15th Triennial World Congress, Barcelona, Spain

BAYES PARAMETER IDENTIFICATION WITH REFERENCE TO NONLINEAR OPTIMAL CONTROL

Piotr Kulczycki [1]

Systems Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences
ul. Newelska 6, PL-01-447 Warsaw, Poland
e-mail: kulczycki@ibspan.waw.pl ; fax: +48 22 8372772

Abstract: This paper deals with the task of parameter identification using the Bayes estimation method, which makes it possible to take into account the differing consequences of positive and negative estimation errors. The calculation procedures are based on the kernel estimators technique. The final result constitutes a complete algorithm usable for specifying the value of the Bayes estimator on the basis of an experimentally obtained random sample. An elaborated method is provided for numerical computations. In particular, an exemplary application to a random time-optimal control for nonlinear mechanical systems is described. *Copyright © 2002 IFAC*

Keywords: Parameter Identification; Bayes Approach Time-Optimal Control; Nonlinear Mechanical Systems; Uncertain Dynamic Systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the elementary issues of contemporary engineering is parameter identification, i.e. the specification of the value of a parameter. In the case typical for engineering applications, its realizations are directly measurable (observable). In that situation, one has – not knowing the "true" value of the parameter x – its m measurements $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m$, obtained by using independent experiments, and in practice burdened with errors of varying origin. On the basis of these measurements, that number $\hat{x}$ which would most nearly approximate the "true" (but unknown) value of the parameter x must be determined. If such measurements can be treated as the sum of the "true" value and the random disturbances, then the task from the mathematical point of view becomes a typical problem for point estimation, while $\hat{x}$ is called the estimator of the parameter x (Lehmann, 1983).

The procedures generally used for specifying the estimator, such as the least squares or maximum likelihood methods, are noted for their great simplicity and general availability in the literature; however, they do not make it possible to take into account the differing consequences of positive and negative estimation errors. Yet in engineering practice it often turns out that one of the two has only a minor impact on the quality of work of the device, while the other has a far more profound influence, not excluding system failure.

The Bayes estimation method (Lehmann, 1983; Section 4.1) used in this paper to solve the problem of parameter identification has no such shortcomings.

[1] The author is also Head of the Department of Control Engineering at the Cracow University of Technology, Poland.

The calculational procedures worked out below will be based on the kernel estimators technique (Silverman, 1986; Wand & Jones, 1994). The final result is a complete usable algorithm for specifying the value of the parameter estimator, which in a natural way makes it possible to take into account the consequences of estimation errors differing in size and sign.

The method presented in this paper is published more fully in article (Kulczycki, 2001) with reference to applicational aspects described in (Kulczycki, 1999a, 1999b, 2000, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c; Schioler & Kulczycki, 1997).

2. BAYES ESTIMATION

Assume the probability space (R, Σ, P), where Ω denotes the set of elementary events, Σ means its σ-algebra, and P is a probability measure. Suppose that the real random variable $X : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ represents the measurement process, and its realizations are interpreted as the particular independent measurements of the value of the estimated parameter x. Consider also the loss function $l : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$; its values $l(\hat{x}, \mathbf{x})$ denote the losses which may be incurred by assuming $\hat{x}$ as the estimator, whereas the "true" (but unknown) value of the estimated parameter is $\mathbf{x}$. Let $l_b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ be a function of the so-called Bayes losses

$$l_b(\hat{x}) = \int_{\Omega} l(\hat{x}, X(\omega))\, dP(\omega) \quad , \tag{1}$$

where $\int_{\Omega} . \, dP(\omega)$ denotes the integral with respect to the probability measure P. Therefore, $l_b(\hat{x})$ constitutes the expectation value of losses if the value $\hat{x}$ is assumed. Every element $\hat{x}_b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$l_b(\hat{x}_b) = \inf_{\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}} l_b(\hat{x}) \tag{2}$$

is known as a Bayes estimator. For details see Section 4.1 of book (Lehmann, 1983).

In the present paper, consideration will be given to an asymmetrical form of the loss function

$$l(\hat{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} -p_1(\hat{x} - x) & \text{if} \\ p_2(\hat{x} - x) & \text{if} \quad \hat{x} - x \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad , \tag{3}$$

where $p_1, p_2 > 0$. The constants p_1 and p_2 constitute, therefore, the coefficients of proportionality of losses suffered after obtaining a value of the estimator that is either smaller or greater than the "true" value of the estimated parameter, i.e. for negative and positive estimation errors, respectively. With the values p_1 and p_2 given, one can easily calculate the quantity r such that

$$r = \frac{p_1}{p_1 + p_2} = \frac{\frac{p_1}{p_2}}{\frac{p_1}{p_2} + 1} \tag{4}$$

It is shown in (Kulczycki, 2002a) that if the quantile of order r is uniquely defined, then it constitutes the Bayes estimator for the loss function given by formula (3). (In practice, the notion of the quantile of order r means such a real value q that the probabilities of the intervals $(-\infty, q]$ and $[q, \infty)$ amount to r and $1-r$, respectively.)

The following will present the practical procedure (Kulczycki, 2001) for calculating the value of the quantile using the kernel estimators technique, which in accordance with the above result will complete the solution of the Bayes method for the point estimation task considered here.

3. KERNEL ESTIMATORS TECHNIQUE

The kernel estimator of the density function of the real random variable X, calculated on the basis of m realizations $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m$, is defined in its basic form by the dependence

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{mh} \sum_{i=1}^{m} K\left(\frac{x - x_i}{h}\right) \quad , \tag{5}$$

where the measurable and symmetrical function $K : \mathbb{R} \to [0, \infty)$ with a unique integral and a maximum in point zero is called the kernel, while the positive constant h is known as the smoothing parameter. Detailed information concerning the rules for choosing the function K and fixing the value of the parameter h is included in books (Silverman, 1986; Wand & Jones, 1994). Especially, the approximate value of the optimal (in the mean squared sense) smoothing parameter can be calculated by assuming the normal distribution; one then obtains

$$h = \left(V_K \frac{8}{3} \sqrt{\frac{1}{m}}\right)^{1/5} \hat{\sigma} \quad , \tag{6}$$

while

$$V_K = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K(x)^2\, dx \cdot \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^2 K(x)\, dx \right)^{-2} \tag{7}$$

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i^2 - \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i \right)^2 \quad . \tag{8}$$

On the other hand, the choice of the type of the kernel K does not have a major impact on the statistical quality of estimation, and in practice it becomes possible to take into account primarily the desired properties of the estimator obtained, e.g. the

simplicity of calculation or the finiteness of the support, etc.

In many applications, it proves to be particularly advantageous to introduce the concept of modification of the smoothing parameter. The estimator can then be constructed in the following manner:

(A) the kernel estimator $\hat{f}$ is calculated in accordance with basic dependence *(5);*

(B) the modifying parameters $s_i > 0$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$ are stated as

$$s_i = \left(\frac{\hat{f}(x_i)}{b} \right)^{-112} , \tag{9}$$

where b denotes the geometric mean of the numbers $\hat{f}(x_1), \hat{f}(x_2), \ldots, \hat{f}(x_m)$, given in the form of the logarithmic equation

$$\log(b) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \log(\hat{f}(x_i)) \quad ; \tag{10}$$

(C) the kernel estimator with the modified smoothing parameter is defined by the formula

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{mh} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{s_i} K\left(\frac{x - x_i}{hs_i} \right) \tag{11}$$

One of the essential features of such an estimator consists in its slight sensitivity to the exactness of the choice of the parameter h. In practice, when the modification procedure is applied, it quite often proves sufficient to accept the approximate value given by dependence **(6).**

A detailed description of the above technique can be found in books (Silverman, 1986; Wand and Jones, 1994).

4. THE ALGORITHM

To continue the considerations of the previous section: if the kernel K is positive and has the primitive given by

$$I(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} K(y)\, dy \quad , \tag{12}$$

then the estimator of the distribution function $\hat{F}$ with modified smoothing parameter can be described as

$$\hat{F}(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} I\left(\frac{x - x_i}{hs_i} \right) \quad , \tag{13}$$

and, therefore, the estimator of quantile of order r, denoted hereinafter as $\hat{q}$, is uniquely defined by the following equation (Kulczycki, 2001):

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} I\left(\frac{\hat{q} - x_i}{hs_i} \right) = mr \tag{14}$$

That estimator is strongly consistent; for a proof see (Kulczycki & Dawidowicz, 1999). Moreover, the estimator $\hat{q}$ may be calculated recurrently using Newton's method as the limit of the sequence $\{\hat{q}^k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ defined by the formulas

$$\hat{q}^0 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i \tag{15}$$

$$\hat{q}^{k+1} = \hat{q}^k + \frac{r - \hat{F}(\hat{q}^k)}{\hat{f}(\hat{q}^k)} \quad \text{for } k = 0,1,\ldots , \tag{16}$$

since, according to dependencies (11)-(13), the function $\hat{f}$ constitutes the derivative of the mapping $\hat{F}$.

For the purposes of the method elaborated here, the kernel

$$K(x) = \frac{e^{-x}}{(1 + e^{-x})^2} \tag{17}$$

can be proposed. It fulfills all the requirements formulated above, and in particular its primitive has a form convenient for calculations, namely:

$$I(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}} \quad . \tag{18}$$

In this case, the quantity V_k occurring in dependence **(6)** amounts to

$$V_K = \frac{3}{2\pi^4} \quad . \tag{19}$$

For details of the presented method, see (Kulczycki, 2001).

5. FINAL SUGGESTIONS AND EXEMPLARY APPLICATION TO NONLINEAR OPTIMAL CONTROL

The substance of this paper provides complete material defining the practical algorithm used to calculate the Bayes estimator for loss function (3). It is assumed that m independent measurements $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m$ of the estimated parameter x are available. Based on prior process knowledge, the user should also identify the ratio p_1 / p_2 which characterizes the proportion of losses resulting from negative and positive estimation errors, i.e. underestimating or overestimating the parameter. It is then easy to successively calculate the following values:

(A) the order r of the quantile – from the second part of formula (4),

(B) the smoothing parameter h – on the basis of dependence (6), along with **(8)** and (19),

(C) quantities $\hat{f}(x_i)$ for basic form (5), applying also equality (17),

(D) modifying parameters s_i – thanks to procedure (9)-(10).

Since the forms of the functions K and I are given by dependencies (17) and (18), and in turn the kernel estimators $\hat{f}$ and $\hat{F}$ by formulas (11) and (13), then all the quantities needed to apply algorithm (15)-(16) have already been defined. This is tantamount to specifying the value of the Bayes estimator.

The estimator obtained in this fashion is strongly consistent, i.e. with probability 1 it converges on the proper value along with the increase in the size of sample. The strict formulation of this fact, under very mild assumptions, is presented in paper (Kulczycki & Dawidowicz, 1999). It should be emphasized that the quite general condition of the uniqueness of the quantile of order r, fulfilled e.g. when the random variable X has a density function with a connected support, is in practice the only limitation on the possibility of applying the method proposed in this paper.

The correct functioning of the algorithm here designed has been comprehensively verified using a numerical simulation, Random disturbances of various distributions, including asymmetrical, long-tailed, and multimodal, were subjected to testing. The results obtained for normal standard distribution are shown in columns (a) of Tab. 1. For simplicity, the parameter being estimated had the value zero.

When $p_1 = p_2$, i.e. given the assumption that negative and positive estimation errors entail the same losses, the Bayes estimator and the classical sample mean are conditioned analogously, which renders it possible to compare the results that are obtained by using them. Columns (a) and (b) for $p_1 = 1$, $p_2 = 1$ in Tab. 1 indicate that their precision was comparable. In the case of the Bayes estimator, however, it is more important that, if $p_1 \neq p_2$, then its value was properly shifted in the direction of those errors for which the parameter p_1 or p_2 was less (see columns (a) in Tab. 1, keeping in mind that the standard deviation of the random disturbances was 1).

The results obtained by using the quantile estimator worked out in Section 4 were more precise in comparison with those generated by other quantile estimators available in the literature, especially with small sample sizes (e.g. compare columns (c) and (d) in Tab. 1 created for the estimators proposed in this work and for Y_8 recommended in survey paper (Parrish, 1990), respectively).

In **sum,** for $p_1 = p_2$ the proposed algorithm yields results that are comparable to those obtained using the sample mean, while assuming different p_1 and p_2 opens up possibilities that are unavailable for **this** classical method: to properly shift the value of the estimator in the direction associated with smaller losses. The Bayes estimation method proposed here is natural, easy to interpret and use in practice.

For details of the method, see (Kulczycki, 2001).

The algorithm presented here **has** also been successfully applied to the random time-optimal control for nonlinear mechanical systems, whose dynamics are described by the following differential inclusion:

$$\ddot{Y}(t) \in H(\dot{Y}(t), Y(t), t) + U(t) \quad , \tag{20}$$

where Y denotes a position of the object, U is a bounded control variable, and the function H represents a multivalued discontinuous model of motion resistance

$$H(\dot{Y}(t), Y(t), t) = X(\dot{Y}(t), Y(t), t) \cdot F(\dot{Y}(t)) \quad , \tag{21}$$

while X denotes a continuous mapping, and F means a piecewise continuous function that may be additionally multivalued at the points of discontinuity. If one omits **this** factor, i.e. when $H \equiv 0$, inclusion (20) is reduced to the classical differential equation that expresses the second law of Newtonian mechanics. This problem is of fundamental significance, especially in the control of industrial manipulators and robots. The task of time-optimal control consists here in bringing the object state to the target $[Y_1^{tar}, Y_2^{tar}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$ in a minimal and finite time. Since the solution of this issue by deterministic methods, mainly due to complex form of the function X, has proven to be impossible without significant trivialization of the model (21), a probabilistic concept was proposed in articles (Kulczycki, 1999a, 1999b). Namely, the values of the function X have been treated as the realizations of the random variable x.

Assume $\hat{x}$ as a fixed real number, and suppose that $[Y_1^+, Y_2^+]^T$ and $[Y_1^-, Y_2^-]^T$ are solutions of the differential equation related then to system (20)-(21):

$$\dot{Y}_1(t) = Y_2(t) \tag{22}$$

$$\dot{Y}_2(t) \in \hat{x} F(Y_2(t)) + U(t) \tag{23}$$

with the condition $[Y_1^+(0), Y_2^+(0)]^T = [Y_1^-(0), Y_2^-(0)]^T = [Y_1^{tar}, Y_2^{tar}]^T$, defined on the interval $(-\infty, 0]$, and generated by the control $U \equiv +1$ or $U \equiv -1$, respectively. Moreover, consider

$$K^+ = \{[Y_1^+(t) Y_2^+(t)]^T \quad \text{for} \quad t < 0\} \tag{24}$$

$$K^- = \{[Y_1^-(t), Y_2^-(t)]^T \quad \text{for} \quad t < 0\} \quad ; \tag{25}$$

therefore, these are the sets of all states which can be brought to the target by the control $U \equiv +1$ or $U \equiv -1$, respectively. Let also

$p_1 = 1$, $p_2 = 5$ $\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2} = 0{,}2 \ ; \ r = 0{,}167\right)$

M	(a)	(c)	(d)
10	-1,031	0,328	0,340
20	-1,021	0,231	0,241
50	-1,007	0,152	0,162
100	-0,993	0,108	0,115
200	-0,980	0,075	0,081
500	-0,972	0,049	0,053
1000	**-0,967**	0,034	0,037

$p_1 = 1$, $p_2 = 3$ $\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2} = 0{,}333 \ ; \ r = 0{,}25\right)$

m	(a)	(c)	(d)
10	-0,717	0,296	0,328
20	-0,707	0,213	0,229
50	-0,698	0,138	0,154
100	-0,690	0,099	0,107
200	-0,682	0,069	0,075
500	-0,677	0,045	0,048
1000	**-0,674**	0,031	0,034

$p_1 = 1$, $p_2 = 2$ $\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2} = 0{,}5 \ ; \ r = 0{,}333\right)$

m	(a)	(c)	(d)
10	-0,462	0,279	0,310
20	-0,451	0,206	0,229
50	-0,447	0,130	0,145
100	-0,442	0,093	0,105
200	-0,436	0,065	0,072
500	-0,434	0,043	0,046
1000	-0,431	0,030	0,033

$p_1 = 1$, $p_2 = 1$ $\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2} = 1 \ ; \ r = 0{,}5\right)$

M	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
10	-0,008	-0,005	0,268	0,293
20	-0,004	-0,003	0,200	0,222
50	-0,005	-0,007	0,125	0,138
100	-0,003	-0,003	0,089	0,099
200	-0,001	-0,001	0,064	0,070
500	-0,002	-0,002	0,041	0,044
1000	-0,001	-0,001	0,029	0,031

$p_1 = 2$, $p_2 = 1$ $\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2} = 2 \ ; \ r = 0{,}667\right)$

M	(a)	(c)	(d)
10	0,440	0,279	0,309
20	0,442	0,202	0,221
50	0,434	0,130	0,143
100	0,433	0,093	0,102
200	0,433	0,067	0,073
500	0,431	0,042	0,046
1000	0,431	0,030	0,032

$p_1 = 3$, $p_2 = 1$ $\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2} = 3 \ ; \ r = 0{,}75\right)$

m	(a)	(c)	(d)
10	0,701	0,295	0,326
20	0,697	0,212	0,228
50	0,683	0,136	0,148
100	0,681	0,097	0,106
200	0,678	0,070	0,078
500	0,674	0,045	0,048
1000	0,674	0,032	0,034

$p_1 = 5$, $p_2 = 1$ $\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2} = 5 \ ; \ r = 0{,}833\right)$

m	(a)	(c)	(d)
10	1,025	0,324	0,346
20	1,016	0,235	0,257
50	0,989	0,148	0,164
100	0,984	0,108	0,117
200	0,976	0,077	0,084
500	0,969	0,049	0,053
1000	0,968	0,035	0,037

Tab. 1. Results obtained for parameter zero and disturbances with standard normal distribution:
(a) value of the Bayes estimator proposed in this work,
(b) value of the classical sample mean (only for $p_1 = 1$, $p_2 = 1$),
(c) precision (in relation to theoretical) of the quantile estimator proposed in this work,
(d) precision (in relation to theoretical) of the estimator Y_8 recommended in survey paper (Parrish, 1990).

$$R^+ = \{[Y_1, Y_2]^T \in \mathbb{R}^2 \quad \text{such thatthereexists} \quad [Y_1^*, Y_2]^T \in K \quad \text{with} \quad Y_1 < Y_1^*\} \tag{26}$$

$$R^- = \{[Y_1, Y_2]^T \in \mathbb{R}^2 \quad \text{such thatthereexists} \quad [Y_1^*, Y_2]^T \in K \quad \text{with} \quad Y_1^* < Y_1\} \tag{27}$$

where $K = K^- \cup \{[Y_1^{tar}, Y_2^{tar}]^T\} \cup K^+$. The time-optimal control is then expressed by the formula:

$$U(t) = U_{FC}(Y_1(t), Y_2(t)) = \tag{28}$$
$$= \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if} \quad [Y_1(t), Y_2(t)]^T \in (R^- \cup K^-) \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad [Y_1(t), Y_2(t)]^T = [Y_1^{tar}, Y_2^{tar}]^T \\ +1 & \text{if} \quad [Y_1(t), Y_2(t)]^T \in (R^+ \cup K^+) \end{cases}$$

and the set K constitutes a switching curve (Kulczycki, 1999a, 1999b).

In the time-optimal feedback controller equations, i.e. formulas (24)-(28), the parameter $\hat{x}$ intervenes, because it influences the form of the trajectories $[Y_1^+, Y_2^+]^T$, $[Y_1^-, Y_2^-]^T$ and therefore also the shape of the switching curve K. In the event that this parameter is underestimated, sliding trajectories appear in the controlled system, increasing the time to reach the target proportionally to the magnitude of the underestimation. If, however, it is overestimated, over-regulations occur in the system, with a much greater impact on the increase in the time to reach the target (likewise proportionally to the value of the overestimation), in the extreme case threatening failure of the device.

For details of the above random time-optimal control task, see articles (Kulczycki, 1999a, 1999b).

In the practical application considered here, the value of the parameter $\hat{x}$ was estimated using the procedure of Bayes estimation described in this paper. This assured the proper operation of the controlling system, while the speed of its operation made possible effective adaptation to changing external conditions. The calculation was performed for $p_1 / p_2 = 0{,}2$; **thanks** to this, more desirable sliding trajectories clearly dominated in the controlled system. In conclusion it should be strongly emphasized that the designed control structure turn out to be only slightly sensitive to the inaccuracy resulting from identification and the occurrence of perturbations. Such robustness should be emphasized as a very valuable property of uncertain, especially random, control systems.

The foregoing applicational example points up an engineering interpretation of the issue, somewhat exceeding the strict mathematical point estimation formulation presented in the Introduction. The parameter under consideration may in fact be the reflection of an entire array of phenomena, reduced to a single constant due to the necessity to simplify the model, Then the issue consists not so much in approaching the "true" value (since no such thing exists), but rather in specifying the best possible characterization of these phenomena using a single number. From the mathematical point of view, the formalism of statistical decision theory (Berger, 1980) is then appropriate, although the results obtained using the Bayes decision rule are in such case identical with those presented in this paper for the task of point estimation.

REFERENCES

Berger, J.O. (1980). *Statistical Decision Theory.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

Kulczycki, P. (1999a). "A Random Approach to Time-Optimal Control". *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurements and Control,* **121,** 542-543.

Kulczycki, P. (1999b). "Random time-optimal control for mechanical systems". *European Journal of Automation,* **33,** 115-140.

Kulczycki, P. (2000). "Fuzzy Controller for Mechanical Systems". *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems,* **8**, 645-652.

Kulczycki, P. (2001). "An Algorithm for Bayes Parameter Identification". *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control,* Special Issue on the Identification of Mechanical Systems, **123,** 611-614.

Kulczycki, P. (2002a). "Fuzzy Controller for a System with Uncertain Load'. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems,* accepted for publication.

Kulczycki, P. (2002b). "Statistical Inference for Fault Detection: A Complete Algorithm Based on Kemel Estimators". *Kybernetika,* accepted for publication,

Kulczycki, P. (2002c). "A test for comparing distributions functions with strongly unbalanced samples". *Statistica,* accepted for publication.

Kulczycki, P. and A.L. Dawidowicz (1999). "Kemel Estimator of Quantile". *Universitatis Jagiellonicae Acta Mathematica,* **37,** 101-112.

Lehmann, E.L. (1983). *Theory of Point Estimation.* Wiley, New York.

Pamsh, R.S. (1990). "Comparison of Quantile Estimators in Normal Sampling". *Biometrics,* **46,** 247-257.

Schiøler, H. and P. Kulczycki (1997). "Neural Network for Estimating Conditional Distributions". *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks,* **8,** 1015-1025.

Silverman, B.W. (1986). *Density Estimation for Statistics and Data Analysis.* Chapman and Hall, London.

Wand M.P. and M.C. Jones (1994). Kemel Smoothing. Chapman and Hall, London.