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Abstract—Dimension-varying linear systems are investigated. First, a dimension-free state space is proposed. A cross dimensional distance is constructed to glue vectors of different dimensions together to form a cross-dimensional topological space. This distance leads to projections over different dimensional Euclidean spaces and the corresponding linear systems on them, which provide a connection among linear systems with different dimensions. Based on these projections, an equivalence of vectors and an equivalence of matrices over different dimensions are proposed. It follows that the dynamics on quotient space is obtained, which provides a proper model for cross-dimensional systems. Finally, using the lift of dynamic systems on quotient space to Euclidean spaces of different dimensions, a cross-dimensional model is proposed to deal with the dynamics of dimension-varying process of linear systems. On the cross-dimensional model a control is designed to realize the transfer between models on Euclidean spaces of different dimensions.

Index Terms—dimension-varying linear (control) system, dimension-free state space, s-system, quotient space, dimension transient process.

I. PRELIMINARIES

Dimension-varying system appears to various complex systems, such as docking, undocking, departure, and joining of spacecrafts [20], [13], modeling of biological systems [19], [11]. Vehicle clutch system is another engineering example. A classical way to deal with dimension-varying systems is switching [20]. This approach ignores the dynamics of the system during the dimension-varying process. In practice, the transient period may be long enough so that the dynamics during this process is not ignorable. For instance, automobile clutch takes about 1 second to complete a connection or separation, docking/undocking of spacecrafts takes even longer. Investigating the dynamics and designing control for transient process of dimension-varying systems can improve the performance of mechanical or other systems.

To our best knowledge, there is no proper theory or technique to model the dimension-varying systems. This paper attempts to explore the dynamic and control of dimension-varying systems. In addition to general dimension-varying systems, particular attention has been paid to the dynamics of the transient process of classical dimension-varying systems, which have invariant dimensions except the transient period. First of all, the dimension-free state space is introduced. A hybrid vector space structure is posed to it, and an inner product is obtained, which is then used to deduce norm and distance of the state space. The distance makes vectors of different dimensions (i.e., different dimensional Euclidean spaces) into a connected topological space. As a consequence, this connection also connected linear systems with state spaces of different dimensions.

The cross-dimensional distance glue some vectors of different dimensions together (i.e., vectors with zero distance in-between), which leads to an equivalence relation on the cross-dimensional topological space. Based on this equivalence relation, a quotient space is obtained. Linear (control) systems on quotient space is also defined and discussed. Finally, by lifting dynamic systems on quotient space to different dimensional Euclidean spaces, the dynamics for transient process of cross-dimensional systems is modeled. Then a technique is proposed to design a control to realize the required transient process.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 proposes a dimension free state space. First, a pseudo-vector space structure and a distance are proposed to make Euclidean spaces of different dimensions a path-wise connected topological space. Based on this equivalence relation, a quotient space is obtained. Linear (control) systems on quotient space is also defined and discussed. Finally, by lifting dynamic systems on quotient space to different dimensional Euclidean spaces, the dynamics for transient process of cross-dimensional systems is modeled. Then a technique is proposed to design a control to realize the required transient process.
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these two equivalences, the corresponding quotient space is obtained, which is a standard vector space and Hausdorff topological space. Then linear (control) systems on quotient space are properly defined. In Section 4, by lifting a linear system on quotient space to Euclidean spaces of different dimensions, the dynamics of transient process of dimension-varying linear control systems is modeled. A technique is proposed to design required controls to realize the dimension transient process. Finally, an example is presented to illustrate the proposed theory and related design technique.

Before ending this section we list some notations:

1) \( \mathbb{R} \): Field of real numbers;
2) \( \mathcal{M}_{m \times n} \): set of \( m \times n \) dimensional real matrices.
3) \( \text{Col}(A) \) (\( \text{Row}(A) \)): the set of columns (rows) of \( A \);
\( \text{Col}_i(A) \) (\( \text{Row}_i(A) \)): the \( i \)-th column (row) of \( A \).
4) One-entry vector: \( \mathbf{1}_n = [1, \ldots, 1]^T \).
5) One-entry matrix: \( \mathbf{1}_{n \times n} = [a_{i,j}] \in \mathcal{M}_{n \times n} \), where \( a_{i,j} = 1 \), \( \forall i, j \).
6) \( m \wedge n = \gcd(m, n) \): The greatest common divisor of \( m \) and \( n \).
7) \( m \lor n = \text{lcm}(m, n) \): The least common multiple of \( m \) and \( n \).
8) \( \langle x, y \rangle_F \), \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \): The Frobenius inner product on \( \mathbb{R}^n \).
9) \( \langle x, y \rangle_V \), \( x, y \in \mathcal{V} \): The inner product on \( \mathcal{V} \).
10) \( \|x\|_V \): A norm on dimension-free vector space, or operator norm of operators over dimension-free vector space.
11) \( \|x\|_\mathcal{F} \): The standard norm on \( \mathbb{R}^n \).
12) \( \mathcal{F} \): The semi-tensor product (STP) of matrices.
13) \( \circ \): The second semi-tensor product (STP) of matrices.
14) \( \tilde{\circ} \): The vector product (or V-product) of matrix with vector.
15) \( \tilde{\circ} \): The second vector product of matrix with vector.
16) \( \oplus (\ominus) \): The left M-addition (M-subtraction) of matrices.
17) \( \ominus (\oplus) \): The left V-addition (V-subtraction) of vectors.
18) \( \leftrightarrow \): Vector equivalence (V-equivalence).
19) \( \tilde{x} \): Vector equivalence class.
20) \( A \approx B \): Matrix equivalence (M-equivalence).
21) \( \tilde{A} \): Matrix equivalence class.

II. DIMENSION FREE STATE SPACE

A. Vector Space Structure and Distance

Consider a cross dimensional dynamic system, its state space should be a dimension free vector space. We construct such a state space as follows:

\[
\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}_n, \tag{1}
\]

where \( \mathcal{V}_n \) is an \( n \)-dimensional vector space. For simplicity, we may identify \( \mathcal{V}_n = \mathbb{R}^n \). A vector \( x \in \mathcal{V} \) could be any finite dimensional vector. A dynamic system with the state \( x(t) \) developing on \( \mathcal{V} \) is called a cross-dimensional dynamic system. As the state space of a dynamic system, \( \mathcal{V} \) needs (i) a vector space structure; (ii) a topological structure.

We first propose a vector space structure on \( \mathcal{V} \):

**Definition II.1.** Let \( x, y \in \mathcal{V} \), say, \( x \in \mathcal{V}_m \) and \( y \in \mathcal{V}_n \), and \( t = m \lor n \). Then an addition of \( x \) and \( y \), called the V-addition, is defined as follows:

\[
x \oplus y := (x \otimes 1_{t/m}) + (y \otimes 1_{t/n}) \in \mathcal{V}_t. \tag{2}
\]

Correspondingly, the V-subtraction is defined as

\[
x \ominus y := x \ominus (-y). \tag{3}
\]

Recall that a set \( V \) with addition and scalar product on \( \mathbb{R} \) is a vector space if the following are satisfied: (1) \( x + y = y + x \); (2) \( (x + y) + z = x + (y + z) \); (3) there exists a unique \( 0 \in V \), such that \( x + 0 = x \), and for each \( x \) there is a unique \( -x \) such that \( x + (-x) = 0 \). (4) \( 1 \cdot x = x \); (5) \( (ab)x = a(bx) \), \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \); (6) \( (a+b)x = ax + bx \), \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \); (7) \( a(x+y) = ax + ay \), \( a \in \mathbb{R} \). If only the uniqueness of 0 and then the uniqueness of \( -x \) for each \( x \), is excluded, \( V \) is called a pseudo-vector space [1].

The following result is evident from one by one verification:

**Proposition II.2.** \( \mathcal{V} \) with addition, subtraction defined by (2) and (3) respectively, and conventional scalar product is a pseudo-vector space.

**Definition II.3.** Let \( x, y \in \mathcal{V} \), say, \( x \in \mathcal{V}_m \) and \( y \in \mathcal{V}_n \), and \( t = m \lor n \). The inner product of \( x \) and \( y \) is defined as follows:

\[
\langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} := \frac{1}{t} \langle x \otimes 1_{t/m}, y \otimes 1_{t/n} \rangle_F. \tag{4}
\]

Using this inner product, we can define a norm on \( \mathcal{V} \):

**Definition II.4.** The norm on \( \mathcal{V} \) is defined as

\[
\|x\|_\mathcal{V} := \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}}. \tag{5}
\]

Finally, we define a distance on \( \mathcal{V} \):

**Definition II.5.** Let \( x, y \in \mathcal{V} \). The distance between \( x \) and \( y \) is defined as

\[
d(x, y) := \|x \ominus y\|_\mathcal{V}. \tag{6}
\]

**Remark II.6.** 1) Precisely speaking, in previous three definitions, the inner product, the norm, and the distance should be pseudo- inner product, pseudo- norm, and pseudo- distance. Because the inner product does not
satisfy: \( (x, x)_V = 0 \Rightarrow x = 0 \) is unique; correspondingly, the norm does not satisfy: \( \|x\|_V = 0 \Rightarrow x = 0 \) is unique, and the distance does not satisfy: \( d(x, y) = 0 \Rightarrow x = y \). For statement ease, the “pseudo-” is omitted.

2) The metric topology deduced by the distance, denoted by \( T_d \), makes \((V, T_d)\) a topological space [12].

3) \((V, T_d)\) is not a Hausdorff space [12].

4) It is easy to see that \((V, T_d)\) is a path-wise connected topological space. Hence, this distance glue all the Euclidean spaces \( \mathbb{R}^n, \, n = 1, 2, \cdots \) together to form the dimension free state space \( V \).

B. Projection From \( V_m \) To \( V_n \)

**Definition II.7.** Let \( \xi \in V_m \). The projection of \( \xi \) on \( V_n \), denoted by \( \pi^m_n(\xi) \), is defined as

\[
\pi^m_n(\xi) := \arg \min_{x \in V_n} \|\xi - x\|_V.
\]

Let \( m \vee n = t \) and set \( \alpha := t/m, \, \beta := t/n \). Then the square error is

\[
\Delta := \|\xi - x\|_V^2 = \frac{1}{t} \|\xi \otimes 1_\alpha - x \otimes 1_\beta\|_2^2.
\]

Denote

\[
\xi \otimes 1_\alpha := (\eta_1, \eta_2, \cdots, \eta_t)^T,
\]

where

\[
\eta_j = \xi_i, \quad (i-1)\alpha + 1 \leq j \leq i\alpha; \quad i = 1, \cdots, m.
\]

Then

\[
\Delta = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{\beta} (\eta(i-1)\beta + j - x_i)^2
\]

Setting

\[
\frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial x_i} = 0, \quad i = 1, \cdots, n
\]
yields

\[
x_i = \frac{1}{\beta} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\beta} \eta(i-1)\beta + j \right), \quad i = 1, \cdots, n.
\]

That is, \( \pi^m_n(\xi) = x \). Moreover, it is easy to verify that

\[
\left( \xi - \pi^m_n(\xi), x \right)_V = 0.
\]

Hence, we have the following result.

**Proposition II.8.** Let \( \xi \in V_m \). The projection of \( \xi \) on \( V_n \), denoted by \( x \), is determined by (9). Moreover, \( \xi - x \) is orthogonal to \( x \). That is,

\[
[x - \pi^m_n(\xi)] \perp \pi^m_n(\xi), \quad \xi \in V_m.
\]

Next, we try to find the matrix expression of \( \pi^m_n(\xi) \), denoted by \( \Pi^m_n \), such that

\[
\pi^m_n(\xi) = \Pi^m_n \xi, \quad \xi \in V_m.
\]

Then, we have

\[
\eta = \xi \otimes 1_\alpha = (I_m \otimes 1_\alpha) \xi
\]

\[
x = \frac{1}{\beta} \left( I_n \otimes 1_\beta \right) (I_m \otimes 1_\alpha) \xi.
\]

Hence, we have

\[
\Pi^m_n = \frac{1}{\beta} (I_n \otimes 1_\beta) (I_m \otimes 1_\alpha).
\]

Using this structure, we can prove the following result.

**Lemma II.9.**

1) Assume \( m \geq n \), then \( \Pi^m_n \) is of full row rank, and hence \( \Pi^m_n (\Pi^m_n)^T \) is non-singular.

2) Assume \( m \leq n \), then \( \Pi^m_n \) is of full column rank, and hence \( (\Pi^m_n)^T \Pi^m_n \) is non-singular.

Proof.

1) Assume \( m \geq n \): When \( m = n \), \( \Pi^m_n (\Pi^m_n)^T \) is an identity matrix. So we assume \( m > n \). Using the structure of \( \Pi^m_n \), defined by (12), it is easy to see that each row of \( \Pi^m_n \) has at least two nonzero elements. Moreover, the columns of nonzero elements of \( i \)-th row pressed the columns of nonzero elements of \( j \) \( > \) \( i \) rows, except \( j = i + 1 \). In latter case, they may have one overlapped column. Hence, \( \Pi^m_n \) is of full row rank. It follows that \( \Pi^m_n (\Pi^m_n)^T \) is non-singular.

2) It follows from (12) that

\[
\Pi^m_n = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} (\Pi^m_n)^T.
\]

The conclusion is obvious.

\[ \square \]

C. Projection of Linear Systems

Consider a linear system:

\[
\xi(t+1) = A\xi(t), \quad \xi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m.
\]

Our purpose is to find a matrix \( A_\pi \in \mathcal{M}_{m \times n} \), such that the the projective system of (14) on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is described as

\[
x(t+1) = A_\pi x(t), \quad x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

Of course, we want system (15) represents the evolution of the projection \( \pi(\xi(t)) \). That is, the idea one is

\[
x(t) = \pi^m_n(\xi(t)).
\]

But it is, in general, not able to find such \( A_\pi \). So we try to find a least square approximate system.
Proposition II.10.

Obtained, the least square solution can be obtained. With the help of Lemma II.9, the least square solution can be obtained.

Proposition II.10.

\[
A_π = \begin{cases} 
\Pi_n^m A (\Pi_n^m)^T (\Pi_n^m (\Pi_n^m)^T)^{-1} & m \geq n \\
\Pi_n^m A ((\Pi_n^m)^T \Pi_n^m)^{-1} (\Pi_n^m)^T & m < n.
\end{cases}
\]  

(19)

Proof. Assume \( m \geq n \): Right multiplying both sides of (18) by \((\Pi_n^m)^T\) yields the first part of (19).

Assume \( m < n \): We may search a solution with the following form:

\[
A_π = \hat{A}(\Pi_n^m)^T.
\]

Then the least square solution of \( \hat{A} \) is

\[
\hat{A} = \Pi_n^m A ((\Pi_n^m)^T \Pi_n^m)^{-1}.
\]

It follows that

\[
A_π = \Pi_n^m A ((\Pi_n^m)^T \Pi_n^m)^{-1} (\Pi_n^m)^T,
\]

which is the second part of (19). \( \square \)

Definition II.11. Let \( A \in \mathcal{M}_{m \times m} \). A mapping \( \pi_n^m : \mathcal{M}_{m \times m} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{n \times n} \) is defined as

\[
\pi_n^m(A) := A_π,
\]

(20)

where \( A_π \) is defined by (19).

Corollary II.12. Consider a continuous linear system

\[
\dot{\xi}(t) = A_π \xi(t), \quad \xi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m.
\]

(21)

Its least square approximated system is

\[
\dot{x}(t) = A_π x(t), \quad x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n
\]

(22)

where \( A_π \) is defined by (19).

Proof. Since \( \dot{\xi}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m \), the proof is exactly the same as the one for system (15). \( \square \)

Similarly, we have the following results for linear control systems.

Corollary II.13. 1) Consider a discrete time linear control system

\[
\begin{cases} 
\xi(t+1) = A_π \xi(t) + Bu, & \xi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m \\
y(t) = C_π \xi(t), & y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p.
\end{cases}
\]

(23)

Its least square approximated linear control system is

\[
\begin{cases} 
x(t+1) = A_π x(t) + \Pi_n^m Bu, & x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \\
y(t) = C_π x(t),
\end{cases}
\]

(24)

where \( A_π \) is defined by (19), and

\[
C_π = \begin{cases} 
C((\Pi_n^m)^T (\Pi_n^m)^{-1} (\Pi_n^m)^T)^{-1}, & m \geq n \\
C ((\Pi_n^m)^T (\Pi_n^m)^{-1} (\Pi_n^m)^T), & m < n.
\end{cases}
\]

(25)

2) Consider a discrete time linear control system

\[
\begin{cases} 
\dot{\xi}(t) = A_π \xi(t) + Bu, & \xi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m \\
y(t) = C_π \xi(t), & y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p.
\end{cases}
\]

(26)

Its least square approximated linear control system is

\[
\begin{cases} 
\dot{x}(t) = A_π x(t) + \Pi_n^m Bu, & x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \\
y(t) = C_π x(t), & y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p.
\end{cases}
\]

(27)

where \( A_π \) is defined by (19), and \( C_π \) is defined by (25).

III. LINEAR SYSTEMS ON QUOTIENT SPACE

A. Linear Systems on Dimension-Free State Space

First, we define a product of two arbitrary matrices, called the second semi-tensor product (STP) of matrices:

Definition III.1. Let \( A \in \mathcal{M}_{n \times n} \subset \mathcal{M} \) and \( B \in \mathcal{M}_{p \times q} \subset \mathcal{M} \). The second STP product on \( \mathcal{M} \) is defined as follows:

Assume \( t = n \land q \), then

\[
A \, \circ \, B := (A \otimes J_{t/n}) (B \otimes J_{t/p}) \in \mathcal{M}_{tm/n \times tq/p},
\]

(28)

where \( J_{k} := \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{1}_{k \times k} \).

Remark III.2. The (first) STP is defined as \[4\]

\[
A \, \otimes \, B := (A \otimes I_{t/n}) (B \otimes I_{t/p}) \in \mathcal{M}_{tm/n \times tq/p}.
\]

(29)

One sees easily that the second STP is a mimic to the first STP. Hence their many properties are similar.

The following proposition is a key for constructing a dynamic system.

Proposition III.3. \( (\mathcal{M}, \circ) \) is a semigroup.

Proof. It is enough to prove the associativity, that is,

\[
(A \circ B) \circ C = A \circ (B \circ C), \quad A, B, C \in \mathcal{M}.
\]

(30)

Let \( A \in \mathcal{M}_{m \times n}, B \in \mathcal{M}_{p \times q}, C \in \mathcal{M}_{r \times m} \), and denote

\[
\text{lcm}(n,p) = nn_1 = pp_1, \quad \text{lcm}(q,r) = qq_1 = rr_1, \\
\text{lcm}(r,qp_1) = rr_2 = qp_1p_2, \quad \text{lcm}(n,pp_1) = nn_2 = pp_1q_2.
\]

Note that

\[
J_p \otimes J_q = J_{pq}.
\]
Using (33), we have equalities:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{LHS of (31) (b)} &= \text{lcm}(qn, lcm(pq, pr)) = \text{lcm}(\text{lcm}(qn, pq), pr). \\
\text{RHS of (31) (b)} &= \text{lcm}(q \text{lcm}(n, p), pr) = \text{lcm}(pq, r) = p \text{lcm}(qp_1, r) = pqp_1 r. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Using (33), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
LHS \text{ of (31) (b)} &= \text{lcm}(qn, p \text{lcm}(q, r)) = \text{lcm}(qn, pqq_1) = q \text{lcm}(n, pq_1) = qq_1 q_2. \\
RHS \text{ of (31) (b)} &= \text{lcm}(q \text{lcm}(n, p), pr) = \text{lcm}(qpp_1, pr) = p \text{lcm}(qp_1, r) = pqp_1 r. \\
\end{align*}
\]

(31) (b) follows.

Using (31) (b), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
n_1p_2 &= n_1 q_1 q_2 = n_1 q_1 p q_2 \frac{\text{lcm(n, p)}}{\text{lcm(n, pq_1)}} = \frac{\text{lcm(n, pq_1)}}{n} = n_2, \\
r_1 q_2 &= r_1 p_1 q_2 = r_1 p_1 p q_2 \frac{\text{lcm(q, r)}}{\text{lcm(q, pq_1)}} = \frac{\text{lcm(r, pq_1)}}{r} = r_2,
\end{align*}
\]

which proves (31) (a).

Similarly,

\[
\begin{align*}
n_1 p_2 &= n_1 q_1 p q_2 \frac{\text{lcm(n, p)}}{\text{lcm(n, pq_1)}} = \frac{\text{lcm(n, pq_1)}}{n} = n_2, \\
r_1 q_2 &= r_1 p_1 q_2 = r_1 p_1 p q_2 \frac{\text{lcm(q, r)}}{\text{lcm(q, pq_1)}} = \frac{\text{lcm(r, pq_1)}}{r} = r_2,
\end{align*}
\]

which shows (31) (c).

**Definition III.4.** 1) Let \( G \) be a semigroup and \( X \) a set. If there is an action \( \varphi : G \times X \to X \), satisfying

\[
\varphi(g_1, \varphi(g_2, x)) = \varphi(g_1 \circ g_2, x), \quad g_1, g_2 \in G, x \in X,
\]

then \((G, \varphi, X)\) is called an \( S_0\)-system.

2) If, in addition, \( G \) is a monoid (i.e., there is an identity \( e \in G \)), and

\[
\varphi(e, x) = x, \quad \forall x \in X,
\]

then \((G, \varphi, X)\) is called an \( S\)-system [15].

Our purpose is to construct an \( S_0\) system \((M, \varphi, \mathcal{V})\). We already know that \((M, \circ)\) is a semigroup. We also need to define an action \( \varphi : M \times \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V} \), which is a product of an arbitrary matrix with an arbitrary vector, called MV-product:

**Definition III.5.** Let \( A \in M_{m \times n} \subset M \) and \( x \in \mathcal{V}_r \subset \mathcal{V} \). Assume \( t = n \lor r \). Then the product of \( A \) with \( x \), called the MV-2 product, is defined as

\[
A \overset{\varphi}{\circ} x := (A \circ J_{t/n}) (x \otimes 1_{t/r}).
\]

**Proposition III.6.** \((M, \circ), (\mathcal{V}, \varphi)\) is an \( S_0\)-system.

**Proof.** Let \( A \in M_{m \times n}, B \in M_{p \times q}, x \in \mathcal{V}_r \). We have only to prove that

\[
(A \circ B) \overset{\varphi}{\circ} x = A \overset{\varphi}{\circ} (B \overset{\varphi}{\circ} x).
\]

Mimic to the proof of Proposition III.3, (37) can be proved. 

In an \( S\)- or \( S_0\)-system, there is no topological structure on state space \( M \), and hence no continuity can be defined. But continuity is one of the most properties of a dynamic system. Hence we need some new concepts about the topological structure on \( M \).

**Definition III.7.** Let \((G, \varphi, X)\) be an \( S\)-(\( S_0\))-system.

1) If \( X \) is a topological space and for each \( g \in G \), \( \varphi|_g : X \to X \) is continuous, then \((G, \varphi, X)\) is called a weak dynamic \( S\)-\((S_0)\)-system.

2) In addition, if \( X \) is a Hausdorff space, then \((G, \varphi, X)\) is called a dynamic \( S\)-\((S_0)\)-system.

Recall \((M, \circ), (\mathcal{V}, \varphi)\). From Section 2 we know that \( \mathcal{V} \) is a topological space, but not Hausdorff. To show the continuity of \( A \overset{\varphi}{\circ} x \), for fixed \( A \in M \), we consider the norm of \( A \).

**Definition III.8.** The norm of \( A \), denoted by \( \|A\|_\mathcal{V} \), is defined as

\[
\|A\|_\mathcal{V} := \sup_{\varphi \neq x \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\|A \overset{\varphi}{\circ} x\|}{\|x\|_\mathcal{V}}. 
\]

First, we give two lemmas, which will be used to estimate the norm \( \|A\|_\mathcal{V} \).

**Lemma III.9.** Assume \( x \in \mathbb{R}^r \). Then

\[
\|x\|_\mathcal{V} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{r} \|x\|},
\]

then \((G, \varphi, X)\) is called an \( S_0\)-system.
where $\|x\|$ is the Frobenius norm of $x$.

Proof. It is a consequence of (4) and (5).

\textbf{Lemma III.10.} Assume $A \in \mathcal{M}$. Then for any $J_r$,

$$\|A \otimes J_r\| = \|A\|,$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

where $\| \cdot \|$ is Frobenius norm.

Proof. We need the following facts, which are either easily verifiable or well known facts:

- $J_r^T J_r = J_r$.
- Denote by $\sigma(A)$ the set of eigenvalues of $A$. Then [8]
  $$\sigma(A \otimes B) = \{\lambda \mu | \lambda \in \sigma(A), \mu \in \sigma(B)\}.$$ It follows that
  $$\sigma_{\text{max}}(A \otimes B) = \sigma_{\text{max}}(A) \sigma_{\text{max}}(B).$$
- A Markov transition matrix $P$ is a primitive matrix, if there is an integer $k \geq 1$ such that $P^k > 0$ [8]. It is obvious that $J_r$ is a primitive matrix.
- Let $P$ be a primitive matrix. Then [8]
  $$\sigma_{\text{max}}(P) = 1.$$ Hence $\sigma_{\text{max}}(J_r) = 1$.

Using above facts, we have

$$\|A \otimes J_r\| = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{max}}((A^T \otimes J_r^T) (A \otimes J_r))} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{max}}(AA^T \otimes (J_r^T J_r))} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{max}}(A^T A)} = \|A\|.$$\hspace{1cm} (41)

(41) follows from (42) and (43) immediately. \hfill \square

Using this proposition, the following result is obvious.

\textbf{Theorem III.12.} $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{s}, V)$ is a weak dynamic $S_0$-system.

Proof. We have only to prove the continuity. Since the topology adopted is the metric topology, the sequence continuity is enough. Let $x_n \to x_0$. Then

$$\|A\mathfrak{s}x_n - A\mathfrak{s}x_0\| \leq \|A\| \|x_n - x_0\| \to 0.$$ \hspace{1cm} \square

In fact, $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{s}, V)$ is a very general class of dimension-varying systems. We give an example to depict it.

\textbf{Example III.13.} Consider a constant linear system

$$x(t + 1) = A\mathfrak{s}x(t),$$

where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$ Find the trajectory for $x(0) = x_0 = (1, 0, 1)^T$.

It is easy to calculate that

$$x(1) = A\mathfrak{s}x(0) = \frac{2}{3}(1, 1, 1, 1, 1)^T.$$ Next, it is easy to see that $\mathbb{R}^6$ is invariant under the action of $A\mathfrak{s} := \mathfrak{s}_A$. Moreover, when $\mathfrak{s}_A$ is restricted on $\mathbb{R}^6$ it has a matrix expression as

$$\mathfrak{s}_A|_{\mathbb{R}^6} := A_s,$$

then

$$A_s = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 & -2 & -1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & -2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & -2 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & -1 & -2 & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$ Then the overall trajectory is

$$x(t + 1) = (A_s)^t x(1), \quad t \geq 1.$$ Though in this paper the second STP and the MV-2 product are used to deduce the dynamic systems to meet the least square requirement, the dynamic systems constructed by first STP and MV-1 product have been discussed in [5], [6]. Many properties are similar.
B. Quotient Vector Space

Since \( \mathcal{V} \) is not a standard vector space and \((\mathcal{V}, T_d)\) is not a Hausdorff space, it is reasonable to glue equivalent points together to form a real vector space as a Hausdorff space. To this end, we have to find proper equivalence relation.

**Definition III.14.** \( x, y \in \mathcal{V} \) are said to be equivalent, denoted by \( x \leftrightarrow y \), if there exist \( 1_\alpha \) and \( 1_\beta \) such that
\[
\bar{x} \oplus 1_\alpha = \bar{y} \oplus 1_\beta.
\]

The equivalence class is denoted by
\[
\bar{x} = \{ y \in \mathcal{V} \mid y \leftrightarrow x \}.
\]

The quotient space is denoted by
\[
\Omega := \mathcal{V} / \leftrightarrow.
\]

**Remark III.15.** It is necessary to verify that the relation determined by (45) is an equivalence relation (i.e., it is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive). The verification is straightforward.

**Proposition III.16.** \( d(x, y) = 0 \), if and only if, \( x \leftrightarrow y \).

**Proof.** Observing (4)-(6), the conclusion follows from definitions. \( \Box \)

Now we transfer the vector space structure from \( \mathcal{V} \) to \( \Omega \).

**Definition III.17.** Let \( \bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \Omega \) and \( a \in \mathbb{R} \). Then
1) \[
\bar{x} + \bar{y} := \bar{x + y}.
\]
2) \[
\bar{x} - \bar{y} := \bar{x - y}.
\]
3) \[
\bar{a} \bar{x} := \bar{ax}.
\]

As a corollary of Proposition III.16, it is ready to check the following result:

**Corollary III.18.** 1) Operators defined by (46)-(48) are properly defined.

2) \( \Omega \) with addition/subtraction defined by (46)-(47) and scalar product defined by (48) is a vector space.

Next, we define the norm of \( \bar{x} \). Define
\[
\|\bar{x}\|_\mathcal{V} := \| x \|_\mathcal{V}.
\]

**Proposition III.19.** Let \( \bar{x} \in \Omega \). Then the norm of \( \bar{x} \), defined by (49), is well defined.

**Proof.** Assume the smallest vector in \( \bar{x} \) is \( z \in \mathcal{V}_1 \). Then any \( x \in \bar{x} \) can be expressed as \( x = z \otimes 1_r \) for certain \( r \). According to (5)-(6)
\[
\|z\|_\mathcal{V} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \|z\|_F.
\]

Now for \( x \) we have
\[
\|x\|_\mathcal{V} = \|z \otimes 1_r\|_V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \|z \otimes 1_r\|_F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \sqrt{r(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \cdots + x_r^2)} = \|z\|_F = \|x\|_\mathcal{V}.
\]

That is, \( \|\bar{x}\|_\mathcal{V} \) is independent of the choice of \( x \). Hence, (49) is properly defined. \( \Box \)

Using (49), a distance can also be defined on \( \Omega \) as
\[
d(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) := \|\bar{x} - \bar{y}\|_\mathcal{V} = d(x, y).
\]

Then we can also verify the following result:

**Corollary III.20.** 1) The distance defined by (50) is properly defined.

2) \( \Omega \) with the corresponding metric topology is a Hausdorff space.

C. Quotient Space of Matrices

Let \( A \in \mathcal{M}_{m \times m}, m|n \), and \( n = km \), where \( m, n, k \in \mathbb{N} \).

Using (19), a straightforward computation shows the following result:

**Proposition III.21.** Assume \( A \in \mathcal{M}_{m \times m} \) and \( n = km \). Then
\[
\pi_n(A) = A \otimes J_k.
\]

Denote the set of all matrices by
\[
\mathcal{M} := \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_{m \times n}.
\]

Then \( \mathcal{M} \) is a topological space with conventional topology as:

(i) each \( \mathcal{M}_{m \times n} \) is a clopen set; (ii) within each clopen subset \( \mathcal{M}_{m \times n} \) the Euclidean topology of \( \mathbb{R}^{mn} \) is adopted.

Motivated by Proposition III.21, we propose an equivalence relation on \( \mathcal{M} \) as follows:

**Definition III.22.** Let \( A, B \in \mathcal{M} \). \( A \) and \( B \) are said to be equivalent, denoted by \( A \approx B \), if there exist \( J_\alpha \) and \( J_\beta \), such that
\[
A \otimes J_\alpha = B \otimes J_\beta.
\]

The equivalence class is denoted by
\[
\hat{A} := \{ B \mid B \approx A \}.
\]
The quotient space is denoted by
\[ \Xi = \mathcal{M}/\sim. \]

**Remark III.23.** It is ready to verify that (52) defines an equivalence relation.

Define a product on \( \Xi \) as
\[ \hat{A} \circ \hat{B} := \overline{A \circ B}. \] (53)

Similarly to the above argument for vector case, one can verify the following easily:

**Proposition III.24.**  
1) (53) is properly defined.  
2) \((\Xi, \circ)\) is a semi-group.

**D. Linear System on Quotient Space**

Now we are ready to define a linear system on quotient space \( \Omega \). It has been proved that \( \Omega \) is a vector space and topologically it is a Hausdorff space. Hence, \( \Omega \) is a nice state space for investigation. A more important fact is: at \( \Omega \) a point \( \bar{x} \) could be the image of points in Euclidean spaces of different dimensions, hence, it is proper to describe cross-dimension dynamic systems.

We use \( \Xi \) and \( \Omega \) to build linear systems on quotient space. Denote the action of \( \Omega \) on \( \Xi \) as
\[ \hat{A} \hat{\xi} := \overline{A \hat{\xi}}. \] (54)

**Proposition III.25.** The action of \( \Omega \) on \( \Xi \), defined by (54), is properly defined.

**Proof.** We have only to show that (54) is independent of the choice of \( A \in \hat{A} \) and \( x \in \hat{\xi} \). That is, to show that if \( A \approx B \), \( x \leftrightarrow y \) then
\[ A\hat{\xi} \leftrightarrow B\hat{\xi}. \] (55)

It is obvious that in equivalence class \( \hat{A} \) there exists a smallest \( \Lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{n \times p} \) such that \( A = \Lambda \otimes J_s \) and \( B = \Lambda \otimes J_o \). Similarly, there exists \( z \in \mathcal{V}_q \) such that \( x = z \otimes 1_t \) and \( y = z \otimes 1_\beta \). Denote \( \xi = p \lor q, \eta = ps \lor qt \), and \( \eta = k\xi \). Then we have
\[
A\hat{\xi} = \Lambda \hat{\xi} \otimes (z \otimes 1_t) = \Lambda \hat{\xi} \otimes (z \otimes 1_t) \otimes \eta = (\Lambda \hat{\xi}) \otimes (J_k1_k).
\]
Hence
\[ A\hat{\xi} \leftrightarrow \Lambda\hat{\xi}. \]

Similarly, we have
\[ B\hat{\xi} \leftrightarrow \Lambda\hat{\xi}. \]

(55) follows.

Now it is clear that \((\Xi, \hat{\cdot}, \Omega)\) is an \( S_0 \) system. Expressing it in classical form yields
\[ \bar{x}(t + 1) = \hat{\Lambda}\hat{\bar{x}}(t), \] (56)
of or
\[ \hat{x}(t) = \hat{\Lambda}\hat{\bar{x}}(t), \] (57)
etc.

To prove such a system is a dynamic system, we have to show that for a given \( \hat{A} \) the mapping \( \bar{x} \mapsto \hat{\Lambda}\hat{\bar{x}} \) is continuous. To this end, we define the norm of \( \hat{A} \). The following definition is classical:

**Definition III.26.** Assume \( \hat{A} \in \Xi \). Its norm is defined as
\[ \|\hat{A}\|_\psi := \|A\|_\psi. \] (58)

**Proposition III.27.** Let \( \hat{A} \in \Xi \). Then the norm of \( \hat{A} \), defined by (58), is well defined.

**Proof.** Assume \( \Lambda \in \hat{A} \) is the smallest element of the class. Then each \( A \in \hat{A} \) can be expressed as \( A = \Lambda \otimes J_r \).

Using Lemma III.10 and Proposition III.11, for \( A \in \mathcal{M}_{m \times n} \) and any \( J_s \), we have
\[ \|A \otimes J_s\|_\psi = \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}\|A \otimes J_s\| = \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}}\|A\|_\psi = \|A\|_\psi. \]
Hence, we can get
\[ \|A\|_\psi = \|\Lambda \otimes J_r\|_\psi = \|\Lambda\|_\psi, \]
which is independent of the particular choice of \( A \).

Then we have the following result:

**Corollary III.28.** The discrete time \( S_0 \)-system (56) or continuous time \( S_0 \)-system (57) on quotient space \( \Omega \) are dynamic systems.

**IV. TRANSIENT DYNAMICS OF DIMENSION-VARYING SYSTEMS**

Though the cross-dimensional systems discussed in previous sections could be very general, this paper is particularily interested in the transient dynamics of systems, which has classical fixed dimensions during normal time, and only on dimension transient period the system changes its model from one to another, which have different dimensions. This kind of dimension-varying systems are practically important.
A. Modeling Transient dynamics via Equivalent Dynamic Systems

**Definition IV.1.**  1) Assume a discrete time linear control system 
\[
x(t + 1) = A(t)\bar{x}(t) + B(t)u(t), \quad u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m
\]
\[
y(t) = H(t)\bar{x}(t), \quad y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n
\]
is given. The following system on quotient space \( \Omega \) is called the projecting system of (59):
\[
x(t + 1) = \hat{A}(t)\bar{x}(t) + \hat{B}(t)u(t)
\]
\[
y(t) = \hat{H}(t)\bar{x}(t), \quad \bar{x}(t) \in \Omega.
\]

2) Assume a continuous time linear control system
\[
\dot{x} = A(t)\bar{x}(t) + B(t)u(t), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m
\]
\[
y(t) = H(t)\bar{x}(t), \quad y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p
\]
is given. The following system on quotient space \( \Omega \) is called the projecting system of (61):
\[
\dot{\bar{x}}(t) = \hat{A}(t)\bar{x}(t) + \hat{B}(t)u(t)
\]
\[
y(t) = \hat{H}(t)\bar{x}(t), \quad \bar{x}(t) \in \Omega.
\]

3) Assume a discrete time linear control system on quotient space \( \Omega \) as (60) is given. System (59) is called its lifting system on \( \mathbb{R}^n \), if \( A \in \hat{A}, \ B \in \hat{B}, \) and \( H \in \hat{H}. \)

4) Assume a continuous time linear control system on quotient space \( \Omega \) as (62) is given. System (61) is called its lifting system on \( \mathbb{R}^n \), if \( A \in \hat{A}, \ B \in \hat{B}, \) and \( H \in \hat{H}. \)

Note that in above we assume \( \hat{B} := (\hat{b}_1, \cdots, \hat{b}_m) \), and \( B \in \hat{B} \) means \( B = (b_1, \cdots, b_m) \) and \( b_i \in \hat{b}_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, m. \)

Since a system on quotient space is a set of equivalent systems with various dimensions, dimension-varying is not a problem for such a system. Then the transient dynamics can be considered as a dynamic process on quotient space. This is our main idea for dealing with transient dynamics.

**Definition IV.2.** Let \( \Theta_O \) be a linear control system on quotient space, \( \Theta_O \) be its lifting on \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Then all such lifting systems are said to be equivalent.

It follows from definition that

**Proposition IV.3.** Linear control systems \((A,B,C)\) and \((A',B',C')\) are equivalent, if and only if, there exist \( r, s \in \mathbb{N} \), such that
\[
A \otimes J_r = A' \otimes J_s
\]
\[
B \otimes 1_r = B' \otimes 1_s
\]
\[
C \otimes J_r = C' \otimes J_s
\]
(63)

Consider a dimension-varying system. Without loss of generality, we assume it has two models:

\[
\Sigma_1: \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^p;
\]
and
\[
\Sigma_2: \dot{y}(t) = Ey(t) + Fu(t), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^q.
\]
We consider the transient dynamics of the system from starting time \( t = t_0 \) to ending time \( t = t_e > t_0 \).
We assume the following:

- A1: The starting states are \( x(t_0) = x_0 \) and \( y(t_0) = y_0 \), and the center gravity is \( z(t) = \mu x(t) + (1 - \mu) y(t) \), where \( \mu = \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2} \).

- A2: During the transient period the law of conservation of momentum holds. That is:
\[
\dot{z}(t) = \mu \dot{x}(t) + (1 - \mu) \dot{y}(t).
\]
Let \( n = p \lor q \) be the least common multiple of \( p \) and \( q \).
Using (19), we can project \( \Sigma_1 \) into \( \mathbb{R}^n \) as
\[
\dot{z}(t) = A_1z + B_1u,
\]
where
\[
A_1 = \Pi_n^q A \left( \Pi_n^p \right)^{-1} \left( \Pi_n^q \right)^T,
\]
\[
B_1 = \Pi_n^q B.
\]
Similarly, projecting \( \Sigma_2 \) into \( \mathbb{R}^n \) yields
\[
\dot{z}(t) = A_2z + B_2v,
\]
where
\[
A_2 = \Pi_n^p E \left( \Pi_n^q \right)^{-1} \left( \Pi_n^p \right)^T,
\]
\[
B_2 = \Pi_n^q F.
\]
According to (66), the transient dynamics becomes
\[
\dot{z}(t) = [\mu A_1 + (1 - \mu) A_2] z + \mu B_1 u + (1 - \mu) B_2 v.
\]

**Definition IV.4.** A dimension transience is properly realized if we can design \( u(t) \) and \( v(t) \) such that, stating from \( z_0 = x_0 \otimes 1_{n/p} \), the ending state of (69) satisfies
\[
z(t_e) = y(t_e) \otimes 1_{n/q} \in \mathbb{R}^q \otimes 1_{n/q}.
\]

**Remark IV.5.**  1) The parameter \( \mu \) (or, \( m_1 \) and \( m_2 \)) is determined by the system model.

2) If the dimension transience is properly realized, then after \( t_e \) the system becomes model \( \Sigma_2 \) with initial value \( y(t_e) \).

3) The method proposed here is applicable to multi-switching or even multi-model case.

The following result is easily verifiable.

**Proposition IV.6.** A dimension transience is properly realized if \( x(t_0) \otimes 1_{n/p} \) is controllable to a point of \( \mathbb{R}^q \otimes 1_{n/q} \).
Example IV.7. Consider a dimension-varying system, which has two models as

\[
\Sigma_1 : \begin{cases} 
\dot{x}_1 = x_2 \\
\dot{x}_2 = u,
\end{cases}
\]  
(71)

\[
\Sigma_2 : \begin{cases} 
\dot{y}_1 = y_3 \\
\dot{y}_2 = v \\
\dot{y}_3 = y_2.
\end{cases}
\]  
(72)

Assume during the period [0, 10] seconds, the system runs in \( \Sigma_1 \), whereas at the tenth second, the system changes and involves in the transient dynamics. Then, after one second, \( \Sigma_1 \) and \( \Sigma_2 \) respectively. Let \( \pi_1 = \pi_0 \), hence \( \pi_2 = \pi_0 -1 \). Using (12) and (19), the projective systems of \( \Sigma_1 \) and \( \Sigma_2 \), denoted by \( \Sigma_1^p \) and \( \Sigma_2^p \), respectively, are

\[
\dot{z} = A_1^p z + B_1^p u;
\]

and

\[
\dot{z} = A_2^p z + B_2^p v,
\]

where

\[
A_1^p = \Pi_0^2 A_1 \left[ \left( \Pi_0^2 \right)^T \left( \Pi_0^2 \right) \right]^{-1} \left( \Pi_0^2 \right)^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}; \\
B_1^p = \Pi_0^2 B_1 = [0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1]^T.
\]

\[
A_2^p = \Pi_0^2 A_2 \left[ \left( \Pi_0^2 \right)^T \left( \Pi_0^2 \right) \right]^{-1} \left( \Pi_0^2 \right)^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}; \\
B_2^p = \Pi_0^2 B_2 = [0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0]^T.
\]

Then the transient dynamics becomes

\[
\dot{z} = A^p z + B_1^p u + B_2^p v,
\]  
(73)
V. CONCLUSION

The problem of modeling dimension-varying linear systems is investigated. First, the Euclidian spaces of various dimensions are put together to form a state space of dimension-varying systems. The inner product on this state space is firstly introduced, which suggests norm and distance. A path-wise connected topology is then deduced on the dimension-free state space. Meanwhile, a vector space structure is also proposed to make this space a pseudo-vector space. Then a general class of weak linear dynamic (control) systems is defined on the space. To make a trajectory “cross” different dimensional Euclidian spaces an equivalence relation is proposed, which is basically deduced from the distance. Then the quotient space, which is a vector, metric, and Hausdorff space. A dimension-varying system can be properly projected on this quotient space, and a dynamic system on quotient space can be lifted to Euclidean space of various dimensions. This project-lift process yields a technique to model dynamics of dimension-varying systems. In this paper, we are particularly interested in the dynamics of dimension-varying linear systems during the dimension transient process. Using “project-lift” technique, a method is proposed to model the dynamics of such systems. An Illustrative example is presented to demonstrate the design technique.

The result presented in this paper is mainly theoretical. Our further study is focused on applying this model to engineering problems.
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