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Abstract

New approach to controlling chaos in discrete-time systems is proposed. It extracts the desired periodic motion from chaotic ones and makes it stable via small control, based on prediction of the trajectory. The method is validated for one-dimensional as well as for multidimensional maps. Numerical simulation for logistic, tent, Henon and some other maps demonstrates the effectiveness of the approach.
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1 Introduction

Control of chaotic dynamical systems attracted much attention during recent years, see e.g. the pioneering paper [1] and surveys [2, 3, 4]. As stated in [2], “controlling chaos consists in perturbing chaotic system in order to stabilize a given unstable periodic orbit embedded in the chaotic attractor”. In the present paper we propose a novel approach to the problem for discrete-time nonlinear systems

\[ x_{k+1} = f(x_k). \] (1)

The idea (proposed by V.Maslov) is to predict the trajectory of the system and to use the control in the form

\[ u(x) = \varepsilon(f_{m+s}(x) - f_m(x)), \] (2)
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where $\varepsilon$ is a small step-size (a simple rule for its choosing will be provided), $m$ is a prediction horizon and $s$ is the desired period. Here and elsewhere $f_m$ denotes $m^{th}$ iteration of the function $f$, i.e.

$$f_1(x) = f(x), f_m(x) = f(f_{m-1}(x)).$$

In contrast with the method of delayed feedback control (DFC, proposed originally by Pyragas for continuous-time systems and extended to discrete-time case in [5]) which uses delayed iterations, (2) exploits predicted iterations of a point $x_k$. This allows to overcome many difficulties and limitations of DFC method and to validate stabilization effect of control (2) for $\varepsilon$ small enough.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 we analyze method (2) for one-dimensional case ($x \in \mathbb{R}^1$) and report simulation results for such classical chaotic systems as logistic and tent ones. Section 2 is devoted to $n$-dimensional case; Henon map is considered as an example. Implementation issues are discussed in Section 3.

## 2 Scalar case

In this section we consider one-dimensional nonlinear discrete-time system

$$x_{k+1} = f(x_k), x_k \in \mathbb{R}^1, k = 1, \ldots$$

Let $x_1^*, x_2^*, \ldots, x_s^*$ be a $s$-cycle (period $s$ orbit) of (3), that is

$$x_{i+1}^* = f_i(x_1^*), i = 1, \ldots, s - 1, x_s^* = f_s(x_1^*).$$

In particular, $s = 1$ relates to a fixed point of $f$. In what follows, we do not assume that the cycle is known, the only assumption is the existence of a cycle of period $s$. This information is often available in advance. The famous Sharkovskii’s theorem on ordering of cycles [6] states that the existence of a 3-cycle implies the existence of cycles of any order or the existence of a $2^m$-cycle implies the existence of cycles of order $2^l, l < m$.

For instance, for the logistic map $f(x) = \lambda x(1 - x)$, with $\lambda > 3.84$ there exist $s$-cycles for arbitrary $s$. The case of interest is an unstable cycle; our goal is to stabilize it by small control.

We suppose that the function $f$ maps some bounded interval $[a, b]$ into itself and is differentiable:

$$f : [a, b] \rightarrow [a, b], f \in C^1.$$
The number
\[ \mu = f'(x^*_s) \cdot \ldots \cdot f'(x^*_1) \]
is called a \textit{multiplicator} of the cycle. Sufficient condition of stability of the cycle (the cycle is an \textit{attractor}) is \(|\mu| < 1\), while sufficient condition of instability of the cycle (the cycle is a \textit{repeller}) is \(|\mu| > 1\). We suppose that the cycle under consideration is unstable and \(|\mu| > 1\). To stabilize it, we replace \(f\) in the right hand side of (3) by its correction, including control therm. Thus the closed-loop system becomes
\[ x_{k+1} = F(x_k) = f(x) - \varepsilon (f_{ps+1}(x) - f_{ps+1}(x)), \quad (4) \]
\[ |\varepsilon - \varepsilon^*| < \frac{1}{|\mu|^{1/s}}, \quad \varepsilon^* = \frac{1}{\mu^p(\mu - 1)}, \quad (5) \]

where \(p\) is an integer. Note that \(\varepsilon^*\) becomes arbitrary small when \(p\) is large enough, thus the control therm has the same property, because \(f_m\) are bounded for all \(m\) and \(\varepsilon\) decreases simultaneously with \(\varepsilon^*\).

**Theorem 1** Suppose (3) has an unstable \(s\)-cycle with the multiplicator \(\mu, |\mu| > 1\). Then the same cycle is stable for system (4) for any \(p \geq 1\) and any \(\varepsilon\), satisfying (5).

**Proof** A cycle \(x^*_1, x^*_2, \ldots, x^*_s\) of \(f\) remains the cycle for \(f_m\) with any \(m\), thus
\[ F(x^*_i) = f(x^*_i) - \varepsilon (f_{p(s+1)}(x^*_i) - f_{ps+1}(x^*_i)) = x^*_{i+1} \]
and this is also the cycle for \(F\). Now calculate its multiplicator for (4):
\[ \nu = F'(x^*_s) \cdot \ldots \cdot F'(x^*_1). \]

Having in mind that
\[ f'_s(x^*_i) = \mu, f'_{ps}(x^*_i) = \mu^p, f'_{ps+1}(x^*_i) = \mu^p f'(x^*_i+1), \]
we get
\[ F'(x^*_i) = (1 - \varepsilon \mu^p(\mu - 1)) f'(x^*_i). \]

Multiplying these equalities for \(i = 1, \ldots, s\) we arrive to the formula for the multiplicator of \(F\):
\[ \nu = (1 - \varepsilon \mu^p(\mu - 1))^s \mu. \quad (6) \]
To verify stability of the cycle, it suffices to show that $|\nu| < 1$. But indeed

$$|\nu| = |(1 - \varepsilon \mu^p(\mu - 1))|^s|\mu| < |(1 - (\varepsilon^* (1 \pm (1/|\mu|^{1/s})) \mu^p(\mu - 1))|^s|\mu| = 1,$$

because the function $|1 - c\varepsilon|^s$ attains its maximum for the extreme values of $\varepsilon$. $\Diamond$

Let us discuss the above result. To implement control law (4), (5) the analytic expression for $f$ is not required, the only assumption is that one can calculate $f(x)$ for arbitrary $x$. Thus $f(x)$ can be given by some computer program, the content of which is not available. On the other hand, computation of $f(x)$ should be precise enough; later we shall discuss the role of arithmetic round offs (it poses some limitations on the choice of $p$). Further, the values of the cycle points $x_1^*, x_2^*, \ldots, x_s^*$ are not used in the algorithm, the only information about the cycle is concentrated in the value of the multiplicator $\mu$. However, formula (5) demonstrates that just approximate value implies stability. Roughly speaking, 50% relative error in $\varepsilon^*$ suffices to obtain stability (see examples below). Another challenging issue related to the proposed control strategy is its global behavior. Theorem 1 ensures local convergence only. However, if we apply the algorithm to stabilize chaotic motion, which has mixing property, then we can expect that beyond a neighborhood of the cycle the trajectory of the controlled system has mixing properties as well ($F$ is close to $f$), so after some number of iterations it will arrive to the attracting neighborhood of the cycle. Another effect which is sometimes encountered - Theorem 1 may ensure stability not of a single cycle, but of few of them. For instance, we take $s = 4$ and try to stabilize 4-cycle, but simultaneously a fixed point and 2-cycle are stabilized. Thus for various initial points various cycles will be attractors.

Let us consider two most popular examples of one-dimensional chaotic systems.

**Example 1 – logistic map.** Let

$$f(x) = \lambda x(1 - x), 0 \leq \lambda \leq 4, f : [0, 1] \to [0, 1].$$

(7)

The behavior of iterations (3) for this map is very well studied, see e.g. [7, 8, 9]. It is simple enough for some values of $\lambda$. In particular:

a) there exists a single stable fixed point $x^* = 0$ for $0 < \lambda < 1$
b) there exists another single stable fixed point $x^* = 1 - 1/\lambda$ for $1 < \lambda < 3$

c) there exists a stable 2-cycle

$$x_1^* = \frac{\lambda + 1 - \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 2\lambda - 3}}{2\lambda}, x_2^* = \frac{\lambda + 1 + \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 2\lambda - 3}}{2\lambda},$$

for $3 < \lambda < 1 + \sqrt{6}$

d) there exists a single stable $2^l$-cycle with some $l > 2$ for $1 + \sqrt{6} < \lambda < 3.569$...

e) there exists a stable 3-cycle for $\lambda = 3.83$...

f) there exist $s$-cycles for any $s$ for $\lambda > 3.84$, but all of them are unstable; for $s = 1, 2, 2^l, 3$ they are the same as in a)-e). The behavior of trajectories in this case is completely chaotic.

Thus it is of interest to stabilize periodic orbits for $\lambda$ close to 4. Below are the results of simulation for $\lambda = 4$. In this case calculations for small $s$ can be performed analytically; the results are presented in Table 1. Here $n_s$ is the number of $s$-cycles, $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{n_s}$ are corresponding values of multiplicators for them.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$s$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n_s$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>4, $-2$</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>8, $-8$</td>
<td>16, $-16$</td>
<td>32, $-32$</td>
<td>64, $-64$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures below for this example are generated as follows. We take 100 initial points on uniform grid for $[0, 1]$ and perform $K = 1000$ iterations of method (4), (5) with various $s, p$; points $x_{1000}$ as functions of $x_1$ are plotted. In (5) we take $\varepsilon = \varepsilon^* = 1/\mu^p(1 - \mu)$, where $\mu$ is calculated for desired $s$-cycle. We report just typical results. Figure 1 relates to uncontrolled sequence (3); it demonstrates chaotic behavior of trajectories in the absence of control. Figure 2 shows the results for $s = 1$ (stabilization of fixed points). For fixed point $x^* = 0.75$ we have $\mu = -2$, it was taken $p = 20$, then $\varepsilon = -3.18 \times 10^{-7}$ (Fig 2a), while for $x^* = 0$ we have $\mu = 4, p = 6, \varepsilon = 8.13 \times 10^{-5}$ (Fig 2b). It can be seen that the method indeed globally stabilizes the desired fixed points, few exceptions (convergence to another fixed point for some initial approximations) will be explained later. Stabilization of 2-cycle is depicted on
Fig. 3 \((s = 2)\); Fig. 3a relates to \(p\) even \((p = 14, \varepsilon = -7.45 \times 10^{-10})\), then 2-cycle is globally stable while for \(p\) odd \((p = 15, \varepsilon = 1.86 \times 10^{-10})\) both 2-cycle and the fixed point are locally stable and various initial points are attracted to either of them. For \(s = 3\) there are two 3-cycles, the first \(x^*_1 = 0.1170, x^*_2 = 0.4132, x^*_3 = 0.9698, \mu = -8\) is stabilized simultaneously with fixed point \(x^* = 0.75\) (Fig. 4a) and the second \(x^*_1 = 0.1883, x^*_2 = 0.6113, x^*_3 = 0.9505, \mu = 8\) - with fixed point \(x^* = 0\) (Fig. 4b).

For cycles of order 4 their total number is 3 [7], direct calculations give the values \(\mu = 16, \mu = -16\). Figure 5 provides the results with these \(\mu\) and \(s = 4\). Separating fixed points and 2-cycle we see that two 4-cycles are found. Similar results are obtained for \(s = 5, s = 6\); total
Figure 3: Stabilizing 2-cycle

Figure 4: Stabilizing 3-cycle

Figure 5: Stabilizing 4-cycles
number of cycles \( n_s \) is given in Table 1; for the variety of cycles just two multiplicators \( \mu = \pm 2^s \) were found for all of them. We do not know, if it is a general rule for all \( s \). Stabilization of all cycles was achieved. For instance, for \( s = 5, \mu = 32 \) three 5-cycles are stabilized simultaneously, and iterations with various initial points are attracted by one of the cycles.

**Example 2 - tent map.** Let

\[
f(x) = \lambda(1 - |2x - 1|), 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1, f : [0, 1] \to [0, 1].
\]  

(8)

Iterations of this map have much similarity with that of logistic map — it exhibits chaotic behavior for \( \lambda \) close to 1. However, there is essential difference — all cycles of (8) are unstable for all \( \lambda > 0.5 \). Indeed, \(|f'(x)| = 2\lambda > 1\) for any point \( x \neq 0.5 \), and \(|\mu| = (2\lambda)^s > 1\) for any \( s \)-cycle, if its points are not binary rational. Nevertheless, it is possible to stabilize these cycles by control law (4), (5). Its application is very simple, because just values \( \mu = \pm (2\lambda)^s \) should be considered (surprisingly for \( \lambda = 1 \) these values are the same as multiplicators for the logistic map, see above).

Below are the results of calculations for \( \lambda = 1 \). For \( s = 1, \mu > 0 \) the fixed point \( x^* = 0 \) is stabilized, for \( s = 1, \mu < 0 \) – the point \( x^* = 2/3 \). For the case \( s = 2 \) one 2-cycle is detected with \( \mu < 0 \), while for \( s = 3 \) and \( s = 4 \) – two cycles. It is possible even to stabilize 5-cycles; six of them were found (for each sign of \( \mu \) three 5-cycles become stable simultaneously).

The value of \( p \) was chosen to get \( ps \sim 25 \), then \( \varepsilon \sim 10^{-8} \).

### 3 Vector case

We consider \( n \)-dimensional counterpart of (3):

\[
x_{k+1} = f(x_k), x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n, k = 1, \ldots
\]  

(9)

The definition of \( s \)-cycle and the multiplicator remains the same, but now it is \( n \times n \) Jacobian matrix

\[
M = f'(x^*_k) \cdot \ldots \cdot f'(x^*_1).
\]

Note that multiplicator depends on ordering of points, i.e. which point in the cycle is chosen as the first one. For instance, if \( x^*_i \) is taken as the starting one, we get

\[
M_i = f'(x^*_{i-1}) \cdot \ldots \cdot f'(x^*_1).
\]
were indices of the arguments are taken in the cyclical decreasing order $i-1, i-2, \ldots, 1, s, s-1, \ldots, i$; thus $M = M_1$ and in general $M_i \neq M_1, i \neq 1$. However the eigenvalues of the matrices $M_1, \ldots, M_s$ coincide (matrices $AB, BA$ have common eigenvalues: if $ABe = \lambda Be$, then multiplying by $B$ we have $BABe = \lambda Be, BAf = \lambda f, f = Be$). We denote $\mu_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ the eigenvalues of any $M_j$. The cycle is stable if $\rho = \max |\mu_i| < 1$ and unstable if $\rho > 1$. We can also write $M_i$ in the form

$$M_i = A_iB_i, A_i = f'(x^*_i) \cdot \ldots \cdot f'(x^*_1), B_i = f'(x^*_s) \cdot \ldots \cdot f'(x^*_i),$$

$$A_1 = I, B_1 = m, B_iA_i = M.$$

We exploit the same control law

$$x_{k+1} = F(x_k), F(x) = f(x) - \varepsilon (f_{p(s+1)}(x) - f_{ps+1}(x)), \quad (10)$$

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\mu^p(\mu - 1)}, \quad (11)$$

but the choice of $\mu$ is specified below. The simplest stabilization result reads as follows.

**Theorem 2** Suppose (9) has an unstable $s$-cycle with the multiplicator $M, \rho > 1$. Assume $\mu_n = \mu$ is real, $|\mu| = \rho$, while $|\mu_i| < 1, i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$. Then the same cycle is stable for system (10) provided $p$ is large enough.

**Proof** We follow the lines of the proof of Theorem 1; the difference arises because matrices are not commutative. To calculate the matrix multiplicator of $F$ for the cycle $x^*_1, x^*_2, \ldots, x^*_s$:

$$N = F'(x^*_s) \cdot \ldots \cdot F'(x^*_1)$$

we should calculate each term of the product. By using the chain rule for differentiation

$$f'_m(x^*_i) = f'_{m-1}(x^*_{i+1})f'(x^*_i)$$

and definition of multiplicators $M_i$ we get

$$f'_{ps}(x^*_i) = M^p_i, f'_{ps+1}(x^*_i) = M^p_{i+1}f'(x^*_i) = f'(x^*_i)M^p_i, M^p_i = A_iM^{p-1}B_i$$

and hence

$$F'(x^*_i) = f'(x^*_i)(I - \varepsilon A_i(M^p - M^{p-1})B_i)$$
By induction we easily get
\[ F'(x_{i-1}^*) \cdot \ldots \cdot F'(x_1^*) = A_i(I - \varepsilon M^p(M - I))^{i-1} \]
and finally
\[ N = F'(x_{s}^*) \cdot \ldots \cdot F'(x_1^*) = A_{s+1}(I - \varepsilon M^p(M - I))^s = M(I - \varepsilon M^p(M - I))^s. \]
The eigenvalues \( \nu_i \) of \( N \) can be expressed via the eigenvalues \( \mu_i \) of \( M \) as
\[ \nu_i = \mu_i(1 - \varepsilon \mu_i^p\mu_i - 1)^s. \]
Now, for \( i = n \mu_n = \mu \) and due to (11) we get \( \nu_n = 0 \). For \( i \neq n \) we have
\[ |\nu_i| \leq |\mu_i|(1 + \frac{|\mu_i|^p|1 - \mu_i|}{|\mu|^p|\mu - 1|}) \]
But \( |\mu_i| < 1 \) under assumption of the theorem, and \( |\mu_i|^p/|\mu|^p \) tends to 0 when \( p \) increases. Thus \( |\nu_i| < 1 \) for \( p \) large enough. We conclude that
\[ r = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\nu_i| < 1 \] for such \( p \), that is the cycle is stable for \( F \).
As can be seen from the proof, the precise knowledge of \( \mu \) can be relaxed - the approximate estimate also fits; the value of \( \varepsilon \) can be chosen as in (5). The assumption on location of eigenvalues of \( M \) (there is a single real unstable eigenvalue; all other eigenvalues are stable) can also be relaxed for some particular cases.

**Example 3 – Henon map** This is classical 2-D example, originated at [10]:
\[ \begin{align*}
y_{k+1} &= 1 - 1.4y_k^2 + z_k \\
z_{k+1} &= 0.3y_k
\end{align*} \]
(there exist other values of parameters of this map, which exhibit chaotic behavior; we choose the most popular version). The values of \( x_{40}, x = (y, z)^T \) for initial \( x_0 \) on the uniform grid at \( S = [-1.4, 1.4] \times [-0.4, 0.4] \) are plotted at Fig.6a; the structure of the "strange attractor" is well seen. To avoid points which tend to infinity, the map is slightly transformed – projection on \( S \) is added. Fig. 6b depicts an individual trajectory for some \( x_0 \), its complicated movement along points of the strange attractor is typical. The following facts about the map can be obtained analytically:
a) trajectories from $S$ either run to infinity or are attracted to the strange attractor in $S$.

b) there is the unstable fixed point $x^* = (0.6314, 0.1894)$, for this point the eigenvalues of matrix $M$ are $(-1.92, 0.15)$, thus assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied with $\mu = -1.92$. There is also another unstable point $(-1.314, -0.3394)$ but iterations from the neighborhood of this point tend to infinity. The first point belongs to the strange attractor, while the second – not, thus attempts to stabilize the second point will fail.

c) there is one 2-cycle $x_1^* = (-0.4758, 0.2927), x_2^* = (0.9758, -0.1427)$, it is also unstable.

Figure 7a plots $y$-component of a typical trajectory when we stabilize the fixed point $x^* = (0.6314, 0.1894), \mu = -1.92$; Fig. 7b shows the last 100 points of this trajectory on $y, z$-plane (all of them coincide within the precision of the picture. The fixed point possesses global stability.

Similar results are obtained for stabilization of 2-cycle ($s = 2, \mu = -3.01$), see Fig. 8.

For $s = 4$ corresponding cycles and values of $\mu$ are not known. By trials it was found that $\mu = -9$ stabilizes 4-cycle

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
0.6382 & 0.2178 & 1.1257 & -0.7068 \\
-0.2120 & 0.1915 & 0.0653 & 0.3377
\end{array}
\]

The results are presented at Fig. 9 (Fig. 9a - for a typical trajectory its first coordinate is plotted; Fig. 9b - for the same trajectory its last 20 iterations are shown on $x$ plane).
Figure 7: Stabilizing the fixed point

Figure 8: Stabilizing 2-cycle

Figure 9: Stabilizing 4-cycle
Note that in all these experiments the typical values were $\varepsilon \sim 10^{-4} - 10^{-5}$.

4 Implementation issues

Choice of $\mu$. In some examples above the value of the multiplicator of a cycle to be stabilized was known apriori or required minor calculations (fixed points or 2-cycles; any cycles for tent map). However sometimes the value of $\mu$ is not available (large $s$; the case of $f$ with no analytic expression but given with some code etc.) Then it can be estimated. The estimates are especially simple for scalar case ($n = 1$). We introduce function $g(x) = f_s(x) - x$ and calculate its values on a uniform grid $a = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_N = b, x_{i+1} - x_i = d$ (it is assumed that the interval $S = [a, b], f : S \rightarrow S$ is known). Then we detect points of interchange of sign: $g(x_i)g(x_{i+1}) < 0$, they are candidates for fixed points of $g$, i.e. for $s$-cycles of $f$. The quantities $(g(x_{i+1}) - g(x_i))/d$ are good estimates for $\mu$ provided that $d$ is small enough.

For $n$-dimensional case this method can be revised. We can minimize the function $\|g(x)\|$ either on a grid or by any minimization procedure, say \texttt{fmin} in Matlab. Suppose that $x_0$ is one of local minima with $\|g(x_0)\| \approx 0$. Then we perform $m$ iterations $x_1 = f_s(x_0), \ldots, x_m = f_s(x_{m-1})$ and calculate $a = (x_m - x_{m-1}, x_{m-1} - x_{m-2}), r_1 = \|x_m - x_{m-1}\|, r_2 = \|x_{m-1} - x_{m-2}\|, q = a/(r_1 r_2)$. Then, if $|q|$ is close to 1, value $a/r_2^2$ is an estimate for $\mu$. This approach was tested for Henon map; value $m = 4$ provided good estimates, even if $x_0$ was not very precise approximation.

Choice of $p$. Formulas (5), (11) ensure that larger is $p$, smaller is $\varepsilon$. However there are some limitations for growth of $p$, they are due to round off errors of computer arithmetic. Thus functions $f_m(x)$ can not be calculated precisely for large $m$. Let us illustrate this for some examples. For $f(x) = 4x(1 - x)$ we have $f_m(0) = 0$ for any $m$, while $f_m(\varepsilon) \approx 4^m \varepsilon$ for small $\varepsilon$ and $m$ not too large. Thus an error in $x$, equal to standard machine accuracy $\texttt{eps}=\varepsilon = 2^{-52}$ causes an error in calculation of $f_m(x)$, equal to $2^{2m-52}$, thus reasonable value of $m$, which does not lead to dramatic consequences, is $m < 20$. In other situations the limitation
is not so severe; if points \( x_i, x_{i+1} = f(x_i), i = 1, \ldots, m \) are approximately uniformly distributed on \([0,1]\), then \( E|f'(x)| = 2 \), and \( E|f_m'(x)| = 2^m \), and reasonable limitation is \( m < 40 \). The same result holds for the tent map \( f(x) = (1 - |2x - 1|) \), \( |f_m'(x)| = 2^m \) for any \( x, m \). We conclude that it is more or less safe to choose \( sp \sim 25 \), and this rule was verified for all simulations.

**Modifications of \( F \).** If \( f : S \to S \), it does not mean in general that \( F : S \to S \) even for \( \varepsilon \) small enough. For instance, if \( f(x) = 4x(1 - x) \), then for \( 0 < x = \varepsilon < \varepsilon \) we get \( F(x) < 0 \) and the trajectory abandons \( S = [0,1] \). To avoid such situations, we can correct \( F \) by including projection on \( S \) for iterations. This does not affect results on stabilization of cycles, because they are of local nature and points of a cycle are inside \( S \). However such modification can cause stabilization of boundary fixed points, as can be seen at Figures 1–5. Similar correction was done for \( f(x) \) itself for Henon map to get rid of trajectories, running to infinity.

**Extensions.** Theorem 2 validates stabilization under strict assumptions on eigenvalues of the multiplicator \( M \). There exist other methods for adjusting of \( \varepsilon \), which guarantee stabilization for different location of eigenvalues; we do not discuss them here. Another option is as follows: if \( F \) does not ensure stabilization of the desired cycle, one can apply the same control law, when \( f \) is replaced by \( F \). This trick can extend stabilization abilities.

### 5 Conclusions

We provided a simple and effective method for stabilization of unstable \( s \)-cycles of nonlinear discrete-time systems by use of small control. It is based on prediction of a current point on \( m \) and \( m + s \) iterations forward, where \( m \) is of the form \( ps + 1 \), \( p \) being large enough. The main assumption is a possibility to perform this prediction precisely enough.

The extension of the approach for differential equations will be reported later.
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