



THE MODULE STRUCTURE of ARMAX SYSTEMS

Jan Willems, K.U. Leuven, Belgium

CDC 2006, San Diego

December 13, 2006

**Joint paper with
Ivan Markovsky & Bart De Moor (K.U. Leuven)**



ARMAX systems

Processes

In this talk **'process'** means:

a vector of real stochastic processes on \mathbb{Z} ,
gaussian, zero mean, stationary, and ergodic.

'White noise': a process ε with

$$\text{the } \varepsilon(t)\text{'s i.i.d. and } \mathbb{E}\left(\varepsilon(0)\varepsilon^\top(0)\right) = I$$

\perp means: 'independence'.

A **(stochastic) system**

:= a collection of processes = the 'behavior'

ARMAX

Consider the difference eq'ns

$$\begin{aligned} W_0 w(t) + W_1 w(t+1) + \cdots + W_L w(t+L) \\ = E_0 \varepsilon(t) + E_1 \varepsilon(t+1) + \cdots + E_L w(t+L) \end{aligned}$$

L = the **lag**. In shorthand:

$$W(\sigma)w = E(\sigma)\varepsilon$$

(ARMAX)

with W, E real polynomial matrices;

σ = the 'shift': $(\sigma f)(t) := f(t+1)$.

ARMAX

Consider the difference eq'ns

$$W(\sigma)w = E(\sigma)\varepsilon$$

(ARMAX)

The stochastic system consisting of all processes w satisfying (ARMAX) with ε white noise is called the ARMAX system (W, E) .

ARMAX

Consider the difference eq'ns

$$W(\sigma)w = E(\sigma)\varepsilon \quad (\text{ARMAX})$$

WLOG W of full row rank \rightsquigarrow the difference eq'ns

$$Y(\sigma)y + U(\sigma)u = E(\sigma)\varepsilon$$

with Y, U, E real polynomial matrices, Y square, $\det(Y) \neq 0$;

Under 'generic' conditions, u is free: $\forall u \exists y \dots$,
 u is an '**exogeneous**' input; y an '**endogenous**' output.

AR-MA-X

WLOG: W full row rank in $W(\sigma)w = E(\sigma)\varepsilon$.

Refine the ARMAX notation, by factoring out A , to:

$$A(\sigma)(R(\sigma)w) = M(\sigma)\varepsilon$$

A, R, M real polynomial matrices,

A square, $\det(A) \neq 0$,

R left prime (i.e. $R(\lambda)$ of full row rank $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$).

AR-MA-X

Refine the ARMAX notation, by factoring out A , to:

$$A(\sigma)(R(\sigma)w) = M(\sigma)\varepsilon$$

Note that $v = R(\sigma)w$ is an ARMA process, satisfying

$$A(\sigma)v = E(\sigma)\varepsilon.$$

Call A the **AR-part**, M the **MA-part**, R the **X-part**.

$G = P^{-1}Q$ ($R = [P \ Q]$) = tf f'n of the **'deterministic part'**.

\exists a **'classification up to equivalence issue'** for (R, A, M) .

System identification

AR-MA-X SYSID

Observe

$$\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}(1), \tilde{w}(2), \dots, \tilde{w}(T))$$

for simplicity, today,

$$\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}(1), \tilde{w}(2), \dots, \tilde{w}(t), \dots)$$

SYSID pbm: **Estimate** one, all, a special, ARMAX system

$$(W, E) \quad \text{or} \quad (R, A, M)$$

to which the observed \tilde{w} belongs.

AR-MA-X system ID

Estimate (W, E) , or (R, A, M) from observed

$$\tilde{w}(1), \tilde{w}(2), \dots, \tilde{w}(t), \dots$$

Today, we explain how to obtain the ‘X-part’: how to compute

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

Assume $\tilde{w} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{u} \\ \tilde{y} \end{bmatrix}$ and a representation

$$A(\sigma) \left(Y(\sigma) \tilde{y} + U(\sigma) \tilde{u} \right) = M(\sigma) \varepsilon$$

with $\tilde{u} \perp \varepsilon$.

$$A(\sigma) \left(P(\sigma) \tilde{y} + Q(\sigma) \tilde{u} \right) = A(\sigma) (R(\sigma) \tilde{w}) = M(\sigma) \varepsilon$$

$$\Rightarrow R(\sigma) \tilde{w} = \sum_{t=-\infty}^{+\infty} H(t) \sigma^t \varepsilon$$

\Rightarrow (since $\varepsilon \perp \tilde{u}$)

$$R(\sigma) \tilde{w} \perp \tilde{u}.$$

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

Idea: the linear combinations of the rows of the **observed**

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{w}(1) & \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(4) & \tilde{w}(5) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+2) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

that are **orthogonal** to the rows of the **observed**

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{u}(1) & \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \tilde{u}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \tilde{u}(3) & \tilde{u}(4) & \tilde{u}(5) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t+2) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

determine R .

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{w}(1) & \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(4) & \tilde{w}(5) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+2) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{u}(1) & \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \tilde{u}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \tilde{u}(3) & \tilde{u}(4) & \tilde{u}(5) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t+2) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

\exists an ∞ number of ‘orthogonalizing’ linear combinations.

What special structure do they have, so that they are determined by a finite number of them, $\cong R$?

Is there a way to limit the number of rows?

Modules

... see my website ...

Modules

A **module** can be thought of as ‘**a vector space over a ring**’.

A mathematician’s favorite example:

the module $\mathbb{Z} + \sqrt{2}\mathbb{Z} + \sqrt{5}\mathbb{Z}$ over the ring \mathbb{Z}

A system theorist’s favorite example:

the module $\mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ over the ring $\mathbb{R}[\xi]$

$\mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$:= the n-dimensional vectors of polynomials

with real coefficients, in the indeterminate ξ .

Modules

A **submodule** of $\mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$: subset that is also a module over $\mathbb{R}[\xi]$.

E.g., for given polynomial vectors v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k , all sums

$$p_1 v_1 + p_2 v_2 + \dots + p_k v_k$$

p 's polynomials. The submodule **'generated by'** v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k .

Fact: Every submodule of $\mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ is like this: **'finitely generated'**.

Fact: Number of generators $\leq n$. (minimum =: the dimension)

Modules

A **submodule** of $\mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$: subset that is also a module over $\mathbb{R}[\xi]$.

A submodule of $\mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ is said to be **slim** if it does not contain other submodules of the same dimension

$$\Leftrightarrow V = [v_1 \ v_2 \ \cdots \ v_k] \text{ right prime.}$$

slim:

$$\begin{bmatrix} * \\ \vdots \\ * \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

not slim:

$$p(\xi) \mathbb{R}[\xi].$$

Modules

Submodules of $\mathbb{R}^n [\xi]$ are of great importance in system theory:

linear time-inv. diff. systems	$\xleftrightarrow{1:1}$	submodules of $\mathbb{R}^n [\xi]$
controllable LTIS	$\xleftrightarrow{1:1}$	slim submodules

Modules

Submodules of $\mathbb{R}^n [\xi]$ are of great importance in system theory:

The ‘left’ or ‘right’ kernel of any Hankel matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} H(1) & H(2) & H(3) & \cdots & H(t'') & \cdots \\ H(2) & H(3) & H(4) & \cdots & H(t'' + 1) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ H(t') & H(t' + 1) & H(t' + 2) & \cdots & H(t' + t'' - 1) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

\cong a submodule of $\mathbb{R}^{\text{coldim}(H)} [\xi]$ or $\mathbb{R}^{\text{rowdim}(H)} [\xi]$:

\leadsto effectively not ∞ -dimensional, but

\leq **rowdim(H)- or coldim(H)-dimensional!**

The orthogonalizers

The orthogonalizers

Let $w = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix}$ be a process. Say, w -dimensional.

$n \in \mathbb{R}^w [\xi]$ is an **orthogonalizer** (for w w.r.t u) if

$$n^\top (\sigma) w \perp u.$$

i.e. a linear combination of the components of the process w and its shifts which becomes independent of the process u .

The orthogonalizers

Let $w = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix}$ be a process. Say, w -dimensional.

$n \in \mathbb{R}^w [\xi]$ is an **orthogonalizer** (for w w.r.t u) if

$$n^\top (\sigma) w \perp u.$$

Ex.: the transpose of the rows of R , since

$$A(\sigma)(R(\sigma)w) = M(\sigma)\varepsilon \Rightarrow R(\sigma)w \perp u.$$

\Rightarrow every element of the module generated by these.
Is this all? Are there no other orthogonalizers?

The orthogonalizers

Let $w = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix}$ be a process. Say, w -dimensional.

Theorem:

1. The orthogonalizers **for w w.r.t. u** form a **submodule** of $\mathbb{R}^w [\xi]$.
2. In fact, a **slim** one.
3. If $w = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix}$ and u is ‘**persistently exciting**’, then it is precisely the submodule **generated by** the transposes of the rows of R .

The orthogonalizers

Let $w = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix}$ be a process. Say, w -dimensional.

Theorem:

1. The orthogonalizers **for w w.r.t. u** form a **submodule** of $\mathbb{R}^w[\xi]$.
2. In fact, a **slim** one.
3. If $w = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix}$ and u is ‘**persistently exciting**’, then it is precisely the submodule **generated by** the transposes of the rows of R .

Proof: 1. is easy. 2. uses ergodicity! 3. a bit of module theory.

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

Find (module basis for) the linear combinations of the rows of

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{w}(1) & \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(5) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+2) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

that are orthogonal to the rows of

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{u}(1) & \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \tilde{u}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

Find the linear combinations of the rows of

$$W := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{w}(1) & \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(5) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+2) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

that are orthogonal to the rows of

$$U := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{u}(1) & \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \tilde{u}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

!! Compute (a module basis for) the left kernel of WU^\top .

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

Find the linear combinations of the rows of

$$W := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{w}(1) & \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(2) & \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(3) & \tilde{w}(5) & \cdots & \tilde{w}(t+2) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

that are orthogonal to the rows of

$$U := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{u}(1) & \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t) & \cdots \\ \tilde{u}(2) & \tilde{u}(3) & \tilde{u}(4) & \cdots & \tilde{u}(t+1) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

∴ Can we limit the number of rows that are needed ??

Yes, provided we assume a known bound on the lags.

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto R$$

It is easy to prove that this, applied to a finite time-series, yields a consistent algorithm.

Note: no stability needed P for $R = [P \ Q]$.

$$\tilde{w} \mapsto A, M$$

Once we have R , we can compute the process

$$\tilde{a} = R(\sigma)\tilde{w}$$

This is an ARMA process.

Thinking in modules proceeds to A and M .

Recapitulation

Conclusion

Linear algebra on the Hankel matrix of the data \rightsquigarrow

the module of orthogonalizers

with a limited depth (L), contains the laws of the deterministic part of the system.

R can be readily indentified

Reduces ARMAX SYSID to ARMA SYSID.

Thank you

Thank you

Thank you

Thank you

Thank you

Thank you

Thank you

Thank you