

Global passive system approximation

L. Knockaert¹

*Dept. Information Technology, IBCN, Ghent University
Gaston Crommenlaan 8, PB 201, B-9050 Gent, Belgium*

Abstract

In this paper we present a new approach towards global passive approximation in order to find a passive transfer function $G(s)$ that is nearest in some well-defined matrix norm sense to a non-passive transfer function $H(s)$. It is based on existing solutions to pertinent matrix nearness problems. It is shown that the key point in constructing the nearest passive transfer function, is to find a good rational approximation of the well-known ramp function over an interval defined by the minimum and maximum dissipation of $H(s)$. The proposed algorithms rely on the stable anti-stable projection of a given transfer function. Pertinent examples are given to show the scope and accuracy of the proposed algorithms.

Key words: Passivity, positive-real lemma, rational approximation

1. INTRODUCTION

For linear time-invariant systems, passivity guarantees stability and the possibility of synthesis of a transfer function by means of a lossy physical network of resistors, capacitors, inductors and transformers [1]. Therefore, passivity enforcement [2] and passification (passivation) [3] have become important issues in recent years [4–8], especially as more and more software tools render transfer functions which need passivity enforcement as a postprocessing step in order to generate reliable physical models. However, most of the techniques [2–7] are local perturbative and/or feedback approaches with fixed poles, while [8] is based on Fourier approximation, yielding passivated systems with a large number of poles.

In this paper we present a new global approach in the sense that we find a passive transfer function $G(s)$ that is nearest in a well-defined matrix norm sense to a non-passive transfer function $H(s)$. It is based on existing solutions to some pertinent matrix nearness problems [9, 10]. We show that the key point in constructing the nearest passive transfer function $G(s)$, is to find a good rational approximation for the ramp function $\max(0, x)$ over an interval defined by the minimum and maximum dissipation of the non-passive transfer function $H(s)$. It is also shown that in the Chebyshev or minimax sense this requires finding a rational Chebyshev approximation of the square root \sqrt{x} over the interval $[0, 1]$. The proposed algorithms rely heavily on the stable anti-stable projection [11, 12] of a given transfer function. Finally, five pertinent examples, both SISO and MIMO, are given to show the accuracy and relevance of the proposed algorithms.

2. PASSIVITY AND DISSIPATION

Notation : Throughout the paper X^T and X^H respectively denote the transpose and Hermitian transpose of a matrix X , and I_n denotes the identity matrix of dimension n . The Frobenius norm is defined as $\|X\|_F = \sqrt{\text{tr } X^H X}$ and the spectral norm (or 2-norm or maximum singular value) is defined as $\|X\|_2 =$

Email address: luc.knockaert@intec.ugent.be (L. Knockaert)

¹Corresponding author : tel. +3292643328, fax +3292649969. This work was supported by a grant of the Research Foundation-Flanders (FWO-Vlaanderen)

$\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(X^H X)}$. It is easy to show that $\|X^H\|_F = \|X\|_F$ and $\|X^H\|_2 = \|X\|_2$. For two Hermitian matrices X and Y , the matrix inequalities $X > Y$ or $X \geq Y$ mean that $X - Y$ is respectively positive definite or positive semidefinite. The closed right halfplane $\Re[s] \geq 0$ is denoted \mathbb{C}_+ .

For the real system with minimal realization

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu \quad (1a)$$

$$y = Cx + Du \quad (1b)$$

where $B \neq 0$, $C \neq 0$ are respectively $n \times p$ and $p \times n$ real matrices and $A \neq 0$ is a $n \times n$ real matrix, to be passive, it is required that the $p \times p$ transfer function

$$H(s) = C(sI_n - A)^{-1}B + D$$

is analytic in \mathbb{C}_+ , such that

$$H(i\omega) + H(i\omega)^H \geq 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}$$

It is well-known [13] that the positive-real lemma in linear matrix inequality (LMI) format : $\exists P^T = P > 0$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^T P + PA & PB - C^T \\ B^T P - C & -D - D^T \end{bmatrix} \leq 0$$

guarantees the passivity of the system (1). A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for passivity is that A is stable, i.e., its eigenvalues are located in the closed left halfplane. In the sequel we will always suppose that A is Hurwitz stable, i.e., its eigenvalues are located in the open left halfplane. We will also assume, unless otherwise stated, that $H(s)$ is non-passive, and devise ways of finding another as close as possible passive transfer function $G(s)$.

In order to measure how far a given system is from passive we define the minimum dissipation $\delta_-(H)$ [14] as

$$\delta_-(H) = \min_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \lambda_{\min} [R(\omega)]$$

where

$$R(\omega) = H(i\omega) + H(i\omega)^H$$

Similarly, we also define the maximum dissipation $\delta_+(H)$ as

$$\delta_+(H) = \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \lambda_{\max} [R(\omega)]$$

It is clear that the system is passive if and only if $\delta_-(H) \geq 0$. If $\delta_-(H) < 0$ the system is non-passive, and if $\delta_+(H) \leq 0$, the system is anti-passive, in the sense that then the system with transfer function $-H(s)$ is passive.

In the sequel we will assume, unless otherwise stated, that the system is non-passive but passifiable, i.e., $-\infty < \delta_-(H) < 0 < \delta_+(H) < \infty$. To obtain $\delta_-(H)$ (or similarly $\delta_+(H)$), a simple bisection algorithm, based on the existence (or non-existence) of imaginary eigenvalues of the one-parameter Hamiltonian matrix

$$\mathbf{N}_\delta = \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & -A^T \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B \\ -C^T \end{bmatrix} (\delta I_p - D - D^T)^{-1} [C \quad B^T]$$

was proposed in [14]. We have

Proposition 2.1. $\delta > \delta_-(H)$ if and only if \mathbf{N}_δ admits purely imaginary eigenvalues.

Proof. See [14]. □

It is clear that Proposition 2.1 always allows to decide, by checking the eigenvalues of \mathbf{N}_δ , whether $\delta > \delta_-(H)$ or not. This forms the basis of the bisection algorithm of [14]. The only problem is to start with a so-called bracket, i.e., provable lower and upper bounds for $\delta_-(H)$. For that purpose we have

Proposition 2.2.

$$-2\|H\|_\infty \leq \delta_-(H) \leq \lambda_{\min}(D + D^T) \leq \lambda_{\max}(D + D^T) \leq \delta_+(H) \leq 2\|H\|_\infty \quad (2)$$

Proof. Straightforward. Here the infinity norm $\|H\|_\infty$ is defined as

$$\|H\|_\infty = \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \|H(i\omega)\|_2$$

□

Note that we can replace $\|H\|_\infty$ in (2) by an upper bound such as the one given in [14].

3. MATRIX NEARNESS CONSIDERATIONS

Theorem 3.1. *Let $A = A^H$ be any Hermitian matrix with eigendecomposition $A = U\Lambda U^H$, with U a unitary and Λ a real diagonal matrix. Then the positive semidefinite Hermitian matrix nearest to A , both with respect to the Frobenius and spectral norms, is given by $A_+ = U \max(0, \Lambda) U^H$.*

Proof. First we give the proof for the Frobenius norm. We need to find

$$\min_{X \geq 0} \|X - A\|_F$$

Putting $X = UYU^H$, and exploiting the unitary invariance of the Frobenius norm, we obtain

$$\|X - A\|_F^2 = \|Y - \Lambda\|_F^2 = \sum_{i \neq j} |Y_{ij}|^2 + \sum_i |Y_{ii} - \Lambda_{ii}|^2$$

It is clear that the minimum occurs when $Y_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$, in other words when Y is diagonal. Hence we obtain

$$\|X - A\|_F^2 = \|Y - \Lambda\|_F^2 = \sum_i |Y_{ii} - \Lambda_{ii}|^2$$

It is easy to see that we must take $Y_{ii} = \max(0, \Lambda_{ii})$ and this completes the proof for the Frobenius norm. Note that

$$\min_{X \geq 0} \|X - A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{\lambda_i(A) < 0} \lambda_i(A)^2}$$

For the spectral norm, it is known [9, 10] that

$$\min_{X \geq 0} \|X - A\|_2 = \inf\{r \geq 0 : A + rI \geq 0\}$$

In other words,

$$\min_{X \geq 0} \|X - A\|_2 = \max(0, -\lambda_{\min}(A))$$

Now

$$\|A_+ - A\|_2 = \max_{\lambda_i(A) < 0} |\lambda_i(A)|$$

which is zero when there are no negative eigenvalues, and $-\lambda_{\min}(A)$ when there are negative eigenvalues. □

Remark 3.1. *From Theorem 3.1 it is possible to find the point-wise nearest positive semidefinite matrix for the Hermitian matrix $R(\omega) = H(i\omega) + H(i\omega)^H$. Obviously, if we decompose $R(\omega)$ as*

$$R(\omega) = U(\omega)\Lambda(\omega)U(\omega)^H$$

then the point-wise nearest positive semidefinite matrix is

$$R_+(\omega) = U(\omega) \max(\Lambda(\omega), 0) U(\omega)^H$$

Unfortunately, in general, the entries of $R_+(\omega)$ will not consist of rational functions and therefore cannot represent the transfer function of an LTI model on the imaginary axis. This problem, which in fact amounts to a rational approximation problem, will be addressed in the sequel.

4. RATIONAL APPROXIMATIONS

Theorem 4.1. *Let $H(s)$ be passifiable, i.e., $-\infty < \delta_-(H) < 0 < \delta_+(H) < \infty$, and let $R(\omega) = H(i\omega) + H(i\omega)^H$. Let further $f(x)$ be a real-rational function² satisfying*

$$\alpha \geq f(x) - \max(x, 0) \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in [\delta_-(H), \delta_+(H)] \quad (3)$$

for some finite positive α . Then $f(R(\omega))$ is positive semidefinite for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore we have

$$\|f(R(\omega)) - R_+(\omega)\|_2 \leq \alpha \quad \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}$$

Proof. We have

$$f(R(\omega)) - R_+(\omega) = U(\omega) \{f(\Lambda(\omega)) - \max(\Lambda(\omega), 0)\} U(\omega)^H \geq 0$$

Since $R_+(\omega)$ is positive semidefinite, the same holds for $f(R(\omega))$. Now, since the spectral norm is unitarily invariant, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(R(\omega)) - R_+(\omega)\|_2 &\leq \max_i |f(\lambda_i(\omega)) - \max(\lambda_i(\omega), 0)| \\ &\leq \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}} \max_i |f(\lambda_i(\omega)) - \max(\lambda_i(\omega), 0)| \\ &\leq \max_{x \in [\delta_-(H), \delta_+(H)]} \{f(x) - \max(x, 0)\} \leq \alpha \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that all $\lambda_i(\omega)$ are inside the interval $[\delta_-(H), \delta_+(H)]$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 4.1 shows that the matrix $R_+(\omega)$ can be approximated from above by the matrix $f(R(\omega))$. The problem is to find a suitable real-rational function $f(x)$. We have the following :

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\zeta_n(x) = x(1+x)^n / ((1+x)^n - 1)$. Then*

$$\frac{1}{n} \geq \zeta_n(x) - \max(x, 0) \geq 0 \quad \forall x \geq -1, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

Proof. First we prove that $\zeta_n(x) - x \geq 0$ for $x \geq 0$. We have

$$\zeta_n(x) - x = \left(\frac{(1+x)^n - 1}{x} \right)^{-1}$$

which is a positive and decreasing function for $x \geq 0$. Next we prove that $\zeta_n(x)$ is increasing for all $x \geq -1$. This is equivalent to proving that $\zeta_n(t-1) = (t^{n+1} - t^n) / (t^n - 1)$ is increasing for all $t \geq 0$. This is clearly the case for $n = 1$. Taking derivatives, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \zeta_n(t-1) = [n - (n+1)t + t^{n+1}] \frac{t^{n-1}}{(t^n - 1)^2}$$

Now $n - (n+1)t + t^{n+1}$ is n when $t = 0$ and ∞ when $t = \infty$. Since the derivative of $n - (n+1)t + t^{n+1}$ is $(n+1)(t^n - 1)$, the function $n - (n+1)t + t^{n+1}$ attains its unique minimum (with value zero) at $t = 1$. Hence $\zeta_n(x)$ is increasing for all $x \geq -1$. We therefore conclude that $\zeta_n(x) - \max(x, 0)$ increases from 0 to $1/n$ in the interval $[-1, 0]$, and decreases from $1/n$ to 0 in the interval $[0, \infty]$, which completes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.1. *Let $H(s)$ be passifiable. Then the real-rational function $f(x) = \nu \zeta_n(x/\nu)$ with $\nu = |\delta_-(H)|$ satisfies the premises of Theorem 4.1 with $\alpha = \nu/n$.*

²A real-rational function $f(x)$ is a rational function assuming only real values for all real x .

Proof. Straightforward. □

Also, we need to find ways and means to define the matrix $f(R(\omega)) = f(H(i\omega) + H(i\omega)^H)$ in the whole s -plane and then to extract a Hurwitz stable transfer function from it. By analytical continuation, we find the transfer function $V(s) = f(H(s) + H(-s)^T)$ in the entire s -plane. Since $f(x)$ is real-rational, the transfer function $V(s)$ represents the realization of a per-symmetric LTI model, *i.e.*, satisfying $V(s) = V(-s)^T$. This implies that the poles of $V(s)$ admit the imaginary axis as symmetry axis. The following proposition indicates how, starting from a per-symmetric LTI model $V(s)$ we can find a Hurwitz stable transfer function by additive decomposition [11, 12].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $V(s)$ be per-symmetric, *i.e.*, $V(s) = V(-s)^T$, such that $V(s)$ has no poles on the imaginary axis. Then $V(s)$ can be decomposed as $V(s) = X(s) + X(-s)^T$, where $X(s)$ is Hurwitz stable.*

Proof. Putting $V(s) = V_0(s) + D$, where $V_0(s)$ is strictly proper and $D = D^T = V(\infty)$, we can decompose $V_0(s)$ uniquely into its stable and anti-stable parts, *i.e.*,

$$V_0(s) = X_{stab}(s) + X_{anti}(s)$$

Since $V_0(s)$ is per-symmetric we have

$$X_{stab}(s) + X_{anti}(s) = X_{stab}(-s)^T + X_{anti}(-s)^T$$

and hence $X_{anti}(s) = X_{stab}(-s)^T$. It follows that $V(s)$ can be decomposed as $V(s) = X(s) + X(-s)^T$, with $X(s) = X_{stab}(s) + \frac{1}{2}D + E$, where E is an arbitrary skew-symmetric matrix. It should be noted that the procedure is unique when the skew-symmetric matrix E is known a priori. □

Remark 4.1. *Proposition 4.1 assumes that $V(s)$, in our case $V(s) = f(H(s) + H(-s)^T)$, does not admit poles on the imaginary axis. By the inequality constraints (3) we know that*

$$\alpha \geq f(\lambda_i(\omega)) - \max(\lambda_i(\omega), 0) \geq 0 \tag{4}$$

for all eigenvalues $\lambda_i(\omega)$ of $R(\omega)$. Since $H(s)$ is assumed Hurwitz stable, $R(\omega) = H(i\omega) + H(i\omega)^H$ cannot admit real poles, and hence, by the inequalities (4), the functions $f(\lambda_i(\omega))$ are bounded. It follows that all entries of $V(i\omega) = f(R(\omega))$ are bounded, which implies that $V(s)$ cannot have poles on the imaginary axis.

In the sequel we will use the Matlab® Robust Control Toolbox [15] routine `stabproj` based on the stable, anti-stable decomposition algorithm [12].

5. TWO ALGORITHMS

By Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.1 we need to find an LTI model with transfer function $\phi_n(H(s) + H^T(-s))$ where the real-rational function $\phi_n(x)$ of denominator degree n and numerator degree $n + 1$ is

$$\phi_n(x) = \nu \zeta_n(x/\nu) = \frac{x(1 + x/\nu)^n}{(1 + x/\nu)^n - 1}$$

where $\nu = |\delta_-(H)|$. Now it is easy to show that the following recurrence relationship holds :

$$\phi_{2n}(x) = \frac{\phi_n(x)^2}{2\phi_n(x) - x} \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

with $\phi_1(x) = x + \nu$.

A first algorithm (Algorithm 1) that comes readily to the mind with $Z(s) = H(s) + H^T(-s)$ is :

Initial value :

$$Z_0(s) = Z(s) + \nu I_p$$

Loop :

$$\text{for } k = 1 \text{ to } n_1 : Z_k(s) = Z_{k-1}(s) (2Z_{k-1}(s) - Z(s))^{-1} Z_{k-1}(s)$$

It is seen that the associated α_k upper bound at each step $Z_k(s)$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_1$, is $\alpha_k = \nu/2^k$, and all $Z_k(i\omega)$ are, by construction, positive semidefinite. Since the $Z_k(s)$ are all per-symmetric, we can use Proposition 4.1 to decompose all (or only the n_1 th one) $Z_k(s)$ in their stable and anti-stable parts as

$$Z_k(s) = Z_k^{stab}(s) + Z_k^{stab}(-s)^T$$

As a last, but necessary step, we must add the skew-symmetric matrix $\frac{1}{2}(D - D^T)$, since this matrix gets deleted when making the sum $Z(s) = H(s) + H^T(-s)$. In other words, the passive Hurwitz stable approximant $G_k(s)$ is

$$G_k(s) = Z_k^{stab}(s) + \frac{1}{2}(D - D^T)$$

As a very simple illustrative example take $k = 0$. Since $Z_0(s) = H(s) + H^T(-s) + \nu I_p$, we obtain easily that

$$\begin{aligned} G_0(s) &= Z_0^{stab}(s) + \frac{1}{2}(D - D^T) \\ &= (H(s) - D) + \frac{1}{2}(D + D^T + \nu I_p) + \frac{1}{2}(D - D^T) \\ &= H(s) + \frac{\nu}{2} I_p \end{aligned}$$

which is passive by construction. In practice, Algorithm 1 has the drawback that the transfer functions $Z_k(s)$ in the algorithmic loop may not be minimal realizations, and hence it could happen that the stable anti-stable projection by means of the routine `stabproj` might not perform well.

Before proposing a second algorithm, and in order to address the computational complexity of the passivated transfer function $G(s)$, we want to estimate the number of poles of $G(s)$. We suppose that $f(x)$ is an irreducible real-rational function with denominator degree M and numerator degree $M + 1$. In this paper this is always the case, see also Section 6. Hence, if we suppose that all the poles are simple, we can decompose $f(x)$ into partial fractions as

$$f(x) = \alpha_0 + \beta_0 x + \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{\alpha_k}{x - \beta_k}$$

Now if the original Hurwitz stable transfer function $H(s)$ has N poles, then the transfer function $Z(s) = H(s) + H(-s)^T$ has $2N$ poles. Also, $f(Z(s))$ can be written as

$$f(Z(s)) = \alpha_0 I_p + \beta_0 Z(s) + \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k (Z(s) - \beta_k I_p)^{-1}$$

Hence, the set of poles of $f(Z(s))$ is at most the union of the sets of poles of $Z(s)$ and $(Z(s) - \beta_k I_p)^{-1}$. It is well known [16], that when a transfer function $H(s)$ is such that $H(\infty)$ is invertible, then $H(s)^{-1}$ exists and has the same number of poles as $H(s)$. Therefore, the number of poles of $f(Z(s))$, not considering potential cancellations, is $2N(M + 1)$. Finally, after the stable anti-stable decomposition, this number is to be divided by two, to yield $N(M + 1)$ poles for the final passivated transfer function $G(s)$. Of course the number $N(M + 1)$ is only an estimate, since pole-zero cancellations can occur. If for some reason, the number of poles of the *explicitly proved passive* transfer function $G(s)$ appears to be unacceptable high, a final judiciously chosen passivity preserving model order reduction step [17–21] can be applied.

Hence, in order to find a workable algorithm, we have to find the partial fractions decomposition of $f(x) = \phi_n(x) = \nu \zeta_n(x/\nu)$. If we restrict ourselves to even $n = 2m \geq 2$, we have the partial fraction expansion

$$\zeta_{2m}(x) = x + \frac{1}{m} \left(\frac{1}{x+2} + \Re e \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \frac{e^{2\pi i k/m} - e^{\pi i k/m}}{x+1 - e^{\pi i k/m}} \right)$$

Hence, with $f(x) = \nu \zeta_{2m}(x/\nu)$ we have

$$f(Z(s)) = Z(s) + \frac{\nu^2}{m} \left([Z(s) + 2\nu I_p]^{-1} + \Re e \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \left(e^{2\pi i k/m} - e^{\pi i k/m} \right) [Z(s) + \nu(1 - e^{\pi i k/m}) I_p]^{-1} \right) \quad (5)$$

Algorithm 2 performs the state space addition (5) as is, *i.e.*, we add the realizations of $Z(s)$, $(\nu^2/m)[Z(s) + 2\nu I_p]^{-1}$, etc., to obtain $f(Z(s))$. The explicit state space form for the terms

$$\Re e \left[\left(e^{2\pi i k/m} - e^{\pi i k/m} \right) [Z(s) + \nu(1 - e^{\pi i k/m}) I_p]^{-1} \right]$$

in formula (5) is obtained by the state space technique described in the Appendix. Finally, the stable anti-stable projection yields the passivated transfer function $G(s)$.

5.1. Numerical Examples

We will consider only reciprocal non-passive systems, *i.e.*, systems with $H(s) = H(s)^T$, as these systems are representative of LTI systems satisfying the electromagnetic condition known as Lorentz reciprocity [22]. Of course the theory also remains valid for non-reciprocal LTI systems. Since for reciprocal systems $R(\omega)$ is real and even, this explains why the plots in the sequel only show values for non-negative frequencies.

5.1.1. First example

As a first example we take the SISO Hurwitz stable non-passive transfer function

$$H(s) = \frac{s^5 + 7.2s^4 + 47.01s^3 + 230.8s^2 + 536.6s + 587.1}{s^5 + 3.2s^4 + 32.61s^3 + 43.63s^2 + 117.5s + 104.3} \quad (6)$$

We use the approach of Algorithm 1 with $n_1 = 2$. The passivated approximation $G(s)$ has a non-minimal realization with 65 poles which are reduced to 20 by the routine `minreal` [16]. The real and imaginary parts of the original transfer function $H(s)$ vs. the passivated transfer function $G(s)$ are shown in Figs 1 and 2.




Figure 1: Real part of $G(s)$ vs. $H(s)$

5.1.2. Second example

As a second example we take the SISO Hurwitz stable minimum phase non-passive transfer function

$$H(s) = \frac{(s+1)(s+3)(s+90)(s+95)(s+100)}{(s+25)(s+35)(s+38)(s+180)(s+185)} \quad (7)$$




Figure 2: Imaginary part of $G(s)$ vs. $H(s)$

We use the approach of Algorithm 2 with $m = 5$. The passivated approximation $G(s)$ has a realization with 50 poles. The real and imaginary parts of the original transfer function $H(s)$ vs. the passivated transfer function $G(s)$ are shown in Figs 3 and 4.




Figure 3: Real part of $G(s)$ vs. $H(s)$

5.1.3. Third example

As a third example we take the 2×2 MIMO Hurwitz stable non-passive transfer function

$$H(s) = \begin{bmatrix} 2 + \frac{12}{s^2 + 3s + 2} & -\frac{2s + 10}{s + 6} \\ -\frac{2s + 10}{s + 6} & 2 - \frac{s + 3}{s^2 + 3s + 2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

We use the approach of Algorithm 2 with $m = 4$. The passivated approximation $G(s)$ has a realization with 48 poles. Fig. 5 plots the values of $\lambda_{\min}(G(i\omega) + G(i\omega)^H)$ vs. $\lambda_{\min}(H(i\omega) + H(i\omega)^H)$. To show the nearness of the original and passivated transfer functions $H(s)$ and $G(s)$, we plot the relative error $\|G(i\omega) - H(i\omega)\|_2 / \|H(i\omega)\|_2$ in Fig. 6.




Figure 4: Imaginary part of $G(s)$ vs. $H(s)$




Figure 5: Minimum eigenvalues of passivated vs. original transfer functions

6. MINIMAX ALGORITHM

The starting point for finding a passive approximant is to find a real-rational function $f(x)$ that satisfies

$$\alpha \geq f(x) - \max(x, 0) \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in [-a, b] \quad (9)$$

where $a = -\delta_-(H) = |\delta_-(H)|$ and $b = \delta_+(H)$. Since $\max(x, 0) = (|x| + x)/2$, this can be written as

$$\alpha \geq 2f(x) - x - \alpha - |x| \geq -\alpha \quad \forall x \in [-a, b] \quad (10)$$

Putting $r(x) = 2f(x) - x - \alpha$, and since our aim is to find the smallest positive α such that (10) is satisfied, it is seen that we must find the rational minimax or Chebyshev approximant, *i.e.*,

$$\min_r \max_{x \in [-a, b]} |r(x) - |x||$$

Let us first treat the case $a = b = 1$, which is well-documented in the literature [23–25]. Since $|x|$ is even and the interval $[-1, 1]$ is symmetric with respect to 0, it is clear that $r(x)$ must be an even rational function, *i.e.*,




Figure 6: Relative error between passivated and original transfer functions

$r(x) = \rho(x^2)$. If we take $\rho(t)$ irreducible with numerator and denominator of exact degree n , the minimax problem can be reformulated as:

$$\min_{\rho} \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\rho(t) - \sqrt{t}| \quad (11)$$

Calling E_n the value obtained by the minimax problem (11), it is clear that at the minimum we must have

$$E_n \geq \rho(t) - \sqrt{t} \geq -E_n \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq 1 \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, the Remes condition [25, 26] requires that there are exactly $2n + 2$ point t_k inside $[0, 1]$ where the equality

$$\sqrt{t_k} - \rho(t_k) = (-1)^k E_n \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, 2n + 2$$

is satisfied. This allows an iterative approach [25] to find the optimal E_n and $\rho(t)$. The poles and zeros of $\rho(t)$ are all simple and intertwined on the negative real axis [27]. It follows that in general $\rho(t)$ can be written as

$$\rho(t) = a_0 - \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{a_k}{t + b_k}$$

where all a_k, b_k are positive. For $n = 4$ the coefficients a_k, b_k with $b_0 = E_n$ are given in Table 1. Fig. 7

Table 1: Coefficients for the function $\rho(t)$ for $n = 4$

k	0	1	2	3	4
a_k	2.6397296257	$1.4034219887 \times 10^{-6}$	0.0003730797	0.0290141901	5.6266532592
b_k	0.0007365636	0.0000917473	0.0049831021	0.1014048457	2.4866930733

shows the approximation error $\rho(t) - \sqrt{t}$ and the equioscillation property. Note that the asymptotic formula of E_n is known [28], *i.e.*, we have $E_n \approx 8e^{-\pi\sqrt{2n}}$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Formula (12) implies

$$2E_n \geq \rho(x^2) + E_n - |x| \geq 0 \quad \text{for } -1 \leq x \leq 1$$

or

$$E_n \geq \frac{\rho(x^2) + x + E_n}{2} - \max(0, x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } -1 \leq x \leq 1 \quad (13)$$




Figure 7: Minimax approximation error for $n = 4$.

For $a = b = 1$, the best rational function $f(x)$ satisfying (9) is therefore $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho(x^2) + x + E_n)$ with $\alpha = E_n$. It should be noted that $f(x)$ has numerator degree $2n + 1$ and denominator degree $2n$. The case of the general interval $[-a, b]$ instead of $[-1, 1]$ is treated by the following

Theorem 6.1. *Let $a, b > 0$ and $f(x)$ a real-rational function such that*

$$\alpha \geq f(x) - \max(x, 0) \geq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad -1 \leq x \leq 1$$

Then the real-rational function

$$f_{a,b}(x) = \left[\frac{x(b-a) + 2ab}{b+a} \right] f \left(\frac{x(b+a)}{x(b-a) + 2ab} \right)$$

is such that

$$\alpha \max(a, b) \geq f_{a,b}(x) - \max(x, 0) \geq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad -a \leq x \leq b$$

Proof. The bilinear transformation $g(x) = x(b+a)/(x(b-a) + 2ab)$ maps the interval $[-a, b]$ onto the interval $[-1, 1]$. Moreover, the linear function $x(b-a) + 2ab$ is positive over $[-a, b]$ since it is positive at the endpoints. Hence

$$\alpha \geq f(g(x)) - \max(g(x), 0) \geq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad -a \leq x \leq b$$

implying

$$\alpha \frac{x(b-a) + 2ab}{a+b} \geq \left[\frac{x(b-a) + 2ab}{b+a} \right] f(g(x)) - \max(x, 0) \geq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad -a \leq x \leq b$$

which completes the proof. Note that, if the denominator degree of $f(x)$ is m and the numerator degree is $m + 1$, then the same holds for $f_{a,b}(x)$. \square

In light of formula (13), we take $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho(x^2) + x + E_n)$ and $\alpha = E_n$. The function $f_{a,b}(x)$ can be conveniently written as

$$f_{a,b}(x) = (\tau x + \kappa) f \left(\frac{x}{\tau x + \kappa} \right)$$

where

$$\tau = \frac{\delta_+(H) - |\delta_-(H)|}{\delta_+(H) + |\delta_-(H)|}, \quad \kappa = 2 \frac{\delta_+(H) |\delta_-(H)|}{\delta_+(H) + |\delta_-(H)|}$$

For the function $f^\ell(x) = 1/(x^2 + \ell)$, the partial fraction expansion of $f_{a,b}^\ell(x)$ is given by

$$f_{a,b}^\ell(x) = \frac{(\tau x + \kappa)^3}{x^2 + \ell(\tau x + \kappa)^2} = x \frac{\tau^3}{1 + \tau^2 \ell} + \kappa \frac{\tau^2(3 + \tau^2 \ell)}{(1 + \tau^2 \ell)^2} + \Re \left\{ \frac{\eta(\tau, \kappa, \ell)}{x - \xi(\tau, \kappa, \ell)} \right\}$$

where

$$\xi(\tau, \kappa, \ell) = \frac{\kappa \sqrt{\ell}}{i - \tau \sqrt{\ell}} \quad \eta(\tau, \kappa, \ell) = \frac{\xi(\tau, \kappa, \ell)^3}{\kappa \ell^2}$$

Hence for the function $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho(x^2) + x + E_n)$, the transformed function $f_{a,b}(x)$ can be written as

$$f_{a,b}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[x + (E_n + a_0)(\tau x + \kappa) - \sum_{k=1}^n a_k f_{a,b}^{b_k}(x) \right] \quad (14)$$

The partial fraction expansion of (14) is the key of Algorithm 3, since we ultimately have to calculate $f_{a,b}(Z(s))$, where $Z(s) = H(s) + H(-s)^T$. The linear terms of (14) all add up to the compound linear term

$$f_{a,b}^{linear}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[x + (E_n + a_0)(\tau x + \kappa) - \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \left\{ x \frac{\tau^3}{1 + \tau^2 b_k} + \kappa \frac{\tau^2(3 + \tau^2 b_k)}{(1 + \tau^2 b_k)^2} \right\} \right]$$

leading to a linear term $f_{a,b}^{linear}(Z(s)) = k_1 Z(s) + k_2 I_p$. The remaining terms, obtained by evaluating

$$\Re \left\{ \eta(\tau, \kappa, b_k)(Z(s) - \xi(\tau, \kappa, b_k) I_p)^{-1} \right\}$$

are obtained by the state space technique described in the Appendix. Finally, as in Algorithm 2, the stable anti-stable projection of $f_{a,b}(Z(s))$ is performed in order to obtain the passivated transfer function $G(s)$.

6.1. Numerical Examples

6.1.1. First example

As our first example we again take the SISO Hurwitz stable minimum phase non-passive transfer function (7), but here we use Algorithm 3 with $n = 4$ and the coefficients of Table 1. The passivated approximation $G(s)$ has a realization with 45 poles. The real and imaginary parts of the original transfer function $H(s)$ vs. the passivated transfer function $G(s)$ are shown in Figs 8 and 9. It is seen by comparing with Figs 3




Figure 8: Real part of $G(s)$ vs. $H(s)$

and 4 that the approximation is better, while requiring 5 poles less.




Figure 9: Imaginary part of $G(s)$ vs. $H(s)$

6.1.2. Second example

For the second example we again take the MIMO Hurwitz stable non-passive transfer function (8), but here we use Algorithm 3 with $n = 4$ and the coefficients of Table 1. The passivated approximation $G(s)$ has a realization with 46 poles. Fig. 10 plots the values of $\lambda_{\min}(G(i\omega) + G(i\omega)^H)$ vs. $\lambda_{\min}(H(i\omega) + H(i\omega)^H)$. To show the nearness of the original and passivated transfer functions $H(s)$ and $G(s)$, we plot the relative error $\|G(i\omega) - H(i\omega)\|_2 / \|H(i\omega)\|_2$ in Fig. 11. It is seen by comparing with Figs 5 and 6 that the approximation is more or less similar, but requires 2 poles less.




Figure 10: Minimum eigenvalues of passivated vs. original transfer functions

7. CONCLUSION

We have presented a new global passification approach towards finding a passive transfer function $G(s)$ that is nearest in some well-defined matrix norm sense to a given non-passive transfer function $H(s)$. It is shown that the key point in constructing the nearest passivated transfer function $G(s)$, is to find a good rational approximation to the well-known ramp function over an interval defined by the minimum and




Figure 11: Relative error between passivated and original transfer functions

maximum dissipation of the given non-passive transfer function $H(s)$. It is also shown that in the Chebyshev or minimax sense this requires finding a rational Chebyshev approximation of the square root function over the unit interval. The proposed algorithms rely strongly on the stable anti-stable projection of a given transfer function. Five pertinent examples, both SISO and MIMO, are given to show the accuracy and relevance of the proposed algorithms.

8. APPENDIX

Suppose we have the real-rational transfer function $H(s) = C(sI_n - A)^{-1}B + D$, and we need to evaluate the transfer function³

$$\Re \eta(H(s) - \xi I_p)^{-1}$$

where η and ξ are complex numbers. Suppose also that $D - \xi I_p$ is invertible. Putting $D_\xi = D - \xi I_p$, we have [16] that the complex state space transfer function $\eta(H(s) - \xi I_p)^{-1}$ is given by $\tilde{C}(sI - \tilde{A})^{-1}\tilde{B} + \tilde{D}$ where

$$\tilde{A} = A - BD_\xi^{-1}C, \quad \tilde{B} = \eta BD_\xi^{-1}, \quad \tilde{C} = -D_\xi^{-1}C, \quad \tilde{D} = \eta D_\xi^{-1}$$

In state space form we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \tilde{A}x + \tilde{B}u \\ y &= \tilde{C}x + \tilde{D}u \end{aligned}$$

The input u is real, but the output y is complex. Putting $y = y_1 + iy_2$, it is clear that we are only interested in y_1 as output. Decomposing all complex vectors and matrices in their real and imaginary components, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 + i\dot{x}_2 &= (\tilde{A}_1 + i\tilde{A}_2)(x_1 + ix_2) + (\tilde{B}_1 + i\tilde{B}_2)u \\ y_1 + iy_2 &= (\tilde{C}_1 + i\tilde{C}_2)(x_1 + ix_2) + (\tilde{D}_1 + i\tilde{D}_2)u \end{aligned}$$

Hence the state space equations with u as input and y_1 as output are simply :

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= \tilde{A}_1x_1 - \tilde{A}_2x_2 + \tilde{B}_1u \\ \dot{x}_2 &= \tilde{A}_2x_1 + \tilde{A}_1x_2 + \tilde{B}_2u \\ y_1 &= \tilde{C}_1x_1 - \tilde{C}_2x_2 + \tilde{D}_1u \end{aligned}$$

³Considering $s = d/dt$ as a real operator.

References

- [1] B. Anderson and S. Vongpanitlerd, *Network Analysis and Synthesis*, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- [2] S. Grivet-Talocia, Passivity enforcement via perturbation of Hamiltonian matrices, *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I* 51 (9) (2004) 1755–1769.
- [3] B. R. Andrievskii, A. L. Fradkov, The passification method in problems of adaptive control, estimation, and synchronization, *Autom. Remote Control* 67 (11) (2006) 1699–1731.
- [4] C. J. Damaren, H. J. Marquez, A. G. Buckley, Optimal strictly positive real approximations for stable transfer functions, *IEE Control Theory and Applications* 143 (6) (1996) 537–542.
- [5] B. Dumitrescu, Parameterization of positive-real transfer functions with fixed poles, *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I* 49 (4) (2002) 523–526.
- [6] C. P. Coelho, J. Phillips, L. M. Silveira, A convex programming approach for generating guaranteed passive approximations to tabulated frequency-data, *IEEE Trans. Computer-Aided Design* 23 (2) (2004) 293–301.
- [7] D. Saraswat, R. Achar, M. S. Nakhla, Global passivity enforcement algorithm for macromodels of interconnect subnetworks characterized by tabulated data, *IEEE Trans. VLSI Systems* 13 (7) (2006) 819–832.
- [8] Y. Tanji, H. Kubota, Passive approximation of tabulated frequency data by Fourier expansion method, in: *Proc. ISCAS*, vol. 6, 2005, pp. 5762–5765.
- [9] N. J. Higham, Matrix nearness problems and applications, in: *Applications of Matrix Theory*, University Press, 1989, pp. 1–27.
- [10] P. R. Halmos, Positive approximants of operators, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 21 (1971/72) 951–960.
- [11] B. Kågström, P. VanDooren, A generalized state-space approach for the additive decomposition of a transfer matrix, *J. Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.* 1 (2) (1992) 165–181.
- [12] M. G. Safonov, E. A. Jonckheere, M. Verma, D. J. N. Limebeer, Synthesis of positive real multivariable feedback systems, *International Journal of Control* 45 (3) (1987) 817–842.
- [13] S. Boyd, L. El Ghaoui, E. Feron, and V. Balakrishnan, *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*, SIAM Studies in Applied Mathematics 15, Philadelphia, PA, 1994.
- [14] S. Boyd, V. Balakrishnan, P. Kabamba, A bisection method for computing the H_∞ norm of a transfer matrix and related problems, *Math. Control Signals Systems* 2 (3) (1989) 207–219.
- [15] G. Balas, R. Chiang, A. Packard and M. Safonov, *Robust Control Toolbox User’s Guide*, Version 3, The MathWorks, Inc, 2005.
- [16] *Control System Toolbox User’s Guide*, Version 4, The MathWorks, Inc, 1998.
- [17] X. Chen, J. T. Wen, Positive realness preserving model reduction with H_∞ norm error bounds, *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I* 42 (1) (1995) 23–29.
- [18] L. Knockaert, A note on strict passivity, *Systems Control Lett.* 54 (9) (2005) 865–869.
- [19] D. C. Sorensen, Passivity preserving model reduction via interpolation of spectral zeros, *Systems Control Lett.* 54 (4) (2005) 347–360.
- [20] A. C. Antoulas, A new result on passivity preserving model reduction, *Systems Control Lett.* 54 (4) (2005) 361–374.
- [21] L. Knockaert, T. Dhaene, F. Ferranti, D. DeZutter, Model order reduction with preservation of passivity, non-expansivity and Markov moments, *Systems Control Lett.* 60 (1) (2011) 53–61.
- [22] L. Knockaert, D. DeZutter, On the complex symmetry of the Poincaré-Steklov operator, *Progress in Electromagnetic Research B.* 7 (2008) 145–157.
- [23] D. J. Newman, Rational approximation to $|x|$, *Michigan Math. J.* 11 (1964) 11–14.
- [24] L. Brutman, E. Passow, On rational approximation to $|x|$, *Constr. Approx.* 13 (1997) 381–391.
- [25] R. S. Varga, A. Ruttan, A. D. Karpenter, Numerical results on the best uniform rational approximations of the function $|x|$ on the interval $[-1, 1]$, *Mat. Sb.* 182 (11) (1991) 1523–1541.
- [26] A. Ralston, Rational Chebyshev approximation by Remes algorithms, *Numer. Math.* 7 (1965) 322–330.
- [27] H. P. Blatt, A. Iserles, E. B. Saff, Remarks on the behaviour of zeros of best approximating polynomials and rational functions, in: *Algorithms for approximation*, Inst. Math. Appl. Conf. Ser. New Ser., 10, Oxford Univ. Press, 1987, pp. 437–445.
- [28] H. R. Stahl, Best uniform rational approximation of x^α on $[0, 1]$, *Acta Math.* 190 (2003) 241–306.