

# Weighted Least-Squares PARSIM

Jiabao He, Cristian R. Rojas and Håkan Hjalmarsson

*Division of Decision and Control Systems, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 100 44 Stockholm, Sweden (e-mail: jiabaoh, crro, hjalmars@kth.se).*

---

**Abstract:** Subspace identification methods (SIMs) have proven very powerful for estimating linear state-space models. To overcome the deficiencies of classical SIMs, a significant number of algorithms has appeared over the last two decades, where most of them involve a common intermediate step, that is to estimate the range space of the extended observability matrix. In this contribution, an optimized version of the parallel and parsimonious SIM (PARSIM),  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$ , is proposed by using weighted least-squares. It not only inherits all the benefits of PARSIM but also attains the best linear unbiased estimator for the above intermediate step. Furthermore, inspired by SIMs based on the predictor form, consistent estimates of the optimal weighting matrix for weighted least-squares are derived. Essential similarities, differences and simulated comparisons of some key SIMs related to our method are also presented.

*Keywords:* Subspace identification, ARX model, Markov parameters, weighted least-squares.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Subspace identification methods (SIMs) are attractive for their numerical robustness and general parametrization for multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems. As summarized in Qin (2006), most classical SIMs can be unified into the theorem proposed in Van Overschee and De Moor (1995), such as canonical variate analysis (CVA) (Larimore, 1990), N4SID (Van Overschee and De Moor, 1994), subspace splitting (Jansson and Wahlberg, 1996) and MOESP (Verahegen and Dewilde, 1992). To be specific, they involve the following steps: First, a high-order model is estimated by regression or projection. Second, the previous high-order model is reduced to an observable low-dimensional subspace using weighted singular value decomposition (SVD). Third, a balanced realization of state-space matrices is obtained based on the structure of the reduced observability matrix and the framework of maximum likelihood (ML). Despite the tremendous development of SIMs in both theory and practice, some drawbacks of classical SIMs should be emphasized (Qin, 2006). The first one is that the model format used in SIMs during the above projection step is non-causal. As a result, the estimated parameters have inflated variance due to the fact that extra and unnecessary terms are included in the model. The second one is that some SIMs are biased for closed-loop data, which require special treatments. Third, due to that SIMs are composed of several steps, including the projection and the weighted SVD step, it is difficult to analyze their statistical properties. There are some significant contributions on this problem, such as Bauer (2005); Bauer and Jansson (2000); Chiuso and Picci (2004,

2005), but a complete statistical analysis and comparison of different weighting matrices regarding optimality is still unavailable. For example, the question of whether there are subspace methods that are asymptotically efficient is still unresolved some 50 years after this family of methods was introduced. Furthermore, SIMs are generally not believed to be as accurate as the prediction error method (PEM).

To address those problems, especially the first two, a significant number of SIMs has appeared over the last two decades. For a comprehensive overview of these methods, we refer to Qin (2006), Chiuso (2007a) and Van der Veen et al. (2013). This paper concentrates on the first problem. In particular, we propose an optimized version of the parallel and parsimonious SIM (PARSIM) (Qin et al., 2005). In addition to inheriting all the benefits of PARSIM, the problem of estimating the range space of the extended observability matrix is fitted into the ML framework. As a result, it attains the best linear unbiased estimator (BLUE) and subsequently implies smaller variances for estimating system matrices.

Besides standing on the shoulders of PARSIM, our method is also inspired by other closed-loop SIMs, such as subspace and ARX modeling (SSARX) (Jansson, 2003), and SIMs based on the predictor identification (PBSID) (Chiuso and Picci, 2005; Chiuso, 2007b) and its optimized version  $\text{PBSID}_{\text{opt}}$  (Chiuso, 2007a). In the following section, we will integrate models and formulations to illustrate essential similarities and differences among those methods, along with how they relate to our method. In Section 3, the implementation of our method is presented. Some numerical examples are provided in Section 4 to compare our method with the state-of-the-art, which suggest that our method should be considered as one of the most appealing SIMs. The paper is then concluded in Section 5.

---

\* This work was supported by VINNOVA Competence Center Ad-BIOPRO, contract [2016-05181] and by the Swedish Research Council through the research environment NewLEADS (New Directions in Learning Dynamical Systems), contract [2016-06079], and contract 2019-04956.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

### 2.1 Problem Formulation and Assumptions

Consider the following discrete linear time-invariant (LTI) system on innovations form:

$$x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k + Ke_k, \quad (1a)$$

$$y_k = Cx_k + Du_k + e_k, \quad (1b)$$

where  $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ ,  $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ ,  $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  and  $e_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  are the state, input, output and innovations, respectively. We are interested in estimating the system matrices  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$ ,  $D$  and the Kalman gain  $K$  using input and output data. System (1) can be represented in predictor form as

$$x_{k+1} = \bar{A}x_k + \bar{B}u_k + Ky_k, \quad (2a)$$

$$y_k = Cx_k + Du_k + e_k, \quad (2b)$$

where  $\bar{A} = A - KC$  and  $\bar{B} = B - KD$ .

As pointed out in Qin (2006), most SIMs use one of the above forms. The advantage of the predictor form over the innovations form is that  $\bar{A}$  is guaranteed to be stable even if  $A$  is unstable, which facilitates the estimation of both stable and unstable processes. However, the drawback is that, for a finite number of samples, the optimal Kalman gain  $K$  is time-varying, which results in a time-varying  $\bar{A}$  even though  $A$  is time-invariant.

Next, we recap the state-of-the-art in SIMs to expose their essential similarities and differences. Since their key variations are rooted in obtaining Markov parameters and the range space of the extended observability matrix, while the remaining steps to estimate the model parameters are similar, we will only cover these steps. Before proceeding further, we introduce the following assumptions commonly used in SIMs:

- Assumption 1.* (1) The system is stable, i.e., the eigenvalues of  $A$  are strictly inside the unit disk.  
(2) The system is minimal, i.e.,  $(A, [B, K])$  is controllable and  $(A, C)$  is observable.  
(3) The innovations sequence  $\{e_k\}$  is a stationary, zero-mean, white noise with  $\mathbb{E}(e_k e_l) = R\delta_{kl}$ , where  $\delta_{kl}$  is the Kronecker delta. For simplicity, we assume  $R = \sigma_e^2 I$  throughout the paper, but we believe that our method can be adapted to arbitrary covariance matrices  $R$ .  
(4) The input sequence  $\{u_k\}$  is quasi-stationary and independent of  $\{e_k\}$ .  
(5) The input  $\{u_k\}$  is persistently exciting of order  $f+p$ , where the future and past horizons  $f$  and  $p$  will be defined later.

### 2.2 SIMs Based on Innovations Form

Here we provide a short review on classical SIMs using the innovations form (1), with focus on PARSIM. An extended state-space model for (1) can be derived as

$$Y_f = \Gamma_f X_k + G_f U_f + H_f E_f, \quad (3a)$$

$$Y_p = \Gamma_p X_{k-p} + G_p U_p + H_p E_p, \quad (3b)$$

where  $f$  and  $p$  denote future and past horizons, respectively. Also, the extended observability matrix is

$$\Gamma_f = \begin{bmatrix} C^\top & (CA)^\top & \dots & (CA^{f-1})^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top, \quad (4)$$

and  $G_f$  with  $H_f$  are Toeplitz matrices of Markov parameters with respect to the input and innovations,

$$G_f = \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ CB & D & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ CA^{f-2}B & CA^{f-3}B & \dots & D \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5a)$$

$$H_f = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ CK & I & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ CA^{f-2}K & CA^{f-3}K & \dots & I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5b)$$

Past and future inputs are collected in the Hankel matrices

$$U_p = \begin{bmatrix} u_{k-p} & u_{k-p+1} & \dots & u_{k-p+N-1} \\ u_{k-p+1} & u_{k-p+2} & \dots & u_{k-p+N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_{k-1} & u_k & \dots & u_{k+N-2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6a)$$

$$U_f = \begin{bmatrix} u_k & u_{k+1} & \dots & u_{k+N-1} \\ u_{k+1} & u_{k+2} & \dots & u_{k+N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_{k+f-1} & u_{k+f} & \dots & u_{k+f+N-2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6b)$$

(6c)

The matrices  $\Gamma_p$ ,  $G_p$ ,  $H_p$ ,  $Y_p$ ,  $Y_f$ ,  $E_p$  and  $E_f$  are defined in a similar way, see Qin et al. (2005). The state sequences are defined as

$$X_k = [x_k \ x_{k+1} \ \dots \ x_{k+N-1}], \quad (7a)$$

$$X_{k-p} = [x_{k-p} \ x_{k-p+1} \ \dots \ x_{k-p+N-1}]. \quad (7b)$$

Although the state  $X_k$  is unknown, it can be recovered from past inputs  $U_p$  and outputs  $Y_p$  using the relation

$$X_k = L_p Z_p + \bar{A}^p X_{k-p}, \quad (8)$$

where  $Z_p = [Y_p^\top \ U_p^\top]^\top$  and  $L_p$  is the extended controllability matrix of the predictor form (2), i.e.,

$$L_p = [\bar{A}^{p-1}K \ \dots \ \bar{A}K \ K \ \bar{A}^{p-1}\bar{B} \ \dots \ \bar{A}\bar{B} \ \bar{B}]. \quad (9)$$

When  $p$  is sufficiently large,  $\bar{A}^p \approx 0$ , hence, the bias term  $\bar{A}^p X_{k-p}$  is omitted. Combining (3a) and (8), we have

$$Y_f = \Gamma_f L_p Z_p + G_f U_f + H_f E_f. \quad (10)$$

Most SIMs use (10) to first estimate the extended observability matrix  $\Gamma_f$ , and then obtain a realization of the system parameters up to a similarity transformation. To begin with, since  $G_f$  is a lower-triangular Toeplitz matrix whose structure is difficult to be preserved with least-squares, this term is eliminated by projecting out  $U_f$  as

$$Y_f \Pi_{U_f}^\perp = \Gamma_f L_p Z_p \Pi_{U_f}^\perp + H_f E_f \Pi_{U_f}^\perp, \quad (11)$$

where  $\Pi_{U_f}^\perp = I - U_f^\top (U_f U_f^\top)^{-1} U_f$ . For the open-loop case,  $U_f$  is uncorrelated with  $E_f$ , so we have  $E_f \Pi_{U_f}^\perp \approx E_f$ . Furthermore, since  $E_f$  is uncorrelated with  $Z_p$ , i.e.,  $\frac{1}{N} E_f Z_p^\top \approx 0$ , by multiplying  $Z_p^\top$  on both sides of (11) we have

$$Y_f \Pi_{U_f}^\perp Z_p^\top \approx \Gamma_f L_p Z_p \Pi_{U_f}^\perp Z_p^\top. \quad (12)$$

Now, the range space of the extended observability matrix  $\Gamma_f L_p$  can be estimated by OLS, i.e.,

$$\widehat{\Gamma_f L_p} = Y_f \Pi_{U_f}^\perp Z_p^\top (Z_p \Pi_{U_f}^\perp Z_p^\top)^\dagger, \quad (13)$$

where  $[\cdot]^\dagger$  is the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse. Then to recover the extended observability matrix  $\Gamma_f$ , weighted SVD is often used, i.e.,

$$W_1 \widehat{\Gamma_f L_p} W_2 = USV^\top \approx U_{n_x} S_{n_x} V_{n_x}^\top, \quad (14)$$

where  $S_{n_x}$  contains the  $n_x$  largest singular values. In this way, a balanced realization of  $\Gamma_f$  is estimated as

$$\hat{\Gamma}_f = U_{n_x} S_{n_x}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (15)$$

As pointed out in Van Overschee and De Moor (1995), one of the main differences among various classical SIMs regards the choice of weighting matrices used in the SVD-step. It is further pointed out in Gustafsson and Rao (2002) that  $W_1$  has no influence on the asymptotic accuracy of the estimated observability matrix, and an approximately optimal weighting for  $W_2$  is

$$W_2 = (Z_p \Pi_{U_f}^\perp Z_p^\top)^{1/2}. \quad (16)$$

There are two aspects to be mentioned:

- (1) The lower-triangular Toeplitz matrix  $G_f$  guarantees that the extended model is causal. Since it is eliminated during the projection step (11), the projected model becomes potentially non-causal. As a result, the estimated parameters have inflated variance due to the fact that unnecessary terms are included.
- (2) For closed-loop data,  $U_f$  and  $E_f$  are correlated, i.e.,  $E_f \Pi_{U_f}^\perp \neq E_f$ , so as a result, many methods are biased for closed-loop setups.

To enforce causal models, a parallel PARSIM is proposed in Qin et al. (2005). Instead of doing the projection once, PARSIM zooms into each row of (10) and equivalently performs  $f$  OLS projections. To illustrate this, the extended state-space model (10) can be partitioned row-wise as

$$Y_{fi} = \Gamma_{fi} L_p Z_p + G_{fi} U_i + H_{fi} E_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, f, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{fi} &= CA^{i-1}, \\ Y_{fi} &= [y_{k+i-1} \ y_{k+i} \ \dots \ y_{k+N+i-2}], \\ U_{fi} &= [u_{k+i-1} \ u_{k+i} \ \dots \ u_{k+N+i-2}], \\ E_{fi} &= [e_{k+i-1} \ e_{k+i} \ \dots \ e_{k+N+i-2}], \\ U_i &= [U_{f1}^\top \ U_{f2}^\top \ \dots \ U_{fi}^\top]^\top, \\ E_i &= [E_{f1}^\top \ E_{f2}^\top \ \dots \ E_{fi}^\top]^\top, \\ G_{fi} &= [CA^{i-2}B \ \dots \ CB \ D] \triangleq [G_{i-1} \ \dots \ G_1 \ G_0], \\ H_{fi} &= [CA^{i-2}K \ \dots \ CK \ I] \triangleq [H_{i-1} \ \dots \ H_1 \ H_0]. \end{aligned}$$

Then the parallel PARSIM uses a bank of OLS to estimate  $\Gamma_{fi} L_p$  and  $G_{fi}$  simultaneously from the causal model (17):

$$\left[ \widehat{\Gamma_{fi} L_p} \ \hat{G}_{fi} \right] = Y_{fi} \begin{bmatrix} Z_p \\ U_i \end{bmatrix}^\dagger. \quad (18)$$

At last, the whole estimate of  $\Gamma_f L_p$  is obtained by stacking the  $f$  values of  $\widehat{\Gamma_{fi} L_p}$  together as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\Gamma_{f1} L_p} \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{\Gamma_{ff} L_p} \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \widehat{\Gamma_f L_p}. \quad (19)$$

As we can see, by estimating the Markov parameters  $G_{fi}$  in each row, the structure of the whole Toeplitz matrix  $\hat{G}_f$  is preserved. Furthermore, it is shown that regarding the estimates of the Markov parameters and the range space of the extended observability matrix, PARSIM generally gives smaller variance than conventional SIMs (Qin et al., 2005). However, to be consistent, PARSIM requires that there is no correlation between future  $\{u_k\}$  and future

$\{e_k\}$ , which is only valid for the open-loop case. To make it applicable to the closed-loop case, an innovation estimation method is proposed in Qin and Ljung (2003), which utilizes the structure of the Toeplitz matrix  $\hat{H}_f$  to decouple the correlation between future  $\{u_k\}$  and  $\{e_k\}$ .

### 2.3 SIMs Based on Predictor Form

To address the bias issue in classical SIMs when applied to closed-loop settings, several closed-loop SIMs have been put forward. In this section, we introduce two techniques that employ the predictor form (2), which provide inspiration for our method.

**SSARX** By defining the following Toeplitz matrices for the predictor form (2),

$$\bar{\Gamma}_f = \left[ C^\top \ (C\bar{A})^\top \ \dots \ (C\bar{A}^{f-1})^\top \right]^\top, \quad (20a)$$

$$\bar{G}_f = \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ C\bar{B} & D & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ C\bar{A}^{f-2}\bar{B} & C\bar{A}^{f-3}\bar{B} & \dots & D \end{bmatrix}, \quad (20b)$$

$$\bar{H}_f = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ CK & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ C\bar{A}^{f-2}K & C\bar{A}^{f-3}K & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (20c)$$

we obtain the extended model

$$\begin{aligned} Y_f &= \bar{\Gamma}_f X_k + \bar{G}_f U_f + \bar{H}_f Y_f + E_f \\ &= \bar{\Gamma}_f L_p Z_p + \bar{G}_f U_f + \bar{H}_f Y_f + E_f. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

To remove the possible correlation between  $U_f$ ,  $Y_f$  and  $E_f$ , SSARX (Jansson, 2003) first estimates the predictor Markov parameters  $\{C\bar{A}^i\bar{B}\}$  and  $\{C\bar{A}^iK\}$  from a high-order ARX model, and then replaces  $\bar{G}_f$  and  $\bar{H}_f$  with their estimates  $\hat{\bar{G}}_f$  and  $\hat{\bar{H}}_f$ , leading to

$$Y_f - \hat{\bar{G}}_f U_f - \hat{\bar{H}}_f Y_f = \bar{\Gamma}_f L_p Z_p + E_f. \quad (22)$$

Here, as  $E_f$  is not correlated to  $Z_p$ , OLS can be used to obtain consistent estimates of  $\bar{\Gamma}_f L_p$ . Putting the truncation error of the high-order ARX model aside, as the estimates  $\hat{\bar{G}}_f$  and  $\hat{\bar{H}}_f$  are consistent for both open-loop and closed-loop data, SSARX is suitable for both cases.

**PBSID** Inspired from SSARX, PBSID, also known as the whitening filter approach (Chiuso and Picci, 2005), starts from the predictor form (2) and utilizes the structure of the lower-triangular Toeplitz matrices  $\bar{G}_f$  and  $\bar{H}_f$  to carry out multi-stage projections row by row in (21). In this way, no pre-estimation as in SSARX is required, and causality is strictly enforced, similar to PARSIM. It should be further pointed out that PBSID is asymptotically equivalent to SSARX, in the sense of yielding the same asymptotic distribution of the estimators (Chiuso, 2007b). Later on, PBSID<sub>opt</sub>, an optimized PBSID algorithm, was proposed in Chiuso (2007a). Besides sharing the advantages of PBSID, it also considers the distribution of the innovations  $E_f$  and attains BLUE for estimating  $\bar{\Gamma}_f L_p$ .

### 3. PARSIM<sub>OPT</sub>

In this section, we propose an optimized PARSIM algorithm. Just as PBSID<sub>opt</sub> refines PBSID, PARSIM<sub>opt</sub> preserves all the merits of PARSIM while demonstrating superior performance with reduced variance.

#### 3.1 Weighted Least-Squares

Our method stands on the shoulders of PARSIM. For the last term  $H_{fi}E_i$  in (17), since  $E_i$  is an unknown Hankel matrix and  $H_{fi}$  contains unknown Markov parameters with respect to the innovations, the correlation structure of the noise in (17) is not used in PARSIM, where OLS is used to estimate  $\Gamma_{fi}L_p$  and  $G_{fi}$ , which is consistent but generally not BLUE. Our contribution is to benefit from this structure to improve on the OLS estimate by way of WLS. For simplicity's sake, we now consider the SISO case, whereas the MIMO case can be dealt with similarly.

Taking  $H_{fi} = [H_1 \ H_0]$  and  $E_i = \begin{bmatrix} e_0 & e_1 \\ e_1 & e_2 \end{bmatrix}$ , since  $H_i$  and  $e_k$  are scalars, we can rewrite  $H_{fi}E_i$  as

$$H_{fi}E_i = \mathcal{E}_i \mathcal{T}_{[H_{fi}]}, \quad (23)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}_i = [e_0 \ e_1 \ e_2]$  is a row vector and  $\mathcal{T}_{[H_{fi}]}$  is a

Toeplitz matrix of  $H_{fi}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}_{[H_{fi}]} = \begin{bmatrix} H_1 & 0 \\ H_0 & H_1 \\ 0 & H_0 \end{bmatrix}$ . Substituting (23) into (17), we have

$$Y_{fi} = [\Gamma_{fi}L_p \ G_{fi}] \begin{bmatrix} Z_p \\ U_i \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{E}_i \mathcal{T}_{[H_{fi}]}. \quad (24)$$

In this way, there are no repeated elements in  $\mathcal{E}_i$ , and the problem can be fitted into the ML framework. To be specific, since  $\mathcal{E}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_e^2 I)$ , we have  $\mathcal{E}_i \mathcal{T}_{[H_{fi}]} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_e^2 \mathcal{T}_{[H_{fi}]}^\top \mathcal{T}_{[H_{fi}]})$ . With the optimal weighting matrix  $W_i^* = (\mathcal{T}_{[H_{fi}]}^\top \mathcal{T}_{[H_{fi}]})^{-1}$ , we have the BLUE in each step given by WLS as

$$\left[ \widehat{\Gamma_{fi}L_p} \ \widehat{G_{fi}} \right] = Y_{fi} \begin{bmatrix} Z_p \\ U_i \end{bmatrix}^\top W_i^* \left( \begin{bmatrix} Z_p \\ U_i \end{bmatrix} W_i^* \begin{bmatrix} Z_p \\ U_i \end{bmatrix}^\top \right)^{-1}. \quad (25)$$

Comparing with PARSIM that performs  $f$  OLS to obtain  $\widehat{\Gamma_f L_p}$ , PARSIM<sub>opt</sub> performs  $f$  WLS. Since the estimates  $\widehat{\Gamma_{fi}L_p}$  of PARSIM<sub>opt</sub> have smaller variances than PARSIM, the overall  $\widehat{\Gamma_f L_p}$  of PARSIM<sub>opt</sub> has smaller variance. Furthermore, it has been shown that PARSIM generally gives smaller variance than other classical SIMs in terms of estimating the range space of the extended observability matrix. Thus, if the optimal weighting matrix is known, then PARSIM<sub>opt</sub> is BLUE and gives a smaller variance among those SIMs using the innovations form.

*Remark 2.* Notice that, in principle, (23) can be omitted. However, to perform WLS directly on (17) requires vectorizing the Hankel matrix  $E_i$  resulting in a noise vector with repeated entries and thus a singular covariance matrix, which needs more careful investigations and computational efforts. This is the approach taken in PBSID<sub>opt</sub>.

#### 3.2 Estimation of Weighting Matrices

The preceding section assumes that the optimal weighting matrices  $W_i^*$  are known, i.e., the terms  $H_i = CA^{(i-1)}K$ ,

$i = 1, 2, \dots, f-1$ , are available, which is generally not the case. To handle this, following the first step in SSARX, we propose to use a high-order ARX model to obtain consistent estimates of these Markov parameters. When the order  $n$  is large enough, the ARX model captures the system dynamics with arbitrary accuracy. It is important to note that the order  $n$  should be selected at a suitable rate with respect to the sample size  $N$  in order to achieve consistency and asymptotic normality (Ljung and Wahlberg, 1992). Omitting the truncation error, consistent estimates of predictor Markov parameters can be obtained using OLS from the ARX model. Then, to form an estimate of the optimal weighting matrix  $W_i^*$ , we need to extract the estimates of  $H_i = CA^{i-1}K$  from the estimates of  $\bar{H}_i = C\bar{A}^{i-1}K = C(A - KC)^{i-1}K$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, f$ . Such extraction can be implemented by the following recursive algorithm (Juang et al., 1993):

$$H_1 = \bar{H}_1, \quad (26a)$$

$$H_i = \bar{H}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \bar{H}_j H_{i-j}, \text{ for } i \geq 2. \quad (26b)$$

#### 3.3 Estimation of System Parameters

As we already mentioned in Section 2, after obtaining  $\widehat{\Gamma_f L_p}$ , the next step for SIMs is to choose weighting matrices  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ , and then perform SVD (14). For PARSIM<sub>opt</sub>, we choose the same weighting matrix as PARSIM, i.e.,  $W_1 = I$  and  $W_2 = (Z_p \Pi_{U_f}^\top Z_p^\top)^{1/2}$ . As for the estimation of system matrices, it follows similar steps as PARSIM. To conserve space, these steps are omitted, and we refer readers to Qin et al. (2005) for more details.

## 4. SIMULATION EXAMPLES

Here we provide some numerical examples to compare PARSIM<sub>opt</sub> with state-of-the-art. For implementations of the methods included in the comparison, we use the following resources: N4SID with CVA weighting (Van Overschee and De Moor, 2012), SSARX (Jansson, 2003), PBSID<sub>opt</sub> (Chiuso, 2007a) and PARSIM (Qin et al., 2005). Here are some common settings of the first two examples:

- (1) The matrix  $D$  is constrained to be 0 in all methods.
- (2) The comparison is under the open-loop case.
- (3) The future horizon  $f$  is fixed, and the past horizon  $p$  is selected according to the AIC criterion (Akaike, 1974) for all methods.
- (4) PEM as implemented in the Matlab (R2021a) System Identification Toolbox is used as a benchmark.

#### 4.1 Example 1

The first example is used in Jansson (2003), which is

$$y_t = \frac{0.21q^{-1} + 0.07q^{-2}}{1 - 0.6q^{-1} + 0.8q^{-2}}u_t + \frac{1}{1 - 0.98q^{-1}}e_t,$$

where  $u_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $e_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 4)$ . We first show that WLS in PARSIM<sub>opt</sub> gives smaller variance than OLS in PARSIM when estimating the Markov parameters and the range space of the extended observability matrix. For this purpose, we consider sample sizes  $N = 1000 : 500 : 3000$  and  $f = 10$ , and the performance is evaluated by

$$\text{Error}(G) = \|\hat{G}_{ff} - G_{ff}\| / \|G_{ff}\|,$$




Fig. 1. Errors of Markov parameters.




Fig. 2. FIT (Example 1).

where  $G_{ff}$  is defined in (17), and  $\|G_{ff}\|$  is the 2-norm of  $G_{ff}$ . We remark that here  $\hat{G}_{ff}$  is directly obtained by solving WLS or OLS in (24), not from the identified system matrices  $A, B$  and  $C$  indirectly. Figure 1 shows the estimation error of the Markov parameters, where the solid lines indicate average errors of each method in 50 Monte Carlo trials, and the shadowed bars around them mean the variances in 50 trials. It is clear that WLS in  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  outperforms OLS in  $\text{PARSIM}$ .

Second, we show the comparison between  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  and other SIMs. The performance is evaluated by

$$\text{FIT} = 100 \left( 1 - \frac{\|g_o - \hat{g}\|}{\|g_o - \text{mean}[g]\|} \right),$$

where  $g_o$  is a vector with the impulse response parameters of the true transfer function from  $u$  to  $y$ , and similarly for  $\hat{g}$  but for the estimated model of different SIMs. The sample size  $N = 2000$ , and the FIT result based on 50 Monte Carlo simulations is shown in Figure 2. We remark that, for a clear representation, outliers are removed from the boxchart. As we can see, for this example SIMs based on innovations form (N4SID and  $\text{PARSIM}$ ) are not as good as SIMs based on the predictor form (SSARX and  $\text{PBSID}_{\text{opt}}$ ). In addition,  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  is better than  $\text{PARSIM}$ .

#### 4.2 Example 2

The second example is used in Jansson and Wahlberg (1998) and Qin et al. (2005). For this counterexample, many SIMs are not consistent and have a poor performance. The system is given by

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= \begin{bmatrix} 2\gamma & -\gamma^2 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x_k + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -2 \end{bmatrix} u_k + \begin{bmatrix} -0.21 \\ -0.559 \end{bmatrix} e_k, \\ y_k &= [2 \ -1] x_k + e_k, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma = 0.9184$ ,  $e_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 217.1)$ ,  $u_k = (1 - \gamma q^{-1})^2 (1 + \gamma q^{-1})^2 r_k$  and  $r_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . The sample size  $N = 2000$  and  $f = 7$ , and the FIT result based on 50 Monte Carlo simulations is shown in Figure 3. As we can see, for this example SIMs based on innovations form (N4SID and  $\text{PARSIM}$ ) are better than SIMs based on the predictor form (SSARX and  $\text{PBSID}_{\text{opt}}$ ). In addition,  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  is




Fig. 3. FIT (Example 2).

slightly worse than  $\text{PARSIM}$ . The reason is that due to the large variance in innovations, the pre-estimation step is not good, which results in a bad estimate of the optimal weighting matrix for  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$ .

#### 4.3 Example 3: Random systems

In order to test the robustness of  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$ , we now perform a simulation with sixth order random systems generated by MATLAB as follows:

```
m = idss(drss(6, 1, 1));
m.d = zeros(1, 1); m.b = 5 * randn(6, 1);
u = idinput([1000, 1], 'rbs', [0 0.1]);
y = sim(m, u) + sigma_e * randn(1000, 1);
```

where  $\sigma_e^2$  is the noise variance. In addition, according to a critical view on the MATLAB command `drss()` (Rojas et al., 2015), the magnitude of the sampled dominant pole  $p_{\text{max}}$  is restricted to satisfy  $0.78 < p_{\text{max}} < 0.9$ . As it has been shown that  $\text{PBSID}$  is asymptotically equivalent to SSARX, and  $\text{PARSIM}$  generally gives smaller variance than classical SIMs Chiuso (2007b), we mainly evaluate the performance of  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  with respect to  $\text{PARSIM}$  and  $\text{PBSID}_{\text{opt}}$ . We believe that such comparison is interesting to the field, as  $\text{PARSIM}$  and  $\text{PBSID}$  algorithms both partition the extended state-space model row-wise and estimate a bank of ARX models using multi-step least-squares. Also, in terms of estimating the range space of the extended observability matrix,  $\text{PBSID}_{\text{opt}}$  is BLUE among those methods based on the predictor form, while now  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  is BLUE among those methods based on the innovations form. For a fair comparison, we use three different noise levels, i.e.,  $\sigma_e^2 = 1, 10, 100$ . For each noise level, 50 independent random systems are generated. The joint FIT distribution of  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  with respect to  $\text{PARSIM}$  and  $\text{PBSID}_{\text{opt}}$  are presented in Figure 4, where each blue \* marker means a random system, and the red line is a bisector line. As shown in the left column of Figure 4, the improvement of  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  over  $\text{PARSIM}$  is quite clear, as for different noise levels,  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  has higher FIT than  $\text{PARSIM}$  on most systems. As shown in the right column, when the noise level is small, the performance of  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  and  $\text{PBSID}_{\text{opt}}$  is roughly equal, and when the level of noise increases,  $\text{PARSIM}_{\text{opt}}$  appears to perform more effectively than  $\text{PBSID}_{\text{opt}}$ .

## 5. CONCLUSION

Standing on the shoulders of  $\text{PARSIM}$  and SSARX, this paper presents an alternative way to handle processing preceding the SVD-step in subspace identification. The idea is to obtain a more accurate estimate of the observability matrix by replacing ordinary least-squares with weighted-least squares, where the optimal weighting matrix is substituted by a consistent estimate thereof. While




Fig. 4. Joint FIT distribution of random systems.

the method follows PARSIM, the estimate of the optimal weighting matrix is based on a high-order ARX model, thus borrowing features from SSARX. Simulation examples suggest that this mixed use of both the innovations form and the predictor form in the estimation method is beneficial for the final state-space model estimate. In the future, we will implement PARSIM<sub>opt</sub> for MIMO systems, and extend it to the closed-loop case. Meanwhile, more simulations will be done to reveal its potential benefits.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Alessandro Chiuso and Magnus Jansson for insightful discussions and sharing codes of PBSID and SSARX, respectively.

#### REFERENCES

Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 19(6), 716–723.

Bauer, D. (2005). Asymptotic properties of subspace estimators. *Automatica*, 41(3), 359–376.

Bauer, D. and Jansson, M. (2000). Analysis of the asymptotic properties of the MOESP type of subspace algorithms. *Automatica*, 36(4), 497–509.

Chiuso, A. (2007a). On the relation between CCA and predictor-based subspace identification. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 52(10), 1795–1812.

Chiuso, A. (2007b). The role of vector autoregressive modeling in predictor-based subspace identification. *Automatica*, 43(6), 1034–1048.

Chiuso, A. and Picci, G. (2004). The asymptotic variance of subspace estimates. *J. Econom.*, 118(1-2), 257–291.

Chiuso, A. and Picci, G. (2005). Consistency analysis of some closed-loop subspace identification methods. *Automatica*, 41(3), 377–391.

Gustafsson, T. and Rao, B.D. (2002). Statistical analysis of subspace-based estimation of reduced-rank linear regressions. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 50(1), 151–159.

Jansson, M. (2003). Subspace identification and ARX modeling. In *Proc. 13th IFAC Symp. Syst. Identification*. Netherlands.

Jansson, M. and Wahlberg, B. (1996). A linear regression approach to state-space subspace system identification. *Signal Process.*, 52(2), 103–129.

Jansson, M. and Wahlberg, B. (1998). On consistency of subspace methods for system identification. *Automatica*, 34(12), 1507–1519.

Juang, J.N., Phan, M., Horta, L.G., and Longman, R.W. (1993). Identification of observer/Kalman filter Markov parameters: Theory and experiments. *J. Guid. Control Dyn.*, 16(2), 320–329.

Larimore, W.E. (1990). Canonical variate analysis in identification, filtering and adaptive control. In *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*. Honolulu, HI, USA.

Ljung, L. and Wahlberg, B. (1992). Asymptotic properties of the least-squares method for estimating transfer functions and disturbance spectra. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 24(2), 412–440.

Qin, S.J. (2006). An overview of subspace identification. *Comput. Chem. Eng.*, 30(10-12), 1502–1513.

Qin, S.J., Lin, W., and Ljung, L. (2005). A novel subspace identification approach with enforced causal models. *Automatica*, 41(12), 2043–2053.

Qin, S.J. and Ljung, L. (2003). Closed-loop subspace identification with innovation estimation. In *Proc. 13th IFAC Symp. Syst. Identification*. Netherlands.

Rojas, C.R., Valenzuela, P.E., and Rojas, R.A. (2015). A critical view on benchmarks based on randomly generated systems. In *Proc. 17th IFAC Symp. Syst. Identification*. Beijing, China.

Van der Veen, G., van Wingerden, J.W., Bergamasco, M., Lovera, M., and Verhaegen, M. (2013). Closed-loop subspace identification methods: An overview. *IET Control Theory Appl.*, 7(10), 1339–1358.

Van Overschee, P. and De Moor, B. (1994). N4SID: Subspace algorithms for the identification of combined deterministic-stochastic systems. *Automatica*, 30(1), 75–93.

Van Overschee, P. and De Moor, B. (1995). A unifying theorem for three subspace system identification algorithms. *Automatica*, 31(12), 1853–1864.

Van Overschee, P. and De Moor, B. (2012). *Subspace identification for linear systems: Theory-Implementation-Applications*. Springer.

Verahegen, M. and Dewilde, P. (1992). Subspace model identification part I: the output-error state-space model identification class of algorithm. *Int. J. Control*, 56, 1187–1210.