I_k$:

$$I_0 = (0, t_1], \quad I_k = (t_k, t_{k+1}] \text{ for } k = 1, \ldots, \mu - 1, \quad I_\mu = (t_\mu, \tau].$$

The forward evolution will follow one of the flows $\Phi_{j_k}$ ($j_k = 1$ or 2 for $k = 0, \ldots, \mu$) in each subinterval $I_k$. Thus, we can define the curve $x(t)$ for $t \in [0, \tau]$ recursively by

$$x(t) = \Phi_{j_k}(t; x_0(0)) \quad \text{for } t \in I_0,$$

$$x(t) = \Phi_{j_k}(t - t_k; x(t_k)) \quad \text{for } t \in I_k, \ k = 1, \ldots, \mu - 1,$$

$$x(t) = \Phi_{j_\mu}(t - t_\mu; x(t_\mu)) \quad \text{for } t \in I_\mu.$$ (5)

For any $t$ in the interior of any of the intervals $I_k$ the point $x(t)$ satisfies the differential equation (3) with the history $x_0$. Thus, the forward evolution $E(T; x_0) \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ for $T \in [0, \tau]$ is defined by

$$E(T; x_0)(t) = \begin{cases} x(t + T) & \text{if } t \in (-T, 0] \\ x_0(t + T) & \text{if } t \in [-\tau, T]. \end{cases}$$ (6)

For times $T > \tau$ we define $E(T; \cdot)$ as a concatenation of time steps smaller than $\tau$, for example $E(T; \cdot) := E(T/(k + 1); \cdot) \circ \ldots \circ E(T/(k + 1); \cdot)$ when $T \in [k\tau, (k + 1)\tau)$. This definition is independent of the particular partition of the interval $(0, T)$.

Recursion (5) reveals that the evolution $E(\cdot, x_0)$ does not depend on the complete shape of $x_0 \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ but only on the position of $x_0(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (the headpoint of $x_0$) and the finitely many switching times $t_1 - \tau, \ldots, t_\mu - \tau$ in the interval $[-\tau, 0]$. This suggests that the dynamics of delayed relay systems such as (3) is governed by only finitely many coordinates despite the infinite-dimensionality of the underlying phase space. This is generically the case near periodic orbits with only finitely many intersections of the switching manifold, which are discussed in section 4. The construction also shows that delayed relays cannot induce ‘sliding’, which is common in non-delayed systems of the form (3) (that is, if $\tau = 0$ in (3)).

The above construction of $E(\cdot, x_0)$ assumes that $x_0$ intersects the switching manifold only finitely many times within $[-\tau, 0]$. For many elements of $C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ this is not the case. For general $x_0 \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ we define the curve $x(t)$ as the solution $x \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ of the variation-of-constants formula corresponding to DDE (3)

$$x(t) = x_0(0) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t f_1(x(s)) \left[ 1 - \text{sgn}(x_0(s - \tau)) \right] ds + f_2(x(s)) \left[ 1 + \text{sgn}(x_0(s - \tau)) \right] ds.$$ (7)

In (7) we use the convention that $\text{sgn}0 = 1$. Equation (7) has a unique solution $x \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $x(0) = x_0(0)$ due to the Lipschitz continuity of $f_1$ and $f_2$. 
and the measurability of sgn\(g(x_0(t))\). In general, the points \(x(t)\) satisfy the differential equation (3) for \(t\) in the open and dense subset of \((0,T)\)

\[
\{ t \in (0, T) : g(x_0(t - \tau)) < 0 \} \cup \text{int} \{ t \in (0, T) : g(x_0(t - \tau)) \geq 0 \}.
\]

For general \(x_0\) we use the solution \(x(t)\) of (7) instead of the simple recursion (5) in the definition (6) of \(E(T; x_0)\).

We observe that the evolution \(E(T; x_0)\) depends continuously on \(T\) but, in general, it does not depend continuously on \(x_0\). In fact, arbitrarily close to any \(x_0 \in C([\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)\) that intersects \(\{ g = 0 \}\) at least once (say, in \(s_1 \in (-\tau, 0)\)) we find a \(x_\varepsilon \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)\) which has \(g(x_\varepsilon(s)) = 0\) for all \(s \in (s_1 - \varepsilon, s_1 + \varepsilon)\). In general, we cannot expect that \(E(T; x_\varepsilon)\) is continuous in its second argument in \(x_\varepsilon\). Thus, \(E\) is not a semiflow in the classical sense of [33].

4. Behaviour near generic relay periodic orbits

Although equation (3) does not define a semiflow we can often understand the dynamics generated by (3) near periodic orbits by studying smooth finite-dimensional maps. This section will explain in detail how this reduction near periodic orbits works in the simplest (but generic) case.

4.1. Illustration — linearized inverted pendulum

Let us consider the example of the inverted pendulum from the introduction to illustrate how the infinite-dimensional semiflow simplifies to a low-dimensional map close to a periodic orbit. Inserting the relay feedback (2) into the differential equation governing the controlled inverted pendulum leads to a system of form (3). In the consideration of small periodic orbits close to the upright position the nonlinearities in (1) can be regarded as small perturbations. If \(\varepsilon \ll 1\) and after rescaling \((\theta, \dot{\theta}) = (\varepsilon x_1, \varepsilon x_2)\) the nonlinear equation (1) with (2) is a perturbation of order \(O(\varepsilon^2)\) of

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1(t) &= x_2(t) \\
\dot{x}_2(t) &= x_1(t) - \text{sgn}[g(x_1(t - \tau), x_2(t - \tau))].
\end{align*}
\]

(7)

Any structurally stable periodic orbit found in (7) will persist under small perturbations, and, thus, exist in the nonlinear system (1) for sufficiently small \(\varepsilon\). This reduction of a piecewise smooth system to the piecewise linear system (7) is an expression of the general fact that many key features of piecewise smooth dynamical systems can already be found in piecewise linear systems [13] where they simply persist under the perturbation caused by a small nonlinearity. The two flows \(\Phi_1\) and \(\Phi_2\) can be computed analytically for (7), giving rise to the affine maps

\[
\Phi_1(t; v) = A(t)v - v_0(t), \quad \Phi_2(t; v) = A(t)v + v_0(t)
\]

where

\[
A(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \cosh(t) & \sinh(t) \\ \sinh(t) & \cosh(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad v_0(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \cosh(t) \\ -\sinh(t) \end{bmatrix}.
\]

Let us choose, for illustration, a linear switching function \(g\) of slope \(\alpha\), namely

\[
g(x_1, x_2) = x_1 \cos \alpha + x_2 \sin \alpha, \quad \alpha \in (0, \pi/2),
\]

and consider a delay \(\tau < \log(1 + \tan \alpha)\). Figure 2 shows a sketch of the situation. The flows \(\Phi_1\) (dashed) and \(\Phi_2\) (dotted) are superimposed in the plane \(\mathbb{R}^2\). The flow
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\[ G_1^\tau = \Phi_1(\tau; \{g = 0\}) \]

\[ G_2^\tau = \Phi_2(\tau; \{g = 0\}) \]

\( l_1^\tau, l_2^\tau \)

\( (0, 1) \)

\( (1, 0) \)

\( (-1, 0) \)

\( (0, -1) \)

**Figure 2.** Sketch of the dynamics near a periodic orbit of the linearized inverted pendulum. The flows \( \Phi_1 \) (dashed) and \( \Phi_2 \) (dotted) are superimposed in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). The periodic orbit is the bold closed curve with corners the \( C_1 \) and \( C_1 \). The return map to this orbit is a 1D map from \( G_1^\tau \) back to itself.

\( \Phi_1 \) has a saddle equilibrium at \((-1, 0)\), the flow \( \Phi_2 \) has a saddle at \((1, 0)\). The stable \((l_1^\tau, l_2^\tau)\) and unstable \((l_1^\nu, l_2^\nu)\) subspaces of both flows form a square, which is sketched in figure 2. We denote the \( \Phi_1(\tau; \cdot) \)-image of \( \{g = 0\} \) by \( G_1^\tau \) and its intersection point with the axis \( x_1 = 0 \) by \( C_1 \). Correspondingly, the \( \Phi_2(\tau; \cdot) \)-image of \( \{g = 0\} \) is denoted by \( G_2^\tau \) and its intersection point with the axis \( x_1 = 0 \) by \( C_2 \). The points \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are mirror images of each other \( (C_2 = -C_1) \). If \( \tau < \log(1 + \tan \alpha) \) they are also mapped onto each other by the flows. That is, \( C_2 = \Phi_2(p/2; C_1), C_1 = \Phi_2(p/2; C_2) \) where

\[
p = 2 \left[ \tau + \log \left( \frac{e^\tau \tan \alpha + 1 - e^{-\tau}}{\tan \alpha + 1 - e^{-\tau}} \right) \right]. \tag{8}
\]

This implies that the closed curve \( W = \Phi_1([0, p/2]; C_2) \cup \Phi_2([0, p/2]; C_1) \) is the graph of a periodic orbit of (7). Moreover, the dynamics near \( W \) are given by the return map to the line \( G_1^\tau \), which is a one-dimensional map. Any initial value \( x \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^2) \) that is sufficiently close to \( \Phi_1([-\tau, 0]; C_1) \) will, after time \( \tau \), follow \( \Phi_2 \). Thus, the next switching to \( \Phi_1 \) will invariably be located on the time-\( \tau \) image of \( \{g = 0\} \) under \( \Phi_2 \), which is \( G_2^\tau \). From now on the trajectory will always follow \( \Phi_1 \) to \( G_1^\tau \) and \( \Phi_2 \) to \( G_2^\tau \), reducing the evolution of (7) to a smooth one-dimensional map from \( G_1^\tau \) back to itself. This map is nonlinear if \( \alpha \neq \pi/4 \) even though both flows and \( g \) are linear.

The facts that make this reduction possible are that

(i) the switchings of \( W \) (\( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \)) have a positive distance from \( \{g = 0\} \),
(ii) the intersections of \( W \) with \( \{g = 0\} \) are transversal,
(iii) the time between successive crossings of the switching manifold is larger than the delay \( \tau \).
The first two conditions are genericity conditions. Their violations correspond to discontinuity induced bifurcation, which are discussed in section 6. Periodic orbits that satisfy the last conditions are called slowly oscillating.

We observe that the same curve \( W \) is the graph of a periodic orbit also if the delay \( \tau \) in (7) is replaced by a delay of size \( \tau + kp \) where \( k \) is a positive integer and \( p \) is the period of \( W \) given in (8). Then all time differences between successive crossings of the switching manifold \( \{ g = 0 \} \) are smaller than the switching delay. Thus, \( W \) for delay \( \tau + kp \) with \( k \geq 1 \) would be a rapidly oscillating periodic orbit. A general lemma expressing the return map will be developed in the following section. It also applies to rapidly oscillating orbits and gives for the pendulum case a dimension of \( 1 + 2k \) for the return map.

4.2. Return map for periodic orbits in the general case

Suppose that the evolution of (3) has a periodic orbit \( W \) of period \( p \). We can assume that \( p \geq \tau \) without loss of generality because we do not require \( p \) to be the minimal period. We denote the elements of \( W \) by \( \tilde{x}_s \), where \( \tilde{x}_t = E(t; \tilde{x}_0) \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \) for \( t \in [0, p] \) and \( \tilde{x}_p = \tilde{x}_0 \), and denote the corresponding trajectory of headpoints \( \tilde{x}_k(0) \) by \( \tilde{x}(t) \). The closed curve \( \tilde{x}([-p, 0]) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) comprises the graph of the periodic orbit in the physical space \( \mathbb{R}^n \). The function \( \tilde{x}(\cdot) \) can be extended to the whole real axis due to the periodicity of \( W \). In the following paragraphs we formulate three fundamental assumptions on \( f_1, f_2, g \) and \( \tilde{x} \). If \( f_1, f_2 \) and \( g \) are at least piecewise smooth functions then these conditions (3, 5, and 6) are genericity conditions on the periodic orbit.

**Condition 3 (finitely many intersections with switching manifold)**

We assume that the graph \( \tilde{x}([-p, 0]) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) of the periodic orbit \( W \) intersects the switching manifold in at most finitely many points. That is, \( g(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)) = 0 \) for at most finitely many times \( \tilde{s}_k \) \( (k = 1, \ldots , m) \) in \( (-p, 0) \).

Then, \( \tilde{x}([-p, 0]) \) is composed of \( m + 1 \) curves following either \( \Phi_1 \) or \( \Phi_2 \) with switching (or touching) times \( \tilde{t}_k = [(\tilde{s}_k + \tau) \mod p] - p \). We can assume without loss of generality that the intersection times \( \tilde{s}_k \) and the switching times \( \tilde{t}_k \) lie in the open interval \( (-p, 0) \) for \( k = 1, \ldots , m \). The trajectory \( t \rightarrow \tilde{x}(t) \) is differentiable for all \( t \in [-p, 0] \) except possibly in \( \tilde{t}_k \) \( (k = 1, \ldots , m) \).

The following lemma states that the evolution \( E \) is continuous with respect to initial conditions in all points of the periodic orbit \( W \) in the topology of the Banach space \( C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \). As pointed out in section 3 this continuity statement is rather subtle. If \( \tilde{x}(\cdot) \), the graph of \( W \), has at least one intersection with the switching manifold, and \( f_1 \neq f_2 \) in this intersection, we cannot find a whole open neighborhood of \( W \) where \( E(t; x) \) is continuous with respect to \( x \).

**Lemma 4 (Continuity of evolution in periodic orbits)**

Let \( t_0 \in \mathbb{R}, T > 0 \) be arbitrary, and \( \tilde{x}_{t_0} \) be an element of a periodic orbit with finitely many intersections of the switching manifold. Then, \( E(T; x) \) is continuous with respect to \( x \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \) in the point \( x = \tilde{x}_{t_0} \). Moreover, this continuity is uniform in \( T \) for \( T \) in any finite interval \( [0, T_0] \).

Lemma 4 exploits the fact all \( x \) close to \( \tilde{x}_{t_0} \) in \( C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) \)-topology follow the same flow as \( \tilde{x} \) outside of small neighborhoods of the finitely many time points \( t_1, \ldots , t_m, t_1 + p, \ldots , t_m + p, \ldots \) Thus, the proof of continuity for all \( T > 0 \) relies strongly on the periodicity of \( \tilde{x}(\cdot) \). The complete proof is included as Appendix Appendix A.
Due to the continuity stated in Lemma 3, it makes sense to define a local return map, or Poincaré map, for the periodic orbit $W$. It is defined as the map induced by the first return to a hyperplane in the phase space transversal to the periodic orbit. For simplicity of notation we restrict in all further considerations to return maps to hyperplanes defined by a condition on the headpoint $z(0)$ of a function $z \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $l_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector of length 1 such that $l_0^T \tilde{x}(0) > 0$. The trajectory $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ is differentiable in $t = 0$ because all switching times $\tilde{t}_k$ are different from 0. The Poincaré map is defined as the local return map from the hyperplane

$$\mathcal{H} := \{z \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n) : l_0^T [z(0) - \tilde{x}(0)] = 0\}$$

(9)

to itself. Locally, this is a well-defined map in the following sense.

There exist small open neighborhoods $U_0 \subset U_1 \subset C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ of $\tilde{x}_0$ and $(T_1, T_2) \subset \mathbb{R}$ of $p$ such that $E(p; U_0) \subset U_1$ and such that, for all $z \in U_0 \cap U_0$, there exists a unique first time of return $T(z) \in (T_1, T_2)$ to the set $U_1 \cap \mathcal{H}$. That is, $l_0^T [E(T(z); z) - \tilde{x}(0)] = 0$ for all $z \in U_0$. The return time $T(z)$ is continuous in the point $z = \tilde{x}_0$. Hence, the Poincaré map $P : U_0 \cap \mathcal{H} \to U_1 \cap \mathcal{H}$ defined by

$$Pz := E(T(z); z)$$

is continuous in $z = \tilde{x}_0$, too. Let us denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the domain of definition of $P$, the local Poincaré section $U_0 \cap \mathcal{H}$.

Let $L \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-1)}$ be such that the augmented matrix $[l_0 L] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is orthogonal. Thus, $l_0^T L v = 0$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. The headpoints of elements of the local Poincaré section $\mathcal{S}$ all have the form $\tilde{x}(0) + L v$ where $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is small.

The following two assumptions on the periodic orbit $\tilde{x}$ and the switching function $g$ will allow us to reduce the Poincaré map $P$ to a smooth finite-dimensional map.

**Condition 5 (Smoothness in intersection points)**

We assume that $g(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_k)) \neq 0$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, m$.

Condition 5 implies that the two sets of points $\{\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_1), \ldots, \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_m)\}$ (where $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ intersects the switching manifold) and $\{\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_1), \ldots, \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_m)\}$ (the corners of $\tilde{x}$, where $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ actually switches) are disjoint. Furthermore, it implies that $\tilde{x}$ is differentiable in its intersections with the switching manifold at the times $\tilde{s}_k$ ($k = 1, \ldots, m$). Thus, $\tilde{x}$ follows either $\Phi_1$ or $\Phi_2$ in $\tilde{s}_k$.

**Condition 6 (Transversality of all intersections)**

For all $k = 1, \ldots, m$ holds: The function $g$ is differentiable in the vicinity of $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)$, and $g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)) \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k) \neq 0$. More precisely, if $\tilde{x}$ follows $\Phi_j$ in $\tilde{s}_k$ then $g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)) f_j(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)) \neq 0$.

Condition 6 asserts that the switching manifold $\{g = 0\}$ is differentiable whenever it intersects the periodic orbit $\tilde{x}$. Moreover, Condition 6 asserts that the orbit $\tilde{x}$ intersects the switching manifold transversally in all its intersection points $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)$ ($k = 1, \ldots, m$). Consequently, the number of switching times, $m$, must be even. We can assume that $\tilde{x}$ follows $\Phi_1$ in $t = 0$ without loss of generality.

To fix notation, we number the intersection and switching times such that, for some $\mu \in \{0, \ldots, m\}$,

$$-\tau < \tilde{t}_1 < \ldots < \tilde{t}_\mu < 0,$$

$$-p < \tilde{t}_{\mu+1} < \ldots < \tilde{t}_m < -\tau$$

(10)

with, correspondingly, $\tilde{s}_k = \lfloor (\tilde{t}_k - \tau) \mod p \rfloor - p$. Thus, $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ has the form

$$\tilde{x}(t) = \begin{cases} 
\Phi_1(t; \tilde{x}(0)) & \text{if } t \in [\tilde{t}_\mu, 0], \\
\Phi_2(t + \tilde{t}_k; \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_k)) & \text{if } t \in [\tilde{t}_{k-1}, \tilde{t}_k) \text{ and } \mu - k \text{ is even}, \\
\Phi_1(t + \tilde{t}_k; \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_k)) & \text{if } t \in [\tilde{t}_{k-1}, \tilde{t}_k) \text{ and } \mu - k \text{ is odd}, \\
\Phi_1(t + \tilde{t}_1; \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_1)) & \text{if } t \in [-p, \tilde{t}_{\mu+1}] 
\end{cases}$$

(11)
for \( k \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \). Lemma 7 below states that the dynamics of the local Poincaré map \( P : S \to S \) is attracted by a finite-dimensional local invariant manifold \( \mathcal{M} \) after finite time. Moreover, the local manifold \( \mathcal{M} \) can be parametrized by tuples \((v, t_1, \ldots, t_\mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1+\mu} \) where each of the \( \mu \) numbers \( t_k \) is close to \( \tilde{t}_k \) and the vector \( v \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \) is small. The number \( \mu \) equals the number of switchings of the periodic orbit in the interval \([−τ, 0)\) (see (10)). In the formulation of the lemma we use the notation that a set \( \mathcal{M} \) is invariant under \( P \) relative to a set \( \mathcal{N} \) if any trajectory starting in \( \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N} \) stays in \( \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N} \) under iterations of \( P \) as long as it stays in \( \mathcal{N} \).

**Lemma 7** There exists an open neighborhood \( \mathcal{N} \) of \( \tilde{x}_0 \) in the local Poincaré section \( S \) that is mapped by \( P^2 = P \circ P \) into a local manifold \( \mathcal{M} \subset S \) of dimension \( \mathbb{R}^{n-1+\mu} \) where \( \mu \) is defined by (10). The local manifold \( \mathcal{M} \) is invariant under \( P \) relative to \( \mathcal{N} \). Moreover, \( \mathcal{M} \) can be parametrized by a small open ball \( \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1+\mu} \) around \((0, \tilde{t}_1, \ldots, \tilde{t}_\mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^\mu \). The parametrization of \( \mathcal{M} \)

\[
\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{M} : (v, t_1, \ldots, t_\mu) \in \mathcal{B} \to z \in C([−τ, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)
\]

is defined recursively by

\[
z(t) = \begin{cases} 
\Phi_1(t; \tilde{x}(0) + Lv) & \text{if } t \in [t_\mu, 0], \\
\Phi_2(t - t_{k+1}; z(t_{k+1})) & \text{if } t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}] \text{ and } \mu - k \text{ is even}, \\
\Phi_1(t - t_{k+1}; z(t_{k+1})) & \text{if } t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}] \text{ and } \mu - k \text{ is odd}.
\end{cases}
\]

We note that the manifold \( \mathcal{M} \) and even the number \( \mu \) defining the dimension of \( \mathcal{M} \) may depend on the choice of the hyperplane of the Poincaré section \( \mathcal{H} \). The proof, which appears in full in Appendix Appendix B, is based on the fact that any initial condition sufficiently close to \( \tilde{x}_0 \) will also always intersect \( \{g = 0\} \) transversally after one iteration of \( P \). This gives rise to parametrization (13) in the second iteration of \( P \). Description (13) of \( \mathcal{M} \) expresses that, for elements \( z \) of \( \mathcal{M} \), we have to store only the location \( v \) of the headpoint \((z(0) = \tilde{x}(0) + Lv) \) and the switching times within \((−τ, 0)\), of which we have exactly \( \mu \) if we are sufficiently close to the periodic orbit \( \tilde{x} \).

Furthermore, \( \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{M} \) induces a map \( P_0 \) on \( \mathcal{B} \) defined by \( \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{M} P_0 y = P \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{M}(y) \). If \( \mathcal{B} \) is sufficiently small all intersections of the headpoint trajectory \( E(t; \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{M}(y))(0) \) with the switching manifold are still transversal for all \( y \in \mathcal{B} \). Thus, \( P_0 \) is differentiable and the smoothness of \( P_0 \) is only limited by the smoothness of the switching function \( g \) and the flows \( \Phi_j \). Hence, if \( f_j \) and \( g \) are differentiable to a higher degree then \( P_0 \) is as well.

### 4.3. Poincaré map \( P_0 \) for slowly oscillating orbits

For slowly oscillating periodic orbits the manifold \( \mathcal{M} \) simplifies to the local manifold in \( \mathbb{R}^n \)

\[
G_0 := \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \tilde{t}_0^D z - \tilde{x}(0) = 0 \} \cap U(\tilde{x}(0)),
\]

where we denote by \( U(\xi) \) a sufficiently small neighborhood of a point \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \). The intersection times \( \tilde{s}_k \) are separated by more than the delay time \( \tau \). This means that, without loss of generality, we can order the switching times as

\[
-p \leq \tilde{s}_1 < \tilde{t}_1 = \tilde{s}_1 + \tau < \tilde{s}_2 < \tilde{t}_2 = \tilde{s}_2 + \tau < \ldots < \tilde{s}_m < \tilde{t}_m = \tilde{s}_m + \tau < 0.
\]
Introducing the local switching manifolds (that is, local neighborhoods of $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_j)$ within the switching manifold $\{g = 0\}$ and their time-$\tau$ images (in the same way as for the pendulum in section 4.1 and figure 2)

$$G_j := \{g = 0\} \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_j)) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, m$$

$$G^\tau_j := \Phi_1(\tau; G_j) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 3, \ldots, m - 1 \text{ (odd)},$$

$$G^\tau_j := \Phi_2(\tau; G_j) \quad \text{for } j = 2, \ldots, m \text{ (even)},$$

we can express the map $P_0$ corresponding to the Poincaré map as a map from $G_0$ back to itself by the concatenation of maps

$$P_0 : x \in G_0 \xrightarrow{\Phi_1} G_1 \xrightarrow{\Phi_2} G^\tau_2 \xrightarrow{\Phi_2} G_2 \xrightarrow{\Phi_1} \cdots \xrightarrow{\Phi_2} G^\tau_m \xrightarrow{\Phi_1} G_0. \quad (15)$$

The symbol $G^\tau_k \xrightarrow{\Phi_j} G_{k+1}$ is defined as the map from a submanifold $G^\tau_k$ to a submanifold $G_{k+1}$ obtained by following the flow $\Phi_j$. All maps in (15) are well defined and smooth because the intersection of the flow $\Phi_j$ with the target manifold is always transversal due to Condition 6. For slowly oscillating orbits the reduction of the Poincaré map to $P_0$ is a well-established fact that has been used extensively in many studies of delayed relay systems, for example, in [23, 24, 25].

We remark that the map $P_0$ will, in general, be nonlinear, even if the local switching manifolds $G_j$ and the flows $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2$ are affine, because the maps $G^\tau_j \xrightarrow{\Phi_j} G_{j+1}$ are nonlinear.

Furthermore, we remark that rapidly oscillating solutions (periodic orbits with $\mu > 0$ for all choices of Poincaré sections) can also occur as stable periodic orbits of a delayed relay system. Some of the periodic orbits found in [23, 24] have this structure. The rapidly oscillating orbits in the linearized pendulum discussed in section 4.1 are, however, all dynamically unstable [34].

5. Existence of stable periodic orbits for arbitrarily large delay

Let us come back to Problem 1 formulated in the introduction and the resulting general Theorem 2. By choosing a suitable $g$, we can create a periodic orbit resembling any closed curve in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that, alternatingly, follows either $\Phi_1$ or $\Phi_2$ for a time longer than $\tau$. This orbit will be slowly oscillating. Thus, its dynamical stability will be determined by the concatenation of $(n-1)$-dimensional maps of the form (15). Hence, we can achieve the dynamic stability of the periodic orbit by ‘tilting’ the local switching manifolds such that their time-$\tau$ images are tangential to a desired hyperplanes.

5.1. Stabilization of the inverted pendulum

We first illustrate the main idea behind our construction of the desired switching function $g$ for the inverted pendulum example. As mentioned in section 4.1, it is sufficient to find a function $g$, dividing $\mathbb{R}^2$ into two simple domains, such that the piecewise affine equation (7) has a stable periodic orbit for a given $\tau > 0$. More precisely, it is sufficient to construct the two domains, $D_1$ for the flow $\Phi_1$ and $D_2$ for the flow $\Phi_2$, and the piecewise affine boundary $G$ separating them. A piecewise affine function $g$ can always be chosen such that $\text{cl}D_2 = \{g(x_1, x_2) \leq 0\}$ and $\text{cl}D_2 = \{g(x_1, x_2) \geq 0\}$.

Figure 3 illustrates the following construction. First, we find a closed curve that consists of two segments, one following $\Phi_1$, one following $\Phi_2$, both for a time longer...
than \( \tau \). Such a curve exists: the periodic orbit \( W \) found in section 4.1 is of this type if the points \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are sufficiently close \((0, \pm 1)\), respectively. Let \( h \in (0, 1/2) \) be such that

\[
e^{-\tau} \in (h^{-1} - 1, h^{-1}).
\]

If we choose \( C_1 = (0, 2e^\tau h - 1)^T \) and \( C_2 = (0, 1 - 2e^\tau h) \) then \( \Phi_1(2\tau - \log(1 - h^{-1}); C_2) = C_1 \) and \( \Phi_2(2\tau - \log(1 - h^{-1}); C_1) = C_2 \). The traveling time \( 2\tau - \log(1 - h^{-1}) \) is larger than \( \tau \) by construction of \( h \). Next, we find the boundary \( G \) such that this curve

\[
W = \Phi_1([0, 2\tau - \log(1 - h^{-1})]; C_2) \cup \Phi_2([0, 2\tau - \log(1 - h^{-1})]; C_1)
\]

is a stable periodic orbit of (7). The local delayed switching manifolds have to contain the corners: \( C_1 \in G_1^\tau \) and \( C_2 \in G_2^\tau \). If \( G_1^\tau = C_1 + s\partial_1\Phi_2(0; C_1) \) where \( s \in (-\delta, \delta) \) then \( G_1^\tau \) is tangent to the outgoing flow \( \Phi_2 \) in \( C_1 \). At the same time \( G_1^\tau \) is transversal to the incoming flow \( \Phi_1 \) in \( C_1 \). Thus, the image of \( G_1^\tau \) under \( \Phi_1(-\tau; \cdot) \) is an affine line segment \( G_1 \) intersecting \( W \) transversally within the (dashed) segment \( \Phi_1([0, 2\tau - \log(1 - h^{-1})]; C_2) \) of the curve \( W \). The corresponding local manifolds for \( C_2 \) are \( G_2^\tau = -G_1^\tau \) and \( G_2 = -G_1 \). Since \( W \) does not self_intersect we can connect \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) by a segment \( G_* \) and extend \( G_1 \cup G_* \cup G_2 \) to a global piecewise affine manifold \( G \) which generates the periodic orbit \( W \).

**Lemma 8** The periodic orbit \( W \) defined by (17) is stable.

**Proof:** As demonstrated in section 4.1, the Poincaré map \( P \) for the periodic orbit \( W \) can be reduced to a one-dimensional return map \( P_0 \) from \( G_1^\tau \) to itself, defined by following \( \Phi_1 \) to \( G_2^\tau \) and then \( \Phi_1 \) back to \( G_1^\tau \). Let \( p_0 = C_1 + s\partial_1\Phi_2(0; C_1) \) be a point in

---

**Figure 3.** Construction of a piecewise affine switching line \( G = G_1 \cup G_* \cup G_2 \) and the stable periodic orbit \( C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow C_1 \). For large delays \( \tau \), the lines \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) will be close to \( l_1^s \) and \( l_2^s \), respectively.
parameters, for example, of $\tau$. That is, it is robust with respect to small nonlinearities or small perturbations of the simple unbounded domain is called $\tau$ since (16) gives effectively a condition on $x$.

A linearization of $P$ where

$\dot{x} = Ax - vsgn(g(x(t - \tau)))$ close to an equilibrium $x_0 = f(x,0)$ to a piecewise affine system

$\dot{x} = Ax - vsgn(g(x(t - \tau)))$ (18)

where $A = \partial_x f(x_0)$ and the dependent variable $x$ has been rescaled by $x \mapsto \varepsilon^{-1}(x-x_0)$.

Any stable periodic orbit $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ found in (18) has a corresponding stable periodic orbit $x_0 + \varepsilon(\tilde{x}(\cdot) - x_0)$ in the nonlinear system for sufficiently small $\varepsilon$.

The pair $(A,v)$ is called controllable if $(v, Av, \ldots, A^{n-1}v)$ has full rank $n$. An unbounded domain is called simple if its closure is homeomorphic to a half-space, say $\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n : z_1 \geq 0 \}$. We call a periodic orbit $W$ quadratically stable if

(i) it has a Poincaré map $P$ which has a fixed point corresponding to $W$ and is two times differentiable on $rg P^2$ in a neighborhood of its fixed point, and

(ii) the linearization of the Poincaré map in this fixed point is zero.

With these notations and arguments we can formulate Theorem 9 which implies Theorem 2.

**Theorem 9** Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$ be a matrix that has eigenvalues with positive real part and eigenvalues with negative real part but no eigenvalues on the imaginary axis. Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that the pair $(A,v)$ is controllable. Let $\tau > 0$ be arbitrary. Then there exists a piecewise affine function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n : g(z) = 0 \}$ is a piecewise affine manifold that splits $\mathbb{R}^n$ into two simple domains and such that the differential equation

$\dot{x}(t) = A [x(t) - vsgn[g(x(t - \tau))]]$ (19)
has a quadratically stable periodic orbit.

The spectral properties of $A$ imply that, without the relay ($v = 0$), the origin is an equilibrium of saddle type. Moreover, they imply that the statement of Theorem 9 is equivalent to the corresponding statement for system (18) because $(A, v)$ is controllable if and only if $(A, A^{-1}v)$ is controllable.

The main difference between the $n$-dimensional case of Theorem 9 and the construction of $W$ and $G$ in section 5.1 is that the choice of $G^r_j$ tangential to the outgoing flow eliminates only one dimension of the linearization. Thus, each switching at one of the delayed switching manifolds $G^s_j$ acts as a projection with a one-dimensional kernel on the linearization of $P_0$. This means that we have to find a closed curve consisting of at least $n$ segments, alternating between $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2$, in the $n$-dimensional case. Subsequently, we have to verify that

(i) we can connect the local switching manifolds to a global manifold, and
(ii) we can choose the projections induced by the switchings such that their concatenation cancels out all components of the linearization.

The existence of an appropriate closed curve and point (i) follow from the saddle property of $A$, which implies that all trajectories that spend a long time near the origin approximately follow first the stable and then the unstable subspace of $A$. The second point is implied by the controllability required in Theorem 9. The detailed proof of Therem 9 is given in Appendix C.

6. Discontinuity-induced bifurcations

This section discusses what happens generically to the dynamics near relay periodic orbits that violate one of the transversality requirements Condition 5 and Condition 6. To simplify our presentation we restrict in this section to the practically most relevant case of slowly oscillating periodic orbits. We assume that the general delayed relay system (3) depends on a parameter $\lambda$ where the dependence of $f_1$, $f_2$, $g$ and $\tau$ on $\lambda$ is smooth:

$$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{cases} f_1(x(t), \lambda) & \text{if } g(x(t-\tau(\lambda)), \lambda) < 0, \\ f_2(x(t), \lambda) & \text{if } g(x(t-\tau(\lambda)), \lambda) \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Moreover, we assume that, for $\lambda < 0$, (20) has a slowly oscillating periodic orbit $\tilde{x}(\cdot, \lambda)$ of uniformly bounded period $p(\lambda)$, which satisfies the transversality conditions 5 and 6. section 6.1 investigates the case of $\tilde{x}(\cdot, 0)$ violating Condition 5, section 6.2 studies the case of $\tilde{x}(\cdot, 0)$ violating Condition 6. This study treats (20) and the periodic orbit only at the parameter $\lambda = 0$. Thus, we can drop the parameter $\lambda$, which is always 0, from our notation in the remainder of the section.

6.1. Corner collision

The graph $\tilde{x}([-p, 0])$ of the periodic orbit is a continuous piecewise smooth curve in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The violation of Condition 5 means that one of the corners (switching points) of the curve $\tilde{x}([-p, 0])$ lies in the switching manifold $\{g = 0\}$. That is, at $\lambda = 0$ there are two times $\tilde{s}_1$ and $\tilde{s}_2$ such that

$$\tilde{s}_1 + \tau = \tilde{s}_2, \quad g(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_1)) = 0, \quad g(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) = 0, \quad (21)$$
which violates Condition 5. The fact that $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ is slowly oscillating for parameters $\lambda < 0$ implies that $\tilde{s}_1$ is the only intersection point of $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ with $\{g = 0\}$ in the interval $[\tilde{s}_1 - \tau, \tilde{s}_2]$. Thus, $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ follows exactly one flow in the time interval $[\tilde{s}_1, \tilde{s}_2]$ (say, $\Phi_1$ without loss of generality).

We assume that $\tilde{x}$ satisfies the following two secondary non-degeneracy conditions:

**Condition 10 (secondary genericity conditions for corner collision)**

(a) Both vector fields intersect the switching manifold transversally in $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$. That is, $g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))f_1(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \neq 0$, and $g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))f_2(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \neq 0$

(b) The local delayed switching manifold $G^c_1 = \Phi_1(\tau; \{g = 0\}) \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))$ and the local switching manifold $G_2 = \{g = 0\} \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))$ are not tangent to each other in $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$. That is, $\partial_x\Phi_1(\tau; \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_1))g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_1))T$ and $g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))^T$ are linearly independent.

Let us choose as Poincaré section $S$ the set of all $z \in C([−\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ with headpoint $z(0) \in G^c_1$. This is an admissible choice since $G^c_1$ intersects the incoming flow $\Phi_1$ transversally.

Condition 10(b) implies that $G^c_1$ and $G_2$ intersect each other in the smooth local manifold $G^c_1 \cap G_2$ of codimension 2, which contains $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$. This intersection divides $G^c_1$ into two parts, $F_- := G^c_1 \cap \{g < 0\}$ and $F_+ = G^c_1 \cap \{g \geq 0\}$.

The following lemma states that the return map for $\tilde{x}$ can still be expressed as an $(n-1)$-dimensional return map $P_0$ to $G^c_1$ but that $P_0$ is only piecewise smooth with, in general, different derivatives in $F_-$ and $F_+$.

**Lemma 11 (Return map for corner collision)** The image of the local return map $P$ of the periodic orbit $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ is contained in a $(n-1)$-dimensional manifold that can be parametrized by the elements of $G^c_1$. On $G^c_1$, $P$ is described by a piecewise smooth $(n-1)$-dimensional map $P_0$ which is smooth in $F_+$ and $F_-$. More precisely, there exist linear maps $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that the local return map $P_0$ has the form

$$P_0(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x) = \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + \begin{cases} A_1x & \text{if } \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x \in F_-, \\ A_2x & \text{if } \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x \in F_+ \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

for all sufficiently small $x \in G^c_1 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$.

The first statement of Lemma 11 follows from the fact that all elements of $S$ have an image under $P$ of the form $\Phi_1([−\tau, 0]; z_0)$ where $z_0 \in G^c_1$. The piecewise linear asymptotics of $P_0$ comes, roughly speaking, from the fact that a trajectory through $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x \in F_+$ spends a different time in $\{g \geq 0\}$ than a trajectory through $F_-$. This time difference is asymptotically linear in $x$.

The precise dependence of $A_1$ and $A_2$ on the right-hand-side is described in Appendix D. There are three distinct cases (shown in a piecewise affine example in Figure 4), giving rise to different expressions for $A_1$ and $A_2$:

(a) $g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))f_1(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \cdot g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))f_2(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) > 0$, shown in figure 4(a). This case corresponds to the situation where the periodic orbit $\tilde{x}$ intersects the switching manifold $\{g = 0\}$ transversally in $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$ in the sense that all convex combinations $f_c = cf_1(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) + (1 - c)f_2(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))$ ($0 \leq c \leq 1$) of the two tangent vectors at the corner satisfy $g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))f_c \neq 0$. That is, $f_c$ points through the switching manifold for all $c \in [0, 1]$. Figure 4(a) illustrates this configuration where the periodic orbit intersects $\{g = 0\}$ at $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$. 
The dynamics of piecewise asymptotically linear maps have been studied in [12, 13], also classifying possible bifurcations when the parameter \( \lambda \) unfolds the degeneracy transversally. Thus, Lemma 11 links the study of the infinite-dimensional delayed relay system to the bifurcation theory of piecewise smooth asymptotically linear finite-dimensional maps.

### 6.2. Tangential grazing

The violation of Condition 6 means that there exists a moment \( s_\epsilon \) when the periodic orbit grazes (touches) the switching manifold \( \{ g = 0 \} \) tangentially, that is, \( g(\tilde{x}(s_\epsilon)) = 0 \) but also \( g'(\tilde{x}(s_\epsilon))\tilde{x}'(s_\epsilon) = 0 \). Let us denote the transversal switching times along \( \tilde{x} \) by \( \tilde{s}_j \) \( (j = 1, \ldots, m \text{ where } m \text{ is even}) \). Moreover, we assume that \( \tilde{x}(\cdot) \) satisfies the
following secondary non-degeneracy conditions:

**Condition 12** (secondary genericity conditions for tangential grazing)

(a) The orbit $\tilde{x}$ is quadratically tangent to the switching manifold $\{g = 0\}$ in $s_*$, and not to a higher order. That is,

$$q := \frac{1}{2} \left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} g(\tilde{x}(t)) \right|_{t=s_*} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ g'(\tilde{x}(s_*)) \tilde{x}(s_*) + g''(\tilde{x}(s_*)) [\tilde{x}(s_*)]^2 \right] \neq 0.$$

(b) The moment when the tangency is noticed along the orbit $\tilde{x}$ does not coincide with another crossing of the switching manifold. That is, $g(\tilde{x}(t_*)) \neq 0$ where $t_* = s_* + \tau$.

(c) The grazing does not coincide with a simultaneous violation of Condition 5 (a corner collision). That is, $g(\tilde{x}(s_* - \tau)) \neq 0$. Hence, $s_* \neq \tilde{t}_j$ ($j = 1, \ldots, m$) where $\tilde{t}_j = \check{s}_j + \tau$.

The periodic orbit $\tilde{x}$ is slowly oscillating for parameter $\lambda < 0$. Thus, $s_*$ lies in an interval $[a, b]$ which is longer than the delay $\tau$ (that is, $b - a > \tau$) where $\tilde{x}$ follows one flow. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $x([a, b])$ follows $\Phi_1$. We choose as Poincaré section $S$ the set of all $x \in C([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ with headpoint $z(0) \in G$ where $G$ is a hyperplane intersecting $\tilde{x}$ transversally at time $t_0 = (a + b + \tau)/2$. The following lemma describes the local return map $P$ to the Poincaré section $S$ to leading order.

**Lemma 13 (Return map for tangential grazing)** The image of the local return map $P$ to the Poincaré section $S$ is contained in a $(n - 1)$-dimensional manifold that can be parametrized by the elements of the affine hyperplane

$$F_0 := \{ x : \tilde{x}(s_*)^T [x - \tilde{x}(s_*)] = 0 \}.$$

On $F_0$, $P$ is described by a piecewise smooth $(n - 1)$-dimensional map $P_0 : F_0 \mapsto F_0$. There exists a smooth function $m : U(\tilde{x}(s_*)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that the map $P_0$ is smooth in $F_+ = F_0 \cap \{ x : m(x) > 0 \}$ and $F_- = F_0 \cap \{ x : m(x) < 0 \}$. For small $x \in F_0 - \tilde{x}(s_*)$ the map $P_0$ has the form

$$P_0(\tilde{x}(s_*) + x) = \tilde{x}(s_*) + \begin{cases} Ax + O(|x|^2) & \text{if } \tilde{x}(s_*) + x \in F_+, \\ v\sqrt{-m(\tilde{x}(s_*) + x)} + O(|x|) & \text{if } \tilde{x}(s_*) + x \in F_- \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $v \in F_0 - \tilde{x}(s_*) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

The expansion of the function $m$ in $\tilde{x}(s_*)$ is

$$m(\tilde{x}(s_*) + x) = q^{-1} g(\tilde{x}(s_*)) x + O(|x|^2).$$

This implies that the return map of all trajectories near $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ that intersect $F_-$ expands to lowest order like a square root. The first statement of Lemma 13 follows from the fact that all elements of $S$ will have an image under $P$ which has the form $\Phi_1([-\tau, 0]; z_0)$ where $z_0 \in G$. This reduces the Poincaré map $P$ to a return map to the hyperplane $G \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Since both hyperplanes $F$ and $G$ are transversal to $\tilde{x}$, return maps to $G$ and to $F$ are diffeomorphomorphic to each other under the local diffeomorphism following the flow $\Phi_1$ from $F$ to $G$.

The function $m(x)$ used in Lemma 13 is defined as the local minimum of the parabola-shaped function $q^{-1} g(\Phi_1(\cdot; x))$ near 0. This local minimum is uniquely defined and depends smoothly on $x$. The square-root asymptotics of $P_0$ arises, roughly speaking, from the fact that the time which a trajectory through $\tilde{x}(s_*) + x \in F_-$ spends in $\{ x : m(x) < 0 \}$ depends asymptotically linearly on the square root of $-m(x)$.
Dynamics of delayed relay systems

The precise dependence of $A$ and $v$ on the right-hand-side is described in detail in Appendix E. Figure 5 illustrates the two different cases that can arise in a piecewise affine example. The difference between the two cases is that in case (a) $\tilde{x}$ does not cross the switching manifold $\{g = 0\}$ between $s_*$ and $t_*$, whereas in case (b) there is an intermediate crossing at $\tilde{x}(s_2)$. Both cases have two subcases depending on the existence of the intermediate switching at $\tilde{t}_1$ between $s_*$ and $t_*$, but those cause only minor differences. Case (b) is more complex because the discontinuity of the return map is affected by the configurations near four points along the periodic orbit: $\tilde{x}(s_*)$, $\tilde{x}(s_2)$, $\tilde{x}(t_*)$ and $\tilde{x}(t_2)$. A special case of type (a) is a periodic orbit of period larger than the delay $\tau$ that has no transversal intersections with the switching manifold $\{g = 0\}$.

Lemma 13 allows one to link phenomena occurring close to a grazing periodic orbit in a delayed relay system to the bifurcation theory of piecewise smooth maps with square-root asymptotics on one side of the discontinuity. The general results in [14, 15] classify the dynamics for maps of this type.

6.3. The dynamics near grazing bifurcations in the small-delay limit — illustrating example

The occurrence of square-root terms in return maps as in Lemma 13 is typical for impacting systems in the vicinity of periodic orbits with slow-velocity impacts rather than ordinary differential equations with discontinuous right-hand-side (that is, systems such as (3) with $\tau = 0$, so-called Filippov systems [13]). A consequence of this fact is that the dynamics of system (3) can change dramatically by changing $\tau$ from 0 to a small positive value. The reason behind this change is that codimension-one grazing events of periodic orbits generically induce $C^1$-smooth or piecewise asymptotically
linear return maps for Filippov systems, in contrast to impacting systems, or the case of (3) with a positive delay. As an illustrative example we consider the system in $\mathbb{R}^2$
\[
\dot{x} = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } x_1(t-\tau) - 1 < 0, \\
-f_2(x) & \text{if } x_1(t-\tau) - 1 \geq 0
\end{cases}
\] (24)
where $a > 0$, $\lambda > 0$, $\| \cdot \|$ is the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and $f_2(x_0) = (-b,0)$ at $x_0 = (1,0)$ with $b > 0$. The switching function $g$ is $g(x) = x_1 - 1$. This system has a stable limit cycle $(\tilde{x}_1(t),\tilde{x}_2(t)) = (\lambda \cos(t), \lambda \sin(t))$ if $\lambda < \lambda_0 = 1$. At the parameter value $\lambda = 1$ the periodic orbit $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ grazes tangentially the switching line $\{x_1 = 1\}$ in $x_0$. Figure 6 illustrates this situation in panel (a). For $\tau = 0$ the orbit continues to exist also for $\lambda \geq 1$ ($\lambda \approx 1$), changes its shape continuously and remains stable. In fact, for $1 < \lambda \ll 2$ the orbit slides along the line $\{x_1 = 1\}$ from $x_2 = -\sqrt{\lambda^2 - 1}$ to $x_2 = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 1}$ (due to $f_2(x_0)$ pointing toward the sliding line in the grazing point). Thus, at the grazing its only non-trivial Floquet multiplier jumps from $c = \exp(-4\pi a) \in (0,1)$ for $\lambda < 1$ to 0 for $\lambda > 1$.

If, however, $\tau$ is small but positive the return map $P_0$ to the line segment $x_2 = 0$, $x_1 \in [1-\delta,1+\delta]$ has the form described in Lemma 13 for $\lambda = 1$. Specifically, introducing the variable $y = x_1 - 1$,
\[
P_0(y) = \begin{cases} 
c y & \text{if } y < 0 \\
-d\sqrt{y} + O(|y|) & \text{if } 0 \leq y \ll 1
\end{cases}
\] (25)
where $d$ is a positive factor close to $2bc$. The Poincaré map of the grazing periodic orbit is depicted in figure 6(c), comparing it to the return map without delay in panel (b). The expression in (25) captures only the first square root branch of the return map of height $O(\tau)$. The dynamics of maps with square-root asymptotics has been
studied by [14, 15]. A consequence of the results of [15] is that, if \( \exp(-4\pi a) > 2/3 \), for any given \( \tau > 0 \) the system has a chaotic attractor for all \( \lambda \) in an interval \((1, \lambda_{\text{max}}(\tau))\). This sudden transition to chaos by an introduction of an arbitrarily small delay is fundamentally different from the behaviour of smooth systems. If one introduces a small delay in one of the arguments of a smooth system of ODEs the delay acts as a regular perturbation parameter, preserving, for example, hyperbolic equilibria or periodic orbits without changing their stability [35].

7. Conclusion

The paper considered the dynamics of dynamical systems with delayed relays in the vicinity of periodic orbits. First, we found that the dynamics can be described generically by low-dimensional local return maps, even though the phase space of the original system is infinite-dimensional. Generically these return maps are smooth. Specifically, we provided two sufficient genericity conditions on the periodic orbit that guarantee the smoothness and finite-dimensionality of the local return map.

We exploited the existence and form of these local return maps to show that relays can be used to design simple static feedback laws that are able to stabilize saddle-type equilibria to nearby periodic orbits even in the presence of arbitrarily large delays.

Finally, we studied the two most common bifurcations that occur when one of the genericity conditions is violated: the corner collision and the tangential grazing. They give rise to piecewise smooth local return maps. These return maps are either piecewise asymptotically linear (corner collision) or have square-root asymptotics on one side (grazing). The reduction to piecewise smooth maps provides a link to well-established results of the bifurcation theory for these types of maps [12, 13, 14, 15]. It also shows that the small-delay limit for relay systems is more subtle than the corresponding limit for smooth DDEs.

The main open problem concerning the bifurcation theoretic part of our studies is that the secondary non-degeneracy conditions, even though they are genericity conditions, are often not fulfilled in practice. Typically, symmetric periodic orbits of piecewise linear systems of the form \( \dot{x} = Ax - v \text{sgn}(b^T x(t-\tau)) \) violate the secondary non-degeneracy conditions formulated in the sections 6.1 and 6.2 whenever they violate the primary conditions 5 or 6. This gives rise to much more degenerate bifurcation scenarios in the systems studied in [23, 24].

A caveat of the stabilizability result in Theorem 9 is that the basin of attraction of the quadratically stable periodic orbit shrinks not only for increasing \( \tau \) but also for decreasing amplitude of the orbit (which is related to the size of \( \varepsilon \)). This gives rise to the idea to use a hybrid control instead, which will be investigated in a future paper.

A possible feedback law for the pendulum could be of the type

\[
\ddot{x} = x - \alpha \quad \text{where } \alpha = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } x(t-\tau) \in D_+ \\
0 & \text{if } x(t-\tau) \in D_0 \\
-1 & \text{if } x(t-\tau) \in D_-,
\end{cases}
\]

where \(D_+ \cup D_0 \cup D_-\) is a partition of the physical space \(\mathbb{R}^n\). This type of hybrid control could potentially allow one to decrease the amplitude of the periodic motion without shrinking its basin of attraction. Moreover, one can choose this partition such that the time spent in \(D_0\) by the periodic orbit is arbitrarily close to \(p\), the period of the orbit. This means that the relay control could be switched off most of the time.
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Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 4

It is sufficient to prove the continuity of $E(T;\cdot)$ in $\tilde{x}(t)$ for $T \in (0, \tau)$ since $\tilde{x}(t)$ lies on a periodic orbit. The set of all roots of $g(\tilde{x}(\theta))$ within $[-\tau, -\tau + T]$ is a subset of $\{t_0 + \delta_1, \ldots, t_0 + \delta_m\}$. Let us denote these time points by $r_j (j = 1, \ldots, q, q \leq m)$ in ascending order: $-\tau < r_1 < \ldots < r_q < T - \tau$. We define the constant

$$C = \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \left[ \|f_1(\tilde{x}(\theta))\| + \|f_2(\tilde{x}(\theta))\| \right]$$

which is bounded since $\tilde{x}$ is periodic. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small enough such that $\exp(4\varepsilon L) < 2$ where $L$ is a Lipschitz constant for $f_1$ and $f_2$. In order to prove continuity it is sufficient to find a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\|E(T;x) - E(T;\tilde{x}(t_0))\| < (8C + 1) \left(2e^{LT}\right)^{q+1} \varepsilon$$

(A.1)

for all $x \in C([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\|x - \tilde{x}(t_0)\| < \delta$ in the maximum norm of $C([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$. We choose $\delta \in (0,\varepsilon)$ such that all $x \in C([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\|x - \tilde{x}(t_0)\| < \delta$ meet the following condition: $g(x(\theta))$ is nonzero and has the same sign as $g(\tilde{x}(\theta))$ for all $\theta \in [-\tau, T - \tau] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{q} [r_j - \varepsilon, r_j + \varepsilon]$. That is, for all $x$ in the $\delta$-neighborhood of $\tilde{x}(t_0)$, $g(x(\cdot))$ can have zeroes only in the vicinity of the zeroes of $g(\tilde{x}(\cdot))$.

Let $x \in C([-\tau,0];\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that $\|x - \tilde{x}(t_0)\| < \delta$. Since $E(T;\cdot)(\theta) = E(0;\cdot)(\theta + T)$ for $\theta \in [-\tau, -T]$, we have

$$\|E(T;x)(\theta) - E(T;\tilde{x}(t_0))(\theta)\| < \delta < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } \theta \in [-p, -T].$$

(A.2)

If $\theta \in (-T,0]$ then $E(T;\cdot)(\theta) = E(\theta + T;\cdot)(0)$. Consequently, we have to focus on the evolution of the difference between the headpoints, $x(t) := E(t;\cdot)(0)$ and $\tilde{x}(t_0 + t)$, $\Delta(t) := \|x(t) - \tilde{x}(t_0 + t)\|$, for $t \in [0,T]$. Inequality (A.2) implies that $|\Delta(0)| < \varepsilon$. If $t$ is not in $\bigcup_{j=1}^{q} [r_j - \varepsilon, r_j + \varepsilon + \varepsilon]$ then both headpoints follow the same flow (either $\Phi_1$ or $\Phi_2$). Thus, we have the following set of recursive inequalities for the evolution
of \( \Delta(t) \) in the intervals \((\tau + r_j + \varepsilon, \tau + r_{j+1} - \varepsilon)\):
\[
\Delta(t) < e^{LT} \Delta(0) < e^{LT} \varepsilon \quad \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \tau + r_1 - \varepsilon,
\]
\[
\Delta(t) < e^{L(t-(\tau + r_j + \varepsilon))} \Delta(\tau + r_j + \varepsilon)
\]
\[
< e^{LT} \Delta(\tau + r_j + \varepsilon)
\]
\[
\quad \text{if } \tau + r_j + \varepsilon \leq t \leq \tau + r_{j+1} - \varepsilon \quad (j = 1, \ldots, q - 1),
\]
\[
\Delta(t) < e^{L(t-(\tau + r_q + \varepsilon))} \Delta(\tau + r_q + \varepsilon)
\]
\[
< e^{LT} \Delta(\tau + r_q + \varepsilon) \quad \text{if } \tau + r_q + \varepsilon \leq t \leq T.
\]

The variation-of-constants formula (7) implies an estimate on how \( \Delta(t) \) evolves in the intervals \((\tau + r_j - \varepsilon, \tau + r_j + \varepsilon)\). Let \( t_1, t_2 \) be in \([0, T] \cap (\tau + r_j - \varepsilon, \tau + r_j + \varepsilon)\) for some \( j \) and \( t_1 < t_2 \):
\[
\Delta(t_2) \leq \Delta(t_1) + \|x(t_2) - x(t_1)\| + \|x_{t_0}(t_2) - x_{t_0}(t_1)\|
\]
\[
\leq \Delta(t_1) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \| f_1(x(s)) \| + \| f_2(x(s)) \| \, ds +
\]
\[
\quad + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \| f_1(x_{t_0}(s)) \| + \| f_2(x_{t_0}(s)) \| \, ds
\]
\[
\leq \Delta(t_1) + 2 \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \| f_1(x_{t_0}(s)) \| + \| f_2(x_{t_0}(s)) \| \, ds +
\]
\[
+ 2L \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \Delta(s) \, ds
\]
\[
\leq \Delta(t_1) + 2(t_2 - t_1)C + 2L \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \Delta(s) \, ds
\]
\[
\leq [\Delta(t_1) + 2C(t_2 - t_1)] e^{2L(t_2 - t_1)}
\]
\[
\leq 2\Delta(t_1) + 4C(t_2 - t_1)
\]

The recursion of inequalities (A.3) and estimate (A.4) (where always \( t_2 - t_1 < 2\varepsilon \)) allow for a global estimate of \( \Delta(t) \) for \( t \in [0, T] \):
\[
\Delta(t) \leq e^{LT} [8C + 8C 2e^{LT} + \ldots + 8C(2e^{LT})^{q-1} + (2e^{LT})^q] \varepsilon
\]
\[
\leq (8C + 1)(2e^{LT})^{q+1} \varepsilon
\]

The inequalities (A.2) and (A.5) combined imply the validity of the estimate (A.1) for the whole maximum norm of the function \( E(T; x) - E(T; x_{t_0}) \).

**Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 7**

Let \( \delta > 0 \) be such that all intervals \((-p, -p + \delta), \(\tilde{s}_k - \delta, \tilde{s}_k + \delta\), \((\tilde{t}_k - \delta, \tilde{t}_k + \delta)\) and \((-\delta, 0)\) are mutually disjoint for all \( k = 1, \ldots, m \). This is possible due to Condition 5 on \( \hat{x} \). Let \( \tilde{s}_k \) for \( k \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \) be one of the zeroes of \( g(\hat{x}(\cdot)) \) in \((-p, 0)\). Due to Condition 5, the periodic orbit \( \hat{x} \) follows one of the flows in \( \tilde{s}_k \), say \( \Phi_f \). Because of the transversality of \( \Phi_f \) with \( \{ g = 0 \} \) in \( \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k) \) (Condition 6) there exists an \( \varepsilon_k > 0 \) such that the function \( t \to g(\Phi_f(t; \xi)) \) changes its sign and has exactly one zero in \((-\delta, \delta)\) for all \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( \| \xi - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k) \| < \varepsilon_k \). Consequently, \( \varepsilon := \min \{ \varepsilon_k : k = 1, \ldots, m \} \) is larger than zero.

Let the open neighborhood \( \mathcal{N} \subset S \) of \( \tilde{x}_0 \) be such that for all \( x \in \mathcal{N} \) the headpoint trajectory \( x(\cdot) = E(\cdot; x)(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) satisfies
B1 \( g(x(t)) \) is non-zero and has the same sign as \( g(\tilde{x}(t)) \) for all \( t \notin (\tilde{s}_k + lp - \delta, \tilde{s}_k + lp + \delta) \) \((l = 1, 2, k = 1, \ldots, m)\), and

B2 \( \|x(\tilde{s}_k + lp) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)\| < \varepsilon \) for all \( l = 1, 2, k = 1, \ldots, m \).

A neighborhood \( \mathcal{N} \) satisfying the conditions B1 and B2 above exists due to Condition 5, because \( E \) is continuous in \( \tilde{x} \), and because \( g(\tilde{x}(\cdot)) \) has no zeroes in the compact set \([-p, 0] \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^m (\tilde{s}_k - \delta, \tilde{s}_k + \delta)\).

Let \( x \in \mathcal{N} \) be arbitrary, and \( x(\cdot) = E(\cdot)\xi(0) \) be its headpoint trajectory. Let \( \tilde{s}_k \) \((k \in \{1, \ldots, \mu\}) \) be one of the zeroes of \( g(\tilde{x}(\cdot)) \) in \([-p, 0] \) corresponding to the switching time \( t_k \) and denote by \( \Phi_j \) the flow \( \tilde{x} \) is following in \( \tilde{s}_k \). Due to condition B1, \( x(\cdot) \) also follows \( \Phi_j \) in the intervals \((\tilde{s}_k + p - \delta, \tilde{s}_k + p + \delta)\) and \((\tilde{s}_k + 2p - \delta, \tilde{s}_k + 2p + \delta)\). Since \( \|x(\tilde{s}_k + p) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)\| < \varepsilon \) and \( \|x(\tilde{s}_k + 2p) - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)\| < \varepsilon \), \( g(x(\cdot)) \) has exactly one zero in each of the intervals \((\tilde{s}_k + p - \delta, \tilde{s}_k + p + \delta)\) and \((\tilde{s}_k + 2p - \delta, \tilde{s}_k + 2p + \delta)\) due to condition B2.

Consequently, \( g(x(\cdot)) \) has exactly \( \mu \) zeroes \( s_1, \ldots, s_\mu \in [2p - 2\tau, 2p - \tau] \) (same number as \( g(\tilde{x}(\cdot)) \)), and \( x(\cdot) \) follows \( \Phi_1 \) in a time interval \([2p - t_p, 2p + t_p]\) around \( 2p \) (as does \( \tilde{x}(\cdot) \)). Thus, \( x(2p - t_p, 2p + t_p) \) also intersects the plane \( \{\tilde{x}(0) + Lv : v \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \) transversally at a time \( t_0 \) in a point \( \tilde{x}(0) + Lv \). Then this \( v \) gives rise to the form (13) for \( P\tilde{x} \) where \( t_k = (s_k + \tau) - t_0 \) \((k = 1, \ldots, \mu)\). \( \square \)

Appendix C. Proof of Theorem 9 in section 5

The proof of Theorem 9 requires several steps which we will follow through in the form of several lemmas. Let us denote by \( \Phi_1 \) the flow corresponding to \( \tilde{x} = A(x + v) \) and by \( \Phi_2 \) the flow corresponding to \( \tilde{x} = A(x - v) \) (following the notation of the section 3). We observe that \( \Phi_1 \) and \( \Phi_2 \) are symmetric to each other with respect to rotation by \( \pi \) in the origin, that is,

\[
\Phi_2(t; z) = -\Phi_1(t; -z)
\]

for all \( z \in \mathbb{R}^n \). The flow \( \Phi_1 \) can be expressed as an affine map

\[
\Phi_1(t; z) = \exp(At)z + \exp(At - I)v
\]

for \( z \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). The equilibrium of the flow \( \Phi_1 \) is at \(-v\) and is of saddle type. There exist nonzero invariant projections \( P_+ \) and \( P_- \) corresponding to the stable \( (P_+) \) and unstable \( (P_-) \) eigenspaces of \( A \) such that \( P_- + P_+ = I \). Let us assume (without loss of generality) that the basis of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is chosen such that \( \|P_k\| = 1 \) and, for certain constants \( K_2 > K_1 > 0 \), the dichotomy inequalities

\[
\exp(K_2 t)\|P_+ z\| \geq \|P_+ \exp(At)z\| \geq \exp(K_1 t)\|P_+ z\| \\
\exp(-K_1 t)\|P_- z\| \geq \|P_- \exp(At)z\| \geq \exp(-K_2 t)\|P_- z\|
\]

hold for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( z \in \mathbb{R}^n \) in the original Euclidean norm of \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

Let \( m \) be an even number greater than \( n + 1 \). We now construct a \( g \) that gives rise to a periodic orbit intersecting the switching manifold \( \{g = 0\} \) transversally \( m \) times and having a Poincaré map of the simple structure (15).

Lemma 14
Let \( \delta > 0 \) be sufficiently small and denote by \( B_\delta := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|P_- z - P_+ v\| < \delta \) and \( \|P_+ z + P_- v\| < \delta \} \). Then there exist \( m \)-tuples \((\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m \) and \((x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^m \) such that

(i) \( x_j \in B_\delta \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, m \),
(ii) $x_j = -\Phi_1(\theta_j; x_{j-1})$ for $j = 2, \ldots, m$ and $x_1 = -\Phi_1(\theta_1; x_m)$,

(iii) the curves $\Phi_1([0, \theta_{j+1}]; x_j)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m - 1$ and $\Phi_1([0, \theta_1]; x_m)$ are mutually disjoint, and,

(iv) using the notation $r_j = \theta_j + \ldots + \theta_m$ ($j = 1, \ldots, m$), the $n$ vectors $x_m, v, \exp(r_m A)v, \ldots, \exp((r_m - n + 3)A)v$ are linearly independent.

PROOF: Let $(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be arbitrary. A tuple $(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^m$ has the second property (ii) if and only if it satisfies the linear system of equations

$$
\begin{align*}
x_j &= -\exp(A\theta_j)x_{j-1} + (\exp(A\theta_j) - I)v & \text{for } j = 2, \ldots, m, \\
x_1 &= -\exp(A\theta_1)x_m + (\exp(A\theta_1) - I)v.
\end{align*}
$$

Using the invariant projections $P_+$ and $P_-$ we can split (C.4) into an equivalent pair of systems of equations for $P_-x_j$ and $P_+x_j$ ($j = 1, \ldots, m$):

$$
\begin{align*}
P_-x_j &= P_-v - P_-\exp(\theta_j)(P_-x_{j-1} - P_-v) & \text{for } j = 2, \ldots, m, \\
P_-x_1 &= P_-v - P_-\exp(\theta_1)(P_-x_m - P_-v), \\
P_+x_j &= -P_+v - P_+\exp(-\theta_j)(P_+x_{j-1} - P_+v) & \text{for } j = 2, \ldots, m, \\
P_+x_1 &= -P_+v - P_+\exp(-\theta_1)(P_+x_m - P_+v).
\end{align*}
$$

If the $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m$ are sufficiently large, system (C.5) is a small perturbation of the regular system

$$
\begin{align*}
P_-x_j &= P_-v & \text{for } j = 2, \ldots, m, \\
P_+x_j &= -P_+v & \text{for } j = 2, \ldots, m,
\end{align*}
$$

due to the dichotomy inequalities (C.3). Consequently, we can find a $\theta_0$ such that, for any tuple $(\theta_j)_{j=1}^m$ of numbers greater than a certain $\theta_0$, the perturbed system (C.5) (and, hence, (C.4)) is uniquely solvable and such that its solution has a distance less than $\delta$ from the solution of the unperturbed system (C.6). Thus, for any tuple $(\theta_j)_{j=1}^m$ of numbers greater than a certain $\theta_0$ we find a unique tuple $(x_j)_{j=1}^m$ that fulfils the assertions i and ii of the lemma. For a sufficiently small $\delta$ let the time $T_\delta$ be bigger than

$$
\sup\{t \geq 0 : \Phi_1(t; B_\delta) \cap B_\delta \neq \emptyset\} + \sup\{t \geq 0 : \Phi_1(t; -B_\delta) \cap -B_\delta \neq \emptyset\}.
$$

Both summands are finite since $-v$ (the equilibrium of $\Phi_1$) is neither in $B_\delta$ nor in $-B_\delta$ due to the controllability of the pair $(A, v)$. In fact, $T_\delta$ becomes smaller when $\delta$ gets smaller. If the tuple $(\theta_j)_{j=1}^m$ is chosen such that each two members of the tuple differ by more than $T_\delta$ then the curves $\Phi_1([0, \theta_{j+1}]; x_j)$ ($j = 1, \ldots, m - 1$) and $\Phi_1([0, \theta_1]; x_m)$ are mutually disjoint. If, in addition, all $\theta_j$ ($j = 1, \ldots, m$) are greater than $\theta_0$ then the assertions (i)-(iii) of the lemma are satisfied simultaneously.

Let us finally adapt the tuple $(\theta_j)_{j=1}^m$ further to achieve property (iv). Since the pair $(A, v)$ is controllable the rows of $\exp(tA)v$ are linearly independent analytical functions. Any strictly decreasing sequence of positive $r_j$ corresponds to a $m$-tuple of positive $\theta_j$. Hence,

$$
\Delta_0 := \det[v, \exp(r_m A)v, \exp(r_{m-1} A)v, \ldots, \exp(r_m - n + 3 A)v, \exp(r_2 A)v]
$$

is analytical as a function of $\theta_2, \ldots, \theta_m$ and not identically zero. Thus, for any $(m - 1)$-tuple $(\theta_j)_{j=2}^m$ we can find a $(m - 1)$-tuple nearby such that $\Delta_0 \neq 0$ and, thus, the $n$ vectors $v, \exp(r_m A)v, \ldots, \exp(r_m - n + 3 A)v, \exp(r_2 A)v$ are linearly independent.
The first \( n-1 \) of these vectors appear in assertion (iv) of the lemma whereas \( \exp(r_2A)v \) is in place of \( x_m \) in assertion (iv). We solve system (C.4) to obtain the representation
\[
x_m = [\exp(r_1A) - I]^{-1} [\exp(r_1A)v - 2 \exp(r_2A)v + \ldots - 2 \exp(r_mA)v + v]
\tag{C.7}
\]
for the point \( x_m \). The matrix \( \exp(r_1A) - I \) is regular because \( A \) has no eigenvalues on the imaginary axis. The vectors \( v, \exp(r_mA)v, \ldots, \exp(r_{m+n+3}A)v, \) and \( x_m \) are linearly independent if the matrix
\[
M = [[\exp(r_1A) - I]v, [\exp(r_1A) - I]\exp(r_mA)v, \ldots, [\exp(r_1A) - I]\exp(r_{m+n+3}A)v, [\exp(r_1A) - I]x_m]
\tag{C.8}
\]
has a nonzero determinant. We introduce a parameter \( \mu \) into this definition of \( M \) by replacing \( r_1 \) by \( \mu \) and \( r_2 \) by \( r_2 + \mu/2 \) (\( r_2 \) appears in (C.8) when inserting (C.7) for \( x_m \)). This turns \( M \) and \( \det M \) into analytic functions \( M(\mu) \) and \( \det M(\mu) \) with the single argument \( \mu \). The derivative of \( M \) at \( \mu = 0 \) is
\[
M'(0) = [Av, A\exp(r_mA)v, A\exp(r_{m+n+3}Av), Av - A\exp(r_2Av)].
\]
The columns of \( M'(0) \) are linearly independent if and only if \( \Delta_0 \) is nonzero because \( A \) is regular. Let \( (\theta_j)_{j=1}^m \) be a \( m \)-tuple such that the assertions (i)–(iii) of the lemma are satisfied (that is, all members are bigger than some \( \theta_0 \) depending on \( \delta \) and differ mutually by at least \( T_3 \)). Then there exists a \( m \)-tuple \( (\theta_j)_{j=1}^m \) nearby such that the assertions (i)–(iii) are satisfied, and \( \Delta_0 \) is regular. This implies that \( M'(0) \) (which depends only on \( (\theta_j)_{j=2}^m \)) has full rank \( n \). Consequently, all roots of \( \det M(\mu) \) are isolated. Therefore, we can choose \( \mu \) such that \( \det M(\mu) \neq 0 \) and \( \mu \) sufficiently large such that all members of the corresponding tuple \( (\theta_j)_{j=1}^m \) are greater than \( \theta_0 \) and differ mutually by at least \( T_3 \). \qed

In the proof of Lemma 14 we used the following auxiliary proposition:

**Proposition 15** Let \( M : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{n,n} \) by an analytic matrix function such that \( M'(0) \) has full rank \( n \). Then all roots of \( \det M : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) are isolated.

**Proof:** We expand \( M \) around 0 up to second order:
\[
M(\mu) = M_0 + \mu M_1 + \mu^2 M_2(\mu)
\]
where \( M_1 \) is regular and \( M_2 \) is analytic. Let us introduce the two-parameter function \( f \)
\[
f(\lambda, \mu) = \det[\lambda M_0 + M_1 + \mu M_2(\mu)],
\]
which is polynomial in its first and analytic in its second argument. There exists a \( \mu_0 > 0 \) such that for all \( \mu \in [-\mu_0, \mu_0] \) the function \( f(0, \mu) \neq 0 \). Hence, none of the polynomials \( f(\cdot, \mu) \) for \( \mu \in [-\mu_0, \mu_0] \) is identically zero. Consequently, there exist a \( \lambda_0 \) and a \( \Gamma > 0 \) such that for all \( \lambda \neq (-\lambda_0, \lambda_0) \) and all \( \mu \in [-\mu_0, \mu_0] \) the inequality
\[
|f(\lambda, \mu)| \geq \Gamma
\tag{C.9}
\]
holds. Note that the constants \( \Gamma \) and \( \lambda_0 \) can be chosen uniform for all \( \mu \in [-\mu_0, \mu_0] \).

Let us define \( \mu_1 := \min\{\mu_0, \lambda_0^{-1}\} \). For \( \mu < \mu_1 \) we can insert \( \lambda = \mu^{-1} \) into the first argument of \( f \) in (C.9) and obtain \( |f(\mu^{-1}, \mu)| \geq \Gamma \). Hence, \( \mu^n f(\mu^{-1}, \mu) = \det M(\mu) \) is not identically zero. Consequently, its roots are isolated. \qed

The \( m \)-tuple \( (x_1, \ldots, x_m) \) constructed in Lemma 14 defines a closed curve \( \Psi \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) that follows alternatingly trajectories of \( \Phi_1 \) and \( \Phi_2 \) and switches at \( x_j \) (for odd \( j \)) from \( \Phi_2 \) to \( \Phi_1 \) and at \( -x_j \) (for even \( j \)) from \( \Phi_1 \) to \( \Phi_2 \):
\[
\Psi = \Phi_1([0, \theta_2]; x_1) \cup \Phi_2([0, \theta_3]; -x_2) \cup \ldots \cup \Phi_1[0, \theta_m]; x_{m-1}) \cup \Phi_2([0, \theta_1]; -x_m). \tag{C.10}
\]
The curve \( \Psi \) is continuous (by construction of \((x_1, \ldots, x_m)\); see Equation (C.4)) and piecewise smooth. It can only be non-differentiable at its joints \( x_i \) \((i = 1, \ldots, m)\).

In the next step we show how to find, for sufficiently small \( \delta \), an appropriate switching function \( g \) such that \( \Psi \) is a periodic orbit of the differential equation (19) of the simple structure as discussed at the end of section 4.

**Lemma 16** Let \( \delta > 0 \) be sufficiently small. Let the tuples \((\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m)\) and \((x_1, \ldots, x_m)\) be as constructed in Lemma 14 and the closed curve \( \Psi \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be as defined in (C.10). Define the \( m \) points \( \tilde{x}_j = \Phi_i(-\tau; x_j) \) and let the vectors \( \tilde{\beta}_j \) \((j = 1, \ldots, m)\) be such that

\[
\tilde{\beta}_j^T A[\tilde{x}_j + v] \neq 0
\]  

(C.11)

Then there exists a smooth function \( g \) such that \( g(-v) < 0, g(v) > 0 \) and that \( \{g = 0\} \) is a manifold that partitions \( \mathbb{R}^n \) into two simple domains and intersects \( \Psi \) transversally exactly once in each of its smooth segments. More precisely,

- \( \{g = 0\} \) intersects the curve \( \Phi_1([0, \theta_j + 1]; x_j) \) in \( \tilde{x}_{j+1} \) and its tangential hyperplane has the normal vector \( \tilde{\beta}_{j+1} \) for \( j = 1, 3, \ldots, m - 1 \),
- \( \{g = 0\} \) intersects \( \Phi_2([0, \theta_j + 1]; -x_j) \) in \( -\tilde{x}_{j+1} \) and its tangential hyperplane is \(-\tilde{\beta}_{j+1}\) for \( j = 2, 4, \ldots, m - 2 \), and
- \( \{g = 0\} \) intersects \( \Phi_2([0, \theta_1]; -x_m) \) in \( -\tilde{x}_1 \) and its tangential hyperplane is \(-\tilde{\beta}_1\).

Condition (C.11) guarantees that the hyperplane with normal vector \( \tilde{\beta}_j \) in \( \tilde{x}_j \) is indeed transversal to the intersecting trajectory.

**Proof:** It is sufficient to construct two simple domains, \( G_1 \) for the flow \( \Phi_1 \) and \( G_2 \) for the flow \( \Phi_2 \), and a piecewise smooth boundary separating them. Then, a piecewise smooth function \( g \) can always be chosen such that \( \text{int}G_1 = \{g < 0\} \) and \( \text{cl}G_2 = \{g \geq 0\} \). This function can then be smoothed without changing its normal vectors \( \tilde{\beta}_j \) or introducing additional intersections with the compact curve \( \Psi \).

Let us first explain the fundamental idea behind the technical construction. The segments of the curve \( \Psi \) following \( \Phi_1 \) are, for large \((\theta_j)_{j=1}^m\), \( C^1 \)-close to the curve \( \gamma^- \cup \gamma^+ = \Phi_1([0, \infty]; -P_+ v + P_- v) \cup \Phi_1([-\infty, 0]; P_+ v - P_- v) \) outside of a small neighborhood of \(-v \) (the equilibrium of \( \Phi_1 \)). Similarly, the segments of the curve \( \Psi \) following \( \Phi_2 \) are \( C^1 \)-close to the curve \(-\gamma^- \cup \gamma^+ \) outside of a small neighborhood of \( v \) (the equilibrium of \( \Phi_2 \)). We choose a switching manifold \( b \) such that it intersects \( \gamma^- \) and \(-\gamma^+ \) transversally but has a positive distance to \( \gamma^+ \) and \(-\gamma^+ \). This manifold \( b \) intersects \( v \) transversally in exactly once in each of its segments. Then we deform the manifold \( b \) close to its intersection points with \( \Psi \) by applying the corresponding flows \( \Phi_1 \) and \( \Phi_2 \) for an appropriate time such that the deformed manifold intersects \( \Psi \) in the points \( \tilde{x}_j \) with the desired normal vector \( \tilde{\beta}_j \).

Let us start the actual construction, introducing some notation. Let \( \rho := \min\{\|P_- v\|, \|P_+ v\|\} \). Since the pair \((A, v)\) is controllable \( \rho \) is greater than zero. Let

\[
B_1 := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|P_- z + P_- v\|^2 + \|P_+ z + P_+ v\|^2 < \rho^2\}, \text{ and}
\]

\[
B_2 := -B_1.
\]

\( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \) are open balls of radius \( \rho \) around \(-v \) and \( v \), respectively, in an appropriate basis of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). The balls \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \) do not intersect each other and the points \(-P_+ v + P_- v \) and \( P_+ v - P_- v \) are outside of \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \). The trajectory \( \Phi_1([0, \infty]; -P_+ v + P_- v) \) enters \( B_1 \) at some time \( T_{\text{in}}^- > 0 \) and stays in \( B_1 \) for all times greater than \( T_{\text{in}}^- \) (due to the dichotomy (C.3)). Similarly, the trajectory \( \Phi_1((-\infty, 0]; P_+ v - P_- v) \) leaves \( B_1 \) in
\( T_1^+ < 0 \) and has stayed in \( B_1 \) for all times less than \( T_1^+ \). Consequently, the following sequence of curves constitutes a closed curve \( \gamma \) that is homeomorphic to a circle:

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_1^- &:= \Phi_1((0, T^-_1]; -P_+ v + P_- v) \\
\gamma_1 &:= \text{straight line from } \Phi_1(T^-_1; -P_+ v + P_- v) \text{ to } \Phi_1(T^+_1; P_+ v - P_- v) \\
\gamma_1^+ &:= \Phi_1([T^+_1, 0]; P_+ v - P_- v) \\
\gamma_2^- &:= -\gamma_1^- \\
\gamma_2 &:= -\gamma_1 \\
\gamma_2^+ &:= -\gamma_1^+.
\end{align*}
\]

Since \( \gamma \) is piecewise smooth we can find a partition of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) into two simple domains with a smooth separating boundary manifold \( b \) that intersects \( \gamma \) transversally exactly twice, once in \( \gamma_1^- \) and once in \( \gamma_2^- \). (Note that \( \gamma_1^- \) and \( \gamma_2^- \) are half-open.) Hence, both intersection points have a positive distance from \( \gamma_1^+ \) (including \( -P_+ v + P_- v \)) and \( \gamma_2^+ \) (including \( P_+ v - P_- v \)). Furthermore, we can choose \( b \) such that it does not intersect \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \).

We can choose \( \delta \) sufficiently small such that we can apply Lemma 14 and

(i) \( b \) has a positive distance to the sets \( B_3 := \{ z : \| P_- z - P_- v \| < \delta, \| P_+ z + P_+ v \| < \delta \} \) and \( -B_3 \),

(ii) there exists a \( \tilde{T}_1^- > T^-_1 \) such that, for all \( z \in B_3 \), \( \Phi_1(\tilde{T}_1^-; z) \in B_1 \) and the trajectories \( \Phi_1(\cdot; z) \) and \( \Phi_2(\cdot; -z) \) each intersect \( b \) transversally exactly once on the interval \((0, \tilde{T}_1^-)\),

(iii) there exists a \( \tilde{T}_1^+ < \min\{ -\tau, T_1^+ \} \) such that, for all \( z \in -B_3 \), \( \Phi_1(\tilde{T}_1^+; z) \in B_1 \) and the trajectory \( \Phi_1(\cdot; z) \) does not intersect \( b \) on the interval \([\tilde{T}_1^+, 0]\),

(iv) the \( \Phi_1(\cdot; -z) \)-image of \( -B_3 \) has a positive distance from \( -B_3 \), and

(v) the sets \( \Phi_1([0, \tilde{T}_1^-]; B_3) \) and \( \Phi_1([\tilde{T}_1^+, 0]; -B_3) \) are disjoint outside of \( B_1 \).

According to Lemma 14 there exists a \( \theta_0 \) such that for all \( m \)-tuples \( (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m) \) of numbers that are all greater than \( \theta_0 \) and have a mutual distance of at least \( T_3 \) there exists a unique \( m \)-tuple \( (x_1, \ldots, x_m) \) generating a closed curve \( \Psi \) of the form (C.10).

The number \( \theta_0 \) is greater than \( \tilde{T}_1^- \) and \( \| \tilde{T}_1^+ \| \) (due to the conditions (ii) and (iii) above, imposed on \( \delta \)). The smooth \( m \) segments of \( \Psi \) lie inside the following open sets:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Phi_1([0, \theta_{j+1}]; x_j) &\subset \Phi_1([0, \tilde{T}_1^-]; B_3) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m-1} \Phi_1([\tilde{T}_1^+, 0]; -B_3) \\
\Phi_2([0, \theta_{j+1}]; x_j) &\subset \Phi_2([0, \tilde{T}_1^-]; -B_3) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m-1} \Phi_2([\tilde{T}_1^+, 0]; B_3)
\end{align*}
\]

The set \( \Phi_1([0, \tilde{T}_1^-]; B_3) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m-1} \Phi_1([\tilde{T}_1^+, 0]; -B_3) \), enclosing the \( \Phi_1 \)-segments of \( \Psi \), and the set \( \Phi_2([0, \tilde{T}_1^-]; -B_3) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m-1} \Phi_2([\tilde{T}_1^+, 0]; B_3) \), enclosing the \( \Phi_2 \)-segments of \( \Psi \), are disjoint outside of \( B_3 \cup -B_3 \). The curve \( \Psi \) intersects the manifold \( b \) transversally \( m \) times, exactly once along each of its smooth segments.

Denote the time of intersection of the curve \( \Phi_1([0, \theta_{j+1}]; x_j) \) \((j = 1, 3, \ldots, m-1)\) with the manifold \( b \) by \( \tilde{\theta}_{j+1} \in (0, \tilde{T}_1^-) \). The intersection is transversal due to condition (ii) on \( \delta \). We can modify the manifold \( b \) such that it intersects \( \Phi_1([0, \theta_{j+1}]; x_j) \) transversally in \( \tilde{x}_{j+1} \) instead of \( \Phi_1(\tilde{\theta}_{j+1}; x_j) \) for \( j = 1, 3, \ldots, m-1 \) but remains unmodified outside of \( \Phi_1([0, \tilde{T}_1^-]; B_3) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m-1} \Phi_1([\tilde{T}_1^+, 0]; -B_3) \setminus (B_3 \cup -B_3) \).

What is more, we can prescribe that the tangent hyperplane to the modification of \( b \) in the intersection point \( \tilde{x}_{j+1} \) has the normal vector \( \beta_{j+1} \). This modification can be achieved in the following way:
Let \( b_j : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be local parametrizations of \( b \) around \( \Phi_1(\hat{\theta}_{j+1}; x_j) \) such that \( b_j(0) = \Phi_1(\hat{\theta}_{j+1}; x_j) \) (\( j = 1, 3, \ldots, m - 1 \)). Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) be sufficiently small such that the sets \( b_j(B_\varepsilon(0)) \) (which are segments of the manifold \( b \)) are mutually disjoint and such that the sets \( \Phi_1([0, \theta_{j+1} - \tau - \hat{\theta}_{j+1} + \varepsilon]; b_j(B_\varepsilon(0))) \) are all subsets of \( \Phi_1([0, T^-_{1j+1}]; B_\delta) \cup B_1 \cup \Phi_1([T^+_{1j+1}, 0]; -B_\delta) \setminus (B_\delta \cup -B_\delta) \). The notation \( B_\varepsilon(0) \) refers to the ball of radius \( \varepsilon \) around \( 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \). An \( \varepsilon \) of this type can be found since the curves \( \Phi_1([0, \theta_{j+1}]; x_j) \) (\( j = 1, 3, \ldots, m - 1 \)) are all mutually disjoint, the points \( \Phi_1(\hat{\theta}_{j+1}; x_j) \) lie in the interior of \( \Phi_1([0, T^-_{1j+1}]; B_\delta) \setminus B_\delta \) (which follows from condition (i) on \( \delta \)), and due to condition (iv) on \( \delta \). Let \( \alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \) be arbitrary. We can find functions \( h_j \in C^\infty(B_\varepsilon(0); \mathbb{R}) \) such that

1. \( h_j(z) = 0 \) and \( h_j^{(k)}(z) = 0 \) for all \( \|z\| = \varepsilon \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \),
2. \( h_j(0) = \theta_{j+1} - \tau - \hat{\theta}_{j+1} \) and \( h_j'(0) = \alpha_j \), and
3. \( h_j(z) \in [0, \theta_{j+1} - \tau - \hat{\theta}_{j+1} + \varepsilon] \) for all \( z \in B_\varepsilon(0) \).

The numbers \( \theta_{j+1} - \tau - \hat{\theta}_{j+1} \) are all greater than zero due to the conditions (iii) and (v) on \( \delta \). We modify \( b \) by choosing the local parametrization \( b_j : z \to \Phi_1(h_j(z); b_j(z)) \) for \( z \in B_\varepsilon(0) \) instead of \( z \to b_j(z) \) for all \( j = 1, 3, \ldots, m - 1 \). Let us denote the modification of \( b \) by \( \tilde{b} \). Locally \( \tilde{b} \) is still a manifold as it is a graph over a ball in \( \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \) in its local parametrizations \( b_j \). Moreover, \( \tilde{b} \) does not intersect itself due to the construction of \( \varepsilon \) and \( b \), and the conditions ii and iii on \( \delta \). Hence, \( \tilde{b} \) is also globally a manifold.

The curve \( \Phi_1([0, \theta_{j+1}]; x_j) \) intersects \( \tilde{b} \) transversally at \( \tilde{x}_{j+1} \). By choosing

\[
\alpha_j = \frac{-\tilde{\beta}_j T_{j+1} A b_j'(0)}{\tilde{\beta}_j T_{j+1} A [\tilde{x}_{j+1}] + v}
\]

in the construction of \( h_j \) we guarantee that the tangential hyperplane to \( \tilde{b} \) at \( \tilde{x}_{j+1} \) has the normal vector \( \tilde{\beta}_{j+1} \).

The above modification of the switching manifold \( b \) to \( \tilde{b} \) happens in the interior of the set \( \Phi_2([0, T^-_{1j+1}]; B_\delta) \cup B_1 \cup \Phi_1([T^+_{1j+1}, 0]; -B_\delta) \setminus (B_\delta \cup -B_\delta) \). Hence, we can apply the same procedure to the intersections of \( b \) (and \( \tilde{b} \)) with the \( \Phi_2 \)-segments of \( \Psi \), \( \Phi_2([0, \theta_{j+1}]; -x_j) \) for \( j = 2, 4, m - 2 \) and \( \Phi_2([0, \theta_{j+1}]; -x_m) \), which lie all in the interior of \( \Phi_2([0, T^-_{1j+1}]; -B_\delta) \cup B_2 \cup \Phi_2([T^+_{1j+1}, 0]; B_\delta) \). This second modification happens only within \( \Phi_2([0, T^-_{1j+1}]; -B_\delta) \cup B_2 \cup \Phi_2([T^+_{1j+1}, 0]; B_\delta) \setminus (B_\delta \cup -B_\delta) \), which is disjoint with \( \Phi_1([0, T^-_{1j+1}); B_\delta) \cup B_1 \cup \Phi_1([T^+_{1j+1}, 0]; -B_\delta) \setminus (B_\delta \cup -B_\delta) \). Thus, both modifications of \( b \) are independent of each other so that they cause no self-intersections of the resulting manifold. □

For the \( g \) constructed in the proof of Lemma 16 the closed curve \( \Psi \) is a periodic orbit that satisfies all genericity conditions postulated in section 4. The intersection points \( \tilde{x}_j \) (for \( j = 2, 4, \ldots, m \)) and \( -\tilde{x}_j \) (for \( j = 1, 3, m - 1 \)) are immediately followed by the corresponding switch at \( x_j \) and \( -x_j \), respectively, without any intermediate crossing of the switching manifold \( \{g = 0\} \). Thus, Poincaré maps along \( \Psi \) are, after symmetry reduction due to (C.1), concatenations of maps generated by following \( \Phi_1 \) between the delayed switching manifolds, discontinuity maps at the switchings, and rotations by \( \pi \). The choice of the cross-section for a Poincaré map does not affect the linearized stability of its fixed point \( \Psi \).

In the next step we choose the normal vectors \( \tilde{\beta}_j \) (which are arbitrary in Lemma 16 apart from the transversality condition (C.11) in the construction of \( g \)) such that
the linearization of a Poincaré map of Ψ in Ψ itself becomes 0. Equivalently, we can choose the normal vectors βₖ to the local delayed switching manifolds at xₖ, -Φ₁(τ; {g = 0}) ∩ U(xₖ) in xₖ for j = 2, 4, ..., m and (after symmetry reduction) -Φ₁(τ; {g = 0}) ∩ U(xₖ) in xₖ for j = 1, 3, ..., m - 1. The transversality condition (C.11) translates into

$$\beta^T_m A[v - x_j] \neq 0. \quad \text{(C.12)}$$

For any tuple (βₖ)ᵢ=₁ⁿ satisfying (C.12), we find the corresponding tuple of normal vectors to the switching manifold at (xₖ)ᵢ=₁ⁿ, which is needed in the construction of g, by using the relation βₖ = -∂₂Φ₁(-τ; -xₖ)βₖ.

Let us choose a Poincaré section G₀ for Ψ through a point Φ₁(t₀; x₁) on the segment Φ₁([0, θ₂]; 1) (transversely to the curve Ψ). Let the intersection be such that t₀ is in the open interval (0, θ₁). The linearization of the return map from G₀ to G₀ in Φ₁(t₀; x₁) contains the product of matrices

$$\Pi_j \exp(\theta_1 A)(-I)\Pi_m \exp(\theta_m A)(-I)\Pi_{m-1} \exp(\theta_{m-1} A) \cdots \Pi_{m-n+2} \quad \text{(C.13)}$$

where the maps Π_j are the discontinuity maps at the switching points x_j (after symmetry reduction). They are projections of the form

$$\Pi_j = I - A[v - x_j]\beta_j^T \overline{\beta}_j A[v - x_j],$$

which are well defined if the β_j satisfy the transversality condition (C.12). Thus, the kernel of Π_j is spanned by A[v - x_j] and its image is \{z ∈ \mathbb{R}^n : β_j^T z = 0\}. Let us define the following recursion of matrices for j from m downward to m - n + 2:

$$P_m := -\Pi_1 \exp(\theta_1 A)\Pi_m, \quad P_j := -P_{j+1} \exp(\theta_{j+1} A)\Pi_j \quad \text{for} \ j < m.$$  

The product (C.13) coincides with the final iterate Pₙ₋₂ of this recursion. We now prove inductively that we can choose the vectors β_j (j = 1, m, m - 1, ..., m - n + 2) defining Π_j such that (denoting rₘ₊₁ = 0)

$$\ker P_j = \exp(-r_{j+1} A)\mathcal{L} (\exp(r_{j+1} A)x_j, v, \exp(r_m A)v, ..., \exp(r_{j+1} A)v). \quad \text{(C.14)}$$

First, we observe that the linear independence of \{x_m, v, \exp(r_m A)v, ..., \exp(r_{m-n+3} A)v\} (as asserted by Lemma 14) and system (C.4) imply that the sets

$$\{\exp(r_{j+1} A)x_j, v, \exp(r_m A)v, ..., \exp(r_{m-n+3} A)v\}$$

are also linearly independent for j = m - n + 2, ..., m. Thus, (C.14) implies that dim ker Pₘ₋ₗ = j + 2, and, hence, Pₘ₋₂ = 0.

**Initial step of induction** (j = m + 1): Let β₁ be arbitrary but satisfying the transversality condition (C.12). The kernel of Π₁ is spanned by A(v - x₁). Thus, the kernel of Π₁ exp(θ₁ A) is spanned by \exp(-θ₁ A)A(v - x₁) = A(v + xₘ) (due to (C.4)). Because xₘ and v are linearly independent, so are A(v + xₘ) and A(v - xₘ) (A is regular). Thus, we can choose βₘ such that βₘ exp(θ_m A(v + xₘ) = 0 but βₘ exp(θ_m A(v - xₘ) ≢ 0 (thus, βₘ satisfies transversality condition (C.12)). The condition βₘ exp(θ_m A(v + xₘ) = 0 implies that ker[Π₁ exp(θ₁ A)] ⊂ ImΠ₁. Since ker Πᵦ = \mathcal{L}(A(xₘ - v)), this implies ker P_m = \mathcal{L}(xₘ, v).
Inductive step from \( j \) to \( j - 1 \): The space spanned by the \( m - j + 3 \) vectors
\[
M_j = \mathcal{L}(\exp(r_j A)x_{j-1}, v, \exp(r_mA)v, \ldots, \exp(r_{j+1} A)v, \exp(r_j A)v)
\]
has dimension \( m - j + 3 \). Thus, the same holds for
\[
\exp(-r_j A)AM_j = \mathcal{L}(x_{j-1}, v, \exp(-\theta_j A)v) \oplus \\
\oplus \exp(-r_j A)\mathcal{L}(v, \exp(r_mA)v, \ldots, \exp(r_{j+2} A)v).
\]

The first part \( \mathcal{L}(x_{j-1}, v, \exp(-\theta_j A)v) \) of the direct sum is equal to the subspace \( \mathcal{L}(x_{j-1} - v, \exp(-\theta_j A)x_j, \exp(-\theta_j A)v) \) due to the identity \(-\exp(-A\theta_j)x_j = \exp(-A\theta_j)v + x_{j-1} + v\) following from (C.4). Thus, \( \exp(-r_j A)AM_j \) is the direct sum of the linearly independent components
\[
\exp(-r_j A)\mathcal{L}(\exp(r_{j+1} A)x_j, v, \exp(r_mA)v, \ldots, \exp(r_{j+1} A)v),
\]
which is equal to \( \ker[P_j \exp(\theta_j A)] \) by the assumption of the inductive step, and \( A(x_{j-1} - v) \). This implies that we can choose \( \beta_{j-1} \) such that \( \beta_{j-1}^T A(x_{j-1} - v) \neq 0 \) but \( \beta_{j-1}^T z = 0 \) for all \( z \in \ker P_j \), defining the map \( P_{j-1} \) such that \( \ker[P_j \exp(\theta_j A)] \subset \operatorname{Im}P_{j-1} \). With this choice of \( \beta_{j-1} \) we have \( \ker P_{j-1} = \ker[P_j \exp(\theta_j A)] \oplus \ker P_{j-1} = \exp(-r_j A)AM_{j-1} \), which has dimension \( m - j + 3 \) and assumes the form of (C.14) for \( j - 1 \), thus, proving the inductive step.

Consequently, if we choose the switching manifold as in the construction of Lemma 16 with \( \beta_j = -\Phi_1(-\tau; \beta_j) \) and the \( \beta_j \) as defined inductively above, the linearization of the Poincaré map in \( G_0 \) for the periodic orbit \( \Psi \) has a kernel of dimension \( n \), which means that it is identically 0. This implies that \( \Psi \) is quadratically stable, which proves Theorem 9.

Appendix D. Proof of Lemma 11

This section explains how the piecewise linearizations \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) in the statement of Lemma 11 depend on the right-hand-side and the concrete configuration of the periodic orbit \( \tilde{x} \). Assume (without loss of generality) that \( \tilde{x} \) follows \( \Phi_1 \) for times smaller than \( \tilde{s}_2 \) and then switches to \( \Phi_2 \) at \( \tilde{s}_2 \). Furthermore, we order the intersection times \(-p < \tilde{s}_1 < \ldots < \tilde{s}_m < 0 \) and denote the corresponding switching times by \( \tilde{t}_1, \ldots, \tilde{t}_m \).

Case (a)

Let us denote \( f^0_j = f_j(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)), f^1_j = f_j(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)) \) where \( j = 1, 2 \) and \( \tilde{t}_2 = \tilde{s}_2 + \tau \), and \( g' = g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \). Furthermore, let \( F_1 \) be the hyperplane intersecting \( \tilde{x} \) in \( \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) \) orthogonal to the outgoing flow \( f^1_1 \). Let \( R \) be the return map along \( \tilde{x}(\cdot) \) from \( F_1 \) to \( G_0^1 \), which is a concatenation of smooth maps. We denote its derivative \( \partial_s R|_{x=\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)} \) by \( R' \). Case (a) is defined in section 6.1 by \( g'f^0_1 \cdot g'f^0_2 > 0 \), which means that the periodic orbit intersects the switching manifold \( \{ g = 0 \} \) transversally. Figure D1 shows the configuration of the neighborhood of \( \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) \) in the left panel. In this case there can be no other intersection or switching point on \( \tilde{x} \) between \( \tilde{s}_2 \) and \( \tilde{t}_2 \). The maps \( A_1 \) (for
x + \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) \in F_-$ and $A_2$ (for $x + \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) \in F_+$) have the form

$$
A_1 = R' \left[ I - \frac{f_1^T f_1}{\|f_1\|^2} \right] \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tau; \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \left[ I - \frac{f_0^T g'}{g' f_2^T} \right] \tag{D.1}
$$

$$
A_2 = R' \left[ I - \frac{f_1^T f_1}{\|f_1\|^2} \right] \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tau; \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \left[ I - \frac{f_0^T g'}{g' f_1^T} \right].
$$

Notice that $A_1$ and $A_2$ differ only in the last factor. Let us first consider the case of a trajectory through a point $y_0 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x \in F_-$ (see figure D1). It follows $\Phi_2$ until it reaches $G_2$ in $y_1$. It continues to follow $\Phi_2$ for time $\tau$ until it reaches $G_2^*$, the time-$\tau$ image of $G_2$ in $y_2$ near $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$ (see right panel of figure D1). The point $y_3 = 3$ is the projection of $y_2$ onto $F_1$ under $\Phi_1$. The points $y_1$, $y_2$, and $y_3$ have the expansions

$$
y_1 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) = \left[ I - \frac{f_0^T g'}{g' f_2^T} \right] x + O(\|x\|^2),
$$

$$
y_2 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) = \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tau; \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))(y_1 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) + O(\|x\|^2),
$$

$$
y_3 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) = \left[ I - \frac{f_1^T f_1}{\|f_1\|^2} \right] (y_2 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) + O(\|x\|^2)
$$

giving the expression for $A_1$ in (D.1). A trajectory through a point $z_0 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x \in F_+$ has crossed $G_2$ in $z_1$ at time $\delta$, following $\Phi_1$. Thus, the trajectory follows $\Phi_2$ from $z_0$ up to $z_3 = \Phi_2(\tau; z_2)$ near $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$ (see right panel of figure D1) where $z_2 = \Phi_2(\delta; z_0)$. The point $z_4$ is the projection of $z_3$ onto $F_1$ under $\Phi_1$. The expansions of $\delta$, $z_2$ to $z_4$ are

$$
\delta = -g' x/(g' f_1^T) + O(\|x\|^2),
$$

\begin{align*}
\text{Figure D1.} & \quad \text{Sketch of the neighborhoods } U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \text{ and } U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)) \text{ when } \tilde{x}(\cdot) \text{ undergoes a corner collision of type (a). Dashed trajectories follow flow } \Phi_1, \text{ dotted trajectories follow flow } \Phi_2. \text{ The return map } P_0 \text{ is a concatenation of a non-smooth map from } G_1' \text{ to } F_1 \text{ and a smooth map } R_1 \text{ from } F_1 \text{ back to } G_1'. \text{ The non-smooth map from } G_1' \text{ to } F_1 \text{ maps } \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) \text{ to } \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2), y_0 \in F_- \text{ to } y_3 \in F_1, \text{ and } z_0 \in F_+ \text{ to } z_4 \in F_1.
\end{align*}
Dynamics of delayed relay systems

Let us denote Case (b) which implies the expression for $f$ orthogonal to the flow $x$ lies entirely on one side of the switching manifold $\partial$. We denote its derivative $g(b)$ is defined in section 6.1 by the orbit $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$ to $\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)$, $y_0 \in F_-$ to $y_2 = \tilde{F}_2$ and $z_0 \in F_+$ to $z_0 \in F_2$.

\[
\begin{align*}
z_2 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) &= \left[I - \frac{f_2^0 g'}{g' f_2^0} g' \right] x + O(\|x\|^2), \\
z_3 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) &= \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tau; \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))(z_2 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) + O(\|x\|^2), \\
z_4 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) &= \left[I - \frac{f_1^0 f_1^0 T}{f_1^0 f_2^0} f_1^0 f_2^0 \right] (z_3 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) + O(\|x\|^2),
\end{align*}
\]

which implies the expression for $A_2$ in (D.1).

**Figure D.2.** Sketch of the neighborhoods $U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))$ and $U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2))$ when $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ undergoes a corner collision of type (b). The return map is a concatenation of a non-smooth map $G_1^* \rightarrow F_2$ and the smooth map $R: F_2 \rightarrow G_1^*$. The non-smooth map maps $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$ to $\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)$, $y_0 \in F_-$ to $y_2 = \tilde{F}_2$ and $z_0 \in F_+$ to $z_0 \in F_2$.

**Case (b)**

Let us denote $f_j^0 = f_j(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))$, $f_j^0 = f_j(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2))$ where $j = 1, 2$ and $\tilde{t}_2 = \tilde{s}_2 + \tau$, and $g' = g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))$. Furthermore, let $F_2$ be the hyperplane intersecting $\tilde{x}$ in $\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)$ orthogonal to the flow $f_2^0$. Let $R$ be the return map along $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ from $F_2$ to $G_1^*$, which is a concatenation of smooth maps. We denote its derivative $\partial_2 R|_{x=\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)}$ by $R'$. Case (b) is defined in section 6.1 by $g' f_1^0 \cdot g' f_2^0 < 0$, which means that the periodic orbit lies entirely on one side of the switching manifold $\{g = 0\}$ near $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$, touching it in $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$. The left panel of figure D2 shows the configuration of the manifolds $G_2$, $G_1^*$ and the periodic orbit $\tilde{x}$ in the neighborhood of $\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)$. In addition, case (b) requires that the orbit $\tilde{x}$ does not intersect $\{g = 0\}$ between $\tilde{s}_2$ and $\tilde{t}_2$. The maps $A_1$ (for $x + \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) \in F_-$) and $A_2$ (for $x + \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) \in F_+$) have the form

\[
\begin{align*}
A_1 &= R' \left[I - \frac{f_2^0 f_2^0 T}{f_2^0 f_2^0} \right] \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tau; \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)), \\
A_2 &= R' \left[I - \frac{f_2^0 f_2^0 T}{f_2^0 f_2^0} \right] \left\{ \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tau; \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) + \frac{f_1^0 g'}{g' f_2^0} f_1^0 \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]
Let us first consider a trajectory going through a point \( y_0 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x \in F_- \). It follows \( \Phi_2 \) until it reaches \( F_2 \) in \( y_2 \). The point \( y_2 \) is the projection of \( y_1 = \Phi_2(\tau; y_0) \) onto \( F_2 \) under \( \Phi_2 \). The expansion for \( y_1 \) and \( y_2 \) is

\[
y_1 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) = \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tau; x(\tilde{s}_2)) x + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
y_2 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) = \left[ I - \frac{f_2 f_2^T}{f_2^T f_2} \right] (y_1 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)) + O(||x||^2),
\]

which, in concatenation with \( R' : F_2 \mapsto G_1^* \), gives the expression for \( A_1 \) in (D.2). For a trajectory through a point \( z_0 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x \in F_+ \) we have to compute the time that this trajectory spent in \( \{ g \geq 0 \} \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \), which is the traveling time \(-\delta_1\) from \( z_1 \) to \( z_0 \) under \( \Phi_1 \) plus the traveling time \( \delta_2 \) from \( z_0 \) to \( z_2 \) under \( \Phi_2 \) (see figure D2). The point \( z_3 \) is the \( \Phi_2(\tau; \cdot) \)-image of \( z_0 \). In the point \( z_4 = \Phi_2(\delta_1; z_3) \) the trajectory switches to the flow \( \Phi_1 \) for time \( \delta_2 - \delta_1 \), reaching \( z_5 \) where it switches back to \( \Phi_2 \). The point \( z_6 \) is the projection of \( z_5 = \Phi_1(\delta_2 - \delta_1; z_4) \) onto \( F_2 \) under \( \Phi_2 \). The expansions of \( \delta_1, \delta_2, \) and \( z_3 \) to \( z_6 \) are

\[
\delta_1 = -g' x / (g' f_1^0) + O(||x||^2), \quad (\delta_1 < 0),
\]

\[
\delta_2 = -g' x / (g' f_2^0) + O(||x||^2), \quad (\delta_2 > 0),
\]

\[
z_3 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) + \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tau; x(\tilde{s}_2)) x + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
z_4 = z_3 + \delta_2 f_2 + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
z_5 = z_4 + (\delta_2 - \delta_1) f_1 + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
z_6 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) + \left[ I - \frac{f_2 f_2^T}{f_2^T f_2} \right] (z_5 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)) + O(||x||^2),
\]

which implies the expression for \( A_2 \) in (D.2) because the difference between \( z_3 \) and \( z_4 \) is in the kernel of the projection onto the hyperplane \( F_2 \).

**Case (c)**

In this case four locations in the physical space are involved in determining the discontinuity in the linearization of the Poincaré map \( P_0 : G_1^* \mapsto G_1^* : U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)), U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)) \) and \( U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3)) \). A characteristic feature of this case is that the orbit \( \tilde{x} \) crosses the switching manifold between \( \tilde{s}_2 \) and \( \tilde{t}_2 = \tilde{s}_2 + \tau \) (see figure 4(c)). Locally near \( \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) \), the orbit \( \tilde{x} \) lies entirely on one side of \( \{ g = 0 \} \), say, \( \{ g \geq 0 \} \), switching from \( \Phi_1 \) to \( \Phi_2 \) in \( \tilde{s}_2 \). Figure D3 shows the four neighborhoods.

Let us denote \( f_j = f_j(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)), f_j = f_j(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)), f_j = f_j(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3)) \), and where \( j = 1, 2 \) and \( \tilde{t}_k = \tilde{s}_k + \tau \) \( (k = 2, 3) \). Furthermore, let \( g_0 = g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \) and \( g'_k = g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_k)) \), and \( F_3 \) be the hyperplane intersecting \( \tilde{x} \) at \( \tilde{t}_3 \) orthogonal to the outgoing flow \( \Phi_1 \). The intersection and switching manifolds are called \( G_1^* = \Phi_1(\tau ; \{ g = 0 \}) \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)), G_2 = \{ g = 0 \} \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)) \), \( G_3 = \{ g = 0 \} \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_3)) \) and \( G_3^* = \Phi_2(\tau ; \{ g = 0 \}) \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3)) \), respectively. We denote by \( \Pi_1 \) the projection along \( \Phi_2 \) onto \( G_3^* \), linearized in \( \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_3) \), and by \( \Pi_3 \) the projection along \( \Phi_1 \) onto \( F_3 \), linearized in \( \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3) \). The projections \( \Pi_1 \) and \( \Pi_3 \) read

\[
\Pi_1 = I - \frac{f_2 g_1}{g_1 f_2^T}, \quad \Pi_3 = I - \frac{f_3 g_1}{f_3 g_1^T}.
\]

Let \( R \) be the return map along \( \tilde{x}() \) from \( F_3 \) back to \( G_1^* \), which is a concatenation of smooth maps. We denote its derivative \( \partial_2 R_{|x=\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3)} \) by \( R' \). We denote by
notations, the piecewise linearizations in the statement of Lemma 11 are satisfied by the relations $g = f$ and $\partial x(\Gamma) \subset \partial x(\Gamma)$. The return map $R : \Gamma_{G_1} \mapsto G_1$ is $\varphi_{B_2} \circ \varphi_{B_1}$, where $B_1 = \partial y \varphi_{B_2}(\Gamma_{B_2} - \partial y \varphi_{B_2}(\Gamma_{B_2}))$ and $B_2 = \partial y \varphi_{B_2}((\Gamma_{B_2} - \partial y \varphi_{B_2}(\Gamma_{B_2}))$ the linearization of the flow $\varphi_{B_2}$ in $\Gamma_{B_2}$ between the different neighborhoods. The vectors $f_1^B$ satisfy the relations $f_1^B = B_1 f_1^B$, $f_2^B = B_1 f_1^B$, and $f_3^B = B_3 B_2 B_1 f_1^B$. Using these notations, the piecewise linearizations in the statement of Lemma 11 are

$$A_1 = R' \Pi_{B_2} B_2 \Pi_{B_1} B_1,$$

$$A_2 = R' \Pi_{B_2} B_2 \left\{ B_2 B_1 \left[ I - \frac{f_1^B}{g_1^B} B_1 f_1^B + \frac{f_1^B}{g_1^B} g_0^B \frac{f_1^B}{g_0^B} f_1^B f_1^B \right] + \left[ \frac{f_1^B}{g_1^B} g_0^B f_2^B \frac{f_1^B}{g_0^B} f_2^B \right] \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (D.3)

Let us first consider a trajectory going through a point $y_0 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x \in F_-$. It follows $\varphi_2$ for time $\tau = \tilde{s}_3 - \tilde{s}_2$. The point $y_1$ is the intersection point of the trajectory with $G_3$, $y_2$ is $\varphi_2(\tau; y_1)$, and $y_3$ is the projection of $y_2$ onto $F_3$ under the flow $\varphi_1$. This point $y_3$ is then mapped back to $G_1$ by $R$. The expansions of $y_1$, $y_2$, and $y_3$ read

$$y_1 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_3) = \Pi_1 B_1 x + O(\|x\|^2),$$

$$y_2 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3) = B_3 B_2 (y_1 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_3)) + O(\|x\|^2),$$

$$y_3 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3) = \Pi_3 (y_2 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3)) + O(\|x\|^2),$$

which, in concatenation with $R' : F_3 \mapsto G_1$, gives the expression for $A_1$ in (D.3).
For a trajectory through a point \( z_0 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) + x \in F_+ \) we have to compute the time that this trajectory spends in \( \{ g < 0 \} \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \), which is the traveling time \( -\delta_1 \) from \( z_1 \) to \( z_0 \) under \( \Phi_1 \) plus the traveling time \( \delta_2 \) from \( z_0 \) to \( z_2 \) under \( \Phi_2 \) (same as in case (b)). The point \( z_3 \) is the intersection point of the trajectory with \( G_3 \). The intersection time of the trajectory with \( G_3 \), starting from \( z_0 \), is \( \tilde{s}_3 - \tilde{s}_2 + \delta_3 \) for a small \( \delta_3 \). In the point \( z_4 = \Phi_2(\tau + \delta_1; z_0) \) the trajectory switches to the flow \( \Phi_1 \), follows it for time \( \delta_2 - \delta_1 \) to \( z_5 \). From \( z_5 \) it continues to follow \( \Phi_2 \) for time \( \tilde{s}_3 - \tilde{s}_2 + \delta_3 - \delta_2 \) to \( z_6 \). The point \( z_7 \) is the projection of \( z_6 \) onto \( F_+ \) under the flow \( \Phi_1 \). This point \( z_7 \) is then mapped back to \( G^*_1 \) by \( R \). The expansions of \( \delta_1, \delta_2, z_4 \) and \( z_5 \) are the same as in case (b), the expansion of \( \delta_3 \), and \( z_4 \) to \( z_7 \) read

\[
\delta_3 = -g_1^1 B_1 x \cdot (g_1^1 f_2^1) + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
z_4 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) + B_2 B_1 x + \delta_1 f_2^1 + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
= \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) + B_2 B_1 (x + \delta_1 f_2^1) + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
z_5 = z_4 + (\delta_2 - \delta_1) f_2^1 + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
z_6 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3) + B_3 (z_5 + (\delta_3 - \delta_2) f_2^1 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)) + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
= \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3) + B_3 B_2 B_1 [x + (\delta_3 - \delta_2 + \delta_1) f_2^1] + B_3 (\delta_2 - \delta_1) f_2^1 + O(||x||^2),
\]

\[
z_7 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3) + \Pi_3 z_6 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_3) + O(||x||^2),
\]

which, in concatenation with \( R' : F_3 \mapsto G^*_1 \), gives the expression for \( A_2 \) in (D.3).

**Appendix E. Proof of Lemma 13**

**Case (a)**

The characteristic feature of case (a) is that the orbit \( \tilde{x} \) does not cross the switching
is uniquely defined and smooth for a sufficiently small $\delta$. Furthermore, let us assume that the configuration is such that the orbit $\tilde{x}$ does not switch from $\Phi_1$ to $\Phi_2$ between $s_*$ and $t_*$, either; see figure E1 where we use the abbreviations $f^0 = \dot{x}(s_*) = f_1(\tilde{x}(s_*))$ and $f^1_1 = f_j(\tilde{x}(t_*))$. The hyperplane $F_1 = \{ x : f^1_1^T [x - \tilde{x}(t_*)] = 0 \}$ intersects $\tilde{x}$ orthogonally in $\tilde{x}(t_*)$. The linearized projection along $\Phi_1$ onto $F_1$ defined by

$$
\Pi = I - \frac{f^1_1 f^1_1^T}{f^1_1^T f^1_1}
$$

is orthogonal. We express the return map to $F_0$ as a concatenation of a piecewise smooth map from $F_0$ to $F_1$ and a smooth map $R$ along $\tilde{x}$ from $F_1$ back to $F_0$, which is a concatenation of smooth maps. Let us denote the derivative $\partial_2 R(\tilde{x}(t_*))$ by $R'$. Using these notations the matrix $A$ and the vector $v$ in the statement of Lemma 13 have the form

$$
A = R'\Pi \partial_2 \Phi_1(\tau; \tilde{x}(s_*))
$$

$$
v = 2R'\Pi f^1_1.
$$

Figure E1 illustrates how points of $F_0$ near $\tilde{x}(s_*)$ are mapped to $F_1$. A trajectory through a point $y_0 = \tilde{x}(s_*) + x \in F_+$ never crosses $\{ g = 0 \}$ in $U(\tilde{x}(s_*))$. Thus, it is mapped to $y_1 = U(\tilde{x}(t_*))$ by $\Phi_1(\tau; \cdot)$. The point $y_2$ is the projection of $y_1$ onto $F_1$ under $\Phi_1$. Thus, the expansion of $y_2$ with respect to $y_0$ is

$$
g_1 - \tilde{x}(t_*) = \partial_2 \Phi_1(\tau; \tilde{x}(s_*)) x + O(\| x \|^2),$$

$$
g_2 - \tilde{x}(t_*) = \Pi(y_1 - \tilde{x}(t_*)) + O(\| x \|^2),$$

which implies the expression for $A$ in (E.1) in the case $\tilde{x}(s_*) + x \in F_+$. The function $m : U(\tilde{x}(s_*)) \to \mathbb{R}$, used to define $F_-$ and $F_+$ in Lemma 13, and defined by

$$
m(x) = \min_{\delta \in [-\delta_0, \delta_0]} q^{-1} g(\Phi_1(\delta; x))$$

is uniquely defined and smooth for a sufficiently small $\delta_0 > 0$ due to Condition 12 (see page 18) stating the non-degeneracy of the grazing event. Moreover, the function

$$
\delta_m : U(\tilde{x}(s_*)) \mapsto [-\delta_0, \delta_0], \text{ defined by } q^{-1} g(\Phi_1(\delta_m(x); x)) = m(x),
$$

and the map

$$
x_m(x) : U(\tilde{x}(s_*)) \mapsto U(\tilde{x}(s_*)), \text{ defined by } x_m(x) = \Phi_1(\delta_m(x); x),
$$

are also well-defined and smooth in $U(\tilde{x}(s_*))$. The function $\delta_m$ describes the traveling time to the minimum in the definition of $m$. The map $x_m$ describes the position in $\mathbb{R}^n$ where this minimum is attained. Thus, $\delta_m(\tilde{x}(s_*)) = 0$, which implies $\delta_m(\tilde{x}(s_*)) = 0$. A trajectory through $z_0 = \tilde{x}(s_*)$ has two intersections $z_1$ and $z_2$ with $\{ g = 0 \}$. The traveling time from $z_0$ to $x_m(z_0)$ is $\delta_m(z_0)$. The traveling times $-\delta_1$ from $z_1$ to $x_m(z_0)$ and $\delta_2$ from $x_m(z_0)$ to $z_2$ are solutions of $h(\delta) := q^{-1} g(\Phi_1(\delta, x_m(z_0))) = 0$, which expands as

$$
0 = h(\delta) = m(z_0) + \delta^2 + O(\| x \|^2) + O(\delta^3).
$$

Thus, $\delta_1$ and $\delta_2$ have the expansions (keeping in mind that $m(z_0) = O(\| x \|)$)

$$
\delta_1 = -\sqrt{-m(z_0)} + O(\| x \|), \quad \delta_2 = \sqrt{-m(z_0)} + O(\| x \|).
$$

(E.2)
This implies that both, the traveling time from \( z_1 \) to \( z_0 \) and the traveling time from \( z_0 \) to \( z_2 \), are of the order \( \sqrt{-m(z_0) + O(||x||)} \) (because \( \delta_m(z_0) = O(||x||) \)).

The trajectory through \( z_0 \) switches to the flow \( \Phi_2 \) time \(-\delta_1\) before it reaches the point

\[
z_3 = \Phi_1(\tau; z_0) = \tilde{x}(t_*) + O(||x||)
\]

(see figure E1). This happens in point

\[
z_4 = z_3 + \delta_1 f_1^1 + O(||x||) = \tilde{x}(t_*) + \delta_1 f_1^1 + O(||x||).
\]

Subsequently the trajectory follows \( \Phi_2 \) for time \( \delta_2 - \delta_1 \) up to

\[
z_5 = z_4 + 2 \sqrt{-m(z_0)f_2^1} + O(||x||) = \tilde{x}(t_*) + \delta_1 f_1^1 + 2 \sqrt{-m(z_0)f_2^1}.
\]

The point \( z_5 \) is the projection of \( z_5 \) onto \( F_1 \) under \( \Pi \), which projects \( f_1^1 \) to 0. Thus, the expansion of \( z_6 \) is

\[
z_6 = \tilde{x}(t_*) + \Pi(z_5 - \tilde{x}(t_*)) + O(||x||^2)
\]

\[
= \tilde{x}(t_*) + \Pi[2f_2^1] \sqrt{-m(z_0)} + O(||x||),
\]

which implies the expression for \( v \) in (E.1).

If the orbit \( \tilde{x} \) switches from \( \Phi_1 \) to \( \Phi_2 \) between \( s_* \) and \( t_* \) (at some time \( t_1 \in (s_*, t_*) \)) a modification of (E.1) applies. Since \( \tilde{x} \) follows \( \Phi_2 \) in \( t_* \) instead of \( \Phi_1 \) the role of \( f_1^1 \) and \( f_2^1 \) is exchanged in the definition of \( \Pi \) and \( v \). Furthermore, the time \( \tau \)-map from \( U(\tilde{x}(s_*)) \) to \( U(\tilde{x}(t_*)) \) is no longer \( \Phi_1(\tau, \cdot) \) but \( R_0(x) = \Phi_2(\tau - t(x); \Phi_1(t(x); x)) \) where \( t(x) \) is the traveling time from \( x \) to the delayed switching manifold \( G^1 \). We denote by \( \Pi \) and \( v \) smooth as well. With these modifications the arguments given above lead to

\[
A = R^T \left[ I - \frac{f_2^1 f_2^T}{f_2^1 f_2^T} \right] \partial_x R_0(\tilde{x}(s_*)), \quad v = 2R^T \left[ I - \frac{f_2^1 f_2^T}{f_2^1 f_2^T} \right] f_1^1.
\] (E.3)

**Case (b)**

The characteristic feature of this case is that the orbit \( \tilde{x} \) intersects the switching manifold \( \{g = 0\} \) between \( s_* \) and \( t_* \) at some time \( \tilde{s}_2 \). Four locations in the physical space are involved in determining the discontinuity in the linearization of the Poincaré map \( P_0 \) from \( F_0 \) back to \( F_0 \): \( U(\tilde{x}(s_*)), U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)), U(\tilde{x}(t_*)) \) and \( U(\tilde{x}(l_2)) \). Let us first assume that the orbit \( \tilde{x} \) does not switch from flow \( \Phi_1 \) to \( \Phi_2 \) between \( s_* \) and \( \tilde{s}_2 \).

Figure E2 shows this configuration. It uses the abbreviations \( f_0^1 = \tilde{x}(s_*), f_1^1 = f_j(\tilde{x}(s_2)), f_2^1 = f_j(\tilde{x}(t_*)) \) and \( f_j^3 = f_j(\tilde{x}(l_2)) \) for \( j = 1, 2 \). The hyperplane \( F_3 = \{x : f_2^3 [x - \tilde{x}(l_2)] = 0\} \) intersects \( \tilde{x} \) orthogonal to the outgoing flow \( \Phi_2 \) in \( \tilde{x}(l_2) \). We denote by \( \Pi_1 \) the projection along \( \Phi_1 \) onto \( G^2 = \{g = 0\} \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \), linearized in \( \tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2) \), and by \( \Pi_3 \) the projection along \( \Phi_2 \) onto \( F_3 \), linearized in \( \tilde{x}(l_2) \). The projections \( \Pi_1 \) and \( \Pi_3 \) read

\[
\Pi_1 = I - \frac{f_1^1 g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))}{g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) f_1^1}, \quad \Pi_3 = I - \frac{f_2^3 f_2^T}{f_2^1 f_2^T}.
\]

We express the return map to \( F_0 \) as a concatenation of a piecewise smooth map from \( F_0 \) to \( F_3 \) and a smooth map \( R \) from \( F_3 \) back to \( F_0 \). The return map \( R \) along \( \tilde{x}(\cdot) \) from \( F_3 \) back to \( F_0 \) is a concatenation of smooth maps. Let us denote its derivative \( \partial_R R(\tilde{x}(l_2)) \) by \( R' \). We also make use of the function \( m \) defined in section 6.2 and discussed in more detail in the treatment of case (a).
Using these notations the matrix $A$ and the vector $v$ in the statement of Lemma 13 have the form

$$A = R' \Pi_1 \partial_2 \Phi_1(\tau; \tilde{x}(s_2)) \Pi_1 \partial_2 \Phi_1(\delta_2 - s_\ast; \tilde{x}(s_\ast))$$

and

$$v = 2R' \Pi_1 \partial_2 \Phi_1(\delta_2 - s_\ast; \tilde{x}(t_\ast)) \left[ f_2^2 - f_1^2 \right]. \tag{E.4}$$

A trajectory through a point $y_0 = \tilde{x}(s_\ast) + x \in F_+$ does not cross $\{ g = 0 \}$ in $U(\tilde{x}(s_\ast))$ (see figure E2). It is mapped to $y_1 \in G_2$ by $\Phi_1$. The trajectory continues to follow $\Phi_1$ for time $\tau$ from $y_1$ to $y_2$. The point $y_3$ is the projection of $y_2$ onto $F_3$ under $\Phi_2$. Thus, the expansion of $y_1$, $y_2$, $y_3$ with respect to $y_0$ is

$$y_1 - \tilde{x}(\delta_2) = \Pi_1 \partial_2 \Phi_1(\delta_2 - s_\ast; \tilde{x}(s_\ast)) x + O(\|x\|^2),$$

$$y_2 - \tilde{x}(t_2) = \partial_1 \Phi_1(\tau; \tilde{x}(\delta_2)),$$

$$y_3 - \tilde{x}(t_2) = \Pi_3(y_2 - \tilde{x}(t_2)) + O(\|x\|^2),$$

which implies the expression for $A$ in (E.4).

A trajectory through a point $z_0 = \tilde{x}(s_\ast) + x \in F_-$ has two intersection points with $\{ g = 0 \}$, $z_1$ and $z_2$ (see figure E2). The traveling times $-\delta_1$ from $z_1$ to $z_0$ and $\delta_2$ from $z_0$ to $z_2$ have been computed to leading order already in (E.2) in the treatment.
of the grazing case (a). The intersection of the trajectory with \( G_2 \) is named \( z_3 \). The difference \( \delta_3 \) between the traveling time from \( z_0 \) to \( z_3 \) and \( \tilde{s}_2 \) is of order \( O(\|x\|) \).

At \( z_4 = \Phi_1(t + \delta_1; z_0) \) the trajectory switches to \( \Phi_2 \) for time \( \delta_2 - \delta_1 \), reaching \( z_5 \). From \( z_5 \) it continues to follow \( \Phi_1 \) for time \( \tilde{t}_2 - t_* + \delta_3 - \delta_2 = \tilde{s}_2 - s_* - \delta_2 + O(\|x\|) \) reaching \( z_6 \). The point \( z_7 \in F_3 \) is the projection of \( z_6 \) onto \( F_3 \) following the outgoing flow \( \Phi_2 \), and is then mapped back to \( F_0 \) by \( R \). The expansion of \( z_7 \) in \( z_0 \) is to leading order

\[
\delta_3 = O(\|x\|),
\]

\[
z_4 = \dot{x}(t_* + \delta_1) + O(\|x\|),
\]

\[
z_5 = z_4 + (\delta_2 - \delta_1) f^1_T + O(\|x\|),
\]

\[
z_6 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) + \partial_2 \Phi_1(\tilde{s}_2; \tilde{t}_2) \left[ z_5 - \delta_2 f^1_T - \tilde{x}(t_*) + O(\|x\|) \right] + O(\|x\|),
\]

\[
= \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) + \partial_2 \Phi_1(\tilde{s}_2 - s_*; \tilde{x}(t_*))(\delta_2 - \delta_1) \left[ f^2_T - f^1_T \right] + O(\|x\|),
\]

\[
= \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) + 2 \partial_2 \Phi_1(\tilde{s}_2 - s_*; \tilde{x}(t_*)) \left[ f^2_T - f^1_T \right] \sqrt{-m(\tilde{z}_0)} + O(\|x\|),
\]

\[
z_7 = \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2) + \Pi_3 [z_6 - \tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_2)] + O(\|x\|),
\]

which implies the expression for \( v \) in (E.4).

If the orbit \( \tilde{x} \) switches from \( \Phi_1 \) to \( \Phi_2 \) between \( s_* \) and \( \tilde{s}_2 \) (at some time \( \tilde{t}_1 \in (s_*, \tilde{s}_2) \)) a modification of (E.4) applies. Since \( \tilde{x} \) follows \( \Phi_2 \) in \( \tilde{s}_2 \) and \( t_* \) instead of \( \Phi_1 \), and switches from \( \Phi_2 \) to \( \Phi_1 \) at \( \tilde{t}_2 \), the role of \( f^1_T \) and \( f^2_T \) is exchanged in the definition of \( \Pi_1 \), \( \Pi_2 \), and \( v \). Furthermore, the time-\((s_* - \tilde{s}_2)\) map from \( U(\tilde{x}(s_*)) \) to \( U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) \) is no longer \( \Phi_1(\tilde{s}_2; s_*) \) but \( R_1(x) = \Phi_2(\tilde{s}_2 - s_* + (t_*) - \Phi_1(t(x); x)) \) where \( t(x) \) is the traveling time from \( x \) to the delayed switching manifold \( G^* = \Phi_1(t; g = 0) \cap U(\tilde{x}(\tilde{t}_1)) \). This traveling time depends smoothly on \( x \), which implies that \( R_1 \) is smooth as well. With these modifications the derivation given above leads to

\[
A = R^T \left[ I - \frac{f^3 f_i^T}{f_i^T f_i^T} \right] \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tau; \tilde{x}(s_2)) \left[ I - \frac{f^2 g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2))}{g'(\tilde{x}(\tilde{s}_2)) f^2_T} \right] \partial_x R_1(\tilde{x}(s_*)),
\]

\[
v = 2 R^T \left[ I - \frac{f^3 f_i^T}{f_i^T f_i^T} \right] \partial_2 \Phi_2(\tilde{s}_2; \tilde{x}(t_*))[f^2_T - f^1_T].
\]

This completes the proof of Lemma 13. \( \square \)