

# System Identification

Control Engineering EN, 3<sup>rd</sup> year B.Sc.  
Technical University of Cluj-Napoca  
Romania

Lecturer: Lucian Buşoniu



# Part VII

## Prediction error methods

# Table of contents

- 1 Model structures
- 2 General prediction error methods
- 3 Solving the optimization problem
- 4 Theoretical guarantees

# Classification

Recall **taxonomy of models** from Part I:

By number of parameters:

- 1 **Parametric models**: have a fixed form (mathematical formula), with a known, often small number of parameters
- 2 Nonparametric models: cannot be described by a fixed, small number of parameters  
Often represented as graphs or tables

By amount of prior knowledge (“color”):

- 1 First-principles, white-box models: fully known in advance
- 2 **Black-box models**: entirely unknown
- 3 Gray-box models: partially known

Like ARX, general prediction error methods (PEM) produce *black-box*, *parametric* (polynomial) models.

# Table of contents

- 1 Model structures
- 2 General prediction error methods
- 3 Solving the optimization problem
- 4 Theoretical guarantees

# Motivation

General PEM can be seen as an extension of ARX to significantly more general model structures, and are therefore able to identify more classes of systems.

To clarify, we first introduce the general class of models to which PEM can be applied.

# General model structure

$$y(k) = G(q^{-1})u(k) + H(q^{-1})e(k)$$

where  $G$  and  $H$  are discrete-time *transfer functions* – fractions of polynomials. Signal  $e(t)$  is zero-mean white noise.

- $G$  is the input-output transfer function.
- $H$  is the disturbance transfer function.

# General model structure: Explicit form

By making the fractions explicit and placing the common factors of the denominators of  $G$  and  $H$  in  $A(q^{-1})$ , we get the more detailed form:

$$y(k) = \frac{B(q^{-1})}{A(q^{-1})F(q^{-1})}u(k) + \frac{C(q^{-1})}{A(q^{-1})D(q^{-1})}e(k)$$
$$A(q^{-1})y(k) = \frac{B(q^{-1})}{F(q^{-1})}u(k) + \frac{C(q^{-1})}{D(q^{-1})}e(k)$$


where  $A, B, C, D, F$  are all polynomials, of orders  $na, nb, nc, nd, nf$ :

$$A = 1 + a_1q^{-1} + \dots + a_{na}q^{-na}$$
$$B(q^{-1}) = b_1q^{-1} + \dots + b_{nb}q^{-nb} \quad F(q^{-1}) = 1 + f_1q^{-1} + \dots + f_{nf}q^{-nf}$$
$$C(q^{-1}) = 1 + c_1q^{-1} + \dots + c_{nc}q^{-nc} \quad D(q^{-1}) = 1 + d_1q^{-1} + \dots + d_{nd}q^{-nd}$$



# General model structure: Graphical form

$$A(q^{-1})y(k) = \frac{B(q^{-1})}{F(q^{-1})}u(k) + \frac{C(q^{-1})}{D(q^{-1})}e(k)$$




Very general form, all other linear forms are special cases of this. Not for practical use, but to describe algorithms in a generic way. In practice, we use one of the special cases, as exemplified next.

# ARMAX model structure

Setting  $F = D = 1$  (i.e. orders  $nf = nd = 0$ ), we get:

$$A(q^{-1})y(k) = B(q^{-1})u(k) + C(q^{-1})e(k)$$



**Name:** **AutoRegressive** (dependence on previous outputs), **Moving Average** (referring to noise model) **with eXogenous input** (dependence on  $u$ )

# ARMAX: explicit form

$$A(q^{-1})y(k) = B(q^{-1})u(k) + C(q^{-1})e(k)$$

$$A(q^{-1}) = 1 + a_1q^{-1} + \dots + a_naq^{-na}$$

$$B(q^{-1}) = b_1q^{-1} + \dots + b_n bq^{-nb}$$

$$C(q^{-1}) = 1 + c_1q^{-1} + \dots + c_n c q^{-nc}$$

$$\begin{aligned} y(k) + a_1y(k-1) + \dots + a_n ay(k-na) \\ = b_1u(k-1) + \dots + b_n bu(k-nb) \\ + e(k) + c_1e(k-1) + \dots + c_n ce(k-nc) \end{aligned}$$

with parameter vector:

$$\theta = [a_1, \dots, a_n a, b_1, \dots, b_n b, c_1, \dots, c_n c]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{na+nb+nc}$$

## Running example: 1st order ARMAX

Take  $na = nb = nc = 1$ . This leads to the 1st order ARMAX model:

$$(1 + aq^{-1})y(k) = bq^{-1}u(k) + (1 + cq^{-1})e(k)$$

$$y(k) = -ay(k-1) + bu(k-1) + ce(k-1) + e(k)$$

where we skipped the indices in  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$  since there is a single parameter in each polynomial.

We will be using this as a running example throughout this part.

## Special case of ARMAX: ARX

Setting  $C = 1$  in ARMAX ( $nc = 0$ ), we get:

$$A(q^{-1})y(k) = B(q^{-1})u(k) + e(k)$$

precisely the ARX model we worked with before.

Compared to ARX, ARMAX can model more intricate disturbances ( $C(q^{-1})e(k)$  instead of  $e(k)$ , which is often assumed to be zero-mean white-noise).

# Recall: FIR special case of ARX

Further setting  $A = 1$  ( $na = 0$ ) in ARX, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}y(k) &= B(q^{-1})u(k) + e(k) = \sum_{j=1}^{nb} b_j u(k-j) + e(k) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{M-1} h(j)u(k-j) + e(k)\end{aligned}$$


the FIR model.

# Output error

Output Error, OE:

$$y(k) = \frac{B(q^{-1})}{F(q^{-1})}u(k) + e(k)$$

obtained for  $na = nc = nd = 0$ , i.e.  $A = C = D = 1$ .



This corresponds to simple, additive measurement noise on the output (the “output error”).

Exercises:

- Is OE a special case of ARMAX/ARX?
- What is the explicit form of the OE model?





# ARX reinterpreted as a PEM

- 1 Compute predictions at each step,  $\hat{y}(k) = \varphi^T(k)\theta$  given parameters  $\theta$ .
- 2 Compute prediction errors at each step,  $\varepsilon(k) = y(k) - \hat{y}(k)$ .
- 3 Find a parameter vector  $\theta$  minimizing criterion 
$$V(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \varepsilon^2(k).$$

The procedure above is just a reinterpretation, equivalent to the algorithm discussed in the ARX lecture.

Prediction error methods are obtained by extending this procedure to general model structures.

# ARX reinterpreted as a PEM (continued)

## Remarks:

- For ARX, we already know how to minimize the MSE (from linear regression); for more general models new methods will be introduced.
- ARX predictor  $\hat{y}(k)$  is chosen to achieve the error  $\varepsilon(k) = e(k)$ , equal to the noise. We will aim to achieve the same error in the general PEM, intuitively because we cannot do better.  
Note different meanings of  $\varepsilon(k)$  (prediction error) and  $e(k)$  (noise)
- The prediction error is just a rearrangement of the equation  $y(k) = \varphi^\top(k)\theta + \varepsilon(k) = \hat{y}(k) + \varepsilon(k)$ .

# Checklist

For each model structure, we will have to run through the three steps: prediction, prediction error, and minimization of the MSE.

We keep a running checklist:

	ARX
prediction $\hat{y}(k)$	✓
prediction error $\varepsilon(k)$	✓
minimization of $V(\theta)$	✓

# Table of contents

- 1 Model structures
  
- 2 General prediction error methods
  - Stepping stone: ARX revisited
  - **General case**
  - Special cases: 1st order ARMAX, ARX
  - Matlab example
  
- 3 Solving the optimization problem
  
- 4 Theoretical guarantees

# Recall: General model structure

$$y(k) = G(q^{-1})u(k) + H(q^{-1})e(k)$$

where  $G$  and  $H$  are discrete-time transfer functions:

$$y(k) = \frac{B(q^{-1})}{A(q^{-1})F(q^{-1})}u(k) + \frac{C(q^{-1})}{A(q^{-1})D(q^{-1})}e(k)$$

In the sequel, we skip argument  $q^{-1}$  to make the equations readable, and implicitly understand that each capital letter is a transfer function or polynomial of  $q^{-1}$ .

# Prediction error

We start by deriving  $e(k)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}y(k) &= Gu(k) + He(k) \\ \Rightarrow e(k) &= H^{-1}(y(k) - Gu(k))\end{aligned}$$

where  $H^{-1} = \frac{AD}{C}$  is the inverse of polynomial fraction  $H$ .

The predictor will be derived so that the prediction error  $\varepsilon(k) = y(k) - \hat{y}(k) = e(k)$ . So, the same formula can also be used to compute  $\varepsilon(k)$ :

$$\varepsilon(k) = H^{-1}(y(k) - Gu(k))$$

This is a **dynamical system** that can be simulated to compute  $\varepsilon(k)$ .

# Predictor

To achieve error  $e(k)$ , the predictor dynamics must be:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{y}(k) &= y(k) - e(k) = Gu(k) + He(k) - e(k) = Gu(k) + (H - 1)e(k) \\ &= Gu(k) + (H - 1)H^{-1}(y(k) - Gu(k)) \\ &= Gu(k) + (1 - H^{-1})(y(k) - Gu(k)) \\ &= Gu(k) + (1 - H^{-1})y(k) - Gu(k) + H^{-1}Gu(k) \\ &= \boxed{(1 - H^{-1})y(k) + H^{-1}Gu(k)}\end{aligned}$$

**Remark:** In order to have a *causal* predictor, that only depends on past values of the output and input, we require  $G(0) = 0$  and  $H(0) = 1$ .

# Preview: Finding the parameters & using the model

**Finding the parameters:** Once the procedure to compute the errors is available, the parameters  $\theta$  are found by minimizing criterion

$V(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \varepsilon^2(k)$ . This will usually require multiple evaluations of error signal  $\varepsilon(k)$ , for multiple values of the parameters  $\theta$ .

We do not yet go into specific computational methods to solve the error minimization problem. We will study them in detail in the next section.

**Using the model:** Once an estimate  $\hat{\theta}$  of the optimum is found, the predictor formula is applied to compute the model outputs  $\hat{y}(k)$ . The model can also be adapted to run in simulation mode.



# Checklist

	ARX	General PEM
prediction $\hat{y}(k)$	✓	✓
prediction error $\varepsilon(k)$	✓	✓
minimization of $V(\theta)$	✓	?

# Table of contents

- 1 Model structures
- 2 General prediction error methods
  - Stepping stone: ARX revisited
  - General case
  - Special cases: 1st order ARMAX, ARX
  - Matlab example
- 3 Solving the optimization problem
- 4 Theoretical guarantees

# Running example: 1st order ARMAX

Recall ARMAX:

$$Ay(k) = Bu(k) + Ce(k)$$

Placing it in the standard form, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}y(k) &= \frac{B}{A}u(k) + \frac{C}{A}e(k) \\ &= Gu(k) + He(k)\end{aligned}$$

So  $G = \frac{B}{A}$ ,  $H = \frac{C}{A}$

For 1st order:  $A = 1 + aq^{-1}$ ,  $B = bq^{-1}$ ,  $C = 1 + cq^{-1}$ .

# 1st order ARMAX: Prediction error

Recall general error formula:

$$\varepsilon(k) = H^{-1}(y(k) - Gu(k))$$

For our case, since  $G = \frac{B}{A}$ ,  $H = \frac{C}{A}$ :

$$\varepsilon(k) = \frac{A}{C} \left( y(k) - \frac{B}{A} u(k) \right)$$

$$C\varepsilon(k) = Ay(k) - Bu(k)$$

$$(1 + cq^{-1})\varepsilon(k) = (1 + aq^{-1})y(k) - bq^{-1}u(k)$$

$$\varepsilon(k) + c\varepsilon(k-1) = y(k) + ay(k-1) - bu(k-1)$$

$$\varepsilon(k) = -c\varepsilon(k-1) + y(k) + ay(k-1) - bu(k-1)$$

This is a *dynamical*, recursive formula which needs to be simulated over time! Requires initialization of  $\varepsilon(0)$ , usually taken 0.

# 1st order ARMAX: Predictor

Recall general predictor formula:

$$\hat{y}(k) = (1 - H^{-1})y(k) + H^{-1}Gu(k)$$

For our case, since  $G = \frac{B}{A}$ ,  $H = \frac{C}{A}$ :

$$\hat{y}(k) = \left(1 - \frac{A}{C}\right)y(k) + \frac{A}{C}\frac{B}{A}u(k)$$

$$C\hat{y}(k) = (C - A)y(k) + Bu(k)$$

$$(1 + cq^{-1})\hat{y}(k) = (\lambda + cq^{-1} - \lambda - aq^{-1})y(k) + bq^{-1}u(k)$$

$$\hat{y}(k) + c\hat{y}(k-1) = (c - a)y(k-1) + bu(k-1)$$

$$\hat{y}(k) = -c\hat{y}(k-1) + (c - a)y(k-1) + bu(k-1)$$

Again, a *dynamical*, recursive formula. Requires initialization at  $\hat{y}(0)$ , usually taken 0.

# Checklist

	ARX	General PEM	1st order ARMAX
prediction $\hat{y}(k)$	✓	✓	✓
prediction error $\varepsilon(k)$	✓	✓	✓
minimization of $V(\theta)$	✓	?	?

# Specializing the framework to ARX

It is instructive to see how the formulas simplify in the ARX case.  
Rewriting ARX in the general model template:

$$y(k) = Gu(k) + He(k) = \frac{B}{A}u(k) + \frac{1}{A}e(k)$$

We have:

$$H = \frac{1}{A}, G = \frac{B}{A}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{y}(k) &= (1 - H^{-1})y(k) + H^{-1}Gy(k) = (1 - A)y(k) + Bu(k) \\ &= (-a_1q^{-1} - \dots - a_{na}q^{-na})y(k) + (b_1q^{-1} + \dots b_{nb} + q^{-nb})u(k) \\ &= \varphi(k)\theta\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon(k) &= H^{-1}(y(k) - Gu(k)) = Ay(k) - Bu(k) \\ &= y(k) - (1 - A)y(k) - Bu(k) = y(k) - \hat{y}(k)\end{aligned}$$

which is therefore equivalent to the ARX formulation.

# Table of contents





- 1 Model structures
  
- 2 General prediction error methods
  - Stepping stone: ARX revisited
  - General case
  - Special cases: 1st order ARMAX, ARX
  - Matlab example
  
- 3 Solving the optimization problem
  
- 4 Theoretical guarantees



# Experimental data


Consider again the experimental data on which ARX was applied.

```
plot(id); and plot(val);
```



# Recall: ARX result

Assuming the system is second-order and without time delay, we take  $na = 2, nb = 2, nk = 1$ .



Results are quite bad.

# Identifying an ARMAX model

```
mARMAX = armax(id, [na, nb, nc, nk]);
```

Arguments:

- 1 Identification data.
- 2 Array containing the orders of  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$  and the *delay*  $nk$ .

Like for ARX, structure includes the explicit minimum delay  $nk$  between inputs and outputs.

$$\begin{aligned}y(k) + a_1 y(k-1) + a_2 y(k-2) + \dots + a_{na} y(k-na) \\= b_1 u(k-nk) + b_2 u(k-nk-1) + \dots + b_{nb} u(k-nk-nb+1) \\+ e(k) + c_1 e(k-1) + c_2 e(k-2) + \dots + c_{nc} e(k-nc)\end{aligned}$$

$A(q^{-1})y(k) = B(q^{-1})u(k-nk) + C(q^{-1})e(k)$ , where:

$$A(q^{-1}) = (1 + a_1 q^{-1} + a_2 q^{-2} + \dots + a_{na} q^{-na})$$


$$B(q^{-1}) = (b_1 + b_2 q^{-1} + b_{nb} q^{-nb+1})$$

$$C(q^{-1}) = (1 + c_1 q^{-1} + c_2 q^{-2} + \dots + c_{nc} q^{-nc})$$

**Remark:** As for ARX, the theoretical structure is obtained by setting  $nk = 1$  (and to represent  $nk > 1$  in the theoretical structure, change  $B$  like in the ARX Matlab example).

# ARMAX model

Considering the system is 2nd order with no time delay, take  $na = 2$ ,  $nb = 2$ ,  $nc = 2$ ,  $nk = 1$ . Validation: `compare(val, mARMAX);`




In contrast to ARX, results are good. Flexible noise model pays off.

# Identifying an OE model

Recall OE model structure:

$$y(k) = \frac{B(q^{-1})}{F(q^{-1})}u(k) + e(k)$$



# Identifying an OE model (continued)

```
mOE = oe(id, [nb, nf, nk]);
```

Arguments:

- 1 Identification data.
- 2 Array containing the orders of  $B$ ,  $F$ , and the delay  $nk$ .

$$y(k) = \frac{B(q^{-1})}{F(q^{-1})} u(k - nk) + e(k), \text{ where:}$$

$$B(q^{-1}) = (b_1 + b_2 q^{-1} + b_{nb} q^{-nb+1})$$

$$F(q^{-1}) = (1 + f_1 q^{-1} + f_2 q^{-2} + \dots + f_{nf} q^{-nf})$$


Explicit formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & y(k) + f_1 y(k-1) + f_2 y(k-2) + \dots + f_{nf} y(k-nf) \\ &= b_1 u(k-nk) + b_2 u(k-nk-1) + \dots + b_{nb} u(k-nk-nb+1) \\ &+ e(k) + f_1 e(k-1) + f_2 e(k-2) + \dots + f_{nf} e(k-nf) \end{aligned}$$

**Remark:** Like before, can transform into theoretical structure by setting  $nk = 1$  (or changing  $B$  if  $nk > 1$ ).

# OE model

Considering the system is second-order with no time delay, we take  $nb = 2, nf = 2, nk = 1$ . Validation: `compare(val, mOE);`



Results as good as ARMAX. System turns out to obey both model structures. **Question:** What is the true structure then?

# Summary

- ARX reinterpreted as a PEM, isolating the predictor and prediction error
- Derived PEM in the general-model case: prediction error, predictor
- Example application to first-order ARMAX: prediction error, predictor
- Double-checked predictor and error formulas for ARX
- Matlab example illustrating ARX, ARMAX, and OE identification
- Error-minimization method remains open



# Table of contents

- 1 Model structures
- 2 General prediction error methods
- 3 Solving the optimization problem**
- 4 Theoretical guarantees

# Checklist

	ARX	General PEM	1st order ARMAX
prediction $\hat{y}(k)$	✓	✓	✓
prediction error $\varepsilon(k)$	✓	✓	✓
minimization of $V(\theta)$	✓	?	?

# Optimization problem

**Objective of identification procedure:** Minimize mean squared error

$$V(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \varepsilon(k)^2$$

where  $\varepsilon(k)$  are the prediction errors. In the general case:

$$\varepsilon(k) = H^{-1}(q^{-1})(y(k) - G(q^{-1})u(k))$$

**Solution:**  $\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} V(\theta)$

So far we took this solution for granted and investigated its properties. While in ARX linear regression could be applied to find  $\hat{\theta}$ , in general this does not work. Main implementation question:

**How to solve the optimization problem?**


# Minimization via derivative root

Consider first the scalar case,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ .


Idea: at any minimum, the derivative  $f(\theta) = \frac{dV}{d\theta}$  is zero. So, find a root of  $f(\theta)$ .

Remarks:

- Care must be taken to find a minimum and not a maximum or inflexion. This can be checked with the second derivative,  $\frac{d^2V}{d\theta^2} = \frac{df}{d\theta} > 0$ .
- We may also find a local minimum which is larger (worse) than the global one.



# Newton's method for root finding



- Start from some initial point  $\theta_0$ .
- At iteration  $\ell$ , next point  $\theta_{\ell+1}$  is the intersection between abscissa and **tangent** at  $f$  in current point  $\theta_\ell$ . By geometry arguments:

$$\theta_{\ell+1} = \theta_\ell - \frac{f(\theta_\ell)}{\frac{df(\theta_\ell)}{d\theta}}$$

## Remarks:

- Notation  $\frac{df(\theta_\ell)}{d\theta}$  means the value of derivative  $\frac{df}{d\theta}$  at point  $\theta_\ell$ .
- The slope of the tangent is  $\frac{df(\theta_\ell)}{d\theta}$ .
- $\theta_{\ell+1}$  is the “best guess” for root given current point  $\theta_\ell$ .

# Newton's method for optimization

Replace  $f(\theta)$  by  $\frac{dV}{d\theta}$  to get back to optimization problem:

$$\theta_{\ell+1} = \theta_{\ell} - \frac{\frac{dV(\theta_{\ell})}{d\theta}}{\frac{d^2V(\theta_{\ell})}{d\theta^2}}$$

# Gradient and Hessian

To extend from the scalar case to  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we need first and second-order derivatives of  $V(\theta)$ , taking into account that  $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then:

$$\frac{dV}{d\theta} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \theta_1} \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial \theta_2} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial \theta_n} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \frac{d^2V}{d\theta^2} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \theta_1^2} & \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \theta_1 \partial \theta_2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \theta_1 \partial \theta_n} \\ \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \theta_2 \partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \theta_2^2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \theta_2 \partial \theta_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \theta_n \partial \theta_1} & \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \theta_n \partial \theta_2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \theta_n^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

**Gradient**  $\frac{dV}{d\theta}$  is an  $n$ -vector, and **Hessian**  $\frac{d^2V}{d\theta^2}$  an  $n \times n$ -matrix.

# Newton's method for optimization – general case

Start from scalar-case formula:

$$\theta_{\ell+1} = \theta_{\ell} - \frac{\frac{dV(\theta_{\ell})}{d\theta}}{\frac{d^2V(\theta_{\ell})}{d\theta^2}}$$

and extend to use the gradient vector and Hessian matrix:

$$\theta_{\ell+1} = \theta_{\ell} - \left[ \frac{d^2V(\theta_{\ell})}{d\theta^2} \right]^{-1} \frac{dV(\theta_{\ell})}{d\theta}$$

Add a **step size**  $\alpha_{\ell} > 0$ . Final formula:

$$\theta_{\ell+1} = \theta_{\ell} - \alpha_{\ell} \left[ \frac{d^2V(\theta_{\ell})}{d\theta^2} \right]^{-1} \frac{dV(\theta_{\ell})}{d\theta}$$

**Remark:**

- The stepsize helps with the convergence of the method, e.g. when  $V$  is noisy.



# Stopping criterion

Algorithm can be stopped:

- When the difference between consecutive parameter vectors is small, e.g.  $\max_{i=1}^n |\theta_{i,\ell+1} - \theta_{i,\ell}|$  smaller than some preset threshold.

or

- When the number of iterations  $\ell$  exceeds a preset maximum.

**Remark:** Nothing so far in Newton's method was specific to system identification. The method works in general for any optimization problem! Next, we return to system identification.

# Computing the derivatives

$$V(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \varepsilon(k)^2$$

Keeping in mind that  $\varepsilon(k)$  depends on  $\theta$ , from matrix calculus:

$$\frac{dV}{d\theta} = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \varepsilon(k) \frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta}$$
$$\frac{d^2V}{d\theta^2} = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta} \left[ \frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta} \right]^T + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \varepsilon(k) \frac{d^2\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta^2}$$

where:

- $\frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta}$  is the vector derivative and  $\frac{d^2\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta^2}$  the Hessian of  $\varepsilon(k)$ .
- $\frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta} \left[ \frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta} \right]^T$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix.

# Gauss-Newton

Ignore the second term in the Hessian of  $V$  and just use the first term:

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta} \left[ \frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta} \right]^\top$$

leading to the **Gauss-Newton** algorithm:

$$\theta_{\ell+1} = \theta_\ell - \alpha_\ell \mathcal{H}^{-1} \frac{dV(\theta_\ell)}{d\theta}$$

Motivation:

- Quadratic form of  $\mathcal{H}$  gives better algorithm behavior.
- Simpler computation.

The details of how to compute  $\frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta}$  depend on the model structure chosen.

# Checklist

	ARX	General PEM	1st order ARMAX
prediction $\hat{y}(k)$	✓	✓	✓
prediction error $\varepsilon(k)$	✓	✓	✓
minimization of $V(\theta)$	✓	✓	?

# Example: 1st order ARMAX

Recall model and prediction error for 1st order ARMAX:

$$y(k) = -ay(k-1) + bu(k-1) + ce(k-1) + e(k)$$
$$\varepsilon(k) = -c\varepsilon(k-1) + y(k) + ay(k-1) - bu(k-1)$$

We need  $\frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta} = \left[ \frac{\partial\varepsilon(k)}{\partial a}, \frac{\partial\varepsilon(k)}{\partial b}, \frac{\partial\varepsilon(k)}{\partial c} \right]^T$ . Differentiating second equation:

$$\frac{\partial\varepsilon(k)}{\partial a} = -c \frac{\partial\varepsilon(k-1)}{\partial a} + y(k-1)$$

$$\frac{\partial\varepsilon(k)}{\partial b} = -c \frac{\partial\varepsilon(k-1)}{\partial b} - u(k-1)$$

$$\frac{\partial\varepsilon(k)}{\partial c} = -c \frac{\partial\varepsilon(k-1)}{\partial c} - \varepsilon(k-1)$$

So,  $\frac{\partial\varepsilon(k)}{\partial a}$ ,  $\frac{\partial\varepsilon(k)}{\partial b}$ ,  $\frac{\partial\varepsilon(k)}{\partial c}$  are **dynamical signals!** They can be computed using the recursions above, starting e.g. from 0 initial values.

## Example: 1st order ARMAX (continued)

Finally, the overall algorithm is implemented as follows:

initialize  $\theta_0$ , iteration counter  $\ell = 0$

**repeat**

    given current value of parameter vector  $\theta_\ell$ ,

        apply recursions above to find  $\frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$

    plug  $\frac{d\varepsilon(k)}{d\theta}$  into equations for  $\frac{dV}{d\theta}$ ,  $\frac{d^2V}{d\theta^2}$

    apply Newton (or Gauss-Newton) update formula to find  $\theta_{\ell+1}$

    increment counter:  $\ell = \ell + 1$

**until**  $\theta_{\ell+1} - \theta_\ell$  is small enough, or maximum  $\ell$  was reached

# Checklist

	ARX	General PEM	1st order ARMAX
prediction $\hat{y}(k)$	✓	✓	✓
prediction error $\varepsilon(k)$	✓	✓	✓
minimization of $V(\theta)$	✓	✓	✓

# Summary

- Need for nonlinear regression
- Newton's method for root finding, scalar case
- Newton's method for optimization, scalar case
- Generalization to  $n$  dimensions; computing the gradient and Hessian
- Gauss-Newton optimization
- Example on first-order ARMAX, with complete formulas and algorithm



# Table of contents


- 1 Model structures
- 2 General prediction error methods
- 3 Solving the optimization problem
- 4 Theoretical guarantees**

# Assumptions

## Assumptions (simplified)

- 1 Signals  $u(k)$  and  $y(k)$  are stationary stochastic processes.
- 2 The input signal  $u(k)$  has a sufficiently high order of persistent excitation.
- 3 The Hessian  $\frac{d^2 V}{d\theta^2}$  is nonsingular at the minimum points of  $V$ .


Recall  $V(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \varepsilon^2(k)$ , the MSE. Assumption 3 ensures  $V$  is not “flat” around minima.



# Guarantee

## Theorem 1

Define the limit  $V_\infty(\theta) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} V(\theta)$ . Given Assumptions 1–3, the identification solution  $\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} V(\theta)$  converges to a minimum point  $\theta^*$  of  $V_\infty(\theta)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .



**Remark:** This is a type of **consistency** guarantee, in the limit of infinitely many data points.

# Further assumptions to strengthen guarantee

## Assumptions (simplified)

- 4 The true system satisfies the model structure chosen. This means there exists at least one  $\theta_0$  so that for any input  $u(k)$  and the corresponding output  $y(k)$  of the true system, we have:

$$y(k) = G(q^{-1}; \theta_0)u(k) + H(q^{-1}; \theta_0)e(k)$$

with  $e(k)$  *white noise*.

- 5 The input  $u(k)$  is independent from the noise  $e(k)$  (the experiment is performed in open loop).

# Additional guarantee

## Theorem 2

Under Assumptions 1-5,  $\hat{\theta}$  converges to a true parameter vector  $\theta_0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark:** Also a consistency guarantee. Theorem 1 guaranteed a minimum-error solution, whereas Theorem 2 additionally says this solution corresponds to the true system, *if* the system satisfies the model structure.