Sufficient Conditions for Local Asymptotic Stability and Stabilization for Discrete-Time Varying Systems

Angeliki Stamati and John Tsinias

Abstract— **The purpose of this paper is to establish sufficient conditions for local asymptotic stability and feedback stabilization for discrete-time systems with time depended dynamics. Our main results constitute generalizations of those developed by same authors in a recent paper, for the case of continuous-time systems.**

Notations: We adopt the following notations. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|x|$ denotes its usual Euclidean norm. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$we denote by $|A| := \sup_{x\neq 0}(|Ax|\,/\,|x|)$its induced norm. By S[0,R] we denote the sphere of radius $R > 0$ around zero $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. $\mathscr{N}$ denotes the set of all C^0 functions $\phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathscr{K}$ is the set of all functions $\phi \in \mathscr{N}$ which are strictly increasing and vanishing at zero. $\mathscr{K}_\infty$ denotes the subset of $\mathscr{K}$ that constitutes by all $\phi \in \mathscr{K}$ with $\phi(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$.

I. INTRODUCTION

The present work provides sufficient conditions for local asymptotic stability and feedback stabilization for the case of discrete-time systems with time depended dynamics. Our results generalize those in existing works (see for instance [1],[2],[4],[5],[8]). Propositions 1 and 2 in Section 2 are the main results of the paper establishing Lyapunov-like sufficient conditions for asymptotic stability for systems:

$$x(n+1) = f(n,x(n)),\ (n,x) \in \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{R}^n \tag{1}$$

These results constitute, in some sense, the discrete analogue to [9, Proposition 1]. It should be emphasized however, that Proposition 1 and 2, as well as the averaging result of Proposition 3 in Section 3, are based on weaker hypotheses than those imposed in earlier works concerning continuous-time systems (see for instance, [2],[3],[7],[9] and relative references therein). The result of Propositions 1 is applied in Sections 3 and 4 for the establishment of sufficient conditions for the solvability of the feedback stabilization problem for control systems:

$$x(n+1) = F(n,x(n),u(n)),\ (n,x,u) \in \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^m \tag{2}$$

and to derive an averaging type sufficient condition for local asymptotic stability for the case:

$$x(n+1) = x(n) + \varepsilon f(\varepsilon,n,x(n)),\ (\varepsilon,n,x)\ \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{R}^n,\ \varepsilon > 0 \tag{3}$$

This work was not supported by any organization

A. Stamati is with the Department of Mathematics, National Technical University, Zografou Campus, Athens, Greece. stamati@math.ntua.gr

J. Tsinias is with the Department of Mathematics, National Technical University, Zografou Campus, Athens, Greece. jtsin@central.ntua.gr

We next provide the concepts of stability, local asymptotic stability and exponential stability for the case (1). In what follows, we assume that $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an equilibrium, i.e., $f(\cdot,0) = 0$.We say that $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is stable with respect to (1), if for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and given bounded $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon,I) \geq 0$ such that

$$|x(n_0)| \leq \delta \Rightarrow |x(n)| \leq \varepsilon,\ \forall n \geq n_0,\ n_0 \in I \tag{4}$$

where $x(n) = x(n,n_0,x_0), n = n_0, n_0+1, n_0+2, ...$ denotes the solution of (1) initiated from $x_0 := x(n_0)$ at time n_0. We say that $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an attractor for (1), if there exists a constant $\rho > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and given bounded $I \subset \mathbb{N}$, a time $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon,I) \in \mathbb{N}$ can be found with

$$|x(n_0)| \leq \rho \Rightarrow |x(n)| \leq \varepsilon,\ \forall n \geq n_0 + \tau \tag{5}$$

We say that (1) is Asymptotically Stable (AS) (at zero $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$), if zero is stable and an attractor. We say that (1) is Uniformly in time Asymptotically Stable (UAS), if it is AS and further both (4) and (5) hold for every $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and for δ and T depending only on ε. We say that (1) is Exponentially AS (expo-UAS), if for any given bounded $I \subset \mathbb{N}$, there exist constants $C = C(n_0) > 0, n_0 \in I$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$|x(n)| \leq C|x(n_0)|\exp\left(-\lambda(n-n_0)\right),\ \forall n \geq n_0,\ n_0 \in I,\ x_0 \textit{ near zero} \tag{6}$$

Finally, (1) is Exponentially UAS (expo-UAS), if (6) holds for certain $C > 0$ being independent of the initial values n_0 of time.

II. MAIN RESULT

The aim of this section is to establish an extension of the main result in [9] for the discrete-time systems (1). We assume that there exists a constant $R > 0$ such that the following property holds:

A1. There exists a function $L \in \mathscr{N}$ such that

$$|f(n,x)| \leq L(n)|x|\ \forall (n,x) \in \mathbb{N}\times S[0,R], \tag{7}$$

Moreover, we assume that one of the following conditions is fulfilled:

A2. There exist functions $V : \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+,\ a,b \in \mathscr{K}_\infty, c \in \mathscr{N}, r \in \mathscr{K}$, a sequence $\{\sigma_i \geq 0,\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$, a function $m_0 \in \mathscr{N}$ and a constant $m > 0$, such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sigma_i = \infty \tag{8a}$$

$$a(|x|) \leq V(n,x) \leq b(|x|)c(n),\ \forall (n,x) \in \mathbb{N}\times S[0,R] \tag{8b}$$

ISBN 978-963-311-370-7

and further the following hold for the solution $x(\cdot) = x(\cdot,\ell_0,x_0)$, $(\ell_0,x_0) \in \mathbb{N}\times S[0,R]$, $x_0 = x(\ell_0)$ of (1):

$$V(n_{i+1},x(n_{i+1})) - V(n_i,x(n_i)) \le -\sigma_i r(V(n_i,x(n_i))),$$

$$n_i = n_i(\ell_0,x_0),\ x_0 \in S[0,R]\ \mathit{for}\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$$

away from zero, provided that

$$x(\nu) \in S[0,R], \nu = n_i, n_i+1, n_i+2, ..., n_{i+1},\ x_0 = x(\ell_0) \quad (8c)$$

for certain strictly increasing sequence $\{n_i = n_i(\ell_0,x_0),\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ with $n_0 = n_0(\ell_0,x_0) \ge \ell_0$, in such a way that

$$n_i \to \infty \quad (9a)$$

$$\sum_{\nu=n_i(\ell_0,x_0)}^{\nu=n_{i+1}(\ell_0,x_0)} L(\nu) \le m,\ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ \ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}, x_0 \in S[0,R] \quad (9b)$$

$$\sum_{\nu=\ell_0}^{n_0(\ell_0,x_0)} L(\nu) \le m_0(\ell_0), \forall \ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}, x_0 \in S[0,R] \quad (9c)$$

$$c(n_0(\ell_0,x_0)) \le m_0(\ell_0) \quad (9d)$$

A'2. There exist functions $V : \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $a,b \in \mathscr{K}_\infty, c \in \mathscr{N}, r \in \mathscr{K}$, a sequence $\{\sigma_i \in \mathbb{R},\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$, a continuous function $m_0 \in \mathscr{N}$ and a constant $m > 0$, such that (8a) and (8c) hold and further

$$V(n_{i+1},x(n_{i+1})) - V(n_i,x(n_i)) \le -\sigma_i V(n_i,x(n_i))$$

$$n_i = n_i(\ell_0,x_0),\ x \in S[0,R]\ \mathit{for\ all}\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0\ \mathit{away\ from\ zero},$$

$$\mathit{provided\ that}\ x(\nu) \in S[0,R], \nu = n_i, n_i+1, n_i+2, ..., n_{i+1} \quad (10)$$

for certain strictly increasing sequence $\{n_i = n_i(\ell_0,x_0) \in \mathbb{N},\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ with $n_0 \ge \ell_0$ in such a way that (9a), (9b) and (9c) hold.

Proposition 1: (i) Under the assumptions A1 and A2(A'2) the system (1) is AS; (ii) If, in addition to A1 and A'2, we assume:

$$\sigma_i \ge \sigma\ \mathit{for\ some\ constant}\ \sigma > 0 \quad (11)$$

$$a_0|x|^2 \le V(n,x) \le b_0|x|^2\ \forall (n,x) \in \mathbb{N}\times S[0,R],$$

$$\mathit{for\ certain\ constants}\ a_0, b_0 > 0 \quad (12)$$

and there is an integer $N > 0$ such that

$$n_{i+1}(\ell_0,x_0) - n_i(\ell_0,x_0) \le N,\ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ \ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}, x \in S[0,R] \quad (13)$$

then (1) is expo-AS; (iii) If, in addition to A1 and A2(A'2), we assume that (11) holds and there exist functions $a,b \in \mathscr{K}_\infty$ and a *constant* $m_0 > 0$ such that

$$a(|x|) \le V(n,x) \le b(|x|), \forall (n,x) \in \mathbb{N}\times S[0,R] \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_{\nu=\ell_0}^{n_0(\ell_0,x_0)} L(\nu) \le m_0, \forall \ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}, x_0 \in S[0,R], x_0 = x(\ell_0) \quad (15)$$

then (1) is UAS; (iv) If, A1, A'2, (11), (12) and (13) hold, then (1) is expo-UAS.

Remark 1: Obviously, (9d) is not required in statements (ii),(iii) and (iv) of Proposition 1.

Proof: (i) A1, A2⇒AS. Some parts of proof of this implication, constitute extensions of the approach employed in [9,Proposition 1]. We denote by $x(\ell) = x(\ell,\ell_0,x_0)$, $\ell = \ell_0, \ell_0+1, \ell_0+2, ...$ the trajectory of (1) with $x_0 = x(\ell_0)$. By invoking (7) we have:

$$|x(\ell)| \le \left(\prod_{\nu=\ell_0}^{\nu=\ell} L(\nu)\right)|x_0| \le \exp\left(\sum_{\nu=\ell_0}^{\nu=\ell} L(\nu)\right)|x_0|$$

$$\mathit{provided\ that}\ x(\nu) \in S[0,R],\ \nu = \ell_0, \ell_0+1, ..., \ell \quad (16)$$

Let I be a bounded subset of $\mathbb{N}$ and, for $\ell_0 \in I$ and $x_0 \in S[0,R]$, consider the sequence $\{n_i = n_i(\ell_0,x_0), i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ satisfying (8c), (9a)-(9d) and $\ell_0 \le n_0$. Without any loss of generality we may assume next that $\ell_0 < n_0$ and (8c) holds for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. It follows from (9c) and (16) that

$$|x(\ell)| \le \exp\left(\sum_{\nu=\ell_0}^{\nu=n_0(\ell_0,x_0)} L(\nu)\right)|x_0| \le \exp(m_0(\ell_0))|x_0|,$$

$$\ell = \ell_0, \ell_0+1, ..., n_0,$$

$$\mathit{provided\ that}\ x(\nu) \in S[0,R],\ \nu = \ell_0, \ell_0+1, ..., n_0 \quad (17)$$

Likewise, by denoting $M := \exp m$, (9b) implies that

$$|x(n)| \le M|x(n_i)|,\ \mathit{provided\ that}\ x(n) \in S[0,R],$$

$$\mathit{for\ all\ integers}\ n \in [n_i, n_{i+1}],\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ x_0 = x(\ell_0) \in S[0,R] \quad (18)$$

From (17),(18), continuity of $m_0(\cdot)$ and boundedness of I, it follows that for any given $\varepsilon \in (0,R)$, a constant $\varepsilon_1 \in \left(0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)$, being independent of I, can be found such that the solution $x(\cdot) = x(\cdot,\ell_0,x(\ell_0))$ of (1) satisfies:

$$|x(\ell_0)| \le \varepsilon_1 \Rightarrow |x(n)| \le \varepsilon,\ \forall n = \ell_0, \ell_0+1, ..., n_0; \quad (19a)$$

$$|x(n_i)| \le \varepsilon_1 \Rightarrow |x(n)| \le \varepsilon,$$

$$\forall n = n_i, n_i+1, ..., n_{i+1}, i = 1,2,...,\ \ell_0 \in I \quad (19b)$$

For simplicity, we denote in the sequel:

$$x(n,\ell,S[0,\varepsilon]) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x = x(n,,w), w = x(\ell) \in S[0,R]\},$$

$$n = \ell, \ell+1, \ell+2, ...$$

We next show that there exists a constant $R' \in (0,R]$, such that the following properties are satisfied:

$$a(|x(n_{i+1})|) \le V(n_{i+1},x(n_{i+1})) \le V(n_i,x(n_i)) \le b(|x(n_i)|)c(n_i),$$

$$i = 1,2,...,\ \ell_0 \in I,\ x_0 = x(\ell_0) \in S[0,R'],\ n_0 > l_0 \quad (20a)$$

$$V(n_{i+1},x(n_{i+1})) - V(n_i,x(n_i)) \le -\sigma_i r(V(n_i,x(n_i))),$$

$$n_i = n_i(\ell_0,x_0),\ x_0 \in S[0,R']\ \mathit{for}\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n_0 > l_0 \quad (20b)$$

Indeed, by exploiting (17) and (18), a positive constant $R' \le R$ can be determined with

$$x(n,\ell_0,S[0,R']) \subset S[0,R], n = \ell_0, \ell_0+1, ..., n_0;$$

$$x(n,n_i,S[0,R']) \subset S[0,R], n = n_i, n_i+1, n_i+2, ..., n_{i+1}, i \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (21)$$

From (8b),(8c) and (21) we obtain the desired (20a) and (20b). From (20a) and (20b) we obtain:

$$V(n_i,x(n_i)) \le V(n_0,x(n_0)) - \sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=i} \sigma_\nu r(V(n_\nu,x(n_\nu)))$$
$$\le V(n_0,x(n_0)) - \left(\sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=i}\sigma_\nu\right) r(V(n_i,x(n_i))),$$
$$\forall i = 1,2,\dots, x_0 \in S[0,R'], \ell_0 \in I$$

The latter in conjunction with (8b),(9d),(17) and (20a) imply

$$a(|x(n_i)|) + \left(\sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=i}\sigma_\nu\right) r(a(|x(n_i)|))$$
$$\le V(n_i,x(n_i)) + \left(\sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=i}\sigma_\nu\right) r(V(n_i,x(n_i)))$$
$$\le b(\exp(m_0(\ell_0))|x(\ell_0)|)m_0(\ell_0),$$
$$for\ i := 1,2,\dots,\ x_0 \in S[0,R'],\ \ell_0 \in I \tag{22}$$

From (8a),(9a),(22), continuity of $m_0(\cdot)$ and boundedness of I it follows:

$$x(n_i) \to 0 \ as\ n_i \to \infty,\ uniformly\ in\ x_0 \in S[0,R']\ and\ \ell_0 \in I. \tag{23}$$

It turns out from (23) that for any $\varepsilon \in (0,R')$ and $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,\varepsilon)$, for which (19a) and (19b) hold, a pair of positive integers $k = k(\varepsilon_1,I)$ and $\tau = \tau(\varepsilon_1,I)$ can be found with

$$n_k \ge \ell_0 + \tau, \tag{24a}$$
$$|x(n_i)| \le \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}, \forall i = k,k+1,k+2,\dots,x_0 \in S[0,R'],\ \ell_0 \in I \tag{24b}$$

We are in position to establish stability and attractivity of zero with respect to (1):

Stability: Let $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a given bounded set. We show that for every $\varepsilon \in (0,R)$ there is a constant $0 < \delta := \delta(\varepsilon_1,I) < \varepsilon_1$ such that (4) is fulfilled. Let $\varepsilon,\varepsilon_1,k$ and τ as defined above. From (1), (7),(9b),(9c),(9d) and (17) we get:

$$|x(n)| \le \exp\left(\sum_{\nu=\ell_0}^{\nu=n} L(\nu)\right)|x_0| \le \exp\left(\sum_{\nu=\ell_0}^{\nu=n_k(\ell_0,x_0)} L(\nu)\right)|x_0|$$
$$\le \exp\left(\sum_{\nu=\ell_0}^{\nu=n_0(\ell_0,x_0)} L(\nu) + \sum_{\nu=n_0(\ell_0,x_0)}^{\nu=n_k(\ell_0,x_0)} L(\nu)\right)|x_0|$$
$$\le (\exp(m_0(\ell_0)+m))|x_0|$$
$$\forall n = \ell_0,\ell_0+1,\ell_0+2,\dots,n_k,\ \ell_0 \in I, x_0 \in S[0,R] \tag{25}$$

Therefore, by (25), boundedness of I and continuity of $m_0(\cdot)$, there is a constant $\delta := \delta(\varepsilon_1,I) < \varepsilon_1$ such that

$$x(n,\ell_0,S[0,\delta]) \in S[0,\varepsilon_1],\ \forall n = \ell_0,\ell_0+1,\dots,n_k,\ell_0 \in I \tag{26}$$

From (24) we obtain:

$$|x(n_i,\ell_0,S[0,\delta])| \le \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2},\ \forall\, i = k,k+1,k+2,\dots,\ \ell_0 \in I \tag{27}$$

Thus, from (26) it follows that $x(n,\ell_0,S[0,\delta]) \subset S[0,\varepsilon_1] \subset S[0,\varepsilon]$ for $n = \ell_0,\ell_0+1,\dots,n_k$ and the latter in conjunction with (19) imply that for all positive integers $n = n_k, n_k+1, n_k+2,\dots$ the following holds:

$$x(n,\ell_0,S[0,\delta]) = x(n,n_k,x(n_k,\ell_0,S[0,\delta])) \subset x(n,n_k,S[0,\varepsilon_1])$$
$$\subset S[0,\varepsilon]$$

and therefore

$$x(n,\ell_0,S[0,\delta]) \subset S[0,\varepsilon],\ \forall n = \ell_0,\ell_0+1,\ell_0+2,\dots,\ell_0 \in I \subset \mathbb{N} \tag{28}$$

hence, as we may see in (28), (4) is established.

Attractivity: We show that for any given bounded subset I of $\mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $0 < \rho \le R$ in such a way that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ a positive integer $T = T(\varepsilon,I)$ can be determined such that (5) holds. Due to stability proven above, for every $0 < \xi \le R$ there exists a strictly positive constant $\rho = \rho(\xi,I) < \xi$ and an arbitrary constant $\varepsilon \in (0,\rho)$ in such a way that $|x(n,\ell_0,x_0)| \le \xi,\ \forall n = \ell_0,\ell_0+1,\dots,\ \ell_0 \in I,\ |x_0| \le \rho$. Also, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ a constant $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon$ can be found such that (19a) and (19b) hold and by recalling (23) there exists an integer $k \ge 1$ such that $|x(n_i,\ell_0,S[0,\rho])| \le \varepsilon_1/2,\ i = k,k+1,k+2,\dots,\ell_0 \in I$. Combining the previous inequality together with (19) and (28) we can establish, as in the case of the proof of stability that $x(\nu,\ell_0,S[0,\rho]) \subset S[0,\varepsilon],\ \forall \nu \ge \ell_0, \ell_0 \in I$. Hence, attractivity is established and we conclude that under A1 and A2 system (1) is AS.

A1, A'2⇒AS. In order to establish AS, we use an analogous procedure, under the presence of A'2. For completeness we note that what differs here, is that, instead of estimation (22), we have by taking into account (8b), (9c), (9d), (10) and (17) that

$$a(|x(n_i)|) \le V(n_i,x(n_i)) \le V(n_0,x_0)\exp\left(-\sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=i}\sigma_\nu\right)$$
$$\le b\left(\exp\left(\sum_{\nu=\ell_0}^{\nu=n_0} L(\nu)\right)|x(\ell_0)|\right)c(n_0)\exp\left(-\sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=i}\sigma_\nu\right)$$
$$\le b(m(\ell_0)|x(\ell_0)|)m_0(\ell_0)\exp\left(-\sum_{\nu=0}^{\nu=i}\sigma_\nu\right),$$
$$i = 1,2,\dots,\ x_0 \in S[0,R'], \ell_0 \in I \tag{29}$$

(ii) **A1, A'2,**(11)**,**(12)**,**(13)**⇒expo-AS.** Let us now assume that, in addition to A1 and A'2 conditions (11),(12) and (13) hold. Then by virtue of (29) we get

$$a_0|x(n_i)|^2 \le V(n_i,x(n_i)) \le V(n_0,x_0)\exp(-i\sigma)$$
$$\le V(n_0,x_0)\exp(-i\lambda(n_i-n_0))$$
$$\le b_0 m(\ell_0)|x(\ell_0)|\exp(-\lambda(n_i-n_0)),$$
$$i = 1,2,\dots,\ x_0 = x(\ell_0) \in S[0,R'], \ell_0 \in I \tag{30}$$

for certain strictly positive constant $\lambda \le \sigma/N$, where N is defined in (13). The desired (5) is an immediate consequence of (18) and (30). Details are left to the reader. The proofs of Statements (iii) and (iv) are quite analogous to those given in [9] and are omitted. ∎

The result of Proposition 1 can be extended for the case of systems (1), whose dynamics are in general unbounded in time, as follows:

Proposition 2: (i)The same conclusions of Statements (i) and (iii) of Proposition 1 are valid, under same assumptions, and by replacing (9b) by the weaker hypothesis that there exists a function $\xi \in \mathscr{K}$ such that

$$|x(n)| \leq \xi(|x(n_i)|), \forall n \in [n_i(\ell_0,x_0), n_{i+1}(\ell_0,x_0)] \qquad (31)$$

provided that $x(n) \in S[0,R]$ for all positive integers $n = n_i, n_i+1, ..., n_{i+1}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where $x(\cdot)$ denotes the solution of (1) initiated from $x(n_i)$ at time n_i.

(ii) The same conclusions of Statements (ii) and (iv) of Proposition 1 are valid, under same assumptions, and by replacing (9b) by the weaker hypothesis that there exists a constant $\Xi > 0$ such that

$$|x(n)| \leq \Xi |x(n_i)|, \forall n \in [n_i(\ell_0,x_0), n_{i+1}(\ell_0,x_0)] \qquad (32)$$

provided that $x(n) \in S[0,R]$ for all positive integers $n = n_i, n_i+1, ..., n_{i+1}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ where $x(\cdot)$ denotes the solution of (1) initiated from $x(n_i)$ at time n_i.

Proof: The proof of Proposition 2 is essentially the same with the part of proof of Proposition 1 after (18) plus some elementary appropriate modifications. ∎

Example 1: Consider the linear case

$$x(n+1) = A(n)x(n), \ (n,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^n \qquad (33)$$

where $A : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and assume that there exists a constant $\Xi > 0$ a strictly increasing sequence $\{N_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ with $N_i \to \infty$, and a function $\mu \in \mathscr{K}$ such that

$$N_{i+1} - N_i \leq \mu(N_i); \qquad (34a)$$

$$|A(n)A(n-1)A(n-2)...A(N_i+1)A(N_i)| \leq \Xi, \quad \forall n \in [N_i, N_{i+1}], \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \qquad (34b)$$

and further there exists a sequence $\{\sigma_i \geq 0, \ i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sigma_i = \infty \qquad (35a)$$

$$|A(N_{i+1})A(N_{i+1}-1)A(N_{i+1}-2)...A(N_i)| \leq 1 - \sigma_i, \quad i \in \mathbb{N} \ \textit{away from zero} \qquad (35b)$$

From (34a),(35a) and (35b) we may easily conclude that A1, (8a),(9a),(9c),(10) and (12) are fulfilled with $V = |x|^2$, appropriate constants m_0, m and constant gain $L := L(\cdot)$ and, due to (34b), instead of (9b), (32) holds as well. Specifically, for any given $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ each term n_i of the sequence involved in A2 depends in our case on the intial value of time ℓ_0; particularly, is defined as $n_0 := N_{\bar{k}} := \min\{N_k, k = 0,1,2,... \ \textit{such that} \ N_k \geq \ell_0\}$ and $n_i := N_{\bar{k}+i}, i = 1,2,...$ The desired (9c) is a consequence of (34a). We conclude, according to third statement of Proposition 2 that system (33) is UAS.

III. Application to Feedback Stabilization

This section is devoted to some applications of Proposition 1 to the feedback stabilization problem for systems (2). For simplicity, we consider the single-input case and assume that (2) takes the form:

$$x(n+1) = F(n,x(n),u(n)) := f(n,x(n)) + u(n)g(n,x(n)) + h(n,x(n),u(n)) \qquad (36)$$

where $f,g : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $h : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy

$$|g(n,x)| \leq C, \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \ x \ \textit{near zero} \qquad (37a)$$

$$|h(n,x,u)| \leq C|u|^2, \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \ x \in x \in \mathbb{R}^n, u \in \mathbb{R} \ \textit{near zero} \qquad (37b)$$

for certain constant $C > 0$. Moreover, we make the following hypotheses:

(H1) There exists an inner product $\langle \cdot,\cdot \rangle : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that, if we denote $\|v\| := \langle v,v \rangle^{1/2}$, then

$$\|f(n,x)\| \leq \|x\|, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \ \textit{near zero} \qquad (38)$$

(H2) There exists an integer $N > 1$ and a function $\varsigma \in \mathscr{K}$ such that for every integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and nonzero $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $\langle f(n,x), g(n,x) \rangle = 0$ there exists an integer $k : n < k \leq n+N$ in such a way that

$$\langle f(i,f(i-1,...,f(n,x),...)), g(i,f(i-1,...,f(n,x),...)) \rangle = 0, \quad i = n+1, n+2, ..., k-1 \qquad (39a)$$

$$|\langle f(k,f(k-1,...,f(n,x),...)), g(k,f(k-1,...,f(n,x),...)) \rangle|^2 \geq \varsigma(|x|) \qquad (39b)$$

The following proposition generalizes [8], Proposition 2.4:

Proposition 3: Under previous assumptions there exists a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the map

$$u = u(n,x) := -\varepsilon \langle f(n,x), g(n,x) \rangle \qquad (40)$$

exhibits (uniform in time) local asymptotic stabilization of (36), namely, the closed-loop (36) with (40) is UAS.

Proof: Consider the closed-loop dynamics

$$E(n,x) := f(n,x) + ug(n,x) + h(n,x,u)|_{u=-\varepsilon\langle f(n,x),g(n,x) \rangle} \qquad (41)$$

Let $x_0 \neq 0$ and $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the increasing sequence $\{n_i = n_i(\ell_0,x_0), i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ with $n_0 := \ell_0$ and $n_{i+1} - n_i \leq N$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and in such a way that for every $x \neq 0$ near zero, either

$$|\langle f(n_i,x), g(n_i,x) \rangle|^2 \geq \varsigma(|x|) \ \textit{and} \ n_{i+1} = n_i + 1 \qquad (42)$$

or

$$\langle f(n_i,x), g(n_i,x) \rangle = 0;$$

$$\langle f(k,f(k-1,...,f(n_i,x),...)), g(k,f(k-1,...,f(n_i,x),...)) \rangle = 0, \quad k = n_i+1, n_i+2, ..., n_{i+1}-1 \qquad (43a)$$

$$\langle f(n_{i+1}, f(n_{i+1}-1,...,f(n_i,x),...,)), g(n_{i+1}, f(n_{i+1}-1,...,f(n_i,x),...)) \rangle \geq \varsigma(|x|) \qquad (43b)$$

Existence of sequence above is guaranteed from hypothesis (H2). Without any loss of generality assume that (43) holds for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then by taking into account (37b), (38),(40),(41) and (43a) we find

$$\|E(n_i,x)\|^2 = \|f(n_i,x)\|^2 \leq \|x\|^2$$

and by induction

$$\|E(k,E(k-1,...,E(n_i,x),...))\|^2$$
$$= \|f(k,f(k-1,...,f(n_i,x),...))\|^2 \leq \|x\|^2$$
$$for\ k = n_i+1,...,n_{i+1}-1,\ x\ near\ zero. \quad (44)$$

Also, by taking into account (37a), (37b) and (43b) we get

$$\|E(n_{i+1},E(n_{i+1}-1,...,E(n_i,x),...))\|^2$$
$$= \|f(n_{i+1},f(n_{i+1}-1,...,f(n_i,x),...))\|^2$$
$$-\varepsilon R|\langle(f(n_{i+1},f(n_{i+1}-1,...,f(n_i,x),...)),$$
$$g(n_{i+1},f(n_{i+1}-1,...,f(n_i,x),...))\rangle|^2$$
$$\times\left(2-\varepsilon|g(n_{i+1},f(n_{i+1}-1,...,f(n_i,x),...))|^2+\varepsilon\rho\right) \quad (45)$$

for appropriate $\varepsilon > 0$ near zero, certain $\rho > 0$ and x near zero. It turns out from (37a),(38),(43b) and (45) that there is a constant $\bar{C} > 0$ such that

$$\|E(n_{i+1},E(n_{i+1}-1,...,E(n_i,x),...))\|^2$$
$$\leq \|x\|^2 - \varepsilon\bar{C}\zeta(|x|),\ x\ near\ zero \quad (46)$$

and for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Also, by taking into account (37),(38),(40) and (41) a constant $L > 0$ can be found such that $|E(n,x)| \leq L|x|$ for x and $\varepsilon > 0$ near zero. We now may conclude that all conditions (7), (11)-(13) hold with constant gain L, $V = \|x\|^2$,$r(s) = \varepsilon\bar{C}\zeta(s)$, $\sigma_i = \sigma := 1$ and $m_0 = m = LN$, therefore, according to Proposition 1(iii) system $x(n+1) = E(n,x(n))$ is UAS. ■

Another interesting case arises for affine in the control systems (2), where again, for reasons of simplicity we consider here the single-input case:

$$x(n+1) = F(n,x(n),u(n)) := f(n,x(n)) + u(n)g(n,x(n)) \quad (47)$$

where $f,g : \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy

$$|f(n,x)| \leq C|x|\ and\ |g(n,x)| \leq C,\ \forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ x\,near\ zero \quad (48)$$

for certain constant $C > 0$ and we make the following assumption:

(H) There exist an inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle : \mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ a function $r \in \mathscr{K}$ and an integer $N > 1$ such that, if we denote $\|v\| := \langle v,v\rangle^{1/2}$, then for every $x \neq 0$ near zero and integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one of the following properties hold:

- $g(n,x) = 0$ and there exists an integer $k : n < k \leq n+N$ in such a way that

$$g(i,f(i-1,...,f(n,x),...))) = 0; \quad (49a)$$

$$g(k,f(k-1,...,f(n,x),...))) \neq 0 \quad (49b)$$

- $g(n,x) \neq 0$ and

$$\|f(n,x)\|^2 - \frac{\langle f(n,x),g(n,x)\rangle^2}{\|g(n,x)\|^2} \leq \|x\|^2 - r(|x|) \quad (50)$$

Proposition 4: Under previous assumptions the feedback law defined as:

$$u = u(n,x) : \begin{cases} = 0,\ if\,either\ g(n,x) = 0\ or\ x = 0 \\ = -\frac{\langle f(n,x),g(n,x)\rangle}{\|g(n,x)\|^2},if\ g(n,x) \neq 0 \end{cases} ; \quad (51)$$

exhibits (uniform in time) local asymptotic stabilization of (47).

Proof : The proof is similar to that given in Proposition 3. For completeness, we note that the closed-loop system (47) with (51) satisfies (7),(9)-(13) with certain constant gain $L(\cdot) = L, V = \|x\|^2$, $m_0 = m = LN$, where N, ρ and $r(\cdot)$ as given in Hypotheses (H). Therefore, according to Proposition 1(iii) the closed-loop (47) with (51) is UAS. Details are left to the reader.

IV. Averaging

In this section we use the result derived in Section II to get an averaging-type sufficient condition for local asymptotic stability for systems (3). We make the following assumptions

B1. We assume that zero is an equilibrium:

$$f(\varepsilon,n,0) = 0,\ \forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ \varepsilon > 0 \quad (52a)$$

and there exists constant $R > 0$ and a function $L \in \mathscr{N}$ such that

$$|f(\varepsilon,n,x_1) - f(\varepsilon,n,x_2)| \leq L(n)\,|x_1 - x_2|,$$
$$\forall(n,x_i) \in \mathbb{N}\times S[0,R],\ i = 1,2, \varepsilon > 0\ near\ zero \quad (52b)$$

B2. Moreover, assume that there exist constants $m, c > 0$, a map $f_{av}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ with $f_{av}(0) = 0$, sequences $\{N_i \in \mathbb{N},\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ and $\{c_i \in \mathbb{R}^+,\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$, the first being strictly increasing, and a sequence of functions $\{T_i = T_i(x) \in N,\ i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ such that

$$N_i \to \infty \quad (53a)$$

$$\sum_{\nu=N_i}^{\nu=N_{i+1}} L(\nu) \leq m,\ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \quad (53b)$$

$$c_i \leq T_i(x) \leq m,\ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}, x \in [0,R] \quad (53c)$$

$$\underline{\lim}\frac{1}{i}\sum_{j=0}^{i} c_j \geq c \quad (53d)$$

and in such a way that for every constant $\xi > 0$ there is an integer $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left| f_{av}(x) - \tfrac{1}{T_i(x)} \sum_{\nu=N_i}^{\nu=N_{i+1}-1} f(\varepsilon,\nu,x) \right| \leq |x|\xi$$
$$for\,all\ i \in \mathbb{N},\ i \geq \bar{n},\ |x| \leq R, \quad (53e)$$

B3. For the map f_{av} introduced in B2 we assume that there exist a function $V(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and positive constants C_i, $i = 0,1,2,3,4$ in such a way that *for all* $x,y \in S[0,R]$, $\varepsilon > 0$ *near zero* the following hold:

$$|f_{av}(x)| \leq C_0|x|, \quad (54a)$$

$$C_1|x|^2 \le V(x) \le C_2|x|^2, \tag{54b}$$

$$V(x)-V(y) \le C_3|x-y|\left(|x|+|y|\right), \tag{54c}$$

$$\overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon\to 0^+}\frac{V(x+\varepsilon f_{av}(x))-V(x)}{\varepsilon} \le -C_4|x|^2, \tag{54d}$$

Remark 2: (i) Condition B3 is fulfilled, if for instance we assume that f_{av} is C^1 and zero is exponentially stable with respect to $\dot{x}=f_{av}(x)$(see for instance [6]). (ii) Condition (53e) is a weaker version of the familiar averaging assumption used in the existing works in the literature (see[1],[4],[5]).

Proposition 5: (i) For system (3), assume that B1-B3 are fulfilled. Then hypotheses A1 and A'2 are fulfilled for (3) for $\varepsilon>0$ near zero, hence, by Proposition 1(i), for each $\varepsilon>0$ near zero, the corresponding system (3) is AS; (ii) If in addition we assume that there exist a constant $c>0$ and an integer N with

$$c_i \ge c, \forall i\in\mathbb{N} \tag{55}$$

$$N_{i+1}-N_i \le N,\ \forall i\in\mathbb{N}_0 \tag{56}$$

then all assumptions of Proposition 1(ii) are satisfied, therefore, for $\varepsilon>0$ near zero, (3) is expo-AS; (iii) If, in addition to B1-B3, we assume that (55) holds, then (3) is UAS; (iv) If all assumptions of the last two statements above are fulfilled, then all assumptions of Proposition 1(iv) are satisfied, therefore, for $\varepsilon>0$ near zero, (3) is expo-UAS.

Proof: **(i)B1, B2, B3⇒AS.** We establish that for $\varepsilon>0$ near zero, all hypotheses of first statement of Proposition 1(i) are fulfilled for (3). For any initial $\ell_0\in\mathbb{N}$, consider the sequence:

$$\{n_i=n_i(\ell_0), i=1,2,...\}\ with$$
$$n_0=n_0(\ell_0):=N_{\bar{k}}=\min\{N_k, k=0,1,2,...\ :\ N_k\ge\ell_0\},$$
$$n_i=N_{\bar{k}+i}, i=1,2,... \tag{57}$$

Without loss of generality, assume next that $n_{i+1}>n_i+1$, $\forall i\in\mathbb{N}$. By (3) and (52) the trajectory $x(n)=x(n,n_i,x(n_i))$ of (3) satisfies $|x(n_i+1)|\le|x(n_i)|(1+\varepsilon L(n_i))$, thus by induction and taking into account (53b) we get:

$$|x(n_{i+1})| \le \left(\prod_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}}(1+\varepsilon L(\nu))\right)|x(n_i)|$$
$$\le \exp\left(\varepsilon\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n}L(\nu)\right)|x(n_i)| \le \exp(\varepsilon m)|x(n_i)|$$

Therefore

$$|x(n)|\le K|x(n_i)|,\ K:=\exp(\varepsilon m),\ (\varepsilon>0\ near\ zero)$$
$$provided\ that\ x(\nu)\in S[0,R]\ for\ all\ \nu=n_i,n_i+1,...,n_{i+1} \tag{58}$$

We also may show that

$$|x(n)-x(n_i)|\le\varepsilon K|x(n_i)|,$$
$$\forall\, n=n_i,n_i+1,...,n_{i+1},\ \varepsilon>0\ near zero,$$
$$provided\ that\ x(\nu)\in S[0,R]\ for\ all\ \nu=n_i,n_i+1,...,n_{i+1} \tag{59}$$

Indeed, by (3) and (52), we obtain $|x(n+1)-x(n)|\le\varepsilon L(n)|x(n)|, \forall n:\ n_i\le n\le n_{i+1}$, provided that $x(n)\in S[0,R]\ for\ n: n_i\le n\le n_{i+1}$. It then follows by taking into account (53b):

$$|x(n)-x(n_i)|\le|x(n)-x(n-1)|+|x(n-1)-x(n-2)|+....$$
$$+|x(n_i+2)-x(n_i+1)|+|x(n_i+1)-x(n_i)|$$
$$\le\varepsilon L(n-1)|x(n-1)|+\varepsilon L(n-2)|x(n-2)|+...$$
$$+\varepsilon L(n_i+1)|x(n_i+1)|+\varepsilon L(n_i)|x(n_i)|$$
$$\le\varepsilon\left(L(n-1)\exp\left(\varepsilon\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n-1}L(\nu)\right)+L(n-2)\exp\left(\varepsilon\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n-2}L(\nu)\right)\right.$$
$$\left.+...+L(n_i+1)\exp\left(\varepsilon\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_i+1}L(\nu)\right)+L(n_i)\right)|x(n_i)|$$
$$\le\varepsilon\exp\left(\varepsilon\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1}L(\nu)\right)|x(n_i)| \tag{60}$$

By (60) and (53b) we get (59), which in conjunction with (52) and (58), imply:

$$\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1}|f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(\nu))|\le\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1}L(\nu)|x(\nu)|\le mK|x(n_i)| \tag{61a}$$

$$\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1}|f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(n_i))|\le\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1}L(\nu)|x(n_i)|\le m|x(n_i)| \tag{61b}$$

$$\left|\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1}\left(f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(\nu))-f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(n_i))\right)\right|$$
$$\le\varepsilon K\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1}L(\nu)|x(n_i)|\le\varepsilon mK|x(n_i)| \tag{61c}$$

provided that $x(n)\in S[0,R]\ for\ n: n_i\le n\le n_{i+1}$. Now, define:

$$\xi:=\frac{C_4}{2C_3(1+\varepsilon m)(1+\varepsilon mC_0)} \tag{62}$$

and suppose that (53e) holds with this ξ and $N_i:=n_i$. We are in position to show that all assumptions of first claim of Proposition 1(i) are fulfilled for sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$, with $V(\cdot)$ as given in B3. We first show that for each $\varepsilon>0$ near zero the trajectories of system (3) satisfy (10). Indeed, we evaluate:

$$V(x(n_{i+1}))-V(x(n_i))\le\ \Xi_1(\varepsilon,i)+\Xi_2(\varepsilon,i)+\Xi_3(\varepsilon,i),\ i\in\mathbb{N}; \tag{63a}$$

$$\Xi_1(\varepsilon,i):=V(x(n_{i+1}))-V\left(x(n_i)+\varepsilon\left(\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1}f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(n_i))\right)\right), \tag{63b}$$

$$\Xi_2(\varepsilon,i):=V\left(x(n_i)+\varepsilon\left(\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1}f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(n_i))\right)\right)$$
$$-V\left(x(n_i)+\varepsilon T_i f_{av}(x(n_i))\right), \tag{63c}$$

$$\Xi_3(\varepsilon,i):=V\left(x(n_i)+\varepsilon T_i f_{av}(x(n_i))\right)-V(x(n_i)) \tag{63d}$$

We first estimate an upper bound $|\Xi_1(\varepsilon,i)|$. By (54c) we get:

$$|\Xi_1(\varepsilon,i)| \leq C_3 \left| x(n_{i+1}) - \left(x(n_i) + \varepsilon \sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1} f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(n_i)) \right) \right| \times \left(|x(n_{i+1})| + \left| x(n_i) + \varepsilon \sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1} f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(n_i)) \right| \right) \quad (64)$$

and since $x(n_{i+1}) = x(n_i) + \varepsilon \left(\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1} f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(\nu)) \right)$ it follows from (59), (61a,b,c) and (64):

$$|\Xi_1(\varepsilon,i)| \leq \varepsilon C_3 \left| \sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1} \left(f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(\nu)) - f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(n_i)) \right) \right| \times \left(\left| x(n_i) + \varepsilon \sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1} f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(\nu)) \right| + \left| x(n_i) + \varepsilon \sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1} f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(n_i)) \right| \right)$$
$$\leq \varepsilon^2 C_3 mK \left[(1+\varepsilon mK) + (1+\varepsilon m) \right] |x(n_i)|^2$$

which implies the existence of a constant $\vartheta > 0$ such that

$$|\Xi_1(\varepsilon,i)| \leq \varepsilon^2 \vartheta |x(n_i)|^2, \ \textit{for all } i \in \mathbb{N} \textit{ away from zero},$$
$$\textit{provided that } x(\nu) = x(\nu,n_i,x(n_i)) \ \in \ S[0,R],$$
$$\textit{for all } \ \nu = n_i, n_i+1, ..., n_{i+1} \quad (65)$$

Likewise, we find an upper bound for (63c). By (53b), (53c), (54c), (53e) and (61b) we obtain:

$$|\Xi_2(\varepsilon,i)| \leq \varepsilon C_3 T_i(x(n_i)) \xi |x(n_i)| \left(|x(n_i) + \varepsilon \left(\sum_{\nu=n_i}^{\nu=n_{i+1}-1} f(\varepsilon,\nu,x(n_i)) \right) \right| + |x(n_i) + \varepsilon T_i(x(n_i)) f_{av}(x(n_i))| \right)$$
$$\leq \varepsilon T_i(x(n_i)) C_3 \xi \left[(1+\varepsilon m) + (1+\varepsilon m C_0) \right] |x(n_i)|^2$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon T_i(x(n_i)) C_4 |x(n_i)|^2 \quad (66)$$

for all $\nu = n_i, n_i+1, ..., n_{i+1}-1$, provided that $x(\nu) \in S[0,R]$ for all $\nu = n_i, n_i+1, ..., n_{i+1}$. Finally, to get an upper bound estimation for (63d), we invoke (53c) and (54d), which imply

$$\overline{\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+}} \frac{V\left(x(n_i) + \varepsilon T_i(x(n_i)) f_{av}(x(n_i))\right) - V(x(n_i))}{\varepsilon T_i(x(n_i))} \leq -C_4 |x(n_i)|^2$$

therefore

$$|\Xi_3(\varepsilon,i)| \leq -\varepsilon T_i(x(n_i)) C_4 |x(n_i)|^2 \quad (67)$$

provided that $x(\nu) \in S[0,R]$ for all $\nu = n_i, n_i+1, ..., n_{i+1}$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ near zero. We conclude from (65), (66) and (67) that

$$V(x(n_{i+1})) - V(x(n_i)) \leq \varepsilon^2 \vartheta |x(n_i)|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon T_i(x(n_i)) C_4 |x(n_i)|^2$$
$$\textit{provided that } x(\nu) \in S[0,R], \textit{for } \ \nu = n_i, n_i+1, ..., n_{i+1},$$
$$\varepsilon > 0 \textit{ near zero} \quad (68)$$

It follows by taking into account (53c), (54b) and (68):

$$V(x(n_{i+1})) - V(x(n_i)) \leq -\sigma_i V(x(n_i)); \ \sigma_i := -\varepsilon^2 \frac{\vartheta}{C_1} + \varepsilon \frac{C_4}{2C_2} c_i \quad (69)$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ away from zero, which establishes (10). Also, notice that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{j=i} \sigma_j \geq i \left(-(i+1) \frac{\varepsilon^2 \vartheta}{iC_1} + \frac{\varepsilon C_4}{2C_2} \left(\frac{1}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{j=i} c_j \right) \right) \quad (70)$$

which by virtue of (53d) guarantees existence of a constant $\varepsilon^* \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ such that (8a) holds as well. It can be easily verified that rest assumptions in A1 and A'2 are fulfilled, hence, according to Proposition 1(i), (3) is AS for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$. Proofs of rest statements are similar plus some appropriate modifications to the procedure above; they are all based on statements (ii)-(iv) of Proposition 1 and are left to the reader. ■

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge the contribution of National Research Organization and reviewers' comments.

REFERENCES

[1] Anderson, Bitmead, Johnson, Kokotovic, Kosut, Mareels, Praly, Riedle, Stability of Adaptive Systems, Passivity and Averaging Analysis , *The MIT Press*, Cambridge, 1986.

[2] D. Aeyels and J. Peuteman, A new asymptotic stability criterion for nonlinear time-variant differential equations, *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 1998, 43, 968-971.

[3] D. Aeyels and J. Peuteman, On exponential stability of nonlinear time-varying differential equations, *Automatica* 1999, 35, 1091-1100.

[4] E. W. Bai, L. C. Fu, and S. S. Sastry, Averaging Analysis for Discrete Time Sampled Data Adaptive Systems, *IEEE Trans. on Circuits and Systems*, 1988, 35, 137-146.

[5] L. C. Fu, E. W. Bai, and S. S. Sastry, Averaging Analysis for Discrete Time Sampled Data Adaptive Systems, *Proceedings of 25th Conference on Decision and Control*, Athens, Greece, December 1985.

[6] H. K. Khalil, Nonlinear Systems, *Prentice-Hall, CityplaceEnglewood Cliffs*, NJ, 1996.

[7] J. Peuteman and D. Aeyels, Exponential stability of nonlinear time varying differential equations and partial averaging, *Math. Control Signals Systems*, 2002, 15, 42-70.

[8] J.Tsinias, Stabilizability of Discrete-Time Nonlinear Systems, *IMA J. of Math. Control and Inf.*, 1989, 135-150.

[9] J.Tsinias, A. Stamati, Local Asymptotic Stability via Averaging for Time-Varying Systems with Unbounded Dynamics with respect to time, *IEEE, Trans. on Automatic Control*, 2009, 54, 1374-1381.