

MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR DYNAMICS OF COMPLEX TECHNICAL SYSTEMS MAGDEBURG



COMPUTATIONAL METHODS IN SYSTEMS AND CONTROL THEORY 20 YEARS

Linear Model Reduction for Nonlinear Input-Output Systems P. Benner, S. Grundel, C. Himpe Computational Methods in Systems and Control Theory Group Max Planck Institute Magdeburg EUropean Conference on Computational Optimization (EUCCO) Model order reduction and low-rank approximation for nonlinear problems 2018-09-12

Supported by:



for Economic Affair and Energy



Why:

- Computationally less involved.
- Less accurate but universal.
- Nonlinearity may not be main challenge.
- Nonlinear methods may not apply.
- Theoretical results for linear systems.

🞯 🚥 Input-Output System

Nonlinear Input-Output System:

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(t, x(t), u(t), \theta)$$
$$y(t) = g(t, x(t), u(t), \theta)$$

Input: $u : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^M$ State: $x : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ Output $y : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^Q$ Parameter: $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^P$ Vector Field: $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^P \to \mathbb{R}^N$ Output Functional: $g : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^P \to \mathbb{R}^Q$

🐟 🚥 Model Reduction

Reduced Order Model (ROM):

$$\dot{x}_r(t) = f_r(t, x_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$
$$\tilde{y}(t) = g_r(t, x_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$

- **Reduced State**: $x_r : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \ll N$
- **Reduced Vector Field**: $f_r : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^P \to \mathbb{R}^n$
- **Reduced Output Func.**: $g_r : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^P \to \mathbb{R}^Q$
- Approximate Output: $\tilde{y} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^Q$
- Goal I: $||y(\theta) \tilde{y}(\theta)|| \ll 1$
- Goal II: Preserve stability, structure, etc.



Projected System:

$$\dot{x}_r(t) = V^{\mathsf{T}} f(t, U x_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$

$$\tilde{y}(t) = g(t, U x_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$

- **Reducing projection**: $V \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$
- **Reconstructing projection**: $U \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$
- Projection ansatz: $x_r(t) := V^{\intercal} x(t) \rightarrow x(t) \approx U x_r(t)$
- (Bi-)Orthogonality: $V^{\intercal}U = \mathbb{1}$
- Galerkin projection: V = U
- Petrov-Galerkin projection: $U \neq V$

🐟 💿 Linear Model Reduction

Linear Time-Invariant System:

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t)$$
$$y(t) = Cx(t)$$

Reduced Linear System:

$$\dot{x}_r(t) = V^{\mathsf{T}}(A(Ux_r(t))) + Bu(t))$$
$$\tilde{y}(t) = C(Ux_r(t))$$

System matrix: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ Input matrix: $B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ Output matrix: $C \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times N}$

🐟 💿 Linear Model Reduction

Linear Time-Invariant System:

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t)$$
$$y(t) = Cx(t)$$

Reduced Linear System:

$$\dot{x}_r(t) = (V^{\mathsf{T}}AU)x_r(t) + (V^{\mathsf{T}}B)u(t)$$
$$\tilde{y}(t) = (CU)x_r(t)$$

System matrix: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ Input matrix: $B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ Output matrix: $C \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times N}$

💿 Linear Model Reduction

Linear Time-Invariant System:

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t)$$
$$y(t) = Cx(t)$$

Reduced Linear System:

$$\dot{x}_r(t) = A_r x_r(t) + B_r u(t)$$
$$\tilde{y}(t) = C_r x_r(t)$$

Reduced System Matrix: A_r ∈ ℝ^{n×n}
 Reduced Input Matrix: B_r ∈ ℝ^{n×M}
 Reduced Output Matrix: C_r ∈ ℝ^{Q×n}



Nonlinear System:

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(t, x_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$
$$y(t) = g(t, x_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$

Reduced Nonlinear System:

$$\dot{x}_r(t) = V^{\mathsf{T}} f(t, U x_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$

$$\tilde{y}(t) = g(t, U x_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$

Reduced Vector Field: f_r: ℝ × ℝⁿ × ℝ^M × ℝ^P → ℝⁿ
Reduced Output Func.: g_r: ℝ × ℝⁿ × ℝ^M × ℝ^P → ℝ^Q
Linear model reduction for a nonlinear system.

So and the second secon

Tackling the lifting bottleneck:

- Reducing the reduced order model.
- Approximate action of projected nonlinearity.
- Solely low-dimensional operator applications.

Hyper Reduction Methods:

- Discrete Empirical Interpolation Method¹ (DEIM)
- Dynamic Mode Decomposition² (DMD)

Numerical Linearization³

^{. . .}

¹S. Chaturantabut, D.C. Sorensen. Nonlinear model reduction via discrete empirical interpolation. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 32: 2737–2764, 2010. doi:10.1137/090766498.

² M.O. Williams, P.J. Schmid, J.N. Kutz. Hybrid Reduced-Order Integration with Proper Orthogonal Decomposition and Dynamic Mode Decomposition. Multiscale Modeling & Simulation, 11: 522–544, 2013. doi:10.1137/120874539.

³B.C. Moore. Principal Component Analysis in Nonlinear Systems: Preliminary Results. 18th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control including the Symposium on Adaptive Processes, 2: 1057–1060, 1979. doi:10.1109/CDC.1979.270114.



Idea:

- Use nonlinear information to build linear subspaces.
- Simulate perturbed systems to capture nonlinearity.
- Data-driven, hence specific to operating region.
- Independent of system structure.
- Superior to linearization⁴.

⁴I. Dones, S. Skogestad, H.A. Preisig. Application of Balanced Truncation to Nonlinear Systems. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 50: 10093–10101, 2011.

Sc Proper Orthogonal Decomposition

POD⁵ (Simplified):

$$X^{k} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1}^{k} & \dots & x_{T}^{k} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$$
$$\mathcal{X} := \begin{bmatrix} X^{1} & \dots & X^{K} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\mathcal{X} \stackrel{\mathsf{tSVD}}{=} UDW$$
$$V := U$$

- State trajectory X^k ,
- for *k*-th perturbation,
- with T snapshots each.

⁵L. Sirovich. Turbulence and the Dynamics of Coherent Structures: I-Coherent structures, II-Symmetries and transformations, III-Dynamics and scaling. Quarterly of Applied Mathematics, 45(3): 561–590, 1987.

So Dynamic Mode Decomposition

Extended DMD-Galerkin⁶ (Simplified):

$$X^{k} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1}^{k} & \dots & x_{T}^{k} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$$

$$\rightarrow X_{0}^{k} := \begin{pmatrix} x_{1}^{k} & \dots & x_{T-1}^{k} \end{pmatrix}, X_{1}^{k} := \begin{pmatrix} x_{2}^{k} & \dots & x_{T}^{k} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{0} := \begin{bmatrix} X_{0}^{1} & \dots & X_{0}^{K} \end{bmatrix}, \mathcal{X}_{1} := \begin{bmatrix} X_{1}^{1} & \dots & X_{1}^{K} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathcal{X}_{1} \stackrel{!}{=} A \mathcal{X}_{0} \rightarrow A \approx \mathcal{X}_{1} \mathcal{X}_{0}^{+}$$

$$\mathcal{X}_{1} \mathcal{X}_{0}^{+} T = \Lambda T$$

$$U := \operatorname{orth}(T), \quad V := U$$

⁶A. Alla and J.N. Kutz. Nonlinear Model Order Reduction via Dynamic Mode Decomposition. SIAM J Sci Comput, 39(5): B778–B796, 2017.

Some Sempirical Balanced Truncation

Empirical Gramians⁷ (Simplified):

$$X^{mk} = (x_1^{mk} \dots x_T^{mk}) \to W_C := \sum_{m,k} \alpha^{mk} X^{mk} (X^{mk})^{\mathsf{T}},$$
$$Y^{q\ell} = (y_q^{\ell 1} \dots y_q^{\ell N}) \to W_O := \sum_{q,\ell} \beta^{n\ell} (Y^{q\ell})^{\mathsf{T}} Y^{q\ell}$$
$$W_C^{\frac{1}{2}} W_O^{\frac{1}{2}} \stackrel{\mathrm{tSVD}}{=} UDV$$

q-th component of output trajectory: *y*^{ℓn}_q,
 for ℓ-th perturbation,

of the n-th initial state component.

⁷S. Lall, J.E. Marsden, and S. Glavaski. Empirical Model Reduction of Controlled Nonlinear Systems. In: Proceedings of the 14th IFAC Congress, F: 473–478, 1999.



Empirical Cross Gramian⁸ (Simplified):

$$X^{mk} := \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{mk} & \dots & x_T^{mk} \end{pmatrix}$$
$$Y^{\ell m} := \begin{pmatrix} y_m^{\ell 1} & \dots & y_m^{\ell N} \end{pmatrix}$$
$$W_X := \sum_{k,\ell,m} \gamma^{k\ell m} X^{mk} Y^{\ell m}$$
$$W_X W_X \stackrel{\mathsf{tSVD}}{=} U D V$$

⁸C.H. and M. Ohlberger. Cross-Gramian-Based Model Reduction: A Comparison. In: Modeling, Simulation and Applications, 17: 271–283, 2017.



Model Reduction Methods:

- Proper Orthogonal Decomposition
- Dynamic Mode Decomposition-Galerkin
- Empirical Balanced Truncation
- Empirical Approximate Balancing



Isothermal Euler Equations⁹:

$$\begin{split} &\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho = -\frac{1}{S}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}q\\ &\frac{\partial}{\partial t}q = -S\frac{\partial}{\partial x}p - Sg\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial x}h - \frac{\lambda}{2DS}\frac{q|q|}{\rho}\\ &p = R_ST_0z\rho \end{split}$$

- Density: $\rho(x,t)$ Constants: S, q, D• Mass-Flux: q(x,t)Parameters: T_0 , R_s Pressure: p(x,t)
 - Friction Factor: $\lambda(q)$
 - Compressibility Factor: z(p,T)

Elevation: h(x)

⁹ P. Benner, S. Grundel, C.H., C. Huck, T. Streubel, C. Tischendorf. Gas Network Benchmark Models. In: Differential Algebraic Equation Forum (Online First), 2018.



Semi-Discrete Gas Network Model¹⁰:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{p} \\ \dot{q} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_{pq} \\ A_{qp} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & B_d \\ B_s & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p_s \\ q_d \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f_{fr}(p, q, p_s, q_d, \theta) \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} p_d \\ q_s \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_d & 0 \\ 0 & C_s \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}$$

Pipe network preprocessing:

- Index reduction (Analytic).
- Spatial discretization (Midpoint).
- Pressure and mass-flux states.
- IMEX integrator.

¹⁰S. Grundel, L. Jansen, N. Hornung, T. Clees, C. Tischendorf, P. Benner. Model Order Reduction of Differential Algebraic Equations Arising from the Simulation of Gas Transport Networks. In: Progress in Differential-Algebraic Equations, Differential-Algebraic Equations Forum: 183–205, 2014.



Structured Reduced Order Model¹¹:

$$\dot{p}_r(t) = V_p^{\mathsf{T}} f_p(t, U_p p_r(t), U_q q_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$
$$\dot{q}_r(t) = V_q^{\mathsf{T}} f_q(t, U_p p_r(t), U_q q_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$
$$\tilde{y}(t) = g(t, U_p p_r(t), U_q q_r(t), u(t), \theta)$$

- Reducing pressure projection: $V_p \in \mathbb{R}^{N_p \times n_p}$
- Reducing mass-flux projection: $V_q \in \mathbb{R}^{N_q \times n_q}$
- Reconstructing pressure projection: $U_p \in \mathbb{R}^{N_p \times n_p}$
- Reconstructing mass-flux projection: $U_q \in \mathbb{R}^{N_q imes n_q}$
- Bi-Orthogonality: $V_p^{\intercal}U_p = \mathbb{1}_{n_p}$, $V_q^{\intercal}U_q = \mathbb{1}_{n_q}$

¹¹ H. Sandberg and R.M. Murray. Model reduction of interconnected linear systems. Optimal Control Applications and Methods, 30(3): 225–245, 2009.





Network Properties:

- Nodes: 22
- **Edges**: 22
- Supplies: 2
- Demands: 4

System Dimensions:

- Pressure states: 518
- Mass-flux states: 520
- Inputs: 6
- Outputs: 6

Solution Model Reduction Workflow

Offline:

- 1. Design input and parameter samples.
- 2. Compute assciated trajectories,
- 3. for short time horizons (< $1 \, h$).
- 4. Compute projections from trajectories.

Online:

- 1. Design scenarios.
- 2. Simulate scenarios,
- 3. for long time horizons (24 h).











Before to Hyper Reduction:

- Comparison: Benchmarks¹²
- Preprocessing: A-Priori Error Indicator (WIP)
- Parallelization: HAPOD¹³
- Postprocessing: Stabilization¹⁴

ROM Efficiency: Memory vs Compute (WIP)

¹²U. Baur, P. Benner, B. Haasdonk, C.H., I. Martini and M. Ohlberger. Comparison of Methods for Parametric Model Order Reduction of Time-Dependent Problems. In: Model Reduction and Approximation: Theory and Algorithms, SIAM: 377–407, 2017.

¹³C.H. and T. Leibner and S. Rave. Hierarchical Approximate Proper Orthogonal Decomposition. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing: Accepted, 2018.

¹⁴ P. Benner, C.H., T. Mitchell. On Reduced Input-Output Dynamic Mode Decomposition. Advances in Computational Mathematics: 1–18, 2018.



Take-home message:

- Nonlinear information for linear subspace.
- Quality of linear subspace.
- Online time may vary.

http://himpe.science

Acknowledgment:

Supported by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, in the joint project: "**MathEnergy** – Mathematical Key Technologies for Evolving Energy Grids", sub-project: Model Order Reduction (Grant number: 0324019**B**).