

# Model Order Reduction

Baboo J. Cui, Yangang Cao

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction by A Mechanical System</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Model Order Reduction Problem</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Naive Attempt to Achieve Order Reduction</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Kalman Approach . . . . .	3
3.2	Drop Method . . . . .	3
3.3	Compromise Approximation . . . . .	3
<b>4</b>	<b>Lower-Rank(by SVD) Approximation of Matrix</b>	<b>4</b>
4.1	LTI System as Linear Operator . . . . .	4
4.2	$\ell_2$ -Gain . . . . .	5
<b>5</b>	<b>Hankel Operator</b>	<b>5</b>
5.1	Decomposition of Hankel Operator . . . . .	5
5.2	Rank of Hankel Operator . . . . .	6
5.3	McMillan Degree . . . . .	6
5.4	Hankel Singular Values . . . . .	6
5.5	Proof of Properties of Hankel Singular Values . . . . .	6
5.6	Hankel Norm . . . . .	7
5.7	Lower-Rank Hankel Operator Approximation . . . . .	7
<b>6</b>	<b>Balanced Realization</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Balanced Truncation</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Example</b>	<b>8</b>

# 1 Introduction by A Mechanical System

Suppose a four-mass mechanical system is described by the following dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -M^{-1}K & -M^{-1}G \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ M^{-1}D \end{bmatrix} u \\ y &= \begin{bmatrix} P & Q \end{bmatrix} x\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}M &= \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \\ G &= \text{diag}(b_1, 0, 0, b_5) \\ K &= \begin{bmatrix} k_1 + k_2 & -k_2 & 0 & 0 \\ -k_2 & k_2 + k_3 & -k_3 & 0 \\ 0 & -k_3 & k_3 + k_4 & -k_4 \\ 0 & 0 & -k_4 & k_4 + k_5 \end{bmatrix} \\ D &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \\ P &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_4/m_4 & -(k_4 + k_5)/m_4 \end{bmatrix} \\ Q &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -b_5/m_4 \end{bmatrix} \\ x &= (q^T, \dot{q}^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^8 \\ y &= (q_1, \ddot{q}_2)^T\end{aligned}$$

this is a two-input, **eight**-state, two-output system model. For real case, for example an airplane, a system could be **too complicate** because of **too many state variables**.

## 2 Model Order Reduction Problem

Given a model  $(A, B, C)$ , with order(state dimension)  $n$ , find a model  $(A_r, B_r, C_r)$  with order  $r < n$  whose transfer function satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned}C_r(sI - A_r)^{-1} B_r &\simeq C(sI - A)^{-1} B & \text{CT-case} \\ C_r(zI - A_r)^{-1} B_r &\simeq C(zI - A)^{-1} B & \text{DT-case}\end{aligned}$$

To determine if two transfer functions are **close** to each other, given the same input  $u$ , they should produce **similar** outputs  $y$  and  $y_r$ . Note that:

- similarity between  $y$  and  $y_r$  is quantified as  $\|y - y_r\|$  using some norm on the vector space of all output signals
- since  $y$  and  $y_r$  are linear in  $u$ ,  $\|y - y_r\|$  can be very large due to large  $u$
- evaluate system by looking for largest output difference under  $u$  with bounded energy:

$$\sup_{\|u\|=1} \|y - y_r\|$$

where  $\|u\|$  is a (sometimes may not be  $\mathcal{L}_2$ ) norm on the vector space of all input signals

### 3 Naive Attempt to Achieve Order Reduction

3 intuitive ways of reducing system order are given and later we will focus on how to make this process systematic rather than relying on intuition.

#### 3.1 Kalman Approach

In Kalman form:

$$\tilde{A} = T^{-1}AT = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}_{11} & \tilde{A}_{12} \\ 0 & \tilde{A}_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \tilde{B} = T^{-1}B = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{B}_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tilde{C} = CT = [\tilde{C}_1 \quad \tilde{C}_2]$$

- if  $(A, B)$  is not controllable, the controllable subsystem  $(\tilde{A}_{11}, \tilde{B}_1, \tilde{C}_1)$  realizes the same transfer function as  $(A, B, C)$  but with a lower order.
- if  $(C, A)$  is not observable, then the observable subsystem realizes the same transfer function with a lower order.

The problem is that most systems are both controllable and observable, meaning that this method won't work.

#### 3.2 Drop Method

Given a DT system:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.8 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 10 \\ 0.1 \end{bmatrix}, C = [10 \quad 0.1]$$

Mode associated with  $\lambda_1 = 0.7$  is much more controllable and observable compared to mode associated with  $\lambda_2 = 0.8$ . Discarding mode 0.8 results in  $A_r = 0.7, B_r = 10, C_r = 10$ , which lead to:

$$C_r(zI - A_r)^{-1}B_r = \frac{100}{z - 0.7} \simeq C(zI - A)^{-1}B = \frac{100}{z - 0.7} + \frac{0.01}{z - 0.8}$$

Note that 0.01 is quite small compared to 100.

#### 3.3 Compromise Approximation

Given a DT system which is slightly different for  $C$ :

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.8 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 10 \\ 0.1 \end{bmatrix}, C = [0.1 \quad 10]$$

Mode for  $\lambda_1 = 0.7$  is still much more controllable, but now much less observable, than mode for  $\lambda_2 = 0.8$ . Discarding either mode will result in a large error for approximating

$$H(z) = C(zI - A)^{-1}B = \frac{1}{z - 0.7} + \frac{1}{s - 0.8}$$

Noting that the two poles of  $H(z)$  are very close to each other, we can first approximate  $H(z)$  by

$$H_r(z) = \frac{2}{z - 0.75} \simeq H(z)$$

and then find a first-order realization of  $H_r(z)$ , say,  $A_r = 0.75, B_r = 2, C_r = 1$ , as the reduced-order model.

## 4 Lower-Rank(by SVD) Approximation of Matrix

A matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  viewed as a map  $A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  with rank  $p$ . The problem is to find a matrix  $A_r \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  with rank  $r < p$  to

$$\text{minimize} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|u\|=1} \|Au - A_ru\|$$

- $\|\cdot\|$  represent Euclidean norm
- Function to be minimized is equal to the  $\mathcal{L}_2$ -norm of matrix  $A - A_r$

Suppose  $A$  has singular value decomposition(SVD)

$$A = U \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_+ & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} V^T$$

with

$$\Sigma_+ = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p), \sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_p > 0$$

then

$$A_r^* = U \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r, 0, \dots, 0) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} V^T$$

with the approximation error

$$\|A_r - A_r^*\| = \sigma_{r+1}$$

This can be extended to linear systems.

### 4.1 LTI System as Linear Operator

Consider the discrete-time LTI system

$$\begin{aligned} x[k+1] &= Ax[k] + Bu[k] \\ y[k] &= Cx[k] \end{aligned}$$

If  $x[0] = 0$ (for convenience), the system maps the input sequence to the output sequence:

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} y[0] \\ y[1] \\ y[2] \\ y[3] \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}}_Y = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ CB & 0 & & & \\ CAB & CB & 0 & & \\ CA^2B & CAB & CB & 0 & \\ \vdots & & & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}}_G \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} u[0] \\ u[1] \\ u[2] \\ u[3] \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}}_U$$

- $G$  is a **Toeplitz matrix** (constant along diagonal direction) because the system is time-invariant
- $G$  is lower triangular matrix because the system is causal
- $G$  is unchanged under coordinate transformation

## 4.2 $\ell_2$ -Gain

The  $\ell_2$ -gain of the system is the induced norm of  $G$ :

$$\|G\|_2 = \sup_{\mathbf{U} \neq 0} \frac{\|G\mathbf{U}\|}{\|\mathbf{U}\|}$$

- maximal energy magnification from input to output
- useful in robust control ( $\mathbf{U}$  is the perturbation)

## 5 Hankel Operator

The operator  $G$  typically has rank infinity, hence difficult to study. Instead, look at the map from past into future output:

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} y[0] \\ y[1] \\ y[2] \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}}_{Y_+} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} CB & CAB & CA^2B & \dots \\ CAB & CA^2B & CA^3B & \dots \\ CA^2B & CA^3B & CA^4 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}}_{\Gamma} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} u[-1] \\ u[-2] \\ u[-3] \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}}_{U_-}$$

- $\Gamma$  is a **Hankel matrix**(constant along anti-diagonal direction)
- Each column represents the impulse response w.r.t.  $u_j[-k]$  at time  $k < 0$ , hence  $\Gamma$  can be constructed from experimental data
- $\Gamma$  unchanged under coordinate changes
- $\Gamma$  has **finite rank**!

### 5.1 Decomposition of Hankel Operator

Since state  $x[0]$  summarizes contributions of past input, we have

$$U_- \xrightarrow{\Psi_c} \underbrace{x[0]}_{\Gamma} \xrightarrow{\Psi_o} Y_+$$

In other words(VIP):

$$\Gamma = \underbrace{\Psi_o}_{\Psi_o} \Psi_c = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ CA \\ CA^2 \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} \cdot \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} B & AB & A^2B & \dots \end{bmatrix}}_{\Psi_c}$$

After coordinate transformation:

$$\begin{aligned} x &= T\tilde{x} \\ \tilde{\Psi}_c &= T^{-1}\Psi_c \\ \tilde{\Psi}_o &= \Psi_o T \\ \tilde{\Gamma} &= \Gamma \end{aligned}$$

Rank of  $\Gamma$  is **at most**  $n = \dim(x)$

## 5.2 Rank of Hankel Operator

- Controllability operator  $\Psi_c$  is full rank if  $(A, B)$  is controllable
- Observability operator  $\Psi_o$  is full rank if  $(C, A)$  is observable

The Hankel operator  $\Gamma$  has rank  $n = \dim(x)$  if and only if the system  $(A, B, C)$  is minimal.

**Proof:** Use the two Sylvester rank inequalities for  $\Gamma = \Psi_o \Psi_c$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(\Gamma) &\leq \min \{ \text{rank}(\Psi_c), \text{rank}(\Psi_o) \} \\ \text{rank}(\Gamma) &\geq \text{rank}(\Psi_c) + \text{rank}(\Psi_o) - n \end{aligned}$$

## 5.3 McMillan Degree

- For a transfer function (or matrix)  $H(s)$ , the state dimension of its minimal realization is called its **McMillan degree**
- McMillan degree is the rank of the Hankel operator  $\Gamma$

## 5.4 Hankel Singular Values

Suppose  $A$  is stable and system  $(A, B, C)$  is minimal. Then both controllability and observability gramians exist and are positive definite:

$$W_c = \Psi_c \Psi_c^T = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} A^k B B^T (A^T)^k, \quad W_o = \Psi_o^T \Psi_o = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (A^T)^k C^T C A^k$$

$W_o W_c$  is **diagonalizable** with **positive** eigenvalues:

- this is because  $W_o W_c$  is similar to  $W_c^{1/2} W_o W_c^{1/2} \succeq 0$
- eigenvalues of  $W_o W_c$  unchanged under coordinate change  $x = T\tilde{x}$ :

$$\widetilde{W}_o = T^T W_o T, \quad \widetilde{W}_c = T^{-1} W_c (T^{-1})^T \Rightarrow \widetilde{W}_o \widetilde{W}_c = T^T W_o W_c (T^{-1})^T$$

**Hankel singular values**(VIP) of the system are (nonzero) singular values of  $\Gamma$  or equivalently, the square roots of the eigenvalues of  $W_o W_c$ .

- The singular values are typically sorted as  $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \sigma_n > 0$
- Singular values do not depend on state coordinates

## 5.5 Proof of Properties of Hankel Singular Values

Singular values of  $\Gamma$  are square roots of nonzero eigenvalues of

$$\Gamma^T \Gamma = (\Psi_o \Psi_c)^T (\Psi_o \Psi_c) = \Psi_c^T W_o \Psi_c = (W_o^{1/2} \Psi_c)^T (W_o^{1/2} \Psi_c)$$

which has the same nonzero eigenvalues as those of

$$(W_o^{1/2} \Psi_c)(W_o^{1/2} \Psi_c)^T = W_o^{1/2} W_c W_o^{1/2}$$

which in turn is similar to  $W_o W_c$  (hence have identical eigenvalues).

## 5.6 Hankel Norm

Suppose  $A$  is stable and system  $(A, B, C)$  is minimal. Then  $\Gamma$  maps finite energy input  $\mathbf{U}_-$  to finite energy output  $\mathbf{Y}_+$ , **Hankel norm** of system is

$$\|\Gamma\| := \sup_{\mathbf{U}_- \neq 0} \frac{\|\Gamma \mathbf{U}_-\|}{\|\mathbf{U}_-\|} = \sigma_1(\Gamma)$$

It is the maximum energy amplification from past input to future output.

## 5.7 Lower-Rank Hankel Operator Approximation

Given a Hankel operator  $\Gamma$  with rank  $n$ , for  $r < n$ , find a Hankel operator  $\Gamma_r$  to

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \quad \|\Gamma - \Gamma_r\| \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \text{rank}(\Gamma_r) = r \end{aligned}$$

- $\Gamma$  corresponds to a minimal system  $(A, B, C)$  with state dimension  $n$
- $\Gamma_r$  corresponds to a minimal system  $(A_r, B_r, C_r)$  with state dimension  $r$  whose I/O operator is **closest** to that of  $(A, B, C)$
- recall lower-rank approximation of matrices using SVD truncation

The optimal solution  $\Gamma_r^*$  satisfies  $\|\Gamma - \Gamma_r^*\| \geq \sigma_{r+1}$ , where  $\sigma_{r+1}$  is the  $(r+1)$ -th largest singular value of  $\Gamma$ . Lower bound may not be tight due to the Hankel constraint on  $\Gamma_r^*$ .

## 6 Balanced Realization

Given a minimal system  $(A, B, C)$  with  $A$  stable, there exists a coordinate transformation  $x = T\tilde{x}$  such that in the new coordinates, the controllability and observability Gramians are equal and diagonal:

$$\widetilde{W}_c = \widetilde{W}_o = \Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$$

where  $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_n$  are the Hankel singular values of the system.

- state space model with the above properties are called **balanced**
- strongly controllable states are also strongly observable!

Tip: note that  $W_c^{1/2} W_o W_c^{1/2} = U \Sigma^2 U^T$  for some orthogonal  $U$  and diagonal  $\Sigma$ . By choosing  $T = W_c^{1/2} U \Sigma^{-1/2}$  we have

$$\widetilde{W}_o = T^T W_o T = \Sigma, \quad \widetilde{W}_c = T^{-1} W_c (T^{-1})^T = \Sigma$$

## 7 Balanced Truncation

Given a minimal system  $(A, B, C)$  with stable  $A$ , first do a coordinate change  $x = T\tilde{x}$  so that  $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$  is a balanced realization:

- $\widetilde{W}_c = \widetilde{W}_o = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$
- states  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n$  have decreasing controllability and observability

To find a reduced-order model of order  $r < n$ , keep only the first  $r$  states:

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc|c} \tilde{A}_{11} & \tilde{A}_{12} & \tilde{B}_1 \\ \tilde{A}_{21} & \tilde{A}_{22} & \tilde{B}_2 \\ \hline \tilde{C}_1 & \tilde{C}_2 & 0 \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n) \rightarrow (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_r)} \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} \tilde{A}_{11} & \tilde{B}_1 \\ \hline \tilde{C}_1 & 0 \end{array} \right]$$

Reduced-order model  $(\tilde{A}_{11}, \tilde{B}_1, \tilde{C}_1)$  is called the  $r$ -th order **balanced truncation** of (the transfer function of) the model  $(A, B, C)$ , and  $(\tilde{A}_{11}, \tilde{B}_1, \tilde{C}_1)$  is also balanced and  $\tilde{A}_{11}$  is stable

## 8 Example

Again, given system:  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.8 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $B = \begin{bmatrix} 10 \\ 0.1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $C = [0.1 \quad 10]$ , find first-order reduction.

1. controllability and observability gramians are

$$W_c = \begin{bmatrix} 196.0784 & 2.2727 \\ 2.2727 & 0.0278 \end{bmatrix}, \quad W_o = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0196 & 2.2727 \\ 2.2727 & 277.7778 \end{bmatrix}$$

so

$$W_o W_c = \begin{bmatrix} 9.01 & 0.10769 \\ 1076.9 & 12.881 \end{bmatrix}$$

2.  $W_o W_c$  has two eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 = 21.888$ ,  $\lambda_2 = 0.0036161$ , whose square roots yield the Hankel singular values:

$$\sigma_1 = 4.6784 \quad \sigma_2 = 0.060134$$

alternatively, Matlab command *hsvd* can be used

3. As  $\sigma_1$  is much larger than  $\sigma_2$ , a first order system can approximate the original system very well.

4. Apply the linear transform  $x = T\tilde{x} = \begin{bmatrix} -6.4152 & 7.671 \\ -0.076711 & -0.064152 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x}$

5. A balanced realization is resulted:

$$\tilde{A} = T^{-1}AT = \begin{bmatrix} 0.75885 & 0.049211 \\ 0.049211 & 0.74115 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{B} = T^{-1}B = \begin{bmatrix} -1.4086 \\ 0.12559 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\tilde{C} = CT = [ -1.4086 \quad 0.12559 ]$$

whose controllability and observability gramians are  $\text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$

6. A 1st-order balanced truncation is as follows

$$\tilde{A}_{11} = 0.75885, \quad \tilde{B}_1 = -1.4086, \quad \tilde{C}_1 = -1.4086$$

whose transfer function is  $\frac{1.9842}{z-0.75885}$ , alternatively, Matlab command *balred* can be used