

1 Gradient Method - Preliminaries

Let $x : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $w : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t)) + w(t) \quad (1)$$

$$y(t) = h(x) \quad (2)$$

$$x(0) = x_0 \quad (3)$$

a dynamic system of the DEN. Let $y : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ a data set with continuous time. The cost function which is to be minimized is

$$J[x, w, t] = \int_0^T \left\{ \sum_{\mu=1}^p |y_\mu(t) - h_\mu(x(t))|^2 + \sum_{v=1}^n \frac{\alpha_2}{2} |w_v(t)|^2 \right\} dt \quad (4)$$

We can solve this problem using the Hamilton formalism with the Hamiltonian

$$H(x, w, \lambda, t) = \sum_{\mu=1}^p |y_\mu(t) - h_\mu(x)|^2 + \sum_{v=1}^n \frac{\alpha_2}{2} |w_v|^2 + \sum_{\rho=1}^n \lambda_\rho (f_\rho(x) + w_\rho) \quad (5)$$

and the canonical equations

$$\nabla_x H|_{x(t), w(t), \lambda(t)}(t) = -\dot{\lambda}(t) \quad (6)$$

$$\nabla_\lambda H|_{x(t), w(t), \lambda(t)}(t) = \dot{x}(t) \quad (7)$$

$$\nabla_w H|_{x(t), w(t), \lambda(t)}(t) = 0 \quad (8)$$

where (6) and (7) ensure the right dynamics and (8) ensures that the solution is extremal. The derivatives are always evaluated at a point $x(t), w(t), \lambda(t)$ so we drop the subscripts. The ∇ -derivation maps $\nabla_x : h_\mu(x) \mapsto (\partial/\partial x_1 h_\mu, \dots, \partial/\partial x_n h_\mu(x))^T$. When deriving the canonical equation you also get $\lambda_\rho(T) = 0$ if there is no terminal cost and no boundary condition on $x(T)$.

Remark. Note that the Hamiltonian is explicitly time dependent via $y(t)$, i.e.

$$\frac{dH}{dt}(t) = \frac{\partial H}{\partial t}(t) = \dot{y}(t) \quad (9)$$

We calculate some derivatives

$$\frac{\partial (w_v)^2}{\partial w_\kappa} = \delta_{v\kappa} \alpha_2 w_\kappa \quad \text{thus} \quad \nabla_w H(t) = \alpha_2 w(t) + \lambda(t) \quad (10)$$

where $\delta_{v\kappa}$ is the Kronecker-delta. Furthermore

$$\frac{\partial (h_\mu(t))^2}{\partial x_\kappa} = 2 \frac{\partial h_\mu(t)}{\partial x_\kappa} h_\mu(x) \quad , \quad \nabla_x (h_\mu(x))^2 = 2 h_\mu(x) \nabla_x h_\mu(x) \quad (11)$$

and then define the Jacobian

$$dh_x = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_x h_1(x)^T \\ \vdots \\ \nabla_x h_p(x)^T \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{to get} \quad \nabla_x \sum_{\mu=1}^p (h_\mu(x))^2 = 2dh_x^T h(x) \quad (12)$$

Combining (10) and (8) yields

$$\alpha_2 w(t) + \lambda(t) = 0 \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \quad (13)$$

and since $\lambda(T) = 0$ we get $w(T) = 0$. This may be the best solution in the context of optimal control but seems to be very restrictive if we want to identify the hidden inputs w with model uncertainties.

One possible reason could be that Hamilton formalism of this problem yields a singular problem, i.e. without the α_2 regularisation it would not be possible to solve the problem at all. By adding a convex function $\alpha_2/2|w|^2$ the cost function becomes locally convex, in a vicinity of $w = 0$.

However it would be highly desirable to consider hidden inputs with $w(T) \neq 0$.

1.1 Terminal Cost

One way to get $\lambda(T) \neq 0$ is to introduce a terminal cost

$$V(x) = \Lambda |y(T) - h(x)|^2 \quad (14)$$

with a new regularisation parameter $\Lambda > 0$. The cost function becomes

$$\tilde{J}[x, w, t] = J[x, w, t] + V(x(T)) \quad (15)$$

and the boundary value

$$\lambda(T) = \nabla_x V(T) \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \lambda(T) = -2\Lambda dh_x^T(y(T) - h(x(T))) \quad . \quad (16)$$

Unfortunately, if we assume $|y(T) - h(x^{[i]})(T)| \rightarrow 0$ with increasing iterations i , again $\lambda^{[i]}(T) \rightarrow 0$.

1.2 Linearisation at T

Though we define x, y as mappings from $[0, T]$ to some vector spaces, the true (real world) system will exist over a larger interval of time, so $\dot{x}(T), \dot{y}(T)$ make sense and even $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} \dot{x}(t) = \dot{x}(T)$.

Consider a small $\epsilon > 0$

$$x(T - \epsilon) \cong x(T) - \underbrace{\dot{x}(T)\epsilon}_{=: \delta x} \quad \text{and} \quad y(T - \epsilon) \cong y(T) - \underbrace{\dot{y}(T)\epsilon}_{=: \delta y} \quad (17)$$

Here \cong denotes equality when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We linearise h by

$$y(T - \epsilon) \cong h(x(T) - \delta x) \cong \underbrace{h(x(T))}_{=: y(T)} - dh_{x(T)} \delta x \quad . \quad (18)$$

and by comparison we find

$$dh_x \delta x \cong \delta y \quad \Rightarrow \quad dh_{x(T)} \dot{x}(T) \cong \dot{y}(T) \quad (19)$$

Using the systems equations and (13) we get

$$\lambda(T) = \alpha_2 \{f(x(T)) - \dot{x}(T)\} \quad (20)$$

which would again yield $\lambda^{[0]}(T) = 0$ if we initialize it with the nominal model, since $\dot{x}^{[0]}(t) = f(x^{[0]}(t))$. If we have a pseudo inverse dh_x^\dagger we write

$$\hat{\dot{x}}(T) = dh_{x(T)}^\dagger \dot{y}(T) \quad . \quad (21)$$

We could then define

$$\lambda^{[i]}(T) = \alpha_2 \left\{ f\left(x^{[i]}(T)\right) - dh_{x(T)}^\dagger \dot{y}(T) \right\} \quad (22)$$

or equivalently

$$w^{[i]}(T) = dh_{x(T)}^\dagger \dot{y}(T) - f\left(x^{[i]}(T)\right) \quad . \quad (23)$$

To calculate (23) we simply have to find an appropriate pseudo inverse dh_x^\dagger , e.g. the Moore-Penrose inverse $dh_x^\dagger = (dh_x^T dh_x)^{-1} dh_x^T$, and get the derivative $\dot{y}(T)$, e.g. via (9) as $\dot{y}(T) = d/dt H(T)$ or simply by numerical differentiation.

1.3 Augmented States

Consider an augmented system with states $\underline{x} = (x, w)^T : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, inputs $v : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and dynamics

$$\dot{\underline{x}} = F(\underline{x}, v) = \begin{pmatrix} f(P_x \underline{x}) + P_w \underline{x} \\ v \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

where we introduced linear projectors $P_x : \underline{x} \mapsto x$ and $P_w : \underline{x} \mapsto w$ with

$$\Pi_x := \frac{\partial P_x \underline{x}}{\partial \underline{x}} = (\mathbb{I} | 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+n)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_w := \frac{\partial P_w \underline{x}}{\partial \underline{x}} = (0 | \mathbb{I}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+n)} \quad . \quad (25)$$

Calculate some derivatives

$$\left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|_x = \mathrm{d}f_x \quad \text{thus} \quad \frac{\partial f(P_x \underline{x})}{\partial \underline{x}} = \mathrm{d}f_{P_x \underline{x}} \Pi_x \quad (26)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \underline{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{d}f_{P_x \underline{x}} \Pi_x + \Pi_w \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial v} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times n} \quad . \quad (27)$$

Introduce an augmented Hamiltonian with costates $\lambda : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$

$$\underline{H}(\underline{x}, v, \lambda, t) = \|y(t) - h(P_x \underline{x})\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_2}{2} \|P_w \underline{x}\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|v\|^2 + \sum_{\mu=1}^{2n} \lambda_\mu F_\mu(\underline{x}, v) \quad (28)$$

and using the Hamilton equations we get

$$\dot{\lambda}(t) = 2\Pi_x^T \mathrm{d}h_{P_x \underline{x}}^T(y(t) - h(P_x \underline{x})) - \Pi_w^T P_w \underline{x}(t) - (\Pi_x^T \mathrm{d}f_{P_x \underline{x}} + \Pi_w^T) \Pi_x \lambda(t) \quad (29)$$

multiplying with Π_x and Π_w yields

$$\Pi_x \dot{\lambda}(t) = 2\mathrm{d}h_{P_x \underline{x}}^T(y(t) - h(P_x \underline{x}(t))) - \mathrm{d}f_{P_x \underline{x}}^T \Pi_x \lambda(t) \quad (30)$$

$$\Pi_w \dot{\lambda}(t) = -P_w \underline{x}(t) - \Pi_x \lambda(t) \quad . \quad (31)$$

These equations reproduce the dynamic of the original system as you can see by inserting $P_x \underline{x} = x$, and $\Pi_x \lambda(t)$ are the costates of the original system. The augmented Hamiltonian gives a penalty to the AUCs of w and \dot{w} . Now, the constrain $\lambda(T) = 0$ leads to

$$v(T) = 0 \quad (32)$$

while $\underline{x}(T)$ is free. At the same time we need to know $\underline{x}(0) = (x_0, w_0)^T$ which means that, given x_0 as usual, we need a way to estimate w_0 .

One way to determine w_0 could again be linearisation at $t = 0$, i.e.

$$w_0 \cong \mathrm{d}h_{x_0}^\dagger \dot{y}(0) - f(x_0) \quad . \quad (33)$$