



Figure 1: Resolution analysis.

In Figure 1 we show an edge length  $l$  for a given  $n$ -gon (polygon with  $n$  sides). We assume that the robot hits that edge for the first time at point  $x_0$  and that there exists a stable limit cycle of period  $n$  that hits the edge at point  $x_{FP}$ . Let  $b_\theta^{+k}(x_0)$  be the hit point on the polygon boundary after iterating  $k$  times the bouncing map  $b_\theta^+(x_0)$ , starting from  $x_0$ . Finally, we show as dotted squares the cells for a given discretization.

In simulations that consider regular polygons with fixed bouncing policy, for the right bouncing angle intervals, only one stable limit cycle shall appear for each  $\theta$ . When the algorithm finds more than one periodic orbit, only one of them can be the sought limit cycle. The other orbits appear as an artefact of the current discretization resolution. For certain values of  $\theta$ , the convergence rate towards  $x_{FP}$  is quite small, resulting in hit points  $b_\theta^{+k}(x_0)$  that slowly move away from  $x_0$ . For example, consider Figure 1a and assume that  $b_\theta^{+k}(x_0)$  has already returned to the  $n$ -gon edge  $e$ . For a given resolution and a certain  $\theta$ ,  $x_0$  and  $b_\theta^{+k}(x_0)$  can fall in the same cell  $z$ , which would result into an apparent periodic orbit, but  $z$  is indeed a transient cell. Conversely, in Figure 1b, the algorithm has iterated enough such that  $b_\theta^{+k}(x_0)$  and  $x_{FP}$  are in the same cell  $z$ , so any  $b_\theta^{+k+jn}(x_0)$  would stay in  $z$ , hence,  $z$  is truly a persistent cell.

To avoid the issue present in Figure 1a, the discretization resolution could

be increased such that  $x_0$  and  $b_\theta^{+k}(x_0)$  fall into different cells  $z$  and  $w$ , just as seen in Figure 1c, therefore,  $z$  and  $w$  would be classified as transient cells. Nonetheless, with this finer discretization there is no guarantee that as  $b_\theta^{+k}(x_0)$  keeps iterating, two consecutive hit points  $b_\theta^{+jn}(x_0)$  and  $b_\theta^{+(j+1)n}(x_0)$ , which are getting closer to  $x_{FP}$ , fall in the same cell  $y$  yielding again a spurious periodic cycle. The resolution could again be increased but this also has the inconvenience that as the cells become smaller, the algorithm will need more iterations in order to find the real stable limit cycle.

Based on the last analysis it is desirable to have large enough cells to avoid over iterating the algorithm. Following this vein, setting  $k = n$  is a suitable election, as it is the minimum  $k$  that guarantees the robot to return to the edge where  $x_0$  is located, opening the possibility of closing a cycle. Inequality (1) can be used to compute an actual bound for the distance between  $b_\theta^{+k}(x_0)$  and  $x_{FP}$  as a function of  $k$ ; again, setting  $k = n$ , yields a bound that can be used to select the actual size of the cells. For instance, suppose that in Figure 1b, the point  $b_\theta^{+k}(x_0)$  has  $k = n$ . If that is the case, it can be seen that the shown cell size is enough to contain distance  $d(b_\theta^{+n}(x_0), x_{FP})$ , so the algorithm would not identify spurious periodic orbits and would rapidly find the persistent cell that contains  $x_{FP}$ . On the other hand, if the distance between  $b_\theta^{+n}(x_0)$  and  $x_{FP}$  is larger, it would require bigger cells just as shown in Figure 1d. In either case, selecting the cell size according to distance  $d(b_\theta^{+n}(x_0), x_{FP})$  (actually according to its bound  $c(\theta)^n l$ ), makes the algorithm identify a single limit cycle with fewer iterations.

**Theorem 1** *Assume an adjacent edges fixed bouncing scheme, and assume that the robot starts over  $\delta P$  at distance  $x_0 \in (0, l)$  from vertex  $v_i$ . When the robot encounters  $\delta P$  for the  $k^{th}$  time, then*

$$d(b_\theta^{+k}(x_0), x_{FP}) < c(\theta)^k l. \quad (1)$$

**Corollary 1** *If the initial distance  $x_0$  is known, then  $c(\theta)^k d(x_0, x_{FP})$  gives the exact bound to  $d(b_\theta^{+k}(x_0), x_{FP})$ .*