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* Complex frequency

Consider 4 models as follows using AWE\_CHF with M = 6, where

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| w | Poles |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(1:20) | 1.6906 + 0.0000i  -1.1379 + 0.0000i  0.3416 + 0.7967i  0.3416 - 0.7967i  -0.1938 + 0.8052i  -0.1938 - 0.8052i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(21:30) | -4.1884 + 0.2317i  1.9618 + 3.1320i  -1.3208 - 0.0000i  -0.4097 + 0.0000i  0.2323 + 1.8643i  -0.0000 + 1.1424i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(31:40) | -0.2437 - 2.3025i  0.5619 + 2.0314i  -0.2437 + 2.3025i  -0.6176 + 1.3746i  0.0937 + 1.4062i  -0.0000 + 1.7136i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(41:50) | -0.2194 - 2.3773i  -0.2194 + 2.3773i  0.0847 + 2.4142i  0.0792 + 2.1397i  -0.0595 + 2.1806i  0.0000 + 2.2848i |

1. Consider the first 3 model and remove all unstable poles we get:

|  |
| --- |
| -0.2437 - 2.3025i  -0.2437 + 2.3025i  -0.6176 + 1.3746i  -0.0000 + 1.7136i  -4.1884 + 0.2317i  -1.3208 - 0.0000i  -0.4097 + 0.0000i  -0.0000 + 1.1424i  -1.1379 + 0.0000i  -0.1938 + 0.8052i  -0.1938 - 0.8052i |

Since there is no overlapping, we assume all these poles are valid and dominant.

1. Find the residues,

We first need to determine the moments,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| w | moments |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(1:20) | 1.0874, , ,…. |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(21:30) | -1.1042 - 0.4466i, ,… |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(31:40) | -0.8856 + 0.1380i, |

Using the moments of the first model, generated residues are:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

All of these residues are close to 0 except for the one highlighted and these are the one associated with the poles from the first model. Hence, the final model is almost the same as the first model. The resultant mode highly depends on the moments’ matrix.

This is not automated and not good implementation, it’s just to obtain an understanding before automating it.

clear

clc

% Generate frequency points

f = linspace(0, 9e5, 100);

w = 2\*pi\*f;

s = 1i \* w;

M = 6;

t = 50e-6;

first\_idx = 1:20;

vo =1./(cosh(400.\*(0 + 1e-10.\*s).^(1/2).\*(0.1 + 2.5e-7.\*s).^(1/2)));

[H1,num,deno] = generate\_yp2(real(vo(first\_idx)),imag(vo(first\_idx)),w(first\_idx));

[A,B,C,D] = create\_state\_space(num,deno);

[p1c,np1c,r1c,m1c] = AWE\_CFH\_poles(A,B,C,D,M,w(first\_idx(1)));

[p1,np1,r1,m1] = AWE\_poles(A,B,C,D,w(first\_idx(1)));

%second model ----------------------------------------------------------

idx = 21:30;

%H\_diff = vo(idx)-H(s(idx));

[H2,num,deno] = generate\_yp2(real(vo(idx)),imag(vo(idx)),w(idx));

[A,B,C,D] = create\_state\_space(num,deno);

[p2c,np2c,r2c,m2c] = AWE\_CFH\_poles(A,B,C,D,M,w(idx(1)));

[p2,np2,r2,m2] = AWE\_poles(A,B,C,D,w(idx(1)));

% Third model ---------------------------------------------

idx = 31:40;

%H\_diff = vo(idx)-H(s(idx));

%[Hi,num,deno] = generate\_yp2(real(H\_diff),imag(H\_diff),w(idx));

[H3,num,deno] = generate\_yp2(real(vo(idx)),imag(vo(idx)),w(idx));

[A,B,C,D] = create\_state\_space(num,deno);

[p3c,np3c,r3c,m3c] = AWE\_CFH\_poles(A,B,C,D,M,w(idx(1)));

[p3,np3,r3,m3] = AWE\_poles(A,B,C,D,w(idx(1)));

% Forth model ---------------------------------------------------

idx = 41:50;

%H\_diff = vo(idx)-H(s(idx));

%[Hi,num,deno] = generate\_yp2(real(H\_diff),imag(H\_diff),w(idx));

[H4,num,deno] = generate\_yp2(real(vo(idx)),imag(vo(idx)),w(idx));

[A,B,C,D] = create\_state\_space(num,deno);

[p4c,np4c,r4c,m4c] = AWE\_CFH\_poles(A,B,C,D,M,w(idx(1)));

[p4,np4,r4,m4] = AWE\_poles(A,B,C,D,w(idx(1)));

poles\_c = [p1c,p2c,p3c,p4c];% poles from AWE\_CFH with many moments

poles\_nc = [np1c,np2c,np3c,np4c];% shifted poles

poles = [p1,p2,p3,p4]; % AWE with q = lenght(B)

polesn = [np1,np2,np3,np4]; %shifted poles

pt = [p3c',p2c',p1c'];

ptest = 0;

% remove unstable poles

for i=1:length(pt)

if real(pt(i))<0

ptest = [ptest,pt(i)];

end

end

ptest = ptest(2:end);

mtest = m1c; %% moments from the first model has 1 value and zeros

[hs,r]= generate\_hs(ptest,length(ptest),mtest);

%plot(f,hs(s),f,vo,f,H1(s),'r\*');
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Figure 1: first model Vs resultant model

Case 2, largest residues:

1. Increase the dimensions of the A matrix to 3x3, currently it’s a 2x2 matrix.

Rounding issue with tol = 8.589176e-02., so these results might not be accurate.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| w | Poles | Residues |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(1:20) | -2.2814 + 0.0000i  -0.2105 + 0.7606i  -0.2105 - 0.7606i | -8.8177 - 0.0000i  0.0032 - 5.6259i  0.0032 + 5.6259i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(21:30) | -4.1540 - 0.4381i  0.2075 + 0.9514i  -0.0003 + 1.1422i | -4.8632 - 0.9176i  0.1442 + 0.1181i  -0.0000 - 0.0000i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(31:40) | -0.6004 - 0.0610i  -0.2231 + 2.3680i  -0.0065 + 1.7156i | 3.1082 - 3.9632i  0.3882 + 5.7094i  -0.0000 - 0.0000i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(41:50) | -0.5261 - 0.0711i  -0.2396 + 2.3472i  -0.0000 + 2.2849i | 6.4974 - 4.9537i  0.4054 + 6.5539i  0.0000 + 0.0000i |

Considering the first 2 models and removing unstable poles, then considering the one with the largest residue we get:

|  |
| --- |
| -0.2105 - 0.7606i, -0.0003 + 1.1422i |
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Figure 2 :impulse response of the first model Vs exact model Vs resultant model (unshifted vs shifted poles).

It can be seen that the resultant model is not more accurate than the first model which we want to achieve.

Consider model 3 and 4.

|  |
| --- |
| -0.6004 - 0.0610i ,-0.5261 - 0.0711i |
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Figure 3: impulse response of the exact model Vs resultant model (unshifted vs shifted poles).

The same as in the previous case, now consider more poles from each model, say 2 poles from each model.

the first 2 models.

|  |
| --- |
| -0.2105 - 0.7606i, -0.2105 + 0.7606i, -0.0003 + 1.1422i |
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Figure 4: impulse response of the resultant model Vs the exact model (shifted and unshifted).

With RMSE 0.3972 compared to 0.0165 of the first model.

## Now, let’s consider expansion points near the imaginary part of the poles of the first model (0.7606):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| w | Poles | Residues |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(1:20) | -2.2814 + 0.0000i  -0.2105 + 0.7606i  -0.2105 - 0.7606i | -8.8177 - 0.0000i  0.0032 - 5.6259i  0.0032 + 5.6259i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(14:30) | -1.6442 + 0.8550i  -0.1184 + 0.6931i  0.0001 + 0.7425i | -1.3628 + 0.3149i  0.3148 - 0.2773i  0.0000 - 0.0000i |

Considering the following poles:

|  |
| --- |
| -0.2105 - 0.7606i, -0.2105 + 0.7606i, -1.6442 - 0.1124i, -0.1184 + 0.0495i |
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Figure 5 : shows the impulse response of the exact solution compared to resultant model (shifted and unshifted)

With RMSE 0.0507 or 0.0412 for shifted and unshifted poles respectively.

## Now, let’s consider evaluating the second model as the difference between the exact model and the first model at the range of frequencies.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| w | Poles | Residues |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(1:20) | -2.2814 + 0.0000i  -0.2105 + 0.7606i  -0.2105 - 0.7606i | -8.8177 - 0.0000i  0.0032 - 5.6259i  0.0032 + 5.6259i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(21:30) | -0.0746 - 0.1820i  -0.2505 + 1.6580i  0.0014 + 1.1530i | -1.2972 + 0.0725i  -0.7350 - 0.0402i  -0.0000 - 0.0000i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(31:40) | -0.7546 - 0.0160i  -0.1737 + 2.2948i  -0.0036 + 1.7130i | 1.0823 - 2.3855i  -0.5038 + 3.6336i  0.0000 - 0.0000i |
| AWE\_, Y\_W(41:50) | -0.2502 - 0.0849i  -0.2343 + 2.4916i  0.0000 + 2.2847ix | 4.5658 - 1.4445i  0.7652 + 1.9364i  -0.0000 - 0.0000i |

Consider the first 2 models with the largest residue, we get

|  |
| --- |
| -0.2105 - 0.7606i, -0.2105 + 0.7606i, -0.2505 - 0.5156i |
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Figure 6 : shows the exact response compared to the result.

With RMSE 0.1560,

Try using the moments of the second model, we get. A graph of a wave
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