BALANCING-RELATED MODEL REDUCTION FOR PARABOLIC CONTROL SYSTEMS

Peter Benner

Professur Mathematik in Industrie und Technik
Fakultät für Mathematik
Technische Universität Chemnitz

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT
CHEMNITZ



Courant Institute, NYU
March 10, 2006

Overview

Given Hilbert spaces

$\mathcal{X}$ – state space,

$\mathcal{U}$ – control space,

$\mathcal{Y}$ – output space,

and operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}: &\quad \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \subset \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}, \\ \mathbf{B}: &\quad \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{X}, \\ \mathbf{C}: &\quad \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}. \end{aligned}$$

Linear Distributed Parameter System (DPS)

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}, \\ \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}, \end{cases} \qquad \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{X},$$

i.e., abstract evolution equation together with observation equation.

Given Hilbert spaces

$\mathcal{X}$ – state space,

$\mathcal{U}$ – control space,

$\mathcal{Y}$ – output space,

and operators

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{A}: & \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \subset \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}, \\ \mathbf{B}: & \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{X}, \\ \mathbf{C}: & \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}. \end{array}$$

Linear Distributed Parameter System (DPS)

$$\Sigma : \left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} \dot{\mathbf{x}} & = & \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}, \\ \mathbf{y} & = & \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}, \end{array} \right. \qquad \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathcal{X},$$

i.e., abstract evolution equation together with observation equation.

Parabolic Systems

The state $x = x(t, \xi)$ is a weak solution of a parabolic PDE with $(t, \xi) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\partial_t x - \nabla(a(\xi).\nabla x) + b(\xi).\nabla x + c(\xi)x = B_{pc}(\xi)u(t), \quad \xi \in \Omega, \ t > 0$$

with initial and boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\xi)x + \beta(\xi)\partial_\eta x &= B_{bc}(\xi)u(t), && \xi \in \partial\Omega, && t \in [0, T] \\ x(0, \xi) &= x_0(\xi) \in \mathcal{X}, && \xi \in \Omega, && \\ y(t) &= C(\xi)x, && \xi \in \Omega, && t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

- $B_{pc} = 0 \implies$ boundary control problem
- $B_{bc} = 0 \implies$ point control problem

Infinite-Dimensional Systems

Assume

- $\mathbf{A}$ generates C_0-semigroup $T(t)$ on $\mathcal{X}$,
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ is exponentially stabilizable, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{F} : \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \mapsto \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{BF}$ generates an exponentially stable C_0-semigroup $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{t})$;
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C})$ is exponentially detectable, i.e., $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$ is exponentially stabilizable;
- $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$ are finite-rank and bounded, e.g., $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^m$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^p$.

Then the system $\Sigma(A, B, C)$ has a transfer function

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B} \in L_\infty.$$

If, in addition, $\mathbf{A}$ is exponentially stable, $\mathbf{G}$ is in the Hardy space H_∞.

Weaker assumptions:
$\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ is Pritchard-Salomon system, allows for certain unboundedness of $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$.

Infinite-Dimensional Systems

Assume

- $\mathbf{A}$ generates C_0-semigroup $T(t)$ on $\mathcal{X}$,
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ is exponentially stabilizable, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{F} : \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \mapsto \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{BF}$ generates an exponentially stable C_0-semigroup $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{t})$;
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C})$ is exponentially detectable, i.e., $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$ is exponentially stabilizable;
- $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$ are finite-rank and bounded, e.g., $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^m$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^p$.

Then the system $\Sigma(A, B, C)$ has a transfer function

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B} \in L_\infty.$$

If, in addition, $\mathbf{A}$ is exponentially stable, $\mathbf{G}$ is in the Hardy space H_∞.

Weaker assumptions:
$\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ is Pritchard-Salomon system, allows for certain unboundedness of $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$.

Infinite-Dimensional Systems

Assume

- $\mathbf{A}$ generates C_0-semigroup $T(t)$ on $\mathcal{X}$,
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ is exponentially stabilizable, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{F} : \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \mapsto \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{BF}$ generates an exponentially stable C_0-semigroup $\mathbf{S(t)}$;
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C})$ is exponentially detectable, i.e., $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$ is exponentially stabilizable;
- $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$ are finite-rank and bounded, e.g., $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^m$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^p$.

Then the system $\Sigma(A, B, C)$ has a transfer function

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B} \in L_\infty.$$

If, in addition, $\mathbf{A}$ is exponentially stable, $\mathbf{G}$ is in the Hardy space H_∞.

Weaker assumptions:
$\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ is Pritchard-Salomon system, allows for certain unboundedness of $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$.

Infinite-Dimensional Systems

Assume

- $\mathbf{A}$ generates C_0-semigroup $T(t)$ on $\mathcal{X}$,
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ is exponentially stabilizable, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{F} : \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \mapsto \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{BF}$ generates an exponentially stable C_0-semigroup $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{t})$;
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C})$ is exponentially detectable, i.e., $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$ is exponentially stabilizable;
- $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$ are finite-rank and bounded, e.g., $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^m$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^p$.

Then the system $\Sigma(A, B, C)$ has a transfer function

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B} \in L_\infty.$$

If, in addition, $\mathbf{A}$ is exponentially stable, $\mathbf{G}$ is in the Hardy space H_∞.

Weaker assumptions:
$\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ is Pritchard-Salomon system, allows for certain unboundedness of $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$.

Infinite-Dimensional Systems

Assume

- $\mathbf{A}$ generates C_0-semigroup $T(t)$ on $\mathcal{X}$,
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ is exponentially stabilizable, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{F} : \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \mapsto \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{BF}$ generates an exponentially stable C_0-semigroup $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{t})$;
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C})$ is exponentially detectable, i.e., $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$ is exponentially stabilizable;
- $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$ are finite-rank and bounded, e.g., $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^m$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^p$.

Then the system $\Sigma(A, B, C)$ has a transfer function

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B} \in L_\infty.$$

If, in addition, $\mathbf{A}$ is exponentially stable, $\mathbf{G}$ is in the Hardy space H_∞.

Weaker assumptions:
$\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ is Pritchard-Salomon system, allows for certain unboundedness of $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$.

Infinite-Dimensional Systems

Assume

- $\mathbf{A}$ generates C_0-semigroup $T(t)$ on $\mathcal{X}$,
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ is exponentially stabilizable, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{F} : \text{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \mapsto \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{BF}$ generates an exponentially stable C_0-semigroup $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{t})$;
- $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C})$ is exponentially detectable, i.e., $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$ is exponentially stabilizable;
- $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$ are finite-rank and bounded, e.g., $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^m$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^p$.

Then the system $\Sigma(A, B, C)$ has a transfer function

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{C}(s\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B} \in L_\infty.$$

If, in addition, $\mathbf{A}$ is exponentially stable, $\mathbf{G}$ is in the Hardy space H_∞.

Weaker assumptions:
$\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ is Pritchard-Salomon system, allows for certain unboundedness of $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$.

(Exponentially) Stable Systems

G is the Laplace transform of

$$\mathbf{h}(t) := \mathbf{C}T(t)\mathbf{B}$$

and symbol of the Hankel operator $\mathbf{H} : L_2(0,\infty;\mathbb{R}^m) \mapsto L_2(0,\infty;\mathbb{R}^p)$,

$$(\mathbf{Hu})(t) := \int_0^\infty \mathbf{h}(t+\tau)u(\tau)\,d\tau.$$

H is compact with countable many singular values σ_j, $j = 1,\dots,\infty$, called the Hankel singular values (HSVs) of **G**. Moreover,

$$\sum_{j=1}^\infty \sigma_j < \infty.$$

HSVs are system invariants, used for approximation similar to truncated SVD. The 2-induced operator norm is the H_∞ norm; here,

$$\|\mathbf{G}\|_{H_\infty} = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \sigma_j.$$

(Exponentially) Stable Systems

$\mathbf{G}$ is the Laplace transform of

$$\mathbf{h}(t) := \mathbf{C}T(t)\mathbf{B}$$

and symbol of the Hankel operator $\mathbf{H} : L_2(0,\infty;\mathbb{R}^m) \mapsto L_2(0,\infty;\mathbb{R}^p)$,

$$(\mathbf{Hu})(t) := \int_0^\infty \mathbf{h}(t+\tau)u(\tau)\,d\tau.$$

$\mathbf{H}$ is compact with countable many singular values σ_j, $j = 1,\ldots,\infty$, called the Hankel singular values (HSVs) of $\mathbf{G}$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{j=1}^\infty \sigma_j < \infty.$$

HSVs are system invariants, used for approximation similar to truncated SVD.
The 2-induced operator norm is the H_∞ norm; here,

$$\|\mathbf{G}\|_{H_\infty} = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \sigma_j.$$

(Exponentially) Stable Systems

$\mathbf{G}$ is the Laplace transform of

$$\mathbf{h}(t) := \mathbf{C}T(t)\mathbf{B}$$

and symbol of the Hankel operator $\mathbf{H} : L_2(0,\infty;\mathbb{R}^m) \mapsto L_2(0,\infty;\mathbb{R}^p)$,

$$(\mathbf{Hu})(t) := \int_0^\infty \mathbf{h}(t+\tau)u(\tau)\,d\tau.$$

$\mathbf{H}$ is compact with countable many singular values σ_j, $j = 1,\ldots,\infty$, called the Hankel singular values (HSVs) of $\mathbf{G}$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{j=1}^\infty \sigma_j < \infty.$$

HSVs are system invariants, used for approximation similar to truncated SVD.
The 2-induced operator norm is the H_∞ norm; here,

$$\|\mathbf{G}\|_{H_\infty} = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \sigma_j.$$

Designing a controller for parabolic control systems requires semi-discretization in space, control design for n-dim. system.

Feedback Controllers

A feedback controller (dynamic compensator) is a linear system of order N, where

- input = output of plant,
- output = input of plant.

Modern (LQG-/$\mathcal{H}_2$-/$\mathcal{H}_\infty$-) control design: $N \geq n$



Real-time control is only possible with controllers of low complexity.

$\rightsquigarrow$ Modern feedback control for parabolic systems w/o model reduction impossible due to large scale of discretized systems.

Model Reduction Based on Balancing

Motivation

Designing a controller for parabolic control systems requires semi-discretization in space, control design for n-dim. system.

Feedback Controllers

A feedback controller (dynamic compensator) is a linear system of order N, where

- input $=$ output of plant,
- output $=$ input of plant.

Modern (LQG-/$\mathcal{H}_2$-/$\mathcal{H}_\infty$-) control design: $N \geq n$



Real-time control is only possible with controllers of low complexity.

$\rightsquigarrow$ Modern feedback control for parabolic systems w/o model reduction impossible due to large scale of discretized systems.

Designing a controller for parabolic control systems requires semi-discretization in space, control design for n-dim. system.

Feedback Controllers

A feedback controller (dynamic compensator) is a linear system of order N, where

- input $=$ output of plant,
- output $=$ input of plant.

Modern (LQG-/$\mathcal{H}_2$-/$\mathcal{H}_\infty$-) control design: $N \geq n$



Real-time control is only possible with controllers of low complexity.

$\rightsquigarrow$ Modern feedback control for parabolic systems w/o model reduction impossible due to large scale of discretized systems.

Designing a controller for parabolic control systems requires semi-discretization in space, control design for n-dim. system.

Feedback Controllers

A feedback controller (dynamic compensator) is a linear system of order N, where

- input $=$ output of plant,
- output $=$ input of plant.

Modern (LQG-/$\mathcal{H}_2$-/$\mathcal{H}_\infty$-) control design: $N \geq n$



Real-time control is only possible with controllers of low complexity.

$\rightsquigarrow$ Modern feedback control for parabolic systems w/o model reduction impossible due to large scale of discretized systems.

Designing a controller for parabolic control systems requires semi-discretization in space, control design for n-dim. system.

Feedback Controllers

A feedback controller (dynamic compensator) is a linear system of order N, where

- input $=$ output of plant,
- output $=$ input of plant.

Modern (LQG-/$\mathcal{H}_2$-/$\mathcal{H}_\infty$-) control design: $N \geq n$



Real-time control is only possible with controllers of low complexity.

$\rightsquigarrow$ Modern feedback control for parabolic systems w/o model reduction impossible due to large scale of discretized systems.

Definition: [Curtain/Glover/(Partington) 1986,1988]

For $\mathbf{G} \in H_\infty$, $\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ is a balanced realization of $\mathbf{G}$ if the controllability and observability Gramians, given by the unique self-adjoint positive semidefinite solutions of the Lyapunov equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{APz} + \mathbf{PA}^*\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{BB}^*\mathbf{z} &= 0 \quad \forall\, \mathbf{z} \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}^*) \\ \mathbf{A}^*\mathbf{Qz} + \mathbf{QAz} + \mathbf{C}^*\mathbf{Cz} &= 0 \quad \forall\, \mathbf{z} \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \end{aligned}$$

satisfy $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Q} = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_j) =: \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$.

Abstract balanced truncation [Glover/Curtain/Partington 1988]

Given balanced realization with

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Q} = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_j) = \mathbf{\Sigma},$$

choose r with $\sigma_r > \sigma_{r+1}$ and partition $\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ according to

$$\mathbf{P}_r = \mathbf{Q}_r = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r),$$

so that

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_r & * \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_r \\ * \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_r & * \end{bmatrix},$$

then the reduced-order model is the stable system $\Sigma_r(\mathbf{A}_r, \mathbf{B}_r, \mathbf{C}_r)$ with transfer function $\mathbf{G}_r$ satisfying

$$\|\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{G}_r\|_{H_\infty} \leq 2 \sum_{j=r+1}^{\infty} \sigma_j.$$

Balanced truncation only applicable for *stable* systems.
Now: unstable systems

Definition: [Curtain 2003].

For $\mathbf{G} \in L_\infty$, $\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ is an LQG-balanced realization of $\mathbf{G}$ if the unique self-adjoint, positive semidefinite, stabilizing solutions of the operator Riccati equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{APz} + \mathbf{PA}^*\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{PC}^*\mathbf{CPz} + \mathbf{BB}^*\mathbf{z} &= 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{z} \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}^*) \\ \mathbf{A}^*\mathbf{Qz} + \mathbf{QAz} - \mathbf{QBB}^*\mathbf{Qz} + \mathbf{C}^*\mathbf{Cz} &= 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{z} \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \end{aligned}$$

are bounded and satisfy $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Q} = \mathrm{diag}(\gamma_j) =: \mathbf{\Gamma}$.
($\mathbf{P}$ stabilizing $\Leftrightarrow$ $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{PC}^*\mathbf{C}$ generates exponentially stable C_0-semigroup.)

LQG Balanced Truncation

LQG Balanced Realization

Balanced truncation only applicable for *stable* systems.
Now: unstable systems

Definition: [Curtain 2003].

For $\mathbf{G} \in L_\infty$, $\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ is an LQG-balanced realization of $\mathbf{G}$ if the unique self-adjoint, positive semidefinite, stabilizing solutions of the operator Riccati equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{APz} + \mathbf{PA}^*\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{PC}^*\mathbf{CPz} + \mathbf{BB}^*\mathbf{z} &= 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{z} \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}^*) \\ \mathbf{A}^*\mathbf{Qz} + \mathbf{QAz} - \mathbf{QBB}^*\mathbf{Qz} + \mathbf{C}^*\mathbf{Cz} &= 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{z} \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathbf{A}) \end{aligned}$$

are bounded and satisfy $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Q} = \mathrm{diag}(\gamma_j) =: \mathbf{\Gamma}$.
($\mathbf{P}$ stabilizing $\Leftrightarrow$ $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{PC}^*\mathbf{C}$ generates exponentially stable C_0-semigroup.)

Abstract LQG Balanced Truncation [Curtain 2003]

Given balanced realization with

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Q} = \mathrm{diag}(\gamma_j) = \mathbf{\Gamma},$$

choose r with $\gamma_r > \gamma_{r+1}$ and partition $\Sigma(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ according to

$$\mathbf{P}_r = \mathbf{Q}_r = \mathrm{diag}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_r),$$

so that

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_r & * \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_r \\ * \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_r & * \end{bmatrix},$$

then the reduced-order model is the LQG balanced system $\Sigma_r(\mathbf{A}_r, \mathbf{B}_r, \mathbf{C}_r)$ with transfer function $\mathbf{G}_r$ satisfying

$$\text{“}\|\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{G}_r\|_{L_\infty}\text{”} \leq 2 \sum_{j=r+1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma_j}{\sqrt{1+\gamma_j^2}}.$$

Computation of Reduced-Order Systems

Spatial discretization (FEM, FDM) $\rightsquigarrow$ finite-dimensional system on $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\dim \mathcal{X}_n = n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= Ax + Bu, \quad x(0) = x_0, \\ y &= Cx, \end{aligned}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n}$, with corresponding

- algebraic Lyapunov equations

$$AP + PA^T + BB^T = 0, \qquad A^TQ + QA + C^TC = 0,$$

- algebraic Riccati equations (AREs)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathcal{R}_f(P) := AP + PA^T - PC^TCP + BB^T, \\ 0 &= \mathcal{R}_c(Q) := A^TQ + QA - QBB^TQ + C^TC. \end{aligned}$$

Computation of Reduced-Order Systems

Spatial discretization (FEM, FDM) $\rightsquigarrow$ finite-dimensional system on $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\dim \mathcal{X}_n = n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= Ax + Bu, \quad x(0) = x_0, \\ y &= Cx, \end{aligned}$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, with corresponding

- algebraic Lyapunov equations

$$AP + PA^T + BB^T = 0, \qquad A^TQ + QA + C^TC = 0,$$

- algebraic Riccati equations (AREs)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathcal{R}_f(P) := AP + PA^T - PC^TCP + BB^T, \\ 0 &= \mathcal{R}_c(Q) := A^TQ + QA - QBB^TQ + C^TC. \end{aligned}$$

Computation of Reduced-Order Systems

Spatial discretization (FEM, FDM) $\rightsquigarrow$ finite-dimensional system on $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $\dim \mathcal{X}_n = n$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{x} &= Ax + Bu, \quad x(0) = x_0, \\
y &= Cx,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, with corresponding

- algebraic Lyapunov equations

$$
AP + PA^T + BB^T = 0, \qquad A^TQ + QA + C^TC = 0,
$$

- algebraic Riccati equations (AREs)

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathcal{R}_f(P) := AP + PA^T - PC^TCP + BB^T, \\
0 &= \mathcal{R}_c(Q) := A^TQ + QA - QBB^TQ + C^TC.
\end{aligned}
$$

Convergence of Gramians

Theorem [Curtain 2003]

Under given assumptions for $\mathbf{\Sigma}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$, the solutions of the algebraic Lyapunov equations on $\mathcal{X}_n$ converge in the nuclear norm to the solutions of the corresponding operator equations and the transfer functions converge in the gap topology if the n-dimensional approximations satisfy the assumptions:

- $\exists$ orthogonal projector $\Pi_n : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}_n$ such that

$$\Pi_n \mathbf{z} \to \mathbf{z} \ (n \to \infty) \quad \forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}, \quad B = \Pi_n \mathbf{B}, \qquad C = \mathbf{C}|_{\mathcal{X}_n}.$$

- For all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $n \to \infty$,

$$e^{At}\Pi_n \mathbf{z} \to T(t)\mathbf{z}, \qquad (e^{At})^* \Pi_n \mathbf{z} \to T(t)^* \mathbf{z},$$

  uniformly in t on bounded intervals.
- A is uniformly exponentially stable.

Convergence of Gramians

Theorem [CURTAIN 2003]

Under given assumptions for $\mathbf{\Sigma}(\mathbf{A},\mathbf{B},\mathbf{C})$, the stabilizing solutions of the algebraic Riccati equations on $\mathcal{X}_n$ converge in the nuclear norm to the solutions of the corresponding operator equations and the transfer functions converge in the gap topology if the n-dimensional approximations satisfy the assumptions:

- $\exists$ orthogonal projector $\Pi_n : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}_n$ such that

  $$\Pi_n \mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{z} \ (n \rightarrow \infty) \quad \forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}, \quad B = \Pi_n \mathbf{B}, \qquad C = \mathbf{C}|_{\mathcal{X}_n}.$$

- For all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$,

  $$e^{At}\Pi_n \mathbf{z} \rightarrow T(t)\mathbf{z}, \qquad (e^{At})^* \Pi_n \mathbf{z} \rightarrow T(t)^* \mathbf{z},$$

  uniformly in t on bounded intervals.
- (A, B, C) is uniformly exponentially stabilizable and detectable.

1. Given the Gramians P, Q of the n-dimensional system from either the Lyapunov equations or AREs in factorized form

$$P = S^T S, \quad Q = R^T R,$$

compute SVD

$$SR^T = [\, U_1, \ U_2 \,] \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_1 & \\ & \Sigma_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_1^T \\ V_2^T \end{bmatrix}.$$

2. Set $\quad W = R^T V_1 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$ and $V = S^T U_1 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$.
3. Then the reduced-order model is

$$(A_r, B_r, C_r) = (W^T A V, W^T B, CV).$$

Thus, need to solve large-scale matrix equations—but need only factors!

PDE Model Reduction

Peter Benner

DPS

Model Reduction Based on Balancing

Motivation

Balanced Truncation

LQG Balanced Truncation

Computation of Reduced-Order Systems

Large Matrix Equations

LQR Problem

Numerical Results

Conclusions and Open Problems

1. Given the Gramians P, Q of the n-dimensional system from either the Lyapunov equations or AREs in factorized form

$$P = S^T S, \quad Q = R^T R,$$

compute SVD

$$SR^T = [\, U_1,\ U_2 \,] \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_1 & \\ & \Sigma_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_1^T \\ V_2^T \end{bmatrix}.$$

2. Set $W = R^T V_1 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$ and $V = S^T U_1 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$.

3. Then the reduced-order model is

$$(A_r, B_r, C_r) = (W^T AV, W^T B, CV).$$

Thus, need to solve large-scale matrix equations—but need only factors!

1. Given the Gramians P, Q of the n-dimensional system from either the Lyapunov equations or AREs in factorized form

$$P = S^T S, \quad Q = R^T R,$$

compute SVD

$$SR^T = [\, U_1, \; U_2 \,] \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_1 & \\ & \Sigma_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_1^T \\ V_2^T \end{bmatrix}.$$

2. Set $\quad W = R^T V_1 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$ and $V = S^T U_1 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$.
3. Then the reduced-order model is

$$(A_r, B_r, C_r) = (W^T AV, W^T B, CV).$$

Thus, need to solve large-scale matrix equations—but need only factors!

1. Given the Gramians P, Q of the n-dimensional system from either the Lyapunov equations or AREs in factorized form

$$P = S^T S, \quad Q = R^T R,$$

compute SVD

$$SR^T = [\, U_1, \; U_2 \,] \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_1 & \\ & \Sigma_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_1^T \\ V_2^T \end{bmatrix}.$$

2. Set $\quad W = R^T V_1 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$ and $V = S^T U_1 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$.
3. Then the reduced-order model is

$$(A_r, B_r, C_r) = (W^T AV, W^T B, CV).$$

Thus, need to solve large-scale matrix equations—but need only factors!

Error Bounds

For control applications, want to estimate/bound

$$\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^m)} \quad \text{or} \quad \|\mathbf{y}(t) - y_r(t)\|_2.$$

Error bound includes approximation errors caused by

- Galerkin projection/spatial FEM discretization,
- model reduction.

Ultimate goal

Balance the discretization and model reduction errors vs. each other in fully adaptive discretization scheme.

Output Error Bound

Assume $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R}^p)$ bounded, $C = \mathbf{C}|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$, $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$. Then:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} &\leq \|\mathbf{y} - y\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} + \|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \\
&= \|\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} - Cx\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} + \|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \\
&\leq \underbrace{\|\mathbf{C}\|}_{=:c} \cdot \underbrace{\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})}}_{\text{FEM error}} + \underbrace{\|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)}}_{\text{model reduction error}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Corollary

Balanced truncation:

$$\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \leq c\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})} + 2\|u\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{j=r+1}^{n} \sigma_j .$$

LQG balanced truncation:

$$\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \leq c\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})} + 2\|u\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{j=r+1}^{n} \frac{\gamma_j}{\sqrt{1+\gamma_j^2}} .$$

Output Error Bound

Assume $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R}^p)$ bounded, $C = \mathbf{C}|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$, $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$. Then:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} &\leq \|\mathbf{y} - y\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} + \|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \\
&= \|\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} - Cx\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} + \|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \\
&\leq \underbrace{\|\mathbf{C}\|}_{=:c} \cdot \underbrace{\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})}}_{\text{FEM error}} + \underbrace{\|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)}}_{\text{model reduction error}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Corollary

Balanced truncation:

$$\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \leq c\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})} + 2\|u\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{j=r+1}^{n} \sigma_j .$$

LQG balanced truncation:

$$\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \leq c\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})} + 2\|u\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{j=r+1}^{n} \frac{\gamma_j}{\sqrt{1+\gamma_j^2}} .$$

Output Error Bound

Assume $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R}^p)$ bounded, $C = \mathbf{C}|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$, $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} &\leq \|\mathbf{y} - y\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} + \|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \\
&= \|\mathbf{Cx} - Cx\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} + \|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \\
&\leq \underbrace{\|\mathbf{C}\|}_{=:c} \cdot \underbrace{\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})}}_{\text{FEM error}} + \underbrace{\|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)}}_{\text{model reduction error}} .
\end{aligned}$$

Corollary

Balanced truncation:

$$\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \leq c\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})} + 2\|u\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{j=r+1}^{n} \sigma_j .$$

LQG balanced truncation:

$$\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \leq c\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})} + 2\|u\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{j=r+1}^{n} \frac{\gamma_j}{\sqrt{1+\gamma_j^2}} .$$

Output Error Bound

Assume $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R}^p)$ bounded, $C = \mathbf{C}|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$, $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$. Then:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} &\le \|\mathbf{y} - y\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} + \|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \\
&= \|\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} - Cx\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} + \|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \\
&\le \underbrace{\|\mathbf{C}\|}_{=:c} \cdot \underbrace{\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})}}_{\text{FEM error}} + \underbrace{\|y - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)}}_{\text{model reduction error}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Corollary

Balanced truncation:

$$\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \le c\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})} + 2\|u\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{j=r+1}^{n} \sigma_j .$$

LQG balanced truncation:

$$\|\mathbf{y} - y_r\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \le c\|\mathbf{x} - x\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathcal{X})} + 2\|u\|_{L_2(0,T;\mathbb{R}^p)} \sum_{j=r+1}^{n} \frac{\gamma_j}{\sqrt{1+\gamma_j^2}} .$$

General form for $A, G = G^T, W = W^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ given and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ unknown:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathcal{L}(Q) := A^T Q + QA + W, \\
0 &= \mathcal{R}(Q) := A^T Q + QA - QGQ + W.
\end{aligned}
$$

In large scale applications from semi-discretized control problems for PDEs,

- $n = 10^3 - 10^6$ ($\Longrightarrow 10^6 - 10^{12}$ unknowns!),
- A has sparse representation ($A = -M^{-1}K$ for FEM),
- G, W low-rank with $G, W \in \{BB^T, C^T C\}$, where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $m \ll n$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n}$, $p \ll n$.
- Standard (eigenproblem-based) $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ methods are not applicable!

General form for $A, G = G^T, W = W^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ given and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ unknown:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathcal{L}(Q) := A^T Q + QA + W, \\
0 &= \mathcal{R}(Q) := A^T Q + QA - QGQ + W.
\end{aligned}
$$

In large scale applications from semi-discretized control problems for PDEs,

- $n = 10^3 - 10^6$ ($\Longrightarrow 10^6 - 10^{12}$ unknowns!),
- A has sparse representation ($A = -M^{-1}K$ for FEM),
- G, W low-rank with $G, W \in \{BB^T, C^T C\}$, where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $m \ll n$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, $p \ll n$.
- Standard (eigenproblem-based) $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ methods are not applicable!

General form for $A, G = G^T, W = W^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ given and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ unknown:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathcal{L}(Q) := A^T Q + QA + W, \\
0 &= \mathcal{R}(Q) := A^T Q + QA - QGQ + W.
\end{aligned}
$$

In large scale applications from semi-discretized control problems for PDEs,

- $n = 10^3 - 10^6$ ($\Longrightarrow 10^6 - 10^{12}$ unknowns!),
- A has sparse representation ($A = -M^{-1}K$ for FEM),
- G, W low-rank with $G, W \in \{BB^T, C^T C\}$, where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $m \ll n$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, $p \ll n$.
- Standard (eigenproblem-based) $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ methods are not applicable!

General form for $A, G = G^T, W = W^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ given and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ unknown:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathcal{L}(Q) := A^T Q + QA + W, \\ 0 &= \mathcal{R}(Q) := A^T Q + QA - QGQ + W. \end{aligned}$$

In large scale applications from semi-discretized control problems for PDEs,

- $n = 10^3 - 10^6$ ($\Longrightarrow 10^6 - 10^{12}$ unknowns!),
- A has sparse representation ($A = -M^{-1}K$ for FEM),
- G, W low-rank with $G, W \in \{BB^T, C^T C\}$, where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $m \ll n$, $\quad C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, $p \ll n$.
- Standard (eigenproblem-based) $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ methods are not applicable!

General form for $A, G = G^T, W = W^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ given and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ unknown:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathcal{L}(Q) := A^T Q + QA + W, \\ 0 &= \mathcal{R}(Q) := A^T Q + QA - QGQ + W. \end{aligned}$$

In large scale applications from semi-discretized control problems for PDEs,

- $n = 10^3 - 10^6$ ($\Longrightarrow 10^6 - 10^{12}$ unknowns!),
- A has sparse representation ($A = -M^{-1}K$ for FEM),
- G, W low-rank with $G, W \in \{BB^T, C^T C\}$, where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $m \ll n$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, $p \ll n$.
- Standard (eigenproblem-based) $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ methods are not applicable!

Low-Rank Approximation

ARE $0 = A^T Q + QA - QBB^T Q + CC^T$

Consider spectrum of ARE solution (analogous for Lyapunov equations).

Example:

- Linear 1D heat equation with point control,
- $\Omega = [0, 1]$,
- FEM discretization using linear B-splines,
- $h = 1/100 \implies n = 101$.



Idea: $Q = Q^T \geq 0 \implies$

$$Q = ZZ^T = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k z_k z_k^T \approx Z^{(r)}(Z^{(r)})^T = \sum_{k=1}^{r} \lambda_k z_k z_k^T.$$

Consider spectrum of ARE solution (analogous for Lyapunov equations).

Example:

- Linear 1D heat equation with point control,
- $\Omega = [0, 1]$,
- FEM discretization using linear B-splines,
- $h = 1/100 \implies n = 101$.



Idea: $Q = Q^T \geq 0 \implies$

$$Q = ZZ^T = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k z_k z_k^T \approx Z^{(r)}(Z^{(r)})^T = \sum_{k=1}^{r} \lambda_k z_k z_k^T.$$

Consider spectrum of ARE solution (analogous for Lyapunov equations).



Example:

- Linear 1D heat equation with point control,
- $\Omega = [0, 1]$,
- FEM discretization using linear B-splines,
- $h = 1/100 \implies n = 101$.

Idea: $Q = Q^T \geq 0 \implies$

$$Q = ZZ^T = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k z_k z_k^T \approx Z^{(r)}(Z^{(r)})^T = \sum_{k=1}^{r} \lambda_k z_k z_k^T.$$

ADI Method for Lyapunov Equations

- For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ stable, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ($w \ll n$), consider Lyapunov equation

$$AX + XA^T = -BB^T.$$

- ADI Iteration: [Wachspress 1988]

$$\begin{aligned} (A + p_k I) X_{(j-1)/2} &= -BB^T - X_{k-1}(A^T - p_k I) \\ (A + \overline{p_k} I) X_k{}^T &= -BB^T - X_{(j-1)/2}(A^T - \overline{p_k} I) \end{aligned}$$

with parameters $p_k \in \mathbb{C}^-$ and $p_{k+1} = \overline{p_k}$ if $p_k \notin \mathbb{R}$.

- For $X_0 = 0$ and proper choice of p_k: $\lim_{k\to\infty} X_k = X$ superlinear.
- Re-formulation using $X_k = Y_k Y_k^T$ yields iteration for Y_k...

ADI Method for Lyapunov Equations

- For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ stable, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ $(w \ll n)$, consider Lyapunov equation
$$AX + XA^T = -BB^T.$$
- ADI Iteration: [WACHSPRESS 1988]
$$\begin{aligned}(A + p_k I)X_{(j-1)/2} &= -BB^T - X_{k-1}(A^T - p_k I)\\ (A + \overline{p_k} I){X_k}^T &= -BB^T - X_{(j-1)/2}(A^T - \overline{p_k} I)\end{aligned}$$
with parameters $p_k \in \mathbb{C}^-$ and $p_{k+1} = \overline{p_k}$ if $p_k \notin \mathbb{R}$.
- For $X_0 = 0$ and proper choice of p_k: $\lim\limits_{k\to\infty} X_k = X$ superlinear.
- Re-formulation using $X_k = Y_k Y_k^T$ yields iteration for Y_k...

ADI Method for Lyapunov Equations

- For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ stable, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ $(w \ll n)$, consider Lyapunov equation

$$AX + XA^T = -BB^T.$$

- ADI Iteration: [Wachspress 1988]

$$\begin{aligned}(A + p_k I)X_{(j-1)/2} &= -BB^T - X_{k-1}(A^T - p_k I)\\ (A + \overline{p_k} I){X_k}^T &= -BB^T - X_{(j-1)/2}(A^T - \overline{p_k} I)\end{aligned}$$

with parameters $p_k \in \mathbb{C}^-$ and $p_{k+1} = \overline{p_k}$ if $p_k \notin \mathbb{R}$.

- For $X_0 = 0$ and proper choice of p_k: $\lim_{k\to\infty} X_k = X$ superlinear.

- Re-formulation using $X_k = Y_k Y_k^T$ yields iteration for Y_k...

ADI Method for Lyapunov Equations

- For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ stable, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ $(w \ll n)$, consider Lyapunov equation
$$AX + XA^T = -BB^T.$$
- ADI Iteration: [Wachspress 1988]
$$\begin{aligned} (A + p_k I)X_{(j-1)/2} &= -BB^T - X_{k-1}(A^T - p_k I) \\ (A + \overline{p_k} I){X_k}^T &= -BB^T - X_{(j-1)/2}(A^T - \overline{p_k} I) \end{aligned}$$
with parameters $p_k \in \mathbb{C}^-$ and $p_{k+1} = \overline{p_k}$ if $p_k \notin \mathbb{R}$.
- For $X_0 = 0$ and proper choice of p_k: $\lim_{k \to \infty} X_k = X$ superlinear.
- Re-formulation using $X_k = Y_k Y_k^T$ yields iteration for Y_k...

Factored ADI Iteration

Lyapunov equation $0 = AX + XA^T = -BB^T$.

Setting $X_k = Y_k Y_k^T$, some algebraic manipulations $\Longrightarrow$

Algorithm [Penzl 1997, Li/White 2002, B./Li/Penzl 1999/2006]

$$V_1 \leftarrow \sqrt{-2\mathrm{Re}\,(p_1)}(A + p_1 I)^{-1}B, \qquad Y_1 \leftarrow V_1$$

FOR $j = 2, 3, \ldots$

$$V_k \leftarrow \sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{Re}\,(p_k)}{\mathrm{Re}\,(p_{k-1})}} \left(V_{k-1} - (p_k + \overline{p_{k-1}})(A + p_k I)^{-1} V_{k-1}\right),$$

$$Y_k \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} Y_{k-1} & V_k \end{bmatrix}$$

At convergence, $Y_{k_{\max}} Y_{k_{\max}}^T \approx X$, where

$$Y_{k_{\max}} = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & \ldots & V_{k_{\max}} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad V_k = \begin{bmatrix} \, \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$$

Note: Implementation in real arithmetic possible by combining two steps.

Factored ADI Iteration

Lyapunov equation $0 = AX + XA^T = -BB^T$.

Setting $X_k = Y_k Y_k^T$, some algebraic manipulations $\Longrightarrow$

Algorithm [Penzl 1997, Li/White 2002, B./Li/Penzl 1999/2006]

$$V_1 \leftarrow \sqrt{-2\mathrm{Re}\,(p_1)}(A + p_1 I)^{-1}B, \qquad Y_1 \leftarrow V_1$$

FOR $j = 2, 3, \ldots$

$$V_k \leftarrow \sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{Re}\,(p_k)}{\mathrm{Re}\,(p_{k-1})}}\left(V_{k-1} - (p_k + \overline{p_{k-1}})(A + p_k I)^{-1}V_{k-1}\right),$$

$$Y_k \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} Y_{k-1} & V_k \end{bmatrix}$$

At convergence, $Y_{k_{\max}} Y_{k_{\max}}^T \approx X$, where

$$Y_{k_{\max}} = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & \ldots & V_{k_{\max}} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad V_k = \Big[\;\Big] \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$$

Note: Implementation in real arithmetic possible by combining two steps.

Newton's Method for AREs

[KLEINMAN '68, MEHRMANN '91, LANCASTER/RODMAN '95, B./BYERS '94/'98, B. '97, GUO/LAUB '99]

- Consider $0 = \mathcal{R}(Q) = C^T C + A^T Q + QA - QBB^T Q.$
- Frechét derivative of $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ at Q:

$$\mathcal{R}'_Q : Z \to (A - BB^T Q)^T Z + Z(A - BB^T Q).$$

- Newton-Kantorovich method:

$$Q_{j+1} = Q_j - \left(\mathcal{R}'_{Q_j}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{R}(Q_j), \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$$

Newton's method (with line search) for AREs

FOR $j = 0, 1, \ldots$

1. $A_j \leftarrow A - BB^T Q_j =: A - BK_j$.
2. Solve the Lyapunov equation $A_j^T N_j + N_j A_j = -\mathcal{R}(Q_j)$.
3. $Q_{j+1} \leftarrow Q_j + t_j N_j$.

END FOR j

Newton's Method for AREs

[Kleinman '68, Mehrmann '91, Lancaster/Rodman '95, B./Byers '94/'98, B. '97, Guo/Laub '99]

- Consider $\quad 0 = \mathcal{R}(Q) = C^T C + A^T Q + QA - QBB^T Q.$
- Frechét derivative of $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ at Q:

$$\mathcal{R}'_Q : Z \to (A - BB^T Q)^T Z + Z(A - BB^T Q).$$

- Newton-Kantorovich method:

$$Q_{j+1} = Q_j - \left(\mathcal{R}'_{Q_j}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{R}(Q_j), \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Newton's method (with line search) for AREs

FOR $j = 0, 1, \dots$

1. $A_j \leftarrow A - BB^T Q_j =: A - BK_j$.
2. Solve the Lyapunov equation $\quad A_j^T N_j + N_j A_j = -\mathcal{R}(Q_j)$.
3. $Q_{j+1} \leftarrow Q_j + t_j N_j$.

END FOR j

Newton's Method for AREs

[Kleinman '68, Mehrmann '91, Lancaster/Rodman '95, B./Byers '94/'98, B. '97, Guo/Laub '99]

- Consider $\quad 0 = \mathcal{R}(Q) = C^T C + A^T Q + QA - QBB^T Q.$
- Frechét derivative of $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ at Q:

$$\mathcal{R}'_Q : Z \to (A - BB^T Q)^T Z + Z(A - BB^T Q).$$

- Newton-Kantorovich method:

$$Q_{j+1} = Q_j - \left(\mathcal{R}'_{Q_j}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{R}(Q_j), \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$$

Newton's method (with line search) for AREs

FOR $j = 0, 1, \ldots$

1. $A_j \leftarrow A - BB^T Q_j =: A - BK_j.$
2. Solve the Lyapunov equation $\quad A_j^T N_j + N_j A_j = -\mathcal{R}(Q_j).$
3. $Q_{j+1} \leftarrow Q_j + t_j N_j.$

END FOR j

Newton's Method for AREs

[Kleinman '68, Mehrmann '91, Lancaster/Rodman '95, B./Byers '94/'98, B. '97, Guo/Laub '99]

- Consider $0 = \mathcal{R}(Q) = C^T C + A^T Q + QA - QBB^T Q.$
- Frechét derivative of $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ at Q:

$$\mathcal{R}'_Q : Z \to (A - BB^T Q)^T Z + Z(A - BB^T Q).$$

- Newton-Kantorovich method:

$$Q_{j+1} = Q_j - \left(\mathcal{R}'_{Q_j}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{R}(Q_j), \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$$

Newton's method (with line search) for AREs

FOR $j = 0, 1, \ldots$

1. $A_j \leftarrow A - BB^T Q_j =: A - BK_j$.
2. Solve the Lyapunov equation $A_j^T N_j + N_j A_j = -\mathcal{R}(Q_j)$.
3. $Q_{j+1} \leftarrow Q_j + t_j N_j$.

END FOR j

Newton's Method for AREs

Properties and Implementation

- Convergence for K_0 stabilizing:
  - $A_j = A - BK_j = A - BB^T Q_j$ is stable $\forall\, j \geq 0$.
  - $\lim_{j\to\infty} \|\mathcal{R}(Q_j)\|_F = 0$ (monotonically).
  - $\lim_{j\to\infty} Q_j = Q_* \geq 0$ (locally quadratic).
- Need large-scale Lyapunov solver; here, ADI iteration: linear systems with dense, but "sparse+low rank" coefficient matrix A_j:

  $A_j \;=\; A \;-\; B \;\cdot\; K_j$

  $= \;$ sparse $\; - \;$ m $\; \cdot \;$

- $m \ll n \implies$ efficient "inversion" using Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula:

$$(A - BK_j)^{-1} = (I_n + A^{-1}B(I_m - K_jA^{-1}B)^{-1}K_j)A^{-1}.$$

- BUT: $Q = Q^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \implies n(n+1)/2$ unknowns!

Newton's Method for AREs

Properties and Implementation

- Convergence for K_0 stabilizing:
  - $A_j = A - BK_j = A - BB^T Q_j$ is stable $\forall\ j \geq 0$.
  - $\lim_{j\to\infty} \|\mathcal{R}(Q_j)\|_F = 0$ (monotonically).
  - $\lim_{j\to\infty} Q_j = Q_* \geq 0$ (locally quadratic).
- Need large-scale Lyapunov solver; here, ADI iteration: linear systems with dense, but "sparse+low rank" coefficient matrix A_j:

$A_j \quad = \quad A \quad - \quad B \quad \cdot \quad K_j$

$\quad\ \ = \quad$ sparse $\quad - \quad m \quad \cdot \quad$ [ ]

- $m \ll n \implies$ efficient "inversion" using Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula:

$$(A - BK_j)^{-1} = (I_n + A^{-1}B(I_m - K_jA^{-1}B)^{-1}K_j)A^{-1}.$$

- BUT: $Q = Q^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \implies n(n+1)/2$ unknowns!

- Convergence for K_0 stabilizing:
  - $A_j = A - BK_j = A - BB^T Q_j$ is stable $\forall\ j \geq 0$.
  - $\lim_{j\to\infty} \|\mathcal{R}(Q_j)\|_F = 0$ (monotonically).
  - $\lim_{j\to\infty} Q_j = Q_* \geq 0$ (locally quadratic).
- Need large-scale Lyapunov solver; here, ADI iteration: linear systems with dense, but "sparse+low rank" coefficient matrix A_j:

$A_j \quad = \quad A \quad - \quad B \quad \cdot \quad K_j$

$= \quad$ sparse $\quad - \quad m \quad \cdot$

- $m \ll n \Longrightarrow$ efficient "inversion" using Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula:

$$(A - BK_j)^{-1} = (I_n + A^{-1}B(I_m - K_j A^{-1}B)^{-1}K_j)A^{-1}.$$

- BUT: $Q = Q^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \Longrightarrow n(n+1)/2$ unknowns!

- Convergence for K_0 stabilizing:
  - $A_j = A - BK_j = A - BB^T Q_j$ is stable $\forall\ j \geq 0$.
  - $\lim_{j\to\infty} \|\mathcal{R}(Q_j)\|_F = 0$ (monotonically).
  - $\lim_{j\to\infty} Q_j = Q_* \geq 0$ (locally quadratic).
- Need large-scale Lyapunov solver; here, ADI iteration: linear systems with dense, but "sparse+low rank" coefficient matrix A_j:

$$A_j = A - B \cdot K_j$$

$$= \text{sparse} - m \cdot \square$$

- $m \ll n \implies$ efficient "inversion" using Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula:

$$(A - BK_j)^{-1} = (I_n + A^{-1}B(I_m - K_jA^{-1}B)^{-1}K_j)A^{-1}.$$

- BUT: $Q = Q^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \implies n(n+1)/2$ unknowns!

Low-Rank Newton-ADI for AREs

Re-write Newton's method for AREs

$$A_j^T N_j + N_j A_j = -\mathcal{R}(Q_j)$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$A_j^T \underbrace{(Q_j + N_j)}_{=Q_{j+1}} + \underbrace{(Q_j + N_j)}_{=Q_{j+1}} A_j = \underbrace{-C^T C - Q_j B B^T Q_j}_{=:-W_j W_j^T}$$

Set $Q_j = Z_j Z_j^T$ for $\mathrm{rank}\,(Z_j) \ll n \Longrightarrow$

$$A_j^T \left(Z_{j+1} Z_{j+1}^T\right) + \left(Z_{j+1} Z_{j+1}^T\right) A_j = -W_j W_j^T$$

Factored Newton Iteration [B./Li/Penzl 1999/2006]

Solve Lyapunov equations for Z_{j+1} directly by factored ADI iteration and use 'sparse + low-rank' structure of A_j.

Low-Rank Newton-ADI for AREs

Re-write Newton's method for AREs

$$A_j^T N_j + N_j A_j = -\mathcal{R}(Q_j)$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$A_j^T \underbrace{(Q_j + N_j)}_{=Q_{j+1}} + \underbrace{(Q_j + N_j)}_{=Q_{j+1}} A_j = \underbrace{-C^T C - Q_j B B^T Q_j}_{=:-W_j W_j^T}$$

Set $Q_j = Z_j Z_j^T$ for $\mathrm{rank}\,(Z_j) \ll n \Longrightarrow$

$$A_j^T \left(Z_{j+1} Z_{j+1}^T\right) + \left(Z_{j+1} Z_{j+1}^T\right) A_j = -W_j W_j^T$$

Factored Newton Iteration [B./Li/Penzl 1999/2006]

Solve Lyapunov equations for Z_{j+1} directly by factored ADI iteration and use 'sparse + low-rank' structure of A_j.

LQR Problem

Linear-Quadratic Regulator Problem

Linear-quadratic optimization problem w/o control/state constraints:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}\in L_2} \int_0^\infty \langle \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t)\rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} + \langle \mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}\, dt$$

subject to $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}, \;\; \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0.$

Solution: feedback control law ($\rightsquigarrow$ static feedback controller)

$$\mathbf{u}(t) = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}(t) := \mathbf{B}^*\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}(t)$$

(with $\mathbf{Q}$ as in LQG operator Riccati equation).
Finite-dimensional approximation is

$$u(t) = K_* x(t) := B^T Q_* x(t),$$

where Q_* is the stabilizing solution of the corresponding ARE.

LQR Problem

Linear-Quadratic Regulator Problem

Linear-quadratic optimization problem w/o control/state constraints:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}\in L_2} \int_0^\infty \langle \mathbf{Cx}(t), \mathbf{Cx}(t)\rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} + \langle \mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \, dt$$

subject to $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{Bu}, \;\; \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0$.

Solution: feedback control law ($\rightsquigarrow$ static feedback controller)

$$\mathbf{u}(t) = \mathbf{Kx}(t) := \mathbf{B}^*\mathbf{Qx}(t)$$

(with $\mathbf{Q}$ as in LQG operator Riccati equation).

Finite-dimensional approximation is

$$u(t) = K_* x(t) := B^T Q_* x(t),$$

where Q_* is the stabilizing solution of the corresponding ARE.

LQR Problem

Linear-Quadratic Regulator Problem

Linear-quadratic optimization problem w/o control/state constraints:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}\in L_2} \int_0^\infty \langle \mathbf{Cx}(t), \mathbf{Cx}(t)\rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} + \langle \mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}\, dt$$

subject to $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{Bu}, \;\; \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}_0.$

Solution: feedback control law ($\rightsquigarrow$ static feedback controller)

$$\mathbf{u}(t) = \mathbf{Kx}(t) := \mathbf{B}^*\mathbf{Qx}(t)$$

(with $\mathbf{Q}$ as in LQG operator Riccati equation).
Finite-dimensional approximation is

$$u(t) = K_* x(t) := B^T Q_* x(t),$$

where Q_* is the stabilizing solution of the corresponding ARE.

K_* can be computed by direct feedback iteration:

- jth Newton iteration:

$$K_j = B^T Z_j Z_j^T = \sum_{k=1}^{k_{\max}} (B^T V_{j,k}) V_{j,k}^T \quad \xrightarrow{j\rightarrow\infty} \quad K_* = B^T Z_* Z_*^T$$

- K_j can be updated in ADI iteration, no need to even form Z_j, need only fixed workspace for $K_j \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$!

Optimal Control from Reduced-Order Model

LQR solution for the reduced-order model yields

$$u_r(t) = K_{r,*}x_r(t) := B_r Q_{r,*}x_r(t).$$

Theorem

Let K_* be the feedback matrix computed from finite-dimensional approximation to LQR problem, $K_{r,*}$ the feedback matrix obtained from the LQR problem for the LQG reduced-order model obtained using the projector VW^T, then

$$K_{r,*} = K_* V^T.$$

Consequence: the reduced-order optimal control can be computed as by-product in the model reduction process!
Similar result for LQG controller.

Optimal Control from Reduced-Order Model

LQR solution for the reduced-order model yields

$$u_r(t) = K_{r,*}x_r(t) := B_r Q_{r,*}x_r(t).$$

Theorem

Let K_* be the feedback matrix computed from finite-dimensional approximation to LQR problem, $K_{r,*}$ the feedback matrix obtained from the LQR problem for the LQG reduced-order model obtained using the projector VW^T, then

$$K_{r,*} = K_* V^T.$$

Consequence: the reduced-order optimal control can be computed as by-product in the model reduction process!

Similar result for LQG controller.

- Linear 2D heat equation with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary and point control/observation.
- FD discretization on uniform 150×150 grid.
- $n = 22.500$, $m = p = 1$, 10 shifts for ADI iterations.
- Convergence of large-scale matrix equation solvers:



Performance of Newton's method for accuracy $\sim 1/n$

grid	unknowns	$\frac{\|\mathcal{R}(P)\|_F}{\|P\|_F}$	it. (ADI it.)	CPU (sec.)
8×8	2,080	4.7e-7	2 (8)	0.47
16×16	32,896	1.6e-6	2 (10)	0.49
32×32	524,800	1.8e-5	2 (11)	0.91
64×64	8,390,656	1.8e-5	3 (14)	7.98
128×128	134,225,920	3.7e-6	3 (19)	79.46

Here,

- Convection-diffusion equation,
- $m = 1$ input and $p = 2$ outputs,
- $Q = Q^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \Rightarrow \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ unknowns.

Numerical Results
Model Reduction Performance

- Numerical ranks of Gramians are 31 and 26, respectively.
- Computed reduced-order model (BT): $r = 6$ ($\sigma_7 = 5.8 \cdot 10^{-4}$),
- BT error bound $\delta = 1.7 \cdot 10^{-3}$.



- Computed reduced-order model (BT): $r = 6$, BT error bound $\delta = 1.7 \cdot 10^{-3}$.
- Solve LQR problem: quadratic cost functional, solution is linear state feedback.
- Computed controls and outputs (implicit Euler):





Numerical Results

Model Reduction Performance

- Computed reduced-order model (BT): $r = 6$, BT error bound $\delta = 1.7 \cdot 10^{-3}$.
- Solve LQR problem: quadratic cost functional, solution is linear state feedback.
- Errors in controls and outputs:



Numerical Results

Model Reduction Performance: BT vs. LQG BT

- Boundary control problem for 2D heat flow in copper on rectangular domain; control acts on two sides via Robins BC.
- FDM $\rightsquigarrow$ $n = 4496$, $m = 2$; 4 sensor locations $\rightsquigarrow$ $p = 4$.
- Numerical ranks of BT Gramians are 68 and 124, respectively, for LQG BT both have rank 210.
- Computed reduced-order model: $r = 10$.



Source: *COMPl$_e$ib* v1.1, `www.compleib.de`.

Numerical Results

Model Reduction Performance: BT vs. LQG BT

- Boundary control problem for 2D heat flow in copper on rectangular domain; control acts on two sides via Robins BC.
- FDM $\rightsquigarrow$ $n = 4496$, $m = 2$; 4 sensor locations $\rightsquigarrow$ $p = 4$.
- Numerical ranks of BT Gramians are 68 and 124, respectively, for LQG BT both have rank 210.
- Computed reduced-order model: $r = 10$.





Source: *COMPl$_e$ib* v1.1, `www.compleib.de`.

Numerical Results

Model Reduction Performance: BT vs. LQG BT

- Boundary control problem for 2D heat flow in copper on rectangular domain; control acts on two sides via Robins BC.
- FDM $\rightsquigarrow$ $n = 4496$, $m = 2$; 4 sensor locations $\rightsquigarrow$ $p = 4$.
- Numerical ranks of BT Gramians are 68 and 124, respectively, for LQG BT both have rank 210.
- Computed reduced-order model: $r = 10$.





Source: *COMPl$_e$ib* v1.1, `www.compleib.de`.

BT is often criticized for its bias towards the input-output behavior of the system. But states can also be reconstructed using

$$x(t) \approx Vx_r(t).$$

Example: 2D heat equation with localized heat source, 64×64 grid, $r = 6$ model by BT, simulation for $u(t) = 10\cos(t)$.

BT is often criticized for its bias towards the input-output behavior of the system. But states can also be reconstructed using

$$x(t) \approx V x_r(t).$$

Example: 2D heat equation with localized heat source, 64×64 grid, $r = 6$ model by BT, simulation for $u(t) = 10\cos(t)$.



BT is often criticized for its bias towards the input-output behavior of the system. But states can also be reconstructed using

$$x(t) \approx Vx_r(t).$$

Example: 2D heat equation with localized heat source, 64×64 grid, $r = 6$ model by BT, simulation for $u(t) = 10\cos(t)$.





Numerical Results

BT modes are intelligent ansatz functions for Galerkin projection



Conclusions and Open Problems

- BT (and LQG) BT perform well for model reduction of (as of yet, simple) parabolic PDE control problems.
- Robust control design can be based on LQG BT (see CURTAIN 2004).
- Need more numerical tests.
- Find implementations for other balancing schemes (H_∞-/bounded real BT,...).
- Open Problems:
  - Optimal combination of FEM and BT error estimates/bounds — use convergence of Hankel singular values for control of mesh refinement?
  - BT modes are intelligent ansatz functions for (Petrov-)Galerkin projection—how to exploit?
  - Application to nonlinear problems: for some semilinear problems, BT approaches seem to work well.

Conclusions and Open Problems

- BT (and LQG) BT perform well for model reduction of (as of yet, simple) parabolic PDE control problems.
- Robust control design can be based on LQG BT (see Curtain 2004).
- Need more numerical tests.
- Find implementations for other balancing schemes (H_∞-/bounded real BT,...).
- Open Problems:
  - Optimal combination of FEM and BT error estimates/bounds — use convergence of Hankel singular values for control of mesh refinement?
  - BT modes are intelligent ansatz functions for (Petrov-)Galerkin projection—how to exploit?
  - Application to nonlinear problems: for some semilinear problems, BT approaches seem to work well.

Conclusions and Open Problems

- BT (and LQG) BT perform well for model reduction of (as of yet, simple) parabolic PDE control problems.
- Robust control design can be based on LQG BT (see CURTAIN 2004).
- Need more numerical tests.
- Find implementations for other balancing schemes (H_∞-/bounded real BT,...).
- Open Problems:
  - Optimal combination of FEM and BT error estimates/bounds — use convergence of Hankel singular values for control of mesh refinement?
  - BT modes are intelligent ansatz functions for (Petrov-)Galerkin projection—how to exploit?
  - Application to nonlinear problems: for some semilinear problems, BT approaches seem to work well.

Conclusions and Open Problems

- BT (and LQG) BT perform well for model reduction of (as of yet, simple) parabolic PDE control problems.
- Robust control design can be based on LQG BT (see Curtain 2004).
- Need more numerical tests.
- Find implementations for other balancing schemes (H_∞-/bounded real BT,...).
- Open Problems:
  - Optimal combination of FEM and BT error estimates/bounds — use convergence of Hankel singular values for control of mesh refinement?
  - BT modes are intelligent ansatz functions for (Petrov-)Galerkin projection—how to exploit?
  - Application to nonlinear problems: for some semilinear problems, BT approaches seem to work well.

Conclusions and Open Problems

- BT (and LQG) BT perform well for model reduction of (as of yet, simple) parabolic PDE control problems.
- Robust control design can be based on LQG BT (see CURTAIN 2004).
- Need more numerical tests.
- Find implementations for other balancing schemes (H_∞-/bounded real BT,...).
- Open Problems:
  - Optimal combination of FEM and BT error estimates/bounds — use convergence of Hankel singular values for control of mesh refinement?
  - BT modes are intelligent ansatz functions for (Petrov-)Galerkin projection—how to exploit?
  - Application to nonlinear problems: for some semilinear problems, BT approaches seem to work well.

Ad(é)



Thank you for your attention!