



Journal Paper

“Anderson Corollary Based on New Approximation
Method for Continuous Interval Systems.”

-IEEE-

Jagadish Kumar Bokami

Department of Electrical Engineering, National Institute of Technology Raipur, India

jagadishjaggu01@gmail.com

Vinay Pratap Singh

Department of Electrical Engineering, Malaviya National Institute of Technology Jaipur, India

vinaymnnit@gmail.com

Sharada Nandam Raw

Department of Mathematics , National Institute of Technology Raipur, India

shardaraw@gmail.com

Ramesh Devarapalli

Department of Electrical Engineering, BIT Sindri, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India

ramesh.ee@bitsindri.ac.in

Fausto Pedro García Márquez

Ingenium Research Group, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

FaustoPedro.Garcia@uclm.es

Cite as: Bokam, J. K., Singh, V. P., Raw, S. N., Devarapalli, R., & Márquez, F. P. G. (2021). Anderson Corollary Based on New Approximation Method for Continuous Interval Systems. IEEE Access, 9, 43601-43610.

DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3062873

Date of publication xxxx 00, 0000, date of current version xxxx 00, 0000.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.DOI

Anderson corollary based on new approximation method for continuous interval systems

JAGADISH KUMAR BOKAM¹, VINAY PRATAP SINGH², SHARADA NANDAN RAW³, RAMESH DEVARAPALLI⁴, and FAUSTO PEDRO GARCÍA MÁRQUEZ⁵

¹Department of Electrical Engineering, National Institute of Technology Raipur, India;(e-mail: jagadishjaggu01@gmail.com)

²Department of Electrical Engineering, Malaviya National Institute of Technology Jaipur, India; (e-mail: vinaymnit@gmail.com)

³Department of Mathematics , National Institute of Technology Raipur, India;(e-mail: shardaraw@gmail.com)

⁴Department of Electrical Engineering, BIT Sindri, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India;(e-mail: ramesh.ee@bitsindri.ac.in)

⁵Ingenium Research Group, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain; (e-mail:FaustoPedro.Garcia@uclm.es; orcid: 0000-0002-9245-440X)

Corresponding author: (e-mail: FaustoPedro.Garcia@uclm.es; Tel.: (+34 926295300 ext. 623091).

The work reported herewith has been financially by the Dirección General de Universidades, Investigación e Innovación de Castilla-La Mancha, under Research Grant ProSeaWind project (Ref.: SBPLY/19/180501/000102).

ABSTRACT In this research, a new technique is developed for reducing the order of high-order continuous interval systems. The model denominator is derived using Anderson corollary and Routh table. Numerator is derived by matching the formulated Markov parameters (MPs) and time moments (TMs). Distinctive features of the proposed approach are: (i) New and simpler expressions for MPs and TMs; (ii) Retaining not only TMs but also MPs while deriving the model; (iii) Minimizing computational complexity while preserving the essential characteristics of system; (iv) Ensuring to produce a stable model for stable system; (v) No need to invert the system transfer function denominator while obtaining the TMs and MPs; and (vi) No need to solve a set of complex interval equations while deriving the model. Two single-input-single-output test cases are considered to illustrate the proposed technique. Comparative analysis is also presented based on the results obtained. The simplicity and effectiveness of the proposed technique are established from the simulation outcomes achieved.

INDEX TERMS Interval systems, Kharitonov polynomials, Markov parameter, Time moments, Modelling, Routh approximation.

I. INTRODUCTION

FOR real world applications, the description of physical systems, in terms of mathematical models, produces high-order transfer functions generally. These transfer functions are relatively complex for in-depth analysis, computer simulations, and controller design [1], [2]. Therefore, the analysis and controller design of such systems become a challenging task. The simplification of such high-order transfer functions into low-order models can be considered as a possible solution. The simplification should be processed so that that the low-order models should retain the dominant characteristics of high-order systems. The simplification offers remarkable features , e.g., reduction in computational effort during simulating the behavior of system, feasible controller design, better understanding of the dynamic behavior of the system, etc. [3].

In literature, a large number of order reduction techniques

are available for non-interval systems both in continuous and discrete time domains [4]. These methods include aggregation matrix [5], power decomposition method [6], pole retention technique [7], time moment matching technique [8], Routh stability criterion [9], Pade approximation [10], Hurwitz polynomial based approximation [11], stability preservation method [12], etc. In spite of the availability of several reduction techniques, only a few among these are extended for order reduction of interval systems. The main reason behind this are involvement of complex interval arithmetic and difficulty in stability analysis of model. Kharitonov [13] proposed, a breakthrough result to verify the robust stability of interval system. This result, known as Kharitonov theorem, attracted many researchers in the field of modelling and system analysis of continuous and discrete interval systems.

Many practical systems in engineering industries possess uncertainties in parameters during entire range of operat-

ing conditions [14], [15]. These uncertainties in the system parameters occur due to sensor noises, nonlinear effects, actuator constraints, internal and external disturbances, aging effect, manual errors, etc. The consideration of uncertainties in model of the system itself turns out to a transfer function having interval parameters [16]–[18]. The transfer function having interval parameters is known as interval systems. Some practical systems, mathematically modelled as interval systems, are cold rolling mill, DC shunt motor, oblique wing aircraft, and Riverol-Pilipovik water treatment [19], [20]. The interval transfer functions of cold rolling mill, DC shunt motor, oblique wing aircraft, and Riverol-Pilipovik water treatment are given, respectively, in (1), (2), (3) and (4).

$$G(s) = \frac{[0.5, 2.6] + [3, 16]s + [4.2, 21]s^2}{[0.05, 0.15] + [1, 2.5]s + [3, 8]s^2 [1, 1]s^3} \quad (1)$$

$$G(s) = \frac{[50000, 50000]}{[2025, 2475]s + [1200, 2800]s^2 + [9.6, 33.6]s^3} \quad (2)$$

$$G(s) = \frac{[900, 1660] + [54, 74]s}{[-1, 1] + [301, 339]s + [504, 808]s^2 + [28, 46]s^3 + 10s^4} \quad (3)$$

$$G(s) = \begin{bmatrix} G_{11}(s) & G_{12}(s) \\ G_{21}(s) & G_{22}(s) \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

The interval transfer function of $G_{11}(s)$, $G_{12}(s)$, $G_{21}(s)$, and $G_{22}(s)$ are given as below

$$G_{11}(s) = \frac{0.0045(0.104s) + 1}{(0.012s^2)}$$

$$G_{12}(s) = 0$$

$$G_{21}(s) = \frac{[900, 1660] + [54, 74]s}{[-1, 1] + [301, 339]s + [504, 808]s^2 + [28, 46]s^3 + 10s^4}$$

$$G_{22}(s) = \frac{10(-3s + 1)}{s^2 + 5s + 1}$$

In the transfer functions given in (1)-(4), the coefficients of numerator and denominator polynomials are varying in definite intervals.

The pioneering work for order reduction of continuous interval system is proposed by Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [21] based on Routh-Pade technique. Here, denominator of the model is obtained by direct truncation of Routh table and numerator is derived using matching of coefficients of power series expansion of the system to model. But, in [22], it is shown that this method generates unstable interval models for stable high-order interval systems in few cases. To overcome this limitation, the formula given in [21], is modified while constructing the elements of Routh table. The resulting reduced-order interval models are assumed to be stable. Further, Yang [23] proved that the method developed in [22] also does not ensure stability of reduced model in all cases. Finally, Dolgin [24] inserted two additional conditions while constructing the elements of Routh table to overcome the problem of unstable denominator polynomial.

Recently, other methods have also been developed for order reduction of interval systems. A reduction technique based on Routh approximation (RA) using Kharitonov polynomial is presented in [25]. In [26], a direct RA method for reduction of interval systems is observed to generate

a stable reduced model. The article [27] proposed reduction employing optimization techniques like particle swarm optimization. Also, mixed technique is suggested in [28], where the numerator of the model is obtained using classical reduction methods like Caue second form, Pade approximation, differentiation and moment matching method, and the denominator is calculated by differentiation method. A variable substitution method is developed in [29], where overshoot of the non-linear system is considered as an major criteria for controller design. An linear matrix criteria was developed for singular fractional order system with order $0 < \alpha < 1$ from non singular decomposition method and stability theory [30]. Zhang and Yang [31] developed a new control strategy that guarantees the prescribed tracking performance for a class of uncertain nonlinear single system with unknown control direction. Kumar *et al.* [32] developed a technique to derive denominator and numerator of an interval model from Routh approximation using Kharitonov polynomials. In article [33], a class of control problems for multi-input-multi-output (MIMO) unknown Euler-Lagrange systems with output constrained are investigated, and also fault-tolerant control technique is effective to compensate for the actuator faults which ensure reliability of the dynamic system like inverted pendulum. Hote *et al.* [34] proposed a non-interval reduced model for a high-order interval system. The denominator of the model is derived from Anderson corollary and Routh approximation whereas the numerator is calculated by matching steady-state value of system to that of model. The reduced model obtained from this technique does not contain interval values of steady-state of high-order system. Recently, Singh *et al.* [35] formulated expressions for calculation of MPs and TMs. Further, Routh-Pade approximation for simplification of high-order interval systems employing the derived MPs and TMs is proposed in [35].

In this investigation, two simple generalized expressions for calculating the Markov parameters (MPs) and time moments (TMs) of continuous interval systems are proposed. Unlike the other methods, this method does not require to invert the denominator of transfer functions of the system and model nor an additional step of solving a set of interval equations for calculating MPs and TMs. Firstly, denominator of model is derived using Anderson corollary and direct truncation of Routh table. Secondly, the coefficients of numerator polynomial of the model are achieved by equating some MPs and TMs of the system with those of the model. Considering the matching of TMs, the steady-state response is improved, while the matching of MPs improves transient response matching. The key highlights of the proposed method are:

- Simpler expressions for MPs and TMs are developed.
- Both MPs and TMs are retained while deriving the model.
- The method is simple and involves relatively lesser computations.
- The proposed model preserves the essential characteristics of system.

- It generates stable model for stable system.
- There is no requirement of inversion of denominator of transfer function of the system to calculate TMs.
- There is no need to solve a set of complex interval equations for deriving the MPs and TMs.

The overview of article is as follows: problem formulation is discussed in Section 2; the generalized expressions of MPs and TMs of interval system are derived in Section 3; Section 4 discusses procedure to derive model; Section 5 includes the demonstration of proposed technique with the help of two test systems; and, finally Section 6 provides conclusions.

II. PROPOSED TECHNIQUE

The high-order continuous interval system (HOCIS) can be expressed by equation (5)

$$G_n(s) = \frac{P_n(s)}{Q_n(s)} = \frac{P_0 + P_1s + P_2s^2 + \dots + P_{n-1}s^{n-1}}{Q_0 + Q_1s + Q_2s^2 + \dots + Q_ns^n} \quad (5)$$

where

$$P_i = [P_i^-, P_i^+] \quad (6)$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ and

$$Q_i = [Q_i^-, Q_i^+] \quad (7)$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$.

$P_n(s)$ and $Q_n(s)$ are, respectively, the numerator and denominator interval polynomials of HOCIS. The parameters P_i^- and Q_i^- are the lower limits, and P_i^+ and Q_i^+ are the upper limits of interval coefficients. Expansions of HOCIS, (5), about $s = 0$ and $s = \infty$, respectively, are expressed as

$$G_n(s) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1s + \dots + \alpha_k s^k + \dots \quad (8)$$

$$G_n(s) = \beta_1s^{-1} + \beta_2s^{-2} + \dots + \beta_k s^{-k} + \dots \quad (9)$$

where, $\alpha_i = [\alpha_i^-, \alpha_i^+]$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $\beta_i = [\beta_i^-, \beta_i^+]$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ are TMs and MPs of interval system respectively.

The adequate k th-order reduced order continuous interval model (ROCIM) of the system given in (5) is represented by (10)

$$G_k(s) = \frac{p_k(s)}{q_k(s)} = \frac{u_0 + u_1s + \dots + u_{k-1}s^{k-1}}{v_0 + v_1s + \dots + v_k s^k} \quad (10)$$

Where $k < n$, being

$$u_i = [u_i^-, u_i^+] \quad (11)$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ and

$$v_i = [v_i^-, v_i^+] \quad (12)$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$.

$p_k(s)$ and $q_k(s)$ are, respectively, interval polynomials of ROCIM. The model (10), is expressed in terms of TMs and MPs by equations (13) and (14)

$$G_k(s) = \hat{\alpha}_0 + \hat{\alpha}_1 s + \dots + \hat{\alpha}_k s^k + \dots \quad (13)$$

(expansion about $s = 0$)

$$G_k(s) = \hat{\beta}_1 s^{-1} + \hat{\beta}_2 s^{-2} + \dots + \hat{\beta}_k s^{-k} + \dots \quad (14)$$

(expansion about $s = \infty$)

where

$$\hat{\alpha}_i = [\hat{\alpha}_i^-, \hat{\alpha}_i^+] \quad (15)$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and

$$\hat{\beta}_i = [\hat{\beta}_i^-, \hat{\beta}_i^+] \quad (16)$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

III. PROPOSED GENERALIZED EXPRESSIONS OF TMS AND MPS

In order to simplify the problem of calculating TMs and MPs of the interval system, the HOCIS, given in (5), is rewritten as equation (17)

$$G_n(s) = \frac{P_n(s)}{Q_n(s)} = \frac{[P_0^-, P_0^+] + [P_1^-, P_1^+]s + [P_2^-, P_2^+]s^2 + \dots + [P_{n-1}^-, P_{n-1}^+]s^{n-1}}{\bar{Q}_0 + \bar{Q}_1s + \bar{Q}_2s^2 + \dots + \bar{Q}_ns^n} \quad (17)$$

It is to be noted that the coefficients of the denominator polynomial $\bar{Q}_n(s)$ are fixed values instead of interval coefficients of $Q_n(s)$. These fixed values are mid-points of the intervals, which are calculated using equation (18)

$$\bar{Q}_i = (Q_i^- + Q_i^+)/2 \quad (18)$$

where $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Therefore, about $s = 0$ and $s = \infty$, power series expansions of (17), respectively, are given as

$$G_n(s) = \frac{P_n(s)}{Q_n(s)} = \alpha_0 + \frac{[P_1^-, P_1^+] - \alpha_0 \bar{Q}_1}{\bar{Q}_0} s + \frac{[P_2^-, P_2^+] - \alpha_0 \bar{Q}_2 - \alpha_1 \bar{Q}_1}{\bar{Q}_0} s^2 + \dots \quad (19)$$

$$G_n(s) = \frac{P_n(s)}{Q_n(s)} = \beta_1 s^{-1} + \frac{[P_{n-2}^-, P_{n-2}^+] - \beta_1 \bar{Q}_{n-1}}{\bar{Q}_n} s^{-2} + \frac{[P_{n-3}^-, P_{n-3}^+] - \beta_1 \bar{Q}_{n-2} - \beta_2 \bar{Q}_{n-1}}{\bar{Q}_n} s^{-3} + \dots \quad (20)$$

where, $\alpha_0 = \frac{[P_0^-, P_0^+]}{\bar{Q}_0}$ and $\beta_1 = \frac{[P_{n-1}^-, P_{n-1}^+]}{\bar{Q}_n}$

Using (8) and (19), the generalized expression for TMs of continuous interval system (5) can be written by equation (21)

$$\alpha_m = \frac{P_m - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \alpha_i \bar{Q}_{m-i}}{\bar{Q}_0}, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (21)$$

By comparing (9) and (20), the generalized expression for MPs of continuous interval system, given in (5), are expressed by equation (22)

$$\beta_m = \frac{P_{n-m} - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \beta_i \bar{Q}_{n-m+i}}{\bar{Q}_n}, \quad m = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (22)$$

In a similar manner, TMs and MPs (Appendix A) of ROCIM (10) turn out to be given by equations (23) and (24)

$$\hat{\alpha}_m = \frac{u_m - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \hat{\alpha}_i \bar{v}_{m-i}}{\bar{v}_0}, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (23)$$

$$\hat{\beta}_m = \frac{P_{k-m} - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \hat{\beta}_i \bar{v}_{k-m+i}}{\bar{v}_k}, \quad m = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (24)$$

IV. PRINCIPAL RESULTS

To illustrate the effectiveness and applicability of proposed TMs and MPs, Anderson corollary based improved Routh-Pade approximation is proposed in this section.

A. PROPOSED LEMMA FOR APPROXIMATION OF THIRD-ORDER INTERVAL SYSTEM

The desired first-order and second-order continuous interval models of a third-order continuous interval system is given by equation (25)

$$G_3(s) = \frac{P_3(s)}{Q_3(s)} = \frac{[P_0^-, P_0^+] + [P_1^-, P_1^+]s + [P_2^-, P_2^+]s^2}{[Q_0^-, Q_0^+] + [Q_1^-, Q_1^+]s + [Q_2^-, Q_2^+]s^2 + [Q_3^-, Q_3^+]s^3} \quad (25)$$

where equation can (25) be represented by equation (26)

$$G_1(s) = \frac{p_1(s)}{q_1(s)} = \frac{u_0}{v_1s + v_0} \quad (26)$$

$$G_2(s) = \frac{p_2(s)}{q_2(s)} = \frac{u_1s + u_0}{v_2s^2 + v_1s + v_0} \quad (27)$$

The procedure to obtain the desired and reduced models are discussed below.

1) Procedure to calculate the denominator

The coefficients of denominator polynomial are obtained employing Anderson corollary [34]. The procedure is described as follows:

Step 1: Apply Anderson corollary [34] on HOCIS. After application, (25) can be expressed by equation (28)

$$G(s) = \frac{P_0^- + P_1^+s + P_2^+s^2}{Q_0^+ + Q_1^-s + Q_2^-s^2 + Q_3^+s^3} \quad (28)$$

Step 2: Construct Routh table for denominator polynomial of (28) as presented in Table 1.

Step 3: Obtain denominator polynomial from $(n+1-k)$ and $(n+2-k)$ rows of the Routh table (Table 1).

TABLE 1. Routh table

s^3	Q_3^+	Q_1^-
s^2	Q_2^-	Q_0^+
s^1	$\frac{Q_2^-Q_1^- - Q_3^+Q_0^+}{Q_2^-} = X$	
s^0	Q_0^+	

The denominator polynomials $q_1(s)$ and $q_2(s)$ of the first-order and second-order models, $G_1(s)$ and $G_2(s)$, respectively, become equations (29) and (30)

$$\begin{aligned} q_1(s) &= v_1s + v_0 \\ &= Xs + Q_0^+ \\ &= \frac{Q_2^-Q_1^- - Q_3^+Q_0^+}{Q_2^-}s + Q_0^+ \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} q_2(s) &= v_2s^2 + v_1s + v_0 \\ &= Q_2^-s^2 + Xs + Q_0^+ \\ &= Q_2^-s^2 + \frac{Q_2^-Q_1^- - Q_3^+Q_0^+}{Q_2^-}s + Q_0^+ \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

2) Procedure to calculate the numerator

The coefficients of unknown numerator polynomial are achieved by equating some initial TMs and MPs of HOCIS and ROCIM as

$$\alpha_i = \hat{\alpha}_i \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, (\mu - 1) \quad (31)$$

and

$$\beta_i = \hat{\beta}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, \lambda \quad (32)$$

where, $\mu + \lambda = k$ and $\mu \geq 1$. At least one time moment of HOCIS and ROCIM is matched by considering $\mu \geq 1$, which guarantees a better matching of steady-state response between original system and model, and also matching of Markov parameters improve the transient-state response.

The new and simple expressions for calculating time moments $(\alpha_i, \hat{\alpha}_i)$ and Markov parameters $(\beta_i, \hat{\beta}_i)$ of HOCIS and ROCIM are proposed in Section III.

B. PROPOSED LEMMA FOR APPROXIMATION OF SECOND-ORDER INTERVAL SYSTEM:

Let the desired first-order continuous interval model of a second-order continuous interval system to be given by equation (33)

$$G_2(s) = \frac{P_2(s)}{Q_2(s)} = \frac{[P_0^-, P_0^+] + [P_1^-, P_1^+]s}{[Q_0^-, Q_0^+] + [Q_1^-, Q_1^+]s + [Q_2^-, Q_2^+]s^2} \quad (33)$$

be represented by equation (34)

$$G_1(s) = \frac{p_1(s)}{q_1(s)} = \frac{u_0}{v_1s + v_0} \quad (34)$$

The procedure to obtain the desired first-order model is discussed below.

1) Procedure to calculate the denominator

The coefficients of denominator polynomial are obtained using Anderson corollary [34]. The procedure is illustrated below.

Step 1: Apply Anderson corollary [34] on HOCIS. Hence, (33) becomes as equation (35)

$$G(s) = \frac{P_0^- + P_1^+ s}{Q_0^+ + Q_1^- s + Q_2^- s^2} \quad (35)$$

Step 2: Construct the Routh table for (35). The Routh table for (35) is provided in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Routh table

s^2	Q_2^+	Q_0^-
s^1	Q_1^-	
s^0	Q_0^-	

Step 3: Obtain the denominator polynomial from Routh table (Table 2).

The denominator $q_1(s)$ of the first-order model can be achieved from Routh table (Table 2) as given by equation (36)

$$q_1(s) = v_1 s + v_0 = Q_1^- s + Q_0^- \quad (36)$$

2) Procedure to calculate the numerator

The coefficient of numerator, $u_0(s)$, is derived by equating initial TM of HOCIS and ROCIM such that

$$\alpha_0 = \hat{\alpha}_0 \quad (37)$$

By using equations (21) and (23) from Section III, equation (37) becomes as

$$\frac{P_0}{Q_0} = \frac{u_0}{v_0} \quad (38)$$

the matching of initial time moment will improves the steady-state responses between HOCIS and ROCIM. The formulas for calculating the time moments ($\alpha, \hat{\alpha}_0$) of HOCIS and ROCIM are given Section III.

V. TEST CASES

Two test systems are taken into consideration to demonstrate procedure and performance of the proposed technique.

A. TEST CASE 1:

Consider a single-input-single-output (SISO) third-order interval system given by equation (39)

$$G_3(s) = \frac{[2, 3]s^2 + [17.5, 18.5]s + [15, 16]}{[2, 3]s^3 + [17, 18]s^2 + [35, 36]s + [20.5, 21.5]} \quad (39)$$

The desired first-order and second-order interval models of (39) are given by equations (40) and (41)

$$G_1(s) = \frac{p_1(s)}{q_1(s)} = \frac{u_0}{v_1 s + v_0} \quad (40)$$

and

$$G_2(s) = \frac{p_2(s)}{q_2(s)} = \frac{u_1 s + u_0}{v_2 s^2 + v_1 s + v_0} \quad (41)$$

1) Calculation of denominator polynomial

The coefficients of denominator polynomial are calculated as follows

Step 1: Utilizing (28), the high-order interval system (39) modifies to equation (42)

$$G(s) = \frac{15 + 18.5s + 3s^2}{21.5 + 35s + 17s^2 + 3s^3} \quad (42)$$

Step 2: The Routh table for (42) is provided in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Routh table

s^3	3	35
s^2	17	21.5
s^1	31.2	
s^0	21.5	

Step 3: The denominator of the first-order interval model, (40), obtained using (29), is given by equation (43)

$$q_1(s) = 31.2s + 21.5 \quad (43)$$

The denominator of the second-order interval model, (41), calculated using (30), is written as equation (44)

$$q_2(s) = 17s^2 + 31.2s + 21.5 \quad (44)$$

2) Calculation of numerator polynomial

The initial TMs and MPs of the HOCIS, (39), calculated from (21) and (22), are given by equations (45-47)

$$\alpha_0 = [0.714, 0.762] \quad (45)$$

$$\alpha_1 = [-0.455, -0.326] \quad (46)$$

$$\beta_1 = [0.8, 1.2] \quad (47)$$

The numerator polynomial of first-order model, (40), can be obtained by equating first TM of HOCIS and ROCIM by equation (48)

$$\hat{\alpha}_0 = \alpha_0 \quad (48)$$

Using (23) and (45), the numerator polynomial obtained is given by equation (49)

$$[u_0^-, u_0^+] = [14.99, 16.002] \quad (49)$$

Therefore, the desired first-order interval model, $G_1(s)$, obtained using (43) and (49), becomes equation (50)

$$G_1(s) = \frac{[14.99, 16.002]}{31.2s + 21.5} \quad (50)$$

Similarly, the numerator polynomial of desired second-order model, (41), can be calculated by matching initial TMs and MPs, such that $\hat{\alpha}_0 = \alpha_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_1 = \beta_1$. Using (23), (45), (24) and (47), the numerator coefficients of (41) turn out to be given by equation (51-52)

$$[u_0^-, u_0^+] = [14.99, 16.002] \quad (51)$$

$$[u_1^-, u_1^+] = [13.6, 20.4] \quad (52)$$




FIGURE 1. Step responses of models and original system.




FIGURE 2. Impulse responses of models and original system.

Therefore, the desired second-order interval model, $G_2(s)$, obtained using (51), (52) and (44) takes the form given by equation (53)

$$G_2(s) = \frac{[12.5, 16.8]s + [15.35, 16.38]}{17s^2 + 31.2s + 21.5} \quad (53)$$

To prove the efficacy of proposed technique, the obtained proposed model of (39) is compared with the other approx-

imants obtained using existing methods. The second-order approximants of (39) obtained using methods from Kumar *et al.* [32], Hote *et al.* [34], Singh *et al.* [35], Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [36], Sastry *et al.* [37], and Kumar *et al.* [38] are given in equations (54)-(59), respectively.

$$G_{MK}(s) = \frac{[1.172, 1.36]s + [1.0269, 1.11]}{[1, 1]s^2 + [2.35, 2.62]s + [1.41, 1.52]} \quad (54)$$




FIGURE 3. Bode responses of models and original system.

$$G_H(s) = \frac{15}{17s^2 + 31.2s + 21.5} \quad (55)$$

$$G_{SD}(s) = \frac{[8.27, 24.05]s + [14.35, 16.77]}{[17, 18]s^2 + [29.47, 35.7]s + [20.5, 21.5]} \quad (56)$$

$$G_B(s) = \frac{[1.01, 1.26]s + [0.841, 1.12]}{[1.0, 1.0]s^2 + [2.02, 2.45]s + [1.15, 1.51]} \quad (57)$$

$$G_{Sa}(s) = \frac{[0.94, 1.35]s + [0.891, 1.167]}{[1, 1]s^2 + [2.02, 2.45]s + [1.15, 1.51]} \quad (58)$$

$$G_K(s) = \frac{[11.12, 20.38]s + [14.17, 16.94]}{[17.01, 18.04]s^2 + [31.38, 33.61]s + [20.31, 21.71]} \quad (59)$$

Therefore, the initial TMs and MPs for system, proposed model, and models obtained due to various existing techniques are calculated and provided in Table 4. From the data tabulated in Table 4, the TMs of system are [0.714,0.762], and [-0.455,-0.326], whereas those of the proposed model are [0.714,0.762] and [-0.525,-0.255]. Therefore, it is clear that TMs of system and proposed model are matching very closely. However, the TMs of models obtained using other existing methods Kumar *et al.* [32], Hote *et al.* [34], Singh *et al.* [35], Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [36], Sastry *et al.* [37], and Kumar *et al.* [38] are, respectively, ([0.703,0.761], [-0.491,-0.259]), (0.697, -1.012), ([0.683,0.799], [-0.851,0.085]), ([0.635,0.843], [-0.658,-0.121]), ([0.672,0.881], [-0.774,-0.113]), and ([0.675,0.807], [-0.715,-0.074]). From these values, it is evident that TMs due to the techniques proposed by Kumar *et al.* [32], Hote *et al.* [34], Singh *et al.* [35], Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [36], Sastry *et al.* [37], and Kumar *et al.* [38] are having larger deviation from those of the system. Also, it can be noted here that the TMs of the model proposed

by Hote *et al.* [34] is having non-interval values. Therefore, from this analysis, it is clearly proven that the proposed method is able to produce interval TMs, which are closer to those of the system when compared to the TMs obtained for other techniques.

The Markov parameter of HOCIS and ROCIMs obtained by different techniques from literature are provided in Table 4. It is clearly observed that Markov parameter of proposed model is [0.74,1.001], which is closer to the Markov parameter of system, i.e., [0.8,1.2]. However, the Markov parameter of models due to the techniques proposed by Kumar *et al.* [32], Hote *et al.* [34], Singh *et al.* [35], Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [36], Sastry *et al.* [37], and Kumar *et al.* [38] are, respectively, given as [1.172,1.368], [0.8823], [0.473,1.374], [1.009,1.255], [0.941,1.349], and [0.639,1.169]. This data clearly shows that the MP of other techniques due to Kumar *et al.* [32], Hote *et al.* [34], Singh *et al.* [35], Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [36], Sastry *et al.* [37], and Kumar *et al.* [38] are having more deviation. Moreover, in case of model proposed by Hote *et al.* [34], it is clear that it is producing non-interval MP. Hence, it is clearly seen that the proposed method is generating interval MP, which are closer to that of the system as compared to other techniques considered. Figure 1 shows the step responses of system (39), model (53) obtained by proposed method, and models (54)-(59) derived by methods existing in literature due to Kumar *et al.* [32], Hote *et al.* [34], Singh *et al.* [35], Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [36], Sastry *et al.* [37] and Kumar *et al.* [38]. From Figure 1, it is clearly observable that the step response of proposed model (53) is matching closely to that of the original system (39) than step responses of the other models (54)-(59). The same holds true for both

TABLE 4. Time moments and Markov parameter of system and models.

System/models	Authors	First two TMs	First MP
(39)	System	$\alpha_0=[0.714, 0.762]$ $\alpha_1=[-0.455, -0.326]$	$\beta_1=[0.8, 1.2]$
(53)	Proposed method	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[0.714, 0.762]$ $\hat{\alpha}_1=[-0.525, -0.255]$	$\hat{\beta}_1=[0.74, 1.001]$
(54)	Kumar <i>et al.</i> [32]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[0.703, 0.761]$ $\hat{\alpha}_1=[-0.491, -0.259]$	$\hat{\beta}_1=[1.172, 1.368]$
(55)	Hote <i>et al.</i> [34]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=0.697$ $\hat{\alpha}_1=-1.012$	$\hat{\beta}_1=0.8823$
(56)	Singh <i>et al.</i> [35]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[0.683, 0.799]$ $\hat{\alpha}_1=[-0.851, 0.085]$	$\hat{\beta}_1=[0.473, 1.374]$
(57)	Bandyopadhyay <i>et al.</i> [36]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[0.635, 0.843]$ $\hat{\alpha}_1=[-0.658, -0.121]$	$\hat{\beta}_1=[1.009, 1.255]$
(58)	Sastry <i>et al.</i> [37]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[0.672, 0.881]$ $\hat{\alpha}_1=[-0.774, -0.113]$	$\hat{\beta}_1=[0.941, 1.349]$
(59)	Kumar <i>et al.</i> [38]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[0.675, 0.807]$ $\hat{\alpha}_1=[-0.715, -0.074]$	$\hat{\beta}_1=[0.639, 1.169]$




FIGURE 4. Step responses of models and original system.

impulse and frequency responses as given in Figures 2 and 3. From the above discussion, it can be concluded that the proposed approximant is more efficient in performance than the other approximants in terms of transient and steady state response matching.

B. TEST SYSTEM 2:

A second-order interval system is given by equation (60)

$$G(s) = \frac{[2.0, 3.0] s + [15.0, 16.0]}{[2.0, 3.0] s^2 + [12.0, 13.0] s + [10.0, 11.0]} \quad (60)$$

and its desired first-order transfer function be of the form according to equation (61)

$$G_1(s) = \frac{u_0}{v_1 s + v_0} \quad (61)$$




FIGURE 5. impulse responses of models and original system.




FIGURE 6. Bode responses of models and original system.

The first-order interval model for (60) using (37) and (38) turns out to be given equation (62)

$$G_1(s) = \frac{[13.64, 16]}{12s + 10} \quad (62)$$

While the first-order models obtained due to the techniques proposed by Hote *et al.* [34], Sastry *et al.* [37], Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [21] and Singh and Chandra [39] are given by equation (63-66)

$$G_1(s) = \frac{15}{12s + 11} \quad (63)$$

$$G_{Sa}(s) = \frac{[1.05, 1.467]}{[1, 1]s + [0.77, 0.917]} \quad (64)$$

$$G_B(s) = \frac{[12.58, 19.072]}{[12, 13]s + [9.23, 11.92]} \quad (65)$$

$$G_{SC}(s) = \frac{[12.58, 19.072]}{[12, 13]s + [9.23, 11.92]} \quad (66)$$

The first TM of system (60) and models (62)-(66) are calculated and tabulated in Table 5. Table 5 shows that the first TM of the original system (60) and model (62) obtained by the proposed method are exactly the same. However, the first TM of other models (63)-(66) obtained using existing methods are deviating from the TM of original system (60).

TABLE 5. Time moments of system and models.

System/ models	Authors	Time moment
(60)	System	$\alpha_0=[1.36, 1.6]$
(62)	Proposed method	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[1.36, 1.6]$
(63)	Hote <i>et al.</i> [34]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=0.697$
(64)	Sastry <i>et al.</i> [37]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[1.15, 1.91]$
(65)	Bandyopadhyay <i>et al.</i> [21]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[1.06, 2.07]$
(66)	Singh and Chandra [39]	$\hat{\alpha}_0=[1.06, 2.07]$

Figures 4-6 represent comparison of the step, impulse and frequency responses of the original system (60) with the proposed model (62) and other models (63)-(66). It is clear that response of proposed model (62) is very close to original system (60) than other models (63)-(66). The steady-state response of proposed model is same as of original system. This shows that proposed method is efficient in producing better approximant for interval systems.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This research work shows a computationally efficient and simpler algorithm for reducing high-order interval systems. In addition to proposing the new efficient algorithm for reducing continuous interval systems, simpler generalized expressions for calculating MPs and TMs are also proposed in such a manner so that there is no requirement of inversion of transfer function. Also, a solution of a set of interval

equations can successfully be evaded while obtaining these parameters. The denominator of proposed model is derived using Anderson corollary and Routh approximation while numerator is obtained by equating initial TMs and MPs of system and model. The steady-state and transient-state responses of proposed model match closely to those of system. Two SISO test systems are considered to demonstrate the proposed technique. The simulation results prove that the proposed technique offers an excellent alternative approach for reducing the order of continuous interval systems. The future research directions of this technique lies in design of control using reduced order modeling.

APPENDIX A

Rewriting ROCIM (10) as equation (67)

$$G_k(s) = \frac{p_k(s)}{q_k(s)} = \frac{[u_0^-, u_0^+] + [u_1^-, u_1^+]s + [u_2^-, u_2^+]s^2 + \dots + [u_{k-1}^-, u_{k-1}^+]s^{k-1}}{\bar{v}_0 + \bar{v}_1s + \bar{v}_2s^2 + \dots + \bar{v}_ks^k} \quad (67)$$

The power series expansions of (67) about $s = 0$ is given by equation (68)

$$G_k(s) = \hat{\alpha}_0 + \frac{[u_1^-, u_1^+] - \hat{\alpha}_0 \bar{v}_1}{\bar{v}_0} s + \frac{[u_2^-, u_2^+] - \hat{\alpha}_0 \bar{v}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_1 \bar{v}_1}{\bar{v}_0} s^2 + \dots \quad (68)$$

By matching (68) and (13), the TMs of interval model (10) can be written by equation (69)

$$\hat{\alpha}_m = \frac{u_m - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \hat{\alpha}_i \bar{v}_{m-i}}{\bar{v}_0}, \quad m = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (69)$$

The same procedure is used to obtain MPs of interval model by expanding (10) around $s = \infty$ and comparing it with (14).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by SERB, DST, Government of India (ECR/2017/000212) and the ENDURUNS project, European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (Research Grant Agreement H2020-MG-2018-2019-2020 n.824348). The authors like to thankful for the assistance received from the TEQIP CRS project ID 1-5766329561 program for the research work.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Singh, V. Singh, and V. Singh, "Analytic hierarchy process based approximation of high-order continuous systems using tlbo algorithm," *International Journal of Dynamics and Control*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 53–60, 2019.
- [2] C. Germoso, J. L. Duval, and F. Chinesta, "Harmonic-modal hybrid reduced order model for the efficient integration of non-linear soil dynamics," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 10, no. 19, p. 6778, 2020.

- [3] V. Singh, "Sine cosine algorithm based reduction of higher order continuous systems," in 2017 International Conference on Intelligent Sustainable Systems (ICISS). IEEE, 2017, pp. 649–653.
- [4] U. Zulfiqar, V. Sreram, and X. Du, "Time-limited pseudo-optimal h 2-model order reduction," IET Control Theory & Applications, vol. 14, no. 14, pp. 1995–2007, 2020.
- [5] S. Lamba and S. Rao, "Aggregation matrix for the reduced-order continued fraction expansion model of chen and shieh," IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 81–83, 1978.
- [6] C. Liaw, C.-T. Pan, and M. Ouyang, "Model reduction of discrete systems using the power decomposition method and the system identification method," in IEE Proceedings D (Control Theory and Applications), vol. 133, no. 1. IET, 1986, pp. 30–34.
- [7] Y. Shamash, "Linear system reduction using pade approximation to allow retention of dominant modes," International Journal of Control, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 257–272, 1975.
- [8] S. Biradar, Y. V. Hote, and S. Saxena, "Reduced-order modeling of linear time invariant systems using big bang big crunch optimization and time moment matching method," Applied Mathematical Modelling, vol. 40, no. 15-16, pp. 7225–7244, 2016.
- [9] V. Krishnamurthy and V. Seshadri, "Model reduction using the routh stability criterion," IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 729–731, 1978.
- [10] Y. Shamash, "Model reduction using the routh stability criterion and the pade approximation technique," International Journal of Control, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 475–484, 1975.
- [11] R. Appiah, "Linear model reduction using hurwitz polynomial approximation," International Journal of Control, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 477–488, 1978.
- [12] R. C. Selga, B. Lohmann, and R. Eid, "Stability preservation in projection-based model order reduction of large scale systems," European journal of control, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 122–132, 2012.
- [13] V. L. Kharitonov, "The asymptotic stability of the equilibrium state of a family of systems of linear differential equations," Differentsial'nye Uravneniya, vol. 14, no. 11, pp. 2086–2088, 1978.
- [14] B. Pariyar and R. Wagle, "Mathematical modeling of isolated wind-diesel-solar photo voltaic hybrid power system for load frequency control," arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05616, 2020.
- [15] N. Karkar, K. Benmhammed, and A. Bartil, "Parameter estimation of planar robot manipulator using interval arithmetic approach," Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 5289–5295, 2014.
- [16] F. P. G. Márquez, "A new method for maintenance management employing principal component analysis," Structural Durability & Health Monitoring, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 89, 2010.
- [17] F. G. Marquez, "An approach to remote condition monitoring systems management," 2006.
- [18] D. Li, S. Zhang, and Y. Xiao, "Interval optimization-based optimal design of distributed energy resource systems under uncertainties," Energies, vol. 13, no. 13, p. 3465, 2020.
- [19] A. K. Choudhary and S. K. Nagar, "Order reduction in z-domain for interval system using an arithmetic operator," Circuits, Systems, and Signal Processing, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 1023–1038, 2019.
- [20] —, "Model order reduction of discrete-time interval systems by differentiation calculus," Automatic Control and Computer Sciences, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 402–411, 2018.
- [21] B. Bandyopadhyay, O. Ismail, and R. Gorez, "Routh-pade approximation for interval systems," IEEE transactions on automatic control, vol. 39, no. 12, pp. 2454–2456, 1994.
- [22] Y. Dolgin and E. Zeheb, "On routh-pade model reduction of interval systems," IEEE transactions on automatic control, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 1610–1612, 2003.
- [23] S.-F. Yang, "Comments on" on routh-pade model reduction of interval systems"; IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 273–274, 2005.
- [24] Y. Dolgin, "Author's reply [to comments on"on routh-pade model reduction of interval systems"]; IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 274–275, 2005.
- [25] N. Selvagesan, "Mixed method of model reduction for uncertain systems," Serbian Journal of Electrical Engineering, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2007.
- [26] G. Sastry and M. Sivakumar, "Direct routh approximation method for linear siso uncertain systems reduction," International Journal of Applied Engineering Research, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 91–98, 2010.
- [27] D. K. Saini and R. Prasad, "Order reduction of linear interval systems using particle swarm optimization," MIT International Journal of Electrical and Instrumentation Engineering, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 16–19, 2011.
- [28] D. K. Kumar, S. Nagar, and J. Tiwari, "A new algorithm for model order reduction of interval systems," Bonfring International Journal of Data Mining, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 06–11, 2013.
- [29] J.-X. Zhang and G.-H. Yang, "Low-complexity tracking control of strict-feedback systems with unknown control directions," IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 64, no. 12, pp. 5175–5182, 2019.
- [30] X. Zhang and Y. Chen, "Admissibility and robust stabilization of continuous linear singular fractional order systems with the fractional order α : the $0 < \alpha < 1$ case," ISA transactions, vol. 82, pp. 42–50, 2018.
- [31] J.-X. Zhang and G.-H. Yang, "Prescribed performance fault-tolerant control of uncertain nonlinear systems with unknown control directions," IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 6529–6535, 2017.
- [32] M. S. Kumar, N. V. Anand, and R. S. Rao, "Impulse energy approximation of higher-order interval systems using kharitonov's polynomials," Transactions of the Institute of Measurement and Control, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 1225–1235, 2016.
- [33] J.-X. Zhang and G.-H. Yang, "Fault-tolerant output-constrained control of unknown euler-lagrange systems with prescribed tracking accuracy," Automatica, vol. 111, p. 108606, 2020.
- [34] Y. V. Hote, A. N. Jha, and J. R. Gupta, "Reduced order modelling for some class of interval systems," International Journal of Modelling and Simulation, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 63–69, 2014.
- [35] V. Singh, D. P. S. Chauhan, S. P. Singh, and T. Prakash, "On time moments and markov parameters of continuous interval systems," Journal of Circuits, Systems and Computers, vol. 26, no. 03, p. 1750038, 2017.
- [36] B. Bandyopadhyay, A. Upadhye, and O. Ismail, "spl gamma/spl delta/routh approximation for interval systems," IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 42, no. 8, pp. 1127–1130, 1997.
- [37] G. Sastry, G. R. Rao, and P. M. Rao, "Large scale interval system modelling using routh approximants," Electronics Letters, vol. 36, no. 8, pp. 768–769, 2000.
- [38] D. K. Kumar, S. Nagar, and J. Tiwari, "Model order reduction of interval systems using mihailov criterion and cauer second form," International Journal of Computer Applications, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 17–21, 2011.
- [39] V. P. Singh and D. Chandra, "Routh-approximation based model reduction using series expansion of interval systems," in 2010 International Conference on Power, Control and Embedded Systems. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1–4.



and applications of optimization.

BOKAM J.K. graduated from JNTUH, Visakhapatnam, India in 2008 with B.Tech degree in Electrical and Electronics Engineering. He received M.Tech degree in control and Instrumentation in Electrical Engineering in 2011 from National institute of technology Calicut (NITC), India. Currently, he is working as Assistant professor in GITAM college of Engineering, Visakhapatnam, India. His research interests include Interval systems, order reduction techniques, controller design



SINGH V.P. graduated from UPTU, Lucknow, India in 2007 with B.Tech degree in Electrical Engineering. He received M.Tech degree in control and Instrumentation and Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering in 2009 and 2013, respectively, from MNIT, Allahabad, India. Currently, he is working as assistant professor in MNIT, Jaipur, India. His research interests include Interval systems, model order reduction and applications of optimization.



RAW S. N. received his Bachelor of Science and Master of Science from Banaras Hindu University (BHU) and he received his Ph.D. degree from ISM DhanbDr. S. N. Rawad. He is currently working as Assistant Professor in Department of mathematics, NIT, Raipur. He is a life time members of International Association of Engineers, Hong Kong, Indian Mathematical Society, India and Indian Science Congress Association, India. He has published more than 20 research papers in reputed

international journals including Thomson Reuters (SCI Web of Science) and conferences it's also available online. His main research work focuses on Disease Dynamics, Real World Problems, Chaos Theory and Dynamical Systems. He has 7 years of teaching experience and 4 years of Research Experience.



RAMESH DEVARAPALLI currently working as Assistant professor in the department of electrical engineering, BIT Sindri, Dhanbad. He did his M.Tech from IIT (BHU), Varanasi in 2012 and pursuing PhD from IIT (ISM), Dhanbad, India. His research interest includes power system stability, renewable source integration into the grid, and power system operation and control.



FAUSTO PEDRO GARCÍA MÁRQUEZ works at UCLM as Full Professor (Accredited as Full Professor from 2013), Spain, Honorary Senior Research Fellow at Birmingham University, UK, Lecturer at the Postgraduate European Institute, and he has been Senior Manager in Accenture (2013-2014). He obtained his European PhD with a maximum distinction. He has been distinguished with the prizes: Runner Prize for Management Science and Engineering Management Nominated

Prize (2020), and Advancement Prize (2018), First International Business Ideas Competition 2017 Award (2017); Runner (2015), Advancement (2013) and Silver (2012) by the International Society of Management Science and Engineering Management (ICMSEM); Best Paper Award in the international journal of Renewable Energy (Impact Factor 3.5) (2015). He has published more than 150 papers, some recognized as: "Applied Energy" (Q1, as "Best Paper 2020"), "Renewable Energy" (Q1, as "Best Paper 2014"); "ICMSEM" (as "excellent"), "Int. J. of Automation and Computing" and "IMechE Part F: J. of Rail and Rapid Transit" (most downloaded), etc. He is author and editor of 25 books (Elsevier, Springer, Pearson, Mc-GrawHill, Intech, IGI, Marcombo, AlfaOmega,...), and 5 patents. He is Editor of 5 Int. Journals, Committee Member more than 40 Int. Conferences. He has been Principal Investigator in 4 European Projects, 6 National Projects, and more than 150 projects for Universities, Companies, etc. His main interest are: Artificial Intelligence, Maintenance, Management, Renewable Energy, Transport, Advanced Analytics, Data Science. He is being expert in the European Union in AI4People (EISMD), and ESF. He is Director of www.ingeniumgroup.eu

...