

STABILITY OF REDUCED ORDER MODELS IN SUBSPACE IDENTIFICATION

Ivan Markovsky¹, Jan C. Willems¹, Paolo Rapisarda² and Bart De Moor¹

1 – Departement Elektrotechniek, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2 – Departement Mathematics, Universiteit Maastricht

Abstract

Given an observed input/output time-series (u_t, y_t) , $t = 0, 1, \dots, t_f - 1$, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^p$, find an approximate time-series model

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= \hat{A}x_t + \hat{B}u_t, & x_t &\in \mathbb{R}^r, \\ y_t &= \hat{C}x_t + \hat{D}u_t. \end{aligned}$$

Problem:

Establish stability preservation and an error bound.

Approach:

Subspace identification, balanced truncated state sequence, least squares.

Equivalently, this is the problem of balanced reduction of the Most Powerful Unfalsified Model directly from the given data.

Overview of deterministic subspace identification

Let the observed time-series (u_t, y_t) be generated by the LTI system

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= Ax_t + Bu_t, & x_t &\in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ y_t &= Cx_t + Du_t. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

For a given natural number $i > n$, define

$$\begin{aligned} X_p &:= \begin{bmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & \dots & x_i & \dots & x_{j-1} \end{bmatrix} & \rightarrow & \text{sequence of initial conditions} \\ U &:= \begin{bmatrix} u_0 & u_1 & \dots & u_i & \dots & u_{j-1} \\ u_1 & u_2 & \dots & u_{i+1} & \dots & u_j \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ u_{2i-1} & u_{2i} & \dots & u_{i+2i-1} & \dots & u_{j+2i-2} \end{bmatrix} & \rightarrow & \text{every column is a sequence of inputs} \\ Y &:= \begin{bmatrix} y_0 & y_1 & \dots & y_i & \dots & y_{j-1} \\ y_1 & y_2 & \dots & y_{i+1} & \dots & y_j \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ y_{2i-1} & y_{2i} & \dots & y_{i+2i-1} & \dots & y_{j+2i-2} \end{bmatrix} & \rightarrow & \text{every column is the corresponding sequence of outputs} \end{aligned}$$

Let $W := \begin{bmatrix} U \\ Y \end{bmatrix}$. $W(:, t)$ gives an I/O response with initial condition x_t .

Split the data in U and Y into two equal length parts

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} U_p \\ U_f \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y_p \\ Y_f \end{bmatrix}.$$

Assume that $\text{rowspan}(U_p) \cap \text{rowspan}(W_p) = \{0\}$. Sufficient conditions is the **persistence of excitation** and $\text{rowspan}(U_f) \cap \text{rowspan}(X_p) = \{0\}$.

$$\mathbb{R}^j = \underbrace{\text{rowspan}(W_p)}_{\text{response due to past inputs and ini. cond.}} \oplus \underbrace{\text{rowspan}(U_f)}_{\text{response due to future inputs}} \oplus \underbrace{\text{rowspan}\left(\begin{bmatrix} W_p \\ U_f \end{bmatrix}\right)}_{\text{noise}}^{\perp}$$

Define $\hat{Y}_f := Y_f / U_f W_p$ (row-wise) as the component of Y_f lying in $\text{rowspan}(W_p)$.

$$\hat{Y}_f = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ CA \\ \vdots \\ CA^{i-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_i & x_{i+1} & \dots & x_{i+j-1} \end{bmatrix} =: \Gamma X_f$$

Subspace identification algorithm

\hat{Y}_f contains **free responses**. Any **rank revealing factorization**

$$\hat{Y}_f = L R^T, \quad L, R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \quad L, R \text{ — full column rank,}$$

defines a valid $\Gamma = L$ and a corresponding state sequence $X_f = R^T$. The rank revealing factorization is **not unique** and this corresponds to the non uniqueness of Γ and X_f due to the **choice of the state space basis**. We will use the SVD of \hat{Y}_f to compute the factorization. With X_f computed, one can **estimate A, B, C , and D** from a LS problem.

Algorithm 1 (Deterministic subspace identification)

1. Input: the Hankel matrix W .
2. Compute the oblique projection $\hat{Y}_f := Y_f / U_f W_p$.
3. Compute the SVD of the oblique projection $\hat{Y}_f = U_f S_f V_f^T$.
4. Define $\Gamma := U_f \sqrt{S_f}$ and $X_f = \sqrt{S_f} V_f^T$.
5. Find the parameters from the LS problem

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sigma X_f \\ \sigma^* Y_f \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^* X_f \\ \sigma^* U_f \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where

$$\sigma X_f := [x_{i+1} \ x_{i+2} \ \dots \ x_{i+j-1}] \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^* X_f := [x_i \ x_{i+1} \ \dots \ x_{i+j-2}].$$

6. Output: the estimates $\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D}$.

Balanced model subspace identification algorithm

Let V be a $j \times j$ to-be-determined matrix, and consider the SVD of $\hat{Y}_f V$

$$\hat{Y}_f V = U_f \Sigma_f V_f^T.$$

Define $\Gamma := U_f \sqrt{\Sigma_f}$ and $X_f := \Gamma^+ \hat{Y}_f$, where Γ^+ is a right inverse of Γ . $\hat{Y}_f = \Gamma X_f$, so that, Γ is an extended observability matrix and X_f is a corresponding state sequence in certain basis.

$$\sqrt{\Sigma_f} V_f^T = X_f V \implies X_f V V^T X_f^T = \Sigma_f \quad (3)$$

For $i \rightarrow \infty$ and A Hurwitz, $X_f = \Delta U_p + A^i X_p \approx \Delta U_p$, where $\Delta := [A^{i-1} B \ A^{i-2} B \ \dots \ AB \ B]$ so from (3), we have

$$\Delta U_p V V^T U_p^T \Delta^T \approx \Sigma_f.$$

Now, if we **choose V such that $U_p V V^T U_p^T = I$** , then the controllability gramian becomes $\Delta \Delta^T \approx \Sigma_f$ and is approximately equal to the observability gramian $\Gamma^T \Gamma = \Sigma_f$, so the state-space basis fixed with the choice of Γ and X_f is **approximately balanced**. A particular matrix V is

$$V = U_p^+ (U_p U_p^T)^{-1} I \ 0].$$

Algorithm 2 (Identification of a balanced model)

1. Input: the Hankel matrix W .
2. Compute $V = U_p^+ (U_p U_p^T)^{-1} I \ 0]$.
3. Compute the oblique projection $\hat{Y}_f := Y_f / U_f W_p$.
4. Compute the SVD of $\hat{Y}_f V = U_f S_f V_f^T$.
5. Define $\Gamma := U_f \sqrt{S_f}$ and $X_f = \Gamma^+ \hat{Y}_f$.
6. Find the parameters from the LS problem (2).
7. Output: the estimates $\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D}$.

Reduced order model estimation by truncation and LS

In subspace identification, one finds **first** the state sequence X , and then (A, B, C, D) . Algorithm 2 finds even an approximate finite-time balanced system. But solving for (A, B, C, D) requires solving equations of order equal to the order of the unreduced system. Reducing X first, leads to equations of order equal to that of the reduced system!

For a given natural number $r < n$, partition the balanced state sequence X_f as follows

$$X_f =: \begin{bmatrix} X_r \\ X_{\text{trunc}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \text{rowdim}(X_r) = r,$$

and find the **reduced order model parameters** $\hat{A}_r, \hat{B}_r, \hat{C}_r, \hat{D}_r$ by the least squares problem

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sigma X_r \\ \sigma^* Y_f \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_r & \hat{B}_r \\ \hat{C}_r & \hat{D}_r \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^* X_r \\ \sigma^* U_f \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

While for the classical approach there is a proof of **stability of the reduced order model** and a **bound for the \mathcal{H}_∞ norm of the error system**, for the alternative approach there are no such results yet. We state the following conjecture:

General stability conjecture

Let (A, B, C, D) be a minimal, asymptotically stable, and balanced n -th order system. Given an infinite input/output sequence (u_t, y_t) , $t = 0, 1, \dots$, where u is persistently exciting of order at least $2n$, construct a balanced state sequence X_f via Algorithm 2. Solve the least squares problem (4) for the truncated state sequence X_r . Then \hat{A}_r is Schur.

Preliminary result: autonomous model

Theorem (Autonomous model). Consider the asymptotically stable model

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t, \quad (5)$$

and let $x \in \ell_2(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a trajectory of (5). Denote by X the infinite matrix

$$X = [x_0 \ x_1 \ \dots \ x_t \ \dots].$$

For a given natural number $r < n$, partition X as follows

$$X =: \begin{bmatrix} X_r \\ X_{\text{trunc}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \text{rowdim}(X_r) = r.$$

The solution

$$\hat{A}_r = \sigma X_r X_r^T (X_r X_r^T)^{-1}$$

of the least squares problem

$$\min_{\hat{A}_r} \|\sigma X_r - \hat{A}_r X_r\|_{\ell_2}^2$$

is Schur.

Proof: Since for any X_r , $(\sigma X_r)(\sigma X_r)^T \leq X_r X_r^T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \begin{bmatrix} X_r \\ \sigma X_r \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} X_r^T & (\sigma X_r)^T \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} X_r X_r^T & X_r (\sigma X_r)^T \\ (\sigma X_r) X_r^T & (\sigma X_r)(\sigma X_r)^T \end{bmatrix} \\ &\leq \begin{bmatrix} X_r X_r^T & X_r (\sigma X_r)^T \\ (\sigma X_r) X_r^T & X_r X_r^T \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The Schur complement of the (2,2) block in the right most matrix is

$$X_r X_r^T - \underbrace{(\sigma X_r) X_r^T (X_r X_r^T)^{-1} X_r (\sigma X_r)^T}_{\hat{A}_r} \geq 0$$

Using the identity $X_r (\sigma X_r)^T = (X_r X_r^T) \hat{A}_r^T$, we obtain a Stein inequality

$$X_r X_r^T \geq \hat{A}_r (X_r X_r^T) \hat{A}_r^T,$$

which proves that \hat{A}_r^T is Schur, so that \hat{A}_r is Schur. \square

Preliminary result: impulse response identification

Corollary (Impulse response case). Consider the model (1), with (A, B, C) minimal and A Schur. Let u be the Kronecker delta function δ_t and $x_0 = 0$. Denote by X the infinite matrix

$$X = [x_0 \ x_1 \ \dots \ x_t \ \dots].$$

For a given natural number $r < n$, partition X as follows

$$X =: \begin{bmatrix} X_r \\ X_{\text{trunc}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \text{rowdim}(X_r) = r.$$

The solution

$$\hat{A}_r = \sigma X_r X_r^T (X_r X_r^T - X_r U^T (U U^T)^{-1} U X_r^T)^{-1} \quad (6)$$

of the least squares problem (4) is Schur.

Proof: The formula in the right-hand-side of (6) is obtained by explicitly computing the (1,1) block of the LS solution of (4)

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_r & \hat{B}_r \\ \hat{C}_r & \hat{D}_r \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma X_r \\ Y_f \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_r^T \\ U_f^T \end{bmatrix} \left(\begin{bmatrix} X_r^T \\ U_f^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_r^T \\ U_f^T \end{bmatrix}^T \right)^{-1}.$$

For $u = \delta$ and $x_0 = 0$, $X_r U^T (U U^T)^{-1} U X_r^T = 0$, so that the estimate

$$\hat{A}_r = \sigma X_r X_r^T (X_r X_r^T)^{-1}$$

has the same form as in the autonomous case. Under the assumptions of the theorem u is persistently exciting and $x \in \ell_2(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, so that the result of the Theorem applies and \hat{A}_r is Schur. \square