

Linearization of Discrete-Time Systems via Restricted Dynamic Feedback

Hong-Gi Lee, *Member, IEEE*

School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering
Chung-Ang University
221 Heuksuk-Dong, Dongjak-Ku
Seoul, Korea 156-756
Tel: +822-820-5317, Fax: +822-817-0292
Email: hglee@cau.ac.kr

Ari Arapostathis, *Senior Member, IEEE*
(*corresponding author*)

The University of Texas at Austin
Electrical and Computer Engineering
1 University Station C0803
Austin, TX 78712-0240
Tel: (512)-471-3265, Fax: (512)-471-5532
Email: ari@ece.utexas.edu

Steven I. Marcus, *Fellow, IEEE*

Electrical and Computer Engineering Department
and Institute for Systems Research
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
Tel: (301)-405-3683, Fax: (301)-405-3751
Email: marcus@eng.umd.edu

October 16, 2002

Abstract

We extend the results in [14] to multi-input systems, and utilize these to obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for the linearization of discrete-time nonlinear systems via restricted dynamic feedback. We observe that for discrete-time nonlinear systems, the bound on the number of delays (or integrators) needed to synthesize the linearizing dynamic feedback differs from the continuous-time analogue.

Index Terms

Nonlinear discrete-time control systems, dynamic-feedback linearization, restricted dynamic feedback.

This research was supported in part by the Chung-Ang University Research Fund, in part by the Office of Naval Research through the Electric Ship Research and Development Consortium, in part by DARPA under Grant F30602-00-2-0588, in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant ECS-0218207, and in part by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under Grant F496200110161.

Hong-Gi Lee is with the School of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Korea, Ari Arapostathis is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at The University of Texas at Austin and Steven I. Marcus is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Institute for Systems Research at the University of Maryland, College Park.

I. INTRODUCTION

Linearization is a widely used tool for the control of nonlinear systems, because well-developed linear system theory techniques can be applied to the nonlinear plant, once this is linearized. The transformations employed for linearization usually involve a state coordinate change and feedback. Linearization via static feedback has been thoroughly studied and an abundance of results exist in the literature applicable to both continuous-time [6], [9], [13], [22] and discrete-time nonlinear systems [7], [11], [14], [16]. More recently, the use of dynamic feedback has been investigated, in the hope of augmenting the class of linearizable systems. However, despite the significant effort already invested in studying linearization via dynamic state feedback [1]–[5], [8], [12], [15], [18]–[21], finding verifiable necessary and sufficient conditions to characterize the class of such linearizable systems is still an open problem. Restricted dynamic feedback refers to a compensator in the feedback loop that consists only of pure integrators. Lee et al. [15] have obtained necessary and sufficient conditions for a continuous-time system to be linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback by establishing a bound on the maximum number of integrators needed for the input channels. In this paper, we extend the study in [15] to discrete-time systems. The method relies on the multi-input version of results in [14].

Consider a smooth nonlinear discrete-time system

$$x(t+1) = f(x(t), u(t)), \quad f(0, 0) = 0, \quad (1)$$

with state $x \in \Sigma \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ and input $u \in \mathcal{U} \simeq \mathbb{R}^m$.

Definition 1: System (1) is linearizable by a state coordinate change, if there exists a smooth diffeomorphism $T : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ which transforms (1) to a reachable linear system, in the variable $\zeta = T(x)$:

$$\zeta(t+1) = A\zeta(t) + Bu(t), \quad \zeta \in \Sigma.$$

Definition 2: System (1) is static-feedback linearizable, if there exists a smooth map $\gamma : \Sigma \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ such that the resulting closed-loop system

$$x(t+1) = f(x(t), \gamma(x(t), u(t))), \quad x \in \Sigma, \quad u \in \mathcal{U},$$

is linearizable by a state coordinate change.

Dynamic state feedback amounts to the use of a controller with dynamics

$$z(t+1) = g(x(t), z(t), u(t)), \quad z \in \Sigma_c \simeq \mathbb{R}^s, \quad u \in \mathcal{U}, \quad (2)$$

and a smooth map $h : \Sigma \times \Sigma_c \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, which when combined with (1) yield the closed-loop system with extended state space $\Sigma \times \Sigma_c$

$$\begin{bmatrix} x(t+1) \\ z(t+1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(x(t), h(x(t), z(t), u(t))) \\ g(x(t), z(t), u(t)) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Definition 3: System (1) is dynamic-feedback linearizable, if there exists a smooth dynamic feedback (2) which yields a closed-loop system (3) that is linearizable by a state coordinate change.

Definition 4: System (1) is said to be linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback of index $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$, if there exists a dynamic compensator of the form

$$z_k^i(t+1) = \begin{cases} z_{k+1}^i(t), & \text{if } d_i \geq 1, \ 1 \leq k \leq d_i - 1, \\ u_i(t), & \text{if } d_i \geq 1, \ k = d_i, \end{cases} \quad (4a)$$

and a map $h = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$, defined by

$$h_i(z, u) = \begin{cases} z_1^i, & \text{if } d_i \geq 1, \\ u_i, & \text{if } d_i = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4b)$$

such that the resulting closed-loop system is static-feedback linearizable.

In this paper, we obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for (1) to be linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback as defined in Definition 4. First, we extend the results in [14] to multi-input systems and then we follow the approach in [15]. The results we obtain are very similar to the continuous-time case. However, the bound obtained on the number of necessary delays is smaller than the corresponding one on the number of integrators.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND DEFINITIONS

In this section, we introduce some basic definitions and then extend the results of [14] to multi-input systems. We refer the reader to [10], [17], and other papers in the references for basic results in nonlinear systems and differential geometry used in the paper.

We view $B := \Sigma \times \mathcal{U}$, $\pi: B \rightarrow \Sigma$ as a vector bundle over Σ . With $B_x \simeq \mathcal{U}$ denoting the fibre over $x \in \Sigma$, we define, for each non-negative integer k , the k th product bundle B^k by

$$B^k = \bigcup_{x \in \Sigma} \underbrace{B_x \times \dots \times B_x}_{k \text{ times}}.$$

Thus, B^k is a smooth vector bundle over Σ , and it may also be viewed as a vector bundle over B^{k-1} , with $\pi: B^k \rightarrow B^{k-1}$ denoting the projection. Also, $B^0 \simeq \Sigma$ denotes the zero-section $\Sigma \times \{0\}$. The response of a discrete-time system to a finite input sequence can be conveniently represented, albeit reversed in time, if one extends the definition of the system map $f: B \rightarrow \Sigma$ to a map $f: B^k \rightarrow B^{k-1}$, for $k > 0$, by

$$f(x, u^1, \dots, u^k) := (f(x, u^k), u^1, \dots, u^{k-1}),$$

where

$$u^j := [u_1^j \ \dots \ u_m^j]^T \in \mathcal{U}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

Also, for $k = 0$, f is interpreted as a map $f: B^0 \rightarrow B^0$, i.e., $f(x, 0) = (f(x, 0), 0)$. Then, the k th composition f^k is well-defined as a map from B^k to Σ , and more generally as a map from B^ℓ to $B^{(\ell-k)^+}$, where $(\cdot)^+$ denotes the positive part of $(\cdot)$. In particular, when the domain of f^k is selected as B , then $f^k: B \rightarrow B^0 \simeq \Sigma$ is identified as the k -step impulse response of the system and we denote it as $\hat{f}^k$. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f}^1(x, u) &:= f(x, u), \\ \hat{f}^\ell(x, u) &:= f(\hat{f}^{\ell-1}(x, u), 0), \quad \ell \geq 2.\end{aligned}$$

Identifying the fibre of B^k over $x \in \Sigma$ with $\mathcal{U}^k \simeq \mathcal{U} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{U}$, k times we often use the convenient notation $f_x^k(\mathbf{u}^k) = f^k(x, \mathbf{u}^k)$, with $\mathbf{u}^k = (u^1, \dots, u^k)$ representing the generic element in $\mathcal{U}^k$.

Definition 5: For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, let κ_i be the smallest non-negative integer such that

$$\frac{\partial \hat{f}^{\kappa_i+1}}{\partial u_i}(0) \in \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial \hat{f}^{k+1}}{\partial u_j}(0) \mid k \geq 0, j < m(\kappa_i - k) + i \right\}.$$

The Kronecker indices of (1) are defined as the collection $\{\kappa_i\}$ and are represented by the multi-index $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$.

It is well known that if $\sum_{i=1}^m \kappa_i = n$, then (1) is reachable around the origin.

For a non-negative multi-index $\boldsymbol{\ell} = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m)$ of length m , we set $\ell_{\max} := \max\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m\}$ and $|\boldsymbol{\ell}| := \sum_i \ell_i$. We also define, for $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}(\boldsymbol{\ell}, k) &= \text{span}\{u_i^j \in \mathcal{U}^k \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, j > \ell_i\}, \\ \mathcal{U}^\perp(\boldsymbol{\ell}, k) &= \text{span}\{u_i^j \in \mathcal{U}^k \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, j \leq \ell_i\},\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

and denote by π_ℓ the projection of $\mathcal{U}^k = \mathcal{U}(\boldsymbol{\ell}, k) \times \mathcal{U}^\perp(\boldsymbol{\ell}, k)$ onto the first factor.

The three theorems and the remark that follow are a straightforward extension of the results in [14]. Thus, we omit the proofs. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the map $f_0^{\kappa_{\max}+1}: \mathcal{U}^{\kappa_{\max}+1} \rightarrow \Sigma$, and Ψ stand for the restriction of $f_0^{\kappa_{\max}}$ on $\mathcal{U}^\perp(\boldsymbol{\kappa}, \kappa_{\max})$.

Theorem 1: System (1) is linearizable by state coordinate change if and only if

- (i) $\sum_{i=1}^m \kappa_i = n$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{F}_* \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u_i^\ell} \right)$ is a well-defined vector field, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $\ell = 1, \dots, \kappa_i + 1$.

Furthermore, $\zeta = \Psi^{-1}(x)$ is a linearizing state coordinate transformation.

Theorem 2: System (1) is static-feedback linearizable if and only if

- (i) $\sum_{i=1}^m \kappa_i = n$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{F}_*(\Delta_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, \kappa_{\max} - 1$, are well-defined distributions, where

$$\Delta_i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j^\ell} \mid 1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq \ell \leq i \right\}.\tag{6}$$

We also state a useful variant of Theorem 2.

Theorem 3: System (1) is static-feedback linearizable if and only if there exist smooth functions $\psi_i: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\psi_i(0) = 0$, defined for $i \in J_+ := \{i \mid \kappa_i > 0\}$, such that, with $\bar{u} := \{u_i \mid i \in J_+\}$,

- (i) $\sum_{i=1}^m \kappa_i = n$.
- (ii) $\frac{\partial \psi_i \circ \hat{f}^\ell}{\partial \bar{u}} = 0$, for $i \in J_+$, and $\ell = 1, \dots, \kappa_i - 1$.
- (iii) $\text{rank} \left\{ \frac{\partial \psi_i \circ \hat{f}^{\kappa_i}}{\partial \bar{u}}(0) \mid i \in J_+ \right\} = |J_+|$, where $|J_+|$ denotes the cardinality of J_+ .

Remark 1: Hypotheses (ii) of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 can be replaced by (ii') and (ii''), respectively [14], [23]:

- (ii') $\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial u_j^\ell}, \ker(\mathcal{F}_*) \right] \subset \ker(\mathcal{F}_*)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, $\ell \leq \kappa_j + 1$.
- (ii'') $\left[\Delta_i, \ker(\mathcal{F}_*) \right] \subset \Delta_i + \ker(\mathcal{F}_*)$, $1 \leq i \leq \kappa_{\max} - 1$.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for the discrete-time nonlinear system (1) to be linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback. Even though our approach is analogous to the one taken for the continuous-time case [15], the proof for the discrete-time case turns out to be somewhat simpler.

The closed-loop system of (1) with the compensator (4) is of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} x(t+1) \\ z(t+1) \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} f(x(t), h(z(t), u(t))) \\ g(z(t), v(t)) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= F((x(t), z(t)), u(t)), \end{aligned}$$

with $x \in \Sigma \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{d}|}$ and $u \in \mathcal{U} \simeq \mathbb{R}^m$.

Consider the map F_0^k with domain $B_0^k \simeq \mathcal{U}^k$. Recall the definitions in (5), and observe that $\ker g_0^k = \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{d}, k)$. Therefore, if we decompose $\mathcal{U}^k = \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{d}, k) \times \mathcal{U}^\perp(\mathbf{d}, k)$, it follows that the restriction $g_0^k: \mathcal{U}^\perp(\mathbf{d}, k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{d}|}$ is a linear isomorphism, provided $k \geq d_{\max}$. Next, define the map $\mathcal{S}^d: \mathcal{U}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^k$ by

$$(\mathcal{S}^d(\mathbf{u}^k))_i^j = \begin{cases} u_i^{j+d_i}, & \text{if } j + d_i \leq k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It follows that $\ker \mathcal{S}^d = \mathcal{U}^\perp(\mathbf{d}, k)$ and hence the restriction of $\mathcal{S}^d$ on $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{d}, k)$ is an isomorphism onto its range. In addition, if π_Σ denotes the projection $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{d}|} \rightarrow \Sigma$ on the first factor, i.e., $\pi_\Sigma(x, z) = x$, we obtain $\pi_\Sigma \circ F_0^k = f_0^k \circ \mathcal{S}^d \circ \pi_{\mathbf{d}}$. Therefore, we have the decomposition

$$F_0^k = (f_0^k \circ \mathcal{S}^d, g_0^k): \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{d}, k) \times \mathcal{U}^\perp(\mathbf{d}, k) \rightarrow \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{d}|},$$

which is also depicted in the commutative diagram below.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{U}^\perp(\mathbf{d}, k) & \xleftarrow{I - \pi_{\mathbf{d}}} & \mathcal{U}^k & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathbf{d}}} & \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{d}, k) \\
 \downarrow g_0^k & \swarrow g_0^k & \downarrow F_0^k & \searrow f_0^k \circ \mathcal{S}^{\mathbf{d}} & \downarrow f_0^k \circ \mathcal{S}^{\mathbf{d}} \\
 \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{d}|} & \xleftarrow{I - \pi_\Sigma} & \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{d}|} & \xrightarrow{\pi_\Sigma} & \Sigma
 \end{array}$$

Definition 6: Given $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$, the *relative Kronecker indices* $\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{d}) = (\tilde{\kappa}_1(\mathbf{d}), \dots, \tilde{\kappa}_m(\mathbf{d}))$ of (1) are defined as follows: For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\tilde{\kappa}_i(\mathbf{d})$ is the smallest non-negative integer such that

$$\frac{\partial \hat{f}^{\tilde{\kappa}_i(\mathbf{d})+1}}{\partial u_i}(0) \in \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial \hat{f}^{k+1}}{\partial u_j}(0) \right\}_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ j < m(\tilde{\kappa}_i(\mathbf{d}) + d_i - d_j - k) + i}}$$

Observe that $|\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{d})| = |\kappa|$. From the above discussion, we obtain the following corollary to Theorem 2.

Corollary 1: System (1) is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback if and only if there exists $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$, such that, with

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}} &:= \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{ \tilde{\kappa}_i(\mathbf{d}) + d_i \}, \\
 \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{d}} &:= f_0^{\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}+1} \circ \mathcal{S}^{\mathbf{d}} : \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{d}, \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}} + 1) \rightarrow \Sigma,
 \end{aligned}$$

and $\{\Delta_i\}$ as defined in (6),

- (i) $\sum_{i=1}^m \kappa_i = n$.
- (ii) $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_i)$, is a well-defined distribution, for $i = 1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}} - 1$.

Lemma 1: Suppose (1) is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback of index $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m)$, and for some $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_\alpha) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_{\alpha+1}), \tag{7}$$

with $\Delta_0 := 0$. Then, it is also linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback of index $\mathbf{d}' = (d'_1, \dots, d'_m)$, where

$$d'_i = \begin{cases} d_i, & \text{if } d_i \leq \alpha, \\ d_i - 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof: Let

$$J_\alpha := \{i \mid d_i \leq \alpha\}, \quad J_\alpha^c := \{i \mid d_i > \alpha\}. \tag{8}$$

We define, for each $i = \alpha + 2, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}$,

$$\tilde{\Delta}_i = \text{span} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j^\ell} \mid j \in J_\alpha^c, d_i < \ell \leq i \right\}.$$

Assumption (7) of the Lemma implies

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u_j^\ell}\right) \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_\alpha), \quad \ell \geq \alpha + 1, \quad j \in J_\alpha. \quad (9)$$

We may assume that $J_\alpha^c \neq \emptyset$, otherwise the conclusion of the Lemma is trivially true. By (9),

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_i) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_\alpha + \tilde{\Delta}_i), \quad i = \alpha + 2, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}. \quad (10)$$

By Corollary 1, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_i)$ is a well-defined distribution, for each $i = 1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}} - 1$, and $\dim(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_{\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}})) = n$.

By (9), this assertion is also true for the map $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{d}}$, which denotes the restriction of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ on the subspace

$$\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha}^{\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}+1} := \mathcal{U}_{\alpha}^{\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}+1} \bigcap \{u_j^{\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}+1} = 0 \mid j \in J_\alpha\}.$$

Observe that the maximum in the definition of $\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is attained on J_α^c . From (9), we deduce that $\tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{d}') = \tilde{\kappa}(\mathbf{d})$. Hence, $\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}'} = \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}} - 1$. Define the map

$$\varphi: \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{d}, \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}} + 1) \cap \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha}^{\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{d}', \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}'} + 1)$$

by

$$(\varphi(\mathbf{u}))_i^j := \begin{cases} u_i^{j+1}, & \text{if } i \in J_\alpha^c, \quad j \geq d_i, \\ u_i^j, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

We obtain,

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{d}} = f_0^{\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}'}+1} \circ \mathcal{S}^{\mathbf{d}'} \circ \varphi = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbf{d}'} \circ \varphi. \quad (12)$$

Combining (10)–(12), we conclude that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}'}(\Delta_i) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_i), & \text{if } i \leq \alpha, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_{i+1}), & \text{if } \alpha < i \leq \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}'}, \end{cases}$$

and the proof follows from Corollary 1. ■

Lemma 2: If (1) is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback of index $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m)$, and for some $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}\}$, $\dim(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_\alpha)) = n$, then it is also linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback of index $\mathbf{d}' = (d'_1, \dots, d'_m)$, defined by

$$d'_i = \min\{d_i, (\alpha - 1)\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Proof: Let $F: \Sigma \times \Sigma_c \times U \rightarrow \Sigma \times \Sigma_c$ denote the closed-loop system map, with a compensator of index $\mathbf{d}$. To simplify the notation, let κ denote the Kronecker indices of the closed-loop system, i.e., $\kappa_i = \tilde{\kappa}_i(\mathbf{d}) + d_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Recall the definition of J_α in (8), and suppose that $J_{\alpha-1}^c \neq \emptyset$. By Theorem 3, there exist smooth functions $\psi_i: \Sigma \times \Sigma_c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that properties (ii)–(iii) hold. Observe that we may choose ψ_i , $i \in J_{\alpha-1} \cap J_+$, so that these are independent of the coordinates $\{z^j \mid j \in J_{\alpha-1}^c\}$.

Indeed, we may select a collection $\{\psi_i \mid i \in J_{\alpha-1} \cap J_+\}$ such that each $d\psi_i$ is orthogonal to the involutive distribution $(F_0^{\bar{\kappa}d+1})_*(\Delta_{\kappa_i-1} + \Delta')$, where

$$\Delta' = \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial u_j^\ell} \mid j \in J_{\alpha-1}^c, 1 \leq \ell \leq d_j\right\},$$

and at the same time, with $\bar{u}$ as defined in Theorem 3,

$$\text{rank}\left\{\frac{\partial\psi_i \circ \hat{F}^{\kappa_i}}{\partial \bar{u}}(0) \mid i \in J_{\alpha-1} \cap J_+\right\} = |J_{\alpha-1} \cap J_+|. \quad (13)$$

Also, $\{\psi_j \mid j \in J_{\alpha-1}^c\}$ may be selected in such a manner that each $d\psi_j$ is orthogonal to $(F_0^{\bar{\kappa}d+1})_*(\Delta_{\kappa_j-1} + \Delta'')$, with

$$\Delta'' = \text{span}\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial u_i^\ell} \mid i \in J_{\alpha-1} \cap J_+, 1 \leq \ell \leq \kappa_i\right\},$$

and they satisfy the rank condition analogous to (13). We use the decomposition $\bar{u} = (\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}^c)$ where $\tilde{u} = \{u_i \mid i \in J_{\alpha-1} \cap J_+\}$ and $\tilde{u}^c$ consists of the remaining input coordinates. By construction,

$$\frac{\partial\psi_i \circ \hat{F}^{\kappa_i}}{\partial \tilde{u}^c}(0) = 0, \quad \forall i \in J_{\alpha-1} \cap J_+. \quad (14)$$

By (13)–(14),

$$\text{rank}\left\{\frac{\partial\psi_i \circ \hat{F}^{\kappa_i}}{\partial \tilde{u}}(0) \mid i \in J_{\alpha-1} \cap J_+\right\} = |J_{\alpha-1} \cap J_+|. \quad (15)$$

Equation (14) together with property (ii) of Theorem 3 yield

$$\text{rank}\left\{\frac{\partial\psi_j \circ \hat{F}^{\kappa_j}}{\partial \tilde{u}^c}(0) \mid j \in J_{\alpha-1}^c\right\} = |J_{\alpha-1}^c|. \quad (16)$$

We claim that if we modify the collection $\{\psi_j \mid j \in J_{\alpha-1}^c\}$ by selecting $\psi_j(x, z) := z_1^j$, (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 3 still hold. Indeed, for $j \in J_{\alpha-1}^c$, since $\kappa_j = d_j$, and

$$\psi_j \circ F^\ell(x, z, u) = \begin{cases} z_{\ell+1}^j, & \text{if } 1 \leq \ell \leq d_j - 1, \\ u_j, & \text{if } \ell = d_j, \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

property (ii) follows. Also, (17) implies (16) and

$$\frac{\partial\psi_j \circ \hat{F}^{\kappa_j}}{\partial \tilde{u}}(0) = 0, \quad \forall j \in J_{\alpha-1}^c. \quad (18)$$

Property (iii), follows from (14)–(16).

Consider now the compensator with index d' and denote by F' and κ' be the corresponding system map and Kronecker indices of the closed-loop system, respectively. Since $\kappa'_i = \kappa_i$, for $i \in J_{\alpha-1}$, and $\kappa'_j = \kappa_j - 1$, for $j \in J_{\alpha-1}^c$, property (i) of Theorem 3 holds. Let the collection $\{\psi_i\}$ be as selected above. Note that these are well defined in the new state-space. Property (ii) of Theorem 3 easily follows. Also, (15), (16) and (18) hold for F' and κ' , which together imply (iii). ■

Using Lemma 1, we obtain the following.

Lemma 3: Suppose (1) is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback of index $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m)$ and $d_i \geq 1$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then it is also linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback of index $\mathbf{d}' = (d'_1, \dots, d'_m)$, where $d'_i = d_i - 1$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Proof: Suppose that $d_i \geq 1$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Then, we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_0) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_1) = 0.$$

The rest follows by Lemma 1. ■

Lemma 3 implies that if (1) is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback, then the linearizing compensator (4) can be chosen so as to satisfy $d_{\min} := \min\{d_1, \dots, d_m\} = 0$. This of course means that a single-input discrete-time nonlinear system is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback only if it is static-feedback linearizable.

Theorem 4: If (1) is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback, then a compensator of index $\mathbf{d}$ can be chosen, satisfying $d_{\min} = 0$, and $d_{\max} \leq n - 1$, yielding the estimate

$$|\mathbf{d}| \leq (m - 1)(n - 1).$$

Proof: By Lemma 1, we may choose the index $\mathbf{d}$ so that

$$\dim(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_i)) < \dim(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_{i+1})), \quad 0 \leq i \leq \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}} - 1.$$

Thus, $\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}} \leq n$. Since $\dim(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_*^{\mathbf{d}}(\Delta_{\bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}}})) = n$, applying Lemma 2, we can choose $\mathbf{d}$ such that $d_{\max} \leq \bar{\kappa}_{\mathbf{d}} - 1$. Therefore, $d_{\max} \leq n - 1$. ■

IV. EXAMPLES

By the results of the previous section, the validity of the conditions for linearization via restricted dynamic feedback needs to be verified only over a finite set of indices. Therefore, we have obtained a set of decidable necessary and sufficient conditions. The bounds for the compensator index in Theorem 4 are sharp, as can be seen by the following example.

Example 1: Consider the system

$$\begin{aligned} x_1(t+1) &= x_2(t) + \sum_{i=2}^m x_1(t)u_i(t), \\ x_\ell(t+1) &= x_{\ell+1}(t), \quad \text{for } \ell = 2, \dots, n-1, \\ x_n(t+1) &= \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t). \end{aligned}$$

This system is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback of index $d_1 = 0$ and $d_i = n - 1$, for $i = 2, \dots, m$. However, it cannot be linearized if the index of the compensator is below the bound established in Theorem 4.

Example 2: Consider the system

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1(t+1) \\ x_2(t+1) \\ x_3(t+1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_2(t) + x_1(t)u_2(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

The system in (19) is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback of index $(d_1, d_2) = (0, 1)$. This feedback yields the closed-loop system

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1(t+1) \\ x_2(t+1) \\ x_3(t+1) \\ z_1(t+1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_2(t) + x_1(t)z_1(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ z_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

If we define new state variables $\zeta_1 = x_1$, $\zeta_2 = x_2 + x_1 z_1$, $\zeta_3 = x_3$, and $\zeta_4 = z_1$, (20) transforms to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \zeta_1(t+1) \\ \zeta_2(t+1) \\ \zeta_3(t+1) \\ \zeta_4(t+1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_2(t) \\ u_1(t) + (x_2(t) + x_1(t)z_1(t))u_2(t) \\ \zeta_4(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

and, in turn, (21) can be linearized via the static state feedback

$$\gamma(x, z, u) = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 - (x_2 + x_1 z_1)u_2 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In the following example, we present a system which is not linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback, but is dynamic-feedback linearizable.

Example 3: Consider the system

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1(t+1) \\ x_2(t+1) \\ x_3(t+1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_2(t) + x_1(t)(u_1(t) + u_2(t)) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_1(t) + u_2(t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

The application of Theorem 4, shows that (22) is not linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback. However, if we let $u_1 = \bar{u}_1$ and $u_2 = \bar{u}_2 - \bar{u}_1$, then (22) transforms to (19). Therefore, system (22) is dynamic-feedback linearizable.

V. CONCLUSION

We have formulated the problem of linearization via restricted dynamic feedback for discrete-time nonlinear systems in analogy to the continuous-time version [15]. We have shown that if a discrete-time nonlinear system is linearizable via restricted dynamic feedback, it is also linearizable without using a delay for at least one of the inputs. This means that the class of single-input systems linearizable by dynamic feedback is no larger than the class linearizable by static feedback, a fact which also holds for continuous-time systems [15], [20]. We have also obtained sharp upper bounds on the number of delays necessary for the input channels. This bound is $n - 1$, for each channel, whereas the analogous bound for the number of integrators used in the continuous-time case is $2n - 3$ [15]. Our results yield verifiable necessary and sufficient conditions for linearization of discrete-time nonlinear systems via restricted dynamic feedback. However, the problem of linearization via general dynamic feedback is still wide open.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Aranda-Bricaire, C. H. Moog, and J. B. Pomet, "A linear algebraic framework for dynamic feedback linearization," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, Vol. 40, pp. 127–132, 1995.
- [2] B. Charlet, J. Levine, and R. Marino, "On dynamic feedback linearization," *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 13, pp. 143–151, 1989.
- [3] B. Charlet, J. Levine, and R. Marino, "Sufficient conditions for dynamic state feedback linearization," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, Vol. 29, pp. 38–57, 1991.
- [4] M. Fliess, J. Levine, P. Martin, and P. Rouchon, "Flatness and defect of non-linear system: introductory theory and examples," *International Journal of Control*, Vol. 61, No. 6, pp. 1327–1361, 1995.
- [5] M. Fliess, J. Levine, P. Martin, and P. Rouchon, "On differentially flat nonlinear systems," *Proc. 2nd IFAC NOLCOS*, Bordeaux, pp. 408–412, 1992.
- [6] R. B. Gardner, W. F. Shadwick, "The GS algorithm for exact linearization to Brunovsky normal form," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, Vol. 37, pp. 224–230, 1992.
- [7] J. W. Grizzle, "Feedback linearization of discrete-time systems," *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Science*, Vol. 83, Springer-Verlag New York Inc., pp. 273–281, 1986.
- [8] M. Guay, P. J. McLellan, and D. W. Bacon, "A condition for dynamic feedback linearization of control-affine nonlinear systems," *International Journal of Control*, Vol. 68, pp. 87–106, 1997.
- [9] L. R. Hunt, R. Su, and G. Meyer, "Design for multi-input nonlinear system," in *Differential Geometric Control Theory*, *Differential Geometric Control Theory*, R. W. Brockett, et al. (ed), Boston: Birkhauser, pp. 268–293, 1983.
- [10] A. Isidori, *Nonlinear Control Systems*, 3rd ed., Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [11] B. Jakubczyk, "Feedback Linearization of discrete-time systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 9, pp. 411–416, 1987.
- [12] B. Jakubczyk, "Remarks on equivalence and linearization of nonlinear systems," *Proc. 2nd IFAC NOLCOS*, Bordeaux, pp. 393–397, 1992.
- [13] B. Jakubczyk and W. Respondek, "On the linearization of control systems," *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Ser. Math. Astron. Physics*, Vol. 28, pp. 517–522, 1980.
- [14] H. G. Lee, A. Arapostathis, and S. I. Marcus, "On the linearization of discrete-time systems," *International Journal of Control*, Vol. 45, pp. 1803–1822, 1987.

- [15] H. G. Lee, Y. M. Kim, and H. T. Jeon, "On the linearization via a restricted class of dynamic feedback," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, Vol. 45, pp. 1385–1391, 2000.
- [16] K. Nam, "Linearization of discrete-time nonlinear systems and a canonical structure," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, Vol. 34, pp. 119–122, 1989.
- [17] H. Nijmeijer and A. J. van der Schaft, *Nonlinear Dynamical Control Systems*, Springer-Verlag New York Inc., 1990.
- [18] P. Rouchon, "Necessary condition and genericity of dynamic feedback linearization," *J. Math. Syst. Estim. Control*, Vol. 4, pp. 1–14, 1994.
- [19] W. F. Shadwick, "Absolute equivalence and dynamic feedback linearization," *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 15, pp. 35–39, 1990.
- [20] W. M. Sluis, "A necessary condition for dynamic feedback linearization," *System & Control Letters*, Vol. 21, pp. 277–283, 1993.
- [21] W. M. Sluis and D. M. Tilbury, "A bound on the number of integrators needed to linearize a control system," *System & Control Letters*, Vol. 29, pp. 43–50, 1996.
- [22] R. Su, "On the linear equivalents of nonlinear systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, Vol. 2, pp. 48–52, 1982.
- [23] A. J. van der Schaft, "Observability and controllability for smooth nonlinear systems," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, Vol. 20, pp. 338–354, 1982.