

Moment matching using Arnoldi/Lanczos methods

Madhu N. Belur
Control and Computing group
Department of Electrical Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology Bombay

<http://www.ee.iitb.ac.in/~belur/talks/>

14th & 15th April, 2015

- Moments of a transfer function (about $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$)
- Moments about $s = \infty$
- Relative degree of a transfer function
- Hessenberg form
- Tridiagonal form (for symmetric A in state space realization)
- Arnoldi method and Lanczos method for Hessenberg reduction
- Matching of moments
- Conclusion

- Recall Taylor series expansion (about $x = a$)

$$f(x) = f(a) + f'(a)(x - a) + f''(a) \frac{(x - a)^2}{2!} + \dots$$

provided $f(a)$ is bounded (i.e. no 'pole' at $x = a$)

- If $G(s)$ has no pole at $s = 0$, then

$$G(s) = g(0) + g'(0)s + g''(0) \frac{s^2}{2!} + \dots$$

- At $x = a$, all terms (except first term) are zero.
- $g(0)$ is **zeroth** moment of $G(s)$ about $s = 0$.
- $g'(0)$ is **first** moment of $G(s)$ about $s = 0$, etc.
- Consider series in **negative** powers of s

$$G(s) = G(\infty) + G_1 s^{-1} + G_2 \frac{s^{-2}}{2!} + \dots$$

- For $s \rightarrow \infty$, we get $s^{-1} \rightarrow 0$.
- $G(\infty)$ is **zeroth** moment of $G(s)$ about $s = \infty$.
- G_1 is **first** moment of $G(s)$ about $s = \infty$, etc.

- Of course, for such an expansion about $s = a$, $G(s)$ **ought not have pole** at $s = a$.
- For expansion in series in **negative** powers in s , $G(s)$ should have no pole at $s = \infty$.
- When $s \rightarrow \infty$, we want $G(s)$ should **not go unbounded**
- $G(s) = \frac{n(s)}{d(s)}$ (with polynomials $n(s)$ and $d(s)$) is **proper**: numerator degree \leq denominator degree
- For **MIMO** systems: proper \equiv each entry in transfer matrix $G(s)$ is proper
- State space realization (A, B, C, D) exists, and then $G(\infty) = D$: the feedthrough term
- In fact, for proper MIMO $G(s)$,

$$G(s) = D + \frac{CB}{s} + \frac{CAB}{s^2} + \frac{CA^2B}{s^3} + \frac{CA^3B}{s^4} \dots$$

- Given a large dynamical system (LTI, with transfer matrix) $G(s)$ of say order N

- Given a large dynamical system (LTI, with transfer matrix) $G(s)$ of say order N
- find \hat{G} : an **approximant** of G

- Given a large dynamical system (LTI, with transfer matrix) $G(s)$ of say order N
- find \hat{G} : an **approximant** of G
- \hat{G} should have its first k moments the same as $G(s)$.

- Given a large dynamical system (LTI, with transfer matrix) $G(s)$ of say order N
- find \hat{G} : an **approximant** of G
- \hat{G} should have its first k moments the same as $G(s)$.
- Moments about $s = s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$: typically $s = 0$ or $s = \infty$.
- More precisely,

- Given a large dynamical system (LTI, with transfer matrix) $G(s)$ of say order N
- find \hat{G} : an **approximant** of G
- \hat{G} should have its first k moments the same as $G(s)$.
- Moments about $s = s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$: typically $s = 0$ or $s = \infty$.
- More precisely,
Given $G(s)$ (of order N) and $k \ll N$ and $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$,

- Given a large dynamical system (LTI, with transfer matrix) $G(s)$ of say order N
- find \hat{G} : an **approximant** of G
- \hat{G} should have its first k moments the same as $G(s)$.
- Moments about $s = s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$: typically $s = 0$ or $s = \infty$.
- More precisely,
Given $G(s)$ (of order N) and $k \ll N$ and $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$,
find \hat{G} such that

- Given a large dynamical system (LTI, with transfer matrix) $G(s)$ of say order N
- find \hat{G} : an **approximant** of G
- \hat{G} should have its first k moments the same as $G(s)$.
- Moments about $s = s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$: typically $s = 0$ or $s = \infty$.
- More precisely,
Given $G(s)$ (of order N) and $k \ll N$ and $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$,
find \hat{G} such that
the first k moments about $s = s_0$ of \hat{G} and G are equal.
- **Match** moments of G .

- Steady state analysis $\equiv s = 0$
- $G(0)$ (zeroth moment about $s = 0$) is steady state value for step input
- Higher moments \equiv 'rate of approaching' steady state value
- Immediate transients ($t \in (0, \epsilon)$ for small positive ϵ) moments of $G(s)$ about $s = \infty$.
- In fact, $G(\infty)$: the value step response **jumps to** at $t = 0^+$.
- Match moments about $s = \infty \equiv$ transient response approximation
- Relevant for 'piece-wise' approximation (transients' analysis)

- Markov parameters \equiv moments of $G(s)$ about $s = \infty$
- In fact, impulse response $h(t)$ of $G(s)$

$$h(t) = D\delta + CBt + CABt^2 + \dots$$

- More generally, **Padé approximation**:
moment matching (about different points s_0)
- Put Markov parameters in special structure: Hankel matrix

Hankel matrix

For $G(s) = D + \frac{CB}{s} + \frac{CAB}{s^2} + \frac{CA^2B}{s^3} + \frac{CA^3B}{s^4} \dots$, define

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} D & CB & CAB & \dots \\ CB & CAB & CA^2B & \dots \\ CAB & CA^2B & CA^3B & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

- Though H is defined to have infinitely many rows and columns, rank is **finite**.
- Suppose D is zero and leave first column (for simplicity).
- Define H_{nn} : the first N rows and first N columns of above H .
- H_{NN} (from this new matrix) is

$$H_{nn} = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ CA \\ \vdots \\ CA^{N-1} \end{bmatrix} [B \quad AB \quad \dots \quad A^{N-1}B]$$

- By Cayley Hamilton theorem, we know observability and controllability matrix ranks cannot keep increasing: atmost N each (if $G(s)$ has order N).
- Hankel matrix: very well-studied for state space **realization** from Markov parameters
- Given Markov parameters, find state space realization (A, B, C, D) that has precisely these Markov parameters
- For **rational** $G(s)$, Markov parameters are ‘dependent’ after N moments
- Like $\frac{10}{27} = 0.370\ 370\ 370\ 370\ 370\ \dots$ (for any **rational** number)
- ‘Dependency’: Hankel matrix rank is bounded for rational $G(s)$
- Well-studied 50 years ago!

- Often state space realization of $G(s)$ given: but N very large
- Mechanical systems, FEM or FDM: we get A, B, C and D .
- D plays no role. ‘Feedthrough’ term needs no states: assume $D = 0$.
- Too much (**computational**) effort to calculate moments and then build lower order \hat{G} from the computed moments
- Large **memory** involved in storing/computing for large matrices
- Floating point error **accumulation** due to ill-conditioned $[B \ AB \ A^2B]$ etc.
- Power method tells for almost any nonzero v (and A), the vectors v, Av, A^2v , become **parallel** (after normalizing) \Rightarrow ill-conditioning

- Recall for square matrix A : ill-conditioned means very large $\|A\| \times \|A^{-1}\| =: \kappa(A)$
- Maximum singular value σ_{\max} : induced 2-norm (maximum amplification/gain when measured in Euclidean/2-norm)
- For induced 2-norm of matrix A , large $\kappa_2(A) \Rightarrow$ singular values very separated: $\sigma_{\max} \gg \sigma_{\min}$
- Well-conditioned A : columns of A are roughly same length **and** quite mutually orthogonal.
- $\kappa_2(A) = 1 \Leftrightarrow A = cQ$ (for any constant c and orthogonal Q).
- Recall a **square** matrix Q is called orthogonal if $Q^{-1} = Q^T$.
- Qx just 'rotates' x and no change in length (for any x).

- Recall for square matrix A : ill-conditioned means very large $\|A\| \times \|A^{-1}\| =: \kappa(A)$
- Maximum singular value σ_{\max} : induced 2-norm (maximum amplification/gain when measured in Euclidean/2-norm)
- For induced 2-norm of matrix A , large $\kappa_2(A) \Rightarrow$ singular values very separated: $\sigma_{\max} \gg \sigma_{\min}$
- Well-conditioned A : columns of A are roughly same length **and** quite mutually orthogonal.
- $\kappa_2(A) = 1 \Leftrightarrow A = cQ$ (for any constant c and orthogonal Q).
- Recall a **square** matrix Q is called orthogonal if $Q^{-1} = Q^T$.
- Qx just ‘rotates’ x and no change in length (for any x).
- Not just rotations, but ‘reflections’ allowed too.
- Givens rotators and Householder reflectors

Moment matching method: overall plan

- Compute moments far more easily by changing basis
- Change of basis using **orthogonal** transformation
- Bring A to ‘Hessenberg’ form
- If A was symmetric, then, in fact, tridiagonal form
- Very scalable methods:
 - memory-wise,
 - computational **effort**-wise,
 - computational floating-point-error-wise
- Computational procedure: Arnoldi (for unsymmetric A) and Lanzos (for symmetric A)

- **Not Heisenberg**, of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, but **Hessenberg**
- Upper triangular matrix \Rightarrow upper Hessenberg
- Upper **triangular**: diagonal and **super**-diagonals can be nonzero

- **Not Heisenberg**, of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, but **Hessenberg**
- Upper triangular matrix \Rightarrow upper Hessenberg
- Upper **triangular**: diagonal and **super**-diagonals can be nonzero
All **sub**-diagonals have to be zero
- Upper **Hessenberg**: upper triangular and **first sub**-diagonal **can be nonzero**

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \dots \\ \star & \star & \star & \star & \star & \dots \\ 0 & \star & \star & \star & \star & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \star & \star & \star & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \star & \star & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \star & \star \end{bmatrix}$$

- Given (A, B, C) (recall that we assumed $D = 0$), find change of coordinates: $x = Qz$ such that
 - Q is orthogonal
 - $Q^T A Q$ is upper Hessenberg
 - correspondingly find B and C
- By $x = Tz$ (with T nonsingular),

$$A \rightarrow T^{-1}AT, \quad B \rightarrow T^{-1}B, \quad C \rightarrow CT$$

- For simplicity consider single input: B is just **one** column: b .
- Well-known: if first column of Q is b (normalized to length one), then all columns Q are just ‘orthonormal’ basis of the **Krylov subspace**
- We will see Krylov subspace $K(A, b, j)$ for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and index $j \leq n$.

Slides kept at:

<http://www.ee.iitb.ac.in/~belur/talks/>