

# From data to reduced-order models via generalized balanced truncation

Azka M. Burohman, Bart Besselink, Jacquelin M. A. Scherpen, M. Kanat Camlibel,

**Abstract**—This paper proposes a data-driven model reduction approach on the basis of noisy data. Firstly, the concept of data reduction is introduced. In particular, we show that the set of reduced-order models obtained by applying a Petrov-Galerkin projection to all systems explaining the data characterized in a large-dimensional quadratic matrix inequality (QMI) can again be characterized in a lower-dimensional QMI. Next, we develop a data-driven generalized balanced truncation method that relies on two steps. First, we provide necessary and sufficient conditions such that systems explaining the data have common generalized Gramians. Second, these common generalized Gramians are used to construct projection matrices that allow to characterize a class of reduced-order models via generalized balanced truncation in terms of a lower-dimensional QMI by applying the data reduction concept. Additionally, we present alternative procedures to compute a priori and a posteriori upper bounds with respect to the true system generating the data. Finally, the proposed techniques are illustrated by means of application to an example of a system of a cart with a double-pendulum.

**Index Terms**—Data-driven model reduction, data informativity, generalized balancing, error bounds

## I. INTRODUCTION

Model reduction refers to the problem of constructing low-dimensional system models that accurately approximate complex high-dimensional systems. Traditionally, model reduction techniques solve this problem by deriving low-dimensional models on the basis of the given high-dimensional model through suitable operations such as projection. In the field of systems and control, roughly two classes of model reduction techniques can be distinguished for linear systems: methods based on energy functions such as balanced truncation [1]–[4] and optimal Hankel norm approximation [5], and methods based on interpolation and/or moment matching [6]–[9], sometimes also referred to as Krylov methods. Extensions to nonlinear systems have emerged in the form of nonlinear balancing methods [10], [11] and nonlinear moment matching techniques [9], [12]. We refer the reader to [13]–[15] for details on a variety of existing model reduction methods.

Azka Muji Burohman, Bart Besselink and Kanat Camlibel are with the Bernoulli Institute for Mathematics, Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence, University of Groningen, Nijenborgh 9, 9747 AG, Groningen, The Netherlands. Azka Muji Burohman is also with the Engineering and Technology Institute Groningen (ENTEG), University of Groningen, Nijenborgh 4, 9747 AG, Groningen, The Netherlands. Jacquelin M. A. Scherpen is with the Engineering and Technology Institute Groningen (ENTEG), University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands. The authors are also with the Jan C. Willems Center for Systems and Control, Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Groningen, The Netherlands (e-mail: a.m.burohman@rug.nl, b.besselink@rug.nl, j.m.a.scherpen@rug.nl, m.k.camlibel@rug.nl)

This paper is based on research developed in the DSSC Doctoral Training Programme, co-funded through a Marie Skłodowska-Curie COFUND (DSSC 754315).

Since recently, the problem of *data-driven* model reduction is attracting increasing attention, partly motivated by the widespread availability of measurement data. Here, low-order models are constructed directly on the basis of measurement data, thus not requiring the availability of a high-order model. We emphasize that these data-driven model reduction approaches differ from traditional approaches in which, first, a high-order model is derived using system identification techniques and, second, existing model-based techniques for model reduction are used. Nevertheless, standard (model-based) model reduction techniques have inspired various data-driven techniques.

First, in the class of energy-based methods for linear systems, to which this paper belongs, [16], [17] propose a data-driven balanced truncation method from *persistently exciting* data and [18] estimates Gramians from frequency and time-domain data based on their quadrature form. For nonlinear systems, empirical balanced truncation is presented in [19], [20], whereas data-driven reduction for monotone nonlinear systems is considered in [21]. Second, in the class of interpolatory methods, we begin by mentioning contributions to data-driven reduction methods on the basis of frequency-domain data by the Loewner framework [22]. In this method, noise-free frequency-domain data are formulated to construct Loewner matrix pencils to enable the construction of state-space models. Extensions of this approach aim at constructing reduced-order models preserving stability [23] and achieving  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -optimality [24]. In addition, the use of Loewner methods based on time-domain data and noisy frequency-domain data is pursued in [25] and [26], respectively. Besides the Loewner framework, data-driven moment matching techniques have been presented in [9] and [27], where the latter exploits the so-called data informativity framework.

Despite these developments, existing methods for data-driven model reduction do often not allow for guaranteeing system properties such as asymptotic stability and do not provide an error bound, especially when the available data is subject to noise. In this paper, we develop a data-driven reduction technique that provides such guarantees on the low-order model, even for noisy data. Specifically, this paper has the following contributions.

First, we introduce the concept of *data reduction* via a Petrov-Galerkin projection. Following the data informativity framework of [28], we characterize the class of systems that are consistent with the measurement data for a given noise model in terms of a quadratic matrix inequality (QMI). Then, we define the class of reduced-order systems as the set of systems obtained by applying the Petrov-Galerkin projection

to all systems explaining the noisy data. Importantly, we show that this class of reduced-order systems can again be characterized in terms of a quadratic matrix inequality, but one of *lower dimension*. As the relevant matrix variables in this QMI depend only on the measurement data, noise model and projection matrices, this can be regarded as *data reduction*.

The second contribution of this paper is the development of a data-driven generalized balanced truncation method. Here, we characterize the set of all reduced-order models obtained by applying generalized balanced truncation to the class of systems explaining the noisy data. This relies on the following two steps. As the first step, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for all systems explaining the data to have a *common* generalized controllability and *common* generalized observability Gramian. In this case, we say that the data are *informative* for generalized Lyapunov balancing. These conditions heavily rely on the so-called matrix S-lemma from [29] and again build on the data informativity framework of [28]. We note that this framework has also been successfully applied in solving various control problems, e.g., data-driven  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control [29]. The second step comprises the use of the common generalized Gramians to obtain the Petrov-Galerkin projection that achieves (generalized) balanced truncation (see [30] for details on generalized balanced truncation for a single given system). This allows for the application of the data reduction concept and yields the desired class of reduced-order models in terms of a low-dimensional quadratic matrix inequality.

This data-driven model reduction procedure has various desirable properties by virtue of the inherent advantages of using a balancing-type reduction method. Namely, all reduced-order models are guaranteed to be asymptotically stable and satisfy an *a priori* error bound. However, the ordinary *a priori* upper bound from model-based reduction methods, e.g., [13], [30], does not determine the error between a selected reduced-order model (from the class of reduced-order models) to the true system generating the data because the true system is unknown. Therefore, as the final contribution of this paper, we provide two alternative error bounds. First, we compute a uniform *a priori* upper bound, i.e., an error bound that holds for any chosen high-order system explaining the data and any reduced-order model. The computation of this error bound again exploits the QMI characterization of the class of (reduced-order) systems, together with the bounded real lemma. Second, we also present an *a posteriori* error bound that is uniform over all systems explaining the data for a *selected* reduced-order system.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we provide appropriate background material on Petrov-Galerkin model reduction and generalized balanced truncation. Section III deals with the data reduction problem through the Petrov-Galerkin projection. The problem formulation of informativity for Lyapunov balancing is given in Section IV, followed by the main results containing necessary and sufficient conditions for generalized Lyapunov balancing, a characterization of the set of reduced-order models and error bounds in Sections IV-A, IV-B, and IV-C, respectively. In Section V, an illustrative example is provided to show how the

set of reduced-order models is extracted from data. Finally, the paper closes with some concluding remarks in Section VI. For the sake of completeness, some important results and proofs are presented in the Appendix.

*Notation.* We denote  $M > 0$  ( $M \geq 0$ ) and  $M < 0$  ( $M \leq 0$ ) for positive and negative (semi-) definite symmetric matrices, respectively. We denote the number of negative, zero, and positive eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix  $M$  by  $v_-(M)$ ,  $v_0(M)$ , and  $v_+(M)$ , respectively. The *inertia* of  $M$  is denoted by  $\text{In}(M) = (v_-(M), v_0(M), v_+(M))$ . For a symmetric matrix  $M$  partitioned as

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{12}^\top & M_{22} \end{bmatrix},$$

its Schur complement with respect to  $M_{22}$  is denoted by  $M/M_{22}$ , i.e.,  $M/M_{22} := M_{11} - M_{12}M_{22}^{-1}M_{12}^\top$ . For a square matrix  $A$ , its spectral radius is denoted by  $\rho(A)$  and the sum of its main diagonal elements is denoted by  $\text{trace}(A)$ . We denote  $\text{blkdiag}(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$  for a block diagonal matrix of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & A_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

The matrix  $I_j$  denotes the identity matrix of size  $j$ . For a discrete-time linear system  $\Sigma$ , its  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm is denoted by  $\|\Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty}$ . For a system  $\Sigma$  having realization  $(A, B, C, D)$  and transfer function  $G(z) = C(zI - A)^{-1}B + D$ , the norm  $\|\Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty}$  is defined by  $\|\Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \|G(e^{i\omega})\|$ .

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Model reduction via a Petrov-Galerkin projection

Consider the discrete-time input/state/output system

$$\Sigma : \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(k+1) &= A\mathbf{x}(k) + B\mathbf{u}(k), \\ \mathbf{y}(k) &= C\mathbf{x}(k) + D\mathbf{u}(k), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with input  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , state  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and output  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . Let  $\hat{W}, \hat{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$  be matrices such that  $\hat{W}^\top \hat{V} = I$  and  $r < n$ . A reduced-order model obtained via a Petrov-Galerkin projection is given by

$$\hat{\Sigma} : \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}(k+1) &= \hat{W}^\top A \hat{V} \hat{\mathbf{x}}(k) + \hat{W}^\top B \mathbf{u}(k), \\ \mathbf{y}(k) &= C \hat{V} \hat{\mathbf{x}}(k) + D \mathbf{u}(k) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^r$  denotes the state of the reduced-order model. The Petrov-Galerkin projection method provides a general framework for model order reduction. Namely, many reduction techniques, including Gramian- and Krylov-based methods can be regarded as Petrov-Galerkin projections with appropriate choice of  $\hat{V}$  and  $\hat{W}$ , see, e.g., [13].

### B. Generalized Lyapunov balancing

Lyapunov balancing is a popular method for model reduction, which is slightly generalized in the concept of generalized Lyapunov balancing (GLB). We begin our discussion on GLB by introducing the notion of a generalized Gramian. Consider

the discrete-time system (1). Then, a matrix  $P = P^\top > 0$  satisfying

$$APA^\top - P + BB^\top < 0$$

and  $Q = Q^\top > 0$  satisfying

$$A^\top QA - Q + C^\top C < 0,$$

are called the *generalized controllability Gramian* and *generalized observability Gramian*, respectively. This is a strict version of the definition of generalized Gramians given in [30]. The generalized Gramians are lower bounded by the ordinary Gramians, i.e.,  $P > P_0$  and  $Q > Q_0$ , where  $Q_0$  and  $P_0$  are the solutions of the corresponding Lyapunov equations. Note that asymptotic stability of  $\Sigma$ , i.e.,  $\rho(A) < 1$ , where  $\rho(A)$  represents the spectral radius of  $A$ , is a necessary condition for the generalized Gramians to exist.

These generalized Gramians can be used to obtain a so-called balanced realization, that is, a realization of (1) for which the corresponding generalized Gramians are equal and diagonal. Specifically, by [13, Lemma 7.3], there exists a nonsingular matrix  $T$  such that  $TPT^\top = T^{-\top}QT^{-1} = \Sigma_H$  where  $\Sigma_H$  is a diagonal matrix of the *generalized Hankel* singular values of  $\Sigma$  in (1), i.e.,

$$\Sigma_H := \text{blkdiag}(\sigma_1 I_{m_1}, \sigma_2 I_{m_2}, \dots, \sigma_\kappa I_{m_\kappa}), \quad (3)$$

with  $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \dots > \sigma_\kappa > 0$ , and where  $m_i$  denotes the multiplicity of  $\sigma_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, \kappa$  satisfying  $n = \sum_{i=1}^\kappa m_i$ . In this case, we say that such a realization is *balanced in the sense of generalized Lyapunov balancing*. In particular, the balanced realization is given by

$$A_{\text{bal}} := TAT^{-1}, B_{\text{bal}} := TB, C_{\text{bal}} := CT^{-1}, D_{\text{bal}} := D. \quad (4)$$

Finally, the reduced-order model via balanced truncation is obtained by truncating the balanced system  $(A_{\text{bal}}, B_{\text{bal}}, C_{\text{bal}}, D_{\text{bal}})$ . Indeed, balanced-truncation model reduction is essentially a Petrov-Galerkin projection. Namely, after introducing the matrix  $\Pi \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$  as

$$\Pi := \begin{bmatrix} I_r \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

the projection matrices  $\hat{V} = T^{-1}\Pi$  and  $\hat{W} = T^\top\Pi$  satisfy  $\hat{W}^\top\hat{V} = I$  and the reduced-order model (2) is equal to the model obtained by balanced truncation (to order  $r$ ).

Generalized balanced truncation guarantees the preservation of some relevant system properties, similarly as in ordinary balanced truncation, see [30, Prop. 4.19] for continuous-time systems. The discrete-time version is presented without proof below.

**Proposition 1.** *Consider the system  $\Sigma$  given in (1). Let  $\hat{\Sigma}$  of the form (2) be a reduced-order system of  $\Sigma$  via generalized balanced truncation. Suppose that  $\hat{\Sigma}$  is of order  $r < n$  where  $r = \sum_{i=1}^\ell m_i$  with  $\ell < \kappa$ . Then it is balanced in the sense of GLB with  $\rho(\hat{W}^\top\hat{A}\hat{V}) < 1$  and*

$$\|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 2 \sum_{i=\ell+1}^\kappa \sigma_i,$$

where the  $\sigma_i$ 's are the neglected generalized Hankel singular values given in (3).

### III. DATA-DRIVEN PETROV-GALERKIN PROJECTION

Consider the linear discrete-time input/state/output system

$$\Sigma_{\text{true}} : \begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(k+1) &= A_{\text{true}}\mathbf{x}(k) + B_{\text{true}}\mathbf{u}(k) + \mathbf{w}(k), \\ \mathbf{y}(k) &= C_{\text{true}}\mathbf{x}(k) + D_{\text{true}}\mathbf{u}(k) + \mathbf{z}(k), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n+p}$  are the input/state/output and  $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$  are noise terms. Throughout the paper, we assume that the system matrices  $(A_{\text{true}}, B_{\text{true}}, C_{\text{true}}, D_{\text{true}})$  and the noise  $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z})$  are *unknown*. What is known instead are a finite number of input/state/output measurements harvested from the true system (5):

$$\begin{aligned} u(0), u(1), \dots, u(L-1), \\ x(0), x(1), \dots, x(L), \\ y(0), y(1), \dots, y(L-1). \end{aligned}$$

We collect these data in the matrices

$$\begin{aligned} X &:= [x(0) \ x(1) \ \dots \ x(L)], \\ X_- &:= [x(0) \ x(1) \ \dots \ x(L-1)], \\ X_+ &:= [x(1) \ x(2) \ \dots \ x(L)], \\ U_- &:= [u(0) \ u(1) \ \dots \ u(L-1)], \\ Y_- &:= [y(0) \ y(1) \ \dots \ y(L-1)]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can define the set of all systems that *explain* the data as

$$\Sigma := \left\{ (A, B, C, D) : \begin{bmatrix} X_+ \\ Y_- \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{N} \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times L}$  captures a *noise model* such that

$$(A_{\text{true}}, B_{\text{true}}, C_{\text{true}}, D_{\text{true}}) \in \Sigma. \quad (6)$$

In this paper, we work with a noise model that is described by a quadratic matrix inequality as

$$\mathcal{N} := \left\{ Z \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times L} : \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{11} & \Phi_{12} \\ \Phi_{12}^\top & \Phi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\Phi_{11} = \Phi_{11}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times (n+p)}$ ,  $\Phi_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times L}$ , and  $\Phi_{22} = \Phi_{22}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ .

Throughout the paper, we make the following blanket assumption on the set  $\mathcal{N}$ .

**Assumption 1.** The set  $\mathcal{N}$  is bounded and has nonempty interior.

As shown in [31], one can verify this assumption by using the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *The set  $\mathcal{N}$  given by (7) is bounded and has nonempty interior if and only if  $\Phi_{22} < 0$  and  $\Phi_{11} - \Phi_{12}\Phi_{22}^{-1}\Phi_{12}^\top > 0$ .*

It is clear from the definition of  $\Sigma$  and (7) that  $(A, B, C, D) \in \Sigma$  if and only if the following quadratic matrix inequality (QMI) is satisfied

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ A^\top & C^\top \\ B^\top & D^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top N \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ A^\top & C^\top \\ B^\top & D^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (8)$$

where

$$N := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & X_+ \\ 0 & I & Y_- \\ 0 & 0 & -X_- \\ 0 & 0 & -U_- \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{11} & \Phi_{12} \\ \Phi_{12}^\top & \Phi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & X_+ \\ 0 & I & Y_- \\ 0 & 0 & -X_- \\ 0 & 0 & -U_- \end{bmatrix}^\top. \quad (9)$$

In characterizing the set of systems that explain the data, one may wonder whether the set  $\Sigma$  is bounded and has nonempty interior. The following proposition provides the required condition, which solely relies on the data.

**Proposition 2.** *The set  $\Sigma$  is bounded and has nonempty interior if and only if there exists  $\bar{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times (n+p)}$  such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ \bar{S} \end{bmatrix}^\top N \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \bar{S} \end{bmatrix} > 0. \quad (10)$$

and  $\begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}$  has full row rank.

*Proof.* The proof is presented in Appendix A.  $\square$

The condition (10) is referred as the *generalized Slater condition*.

In this paper, we are not interested in the true system (5) per se. Instead, we would like to find a *reduced-order approximation* of (5) directly on the basis of the available data.

As a first step, we consider a Petrov-Galerkin projection as in Section II and assume that the projection matrices  $\hat{W}$  and  $\hat{V}$  satisfying  $\hat{W}^\top \hat{V} = I$  are given. Then, the set of reduced-order models of all systems explaining the data is defined as

$$\Sigma_{\hat{V}, \hat{W}} := \left\{ (\hat{W}^\top A \hat{V}, \hat{W}^\top B, C \hat{V}, D) : (A, B, C, D) \in \Sigma \right\}.$$

The first main result of this paper is that the set  $\Sigma_{\hat{V}, \hat{W}}$  can itself be represented as a QMI of a similar form as (8). This is formalized in the following theorem, whose proof can be found in Appendix B.

**Theorem 1.** *Consider the set  $\Sigma$  of systems explaining the data. Suppose that there exists  $\bar{S}$  such that (10) holds and the matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}$  has full row rank. Let  $\hat{W}, \hat{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$  be such that  $\hat{W}^\top \hat{V} = I$ . Then, the set  $\Sigma_{\hat{V}, \hat{W}}$  of reduced-order models of  $\Sigma$  using projection matrices  $\hat{W}, \hat{V}$  satisfies*

$$\Sigma_{\hat{V}, \hat{W}} = \left\{ (\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D}) : \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ \hat{A}^\top & \hat{C}^\top \\ \hat{B}^\top & \hat{D}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top N_{V,W} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ \hat{A}^\top & \hat{C}^\top \\ \hat{B}^\top & \hat{D}^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \right\},$$

where  $N_{V,W}$  is given by (13) with

$$W := \begin{bmatrix} \hat{W} \\ I_p \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } V := \begin{bmatrix} \hat{V} \\ I_m \end{bmatrix}.$$

Theorem 1 has a nice interpretation in terms of *data reduction*. Namely, the matrix  $N_{V,W}$  characterizing all reduced-order models depends only on the projection matrices  $\hat{V}, \hat{W}$  and the original data matrix  $N$ . As such,  $N_{V,W}$  is constructed from the data and noise model only. Importantly,  $N_{V,W}$  has a lower dimension than  $N$  and can thus be regarded as a reduced data matrix. Hence, we can characterize all reduced-order models by directly reducing the data matrix  $N$  rather than reducing individual systems  $(A, B, C, D) \in \Sigma$ . It is also worth mentioning that

$$(\hat{W}^\top A_{\text{true}} \hat{V}, \hat{W}^\top B_{\text{true}}, C_{\text{true}} \hat{V}, D_{\text{true}})$$

i.e., the reduced-order model of the true system, is in  $\Sigma_{\hat{V}, \hat{W}}$ .

In this section, we have characterized reduced-order approximations of systems explaining the collected data for given projection matrices  $\hat{W}$  and  $\hat{V}$ . In the next section, we will choose the projection matrices on the basis of the available data by following a generalized balancing framework.

#### IV. DATA-DRIVEN GENERALIZED BALANCED TRUNCATION

In this section, we will introduce the notion of informativity for generalized Lyapunov balancing (GLB). Moreover, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for informativity for GLB, followed by the set of reduced-order models obtained from data-driven GLB and their error-bounds.

##### A. Data informativity for generalized Lyapunov balancing

Based on Section II-B, one can introduce the notion of informativity for GLB as follows.

**Definition 1.** We say that the data  $(U_-, X, Y_-)$  are *informative for generalized Lyapunov balancing (GLB)* if there exist  $P = P^\top > 0$  and  $Q = Q^\top > 0$  such that

$$APA^\top - P + BB^\top < 0 \quad (11)$$

and

$$A^\top QA - Q + C^\top C < 0 \quad (12)$$

for all  $(A, B, C, D) \in \Sigma$ .

**Remark 1.** It is known, see, e.g., [13, Chapter 7], that the satisfaction of (11) or (12) implies that all systems in  $\Sigma$  are asymptotically stable.

From Definition 1,  $P$  and  $Q$  can be regarded as *common* generalized controllability and observability Gramian, respectively, for all systems explaining the data. We thus formalize the following informativity and model reduction problems.

**Problem 1.** Find necessary and sufficient conditions under which the data  $(U_-, X, Y_-)$  are informative for generalized Lyapunov balancing (GLB). If the data are informative for

$$N_{V,W} := \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} W^\top (N|N_{22} + N_{12}N_{22}^{-1}V(V^\top N_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1}V^\top N_{22}^{-1}N_{12}^\top)W & W^\top N_{12}N_{22}^{-1}V(V^\top N_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1} \\ \hline (V^\top N_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1}V^\top N_{22}^{-1}N_{12}^\top W & (V^\top N_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1} \end{array} \right] \quad (13)$$

GLB, then characterize the reduced-order models via data-driven balanced truncation and provide error bounds with respect to the true system.

Observe that the data are informative for GLB if and only if QMI (8) implies the existence of positive definite matrices  $P$  and  $Q$  such that (11) and (12) hold. Such QMI implications can be viewed as a generalization of the classical S-lemma [32] and have been investigated in [29]. Based on the results of [29] and [31] (see Appendix C), data informativity for GLB can be fully characterized in terms of feasibility of certain LMIs as stated next.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose that there exists  $\bar{S}$  such that (10) holds. Define

$$N_C := \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix}^\top N \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$N_O := \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} \end{bmatrix}^\top N^\# \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$N^\# := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I_{n+m} \\ I_{n+p} & 0 \end{bmatrix} N^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I_{n+p} \\ I_{n+m} & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, the data  $(U_-, X, Y_-)$  are informative for generalized Lyapunov balancing if and only if

- (i)  $\begin{bmatrix} X \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}$  has full row rank,
- (ii) there exists  $P = P^\top > 0$  and a scalar  $\alpha > 0$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -P & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -I_m \end{bmatrix} - \alpha N_C > 0, \quad (14)$$

- (iii) there exists  $Q = Q^\top > 0$  and a scalar  $\beta > 0$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -Q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -I_p \end{bmatrix} - \beta N_O > 0. \quad (15)$$

*Proof.* The proof can be found in Appendix D.  $\square$

A direct consequence of data informativity for GLB is that all systems explaining the data have *common* generalized Gramians  $P$  and  $Q$ . As a result, all systems in  $\Sigma$  are balanced by a common balancing transformation matrix  $T$  satisfying  $TP T^\top = T^{-\top} Q T^{-1} = \Sigma_H$  where  $\Sigma_H$  is a matrix of the form (3), containing the common generalized Hankel singular values. Next, we note that the balanced realizations of all systems explaining the data can be constructed from (4) where  $(A, B, C, D) \in \Sigma$ .

**Remark 2.** Since  $P$  and  $Q$  satisfying (14) and (15), respectively, are lower bounded by the ordinary Gramians of the true system, (see the discussion in Section II-B), smaller  $P$  and  $Q$  are expected to yield a balancing that is “closer” to the ordinary balancing of the true system. Therefore, one may solve LMIs (14) and (15) by minimizing  $\text{trace}(P)$  and  $\text{trace}(Q)$  to expect a better reduced-order approximation.

In the next section, we will use these balanced realizations to obtain reduced-order models directly from data.

### B. Reduced-order models

By applying the Petrov-Galerkin projection, the reduced-order models of all systems in  $\Sigma$  via generalized balanced truncation are contained in the set

$$\hat{\Sigma} := \left\{ (\hat{W}^\top A \hat{V}, \hat{W}^\top B, C \hat{V}, D) : (A, B, C, D) \in \Sigma \right\}$$

where  $\hat{V} = T^{-1}\Pi$  and  $\hat{W} = T^\top\Pi$  with  $\Pi$  given by

$$\Pi := \begin{bmatrix} I_r \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and  $T$  is obtained from the common generalized Gramians  $P$  and  $Q$  for all systems in  $\Sigma$ . Based on Theorem 1, we can characterize the set  $\hat{\Sigma}$  in terms of a quadratic matrix inequality. We formalize this fact in the following corollary of Theorem 1.

**Corollary 1.** Suppose that there exists  $\bar{S}$  such that (10) holds and the data  $(U_-, X, Y_-)$  are informative for generalized Lyapunov balancing with  $T$  the corresponding balancing transformation. Then,

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \left\{ (\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D}) : \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}^\top N_{V,W} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \right\},$$

where  $N_{V,W}$  is given by (13) with

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} T^\top \Pi \\ I_p \end{bmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{bmatrix} T^{-1} \Pi \\ I_m \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi := \begin{bmatrix} I_r \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, we can see that the set  $\hat{\Sigma}$  characterizes a *data reduction* by generalized balanced truncation. Namely, the reduced matrix  $N_{V,W}$  depends only on the data matrix  $N$  and projection matrices  $\hat{V} = T^{-1}\Pi$  and  $\hat{W} = T^\top\Pi$ , where now these projection matrices are also derived from the data only via Theorem 2.

From the definition of  $\hat{\Sigma}$  above, suppose that  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D}) \in \hat{\Sigma}$ , then it is always a truncation of a model in  $\Sigma$  by generalized balanced truncation. Therefore, any  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D}) \in \hat{\Sigma}$  satisfies the guaranteed properties in Proposition 1. Namely,  $\rho(\hat{A}) < 1$  and the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm error between a system in  $\hat{\Sigma}$  and its *corresponding* system in  $\Sigma$  is

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c|c} \text{blkdiag}(K_{11}, (\frac{1}{2} - \mu)I_p, -K_{11}, -\gamma^{-2}I_m) & \text{blkdiag}(K_{12}, -\mu I_p, -K_{12}, -\gamma^{-2}I_m) \\ \hline \text{blkdiag}(K_{12}^\top, -\mu I_p, -K_{12}^\top, -\gamma^{-2}I_m) & \text{blkdiag}(K_{22}, (\frac{1}{2} - \mu)I_p, -K_{22}, -\gamma^{-2}I_m) \end{array} \right] - \text{blkdiag}(\delta N, \eta N_{V,W}) > 0 \quad (16)$$

upper bounded by the neglected common generalized Hankel singular values, i.e.,

$$\|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 2 \sum_{i=\ell+1}^{\kappa} \sigma_i \quad (17)$$

where  $\Sigma$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}$  are systems whose realizations are in  $\Sigma$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}$ , respectively, and  $\sigma_i$  is defined similarly as in Proposition 1.

However, the bound (17) has little practical relevance as it characterizes the error between *one* reduced-order system in  $\hat{\Sigma}$  and its *corresponding* high-order system in  $\Sigma$ . Instead, recall that we are interested in a reduced-order approximation of the true system (5). This system is unknown, but is guaranteed to satisfy (6). As also the corresponding reduced-order system is unknown (but in  $\hat{\Sigma}$ ), a practical relevant error bound should hold for *any* selection of a high-order system (from  $\Sigma$ ) and *any* reduced-order system (from  $\hat{\Sigma}$ ). The following section provides such bounds.

### C. Distance to the true system

Suppose that we consider a reduced-order system of order  $r < n$  given by  $\hat{\Sigma}_0$  with realization  $(\hat{A}_0, \hat{B}_0, \hat{C}_0, \hat{D}_0) \in \hat{\Sigma}$ . We will use  $\hat{\Sigma}_0$  as an approximation of the unknown true system  $\Sigma_{\text{true}}$ . To evaluate the quality of this approximation, note that

$$\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_{\text{true}}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \sup \{ \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} : \Sigma \in \Sigma, \hat{\Sigma} \in \hat{\Sigma} \}. \quad (18)$$

Here, we have used the small abuse of notation  $\Sigma \in \Sigma$  to mean  $(A, B, C, D) \in \Sigma$ , where  $(A, B, C, D)$  is a realization of  $\Sigma$ .

In this section, we aim to compute a bound on the right-hand side of (18) on the basis of the available data only. The computation of this is stated in the following result.

#### Theorem 3. The bound

$$\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} < \gamma$$

holds for any  $\Sigma \in \Sigma$  and any  $\hat{\Sigma} \in \hat{\Sigma}$  if and only if there exist a matrix  $K = K^\top > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{(n+r) \times (n+r)}$  partitioned as

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} \\ K_{12}^\top & K_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with } K_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n},$$

and scalars  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\eta > 0$  and  $\mu$  such that (16) holds, where  $N$  and  $N_{V,W}$  are given by (9) and (13), respectively.

*Proof.* The proof can be found in Appendix E.  $\square$

In order to obtain the smallest upper bound, i.e., the smallest  $\gamma$  such that the conditions in Theorem 3 hold, one may solve the following semidefinite program [33, Sect. 6.4]:

$$\min_{K, \delta, \eta, \mu} \gamma \quad (19a)$$

$$\text{subject to } K > 0, \delta > 0, \eta > 0 \text{ and (16)}. \quad (19b)$$

In conclusion, the solution of (19) gives  $\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_{\text{true}}\| < \gamma$ . Note that this upper bound is uniform for any  $\hat{\Sigma}_0$  picked from  $\hat{\Sigma}$ . Therefore, it can be regarded as an *a priori* error bound.

### A posteriori error bound

Now suppose we pick a *known* system  $\hat{\Sigma}_0$  from  $\hat{\Sigma}$ . Let its realization be  $(\hat{A}_0, \hat{B}_0, \hat{C}_0, \hat{D}_0)$ . An a posteriori error bound is computed to measure the error between this known system  $\hat{\Sigma}_0$  and the true system  $\Sigma_{\text{true}}$ . However, since the true system is unknown, this error cannot be directly computed.

Fortunately, we know that

$$\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_{\text{true}}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \sup \{ \|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} : \Sigma \in \Sigma \}.$$

The following proposition gives the computation of an upper bound of  $\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty}$  for any  $\Sigma \in \Sigma$ .

**Proposition 3.** Let  $\hat{\Sigma}_0$  be a given reduced-order model with realization  $(\hat{A}_0, \hat{B}_0, \hat{C}_0, \hat{D}_0) \in \hat{\Sigma}$ . Then, the bound

$$\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} < \gamma_0$$

holds for any  $\Sigma \in \Sigma$  if and only if there exist  $K = K^\top > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{(n+r) \times (n+r)}$  partitioned as

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & K_{12} \\ K_{12}^\top & K_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with } K_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n},$$

and a scalar  $\delta > 0$  such that (21) holds.

*Proof.* The proof is presented in Appendix F.  $\square$

Similar to before, one may obtain the smallest upper bound by solving the following semidefinite program:

$$\min_{K, \delta} \gamma_0 \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{subject to } K > 0, \delta > 0, \text{ and (21)}. \quad (20b)$$

Finally, we have  $\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_{\text{true}}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} < \gamma_0$ . Note that this a posteriori error bound holds for a specific  $\hat{\Sigma}_0$ . It follows readily that  $\gamma_0 \leq \gamma$  where  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma_0$  are the solutions of (19) and (20), respectively, since the bound  $\gamma_0$  holds for a specific  $\hat{\Sigma}_0 \in \hat{\Sigma}$  while the bound  $\gamma$  holds for any  $\hat{\Sigma}$  taken from  $\hat{\Sigma}$ .

$$\left[ \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} K_{11} & 0 & 0 & 0 & K_{12} & \\ 0 & I_p - \hat{C}_0 K_{22} \hat{C}_0^\top - \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{D}_0 \hat{D}_0^\top & \hat{C}_0 K_{12}^\top & \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{D}_0 & \hat{C}_0 K_{22} \hat{A}_0^\top + \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{D}_0 \hat{B}_0^\top & \\ 0 & K_{12} \hat{C}_0^\top & -K_{11} & 0 & -K_{12} \hat{A}_0^\top & \\ 0 & \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{D}_0^\top & 0 & -\gamma_0^{-2} I_m & -\gamma_0^{-2} \hat{B}_0^\top & \\ \hline K_{12}^\top & \hat{A}_0 K_{22} \hat{C}_0^\top + \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{B}_0 \hat{D}_0^\top & -\hat{A}_0 K_{12}^\top & -\gamma_0^{-2} \hat{B}_0 & K_{22} - \hat{A}_0 K_{22} \hat{A}_0^\top - \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{B}_0 \hat{B}_0^\top & \end{array} \right] - \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} \delta N & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] > 0 \quad (21)$$




Figure 1: The Hankel singular values of the true system denoted by  $\Sigma_{H,\text{true}}$  and generalized Hankel singular values of all systems explaining the data for different noise levels denoted by  $\Sigma_{H,\sigma}$ . The values  $\Sigma_{H,\text{true}}$  are computed via the ordinary balancing procedure, i.e., balancing by Lyapunov equations, and using the system matrices of  $\Sigma_{\text{true}}$ .

## V. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

Consider a continuous-time system of a cart with double pendulum, see [34] for details. After discretizing this model using the zero-order hold method with sampling time 0.5 seconds, we obtain a true discrete-time system of the form (5) where  $A_{\text{true}}$ ,  $B_{\text{true}}$ ,  $C_{\text{true}}$ , and  $D_{\text{true}}$  are given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.9299 & 0.4160 & 0.7447 & 0.2291 & 0.2452 & 0.0592 \\ -0.1869 & 0.7430 & 0.3318 & 0.7617 & 1.0859 & 0.3560 \\ 0.0380 & 0.0477 & -0.3644 & 0.0647 & 0.1370 & 0.0766 \\ 0.0169 & 0.0549 & -0.0972 & -0.3693 & -0.8685 & 0.0484 \\ 0.0250 & 0.0285 & 0.2741 & 0.1393 & -0.0474 & 0.1615 \\ 0.1108 & 0.1358 & -1.7370 & 0.1855 & -1.8002 & -0.2311 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$[0.0701 \ 0.1869 \ -0.0380 \ -0.0169 \ -0.0250 \ -0.1108]^T,$$

$$[1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0], \text{ and } 0, \text{ respectively.}$$

To illustrate the data-driven model reduction from noisy data, we collect input/state/output data of system (5) up to  $L = 200$  for input signal

$$u(k) = 2 \sin(k) + \cos(0.5k) \quad (22)$$

and a random initial condition  $x(0)$  which follows a Gaussian distribution with zero mean and unit variance. In addition, we take the noise  $w$  and  $z$  in (5) to be Gaussian with zero mean and variance  $\sigma^2$ . For a realization of this noise, we obtain the data matrices  $U_-, X_-, X_+, Y_-$ . In the remainder of this example, we assume that the noise samples satisfy noise model (7) with  $\Phi_{11} = 1.35\sigma^2 I$ ,  $\Phi = 0$  and  $\Phi_{22} = -I$ . We simulate the noise with different levels:  $\sigma \in \{0.002, 0.005, 0.01, 0.03, 0.05\}$  and it has been checked that they satisfy the noise model above. Hence, we characterize




Figure 2: Bode plots of reduced-order models for five different noise levels. The systems  $\hat{\Sigma}_{0.002}$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}_{0.005}$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}_{0.01}$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}_{0.03}$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}_{0.05}$  denote reduced-order models of systems explaining the data with noise levels  $\sigma = 0.002, 0.005, 0.01, 0.03$  and  $0.05$ , respectively, while  $\Sigma_{\text{true}}$  denotes the true system. We stress that  $\Sigma_{\sigma}$  is one from infinitely many systems in  $\hat{\Sigma}_{\sigma}$  and  $\Sigma_{\text{true}}$  is assumed to be unknown.

all systems explaining the data in a QMI of the form (8), where  $N \in \mathbb{R}^{14 \times 14}$ .

First, we check the generalized Slater condition (10) by verifying that  $N$  has 7 positive eigenvalues. Next, we can verify that conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 2 are satisfied, for each  $\sigma \in \{0.002, 0.005, 0.01, 0.03, 0.05\}$ , meaning that the data are informative for generalized Lyapunov balancing. Conditions (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 2 are semidefinite programs that we solve in Matlab, using Yalmip [35] with SDPT3 [36] as an LMI solver. As a result, we obtain generalized Hankel singular values that are common to all systems explaining the data. They are depicted in Figure 1 for various noise levels.

Figure 1 shows that the generalized Hankel singular values (generalized Gramians) obtained from the data indeed bound the ordinary Hankel singular values (Gramians) of the true system, see also the discussion in Section II-B. We stress however that the true system (and, hence, its Gramians) is assumed to be unknown. Additionally, we observe that the generalized Hankel singular values provide less strict bounds on the unknown ordinary Hankel singular values when the noise level is increased.

In the balancing process, we also obtain the data-driven balancing transformation  $T$  as well as the data-driven projection matrices  $\hat{W}$  and  $\hat{V}$ . Here, we take reduced models of order  $r = 3$  and therefore we have  $\hat{W}, \hat{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{6 \times 3}$ . From these projection matrices, the set  $\hat{\Sigma}$ , i.e., the set of reduced-order models via data-driven generalized balanced truncation, can be defined in terms of a QMI as stated in Corollary 1. We note that the set of reduced-order models  $\hat{\Sigma}$  is only characterized by matrix  $N_{V,W} \in \mathbb{R}^{8 \times 8}$ , which is of reduced dimension (with




Figure 3: Time-domain output of a reduced-order model corresponding to the noise level  $\sigma = 0.03$  with input signal (22):  $u(k) = 2\sin(k) + \cos(0.5k)$  compared to the noise-free and noisy output of the true system with the same input signal.

respect to  $N$ ).

In this example, for each noise level which is indicated by  $\sigma$ , we have a different set of reduced-order models denoted by  $\hat{\Sigma}_\sigma$ . Then, from each set  $\hat{\Sigma}_\sigma$ , we pick a reduced-order model  $\hat{\Sigma}_\sigma$ . We stress that for a given noise level,  $\hat{\Sigma}_\sigma$  depicts one from infinitely many possible reduced-order models contained in  $\hat{\Sigma}_\sigma$ . The Bode diagram of the reduced-order systems  $\hat{\Sigma}_\sigma$ 's is depicted in Figure 2. Additionally, the time-domain output of  $\hat{\Sigma}_{0.03}$  is shown in Figure 3. The Bode diagram in Figure 2 shows that reduced-order models accurately approximate the true system at least up to the noise level  $\sigma = 0.03$ . But, if we increase the noise, e.g.,  $\sigma = 0.05$ , the resulting reduced-order model may not be able to accurately approximate the true system. From Figure 3, we see that the reduced-order model corresponding to noise  $\sigma = 0.03$  is able to reconstruct the output data of the true system.

Next, we will compute the error bounds for the reduced-order models in this framework. We note first that from the result of Theorem 2, all systems in  $\Sigma$  and therefore  $\hat{\Sigma}$  are guaranteed to be asymptotically stable. As a consequence, the LMIs (16) and (21) are guaranteed to be feasible for some large enough  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma_0$ , respectively. Hence, we can solve problems (19) and (20). The results can be found in Figure 4.

From Figure 4, the upper bounds on the error with respect to the true system either from a priori or a posteriori upper bounds are getting more conservative when the noise levels are increased. This conservatism is caused by the fact that the only knowledge that is available on the true system is that it is contained in  $\Sigma$ , the set of systems explaining the data. As the set  $\Sigma$  has a larger size for increasing noise level, this leads to more conservative results. It is also clear that the a posteriori upper bound (the solution of problem (20)) is




Figure 4: Comparison of a priori error bounds  $\gamma$  (solution of Problem (19)), a posteriori error bounds  $\gamma_0$  (solution of Problem 20), the actual  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm of the error between the true system  $\Sigma_{\text{true}}$  and a reduced-order model  $\hat{\Sigma}_\sigma$  using this method and the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm of the error between the true system and its reduced-order model via ordinary balanced truncation (ordinary BT).

less conservative than the corresponding a priori upper bound (solutions of problem (19)) for each noise level.

In spite of the conservatism, the actual  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norms of the errors between the true system and the reduced-order models selected from  $\hat{\Sigma}_\sigma$  for some small enough noise levels show that this data-driven method performs well. In particular, the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ -norm of the errors for noise levels  $\sigma = 0.002, 0.005, 0.01$  and  $0.03$  which are given by  $0.0405, 0.0470, 0.0507$  and  $0.0513$ , respectively, are relatively small compared to the error of reduction by the ordinary balanced truncation, which is equal to  $0.0314$ . We stress, however, that computation via the ordinary balanced truncation requires the knowledge of the true system which cannot be achieved on the basis of the data.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a data-driven procedure to obtain reduced-order models from noisy data is developed. The procedure begins with introducing the concept of data reduction. Based on the noise model introduced by [29], all (higher-order) systems explaining the data can be characterized in a high-dimensional quadratic matrix inequality (QMI) with a special structure. Due to this special structure, the class of reduced-order models obtained by applying a Petrov-Galerkin projection to all systems explaining the data can be characterized in a reduced-order QMI. As these QMIs depend only on the data and projection matrices, this can be regarded as a data reduction procedure. Since this concept holds for general Petrov-Galerkin projections, it can potentially be extended to solve data-driven model reduction problems via any projection-based reduction technique.



We then follow up the data reduction concept by constructing specific projection matrices from data. In particular, based on generalized controllability and observability Gramians, we provide necessary and sufficient conditions such that all systems explaining the data have common generalized Gramians. These conditions substitute Lyapunov inequalities by a data-guided linear matrix inequality which can be solved efficiently by modern LMI solvers. Subsequently, a common balancing transformation and therefore common projection matrices for generalized balanced truncation (which are in the class of the Petrov-Galerkin projections) are available to apply the data reduction. As such, a set of reduced-order models via generalized balanced truncation can then be characterized in a lower-dimensional QMI. Moreover, all reduced-order models in this set are guaranteed to be asymptotically stable and computable a priori and a posteriori upper bounds on the reduction error with respect to the true system are available.

Beside the extension on exploiting data reduction via any projection-based reduction technique as mentioned above, ideas for future work include several directions. First, we aim at extending this result for input-output noisy data, even though an obstacle in this setting may be the construction of a state sequence. Second, investigating model reduction with preserving specific system properties such as network structure and port-Hamiltonian structure is often desirable.

## APPENDIX PROOFS

### A. Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof.* To prove the ‘only if’ part, suppose that  $\Sigma$  is bounded and has nonempty interior. Since  $\Sigma$  has nonempty interior, then (10) holds for some  $\tilde{S}$ . Next, let  $N$  be defined as in (9) and partitioned as

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} N_{11} & N_{12} \\ N_{12}^\top & N_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $N_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times (n+p)}$ ,  $N_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times (n+m)}$ , and  $N_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times (n+m)}$ . By Lemma 1, matrix  $N$  is nonsingular with  $N_{11} - N_{12}N_{22}^{-1}N_{12}^\top > 0$  and  $N_{22} < 0$ . As a result, the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & X_+ \\ 0 & I & Y_- \\ 0 & 0 & -X_- \\ 0 & 0 & -U_- \end{bmatrix}$$

and therefore  $\begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}$  are full row rank.

To prove the ‘if’ part, observe that it follows from (10) and [37, Fact 5.8.16] that

$$v_+(N) \geq n + p. \quad (23)$$

Note that

$$N_{22} = \begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix} \Phi_{22} \begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}^\top.$$

Since  $\Phi_{22} < 0$  and  $\begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}$  has full row rank, we have that  $N_{22} < 0$ . Then, following Haynsworth’s inertia additivity formula, see [37, Fact 6.5.5], we have

$$\text{In}(N) = \text{In}(N_{22}) + \text{In}(N_{11} - N_{12}N_{22}^{-1}N_{12}^\top),$$

and hence

$$v_-(N) \geq n + m. \quad (24)$$

Since  $N \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+2n+p) \times (m+2n+p)}$ ,  $v_-(N) + v_+(N) \leq m + 2n + p$ . This, together with (23) and (24), implies that  $v_+(N) + v_-(N) = m + 2n + p$ . Therefore,  $N$  has no zero eigenvalues. Consequently, it is nonsingular with  $N_{22} < 0$  and  $N_{11} - N_{12}N_{22}^{-1}N_{12}^\top > 0$ . Then, it follows from (8) and Lemma 1 that  $\Sigma$  is bounded and has nonempty interior.  $\square$

### B. Proof of Theorem 1

Before giving the proof of Theorem 1, we will develop some general results on quadratic matrix inequalities.

To this end, consider the set

$$\mathcal{M} := \left\{ Z \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q} : \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \right\}, \quad (25)$$

where  $\Psi$  admits the partitioning

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{11} & \Psi_{12} \\ \Psi_{12}^\top & \Psi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (26)$$

with  $\Psi_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ . We assume throughout this appendix that  $\Psi_{22} < 0$  and  $\Psi_{11} - \Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top > 0$ . It is known from Lemma 1 that  $\mathcal{M}$  is bounded and has nonempty interior. As a consequence of this,  $\mathcal{M}$  admits various representations, as stated next.

**Lemma A.1.** Consider  $\mathcal{M}$  given by (25). Define  $\Psi|\Psi_{22} := \Psi_{11} - \Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top$  and

$$\Psi^\# := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I_q \\ I_p & 0 \end{bmatrix} \Psi^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I_p \\ I_q & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

Suppose that  $\Psi|\Psi_{22} > 0$  and  $\Psi_{22} < 0$ . Then,  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_2$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_1 &:= \left\{ Z : \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi^\# \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{M}_2 &:= \left\{ Z : \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix} = Q \text{ where } 0 \leq Q \leq \Psi|\Psi_{22} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof of  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1$  is provided in [31]. We will prove that  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_2$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{M}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ . Then, it remains to show that the reverse inclusion holds. Let  $Z \in \mathcal{M}$  and let

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix}.$$

Clearly,  $Q \geq 0$ . Note that

$Q = \Psi|\Psi_{22} + (Z^\top + \Psi_{22}\Psi_{12}^\top)^\top \Psi_{22} (Z^\top + \Psi_{22}\Psi_{12}^\top) \leq \Psi|\Psi_{22}$  since  $\Psi_{22} < 0$ . Therefore,  $0 \leq Q \leq \Psi|\Psi_{22}$  and, as a result,  $Z \in \mathcal{M}_2$ .  $\square$

Now, we will consider projections of the elements of the set  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times \hat{q}}$  and  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times \hat{p}}$  be full column rank projection matrices with  $\hat{p} \leq p$  and  $\hat{q} \leq q$ . We refer to the set

$$\mathcal{M}_{V,W} := \{W^\top ZV : Z \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

as a reduction of  $\mathcal{M}$  using projectors  $W$  and  $V$ . Note that we do not assume that  $W^\top V = I$ .

$$\Psi_{V,W} := \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} W^\top(\Psi|\Psi_{22} + \Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1}V(V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1}V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top)W & W^\top\Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1}V(V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1} \\ \hline (V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1}V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top W & (V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1} \end{array} \right] \quad (28)$$

$$\Psi_V := \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} \Psi|\Psi_{22} + \Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1}V(V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1}V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top & \Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1}V(V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1} \\ \hline (V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1}V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top & (V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}V)^{-1} \end{array} \right] \quad (29)$$

$$\Psi_V^\# := \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} -V^\top(\Psi_{22}^{-1} - \Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top(\Psi|\Psi_{22})^{-1}\Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1})V & -V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top(\Psi|\Psi_{22})^{-1} \\ \hline -(\Psi|\Psi_{22})^{-1}\Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1}V & -(\Psi|\Psi_{22})^{-1} \end{array} \right] \quad (30)$$

We will show that elements of  $\mathcal{M}_{V,W}$  themselves satisfy a quadratic matrix inequality. To do so, let  $Z \in \mathcal{M}$  such that we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{11} & \Psi_{12} \\ \Psi_{12}^\top & \Psi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0,$$

which can be written as

$$\Psi|\Psi_{22} + (Z + \Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1})\Psi_{22}(Z^\top + \Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top) \geq 0. \quad (31)$$

Using the Schur complement, (31) is equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi|\Psi_{22} & Z + \Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1} \\ Z^\top + \Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top & -\Psi_{22}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (32)$$

where we note that the inverse of  $\Psi_{22}$  exists as  $\Psi_{22} < 0$  by assumption. Pre- and postmultiplying (32) by  $\text{blkdiag}(W^\top, V^\top)$  and  $\text{blkdiag}(W, V)$ , respectively, gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} W^\top(\Psi|\Psi_{22})W & W^\top(Z + \Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1})V \\ V^\top(Z^\top + \Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top)W & -V^\top\Psi_{22}^{-1}V \end{bmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (33)$$

Let us define  $\hat{Z} = W^\top ZV$ . Using again a Schur complement argument and writing the result as a quadratic matrix inequality, we obtain that (33) is equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ \hat{Z}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi_{V,W} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \hat{Z}^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (34)$$

where  $\Psi_{V,W}$  is given by (28). This shows that if  $Z \in \mathcal{M}$  then  $W^\top ZV$  satisfies (34). Stated differently, we have that  $\mathcal{M}_{V,W} \subseteq \{\hat{Z} : (34) \text{ holds}\}$ . In fact, we have that the equality holds as asserted in the following theorem.

**Theorem A.1.** *It holds that*

$$\mathcal{M}_{V,W} = \left\{ \hat{Z} : \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \hat{Z}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi_{V,W} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \hat{Z}^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Before we present the proof of Theorem A.1, we need to state some auxiliary lemmas. First, we recall the following result from linear algebra [37, Fact 5.10.19].

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ . Then,  $X^\top X = Y^\top Y$  if and only if  $Y = UX$  where  $U$  is an orthogonal matrix, i.e.,  $U^\top U = I$ .*

The next two lemmas are central to prove Theorem A.1.

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $S = S^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  such that  $S > 0$ . Let  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$  be a full rank matrix with  $r \leq p$  and  $Q_V = Q_V^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$*

*such that  $0 \leq Q_V \leq V^\top S V$ . Then, there exists  $Q = Q^\top$  such that  $0 \leq Q \leq S$  and  $V^\top Q V = Q_V$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $V$  is full rank, there exists a matrix  $\tilde{V}$  such that  $T_V := [V \ \tilde{V}]$  is nonsingular. Note that

$$T_V^\top S T_V = F^\top \begin{bmatrix} V^\top S V & 0 \\ 0 & (T_V^\top S T_V)|(V^\top S V) \end{bmatrix} F$$

where

$$F := \begin{bmatrix} I & (V^\top S V)^{-1} V^\top S \tilde{V} \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let

$$\bar{Q} := F^\top \begin{bmatrix} Q_V & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta \end{bmatrix} F,$$

where  $0 \leq \Delta \leq (T_V^\top S T_V)|(V^\top S V)$ . Clearly, we have  $0 \leq \bar{Q} \leq T_V^\top S T_V$ . Take  $Q = T_V^{-\top} \bar{Q} T_V^{-1}$  to guarantee that  $0 \leq Q \leq S$  and  $V^\top Q V = Q_V$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.4.** *Consider the matrix  $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{(p+q) \times (p+q)}$  partitioned as in (26) such that  $\Psi_{11} - \Psi_{12}\Psi_{22}^{-1}\Psi_{12}^\top > 0$  and  $\Psi_{22} < 0$ . Let  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$  be a full rank matrix with  $r \leq p$ . Suppose that  $Z_W$  satisfies*

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z_W^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} W^\top \Psi_{11} W & W^\top \Psi_{12} \\ \Psi_{12}^\top W & \Psi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z_W^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (35)$$

*Then, there exists  $Z$  such that  $Z^\top W = Z_W^\top$  and*

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0.$$

*Proof.* Note that (35) can be written as

$$W^\top(\Psi|\Psi_{22})W + \bar{Z}_W \Psi_{22} \bar{Z}_W^\top \geq 0,$$

where  $\bar{Z}_W = Z_W + W^\top \Psi_{12} \Psi_{22}^{-1}$ . Let

$$Q_W := W^\top(\Psi|\Psi_{22})W + \bar{Z}_W \Psi_{22} \bar{Z}_W^\top. \quad (36)$$

Then,  $0 \leq Q_W \leq W^\top(\Psi|\Psi_{22})W$  since  $\Psi_{22} < 0$ . By Lemma A.3, there exists  $Q = Q^\top$  such that  $0 \leq Q \leq \Psi|\Psi_{22}$  and  $W^\top Q W = Q_W$ . As  $\Psi|\Psi_{22} - Q \geq 0$ , there exists a matrix  $R$  such that

$$\Psi|\Psi_{22} - Q = R^\top R,$$

which implies

$$Q_W = W^\top(\Psi|\Psi_{22})W - W^\top R^\top R W. \quad (37)$$

By comparing (36) and (37), it follows from Lemma A.2 that

$$(-\Psi_{22})^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{Z}_W^\top = URW$$

for some orthogonal matrix  $U$ . Note that since  $W$  is full rank, there exists  $\tilde{W}$  such that  $[W \ \tilde{W}]$  is nonsingular. Now, let  $\tilde{Z}_W$  be such that

$$(-\Psi_{22})^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{Z}_W^\top = UR\tilde{W}.$$

Next, define

$$Z^\top = [\bar{Z}_W^\top \ \tilde{Z}_W^\top] [W \ \tilde{W}]^{-1} - \Psi_{22}^{-1} \Psi_{12}^\top,$$

which can be easily checked to verify  $Z^\top W = Z_W^\top$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{11} & \Psi_{12} \\ \Psi_{12}^\top & \Psi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z^\top \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \Psi | \Psi_{22} + (Z + \Psi_{12} \Psi_{22}^{-1}) \Psi_{22} (Z + \Psi_{12} \Psi_{22}^{-1})^\top \\ &= \Psi | \Psi_{22} - R^\top R = Q \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem A.1.

*Proof of Theorem A.1.* It is clear that

$$\mathcal{M}_{V,W} \subseteq \left\{ \hat{Z} : (34) \text{ holds} \right\}.$$

To prove the reverse inclusion, let  $\hat{Z}$  be such that (34) holds, i.e.,

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ \hat{Z}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi_{V,W} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \hat{Z}^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0.$$

We will show that there exists  $Z \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\hat{Z} = W^\top ZV$ . By Lemma A.4, there exists  $Z_V$  such that  $Z_V^\top W = \hat{Z}^\top$  and

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z_V^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi_V \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (38)$$

where  $\Psi_V$  is given by (29). From Lemma A.1, (38) is equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z_V^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi_V^\# \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (39)$$

where  $\Psi_V^\#$  is given by (30). Using Lemma A.4 again, (39) implies the existence of  $Z$  such that  $ZV = Z_V$  and

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z \end{bmatrix}^\top \Psi^\# \begin{bmatrix} I \\ Z \end{bmatrix} \geq 0,$$

where  $\Psi^\#$  is given by (27). Therefore, there exists  $Z$  such that  $\hat{Z} = W^\top ZV$  and, due to Lemma A.1,  $Z \in \mathcal{M}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Since (10) holds for some  $\bar{S}$  and matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}$  has full row rank,  $\Sigma$  is bounded and has nonempty interior. In addition, since  $\hat{W}^\top \hat{V} = I$ , then  $W$  and  $V$  are full column rank. Therefore, the claim follows from the result of Theorem A.1.  $\square$

### C. Strict matrix S-Lemma

**Proposition A.1 ( [29, Thm. 11]).** Let  $F, G \in \mathbb{R}^{(q+r) \times (q+r)}$  be symmetric matrices. Assume that

$$\Sigma_G := \left\{ V \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times q} : \begin{bmatrix} I \\ V \end{bmatrix}^\top G \begin{bmatrix} I \\ V \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \right\}$$

is bounded. Consider the statements

(i) There exists some matrix  $\bar{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times q}$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ \bar{V} \end{bmatrix}^\top G \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \bar{V} \end{bmatrix} > 0.$$

(ii)  $\begin{bmatrix} I \\ V \end{bmatrix}^\top F \begin{bmatrix} I \\ V \end{bmatrix} > 0 \ \forall V \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times q}$  with  $\begin{bmatrix} I \\ V \end{bmatrix}^\top G \begin{bmatrix} I \\ V \end{bmatrix} \geq 0$ .

(iii) There exists a scalar  $\alpha \geq 0$  such that  $F - \alpha G > 0$ .

Then, the following implications hold:

- (I) (i) and (ii)  $\implies$  (iii).
- (II) (iii)  $\implies$  (ii).

### D. Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* Let us first prove the ‘only if’ statement. Suppose that the data  $(U_-, X, Y_-)$  are informative for GLB. By Definition 1, there exist  $P = P^\top > 0$  and  $Q = Q^\top > 0$  such that (11) and (12) hold for all  $(A, B, C, D)$  satisfying (8). We begin with statement (i). Let  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be such that

$$[\xi^\top \ \eta^\top] \begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Moreover, let  $(A, B, C, D) \in \Sigma$  and  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a nonzero vector. Note that

$$(A + \alpha \zeta \xi^\top, B + \alpha \zeta \eta^\top, C, D) \in \Sigma$$

for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , as can be concluded from (8). Since the data are informative for GLB, there exists  $P = P^\top > 0$  such that

$$P - A_\alpha P A_\alpha^\top - B_\alpha B_\alpha^\top > 0 \quad (40)$$

where  $A_\alpha := A + \alpha \zeta \xi^\top$  and  $B_\alpha = B + \alpha \zeta \eta^\top$ . Note that (40) holds for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, by dividing (40) by  $\alpha^2$  and letting  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain

$$(-\xi^\top P \xi - \eta^\top \eta) \zeta \zeta^\top \geq 0.$$

Since  $P > 0$  and  $\zeta \neq 0$ , we see that  $\xi = 0$  and  $\eta = 0$ .

Therefore,  $\begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}$  has full row rank.

To show (ii) and (iii), we first rewrite the matrix inequalities (11) and (12) as the quadratic matrix inequalities

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -P & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -I_m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix} > 0 \quad (41)$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ A \\ C \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} Q & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -Q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -I_p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ A \\ C \end{bmatrix} > 0, \quad (42)$$

respectively. Note that we have the QMI (8) characterizing the set of all systems explaining the data. Moreover, since  $\begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}$

has full row rank and we assume that there exists  $\bar{S}$  such that (10) holds, it follows from the proof of Proposition 2 that systems explaining the data are equivalently characterized by

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}^\top N^\# \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (43)$$

where

$$N^\# := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I_{n+m} \\ I_{n+p} & 0 \end{bmatrix} N^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I_{n+p} \\ I_{n+m} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

see Lemma A.1. From a projection of (8) and Lemma A.4, we have that all  $(A, B)$  satisfying (8) are equivalent to those satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top N_C \begin{bmatrix} I \\ A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (44)$$

where  $N_C$  is given by

$$N_C := \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix}^\top N \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+m} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly, all  $(A, C)$  satisfying (43) are equivalent to those satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} I \\ A \\ C \end{bmatrix}^\top N_O \begin{bmatrix} I \\ A \\ C \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (45)$$

where

$$N_O := \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} \end{bmatrix}^\top N^\# \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n+p} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, we are ready to apply the matrix S-lemma from Appendix C. In particular, by informativity for GLB, (41) holds for all  $(A, B)$  satisfying (44), such that the use of the matrix S-lemma (Proposition A.1 in Appendix C) yields (14) and proves (ii). The proof of (iii) is similar, using (42) and (45).

To prove the ‘if’ statement, first suppose that  $\begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}$  has full row rank. Then, under assumption (10),  $N$  is nonsingular with  $N_{22} < 0$  and  $N_{11} - N_{12}N_{22}^{-1}N_{12}^\top > 0$ . Thus,  $N_O$  is well-defined. Now, suppose that statements (ii) and (iii) are satisfied. Then, the matrix S-lemma in Proposition A.1 implies that (41) and (42) hold for all  $(A, B)$  and  $(A, C)$  satisfying (44) and (45), respectively. This implies that (11) and (12) hold for all systems explaining the data, i.e., the data are informative for generalized Lyapunov balancing.  $\square$

### E. Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof.* We will prove the upper bound by employing the bounded real lemma. To do so, consider any  $\Sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $\hat{\Sigma} \in \hat{\Sigma}$  with realizations  $(A, B, C, D)$  and  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D})$ , respectively. Then, a realization for  $\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma$  is given by the quadruplet

$$A_d := \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{A} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_d := \begin{bmatrix} B \\ \hat{B} \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_d := [C \quad -\hat{C}], \quad D_d := D - \hat{D}.$$

Let  $\gamma > 0$ . By (the discrete-time version of) the bounded real lemma, e.g., [38, Thm. 4.6.6 (iv)], the matrix  $A_d$  satisfies  $\rho(A_d) < 1$  and  $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} < \gamma$  if and only if there exists  $K \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+r) \times (n+r)}$  with  $K = K^\top > 0$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} K & 0 \\ 0 & I_p \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} A_d & B_d \\ C_d & D_d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma^{-2} I_m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_d & B_d \\ C_d & D_d \end{bmatrix}^\top > 0. \quad (46)$$

If (46) holds for all  $\Sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $\hat{\Sigma} \in \hat{\Sigma}$  (for the same  $K$ ), then clearly the norm  $\|\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty}$  is upper bounded by  $\gamma$  for all choices of systems in  $\Sigma$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}$ . Note that (46) can be written in the QMI form

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ A_d^\top & C_d^\top \\ B_d^\top & D_d^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} K & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_p & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -K & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\gamma^{-2} I_m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ A_d^\top & C_d^\top \\ B_d^\top & D_d^\top \end{bmatrix} > 0. \quad (47)$$

We will show the equivalence of (16) and the satisfaction of (47) for all systems in  $\Sigma$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}$  by using the matrix S-lemma. As a first step, we introduce the notation

$$J := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ A^\top & C^\top \\ B^\top & D^\top \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{J} := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ \hat{A}^\top & \hat{C}^\top \\ \hat{B}^\top & \hat{D}^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

such that the data equations (8) and

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ \hat{A}^\top & \hat{C}^\top \\ \hat{B}^\top & \hat{D}^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top N_{V,W} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ \hat{A}^\top & \hat{C}^\top \\ \hat{B}^\top & \hat{D}^\top \end{bmatrix} \geq 0$$

can be written as  $J^\top N J \geq 0$  and  $\hat{J}^\top N_{V,W} \hat{J} \geq 0$ , respectively. On the other hand, it can be checked that (47) is equivalent to

$$\Gamma^\top \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{J} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Theta}_{11} & \tilde{\Theta}_{12} \\ \tilde{\Theta}_{12}^\top & \tilde{\Theta}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{J} \end{bmatrix} \Gamma > 0, \quad (49)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Theta}_{12} &:= \text{blkdiag}(K_{12}, 0, -K_{12}, -\gamma^{-2} I_m), \\ \tilde{\Theta}_{ii} &:= \text{blkdiag}(K_{ii}, \frac{1}{2} I_p, -K_{ii}, -\gamma^{-2} I_m) \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ , and

$$\Gamma := \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_p \\ 0 & I_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -I_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that (49) means that

$$x^\top \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{J} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Theta}_{11} & \tilde{\Theta}_{12} \\ \tilde{\Theta}_{12}^\top & \tilde{\Theta}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{J} \end{bmatrix} x > 0,$$

for all  $x \in \text{im}(\Gamma) \setminus \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+r+p}$  or, equivalently,  $x \in \ker [0 \ I_p \ 0 \ I_p] \setminus \{0\}$ . Let  $R = [0 \ I_p \ 0 \ I_p]$ , then by Finsler’s lemma [39], (49) is equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{J} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Theta}_{11} & \tilde{\Theta}_{12} \\ \tilde{\Theta}_{12}^\top & \tilde{\Theta}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{J} \end{bmatrix} - \mu R^\top R > 0,$$

for some  $\mu$ , which can be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{J} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_{11} & \Theta_{12} \\ \Theta_{12}^\top & \Theta_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{J} \end{bmatrix} > 0, \quad (50)$$

with

$$\Theta_{12} := \text{blkdiag}(K_{12}, -\mu I_p, -K_{12}, -\gamma^{-2} I_m)$$

and

$$\Theta_{ii} := \text{blkdiag}(K_{ii}, (\frac{1}{2} - \mu)I_p, -K_{ii}, -\gamma^{-2} I_m),$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . The motivation of writing (47) in the form (50) is that the later form can be written in a QMI with the same quadratic variable as  $J^\top N J \geq 0$ . Namely, by using a Schur complement argument, (50) is equivalent to

$$J^\top \left( \Theta_{11} - \Theta_{12} \hat{J} \left( \hat{J}^\top \Theta_{22} \hat{J} \right)^{-1} \hat{J}^\top \Theta_{12}^\top \right) J > 0 \quad (51)$$

and  $\hat{J}^\top \Theta_{22} \hat{J} > 0$ . This form allows us to use the matrix S-lemma in Proposition A.1 such that QMI  $J^\top N J \geq 0$  implies (51). Particularly, (51) holds with  $J$  satisfying  $J^\top N J \geq 0$  if and only if

$$\Theta_{11} - \delta N - \Theta_{12} \hat{J} \left( \hat{J}^\top \Theta_{22} \hat{J} \right)^{-1} \hat{J}^\top \Theta_{12}^\top > 0 \quad (52)$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ . To this end, we assume that  $\hat{J}^\top \Theta_{22} \hat{J} > 0$  holds for all  $\hat{J}$  satisfying  $\hat{J}^\top N_{V,W} \hat{J} \geq 0$ . We will see that this assumption is satisfied after completing the proof.

Next, by using the (backward) Schur complement, (52) together with  $\hat{J}^\top \Theta_{22} \hat{J} > 0$  is equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Theta_{11} - \delta N & \Theta_{12} \hat{J} \\ \hat{J}^\top \Theta_{12}^\top & \hat{J}^\top \Theta_{22} \hat{J} \end{bmatrix} > 0.$$

Then, a Schur complement with respect to the block matrix  $\Theta_{11} - \delta N$  results in

$$\hat{J}^\top \left( \Theta_{22} - \Theta_{12}^\top (\Theta_{11} - \delta N)^{-1} \Theta_{12} \right) \hat{J} > 0 \quad (53)$$

and  $\Theta_{11} - \delta N > 0$ . Using Proposition A.1 again, (53) holds for  $\hat{J}$  satisfying  $\hat{J}^\top N_{V,W} \hat{J} \geq 0$  if and only if

$$\Theta_{22} - \eta N_{V,W} - \Theta_{12}^\top (\Theta_{11} - \delta N)^{-1} \Theta_{12} > 0$$

for some  $\eta > 0$ . Finally, a (backward) Schur complement argument implies that this is equivalent to (16) as desired. Here, we have seen that  $\hat{J}$  satisfies  $\hat{J}^\top \Theta_{22} \hat{J} > 0$  for any  $\hat{J}$  satisfying  $\hat{J}^\top N_{V,W} \hat{J} \geq 0$  as an implication of (53).  $\square$

### F. Proof of Proposition 3

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma_0 > 0$ . Then, from the bounded real lemma [38], [40], we have that  $\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} < \gamma_0$  if and only if there exists  $K = K^\top > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{(n+r) \times (n+r)}$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} K & 0 \\ 0 & I_p \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} A_d & B_d \\ C_d & D_d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_0^{-2} I_m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_d & B_d \\ C_d & D_d \end{bmatrix}^\top > 0. \quad (54)$$

where

$$A_d := \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{A}_0 \end{bmatrix}, B_d := \begin{bmatrix} B \\ \hat{B}_0 \end{bmatrix}, C_d := [C \ -\hat{C}_0], D_d := D - \hat{D}_0.$$

Next, we will show that condition (21) is equivalent to the existence of  $K = K^\top > 0$  such that (54) holds for any system in  $\Sigma$ .

First we introduce  $J$  to denote the matrix as in (48). This allows to write (8) into  $J^\top N J \geq 0$  and moreover (54) into

$$\begin{bmatrix} J^\top \bar{\Theta}_{11} J & J \bar{\Theta}_{12} \\ \bar{\Theta}_{12}^\top J & \bar{\Theta}_{22} \end{bmatrix} > 0, \quad (55)$$

where

$$\bar{\Theta}_{11} := \begin{bmatrix} K_{11} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_p - \hat{C}_0 K_{22} \hat{C}_0^\top - \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{D}_0 \hat{D}_0^\top & \hat{C}_0 K_{12}^\top & \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{D}_0 \\ 0 & K_{12} \hat{C}_0^\top & -K_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{D}_0^\top & 0 & -\gamma_0^{-2} I_m \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\bar{\Theta}_{12} := \begin{bmatrix} K_{12} \\ \hat{C}_0 K_{22} \hat{A}_0^\top + \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{D}_0 \hat{B}_0^\top \\ -K_{12} \hat{A}_0^\top \\ -\gamma_0^{-2} \hat{B}_0^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $\bar{\Theta}_{22} := K_{22} - \hat{A}_0 K_{22} \hat{A}_0^\top - \gamma_0^{-2} \hat{B}_0 \hat{B}_0^\top$ , which are denoting the block elements of the first matrix in (21). Furthermore, the Schur complement of (55) admits that  $\bar{\Theta}_{22} > 0$  and

$$J^\top (\bar{\Theta}_{11} - \bar{\Theta}_{12} \bar{\Theta}_{22}^{-1} \bar{\Theta}_{12}^\top) J > 0. \quad (56)$$

Hence, by the strict matrix S-lemma in Proposition A.1, (56) holds with  $J$  satisfying  $J^\top N J \geq 0$  if and only if

$$\bar{\Theta}_{11} - \bar{\Theta}_{12} \bar{\Theta}_{22}^{-1} \bar{\Theta}_{12}^\top - \delta N > 0 \quad (57)$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ . Finally, (57) and  $\bar{\Theta}_{22} > 0$  yield (21) via the (backward) Schur complement.  $\square$

### REFERENCES

- [1] B. C. Moore, "Principal component analysis in linear systems: Controllability, observability, and model reduction," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 17–32, 1981.
- [2] L. Pernebo and L. Silverman, "Model reduction via balanced state space representations," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 382–387, 1982.
- [3] D. F. Enns, "Model reduction with balanced realizations: An error bound and a frequency weighted generalization," in *Proceedings of the 23rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 1984, pp. 127–132.
- [4] P. Benner and T. Damm, "Lyapunov equations, energy functionals, and model order reduction of bilinear and stochastic systems," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 686–711, 2011.
- [5] K. Glover, "All optimal Hankel-norm approximations of linear multivariable systems and their  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -error bounds," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1115–1193, 1984.
- [6] P. Feldmann and R. W. Freund, "Efficient linear circuit analysis by Padé approximation via the Lanczos process," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 639–649, 1995.
- [7] E. J. Grimme, "Krylov projection methods for model reduction," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, 1997.
- [8] K. Gallivan, A. Vandendorpe, and P. Van Dooren, "Model reduction of MIMO systems via tangential interpolation," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 328–349, 2004.
- [9] A. Astolfi, "Model reduction by moment matching for linear and nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp. 2321–2336, 2010.
- [10] J. M. A. Scherpen, "Balancing for nonlinear systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 143–153, 1993.
- [11] B. Besselink, N. van de Wouw, J. M. A. Scherpen, and H. Nijmeijer, "Model reduction for nonlinear systems by incremental balanced truncation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 2739–2753, 2014.

- [12] T. C. Ionescu and A. Astolfi, "Nonlinear moment matching-based model order reduction," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 2837–2847, 2015.
- [13] A. C. Antoulas, *Approximation of Large-Scale Dynamical Systems*. Philadelphia, PA: Advances in Design and Control, SIAM, 2005.
- [14] A. C. Antoulas, C. A. Beattie, and S. Gugercin, *Interpolatory Methods for Model Reduction*. Philadelphia, PA: Computational Science and Engineering, SIAM, 2020.
- [15] P. Benner, S. Gugercin, and K. Willcox, "A survey of projection-based model reduction methods for parametric dynamical systems," *SIAM Review*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 483–531, 2015.
- [16] P. Rapisarda and H. L. Trentelman, "Identification and data-driven model reduction of state-space representations of lossless and dissipative systems from noise-free data," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 1721–1728, 2011.
- [17] I. Markovsky, J. C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, and B. L. M. De Moor, "Algorithms for deterministic balanced subspace identification," *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 755–766, 2005.
- [18] I. V. Gosea, S. Gugercin, and C. Beattie, "Data-driven balancing of linear dynamical systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.01006*, 2021.
- [19] S. Lall, J. E. Marsden, and S. Glavaški, "A subspace approach to balanced truncation for model reduction of nonlinear control systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 519–535, 2002.
- [20] Y. Kawano and J. M. A. Scherpen, "Empirical differential Gramians for nonlinear model reduction," *Automatica*, vol. 127, p. 109534, 2021.
- [21] Y. Kawano, B. Besselink, J. M. A. Scherpen, and M. Cao, "Data-driven model reduction of monotone systems by nonlinear DC gains," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2094–2106, 2020.
- [22] A. J. Mayo and A. C. Antoulas, "A framework for the solution of the generalized realization problem," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 425, no. 2-3, pp. 634–662, 2007.
- [23] I. V. Gosea and A. C. Antoulas, "Stability preserving post-processing methods applied in the Loewner framework," in *Proceedings of the 20th IEEE Workshop on Signal and Power Integrity*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–4.
- [24] C. Beattie and S. Gugercin, "Realization-independent  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -approximation," in *Proceedings of the 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 4953–4958.
- [25] B. Peherstorfer, S. Gugercin, and K. Willcox, "Data-driven reduced model construction with time-domain Loewner models," *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. A2152–A2178, 2017.
- [26] Z. Drmač and B. Peherstorfer, "Learning low-dimensional dynamical-system models from noisy frequency-response data with loewner rational interpolation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.00110*, 2019.
- [27] A. M. Burohman, B. Besselink, J. M. A. Scherpen, and M. K. Camlibel, "From data to reduced-order models via moment matching," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.00150*, 2020.
- [28] H. J. van Waarde, J. Eising, H. L. Trentelman, and M. K. Camlibel, "Data informativity: A new perspective on data-driven analysis and control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 4753–4768, 2020.
- [29] H. J. van Waarde, M. K. Camlibel, and M. Mesbahi, "From noisy data to feedback controllers: non-conservative design via a matrix S-lemma," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control (Early Access)*, 2020.
- [30] G. E. Dullerud and F. Paganini, *A Course in Robust Control Theory: A Convex Approach*. New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media, 2000, vol. 36.
- [31] H. J. van Waarde, M. K. Camlibel, P. Rapisarda, and H. L. Trentelman, "Data-driven dissipativity analysis: application of the matrix S-lemma," to appear in *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 2022, preprint available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.02090>.
- [32] V. A. Yakubovich, "S-procedure in nonlinear control theory," *Vestnik Leningrad University Mathematics*, vol. 4, pp. 73–93, 1977.
- [33] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovskii, *Interior-Point Polynomial Algorithms in Convex Programming*. Philadelphia, PA: Studies in Applied Mathematics, SIAM, 1994, vol. 13.
- [34] T. C. Ionescu, "Two-sided time-domain moment matching for linear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 2632–2637, 2015.
- [35] J. Lofberg, "YALMIP : A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2004, pp. 284–289.
- [36] K. C. Toh, M. J. Todd, and R. H. Tütüncü, "SDPT3—A MATLAB software package for semidefinite programming, version 1.3," *Optimization Methods and Software*, vol. 11, no. 1-4, pp. 545–581, 1999.
- [37] D. S. Bernstein, *Matrix Mathematics: Theory, Facts, and Formulas*, 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University press, 2009.
- [38] R. E. Skelton, T. Iwasaki, and K. M. Grigoriadis, *A Unified Algebraic Approach to Linear Control Design*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis Ltd., 1997.
- [39] P. Finsler, "Über das vorkommen definiter und semidefiniter formen in scharen quadratischer formen," *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, vol. 9, pp. 188–192, 1936.
- [40] C. E. de Souza and L. Xie, "On the discrete-time bounded real lemma with application in the characterization of static state feedback  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  controllers," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 61–71, 1992.