

Robust safety design for strict-feedback nonlinear systems via observer-based linear time varying feedback

Imtiaz Ur Rehman ^{*,**} Moussa Labbadi ^{***} Amine Abadi ^{*}
Lew Lew Yan Voon ^{*}

^{*} *ImViA Laboratory EA 7535, Université Bourgogne Europe, 720 avenue de l'Europe, 71200 Le Creusot, France (e-mail: Imtiaz-Ur.Rehman@ube.fr; Amine.Abadi@ube.fr; lew.lew-yan-voon@ube.fr)*

^{**} *COMSATS University Islamabad, Islamabad, Pakistan (e-mail: imtiaz.rehman@comsats.edu.pk)*

^{***} *Aix-Marseille University, LIS UMR CNRS 7020, 13013 Marseille, France (e-mail: moussa.labbadi@lis-lab.fr)*

Abstract: This paper develops a robust safety-critical control method for nonlinear strict-feedback systems with mismatched disturbances. Using a state transformation and a linear time-varying disturbance observer, the system is converted into a form that enables safe control design. The approach ensures forward invariance of the safety set and also applies to disturbance-free systems. Safety is proven for all cases, and a numerical example illustrates the results.

Keywords: Robust control, Safety-critical systems, Nonlinear systems, Forward invariance

1. INTRODUCTION

Safety-critical control has become essential for autonomous and robotic systems operating under uncertainty. Control Barrier Functions (CBFs), introduced for real-time safety filtering in (Ames et al., 2016), have been extended to robust and adaptive formulations for uncertain nonlinear systems (Xu et al., 2015; Buch et al., 2021; Alan et al., 2022). Recent developments include reduced-order safety design (Cohen et al., 2024), safe backstepping (Taylor et al., 2022), and applications to nonholonomic vehicles (Haraldsen et al., 2024) and robotic systems (Cortez et al., 2019).

Prescribed-time and finite-time safety frameworks have also emerged to ensure constraint satisfaction within a user-defined time horizon. These include prescribed-time safety for integrator and strict-feedback systems (Abel et al., 2022, 2023), as well as analyses of fundamental performance and robustness limitations (Aldana-López et al., 2023). Robust prescribed-time and fixed-time algorithms have been further explored in safety-critical contexts (Garg and Panagou, 2021; Nasab et al., 2025).

Ensuring robust, fast, and computationally efficient safety-critical control under mismatched disturbances remains a significant challenge. This paper develops a robust safety-critical control framework for nonlinear strict-feedback systems. The proposed approach leverages a

state transformation technique, originally introduced in (Praly, 1997) and extended in (Abel et al., 2023) for free-disturbances, to convert strict-feedback dynamics into a chain-of-integrators structure suitable for safety analysis. Systems subject to both matched and mismatched disturbances are considered, and a disturbance observer is designed to estimate these uncertainties. A linear time-varying control law is then employed to synthesize a safety-critical controller for the transformed system. The method also applies to the nominal disturbance-free case. Rigorous analysis establishes forward invariance of the safety set under all considered scenarios, and a numerical example illustrates the effectiveness of the proposed strategy.

Notations: This paper will utilize the notation listed below. $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq 0\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_+^* = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\}$, where \mathbb{R} represents the set of real numbers. The absolute value in \mathbb{R} is denoted by $|\cdot|$, and $\|\cdot\|$ represents the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^n . For a (Lebesgue) measurable function $d : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, the norm $\|d\|_\infty = \text{ess sup}_{t \geq 0} \|d(t)\|$ is defined. The set of functions d satisfying $\|d\|_\infty < +\infty$ is denoted as L_m^∞ . A function $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a class κ provided $\alpha(0)=0$, strictly increasing and continuous; if $\alpha(\infty) = \infty$ and is of class κ then function α is a class κ_∞^e .

2. BACKGROUND

Consider the following system:

$$\dot{x} = f(x, t) + g(x, t)u + d(t), \quad x \in \mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \quad u \in \mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^m, \quad (1)$$

where $t \in \mathbb{T} \triangleq [t_0, \infty)$ denotes the time with initialization $t_0 \geq 0$, while $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are assumed locally Lipschitz in x and $d(t)$ denotes the external disturbance and assumed to be bounded as $\|d(t)\|_\infty := \sup_{t \geq 0} \|d(t)\| \leq \rho$, with $\rho > 0$. The

¹ We thank the French government for the Plan France Relance initiative which provided fundings via the European Union under contract ANR-21-PRRD-0047-01. We are also grateful to the Doctoral School and the French Ministry of Research for the PhD MENRT scholarship.

disturbance free definition of CBFs can be found in (Ames et al., 2016).

Definition 1. (Zhao et al., 2020) A function $h : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to \mathcal{C}^n is a robust CBF (RCBF) for the system (1), on the safe set \mathcal{S}

$$\mathcal{S} = \{x \in \mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \mid h(x) \geq 0\}, \quad (2)$$

such that $\forall x \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\forall t \geq 0$:

$$\sup_{u \in U} \underbrace{[L_f h(x) + L_g h(x)u - \|h_x(x)\|\rho]}_{h(x,u,\rho)} \geq -\Gamma(h(x)), \quad (3)$$

where $\Gamma \in \kappa_\infty^e$, $L_f h(x) = (\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}) f(x)$, $L_g h(x) = (\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}) g(x)$ and $h_x(x) = \frac{\partial h(x)}{\partial x}$. Defining the point-wise control command set:

$$K_{\text{RCBF}}(x) \triangleq \{u \in \mathcal{U} \mid h(x, u, \rho) \geq -\Gamma(h(x))\}. \quad (4)$$

The aforementioned definition can encompass several types of uncertainty/disturbance owing to the generalized structure presented in (Alan et al., 2025). In this paper, we will use the following lemmas.

Lemma 1. (Levant, 2002) Examine the nonlinear differential equation with perturbation:

$$\dot{Z} + \iota_1 |Z|^{1/2} \text{sign}(Z) + \iota_2 \int_0^t \text{sign}(Z) d\tau = \Theta(t), \quad (5)$$

where Z represents the solution, $\iota_1, \iota_2 > 0$ are design gains, and $\Theta(t)$ is a bounded perturbation with $\|\dot{\Theta}(t)\|_\infty \leq C$ for some known $C \geq 0$. If the gains are chosen such that $\iota_1 \geq 1.5\sqrt{C}$ and $\iota_2 \geq 1.1C$, then $Z \rightarrow 0$ and $\dot{Z} \rightarrow 0$ in finite time.

Lemma 2. (Levant, 1998) The first-order sliding-mode differentiator

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\chi}_0 &= \gamma_0 = -\lambda_1 |\chi_0 - f(t)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{sign}(\chi_0 - f(t)) + \chi_1, \\ \dot{\chi}_1 &= -\lambda_2 \text{sign}(\chi_1 - \gamma_0) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $f(t)$ is a known signal, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ are tuning gains, and γ_0, χ_0, χ_1 are the states of (6). If the initial deviations $\chi_0 - f(t_0)$ and $\gamma_0 - f(t_0)$ are constrained, then ζ_0 estimates $f(t)$ with arbitrary precision.

3. PROBLEM STATEMENT

We next focus on perturbed vector strict-feedback systems, generalizing the affine dynamics in (1), of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) &= \mathbf{x}_{i+1}(t) + \phi_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n(t)) + d_i(t), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ \dot{\mathbf{x}}_n(t) &= G(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n(t))u(t) + \phi_n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n(t)) + d_n(t), \\ y(t) &= h(x_1(t)), \quad t \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are vector valued states, and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i$ denotes the column vector as $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i = [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{mi}$ with $\mathbf{x} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_n$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the Lebesgue-integrable input. The functions $G : \mathbb{R}^{mn} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\phi_i : \mathbb{R}^{mi} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ are defined as

$$G(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n) := \begin{bmatrix} g_{1,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n) & \cdots & g_{1,m}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ g_{m,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n) & \cdots & g_{m,m}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \phi_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) := \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{i,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_{i,m}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The disturbance vector $d(t) = [d_1(t) \dots d_n(t)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ representing the mismatched and matched disturbances.

Assumption 1. The disturbances are bounded and satisfies $\|d(t)\| \leq \rho$, $\rho > 0$.

Assumption 2. The matrix $G(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n)$ is non-singular $\forall \bar{\mathbf{x}}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$. Moreover, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, the functions $\phi_{i,k}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$ are $n - i$ times differentiable.

Despite the structural differences between (7) and (1), the system can be transformed into an input-affine chain of integrators (see the next paragraph) via standard backstepping coordinate transformations. As a result, the safety notions and the CBF/RCBF conditions introduced earlier remain valid in the transformed coordinates, where the control input enters linearly through a virtual control variable. Hence, the same safety-critical control framework can be systematically extended to this well-known class of perturbed strict-feedback systems.

3.1 Coordinate Transformation

This study aims to design a safe control law for the system (7), in the presence of both matched and mismatched disturbances. The design process in our work begins with a transformation of system (7) as follows:

$$\beta_0 = 0, \quad \beta_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) = -\phi_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i) + \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \frac{\partial \beta_{i-1}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_k} (\mathbf{x}_{k+1} + \phi_k(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

The introduce new coordinates

$$\varphi_i = \mathbf{x}_i - \beta_{i-1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i-1}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \quad (8)$$

with the input transformation is

$$u = G^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n)(v + \beta_n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n)). \quad (9)$$

differentiating (8) and substituting the system dynamics (7) along with the input transformation and reformulating its dynamics gives a perturbed vector chain of integrators:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\varphi}_i &= \varphi_{i+1}(t) + w_i(t, x), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \\ \dot{\varphi}_n &= v(t) + w_n(t, x), \\ y(t) &= h(\varphi_1(t)), \quad \forall t \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} w_i(t, x) &= d_i(t) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \frac{\partial \beta_{i-1}}{\partial x_k} d_k(t), \\ w_n(t, x) &= d_n(t) - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial \beta_{n-1}}{\partial x_k} d_k(t) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Remark 3.1. Note that the effects of all mismatched and matched disturbances accumulate in the residual term $w(t, x)$. The mismatch disturbances d_k for ($k < i$) persist because the terms $-\sum \frac{\partial \beta_{i-1}}{\partial x_k} d_k$ propagate them to higher levels. If only the matched disturbance is present, i.e., $d_n \neq 0$ and $d_k = 0 \ \forall k < n$, then $w_i = 0 \ \forall i < n$ and $w_n = d_n$. ■

The terms $w_i(t, x)$ capture how the original mismatched and matched perturbations propagate through the backstepping change of coordinates, as shown in the subsequent example. **Example:** Consider the following strict-feedback system:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_1 &= x_1^2 + x_2 + d_1, \quad \dot{x}_2 = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3 + d_2, \quad \dot{x}_3 = u + d_3, \\
y &= x_1, \quad \phi_1(x_1) = x_1^2, \quad \phi_2(\bar{x}_2) = x_1^2 + x_2^2, \quad \phi_3 \equiv 0, \\
G(\bar{x}_3) &= 1, \quad \beta_0 = 0, \quad \beta_1(x_1) = -x_1^2, \quad \beta_2(\bar{x}_2) = -x_1^2 - x_2^2 \\
&\quad - 2x_1x_2 - 2x_1^3, \quad \varphi_1 = x_1 + w_1, \quad \varphi_2 = x_2 + x_1^2 + w_2, \\
\varphi_3 &= x_3 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 2x_1x_2 + 2x_1^3 + w_3, \quad w_1 = d_1, \quad w_2 = d_2 \\
&\quad + 2x_1d_1, \quad w_3 = d_3 + (2x_1 + 2x_2 + 6x_1^2)d_1 + (2x_2 + 2x_1)d_2. \\
\text{Assumption 3.} \quad &\text{Consider the transformed system (10) with } w_i(t, x) \text{ defined in (11). Assume that for each } i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ there exist finite constants } \bar{w}_i, \bar{\delta}_i > 0 \text{ such that,} \\
&\forall t \geq 0: \|w_i(t, x)\| \leq \bar{w}_i, \quad \|\dot{w}_i(t, x)\| \leq \bar{\delta}_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi_1 = \mathbf{x}_1$, the original output in (7) and the transformed output in (10) are identical. As a result, we focus the safety design on the transformed dynamics (10) by synthesizing the input v , and then recover the actual input u for the original strict-feedback system using the inverse mapping in (9). As the safety design is carried out in the transformed dynamics (10), any Lebesgue-integrable nominal control input u_{no} formulated for the original system (7) must be mapped into the transformed coordinates. This is accomplished by specifying

$$v_{no} = G(\bar{\mathbf{x}})u_{no} - \beta_n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n) \quad (12)$$

as in (12). Our safety filter is thereafter applied directly to the converted nominal input v_{no} .

Our previous work (Labbadi et al., 2025) addressed only single-input linear integrator dynamics with disturbances, constant system matrices, and a fixed input channel. It cannot accommodate the nonlinear, state-dependent input matrix, coupled subsystem dynamics, or the propagation of mismatched disturbances present in strict-feedback systems, neither it support multi-input or vector-valued states. Furthermore, imposing constant upper bounds on the disturbances introduces conservatism. Thus, a disturbance observer is introduced to cope with this issue. Prescribed-time safety and persistent safety address distinct control objectives. Prescribed-time methods such as (Abel et al., 2022, 2023) guarantee safety only up to a fixed terminal time t_f and assume disturbance free dynamics, limiting their robustness and practical applicability, particularly because their time-varying gains diverge as $t \rightarrow t_f$. In contrast, the persistent safety framework developed in this work ensures safety for all $t \geq 0$ under mismatched and matched perturbations. By using bounded, strictly increasing gains, the controller prevents singularities while guaranteeing robust forward invariance. This enables continuous safe operation in long-duration, safety-critical applications where robustness to uncertainties/disturbances is important, such as aerial robotics, autonomous navigation, and industrial process control.

4. MAIN RESULTS

4.1 Vector chain of integrators without disturbances

In this subsection, we first consider the unperturbed system case and aim to propose a control architecture that ensures the persistent safety of a vector chain of integrators in the absence of disturbances. Conventional CBF approaches are generally insufficient for systems with high relative degree (RD). To address this, we introduce a new

RD-one CBF and synthesize the corresponding controller via a Quadratic Program (QP), leveraging the backstepping technique presented in (Krstic and Bement, 2006). Specifically, consider system (10) with $w_i \equiv 0$ and a candidate CBF $h_1(\varphi)$ of relative degree $n > 1$, which will serve as the basis for the design algorithm, under the following assumption:

Assumption 4. The function $h_1(\varphi) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to \mathcal{C}^n and satisfies

$$\frac{\partial h_1(\varphi)}{\partial \varphi} \neq 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}, \quad (13)$$

whereas, the safe set $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ is defined as:

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_1(\varphi) \geq 0\}, \quad (14)$$

with boundary $\partial\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_1(\varphi) = 0\}$ and interior $\text{Int}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}) = \{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_1(\varphi) > 0\}$.

Computing the time derivative of $h_1(\varphi)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
h_1(\varphi) &= L_f h_1(\varphi), \\
&= -\bar{\varrho}_1 \Upsilon(t) h_1(\varphi) + \underbrace{\bar{\varrho}_1 \Upsilon(t) h_1(\varphi) + L_f h_1(\varphi)}_{h_2(\varphi)}, \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\varrho}_1 > 0$, and $\Upsilon(t) = 1 + t$ is a strictly increasing time varying function.

Remark 4.1. In (15), any continuous and strictly increasing function $\Upsilon : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying $\Upsilon(0) > 0$ and possessing an unbounded integral can be employed. For instance, one may choose exponential, linear, or polynomial functions, for example: $\Upsilon(t) = ae^{\alpha t}$, $a, \alpha > 0$, $\Upsilon(t) = 1 + t$, $\Upsilon(t) = (1 + t)^p$, $p > 0$. ■

Remark 4.2. The prescribed-time form $\Upsilon(t) = \frac{\Upsilon_0}{T-t}$, with $\Upsilon_0 > 0$, $T > 0$, $t \in [0, T]$, can enforce finite-time safety but suffers from singularity at $t = T$, which prohibits its usage for persistent safety applications, and also lack robustness owing to noise/disturbance amplification. On the other hand, the functions in Remark 4.1 circumvent singularity and are recommended in persistent safety-critical applications. ■

Using condition (3), the inequality $\dot{h}_1 \geq -\Gamma(h_1)$ holds for $h_1(\varphi)$ in the disturbance-free case, given that $h_2(\varphi) \geq 0$. As a consequence, a new candidate CBF given by

$$h_2(\varphi) = \bar{\varrho}_1 \Upsilon(t) h_1(\varphi) + L_f h_1(\varphi). \quad (16)$$

However, the initial condition must lie within the safe set defined by $h_2(\varphi)$ (i.e., $h_2(\varphi_0) > 0$). To ensure this, we impose the subsequent assumption:

Assumption 5. $h_1(\varphi_0) > 0$.

In standard CBF-based safety frameworks, it is typically considered that the initial condition satisfies $h_1(\varphi_0) \geq 0$. However, we do not deal with situations in which the initial state is right on the boundary of the safe set $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ (i.e., $h_1(\varphi_0) = 0$), as ensuring safety from such places can pose control feasibility issues. Thus, under Assumption 5, we select

$$\bar{\varrho}_1 > \max \left\{ 0, -\frac{L_f h_1(\varphi_0)}{\Upsilon(t_0) h_1(\varphi_0)} \right\}, \quad (17)$$

this ensures $h_2(\varphi_0) > 0$ in accordance with (16). The scaling of the time-varying function $\Upsilon(t)$ at each stage, with its power proportional to the step index i , is a crucial design aspect. As a result, feedback improves over time,

which speeds up convergence to the interior of the safe set and inhibits the propagation of disturbances along the integrator chain. Inspired by (Abel et al., 2023; Labbadi and Efimov, 2024), this scheme incorporates a significant time-varying feedback gain that offers strong safety for higher-order systems. The application of the backstepping transformation to system (10) with $w_i \equiv 0$ is carried out as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(\varphi) &= h_1(\varphi), \\ h_i(\varphi) &= \bar{\varrho}_{i-1} \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta(i-1)} h_{i-1}(\varphi) + L_f h_{i-1}(\varphi), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for $i = \{2, \dots, n\}$, where the tuning factor $\vartheta \geq 1$, controls the intensity of the variable gain adjustment. Additionally, $\bar{\varrho}_{i-1}$ are selected to ensure that $h_i(\varphi, t_0)$ is initially positive:

$$\bar{\varrho}_{i-1} > \max \left\{ 0, -\frac{L_f h_{i-1}(\varphi_0)}{\Upsilon(t_0)^{\vartheta(i-1)} h_{i-1}(\varphi_0)} \right\}. \quad (19)$$

It is possible to explicitly specify the appropriate safety control law in (20) after constructing the CBF $h_n(\varphi)$ with RD one. This law overrides the nominal control \mathbf{v}_{no} if the trajectories go close to the boundary of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. Consequently, the safety requirement is enforced by the final control \mathbf{v} , which ensures the forward invariance of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ and prevents violations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v} &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}} \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{no}\|^2 \\ \text{s.t. } \dot{h}_n(\varphi, \mathbf{v}) &\geq -\bar{\varrho}_n \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta n} h_n(\varphi), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\bar{\varrho}_n > 0$. By employing the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) optimality conditions, the closed-form solution to this QP is obtained, yielding the following expression (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004):

$$\mathbf{v} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_{no}, & \zeta(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_{no}) \geq 0, \\ \mathbf{v}_{no} - (L_g h_n(\varphi))^{\top} \frac{\zeta(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_{no})}{\|L_g h_n(\varphi)\|^2}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

wherein

$$\zeta(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_{no}) := \dot{h}_n(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_{no}) + \bar{\varrho}_n \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta n} h_n(\varphi). \quad (22)$$

Remark 4.3. Our approach offers persistent safety, which is necessary in applications like continuous collision avoidance, in contrast to (Abel et al., 2023), which addresses temporary safety tasks. Furthermore, to ensure limited, monotonic gain growth and circumvent singularities, we opt a strictly increasing but bounded function instead of a blow-up function with unbounded gains and potential singularities. ■

Proposition 1. Consider system (10) with $w_i \equiv 0$ that satisfies Assumptions 4 and 5. Then the control law (21), synthesized employing the backstepping transformation (18) with the initial gain (19) and $\bar{\varrho}_n > 0$, ensures that $h_1(\varphi(t)) \geq 0 \ \forall t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

4.2 Disturbance observer

In the previous subsection, the QP formulation ensures safety in the disturbance-free case. However, practical systems often encounter external disturbances. Considering a constant bound for the perturbed system (10) to represent the time-varying disturbances in CBF constraints may lead to undesired conservativeness and a performance reduction in closed-loop. To cope with this, inspired by (Chen et al., 2015), we employed a disturbance

observer to estimate the unmatched and matched external disturbances in (11). The disturbance observer is designed as follows. Defining the error and its derivative as:

$$\begin{aligned} e_i &= \varphi_i - \varphi_d, \\ \dot{e}_i &= \dot{\varphi}_i - \dot{\varphi}_d = \varphi_{i+1} + w_i(t, x) - \dot{\varphi}_d, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where φ_d is the desired value for φ_i in (10), we simply set $\varphi_d = 0$ for safety. Note that to keep the observer design uniform for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ in (23), we adopt the convention $\varphi_{n+1} = \mathbf{v}$. Then, to estimate the external disturbance $w_i(t, x)$, an auxiliary variable is defined as

$$\sigma_{i0} = r_i - e_i, \quad \dot{r}_i = \varphi_{i+1} + \hat{w}_i(t, x), \quad (24)$$

whereas \hat{w}_i is the estimate of w_i . Taking into account (23) and (24), we obtain

$$\dot{\sigma}_{i0} = \hat{w}_i(t, x) - w_i(t, x) = \tilde{w}_i. \quad (25)$$

Thus, the derivative of σ_{i0} is exactly the disturbance estimation error. Since $\dot{\sigma}_{i0}$ is not measured directly, we approximate it using a first-order sliding mode differentiator according to lemma 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\chi}_{i0} &= \zeta_i = -\lambda_{i0} |\chi_{i0} - \sigma_{i0}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{sign}(\chi_{i0} - \sigma_{i0}) + \chi_{i1}, \\ \dot{\chi}_{i1} &= -\lambda_{i1} \text{sign}(\chi_{i1} - \zeta_i), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $\lambda_{i0}, \lambda_{i1} > 0$ are the design gains, and $\dot{\chi}_{i0}, \dot{\chi}_{i1}$ and ζ_i are the states of (26). As per (26) and lemma 2, we have

$$\dot{\sigma}_{i0} = \zeta_i + \Omega_i, \quad (27)$$

where Ω_i is the differentiator residual. Defining $\sigma_{i1} = \sigma_{i0} + \zeta_i$, the disturbance observer is proposed as

$$\dot{w}_i = -\zeta_i - k_{i1} |\sigma_{i1}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{sign}(\sigma_{i1}) - k_{i2} \int_0^t \text{sign}(\sigma_{i1}) d\tau, \quad (28)$$

By differentiating (25), we get $\ddot{\sigma}_{i0} = \dot{\hat{w}}_i - \dot{w}_i$. employing (27), it follows that

$$\dot{\sigma}_{i1} = \dot{\sigma}_{i0} + \ddot{\sigma}_{i0} - \dot{\Omega}_i = \dot{\sigma}_{i0} + \dot{\hat{w}}_i - \dot{w}_i - \dot{\Omega}_i. \quad (29)$$

Invoking (27) and substituting (28) into (29) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\sigma}_{i1} + k_{i1} |\sigma_{i1}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{sign}(\sigma_{i1}) + k_{i2} \int_0^t \text{sign}(\sigma_{i1}) d\tau \\ = \Omega_i - \dot{w}_i - \dot{\Omega}_i = \bar{D}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Proposition 2. Consider the system in (10) with disturbances $w_i(t, x)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ in (11), satisfying Assumption 3. The disturbance observer given in (28) for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with \bar{D}_i as given in (30), where $\dot{\Omega}_i$ and \dot{w}_i are the derivatives of the residual and the disturbance, respectively. Assume that there exists a known constant $\bar{\zeta}_i > 0$ such that

$$\|\dot{\bar{D}}_i\| \leq \bar{\zeta}_i. \quad (31)$$

If the observer gains satisfy,

$$k_{i1} \geq 1.5\sqrt{\bar{\zeta}_i}, \quad k_{i2} \geq 1.1\bar{\zeta}_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (32)$$

then the disturbance estimation errors $\tilde{w}_i = \hat{w}_i - w_i$ converge to zero in finite time.

4.3 Safety theorem

A disturbance observer based RCBF (DORCBF) is proposed in this subsection by explicitly incorporating the disturbance estimate and extending the backstepping technique aiming to propose a control architecture for robust safety-critical control to obtain the persistent safety objective for (10) with mismatched and matched disturbances defined in (11).

Definition 2. (DORCBF for perturbed system (10)). For the system (10), a function $h_1(\varphi) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to \mathcal{C}^n is a DORCBF on the set (14), such that $\forall \varphi \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\forall t \geq 0$:

$$\sup_{u \in U} \underbrace{[L_f h_1(\varphi) + L_g h_1(\varphi)u - \|h_\varphi(\varphi)\|\hat{w}]}_{h_1(\varphi, u, \hat{w})} \geq -\Gamma(h_1(\varphi)), \quad (33)$$

where $\hat{w} = [\hat{w}_1^\top \hat{w}_2^\top \cdots \hat{w}_n^\top]^\top$ is the estimation of $w = [w_1^\top w_2^\top \cdots w_n^\top]^\top$ in (11) and $h_\varphi(\varphi) = \frac{\partial h(\varphi)}{\partial \varphi}$, we define the point-wise set of controllers:

$$K_{\text{DORCBF}}(\varphi) \triangleq \left\{ u \in \mathcal{U} \mid \dot{h}_1(\varphi, u, \hat{w}) \geq -\Gamma(h_1(\varphi)) \right\}. \quad (34)$$

The requirement for smooth control laws to facilitate the repeated differentiations needed at each stage is a major obstacle when integrating CBF-based techniques with backstepping. These differentiations are incompatible with traditional robust CBF constraints, such as (33), which are nonsmooth, particularly for higher RD systems (Taylor et al., 2022). To resolve this, we present the revised definition of DORCBF by observing the upper bound of the nonsmooth component with a smooth function for $\mu > 0$:

$$\frac{1}{4\mu} \|h_\varphi(\varphi)\|^2 + \mu\hat{w}^2 \geq \|h_\varphi(\varphi)\|\hat{w}. \quad (35)$$

Now introducing a new definition of DORCBFs for (10) as follows.

Definition 3. For the transformed system (10), a function $h_1(\varphi) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to \mathcal{C}^n is a smooth DORCBF (SDORCBF) on the set (14) such that $\forall \varphi \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}$, for $\mu > 0$ and $\forall t \geq 0$:

$$\sup_{u \in U} \underbrace{\left[\dot{h}_1(\varphi, u) - \left(\frac{1}{4\mu} \|h_\varphi(\varphi)\|^2 + \mu\hat{w}^2 \right) \right]}_{\dot{h}_1(\varphi, u, \hat{w})} \geq -\Gamma(h_1(\varphi)), \quad (36)$$

we can define the point-wise set of controllers:

$$K_{\text{SDORCBF}}(\varphi) \triangleq \left\{ u \in \mathcal{U} \mid \dot{h}_1(\varphi, u, \hat{w}) \geq -\Gamma(h_1(\varphi)) \right\}. \quad (37)$$

Now consider a system (10), and assume a desired CBF $h_1(\varphi)$ with RD $n > 1$ that also satisfies Assumption 4. We design a smooth controller that accounts for the disturbances in (11) while evading the singularities linked to nonsmooth constraints by employing the SDORCBF formulation. The time derivative of $h_1(\varphi)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{h}_1(\varphi) &= L_f h_1(\varphi) + \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial \varphi} \hat{w}_1, \\ &\geq -\varrho_1 \Upsilon(t) h_1(\varphi) + \underbrace{\varrho_1 \Upsilon(t) h_1(\varphi) + L_f h_1(\varphi) - \Lambda_1(\varphi)}_{h_2(\varphi)}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where $\Lambda_1(\varphi) = \frac{1}{4\mu_1} \|\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial \varphi}\|^2 + \mu_1 \hat{w}_1^2$, $\mu_1 > 0$ and $\varrho_1 > \max \left\{ 0, \frac{-L_f h_1(\varphi_0) + \Lambda_1(\varphi_0)}{\Upsilon(t_0) h_1(\varphi_0)} \right\}$. Then, using the same method as previously mentioned in (4.1) with the inclusion of backstepping, we determined a CBF as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(\varphi) &= h_1(\varphi), \\ h_i(\varphi) &= \varrho_{i-1} \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta(i-1)} h_{i-1}(\varphi) + L_f h_{i-1}(\varphi) - \Lambda_{i-1}(\varphi), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

for $i = \{2, \dots, n\}$ and $\Lambda_{i-1}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{4\mu_{i-1}} \|\frac{\partial h_{i-1}}{\partial \varphi}\|^2 + \mu_{i-1} \hat{w}_{i-1}^2$, while updating the initial gains to include the perturbation bound:

$$\varrho_{i-1} > \max \left\{ 0, \frac{-L_f h_{i-1}(\varphi_0) + \Lambda_{i-1}(\varphi_0)}{\Upsilon(t_0)^{\vartheta(i-1)} h_{i-1}(\varphi_0)} \right\}. \quad (40)$$

As a result, the QP problem and its closed-form solution is formulated as follows:

$$\mathbf{v} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}} \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{\text{no}}\|^2$$

$$\text{s.t. } \dot{h}_n(\varphi, \mathbf{v}, \hat{w}) - \Lambda_n(\varphi) \geq -\varrho_n \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta n} h_n(\varphi). \quad (41)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_{\text{no}}, & \zeta(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_{\text{no}}, \hat{w}) \geq 0, \\ \mathbf{v}_{\text{no}} - (L_g h_n(\varphi))^\top \frac{\zeta(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_{\text{no}}, \hat{w})}{\|L_g h_n(\varphi)\|^2}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

where

$$\zeta(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_{\text{no}}, \hat{w}) := \dot{h}_n(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_{\text{no}}, \hat{w}) - \Lambda_n(\varphi) + \varrho_n \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta n} h_n(\varphi). \quad (43)$$

Remark 4.4. Inspired by (Labbadi and Efimov, 2024), our research focuses on time-varying, continuous, and bounded external perturbations that do not depend on system state, such as wind gusts affecting the drone, while the framework in (Kim et al., 2025) tackles state-dependent perturbations. This distinction is important because a hovering drone becomes unsafe if disturbances are assumed to disappear at equilibrium. Our approach addresses this gap by ensuring robustness against external disturbances. ■

Theorem 1. For the disturbed system (10), the safe set $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ defined in (14), and the disturbance observer is presented in 4.2. Assume Assumptions 3 and 4 satisfies, and $h_1(\varphi_0) > 0$. Then, the control law (42), derived using the backstepping transformation (39) with the initial gain (40) and $\varrho_n > 0$, ensures that $h_1(\varphi(t)) \geq 0 \ \forall t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

5. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

In this simulation problem setting, we are considering a vehicle and our objective is to navigate safely while being subjected to disturbances. The vehicle is described by:

$$\dot{x} = v \cos \theta, \quad \dot{y} = v \sin \theta, \quad \dot{v} = u_1, \quad \dot{\theta} = u_2, \quad (44)$$

where the positional states of the vehicle are represented by $[x \ y]^\top$, the turning rate and acceleration are controlled by u_1 and u_2 , respectively. Whereas, θ and v denote the heading angle and forward speed, respectively, and we assume $v \neq 0$. Assume the vehicle is unaware of the dynamics of the obstacle. Because of this, the vehicle will handle the obstacle dynamics as unknown external disturbances, which are illustrated as follows:

$$\dot{x}_d = d_x, \quad \dot{y}_d = d_y, \quad (45)$$

with the position of the obstacle denoted by $(x_d \ y_d)^\top$, and $\mathbf{d} = [d_x \ d_y]^\top$ indicates the external disturbances with $\|\mathbf{d}\| \leq \rho$, $\rho > 0$. By augmenting the vehicle and obstacle dynamics the overall system is as follows:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \\ \dot{v} \\ \dot{\theta} \\ \dot{x}_d \\ \dot{y}_d \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v \cos \theta \\ v \sin \theta \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ u_1 \\ u_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ d_x \\ d_y \end{bmatrix}.$$

The above dynamics are not in the form of (7), to transformed into such a form we define

$$\mathbf{x}_1 := [x, y]^\top, \quad \mathbf{x}_2 := [v \cos \theta, v \sin \theta]^\top$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_1 &= x_2 + \underbrace{\phi_1(\bar{x}_1)}_0, \\ \dot{x}_2 &= G(x)u + \underbrace{\phi_2(\bar{x}_2)}_0,\end{aligned}\quad (46)$$

where

$$G(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -v \sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & v \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}, \quad u = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (47)$$

Now, applying the coordinate transformation gives $\beta_0 = 0$, $\beta_1 = -\phi_1 = 0$ and $\beta_2 = -\phi_2 + \frac{\partial \beta_1}{\partial x_1}(x_2 + \phi_1) = 0$. The transformed coordinates are simply

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_1 &= \mathbf{x}_1 := \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_{1,1} \\ \varphi_{1,2} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \varphi_2 &= \mathbf{x}_2 := \begin{bmatrix} v \cos \theta \\ v \sin \theta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_{2,1} \\ \varphi_{2,2} \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}\quad (48)$$

The transformed chain becomes the exact vector chain

$$\dot{\varphi}_1 = \varphi_2, \quad \dot{\varphi}_2 = \mathbf{v} \quad (49)$$

where $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2)^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the new transformed input. The original actuator inputs are obtained by $u = G^{-1}(x)\mathbf{v}$. To incorporate the moving obstacle, the dynamics were modeled as another vehicle:

$$\dot{x}_d = v_d \cos \theta, \quad \dot{y}_d = v_d \sin \theta, \quad \dot{\theta}_d = u_d, \quad (50)$$

define the relative position:

$$\Delta := \varphi_1 - \mathbf{p}_d, \quad \mathbf{p}_d = [x_d, y_d]^\top, \quad (51)$$

where \mathbf{p}_d denotes the obstacle vehicle position. Differentiating (51) and using (49) yields

$$\dot{\Delta} = \dot{\varphi}_1 - \dot{\mathbf{p}}_d = \varphi_2 - \mathbf{d}, \quad \mathbf{d} = \dot{\mathbf{p}}_d = [\dot{x}_d, \dot{y}_d]^\top. \quad (52)$$

Treating the velocity of the obstacle vehicle as a disturbance $w_1 := -\mathbf{d}$, we obtain the perturbed chain form

$$\dot{\varphi}_1 = \varphi_2 + w_1, \quad \dot{\varphi}_2 = \mathbf{v} + w_2, \quad (53)$$

where for the moving obstacle vehicle only scenario $w_2 = 0$. To circumvent obstacle collision, a candidate CBF is considered as:

$$h_1(\varphi_1) = (\varphi_{1,1} - x_d)^2 + (\varphi_{1,2} - y_d)^2 - r^2, \quad (54)$$

while, $r \in \mathbb{R}$ defines the user-specified safety distance. Differentiating (54) and employing the disturbance estimate \hat{w}_1 from the observer yields

$$\begin{aligned}h_1(\varphi_1) &= 2(\varphi_{1,1} - x_d)(\varphi_{2,1}) + 2(\varphi_{1,2} - y_d)(\varphi_{2,2}) \\ &\quad - 2(\varphi_{1,1} - x_d)d_x - 2(\varphi_{1,2} - y_d)d_y \\ &= 2\Delta^\top \varphi_2 + 2\Delta^\top \hat{w}_1 \\ &\geq -\varrho_1 \Upsilon(t)h_1(\varphi_1) \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\varrho_1 \Upsilon(t)h_1(\varphi_1) + L_f h_1(\varphi_1) - \Lambda_1(\varphi_1)}_{h_2(\varphi)},\end{aligned}\quad (55)$$

and

$$h_2(\varphi) = \varrho_1 \Upsilon(t)h_1(\varphi_1) + L_f h_1(\varphi_1) - \Lambda_1(\varphi_1), \quad (56)$$

whereas, $L_f h_1(\varphi_1) = 2\Delta^\top \varphi_2$ and $\Lambda_1(\varphi_1) = \frac{1}{4\mu_1} \|\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial \varphi_1}\|^2 + \mu_1 \|\hat{w}_1\|^2 = \frac{1}{\mu_1} \|\Delta\|^2 + \mu_1 \|\hat{w}_1\|^2$, $\mu_1 > 0$. Now, we select $\varrho_1 > \max\left\{0, \frac{-L_f h_1(\varphi_0) + \Lambda_1(\varphi_0)}{\Upsilon(t_0) h_1(\varphi_0)}\right\}$, such that $h_2(\varphi_0) > 0$. Theorem 1 demonstrates that imposing $h_2(\varphi) > 0$ guarantees the safety of the system. Computing the time derivative of $h_2(\varphi) > 0$ results in

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{h}_2 &= \varrho_1 \vartheta \Upsilon^{\vartheta-1} h_1 + 2\varrho_1 \Upsilon(t)^\vartheta \Delta^\top (\varphi_2 + \hat{w}_1) + 2\|\varphi_2 + \hat{w}_1\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\Delta^\top \mathbf{v} + 2\Delta^\top \hat{w}_1 - \frac{2}{\mu_1} \Delta^\top (\varphi_2 + \hat{w}_1) - 2\mu_1 \hat{w}_1^\top \dot{\hat{w}}_1.\end{aligned}\quad (57)$$




Fig. 1. System trajectory of vehicles in the presence of an obstacle (red) with unknown dynamics. The vehicle using the standard BCBF (green) fails to evade collision, while the vehicle considering the proposed safety filter DORCBF (blue) remains safe from the obstacle by effectively guiding the vehicle.

$$\mathbf{v} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}} \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{no}\|^2$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad h_2(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_{no}, \hat{w}_1, \dot{\hat{w}}_1) \geq -\varrho_2 \Upsilon^{2\vartheta} h_2. \quad (58)$$

The proposed safety controller is applied on the vehicle and named as DORCBF compared while on another vehicle standard backstepping CBF referred to as BCBF strategy outlined in (Krstic and Bement, 2006) is applied to test the safety performance subjected to unknown external perturbations. The safe distance is selected as $r = 1$ and both vehicles are initialized at $[x(0) \ y(0) \ v(0) \ \theta(0)]^\top = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]^\top$, while the obstacle vehicle is initialized at $[x_d(0) \ y_d(0) \ \theta_d(0)]^\top = [3 - 3\frac{\pi}{2}]^\top$, with $v_d(t) = 1$ and $u_d(t) = 2 \cos(2t)$. The nominal control aim of the vehicle was to drive to the right at a constant velocity of $v = 1$ with a heading angle $\theta = 0$. The nominal control commands were therefore specified as $u_{1(no)} = -a_1(v-1)$ and $u_{2(no)} = -a_2\theta$, where $a_1 = a_2 = 1$. The parameters were chosen as $\varrho_1 = 5$, $\varrho_2 = 0.5$, $\mu_1 = 0.2$, and $\vartheta = 3$. The gains in DO design were selected as $\lambda_{10} = 20$, $\lambda_{11} = 10$, and $k_{11} = k_{12} = 10$.

The corresponding system trajectories are shown in Fig. 1, and the evolution of the vehicle states under the standard BCBF strategy and the DORCBF framework is shown in Fig. 2. As can be observed at $t = 3.35$ sec in Fig. 1, the vehicle using the BCBF technique breaches safety by failing to account for the obstacle's dynamics, which leads to a collision. On the other hand, the vehicle that incorporates external perturbations and employs the DORCBF prevents collisions and keeps a safe distance from dynamic obstacle when it encounters them twice, roughly at $t = 3.35$ sec and $t = 5.80$ sec, validating our method.




Fig. 2. System states of the vehicles representing the positional states $[x \ y]$, forward velocity v , and the heading angle θ .

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, a robust approach for ensuring the safety of strict-feedback systems is proposed. The proposed method is applied both in the absence of disturbances and in the presence of matched and mismatched disturbances. A linear time-varying control law is designed using a backstepping approach within the CBF framework. The theoretical guarantees are established based on the convergence of the designed observer, time-scale transformations, and quadratic programming (QP) methods. An illustrative example is provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

Appendix A. PROOFS

A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. Given $h_{i-1}(\varphi_0) > 0$, the initial gain in (19) is intended to ensure $h_i(\varphi_0) > 0$. Since we know $h_1(\varphi_0) > 0$, choosing

$$\bar{\varrho}_1 > \max \left\{ 0, -\frac{L_f h_1(\varphi_0)}{\Upsilon(t_0) h_1(\varphi_0)} \right\}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

guarantees that $h_2(\varphi_0) > 0$. Thus, reiterating this argument inductively yields $h_i(\varphi_0) > 0$ for $i = \{2, \dots, n\}$. Then, by differentiating the CBF recursion in (18) yield:

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_k(\varphi(t)) = -\bar{\varrho}_k \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta k} h_k(\varphi(t)) + h_{k+1}(\varphi(t)), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} h_n(\varphi(t)) &= L_f h_n(\varphi(t)) + L_g h_n(\varphi(t)) u \\ &\geq -\bar{\varrho}_n \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta n} h_n(\varphi(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for $k = \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. Employing the comparison lemma and the variation of constants formula, for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, gives

$$\begin{aligned} h_k(\varphi(t)) &\geq h_k(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\bar{\varrho}_k \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s)^{\vartheta k} ds} \\ &\quad + \int_{t_0}^t h_{k+1}(s) e^{-\bar{\varrho}_k \int_{t_0}^s \Upsilon(\tau)^{\vartheta k} d\tau} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$h_n(\varphi(t)) \geq h_n(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\bar{\varrho}_n \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s)^{\vartheta n} ds}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

for $k = \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. Because, $h_n(\varphi(t_0)) > 0$, inequality (A.5) ensures $h_n(\varphi(t)) > 0$ for all $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. Substituting (A.5) into (A.4) for $k = n-1$ leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{n-1}(\varphi(t)) &\geq \underbrace{h_{n-1}(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\bar{\varrho}_{n-1} A(t)}}_{>0} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{h_n(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\bar{\varrho}_{n-1} A(t)} \int_{t_0}^t e^{\bar{\varrho}_{n-1} A(\tau) - \varrho_n B(\tau)} d\tau}_{\geq 0} \\ &\geq h_{n-1}(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\bar{\varrho}_{n-1} A(t)} > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $\bar{A}(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s)^{\vartheta(n-1)} ds$ and $\bar{B}(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s)^{\vartheta n} ds$. Employing backward induction with (A.5) and (A.6), we finally obtain

$$h_1(\varphi(t)) \geq h_1(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\bar{\varrho}_1 \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s) ds}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

which implies

$$h_1(\varphi(t)) \geq 0, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, \infty). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

■

A.2 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the auxiliary variable in the disturbance estimator and the estimation error from (25). The differentiator approximation and bounded residual property is given by (27). Consequently, (30) provides the dynamics of the sliding variable σ_{i1} , with \bar{D}_i specified in (30). By Assumption 3 and the differentiator approximation, the bound (31) holds. Hence, Lemma 1 applies to the dynamics in (30). Under the gain conditions (32), it follows that $\sigma_{i1} \rightarrow 0$ (and $\dot{\sigma}_{i1} \rightarrow 0$) in finite time. Thus, $\sigma_{i1} = \sigma_{i0} + \zeta_i \implies$ the signal $\dot{\sigma}_{i0}$ is convergent in finite time according to (27). Using (25), this implies $\tilde{w}_i \rightarrow 0$ in finite time.

■

A.3 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Given $h_{i-1}(\varphi_0) > 0$, the initial gain (40) is selected to ensure $h_i(\varphi_0) > 0$. Because $h_1(\varphi_0) > 0$, choosing

$$\varrho_1 > \max \left\{ 0, \frac{-L_f h_1(\varphi_0) + \Lambda_1(\varphi_0)}{\Upsilon(t_0) h_1(\varphi_0)} \right\}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

guarantees $h_2(\varphi_0) > 0$. Repeating this argument for $i = \{2, \dots, n\}$, it follows that $h_i(\varphi_0) > 0$ by induction. Differentiating the recursive CBFs in (39) yields:

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_k(\varphi(t)) = -\varrho_k \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta k} h_k(\varphi(t)) + h_{k+1}(\varphi(t)), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} h_n(\varphi(t)) &= L_f h_n(\varphi(t)) + L_g h_n(\varphi(t)) u - \Lambda_n(\varphi) \\ &\geq -\varrho_n \Upsilon(t)^{\vartheta n} h_n(\varphi(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

for $k = \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. Using the variation of constants formula and the comparison lemma, for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, gives

$$\begin{aligned} h_k(\varphi(t)) &\geq h_k(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\varrho_k \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s)^{\vartheta k} ds} \\ &\quad + \int_{t_0}^t h_{k+1}(s) e^{-\varrho_k \int_{t_0}^s \Upsilon(\tau)^{\vartheta k} d\tau} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$h_n(\varphi(t)) \geq h_n(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\varrho_n \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s)^{\vartheta_n} ds}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

for $k = \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. As previously stated, $h_n(\varphi(t_0)) > 0$. Consequently, inequality (A.13) ensures $h_n(\varphi(t)) > 0 \forall t \in [t_0, \infty)$. Substituting (A.13) into (A.12) for $k = n-1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} h_{n-1}(\varphi(t)) &\geq \underbrace{h_{n-1}(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\varrho_{n-1} A(t)}}_{>0} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{h_n(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\varrho_{n-1} A(t)} \int_{t_0}^t e^{\varrho_{n-1} A(\tau) - \varrho_n B(\tau)} d\tau}_{\geq 0} \\ &\geq h_{n-1}(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\varrho_{n-1} A(t)} > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where $A(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s)^{\vartheta(n-1)} ds$ and $B(t) = \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s)^{\vartheta n} ds$. Employing backward induction with (A.13) and (A.14), it follows that

$$h_1(\varphi(t)) \geq h_1(\varphi(t_0)) e^{-\varrho_1 \int_{t_0}^t \Upsilon(s) ds}, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

hence

$$h_1(\varphi(t)) \geq 0, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, \infty). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

■

REFERENCES

Abel, I., Steeves, D., Krstić, M., and Janković, M. (2022). Prescribed-time safety design for a chain of integrators. In *2022 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 4915–4920. IEEE.

Abel, I., Steeves, D., Krstić, M., and Janković, M. (2023). Prescribed-time safety design for strict-feedback nonlinear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 69(3), 1464–1479.

Alan, A., Molnar, T.G., Ames, A.D., and Orosz, G. (2025). Generalizing robust control barrier functions from a controller design perspective. *IEEE Open Journal of Control Systems*.

Alan, A., Molnar, T.G., Daş, E., Ames, A.D., and Orosz, G. (2022). Disturbance observers for robust safety-critical control with control barrier functions. *IEEE control systems letters*, 7, 1123–1128.

Aldana-López, R., Seeber, R., Haimovich, H., and Gómez-Gutiérrez, D. (2023). On inherent limitations in robustness and performance for a class of prescribed-time algorithms. *Automatica*, 158, 111284.

Ames, A.D., Xu, X., Grizzle, J.W., and Tabuada, P. (2016). Control barrier function based quadratic programs for safety critical systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(8), 3861–3876.

Boyd, S.P. and Vandenberghe, L. (2004). *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press.

Buch, J., Liao, S.C., and Seiler, P. (2021). Robust control barrier functions with sector-bounded uncertainties. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 6, 1994–1999.

Chen, M., Shi, P., and Lim, C.C. (2015). Robust constrained control for mimo nonlinear systems based on disturbance observer. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(12), 3281–3286.

Cohen, M.H., Molnar, T.G., and Ames, A.D. (2024). Safety-critical control for autonomous systems: Control barrier functions via reduced-order models. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 57, 100947.

Cortez, W.S., Oetomo, D., Manzie, C., and Choong, P. (2019). Control barrier functions for mechanical systems: Theory and application to robotic grasping. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 29(2), 530–545.

Garg, K. and Panagou, D. (2021). Robust control barrier and control Lyapunov functions with fixed-time convergence guarantees. In *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2292–2297. IEEE.

Haraldsen, A., Wiig, M.S., Ames, A.D., and Pattersen, K.Y. (2024). Safety-critical control of nonholonomic vehicles in dynamic environments using velocity obstacles. In *2024 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 3152–3159. IEEE.

Kim, K.H., Diagne, M., and Krstić, M. (2025). Robust control barrier function design for high relative degree systems: Application to unknown moving obstacle collision avoidance. In *2025 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 355–360. IEEE.

Krstić, M. and Bement, M. (2006). Nonovershooting control of strict-feedback nonlinear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 51(12), 1938–1943.

Labbadi, I.U.R.M., Abadi, A., and Voon, L.L.Y. (2025). Robust safety-critical control of integrator chains with mismatched perturbations via linear time-varying feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.26629*.

Labbadi, M. and Efimov, D. (2024). Hyperexponential stabilization of double integrator with unmatched perturbations. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*.

Levant, A. (1998). Robust exact differentiation via sliding mode technique. *automatica*, 34(3), 379–384.

Levant, A. (2002). Universal single-input-single-output (siso) sliding-mode controllers with finite-time convergence. *IEEE transactions on Automatic Control*, 46(9), 1447–1451.

Nasab, A.A., Badiei, R., and Asemani, M.H. (2025). Safe prescribed time controller for wheeled mobile robots by using control barrier functions as a safety filter. *ISA transactions*.

Praly, L. (1997). Generalized weighted homogeneity and state dependent time scale for linear controllable systems. In *Proceedings of the 36th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, volume 5, 4342–4347. IEEE.

Taylor, A.J., Ong, P., Molnar, T.G., and Ames, A.D. (2022). Safe backstepping with control barrier functions. In *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 5775–5782. IEEE.

Xu, X., Tabuada, P., Grizzle, J.W., and Ames, A.D. (2015). Robustness of control barrier functions for safety critical control. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 48(27), 54–61.

Zhao, P., Mao, Y., Tao, C., Hovakimyan, N., and Wang, X. (2020). Adaptive robust quadratic programs using control Lyapunov and barrier functions. In *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 3353–3358. IEEE.