## 9 Controller Discretization

In most applications, a control system is implemented in a digital fashion on a computer. This implies that the measurements that are supplied to the control system must be sampled. If the sampler has period $T$, then the sampled value of the measurements are denoted by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{y}_{k}=\mathbf{y}\left(t_{k}\right), \quad t_{k}=k T, k=0,1,2,3, \cdots \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The output from the controller will take on discrete values which we denote by $\mathbf{u}_{k}$. The actual input to the plant be controlled is usually obtained by passing the sequence $\mathbf{u}_{k}$ through a zero-order hold ( ZOH ). The output of the ZOH is given by

$$
\mathbf{u}(t)=\mathbf{u}_{k}, \quad t_{k} \leq t<t_{k+1}
$$

In this section we would like to determine mathematical models for the relationship between $\mathbf{u}_{k}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{k}$ and establish a technique for digital implementation of a controller design.

### 9.1 Discrete-Time Plant Model

Assume that the plant to be controlled is described by a state-space model of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{\mathrm{x}}=\mathbf{A x}+\mathbf{B u}, \quad \mathbf{y}=\mathbf{C x} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us first of all note that the sampled value of the output $\mathbf{y}$ satisfies

$$
\mathbf{y}_{k}=\mathbf{y}\left(t_{k}\right)=\mathbf{C x}\left(t_{k}\right)=\mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_{k}
$$

Given the plant model in (2), the solution is

$$
\mathbf{x}(t)=e^{\mathbf{A}\left(t-t_{0}\right)} \mathbf{x}\left(t_{0}\right)+\int_{t_{0}}^{t} e^{\mathbf{A}(t-\tau)} \mathbf{B u}(\tau) d \tau
$$

Let $t_{0}=t_{k}, t=t_{k+1}$, and $t_{k+1}-t_{k}=T$. Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x}_{k+1} & =e^{\mathbf{A} T} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\int_{t_{k}}^{t_{k+1}} e^{\mathbf{A}\left(t_{k+1}-\tau\right)} \mathbf{B u}(\tau) d \tau \\
& =e^{\mathbf{A} T} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\int_{t_{k}}^{t_{k+1}} e^{\mathbf{A}\left(t_{k+1}-\tau\right)} \mathbf{B} d \tau \mathbf{u}_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting, $\tau^{\prime}=t_{k+1}-\tau$, we have

$$
\int_{t_{k}}^{t_{k+1}} e^{\mathbf{A}\left(t_{k+1}-\tau\right)} \mathbf{B} d \tau=\int_{T}^{0} e^{\mathbf{A} \tau^{\prime}}\left(-d \tau^{\prime}\right) \mathbf{B}=\int_{0}^{T} e^{\mathbf{A} \tau} d \tau \mathbf{B}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{x}_{k+1} & =\mathbf{A}_{d} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B}_{d} \mathbf{u}_{k}  \tag{3}\\
\mathbf{y}_{k} & =\mathbf{C}_{d} \mathbf{x}_{k}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{C}_{d} & =\mathbf{C} \\
\mathbf{A}_{d} & =e^{\mathbf{A} T} \\
\mathbf{B}_{d} & =\int_{0}^{T} e^{\mathbf{A} \tau} d \tau \mathbf{B}
\end{aligned}
$$

This is termed the ZOH equivalent of the state-space system.

### 9.2 Stability of LTI Discrete-Time Systems

Consider

$$
\mathbf{x}_{k+1}=\mathbf{A}_{d} \mathbf{x}_{k}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{0} \text { given }
$$

It is readily verified that the solution is

$$
\mathbf{x}_{k}=\mathbf{A}_{d}^{k} \mathbf{x}_{0}
$$

For simplicity, assume that $\mathbf{A}_{d}$ has distinct eigenvalues and permits the eigendecomposition

$$
\mathbf{A}_{d}=\mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{E}^{-1}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{A}_{d}^{k} & =\left(\mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{E}^{-1}\right)\left(\mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{E}^{-1}\right) \cdots\left(\mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{E}^{-1}\right) \\
& =\mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{k} \mathbf{E}^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\mathbf{x}_{k}=\mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{k} \mathbf{E}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{0}
$$

Letting $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k}=\mathbf{E}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{k}$, it follows that

$$
\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k}=\Lambda^{k} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{0}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{k}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{\lambda_{i}^{k}\right\}$. If

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\lambda_{i}\right|<1, \quad i=1, \cdots, n \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Rightarrow \quad \lambda_{i}^{k} \rightarrow 0 \text { as } k \rightarrow \infty \\
& \Rightarrow \Lambda^{k} \rightarrow \mathbf{O} \text { as } k \rightarrow \infty \\
& \Rightarrow \mathbf{x}_{k}=\mathbf{E} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k} \rightarrow \mathbf{0} \text { as } k \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\left|\lambda_{i}\right|>1$ for some $i$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Rightarrow \quad \lambda_{i}^{k} \rightarrow \infty \text { as } k \rightarrow \infty \\
& \Rightarrow \quad\left\|\mathbf{x}_{k}\right\| \rightarrow \infty \text { as } k \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 1. If the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}_{d}$ lie within the open unit disk of the complex plane, the discrete-time system is asymptotically stable.
Theorem 2. If any of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}_{d}$ lie outside the unit disk of the complex plane, then the discrete-time system is unstable.
Consider the ZOH equivalent in (3) and assume that $\mathbf{A}$ has distinct eigenvalues. If $\mathbf{A}$ has the eigendecomposition

$$
\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{E}^{-1}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Lambda}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{\lambda_{i}\right\}, \quad \lambda_{i}=\sigma_{i} \pm j \omega_{i}
$$

then

$$
\mathbf{A}_{d}=e^{\mathbf{A} T}=\mathbf{E} e^{\boldsymbol{\Lambda} T} \mathbf{E}^{-1}
$$

Therefore

$$
\lambda\left\{\mathbf{A}_{d}\right\}=e^{\lambda_{i} T}=e^{\sigma_{i} T} e^{j \omega_{i} T}
$$

Now, $\left|e^{\lambda_{i} T}\right|=\left|e^{\sigma_{i} T}\right|$. Hence if $\sigma_{i}<0$, then $\left|e^{\lambda_{i} T}\right|<1$. Therefore, the ZOH equivalent of an asymptotically stable continuous-time system is also asymptotically stable.

### 9.3 Digital Control Design

There are two broad approaches to digital control design:
(i) direct discrete design using the ZOH equivalent as a model;
(ii) discretization of a continuous-time design based on the continuous-time plant model.

Initially we consider (ii) using the bilinear transformation (also called Tustin's rule or the trapezoidal rule).
Assume that we have a continuous-time controller with the following model:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{\mathbf{x}}=\mathbf{A x}+\mathbf{B u}, \mathbf{y}=\mathbf{C x} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We want to replace this with difference equations that relate the sampled values $\mathbf{y}_{k}$ and $\mathbf{u}_{k}$. Since $\mathbf{y}\left(t_{k}\right)=\mathbf{C x}\left(t_{k}\right)$ we have

$$
\mathbf{y}_{k}=\mathbf{C x}_{k}
$$

Since $\dot{\mathbf{x}}=\mathbf{A x}+\mathbf{B u}$, it follows that

$$
\mathbf{x}_{k+1}-\mathbf{x}_{k}=\int_{t_{k}}^{t_{k+1}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} d t=\mathbf{A} \int_{t_{k}}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbf{x} d t+\mathbf{B} \int_{t_{k}}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbf{u} d t
$$

Now, approximate the integrals on the right-hand side using the trapezoidal rule:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{t_{k}}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbf{x} d t & =\frac{T}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}+\mathbf{x}_{k}\right) \\
\int_{t_{k}}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbf{u} d t & =\frac{T}{2}\left(\mathbf{u}_{k+1}+\mathbf{u}_{k}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x}_{k+1}-\mathbf{x}_{k} & =\mathbf{A} \frac{T}{2}\left[\mathbf{x}_{k+1}+\mathbf{x}_{k}\right]+\mathbf{B} \frac{T}{2}\left[\mathbf{u}_{k+1}+\mathbf{u}_{k}\right] \\
\Rightarrow\left[1-\mathbf{A} \frac{T}{2}\right] \mathbf{x}_{k+1} & =\left[1+\mathbf{A} \frac{T}{2}\right] \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B} \frac{T}{2}\left[\mathbf{u}_{k+1}+\mathbf{u}_{k}\right] \\
\Rightarrow \mathbf{x}_{k+1} & =\underbrace{\left[1-\mathbf{A} \frac{T}{2}\right]^{-1}\left[1+\mathbf{A} \frac{T}{2}\right]}_{\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d}} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\underbrace{\left[1-\mathbf{A} \frac{T}{2}\right]^{-1} \mathbf{B} \frac{T}{2}}_{\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d}}\left[\mathbf{u}_{k+1}+\mathbf{u}_{k}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Consider the difference equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{z}_{k+1}=\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k}+\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d} \mathbf{u}_{k} \\
& \mathbf{z}_{k+2}=\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k+1}+\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d} \mathbf{u}_{k+1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that setting $\mathbf{x}_{k}=\mathbf{z}_{k}+\mathbf{z}_{k+1}$ and adding the two equations gives the desired one for $\mathbf{x}_{k}$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{y}_{k}=\mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_{k} & =\mathbf{C}\left(\mathbf{z}_{k}+\mathbf{z}_{k+1}\right) \\
& =\mathbf{C} \quad \mathbf{z}_{k}+\mathbf{C}\left(\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k}+\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d} \mathbf{u}_{k}\right) \\
& =\underbrace{\mathbf{C}\left(\mathbf{1}+\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d}\right)}_{\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{d}} \mathbf{z}_{k}+\underbrace{\mathbf{C} \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d}}_{\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{d}} \mathbf{u}_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence the discrete equivalent of the state-space model in Eq. (5) is

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{z}_{k+1} & =\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k}+\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d} \mathbf{u}_{k}  \tag{6}\\
\mathbf{y}_{k} & =\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k}+\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{d} \mathbf{u}_{k} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d}, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d}, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{d}$, and $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{d}$ are defined as above.

### 9.4 Closed-Loop Discrete-Time Stability Analysis

Assume the plant is described by its ZOH equivalent:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x}_{k+1} & =\mathbf{A}_{d} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B}_{d} \mathbf{u}_{k} \\
\mathbf{y}_{k} & =\mathbf{C}_{d} \mathbf{x}_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Assume that the controller is described by a discrete equivalent of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{z}_{k+1} & =\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k}+\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d} \mathbf{y}_{k} \\
-\mathbf{u}_{k} & =\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k}+\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{d} \mathbf{y}_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Closing the loop gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x}_{k+1} & =\mathbf{A}_{d} \mathbf{x}_{k}-\mathbf{B}_{d} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k}-\mathbf{B}_{d} \hat{\mathbf{D}}_{d} \mathbf{y}_{k} \\
& =\left(\mathbf{A}_{d}-\mathbf{B}_{d} \hat{\mathbf{D}}_{d} \mathbf{C}_{d}\right) \mathbf{x}_{k}-\mathbf{B}_{d} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Also,

$$
\mathbf{z}_{k+1}=\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d} \mathbf{z}_{k}+\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d} \mathbf{C}_{d} \mathbf{x}_{k}
$$

Combining these two gives

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{x}_{k+1} \\
\mathbf{z}_{k+1}
\end{array}\right]=\underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{A}_{d}-\mathbf{B}_{d} \hat{\mathbf{D}}_{d} \mathbf{C}_{d} & -\mathbf{B}_{d} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{d} \\
\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{d} \mathbf{C}_{d} & \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{d}
\end{array}\right]}_{\mathbf{A}_{\text {comp }}}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{x}_{k} \\
\mathbf{z}_{k}
\end{array}\right]
$$

For stability $\lambda\left\{\mathbf{A}_{\text {comp }}\right\}$ must lie within the unit disc.

### 9.5 Discrete-Time Optimal Control

Assume that the system to be controlled is described by difference equations of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{x}_{k+1}=\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B} \mathbf{u}_{k}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{0}=\mathbf{c} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider a performance index of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{J}=\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_{N}^{T} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{x}_{N}+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{x}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{u}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{u}_{k} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{R}=\mathbf{R}^{T}>\mathbf{O}, \quad \mathbf{Q}=\mathbf{Q}^{T} \geq \mathbf{O}, \quad \mathbf{S}=\mathbf{S}^{T} \geq \mathbf{O}
$$

We would like to determine $\mathbf{u}_{k}, k=0,1,2, \cdots, N-1$ to minimize $\mathcal{J}$.
The state equation is treated as a constraint which we rewrite as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B} \mathbf{u}_{k}-\mathbf{x}_{k+1}=\mathbf{0} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us adjoin (10) to (9) using Lagrange multipliers $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k}, k=1, \cdots, N$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
L=\mathcal{J}+\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}^{T}\left(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B} \mathbf{u}_{k}-\mathbf{x}_{k+1}\right) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Necessary conditions for optimality are

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{k}}=\mathbf{0}, \quad k=1, \cdots, N \\
& \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{u}_{k}}=\mathbf{0}, \quad k=1, \cdots, N-1 \\
& \frac{\partial L}{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k}}=\mathbf{0}, \quad k=1, \cdots, N
\end{aligned}
$$

We have

$$
L=\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_{N}^{T} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{x}_{N}+\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{u}_{k}+\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}^{T}\left(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B} \mathbf{u}_{k}-\mathbf{x}_{k+1}\right)\right]
$$

Hence the optimality conditions become

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{N}} & =\mathbf{S} \mathbf{x}_{N}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{N}=\mathbf{0} \\
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{k}} & =\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{A}^{T} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}-\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k}=\mathbf{0}, \quad k=1, \cdots, N-1
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{u}_{k}}=\mathbf{R u}_{k}+\mathbf{B}^{T} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}=\mathbf{0}, \quad k=1, \cdots, N-1 \\
& \frac{\partial L}{\partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k}}=\mathbf{A x}_{k-1}+\mathbf{B u}_{k-1}-\mathbf{x}_{k}=\mathbf{0}, \quad k=1, \cdots, N
\end{aligned}
$$

We can rewrite these as

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{x}_{k+1} & =\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B} \mathbf{u}_{k}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{0}=\mathbf{c}  \tag{12}\\
\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k} & =\mathbf{A}^{T} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}+\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}_{k}, \quad \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{N}=\mathbf{S} \mathbf{x}_{N}  \tag{13}\\
\mathbf{u}_{k} & =-\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{T} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1} \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

Substituting (14) into (12) leads to

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{x}_{k+1} & =\mathbf{A x}_{k}-\mathbf{B R}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{T} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{0}=\mathbf{c} \\
\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k} & =\mathbf{A}^{T} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}+\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}_{k}, \quad \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{N}=\mathbf{S x}_{N} \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

This is a discrete two-point boundary value problem. Since $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{N}=\mathbf{S} \mathbf{x}_{N}$, let us assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k}=\mathbf{P}_{k} \mathbf{x}_{k}, \quad k=1, \cdots, N \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\mathbf{P}_{N}=\mathbf{S}$. Substituting (16) into (14) gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{u}_{k} & =-\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{x}_{k+1} \\
& =-\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1}\left(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B} \mathbf{u}_{k}\right) \\
\Rightarrow\left(\mathbf{R}+\mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{B}\right) \mathbf{u}_{k} & =-\mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k} \\
\Rightarrow \mathbf{u}_{k} & =-\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k} \\
& =\mathbf{F}_{k} \mathbf{x}_{k}, \mathbf{F}_{k}=-\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{A}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{k+1}=\mathbf{R}+\mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{B}
$$

Hence, the optimal control is state feedback.
In order to determine $\mathbf{P}_{k}$, let us substitute (16) into (15):

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_{k} \mathbf{x}_{k} & =\mathbf{A}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{x}_{k+1}+\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}_{k} \\
& =\mathbf{A}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1}\left(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{B u} \mathbf{u}_{k}\right)+\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}_{k} \\
& =\mathbf{A}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k}-\mathbf{A}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{B} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}_{k}+\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{x}_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since this must hold for all $\mathbf{x}_{k}$, the coefficient matrix on each side must match. Therefore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{P}_{k}=\mathbf{A}^{T}\left(\mathbf{P}_{k+1}-\mathbf{P}_{k+1} \mathbf{B} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{T} \mathbf{P}_{k+1}\right) \mathbf{A}+\mathbf{Q} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is called the discrete-time Riccati equation. It can be solved backwards given the terminal condition $\mathbf{P}_{N}=\mathbf{S}$. When $\mathbf{P}_{k}, k=N, N-1, \cdots, 0$ is known, the optimal feedback gains $\mathbf{F}_{k}$ can be determined.

