Prove that the family of sets $\mathcal{V}_{\gamma} = \left\{ x \in \mathcal{R}^p : \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_i \cdot \phi_i(x) \le \gamma \right\}$ with $\alpha_i > 0$ are forward invariant.

Proof:

According to the spectral property of the Koopman operator in [41], an eigenfunction $\varphi(x)$ and its corresponding eigenvalue $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$ of the Koopman operator K^t satisfies

$$\mathbf{K}^t \varphi(\mathbf{x}) = e^{\lambda t} \cdot \varphi(\mathbf{x})$$

$$\frac{d\varphi(x)}{dt} = \lambda \cdot \varphi(x)$$

For each $\phi_i(\mathbf{x}) := \varphi_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \overline{\varphi}_i(\mathbf{x}) = |\varphi_i(\mathbf{x})|^2 \ (i = 1, 2, ..., N_{\phi}),$

$$\dot{\phi}_i(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{d\phi_i(\mathbf{x})}{dt} = \frac{d\varphi_i(\mathbf{x})}{dt} \cdot \bar{\varphi}_i(\mathbf{x}) + \varphi_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{d\bar{\varphi}_i(\mathbf{x})}{dt}$$

Note $\frac{d\overline{\varphi}_l(x)}{dt} = \frac{\overline{d\varphi_l(x)}}{dt} = \overline{\lambda}_l \cdot \varphi_l(x) = \overline{\lambda}_l \cdot \overline{\varphi_l(x)}$, thus

$$\dot{\phi}_i(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\lambda_i + \overline{\lambda}_i\right) \cdot |\varphi_i(\mathbf{x})|^2 = 2 \cdot \text{Re}[\lambda_i] \cdot \phi_i(\mathbf{x})$$

Since the Koopman eigenfunctions are approximated using the SoC algorithm, there are approximation errors $e_i(x)$'s. With a mild assumption that the errors are bounded such that $|e_i(x)| \le \zeta_i \cdot \phi_i^2(x) + \eta_i$ for some positive constants ζ_i and η_i ,

$$\dot{\phi}_i(x) = 2 \cdot \text{Re}[\lambda_i] \cdot \phi_i(x) + e_i(x) \le 2 \cdot \text{Re}[\lambda_i] \cdot \phi_i(x) + |e_i(x)|$$
$$= \zeta_i \cdot \phi_i^2(x) + 2 \cdot \text{Re}[\lambda_i] \cdot \phi_i(x) + \eta_i$$

If $\dot{\phi}_i(x) \leq 0$ always holds for certain interval $(\underline{\gamma_i}, \overline{\gamma_i}) \subset \mathcal{R}_{>0}$, the minimum of the above quadratic function of $\phi_i(x)$ should be negative, which leads to the condition $(\text{Re}[\lambda_i])^2 > \zeta_i \cdot \eta_i$. It also implies that the $\overline{\gamma_i}$ -sublevel set of $\phi_i(x)$ is forward invariant.

Further, define $\gamma \coloneqq \min_i(\alpha_i \cdot \overline{\gamma_i})$ for $\alpha_i > 0$ ($i = 1, 2, ..., N_{\phi}$). From $\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_i \cdot \phi_i(x) \le \gamma$, we have

$$\alpha_i \cdot \phi_i(x) \le \gamma = \min_i (\alpha_i \cdot \overline{\gamma_i})$$

Thus, $\phi_i(x) \leq \overline{\gamma_i}$ holds for $i = 1, 2, ..., N_{\phi}$.

Now, define $\beta := 2 \cdot \min_{i} |\text{Re}[\lambda_i]|$. Then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_{i} \cdot \dot{\phi}_{i}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_{i} \cdot (2 \cdot \operatorname{Re}[\lambda_{i}]) \cdot \phi_{i}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_{i} \cdot [\zeta_{i} \cdot \phi_{i}^{2}(\mathbf{x}) + \eta_{i}]$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_{i} \cdot (-\beta) \cdot \phi_{i}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_{i} \cdot (\zeta_{i} \cdot \overline{\gamma_{i}}^{2} + \eta_{i})$$

Therefore, if $\gamma \cdot \beta \ge \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_i \cdot (\zeta_i \cdot \overline{\gamma_i}^2 + \eta_i)$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_i \cdot \dot{\phi}_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_i \cdot (-\beta) \cdot \phi_i(\mathbf{x}) + \gamma \cdot \beta = \beta \cdot [\gamma - \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_i \cdot \phi_i(\mathbf{x})]$$

This suggests that the γ -sublevel set of $\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_i \cdot \phi_i(\mathbf{x})$ is forward invariant. It should also be noted that the condition $\gamma \cdot \beta \geq \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\phi}} \alpha_i \cdot (\zeta_i \cdot \overline{\gamma_i}^2 + \eta_i)$ can be easily met if β is large enough, which translates to that all λ_i 's $(i = 1, 2, ..., N_{\phi})$ have a sufficiently large negative real part.

Q.E.D.