Outline

An algorithm for approximate common divisor computation

Ivan Markovsky and Sabine Van Huffel

K.U.Leuven, ESAT-SISTA

Motivation: distance to uncontrollability

An algorithm for approximate GCD computation

SISTA

Motivation: distance to uncontrollability

An algorithm for approximate GCD computation

Definition of distance to uncontrollability

Notation:

 \mathscr{L} — set of LTI systems

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ctrb}}/\mathcal{L}_{\text{ctrb}}$ — set of controllable/uncontrollable LTI systems

 $\operatorname{dist}(\mathscr{B},\widehat{\mathscr{B}})$ — measure for the distance from \mathscr{B} to $\widehat{\mathscr{B}}$

Definition: Given $\mathscr{B} \in \mathscr{L}$ and dist (\cdot, \cdot) , define

$$d(\mathscr{B}) := \min_{\widehat{\mathscr{B}}} \operatorname{dist}(\mathscr{B}, \widehat{\mathscr{B}}) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \widehat{\mathscr{B}} \in \overline{\mathscr{L}_{\operatorname{ctrb}}}$$

to be the distance of ${\mathscr B}$ to uncontrollability (w.r.t. to dist (\cdot,\cdot))

Note: $d(\mathcal{B})$ is a representation free notion, however, in order to compute it one has to use a representation of \mathcal{B}

Motivation: distance to uncontrollability

An algorithm for approximate GCD computation

Input/output and input/state/output representations

Let σ be the

• shift operator $(\sigma x)(t) = x(t+1)$ (in discrete-time) or

• derivative operator $\sigma x = dx/dt$ (in continuous-time)

I/O representation: $\forall \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{L}$, \exists polynomials P, Q, $det(P) \neq 0$, degree(P) > degree(Q), and a permutation matrix Π , such that

$$\mathscr{B} = \mathscr{B}(P, Q, \Pi) := \{ \Pi \operatorname{col}(u, y) \mid P(\sigma)y = Q(\sigma)u \}$$

I/S/O representation: $\forall \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{L}$, \exists matrices A, B, C, D, and a permutation matrix Π , such that

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(A, B, C, D, \Pi) := \{ \Pi \operatorname{col}(u, y) \mid \exists x, \\ \sigma x = Ax + Bu, \quad y = Cx + Du \}$$

SISTA

About the mappings $\mathscr{B} \mapsto (P, Q)$ and $\mathscr{B} \mapsto (A, B, C, D)$

Passing among representations are classical problems e.g., $(P, Q) \mapsto (A, B, C, D)$ is a realization problem

The parameters P, Q and A, B, C, D are not unique, so that $\mathscr{B} \mapsto (P, Q)$ and $\mathscr{B} \mapsto (A, B, C, D)$ are one-to-many mappings

Notable exception, for a SISO system, taking p monic,

(p,q) is in a one-to-one relation with \mathscr{B}

Next, we will use this special case for computing $d(\mathcal{B})$, w.r.t.

$$\mathsf{dist}(\mathscr{B},\widehat{\mathscr{B}}) := \sqrt{\|p - \widehat{p}\|_2^2 + \|q - \widehat{q}\|_2^2}$$

SISTA

Motivation: distance to uncontrollability

An algorithm for approximate GCD computation

Equivalent problem: structured low-rank approx.

 $\widehat{\mathscr{B}} \in \overline{\mathscr{L}_{ctrb}}$ is equivalent to rank deficiency of the Sylvester matrix

$$S(\widehat{p},\widehat{q}) := egin{bmatrix} \widehat{
ho}_0 & \widehat{q}_0 & \widehat{q}_0 & & & & \\ \widehat{
ho}_1 & \widehat{
ho}_0 & \widehat{q}_1 & \widehat{q}_0 & & & & & \\ dots & \widehat{
ho}_1 & \ddots & dots & \widehat{q}_1 & \ddots & & & & \\ \widehat{
ho}_n & dots & \ddots & \widehat{
ho}_0 & \widehat{q}_n & dots & \ddots & \widehat{q}_0 & & & \\ \widehat{
ho}_n & \widehat{
ho}_1 & \widehat{
ho}_1 & \widehat{q}_n & \widehat{q}_1 & & & & & \\ & \ddots & dots & & \ddots & dots & & & \ddots & dots & \\ & \widehat{
ho}_n & & \widehat{
ho}_n & & \widehat{q}_n & & \widehat{q}_n & & & \\ \hline \end{pmatrix}$$

our problem becomes a Sylvester structured low-rank approx.

$$\min_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q},w}\left\| \begin{bmatrix} p\\q \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{p}\\\widehat{q} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathcal{S}(\widehat{p},\widehat{q}) \begin{bmatrix} w\\1 \end{bmatrix} = 0 \qquad (**)$$

 $\widehat{\mathscr{B}} \in \mathscr{L}_{ctrb} \iff p, q \text{ coprime}$

Our problem becomes:

$$\min_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{p} \\ \boldsymbol{q} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\boldsymbol{p}} \\ \widehat{\boldsymbol{q}} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{2} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathscr{B}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}},\widehat{\boldsymbol{q}}) \in \overline{\mathscr{L}_{\text{ctrb}}}$$

or equivalently

$$\min_{\widehat{p},\widehat{q}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} p \\ q \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{p} \\ \widehat{q} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \begin{array}{c} \widehat{p} \text{ and } \widehat{q} \text{ have} \\ \text{a common factor} \\ \text{of degree} \geq 1 \end{array}$$

SISTA

Motivation: distance to uncontrollability

An algorithm for approximate GCD computation

Paige's distance to uncontrollability

C. C. Paige defined in

Properties of numerical algorithms related to computing controllability, IEEE-AC, vol. 26, 1981

the following measure for distance of \mathcal{B} to uncontrollability

$$d(A,B) := \operatorname{minimize}_{\widehat{A},\widehat{B}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{A} & \widehat{B} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{F}$$
subject to $(\widehat{A},\widehat{B})$ is uncontrollable

many papers on computing d(A, B) (98 citations in WoS)

However, d(A,B) depends on the choice of the state space basis!

 $\implies d(A,B)$ not a genuine property of the pair of systems $(\mathscr{B},\widehat{\mathscr{B}})$

Equivalent optimization problem

Theorem The optimization problem

$$\min_{\substack{\widehat{p},\widehat{q},c \ p_{\mathsf{red}},q_{\mathsf{red}}}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} p \ q \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\widehat{p}} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 \quad \mathsf{subject to} \quad egin{array}{c} \widehat{p} = p_{\mathsf{red}}c \ \widehat{q} = q_{\mathsf{red}}c \ \mathsf{deg}(c) = k \end{array}$$

is equivalent to

$$\min_{c} \operatorname{trace} \left(\begin{bmatrix} p & q \end{bmatrix}^{\top} \left(I - T(c) \left(T^{\top}(c) T(c) \right)^{-1} T^{\top}(c) \right) \begin{bmatrix} p & q \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

where $T(c) \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)\times n}$ is a lower triangular banded Toeplitz matrix with first column equal to $\operatorname{col}(c, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$.

SISTA

SISTA

Motivation: distance to uncontrollability

An algorithm for approximate GCD computation

Suboptimal initial approximations

Computable from unstructured low-rank approx. (SVD) of

- 1. Sylvester matrix S(p,q)
- 2. Bezout matrix B(p,q)
- 3. Hankel matrix *H*(*h*)

$$B(p,q) := \begin{bmatrix} p_1 & \cdots & p_n \\ \vdots & \ddots & \\ p_n & & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_0 & \cdots & q_{n-1} \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & & q_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} q_1 & \cdots & q_n \\ \vdots & \ddots & \\ q_n & & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} p_0 & \cdots & p_{n-1} \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & & p_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$H(h) := \begin{bmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & \cdots & h_n \\ h_2 & h_3 & \cdots & h_{n+1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_n & h_{n+1} & \cdots & h_{2n} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \frac{q(\xi)}{p(\xi)} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} h_t \xi^{-t-1}$$

Comments

- \hat{p} , \hat{q} , p_{red} , q_{red} , and the constraint are eliminated
- nonconvex nonlinear least squares problem
- can be solved numerically using local optimization methods
- cost function evaluations: solve a structured LS problem
- exploiting structure, comput. complexity O(n) per iteration

 \rightsquigarrow an algorithm for approximate GCD computation the algorithm needs an initial approximation for $c(\xi)$

SISTA

Motivation: distance to uncontrollability

An algorithm for approximate GCD computation

Using the Sylvester matrix

$$\mathcal{B}(p,q) \in \overline{\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ctrb}}} \iff p,q$$
 have common divisor $c, \deg(c) \geq 1$
 $\iff \exists \ p_{\mathrm{red}}, q_{\mathrm{red}} \text{ such that } p(\xi)q_{\mathrm{red}}(\xi) = q(\xi)p_{\mathrm{red}}(\xi)$
 $\iff \exists \ p_{\mathrm{red}}, q_{\mathrm{red}} \text{ such that } S(p,q) \begin{bmatrix} q_{\mathrm{red}} \\ -p_{\mathrm{red}} \end{bmatrix} = 0$
 $\iff S(p,q) \text{ is low-rank}$

After computing p_{red} , q_{red} from the SVD, we solve the LS problem

and define
$$\widehat{p}(\xi) = p_{\mathsf{red}}(\xi) c_{\mathsf{ls}}(\xi)$$
 and $\widehat{q}(\xi) = q_{\mathsf{red}}(\xi) c_{\mathsf{ls}}(\xi)$. Then
$$d\big(\mathscr{B}(p,q)\big) \leq \|\operatorname{col}(p,q) - \operatorname{col}(\widehat{p},\widehat{q})\|_2$$

Contractions

- motivation: replace the statement "## contr./uncontr." with a quantitative one "distance of ### to uncontrollability"
- the definition invariably considered in the literature is not representation invariant
- behavioral measure: $d(\mathscr{B}) := \min_{\widehat{\mathscr{B}} \in \mathcal{I}_{\operatorname{cirb}}} \operatorname{dist}(\mathscr{B}, \widehat{\mathscr{B}})$
- in the SISO case, $d(\mathcal{B})$ can be defined in terms of the normalized I/O representation $p(\sigma)y = q(\sigma)u$
- the computation of $d(\mathcal{B})$ leads to a nonlinear least squares problem, which cost function evaluation is O(n)
- SVD upper bounds, based on the Sylvester, Bezout, and Hankel matrices

Thank you

Motivation: distance to uncontrollability

SISTA