

Localization of Invariable Sparse Errors in Dynamic Systems ^{*†}

Accepted version of DOI:10.1109/TCNS.2021.3077987m;

Copyright: 978-1-7281-3949-4/19/\$31.00 ©2021 IEEE

Dominik Kahl^{1,2}, Andreas Weber², and Maik Kschischo^{†1}

¹Department of Mathematics and Technology, University of Applied Sciences Koblenz, Koblenz, Germany.

²Department of Computer Science, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität Bonn, Bonn, Germany

December 23, 2022

Abstract

Understanding the dynamics of complex systems is a central task in many different areas ranging from biology via epidemics to economics and engineering. Unexpected behaviour of dynamic systems or even system failure is sometimes difficult to comprehend. Such a data-mismatch can be caused by endogenous model errors including misspecified interactions and inaccurate parameter values. These are often difficult to distinguish from unmodelled process influencing the real system like unknown inputs or faults. Localizing the root cause of these errors or faults and reconstructing their dynamics is only possible if the measured outputs of the system are sufficiently informative.

Here, we present criteria for the measurements required to localize the position of error sources in large dynamic networks. We assume that faults or errors occur at a limited number of positions in the network. This invariable sparsity differs from previous sparsity definitions for inputs to dynamic systems. We provide an exact criterion for the recovery of invariable sparse inputs to nonlinear systems and formulate an optimization criterion for invariable sparse input reconstruction. For linear systems we can provide exact error bounds for this reconstruction method.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the localization and reconstruction of *invariable sparse* faults and model errors in complex dynamic networks described by ordinary differential equations (ODEs). Invariable sparsity means here that there is a maximum number of state variables (state nodes) k affected by an error and that the set of these states targeted by errors is invariant

in time. Typically, k is much smaller than the total number of state nodes N . In contrast to fault isolation approaches [1, 2], we do not require the a priori specification of certain types of faults, but we allow for the possibility that each state node in the network can potentially be targeted by errors (or faults). The invariable sparse error assumption is often realistic in both the cases of a poor model and the fault detection context. Faults often affect only a small number of nodes in the network because the simultaneous failure of several components in a system is unlikely to occur spontaneously. For example, a hardware error or a network failure usually occurs at one or two points in the system, unless the system has been deliberately attacked simultaneously at several different positions. Similarly, gene mutations often affect a restricted number of proteins in a larger signal transduction or gene regulatory network. In the context of model error localization and reconstruction, the invariable sparsity assumption implies that the model is incorrect only at a limited number of positions or, alternatively, that small inaccuracies are ignored and that we focus only on the few (less than k) state variables with grossly misspecified governing equations.

A model error is often understood as a poor specification of the model structure, the interaction terms and the parameter values. These endogenous errors are then distinguished from exogenous influences acting on the real system including unknown inputs and faults. One could, however, regard unknown inputs and faults as part of the real system. Then, the absence of terms in the model representing inputs and faults can be considered as unmodelled dynamics or model error. This is in accordance with the fact that faults, model errors, and interactions with the environment can all mathematically be represented as unknown inputs to the system [3–7]. Thus, throughout this paper we use model error, fault, and unknown input as synonyms.

Sparsity of control inputs has been studied in previous publications in various contexts, which we can only briefly review here: Hands-off control is a paradigm

^{*}The present work is part of the SEEDS project, funded by *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)*, project number 354645666.

[†]Copyright: 978-1-7281-3949-4/19/\$31.00 ©2021 IEEE

[‡]kschischo@rheinahr-campus.de

to deal with limitations in equipment by searching for controls with minimum support per unit time [8–10]. For discrete time systems, sparsity is often defined by a maximum number inputs at each time instance [11–13]. Here, we consider the reconstruction of invariable sparse inputs in continuous time, which means that zero inputs remain zero throughout time. This is related to the problem of minimal controllability [14], where the aim is to find a minimum set of state variables to be targeted by a control, which renders the resulting system controllable [15].

To summarize, our main contributions are:

1. We provide a graphical criterion for the recovery of invariable sparse model errors, unknown inputs or faults in *nonlinear* dynamic systems. To derive this criterion, we combine structural control theory and gammoid theory to define sets of input states which are independent in the sense that they can independently be reconstructed. This abstraction allows us to transfer the concept of the spark from compressed sensing theory [16–19] to nonlinear dynamic systems.
2. Computation of the spark can be very demanding in large systems. Therefore, we provide efficient approximations for the spark based on the concept of coherent input states for linear systems.
3. We provide a method for the recovery of invariable sparse inputs based on the solution of a convex optimisation problem. We propose a function space norm for model errors which promotes invariable sparsity. The resulting optimisation problem is different from the L_1 or L_1/L_2 regularization used in other sparse optimal control settings [8–10].
4. For linear systems, we also present a variant of the Restricted-Isometry-Property [20], which guarantees the recovery of invariable sparse inputs in the presence of measurement noise using our convex optimization method.

Please note that the proofs of all theorems can be found in the Supplemental Text.

2 Background

2.1 Open dynamic systems with errors and faults

The models we want to consider are dynamic input-output systems of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t)) + \mathbf{w}(t) \\ \mathbf{x}(0) &= \mathbf{x}_0 \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}(t) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ denotes the state of the system at time $t \in [0, T]$ and $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the initial state. The vector field \mathbf{f} encodes the model of the system and is assumed to be Lipschitz. The function $\mathbf{c} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow$

\mathbb{R}^P describes the measurement process and maps the system state \mathbf{x} to the directly observable output \mathbf{y} .

Model errors are represented as unknown input functions $\mathbf{w} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$. This ansatz incorporates all types of errors, including missing and wrongly specified interactions, parameter errors [3, 5, 6, 21–23] as well as faults [1, 2] and unobserved inputs from the environment [7].

The system (1) can be seen as an input-output map $\Phi : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}, \mathbf{w} \mapsto \mathbf{y}$. The input space $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{W}_N$ is assumed to be the direct sum of suitable (see below) function spaces $\mathcal{W}_i, i = 1, \dots, N$. For zero errors $\mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ (i.e. $\mathbf{w}(t) = \mathbf{0} \forall t \in [0, T]$) we call the system (1) a closed dynamic system. Please note that we do not exclude the possibility of known inputs for control, but we suppress them from our notation.

The residual between the measured output data $\mathbf{y}^{\text{data}}(t)$ and the output $\mathbf{y}^{(0)}(t) = \Phi(\mathbf{0})(t)$ of the closed system

$$\mathbf{r}(t) := \mathbf{y}^{\text{data}}(t) - \mathbf{y}^{(0)}(t) \quad (2)$$

carries all the available information about the model error. To infer the model error aka unknown input $\mathbf{w}(t)$ we have to solve the equation

$$\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{y}^{\text{data}} \quad (3)$$

for \mathbf{w} .

In general, there can be several solutions to the problem (3), unless we either measure the full state of the system or we restrict the set of unknown inputs \mathbf{w} . In fault detection applications [1, 2], the restriction is given by prior assumptions about the states which are targeted by errors. We will use the invariable sparsity assumption instead. For both cases, we need some notation: Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ be the index set of the N state variables and $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ be a subset with complement $S^c = \mathcal{N} \setminus S$. By $\mathbf{w}_S(t)$ we indicate the vector function obtained from $\mathbf{w}(t)$ by setting the entries $(\mathbf{w}_S)_i$ with $i \in S^c$ to the zero function. If S is of minimal cardinality and $\mathbf{w}_S = \mathbf{w}$ we call S the *support* of \mathbf{w} . The corresponding restriction on the input space is defined via

$$\mathcal{W}_S := \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W} \mid \text{supp } \mathbf{w} \subseteq S\}. \quad (4)$$

Thus, S characterizes the states x_i with $i \in S$ which can *potentially* be affected by a non-zero unknown input w_i . We will also refer to S as the set of input or source nodes. The restricted input-output map $\Phi_S : \mathcal{W}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is again given by (1), but all input components \mathbf{w}_i with $i \notin S$ are restricted to be zero functions.

Now, we can formally define invertibility [24, 25]:

Definition 1 *The system (1) with input set S and input-output map Φ is called **invertible**, if for two different solutions $\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \mathbf{w}^{(2)} \in \mathcal{W}_S$ of (3) and for any data set $\mathbf{y}^{\text{data}} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P$ we have*

$$\mathbf{w}^{(1)}(t) - \mathbf{w}^{(2)}(t) = \mathbf{0} \quad (5)$$

almost everywhere in $[0, T]$.

In other words, invertibility guarantees that (3) with an input set S has only one solution \mathbf{w}^* (up to differences of measure zero), which corresponds to the true model error. In the following, we mark this true model error with an asterisk, while \mathbf{w} without asterisk denotes an indeterminate input function.

2.2 Structural invertibility and independence of input nodes

There are several algebraic or geometric conditions for invertibility [24–28], which are, however, difficult to test for large systems and require exact knowledge of the systems equations (1), including all the parameters. *Structural invertibility* of a system is prerequisite for its invertibility and can be decided from a graphical criterion [29], see also Theorem 1 below. Before, we define the influence graph (see e.g. [15])

Definition 2 The *influence graph* $g = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ of the system (1) is a digraph, where the set of nodes $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ represents the N state variables, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$, and the set of directed edges $\mathcal{E} = \{i_1 \rightarrow l_1, i_2 \rightarrow l_2, \dots\}$ represents the interactions between those states in the following way: There is a directed edge $i \rightarrow l$ for each pair of state nodes $i, l \in \mathcal{N}$ if and only if $\frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_i}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ for some \mathbf{x} in the state space \mathcal{X} .

In addition to the set of input nodes $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ we define the output nodes $Z \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ of the system (1). The latter are determined by the measurement function \mathbf{c} . Without restriction of generality we assume in the following that a subset $Z \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ of P state nodes are sensor nodes, i.e., they can directly be measured, which corresponds to $c_i(\mathbf{x}) = x_i$ for $i \in Z$. All states x_l with $l \notin Z$ are not directly monitored.

A necessary criterion for structural invertibility is given by the following graphical condition [29]:

Theorem 1 Let $g = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ be an influence graph and $S, Z \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ be known input and output node sets with cardinality $M = \text{card}S$ and $P = \text{card}Z$, respectively. If there is a family of directed paths $\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_M\}$ with the properties

1. each path π_i starts in S and terminates in Z ,
2. any two paths π_i and π_j with $i \neq j$ are node-disjoint,

then the system is structurally invertible. If such a family of paths exists, we say S is **linked in g into Z** .

In the Supplemental Text we discuss why we have the strong indication that this theorem provides also a sufficient criterion for structural invertibility up to some pathological cases.

A simple consequence of this theorem is that for an invertible system, the number P of sensor nodes cannot be smaller than the number of input nodes M . This is the reason, why for fault detection the set of potentially identifiable error sources S is selected in advance [2]. Without a priori restriction on the set of

potential error sources, we would need to measure all states. Please note that there are efficient algorithms to check, whether a system with a given influence graph g and given input and sensor node set S and Z is invertible (see [7] for a concrete algorithm and references therein).

2.3 Independence of input nodes

If the path condition for invertibility in Theorem 1 is fulfilled for a given triplet (S, g, Z) we can decide, whether the unknown inputs targeting S can be identified in the given graph g using the set of sensor nodes Z . Without a priori knowledge about the model errors, however, the input set S is unknown as well. Therefore, we will consider the case that the input set S is unknown in the results section. To this end, we define an independence structure on the union of all possible input sets:

Definition 3 The triple $\Gamma := (\mathcal{L}, g, Z)$ consisting of an influence graph $g = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$, an **input ground set** $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, and an output set Z is called a **gammoid**. A subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is understood as an input set. An input set S is called **independent in Γ** , if S is linked in g into Z .

The notion of (linear) independence of vectors is well known from vector space theory. For finite dimensional vector spaces, there is the rank-nullity theorem relating the dimension of the vector space to the dimension of the null space of a linear map. The difference between the dimension of the vector space and the null space is called the rank of the map. The main advantage of the gammoid interpretation lies in the following rank-nullity concept:

Definition 4 Let $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, Z)$ be a gammoid.

1. The **rank** of a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is the size of the largest independent subset $\tilde{S} \subseteq S$.
2. The **nullity** is defined by the rank-nullity theorem

$$\text{rank}S + \text{null}S = \text{card}S. \quad (6)$$

Note that the equivalence of a consistent independence structure and a rank function (see definition 4 1.) as well as the existence of a rank-nullity theorem (see definition 4 2.) goes back to the early works on matroid theory [30]. It has already been shown [31] that the graph theoretical idea of linked sets (see definition 3) fulfils the axioms of matroid theory and therefore inherits its properties. The term gammoid for such a structure of linked sets was probably first used in [32] and since then investigated under this name, with slightly varying definitions. We find the formulation above to be suitable for our purposes (see also the Supplemental Text for more information about gammoids).

3 Results

Here, we consider the localization problem, where the input set S is unknown. However, we make an invariable sparsity assumption by assuming that S is a small subset of the ground set $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$.

Definition 5 *The input signal \mathbf{w} with the input set S is **invariable k -sparse** if the cardinality of S is at most k .*

Please note that invariable sparsity refers to the input set S , i.e., to the invariable support of the input \mathbf{w} . This should not be confused with other sparsity definitions used for continuous time signals [8–10] which take the temporal support. Invariable sparse input functions $\mathbf{w}(t)$ have zero components $w_i(t) = 0$ for all times $t \in [0, T]$, if $i \in S^c$. Depending on the prior information, the ground set \mathcal{L} can be the set of all state variables \mathcal{N} or a subset.

The invariable sparsity assumption together with the definition of independence of input nodes in Definitions 3 and 4 can be exploited to generalize the idea of sparse sensing [16–18, 20] to the solution of the dynamic problem (3). Sparse sensing for matrices is a well established field in signal and image processing (see e.g. [18, 19]). There are, however, some nontrivial differences: First, the input-output map Φ is not necessarily linear. Second, even if Φ is linear, it is a compact operator between infinite dimensional vector spaces and therefore the inverse Φ^{-1} is not continuous. This makes the inference of unknown inputs \mathbf{w} an ill-posed problem, even if (3) has a unique solution [33].

3.1 Invariable sparse error localization and spark for nonlinear systems

Definition 3 enables us to transfer the concept of the *spark* [16] to dynamic systems:

Definition 6 *Let $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, Z)$ be a gammoid. The **spark** of Γ is defined as the largest integer, such that for each input set $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}$*

$$\text{card} S < \text{spark} \Gamma \Rightarrow \text{null} S = 0. \quad (7)$$

Let's assume we have a given dynamic system with influence graph $g = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ and with an output set $Z \subset \mathcal{N}$. In addition, we have chosen an input ground set \mathcal{L} . Together, we have the gammoid $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, Z)$. The spark gives the smallest number of inputs that are dependent. As for the compressed sensing problem for matrices [16], we can use the spark to check, under which condition an invariable sparse solution is unique:

Theorem 2 *For an input \mathbf{w} we denote $\|\mathbf{w}\|_0$ the number of non-zero components. Assume \mathbf{w} solves (3). If*

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_0 < \frac{\text{spark} \Gamma}{2}, \quad (8)$$

then \mathbf{w} is the unique invariable sparsest solution.

This theorem provides a necessary condition for the localizability of an invariable k -sparse error in a nonlinear dynamic system. The analogous condition for sparse sensing of matrices is also sufficient [34, 35]. More research is needed to check whether this carries over to Theorem 2 for the dynamic systems setting.

For instance, if we expect an error or input to target a single state node like in Fig. 3(a), we have $\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_0 = 1$ and we need spark $\Gamma \geq 3$ to pinpoint the exact position of the error in the network. If an edge in the network is the error source, then two nodes are affected and $\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_0 = 2$. Such an error could be a misspecified reaction rate in a biochemical reaction or a cable break in an electrical network. To localize such an error we need spark $\Gamma \geq 5$.

For smaller networks like the one in Fig. 3(a), it is possible to exactly compute the spark (Definition 6) of a gammoid (Definition 3) using a combinatorial algorithm iterating over all possible input node sets. However, the computing time grows rapidly with the size of the network. Below we present bounds for the spark, which can efficiently be computed.

3.2 Coherence of potential input nodes in linear systems

So far we have given theorems for the localizability of invariable sparse errors in terms of the spark. However, computing the spark is again a problem whose computation time grows rapidly with increasing systems size. Now, we present a coherence measure between a pair of state nodes i, j in linear systems indicating how difficult it is to decide whether a detected error is localized at i or at j . The coherence provides a lower bound for the spark and can be approximated by an efficient shortest path algorithm. Computing the coherence for each pair of state nodes in the network yields the coherence matrix, which can be used to isolate a subset of states where the root cause of the error must be located.

If the system (1) is linear, i.e., $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = A\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) = C\mathbf{x}$, we can use the Laplace-transform

$$T(s)\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(s) = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}(s), \quad s \in \mathbb{C} \quad (9)$$

to represent the input-output map $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}}$ by the $L \times P$ -transfer matrix $T(s)$. The tilde denotes Laplace-transform. Again, we assume that $w_i \equiv 0$ for all $i \neq \mathcal{L}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(s)$ is the vector of Laplace-transforms of the components of \mathbf{w} which are in the ground set \mathcal{L} . Recall that $L \leq N$ is the number of states in the ground set \mathcal{L} and P the number of measured outputs. As before, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{N}$ is still a possible special case.

We introduce the input gramian

$$G(s) := T^*(s)T(s) \quad (10)$$

where the asterisk denotes the hermitian conjugate. Note that the input gramian is an $L \times L$ matrix. Assume that we have chosen an arbitrary but fixed numbering of the states in the ground set, i.e., $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, \dots, l_L\}$ is ordered.

Definition 7 Let G be the input gramian of a linear dynamic system. We call

$$\mu_{ij}(s) := \frac{|G_{ij}(s)|}{\sqrt{G_{ii}(s)G_{jj}(s)}}, \quad s \in \mathbb{C} \quad (11)$$

the **coherence function** of nodes l_i and l_j . We call

$$\mu(s) := \max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij}(s) \quad (12)$$

the **mutual coherence** at $s \in \mathbb{C}$.

It should be noted that $\mu_{ij} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ has no singularities, because poles in the transfer function T can easily be seen to cancel each other. Coherence measures to obtain lower bounds for the spark have been used for signal decomposition [36] and compressed sensing for matrices [16, 34]. In the next theorem, we use the mutual coherence for linear dynamic systems in a similar way to provide bounds for the spark.

Theorem 3 Consider a linear system with gammoid $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, Z)$ and mutual coherence $\mu(s)$ at some point $s \in \mathbb{C}$. Then

$$\text{spark} \Gamma \geq \frac{1}{\mu(s)} + 1 \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (13)$$

Since (13) is valid for all values of $s \in \mathbb{C}$, it is tempting to compute $\inf_{s \in \mathbb{C}} \mu(s)$ to tighten the bound as much as possible. Please note, however, that $\mu(s)$ is not a holomorphic function and thus the usual trick of using a contour in the complex plane and the maximum/minimum modulus principle can not be applied (see e.g. [37]). Instead, we will introduce the shortest path coherence, which can efficiently be computed and which can be used in Theorem 3 to obtain lower bounds for the spark.

3.3 Shortest path coherence

There is a one-to-one correspondence between linear dynamic systems and weighted¹ gammoids. The weight of the edge $j \rightarrow i$ is defined by the Jacobian matrix

$$F(j \rightarrow i) := \frac{\partial f_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \quad (14)$$

and is constant for a linear system. We extend this definition to sets of paths in the following way: Denote by $\pi = (i_0 \rightarrow i_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_\ell)$ a directed path in the influence graph g . The length of π is $\text{len}(\pi) = \ell$ and the weight of π is given by the product of all edge weights along that path:

$$F(\pi) = \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} F(i_{k-1} \rightarrow i_k). \quad (15)$$

Let $\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_M\}$ be a set of paths. The weight of Π is given by the sum of all individual path weights:

$$F(\Pi) = \sum_{k=1}^M F(\pi_k). \quad (16)$$

¹Weights are understood as real constant numbers.




Figure 1: Gammoid representation of the input gramian. (a) An exemplary gammoid Γ . The nodes in red represent the input ground set \mathcal{L} and the nodes in blue (squares) the output set Z . (b) The transposed gammoid Γ' . Compared to (a), the arrows are flipped. The red nodes (squares) represent the input ground set Z' and the nodes in blue the output set \mathcal{L}' . (c) The combined gammoid $(\Gamma \circ \Gamma')$. The outputs Z of Γ are identified with the inputs Z' of Γ' . Again, red nodes represent the inputs \mathcal{L} and the blue nodes represent the outputs \mathcal{L}' of the gammoid $(\Gamma \circ \Gamma')$.

The input gramian $G(s)$ (10) is the composition of the transfer function T and its hermitian conjugate T^* . The transfer function T can be interpreted as a gammoid $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, Z)$, where the input nodes from \mathcal{L} correspond to the columns of T and the output nodes from Z correspond to the rows of T .

There is also a *transposed gammoid*²,

$$\Gamma' = (Z', g', \mathcal{L}'), \quad (17)$$

corresponding to the hermitian conjugate T^* , see Fig. 1. Here, the *transposed graph* g' is obtained by flipping the edges of the original graph g . The input ground set Z' of the transposed gammoid Γ' corresponds to the output set Z of Γ . Similarly, the output set \mathcal{L}' of Γ' is given by the input ground set \mathcal{L} of Γ .

As we have gammoid representations Γ and Γ' for T and T^* , also the gramian has such a gammoid representation which we denote as $(\Gamma \circ \Gamma')$. To obtain $(\Gamma \circ \Gamma')$ we identify the outputs Z of Γ with the inputs Z' of Γ' , see Fig. 1(c).

Definition 8 Let Γ be a weighted gammoid with ground set $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, \dots, l_L\}$. For two nodes $l_i, l_j \in \mathcal{L}$ let ψ_{ij} denote the shortest path from l_i to l_j in $(\Gamma \circ \Gamma')$. We call

$$\mu_{ij}^{\text{short}} := \frac{|F(\psi_{ij})|}{\sqrt{F(\psi_{ii})F(\psi_{jj})}} \quad (18)$$

the **shortest path coherence** between l_i and l_j .

Theorem 4 We find that

$$\mu_{ij}^{\text{short}} \geq \lim_{|s| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|G_{ij}(s)|}{\sqrt{G_{ii}(s)G_{jj}(s)}}. \quad (19)$$

We see that

$$\inf_{s \in \mathbb{C}} \max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij}(s) \leq \max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij}^{\text{short}} \quad (20)$$

²The transposed gammoid should not be confused with the notion of a dual gammoid in matroid theory [30].

and therefore the shortest path mutual coherence can also be used in theorem 3 to get a (more pessimistic) bound for the spark. The advantage of the shortest path mutual coherence is that it can readily be computed even for large ($N > 100$) networks.

3.4 Convex optimization for invariable sparse input reconstruction

As in compressed sensing for matrices, finding the solution of (3) with a minimum number of non-zero components $\|\mathbf{w}\|_0$ is an NP-hard combinatorial problem. Here, we formulate a convex optimal control problem as a relaxed version of this combinatorial problem. We define a Restricted-Isometry-Property (RIP) [20] for the input-output operator Φ defined by (1) and provide conditions for the exact recovery of invariable sparse errors in linear dynamic systems by solutions of the relaxed problem. As a first step it is necessary to introduce a suitable norm promoting invariable sparsity of the vector of input functions $\mathbf{w}(t)$.

Say, \mathcal{L} is an input ground set of size L . The space of input functions

$$\mathcal{W} := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{W}_i \quad (21)$$

is composed of all function spaces \mathcal{W}_i corresponding to input component w_i . Assume that each function space $\mathcal{W}_i = L^p([0, T])$ is a Lebesgue space equipped with the p -norm

$$\|w_i\|_p = \left(\int_0^T |w_i(t)|^p dt \right)^{1/p}. \quad (22)$$

We indicate the vector

$$\underline{\mathbf{w}} := \begin{pmatrix} \|w_1\|_p \\ \vdots \\ \|w_L\|_p \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^L \quad (23)$$

collecting all the component wise function norms by an underline. Taking the q -norm in \mathbb{R}^L

$$\|\underline{\mathbf{w}}\|_q = (\underline{w}_1^q + \dots + \underline{w}_L^q)^{1/q} \quad (24)$$

of $\underline{\mathbf{w}}$ yields the p - q -norm on \mathcal{W}

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_q := \|\underline{\mathbf{w}}\|_q. \quad (25)$$

The parameter p appears implicitly in the underline. Since our results are valid for all $p \in [1, \infty)$, we will suppress it from the notation.

Similarly, for the P outputs of the system, the output space

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{Y}_P \quad (26)$$

can be equipped with a p - q -norm

$$\|\mathbf{y}\|_q := \|\underline{\mathbf{y}}\|_q. \quad (27)$$

An important subset of the input space \mathcal{W} is the space Σ_k of invariable k -sparse inputs

$$\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_k \Rightarrow \|\mathbf{w}\|_0 \leq k. \quad (28)$$

In analogy to a well known property [20] from compressed sensing we define for our dynamic problem:

Definition 9 *The **Restricted-Isometry-Property (RIP)** of order $2k$ is fulfilled, if there is a constant $\delta_{2k} \in (0, 1)$ such that for any two vector functions $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \Sigma_k$ the inequalities*

$$(1 - \delta_{2k}) \|\underline{\mathbf{u}} - \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^2 \leq \|\underline{\Phi(\mathbf{u})} - \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})}\|_2^2 \quad (29)$$

and

$$\|\underline{\Phi(\mathbf{u})} + \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})}\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_{2k}) \|\underline{\mathbf{u}} + \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^2 \quad (30)$$

hold.

The RIP is well established in the literature on compressed sensing for finite dimensional maps [19, 20, 35, 38]. For this matrix case, bounds for the constants δ_{2k} , [39] were derived and the null space property was formulated, see for instance [40] for recent work on a robust null space property. Connections to the mutual coherence also exist, see [34], where the mutual coherence inequality is investigated as an alternative to the RIP and where it was argued that in practical contexts such alternatives might be easier to handle. Our results on the newly defined coherence and RIP show that these notions are useful in the treatment of model errors of a dynamic system. It is currently an open question, whether it is possible to draw an analogous connection for our function space setting. Note that the structure of the input space \mathcal{W} as a direct sum of Banach spaces makes the introduction of the underline (23) necessary. The underline, however, is a nonlinear operation. As a consequence, even for linear systems it is not obvious whether such a one-to-one analogy between compressed sensing for matrices and for dynamic systems can be established.

The reconstruction of invariable sparse unknown inputs can be formulated as the optimization problem

$$\text{minimize } \|\mathbf{w}\|_0 \text{ subject to } \|\Phi(\mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{y}^{\text{data}}\|_2 \leq \epsilon \quad (31)$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ incorporates uniform bounded measurement noise. A solution $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ of this problem will reproduce the data \mathbf{y}^{data} according to the dynamic equations (1) of the system with a minimal set of nonzero components, i.e., with a minimal set S of input nodes. As before, finding this minimal input set is a NP-hard problem. Therefore, let us consider the relaxed problem

$$\text{minimize } \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 \text{ subject to } \|\Phi(\mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{y}^{\text{data}}\|_2 \leq \epsilon. \quad (32)$$

The following result implies that for a linear system of ODEs with $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}$ with matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times N}$ in (1) the optimization problem (32) has a unique solution.

Theorem 5 *If Φ is linear, then (32) is a convex optimization problem.*

For a given input vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ we define the best invariable k -sparse approximation in q -norm as [19]

$$\sigma_k(\mathbf{w})_q := \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_k} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}\|_q, \quad (33)$$

i.e., we search for the function \mathbf{u} that has minimal distance to the desired function \mathbf{w} under the condition

that \mathbf{u} has at most k non-vanishing components. If \mathbf{w} is invariable k -sparse itself, then we can choose $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{w}$ and thus the distance between the approximation and the desired function vanishes, $\sigma_k(\mathbf{w})_q = 0$.

Theorem 6 *Assume Φ is linear and the RIP of order $2k$ holds. Let \mathbf{w}^* be the solution of (31). The optimal solution $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ of (32) obeys*

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2 \leq C_0 \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{w}^*)_1}{\sqrt{k}} + C_2 \epsilon \quad (34)$$

with non-negative constants C_0 and C_2 .³

It is known, see for instance [19] that problem (32) can be reformulated via the cost functional

$$J[\mathbf{w}] := \frac{1}{2} \|\Phi(\mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{y}^{\text{data}}\|_2^2 + \beta \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 \quad (35)$$

with given data \mathbf{y}^{data} and regularization constant β . The solution of the optimization problem in Lagrangian form

$$\text{minimize } J[\mathbf{w}] \text{ subject to (1),} \quad (36)$$

provides an estimate for the input $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$. Examples are provided in the next section, see Fig. 3. A practical method to choose a suitable value for the regularisation parameter β is the discrepancy method, see e.g. [41]. The basic idea is to increase β up to the point where the data can not be fitted anymore to a given tolerance ϵ . The tolerance can for example be inferred from the standard deviation of the measurement noise.

4 Numerical example for the reconstruction of an invariable sparse model error

In this section we illustrate by example, how our theoretical results from the previous section can be used to localize and reconstruct unknown inputs. These inputs can be genuine inputs from the environment or model errors or faults in a dynamic system [6, 7].

4.1 Error reconstruction in a linear dynamic system

Assume, we have detected some unexpected output behaviour in a given dynamic system. Now, we want to reconstruct the root cause for the detected error. If the location of the state nodes would be known, then this would be a systems inversion problem [7, 24–26]. However, we assume here that we have no information about the location of the error. Thus, we need to reconstruct both the position of the states targeted by the error and its time course.

We simulated this scenario for a linear system with $N = 30$ state nodes $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, 30\}$ and randomly sampled the interaction graph g , see Fig.3(a).

³Formulas for the constants C_1 and C_2 can be found in the Supplemental Text.

The outputs are given as time course measurements $y_1^{\text{data}}(t), \dots, y_{10}^{\text{data}}(t)$ of $P = 10$ randomly selected sensor nodes Z , see Fig.3(b). In our simulation, we have added the unknown input $\mathbf{w}^*(t)$ with the only nonzero component $w_6^*(t)$ (Fig.3(c)). However, we assume that we have no information about the location of this unknown input. Thus, the ground set is $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{N}$.

For a network of this size, it is still possible to exactly compute the spark (Definition 6) of the gammoid (\mathcal{L}, g, Z) (Definition 3). This straightforward algorithm iterates over two different loops: In the inner loop we iterate over all possible input sets S of size r and check, whether S is linked in g into Z (see Theorem 1). In the outer loop we repeat this for all possible $r = 1, 2, \dots, N$. The algorithm terminates, if we find an input set which is not linked into Z . If r is largest subset size for which all S are linked in g into Z , the spark is given by $r + 1$.

In larger networks, an exact computation of the spark can be too long. Then, we have to rely on the shortest path coherence (see definition 8) as an upper bound for the coherence (compare (20)).

For the network in Fig.3(a) we find that spark $\Gamma = 3$. From (8) we conclude that an unknown input targeting a single node in the network can uniquely be localized. Thus, under the assumption that the output residual was caused by an error targeting a single state node, we can uniquely reconstruct this input from the output. In this example, the shortest path mutual coherence $\max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij}^{\text{short}}$ turns out to be equal to one and therefore leads to the bound spark $\Gamma \geq 2$. A spark of two, however, would mean that an unknown input on a single node can not be localized. This example illustrates that the shortest path coherence bounds on the spark and the error localizability can be quite conservative. This is the price to be paid for the much higher computational efficiency.

The reconstruction is obtained as the solution of the regularized optimization problem in (36), see Fig.3(c). For the fit we allowed each node x_i to receive an input \hat{w}_i . We used a regularization constant of $\beta = 0.01$ in (36) and $p = 2$ for the components of the error (see (36)). The numerical solution was obtained by a discretisation of (36), see the Supplemental Text for an example program.

Please note that a necessary condition for the reconstruction to work is an assumption about the invariable 1-sparsity of the unknown input. If we would assume that more than one state node is targeted by an error, we would need a larger spark to exactly localize and reconstruct the error. This would either require a smaller ground set \mathcal{L} or a different set of sensor nodes Z , or both.

4.2 Recovering the nonlinearities of the chaotic Lorenz system

To illustrate that the reconstruction method (36) is also useful for nonlinear systems we considered the




Figure 2: Reconstruction of the nonlinearities in the Lorenz system using the optimization based error reconstruction method (36). (a-c) The reconstructed error signals $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \hat{w}_3)^T$ when the linear system (38) is used as a model for the Lorenz system (37). The small signal $\hat{w}_1(t)$ for the first component suggests that this error could be neglected. (d-e) Constraining the first unknown input component to zero ($w_1 = 0$) still provides an accurate reconstruction of true error.




Figure 3: Reconstruction of an invariable sparse unknown input. (a) The influence graph of a linear dynamic system with $N = 30$ states. The nodes correspond to the state variables and the edges indicate their interactions. The simulated error signal $\mathbf{w}^*(t) = (0, \dots, 0, w_6^*(t), 0, \dots, 0)^T$ targets the state variable x_6 . The squares indicate the $P = 10$ sensor nodes providing the output $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{10})^T$ (b) The measured output data $\mathbf{y}^{\text{data}}(t) = (y_1^{\text{data}}(t), \dots, y_{10}^{\text{data}}(t))^T$ (solid lines) can be fitted (dashed lines) by the output $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(t)$ corresponding to the solution $\hat{\mathbf{w}}(t)$ (see (c)) of the convex optimal control problem in (36). (c) This estimate $\hat{\mathbf{w}}(t)$ simultaneously reconstructs the true unknown input $\mathbf{w}^*(t)$. One can see that among the thirty inputs the node $i = 6$ (w_6) was localized as the root cause of the error.

Lorenz system [42]

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= \sigma y(t) - \sigma x(t) \\ \dot{y}(t) &= -x(t)y(t) + \rho x(t) - y(t) \\ \dot{z}(t) &= x(t)y(t) - \beta z(t),\end{aligned}\quad (37)$$

with initial value $(x_0, y_0, z_0) = (1, 1, 1)$ and the standard choice of parameters $\rho = 28$, $\sigma = 10$, and $\beta = 8/3$.

Cancelling the nonlinearities of (37) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= \sigma y(t) - \sigma x(t) \\ \dot{y}(t) &= \rho x(t) - y(t) \\ \dot{z}(t) &= -\beta z(t).\end{aligned}\quad (38)$$

Can we reconstruct the error incurred by this linear model using data from the "true system" (37)? We assumed that we can only measure variables x and z as output data from (37).

The reconstructed error signal $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}$ and the true error \boldsymbol{w}^* are compared in Fig. 2(a-c). Clearly, the estimated signal \hat{w}_1 is small compared to the scale of the other components. This suggests a basic thresholding procedure where we set $w_1(t) = 0$. Indeed, the reconstruction of the other components is still very accurate under this constraint, see Fig. 2(d-f).

Please note that the system (38) has a nonlinear, more precisely an affine input-output map Φ . This suggests that the reconstruction method (36) can still be useful for nonlinear systems as well as nonlinear input-output maps, even if we have currently no proven accuracy bounds in the spirit of Theorem 6.

5 Discussion

Finding the root cause of errors or faults is important in many contexts. We have presented a mathematical theory for the localization of invariable sparse errors in ODE-models, which overcomes the need to a priori assume certain types of errors. This restriction is replaced by the invariable sparsity assumption, which is plausible in many real world settings, where the failure of a small number of components is observed from the sensors, but the localization of the fault is unknown. Similarly, for the problem of modelling dynamic systems, it is important to know where the model is wrong and which states in the model need a modified description. This includes also open systems, which are influenced by unknown inputs from their environment.

We have used the gammoid concept to define the notion of independence for inputs to dynamic systems. This allowed us to generalize concepts from sparse sensing to localize and recover such invariable sparse unknown inputs. Theorem 2 is general and applies to nonlinear systems. It is of note that Theorem 2 can also be used to test, how sparse the errors have to be in order to reconstruct their location for a given system with a given number of outputs. We are currently working towards a sensor node placement algorithm to relocate or add output measurements in order to increase the spark and therefore increase the number of

error sources which can be localized with a minimum number of additional sensors.

The other results are only proved for linear systems. However, our numerical experiment with the Lorenz system suggests that the the optimization based recovery method in (32) is also suitable for highly nonlinear dynamics. In addition, the RIP-condition in Definition 9 is already hard to test for linear systems, a situation we already know from classical compressed sensing for matrices [18]. Thus, one important question for future research is a more operational criterion for the recovery of invariable sparse errors from solutions of the optimization problem (32) in linear and nonlinear systems in the presence of measurement errors.

There is a further complication in the problem of estimating the inverse of the input-output map Φ corresponding to the dynamic system (1): The map Φ is compact and maps from an infinite dimensional input space to the infinite dimensional output space. Inverse systems theory [33] tells us that the inversion of such operators is discontinuous. Thus, more research on the numerics of this L_1 -regularized estimation problem is needed [43]. Our results in Fig. 2 suggest that the idea of iterative thresholding [19] from classical compressed sensing can be transferred to our functional recovery problem. It will also be very intriguing to see, whether noniterative algorithms [44] can be designed for our dynamic system setting. In addition, stochastic dynamic systems with unknown inputs will provide another interesting direction for further research.

Our results are complementary to recent work on Data-Driven Dynamic Systems, where the goal is to discover the dynamics solely from measurement data [45–48]. For data sets of limited size, these purely data driven methods might be restricted to situations where all state variables are measured or time delays are used. In the more realistic case that not all the states can directly be measured, it might be useful to incorporate the prior knowledge encoded by a possibly imperfect but informative model. Our work suggests a promising approach to combine models and data driven methods: For a given model, the error signals should be estimated and then analysed with a data driven method to discover their inherent dynamics. In this way, the data driven method could be used to correct the informative but incomplete model. This could potentially decrease the number of measurements necessary in comparison to an *ab initio*, purely data driven model discovery approach. We believe that the combination of data driven systems with the prior information from interpretable mechanistic models will provide major advances in our understanding of dynamic networks.

References

- [1] R. Isermann, *Fault-diagnosis applications*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer, 2011.
- [2] M. Blanke, M. Kinnaert, J. Lunze, and M. Staroswiecki, *Diagnosis and Fault-Tolerant Control*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer, 2016.

- [3] D. J. Mook and J. L. Junkins, “Minimum model error estimation for poorly modeled dynamic systems,” *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 256–261, May 1988.
- [4] J. Moreno, E. Rocha-Cozatl, and A. Vande Wouwer, “Observability/detectability analysis for nonlinear systems with unknown inputs - Application to biochemical processes,” in *2012 20th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation, MED 2012 - Conference Proceedings*, Jul. 2012, pp. 151–156.
- [5] B. Engelhardt, H. Fröhlich, and M. Kschischo, “Learning (from) the errors of a systems biology model,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 6, no. 20772, Nov. 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00152192>
- [6] B. Engelhardt, M. Kschischo, and H. Fröhlich, “A Bayesian approach to estimating hidden variables as well as missing and wrong molecular interactions in ordinary differential equation-based mathematical models,” *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, vol. 14, no. 131, p. 20170332, Jun. 2017.
- [7] D. Kahl, P. Wendland, M. Neidhardt, A. Weber, and M. Kschischo, “Structural Invertibility and Optimal Sensor Node Placement for Error and Input Reconstruction in Dynamic Systems,” *Phys. Rev. X*, vol. 9, no. 4, p. 041046, Dec. 2019.
- [8] M. Nagahara, D. E. Quevedo, and D. Nesic, “Maximum Hands-Off Control: A Paradigm of Control Effort Minimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 735–747, Mar. 2016.
- [9] T. Ikeda and K. Kashima, “On Sparse Optimal Control for General Linear Systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 5, pp. 2077–2083, May 2019.
- [10] M. Nagahara, D. Chatterjee, N. Challapalli, and M. Vidyasagar, “CLOT norm minimization for continuous hands-off control,” *Automatica*, vol. 113, p. 108679, Mar. 2020.
- [11] S. Sefati, N. J. Cowan, and R. Vidal, “Linear systems with sparse inputs: Observability and input recovery,” in *2015 American Control Conference (ACC)*. Chicago, IL, USA: IEEE, Jul. 2015, pp. 5251–5257.
- [12] M. Kafashan, A. Nandi, and S. Ching, “Analysis of Recurrent Linear Networks for Enabling Compressed Sensing of Time-Varying Signals,” *arXiv:1408.0202 [math]*, Nov. 2015, [Preprint].
- [13] G. Joseph and C. R. Murthy, “Controllability of Linear Dynamical Systems Under Input Sparsity Constraints,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, p. 1, Apr. 2020.
- [14] A. Olshevsky, “Minimal Controllability Problems,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 249–258, Sep. 2014.
- [15] Y.-Y. Liu and A.-L. Barabási, “Control principles of complex systems,” *Reviews of Modern Physics*, vol. 88, no. 3, p. 035006, Sep. 2016.
- [16] D. L. Donoho and M. Elad, “Optimally sparse representation in general (nonorthogonal) dictionaries via l_1 minimization,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 100, no. 5, pp. 2197–2202, Mar. 2003.
- [17] D. L. Donoho, “Compressed sensing,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1289–1306, Apr. 2006.
- [18] Y. C. Eldar and G. Kutyniok, *Compressed Sensing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [19] S. Foucart and H. Rauhut, *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing*, ser. Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis. Cambridge, MA: Birkhauser Boston Inc., 2013.
- [20] E. Candes and T. Tao, “Decoding by linear programming,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 4203–4215, Dec. 2005.
- [21] M. Kahm, C. Navarrete, V. Llopis-Torregrosa, R. Herrera, L. Barreto, L. Yenush, J. Ariño, J. Ramos, and M. Kschischo, “Potassium Starvation in Yeast: Mechanisms of Homeostasis Revealed by Mathematical Modeling,” *PLoS Computational Biology*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 1–11, Jun. 2012.
- [22] M. Schelker, A. Raue, J. Timmer, and C. Kreutz, “Comprehensive estimation of input signals and dynamics in biochemical reaction networks,” *Bioinformatics*, vol. 28, no. 18, pp. i529–i534, Sep. 2012.
- [23] N. Tsiantis, E. Balsa-Canto, and J. R. Banga, “Optimality and identification of dynamic models in systems biology: an inverse optimal control framework,” *Bioinformatics*, vol. 34, no. 14, pp. 2433–2440, Jul. 2018.
- [24] L. Silverman, “Inversion of multivariable linear systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 270–276, Jun. 1969.
- [25] M. Sain and J. Massey, “Invertibility of linear time-invariant dynamical systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 141–149, Apr. 1969.
- [26] M. Fliess, “A note on the invertibility of nonlinear input-output differential systems,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 147–151, Dec. 1986.

- [27] —, “Nonlinear Control Theory and Differential Algebra: Some Illustrative Examples,” ser. 10th Triennial IFAC Congress on Automatic Control - 1987 Volume VIII, Munich, Germany, 27-31 July, vol. 20, no. 5, Part 8, Jul. 1987, pp. 103–107.
- [28] G. Basile and G. Marro, “A new characterization of some structural properties of linear systems: unknown-input observability, invertibility and functional controllability,” *International Journal of Control*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 931–943, May 1973.
- [29] T. Wey, “Rank and Regular Invertibility of Nonlinear Systems: A Graph Theoretic Approach,” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 31, no. 18, pp. 257–262, Jul. 1998.
- [30] H. Whitney, “On the Abstract Properties of Linear Dependence,” *American Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 509–533, Jul. 1935.
- [31] H. Perfect, “Applications of Menger’s graph theorem,” *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 96–111, Apr. 1968.
- [32] J. S. Pym, “The Linking of Sets in Graphs,” *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. s1-44, no. 1, pp. 542–550, Jan. 1969.
- [33] G. Potthast and R. Nakamura, *An introduction to the theory and methods of inverse problems and data assimilation*. Bristol, UK: IOP Publishing, 2015.
- [34] T. T. Cai, L. Wang, and G. Xu, “Stable recovery of sparse signals and an oracle inequality,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 3516–3522, 2010.
- [35] M. Vidyasagar, *An Introduction to Compressed Sensing*. SIAM - Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2019.
- [36] D. L. Donoho and P. B. Stark, “Uncertainty Principles and Signal Recovery,” *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 906–931, Jun. 1989.
- [37] E. D. Sontag, “Mathematical Control Theory,” in *Texts in Applied Mathematics*, J. E. Marsden, L. Sirovich, M. Golubitsky, and W. Jäger, Eds., vol. 6. New York, NY: Springer New York, 1998.
- [38] Y. C. Eldar and G. Kutyniok, Eds., *Compressed sensing: theory and applications*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [39] T. T. Cai and A. Zhang, “Sparse representation of a polytope and recovery of sparse signals and low-rank matrices,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 122–132, 2014.
- [40] S. Ranjan and M. Vidyasagar, “Tight performance bounds for compressed sensing with conventional and group sparsity,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 11, pp. 2854–2867, 2019.
- [41] J. Honerkamp and J. Weese, “Tikhonovs regularization method for ill-posed problems: A comparison of different methods for the determination of the regularization parameter,” *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 17–30, 1990. [Online]. Available: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF01170953>
- [42] E. N. Lorenz, “Deterministic Nonperiodic Flow,” *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 130–141, Mar. 1963.
- [43] G. Vossen and H. Maurer, “OnL1-minimization in optimal control and applications to robotics,” *Optimal Control Applications and Methods*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 301–321, Nov. 2006.
- [44] M. Lotfi and M. Vidyasagar, “A fast noniterative algorithm for compressivesensing using binary measurement matrices,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 15, pp. 4079–4089, 2018.
- [45] S. L. Brunton, J. L. Proctor, and J. N. Kutz, “Discovering governing equations from data by sparse identification of nonlinear dynamical systems,” *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, vol. 113, no. 15, pp. 3932–3937, Apr. 2016. [Online]. Available: <http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.1517384113>
- [46] O. Yair, R. Talmon, R. R. Coifman, and I. G. Kevrekidis, “Reconstruction of normal forms by learning informed observation geometries from data,” *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, vol. 114, no. 38, pp. E7865–E7874, Sep. 2017.
- [47] J. Pathak, B. Hunt, M. Girvan, Z. Lu, and E. Ott, “Model-Free Prediction of Large Spatiotemporally Chaotic Systems from Data: A Reservoir Computing Approach,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 120, no. 2, p. 024102, Jan. 2018.
- [48] K. Champion, B. Lusch, J. N. Kutz, and S. L. Brunton, “Data-driven discovery of coordinates and governing equations,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 116, no. 45, pp. 22445–22451, Nov. 2019.

Suplemental Text and Proofs: Localization of Invariable Sparse Errors in Dynamic Systems ^{*†}

Accepted version of DOI:10.1109/TCNS.2021.3077987m;
Copyright: 978-1-7281-3949-4/19/\$31.00 ©2021 IEEE

Dominik Kahl^{1,2}, Andreas Weber², and Maik Kschischo^{†1}

¹Department of Mathematics and Technology, University of Applied Sciences Koblenz, Koblenz, Germany.

²Department of Computer Science, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität Bonn, Bonn, Germany

December 23, 2022

1 Spaces and Norms

1.1 Input Space

Underline Notation

We introduce the underline notation

$$\underline{u}_i := \|u_i\|_{L^p} \quad (1)$$

and for the vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^1$ we write

$$\underline{\mathbf{u}} := \begin{pmatrix} \underline{u}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \underline{u}_L \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

so the underline maps \mathbf{u} to a vector $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. In the more general setting, \mathcal{U}_i is only assumed to be a Banach space with some norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{U}_i}$ and the underline maps according to this norm. The underline notation will help clarify our understanding of invariable sparsity and will be useful for the formulation of theorems and proofs. As the underline is basically a norm, it inherits the usual properties as stated by the following lemma.

Lemma 1 1. For $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$ we find $\underline{u}_i = 0 \Leftrightarrow u_i(t) = 0$ a.e. in $[0, T]$.

2. For $u_i, v_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$ we find $\underline{u_i + v_i} \leq \underline{u_i} + \underline{v_i}$.

3. For $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we find $\underline{au_i} = |a|\underline{u_i}$.

Proof 1 1. From the definition of the L^p spaces we get

$$\|u_i\|_{L^p} = 0 \Leftrightarrow u_i = 0 \text{ a.e.} \quad (3)$$

2. Again from the definition we find

$$\underline{u_i + v_i} = \|u_i + v_i\|_{L^p} \leq \|u_i\|_{L^p} + \|v_i\|_{L^p} = \underline{u_i} + \underline{v_i}. \quad (4)$$

3. Since the L^p -norm is homogeneous we have

$$\underline{au_i} = \|au_i\|_{L^p} = |a|\|u_i\|_{L^p} = |a|\underline{u_i}. \quad (5)$$

*The present work is part of the SEEDS project, funded by *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)*, project number 354645666.

†Copyright: 978-1-7281-3949-4/19/\$31.00 ©2021 IEEE

‡kschischo@rheinahr-campus.de

¹For a simpler notation we used \mathcal{W} for the space of input function in the main text. In this more general treatment the letter \mathcal{U} is more common.

Proper Norm

Utilizing the underline notation, we define the q -norm on \mathcal{U} as

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_q := \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_q \quad (6)$$

where on the right hand side the standard q -norm on \mathbb{R}^L is understood.

Proposition 1 *The q -norm on \mathcal{U} is a proper norm.*

Proof 2 *The L^p norm and the q -norm on \mathbb{R}^N both are proper norms that fulfil the three properties positive definiteness, the triangle property, and homogeneity. Since the q -norm on \mathcal{U} is a combination of these two norms, it becomes clear, that it again fulfils these properties.*

1. *Positive definiteness. We find*

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_q = \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_q \geq 0 \quad (7)$$

where the inequality comes from the fact, that we have a proper norm on \mathbb{R}^L . Equality holds if and only if $\underline{\mathbf{u}} = 0$. Due to lemma 1 this is the case if and only if $\mathbf{u} = 0$.

2. *Triangle inequality. Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}$.*

$$\|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_q = \|\underline{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}}\|_q = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (\underline{u}_i + \underline{v}_i)^q \right)^{1/q} \quad (8)$$

From lemma 1 one can see, that

$$(\underline{u}_i + \underline{v}_i)^q \leq (\underline{u}_i + \underline{v}_i)^q \quad (9)$$

so we get

$$\|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_q \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (\underline{u}_i + \underline{v}_i)^q \right)^{1/q} = \|\underline{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}}\|_q \quad (10)$$

and since the latter is a proper q -norm on \mathbb{R}^L

$$\|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_q \leq \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_q + \|\underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_q = \|\mathbf{u}\|_q + \|\mathbf{v}\|_q. \quad (11)$$

3. *Finally we proof homogeneity. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$.*

$$\|a\mathbf{u}\|_q = \|\underline{a\mathbf{u}}\|_q = \left(\sum_{i=1}^L (a\underline{u}_i)^q \right)^{1/q} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^L (|a|\underline{u}_i)^q \right)^{1/q} = |a| \left(\sum_{i=1}^L (\underline{u}_i)^q \right)^{1/q} = |a| \|\mathbf{u}\|_q \quad (12)$$

For $q = 0$ one derives a situation comparable to the “0-norm” on \mathbb{R}^L . First,

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_0 := \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_0 \quad (13)$$

counts the non-zero components of $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$. Due to lemma 1, a component of $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ is zero if and only if the corresponding component of \mathbf{u} is zero, so $\|\mathbf{u}\|_0$ is indeed a “0-norm” on \mathcal{U} .

Support of an Input

Similar to [1], for an index set $\Lambda \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ we write \mathbf{u}_Λ for the vector

$$(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda)_i = \begin{cases} u_i & \text{if } i \in \Lambda \\ 0 & \text{if } i \notin \Lambda \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

and with Λ^c we denote the complement in $\{1, \dots, N\}$. As in [2] we call Λ the *support* of \mathbf{u} , if Λ is of minimal cardinality and $\mathbf{u}_\Lambda = \mathbf{u}$. Let the index set Λ be given, then

$$\mathcal{U}_\Lambda := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U} \mid \text{supp } \mathbf{u} \subseteq \Lambda\} \quad (15)$$

is understood as a restriction of the input space.

The three following facts can be proven directly: Let Λ_0 and Λ_1 be two index sets with $\text{card } \Lambda_0 = \text{card } \Lambda_1 = k$ and let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$. We find

$$\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0}, \mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1} \in \Sigma_k \quad (16)$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0} + \mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1} \in \Sigma_{2k}. \quad (17)$$

If Λ_0 and Λ_1 are disjoint we also get

$$\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0} + \mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1} = \mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1}. \quad (18)$$

Lemma 2 *Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}$ with disjoint support, then*

$$\underline{\mathbf{u}} \pm \underline{\mathbf{v}} = \underline{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}} \quad (19)$$

and for the q -norm

$$\|\underline{\mathbf{u}} - \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_q = \|\underline{\mathbf{u}} \pm \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_q = \|\underline{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}}\|_q \quad (20)$$

Proof 3 *If i is in the support of \mathbf{u} , then $v_i = 0$ and equation (19) reduces to*

$$\underline{u}_i = \underline{u}_i \quad (21)$$

which is true. If i is in the support of \mathbf{v} , then $u_i = 0$. Equation (19) together with lemma 1 then becomes

$$\pm \underline{v}_i = |\pm 1| \underline{v}_i = \underline{v}_i \quad (22)$$

which also holds true. If i is in neither support, the equation becomes trivial. For equation (22) note, that

$$\|\mathbf{u} \pm \mathbf{v}\|_q = \|\underline{\mathbf{u}} \pm \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_q = \|\underline{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}}\|_q \quad (23)$$

where the first equality is clear by definition and the second equality was just proven. It remains to show, that for any two vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with disjoint support one gets

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_q = \|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}\|_q. \quad (24)$$

However due to the disjoint support $|x_i + y_i|^q = |x_i|^q + |y_i|^q = |x_i - y_i|^q$ since at least one of the two terms is zero. One finds

$$\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_q^q = \sum_{i=1}^N |x_i - y_i|^q = \sum_{i=1}^N |x_i + y_i|^q = \|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}\|_q^q. \quad (25)$$

The following proposition for the case, where \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} are \mathbb{R}^N vectors, stems from [3] and has already been used for the classical compressed problem in [4]. We proof its validity for \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} being input vectors of a dynamic system.

Proposition 2 *Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}$ with disjoint support, then*

$$\|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_q^q = \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^q + \|\mathbf{v}\|_q^q. \quad (26)$$

Proof 4 *With lemma 2 we find*

$$\|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_q^q = \|\underline{\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}}\|_q^q = \|\underline{\mathbf{u}} + \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_q^q = \sum_{i=1}^N (\underline{u}_i + \underline{v}_i)^q. \quad (27)$$

Again due to the disjoint support we can write

$$(\underline{u}_i + \underline{v}_i)^q = (\underline{u}_i)^q + (\underline{v}_i)^q \quad (28)$$

to get

$$\|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_q^q = \sum_{i=1}^N (\underline{u}_i)^q + \sum_{i=1}^N (\underline{v}_i)^q = \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^q + \|\mathbf{v}\|_q^q. \quad (29)$$

We close the investigation of the input space with three lemmas on norm-inequalities. For \mathbf{u} being a \mathbb{R}^N vector, these lemmas are proven in [1]. For our purposes, it is necessary to prove the validity for the q -norms on composite Banach spaces.

Lemma 3 *For $\mathbf{u} \in \Sigma_k$ we find*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{k} \|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty. \quad (30)$$

Proof 5 Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the standard scalar product on \mathbb{R}^N . We can write

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_1 = \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_1 = \langle \mathbf{u}, \text{sgn} \underline{\mathbf{u}} \rangle \leq \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_2 \|\text{sgn} \underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_2, \quad (31)$$

where the latter inequality comes from Cauchy-Schwartz and the signum function is understood component-wise. By assumption \mathbf{u} is k -sparse, hence $\|\text{sgn} \underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_2^2$ is a sum of at most k ones. We obtain

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{k} \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_2 = \sqrt{k} \|\mathbf{u}\|_2. \quad (32)$$

One will see, that

$$\underline{u}_i \leq \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_\infty = \|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty, \quad (33)$$

where both sides of the inequality are non-negative. Let $\Lambda = \text{supp} \mathbf{u}$, then

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 = \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}\|_2^2 = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} (u_i)^2 \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty^2 \sum_{i \in \Lambda} 1 = k \|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty^2. \quad (34)$$

Taking the square-root leads to the desired inequality.

Lemma 4 For $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}$ with disjoint support we find

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2} \|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_2. \quad (35)$$

Proof 6 Consider the \mathbb{R}^2 vector

$$\mathbf{x} := \begin{pmatrix} \|\mathbf{u}\|_2 \\ \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

Lemma 3 holds also for constant vectors and by construction \mathbf{x} is $k = 2$ sparse, thus

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2. \quad (37)$$

We can now replace

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 = \|\mathbf{u}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_2. \quad (38)$$

For the right hand side we find

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \quad (39)$$

where the second equality comes from proposition 2. Combining the latter the equations leads to the desired inequality.

Lemma 5 Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ an Λ_0 and index set of cardinality k . For better readability we write $\mathbf{x} := \underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_0^c}$. Note, that \mathbf{x} is a \mathbb{R}^N vector with non-negative components. Let $L = (l_1, \dots, l_N)$ a list of indices with $l_i \neq l_j$ for $i \neq j$ such that for the components of \mathbf{x} we find

$$x_{l_1} \geq x_{l_2} \geq \dots \geq x_{l_N}. \quad (40)$$

Define index sets $\Lambda_1 := \{l_1, \dots, l_k\}$, $\Lambda_2 := \{l_{k+1}, \dots, l_{2k}\}$ and so forth until the whole list L is covered. If k is not a divisor of N the last index set would have less than k elements. This can be fixed by appending \mathbf{u} by zero elements. We find

$$\sum_{j \geq 2} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}} \quad (41)$$

Proof 7 First note, that by construction all Λ_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots$ are pair-wise disjoint and that

$$\Lambda_0^c = \Lambda_1 \dot{\cup} \Lambda_2 \dot{\cup} \dots \quad (42)$$

For any $m \in \Lambda_{j-1}$ we get by construction

$$\underline{u}_m \geq \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}\|_\infty. \quad (43)$$

We now take the sum over all $m \in \Lambda_{j-1}$

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_{j-1}}\|_1 \geq k \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}\|_\infty. \quad (44)$$

From lemma 3 we have for each j

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{k} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}\|_\infty \quad (45)$$

and in combination with the latter inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_{j-1}}\|_1. \quad (46)$$

We take the sum over $j \geq 2$

$$\sum_{j \geq 2} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}\|_2 \leq \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_{j-1}}\|_1. \quad (47)$$

In the right hand side we first perform an index shift and then use proposition 2 to see that

$$\sum_{j \geq 2} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_{j-1}}\|_1 = \sum_{j \geq 1} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}\|_1 = \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2 \cup \dots}\|_1 = \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1. \quad (48)$$

1.2 Output Space

In analogy to the input space \mathcal{U} , the underline notation can be used for the output space $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{Y}_P$,

$$\underline{y}_i := \|y_i\|_{p'}. \quad (49)$$

Here, we assume that each $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i$ is in $L^{p'}[0, T]$ and piecewise $C^\infty[0, T]$. Principally, p' does not have to be equal to the parameter p from the input spaces. It will be suppressed from our notation as the result are valid for any fixed value of p' . Again it would also be sufficient that \mathcal{Y}_i is a Banach space. The q -norm on \mathcal{Y} is defined

$$\|\mathbf{y}\|_q := \|\underline{\mathbf{y}}\|_q. \quad (50)$$

Clearly, all rules we have derived for underlined input vectors hold true for underlined output vectors. The following lemma yields a last inequality for underlined vectors.

Lemma 6 *Let $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Y}$, then*

$$\|\underline{\mathbf{y}} - \underline{\mathbf{z}}\|_2^2 \leq \|\underline{\mathbf{y}} + \underline{\mathbf{z}}\|_2^2. \quad (51)$$

Proof 8 *The inequality can be written as*

$$\sum_{i=1}^P (\underline{y}_i - \underline{z}_i)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^P (\underline{y}_i + \underline{z}_i)^2. \quad (52)$$

To prove the validity of the latter inequality it suffices to show that

$$|\underline{y}_i - \underline{z}_i| \leq |\underline{y}_i + \underline{z}_i| \quad (53)$$

for each i in order to complete the proof. First, consider the case $\underline{y}_i \geq \underline{z}_i$. From lemma 1 we get

$$\underline{y}_i = (\underline{y}_i + \underline{z}_i) - \underline{z}_i \leq \underline{y}_i + \underline{z}_i + \underline{z}_i \quad (54)$$

and subtracting \underline{z}_i on both sides yields

$$\underline{y}_i - \underline{z}_i \leq \underline{y}_i + \underline{z}_i. \quad (55)$$

Both sides are positive so (53) holds. Second, consider the case $\underline{z}_i \geq \underline{y}_i$ and perform the same steps with z_i and y_i swapped to get

$$\underline{z}_i - \underline{y}_i \leq \underline{z}_i + \underline{y}_i. \quad (56)$$

For the right hand side it is clear that

$$\underline{z}_i + \underline{y}_i = \underline{y}_i + \underline{z}_i \quad (57)$$

and for the left hand side

$$\underline{z}_i - \underline{y}_i = |\underline{y}_i - \underline{z}_i| \quad (58)$$

thus equation (53) holds also in this case.

2 A Note on the Gammoid Structure

2.1 Sufficiency of Structural Invertibility

The structural invertibility of a dynamic input-output system is now completely determined by the triplet (S, g, Z) , as the system is structurally invertible if and only if S is linked in g into Z . It has been shown [5], that structural invertibility of the influence graph is necessary for the invertibility of a system.

To the best of our knowledge, the sufficiency of structural invertibility for the invertibility of a system is an open question. However, we have found the intermediate result: Say we have a dynamic system with input-output map $\Phi : \mathcal{U}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ where the outputs are characterized by the output set

$$Z = (z_1, \dots, z_P). \quad (59)$$

Assume this system is invertible. Necessarily, the triplet (S, g, Z) is structurally invertible, where $g = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ is the influence graph of the system. Now assume, there is a distinct set

$$\tilde{Z} = (\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_P) \quad (60)$$

with either $\tilde{z}_i = z_i$ or $(z_i \rightarrow \tilde{z}_i) \in \mathcal{E}$. Note, that the output signals from Z carry enough information to infer the unknown inputs of the system. As each \tilde{z}_i is either equal or directly influenced by z_i , it is plausible, that this information is directly passed from Z to \tilde{Z} . Unless, we encounter a pathological situation where information is lost in this step.

To give an example for such a pathological situation is given for instance in the toy system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1(t) &= x_2(t) \\ \dot{x}_2(t) &= -x_1(t) \\ \dot{x}_3(t) &= x_1(t)x_2(t) \\ \dot{x}_4(t) &= \frac{x_2^2(t) - x_1^2(t)}{x_3(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

We find the differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}f + x_3g = 0 \quad (62)$$

is solved by the right hand sides $f = x_1x_2$ and $g = x_2^2 - x_1^2/x_3$. Say the functions x_1 and x_2 yield *independent information*. The information content from x_3 and x_4 is not independent any more, but coupled through the differential equation above.

2.2 Gammoids

Gammoids, e.g. the gammoid $\Gamma = (S, g, Z)$, emerge from the graph theoretical problem of node-disjoint paths from the input set S to the output set Z through a given graph g . This problem has been studied earlier without connection to dynamic systems. In [6] a connection was made between gammoids and independence structures. The probably first usage of the word gammoid stems from [7]. The topic has mainly been developed in [8–11] and also the connection to matroid theory developed in [12] has been discovered.

The rank-nullity theorem for the gammoid $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, \mathcal{M})$ follows from the general investigation of matroids in [12] and states, that for any $S \in \mathcal{L}$

$$\text{rank } S + \text{null } S = \text{card } S, \quad (63)$$

where $\text{rank } S$ is the size of the largest independent subset $T \subseteq S$. The declaration as *theorem* has historical roots as it is actually true by definition.

2.3 Uniqueness of Invariably Sparse Solutions

Theorem 2 from the main text is known for the spark of a matrix [13]. Utilizing gammoid theory, we are able to proof its validity for non-linear dynamic systems.

Proof 9 We first reformulate the theorem as follows: There is at most one solution with “0-norm” smaller than $\frac{\text{spark } \Gamma}{2}$.

So assume there are two distinct solutions $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{v}$ that both have “0-norm” smaller than $\frac{\text{spark } \Gamma}{2}$. If we denote $S := \text{supp } \mathbf{u}$ and $T := \text{supp } \mathbf{v}$ the assumption says

$$\text{card}(S) < \frac{\text{spark } \Gamma}{2} \quad (64)$$

and

$$\text{card}(T) < \frac{\text{spark}\Gamma}{2}. \quad (65)$$

The union $Q := S \cup T$ has $\text{card}Q < \text{spark}\Gamma$ thus by definition of the spark

$$\Phi : \mathcal{U}_Q \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \quad (66)$$

is invertible. So if there is a $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{U}_Q$ that solves

$$\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{y}, \quad (67)$$

this \mathbf{w} is unique with respect to \mathcal{U}_Q . By construction $\mathcal{U}_S \subseteq \mathcal{U}_Q$, thus \mathbf{u} is a solution that lies in \mathcal{U}_Q . So we know that \mathbf{w} exists and is necessarily equal to \mathbf{u} . But also $\mathcal{U}_T \subseteq \mathcal{U}_Q$ so \mathbf{w} must also equal \mathbf{v} . We found $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v}$ which contradicts the assumption.

2.4 Transfer Function

The following lemma is known in the literature (see e.g. [14]), but usually given for adjacency matrices with entries that are either zero or one. We formulate it in a way that is consistent with our notation and such that the edge weights can be arbitrary.

Lemma 7 Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ a matrix and $g = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ the weighted graph with nodes $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and edges $(i \rightarrow j) \in \mathcal{E}$ whenever $A_{ji} \neq 0$. For each edge we define its weight as $F(i \rightarrow j) := A_{ji}$. The edge weights imply a weight for sets of paths. Let $\mathcal{P}_k(a, b)$ denote the set of paths from node a to node b of length k . Then

$$A_{ba}^k = F(\mathcal{P}_k(a, b)) \quad (68)$$

Proof 10 Let $l_0, l_1, \dots, l_k \in \mathcal{N}$ be a list of nodes. If the path $\pi := (l_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow l_k)$ exists, then $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_k(l_0, l_k)$ and we can use the homomorphic property of F to get

$$F(\pi) = F(l_0 \rightarrow l_1) \dots F(l_{k-1} \rightarrow l_k) = A_{l_k l_{k-1}} \dots A_{l_1 l_0}. \quad (69)$$

On the other hand, if π does not exist, that means at least one of the terms $A_{l_i l_{i-1}}$ equals zero and

$$A_{l_k l_{k-1}} \dots A_{l_1 l_0} = 0. \quad (70)$$

When we compute the powers of A we find

$$A_{ba}^k = \sum_{l_1, \dots, l_{k-1}=1}^N A_{bl_{k-1}} \dots A_{l_1 a} \quad (71)$$

which sums up all node lists $l_1, \dots, l_{k-1} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $l_0 = a$ and $l_k = b$ fixed. It is clear, that the terms in the sum do not vanish if and only if the path $(a \rightarrow l_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow l_{k-1} \rightarrow b)$ exists. Thus we can replace the sum by

$$A_{ba}^k = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_k(a, b)} A_{bl_{k-1}} \dots A_{l_1 a} \quad (72)$$

and we have already seen, that for an existing path we can replace the right hand side by

$$A_{ba}^k = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_k(a, b)} F(\pi) = F(\mathcal{P}_k(a, b)) \quad (73)$$

where the second equality comes simply from the definition of the weight function for sets of paths.

Proposition 3 Let T be the transfer function of a linear system and $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ nodes in the weighted influence graph. Let $\mathcal{P}(i, j)$ denote the paths from i to j . Then

$$T_{ji}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(i, j)} \frac{F(\pi)}{\sigma^{\text{len}\pi}}. \quad (74)$$

Proof 11 We use the Neumann-series to write

$$T_{ji}(\sigma) = [(\sigma - A)^{-1}]_{ji} = \frac{1}{\sigma} \left[\left(1 - \frac{A}{\sigma} \right)^{-1} \right]_{ji} = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{[A^k]_{ji}}{\sigma^k}. \quad (75)$$

where the brackets just indicate that we first take the matrix power and then take the ji -th element. With lemma 7 we get

$$T_{ji}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_k(i,j)} \frac{F(\pi)}{\sigma^k}. \quad (76)$$

We now see that in σ^{-k} we always find that k is the length of the path, $k = \text{len } \pi$. Furthermore we can combine the two sums to one sum over all paths

$$T_{ji}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(i,j)} \frac{F(\pi)}{\sigma^k}. \quad (77)$$

2.5 Transposed Gammoids

For a linear dynamic system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= A\mathbf{x}(t) + B\mathbf{w}(t) \\ \mathbf{x}(0) &= \mathbf{x}_0 \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= C\mathbf{x}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

the system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= A^T \mathbf{x}(t) + C^T \mathbf{y}(t) \\ \mathbf{x}(0) &= \mathbf{x}_0 \\ \mathbf{w}(t) &= B^T \mathbf{x}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

is called *dual* in the literature, referring to the duality principle of optimization theory, see for instance [15]. To avoid confusion, we will use the term *transposed system* instead, which then leads to a *transposed gammoid*. This nomenclature helps avoiding confusion with the term *dual gammoid*, which is already occupied by the duality principle of matroid theory [12] and which, to the best of our knowledge, is not related to dual dynamic systems.

From a gammoid Γ one can easily switch to the transposed gammoid Γ' without detour over the transposed dynamic system. Let g and g' denote the influence graphs of the original and the transposed system, respectively. Both systems have differential equations for the variables $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)^T$, so both influence graphs have N nodes. To avoid confusion, say

$$\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\} \quad (80)$$

and the nodes of the transposed graph are indicated by a prime symbol

$$\mathcal{N}' = \{1', \dots, N'\}. \quad (81)$$

We also have a one-to-one correspondence between the edges \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}' which can be written as

$$(i \rightarrow j)' = (j' \rightarrow i') \quad (82)$$

which is the gammoid analogue to $A_{ji} = (A^T)_{ij}$. This shows, that to switch from g to g' , one basically has to flip the edges. Finally, one will realize that inputs and outputs swap their roles. So if $S = (s_1, \dots, s_M)$ is an input set in g , then $S' = (s'_1, \dots, s'_M)$ is an output set of g' . In the same way, an output set Z in g becomes an input set Z' in g' . We find that

$$(\mathcal{L}, g, \mathcal{M})' = (\mathcal{M}', g', \mathcal{L}') \quad (83)$$

directly maps the gammoid Γ to the transposed gammoid Γ' . We have just derived the construction of the transposed gammoid for linear system. Clearly, we can use the derived formula to define the transposed gammoid also for the general case.

Definition 1 Let $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, \mathcal{M})$ be a gammoid, we call

$$\Gamma' := (\mathcal{M}', g', \mathcal{L}') \quad (84)$$

the *transposed gammoid*.

If the gammoid is a weighted gammoid, one simply keeps the weight of each single edge,

$$F(i \rightarrow j) = F((i \rightarrow j)'). \quad (85)$$

Now any path

$$\pi = (n_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow n_k) \quad (86)$$

in Γ corresponds to a path

$$\pi' = (n'_k \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow n'_0) \quad (87)$$

in Γ' and

$$F(\pi) = F(\pi'). \quad (88)$$

2.6 Concatenation of Gammoids

Consider two gammoids $\Gamma_1 = (\mathcal{L}_1, g_1, \mathcal{M}_1)$ and $\Gamma_2 = (\mathcal{L}_2, g_2, \mathcal{M}_2)$. If we now think of a signal that flows through a gammoid from the inputs to the outputs we can define the *concatenation*

$$\Gamma := \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2. \quad (89)$$

A signal enters somewhere in the input ground set \mathcal{L}_1 and flows through Γ_1 to the output set \mathcal{M}_1 . From there, the signal is passed over to \mathcal{L}_2 and flows through Γ_2 to the final output set \mathcal{M}_2 . To get a well defined concatenation, one must assume, that the signal transfer between the gammoids, i.e., from \mathcal{M}_1 to \mathcal{L}_2 is well defined. To ensure this, we assume, that $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{m_1, \dots, m_P\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \{l_1, \dots, l_P\}$ have the same size and are present in a fixed ordering such that the signal is passed from m_i to l_i . In other words, we identify

$$m_i = l_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, P. \quad (90)$$

The result $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, \mathcal{M})$ is indeed again a gammoid with input ground set $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1$ and output set $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_2$. The graph g of this gammoid is simply the union of g_1 and g_2 , i.e., $g = (\mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2)$. A special case is the concatenation of a gammoid with its own transpose, $\Gamma \circ \Gamma'$.

2.7 Gramian Matrix

Let $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_M\}$ be the input set and $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_P\}$ be the output set and T the transfer function of a linear system. Making use of proposition 3 we can compute the input gramian via

$$G_{ji}(\sigma) = \sum_{k=1}^P \frac{1}{|\sigma|^2} \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}(s_i, z_k)} \frac{F(\rho)}{\sigma^{\text{len } \rho}} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(s_j, z_k)} \frac{F(\pi)}{\bar{\sigma}^{\text{len } \pi}}. \quad (91)$$

We already know that if there is a path π in Γ that goes from s_j to z_k , then there is a path π' in Γ' that goes from z'_k to s'_j . So if

$$\rho = (n_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow n_{l-1} \rightarrow n_l) \quad (92)$$

is a path in Γ from $n_0 = s_i$ to $n_l = z_k$, and if π'

$$\pi' = (p'_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow p'_r) \quad (93)$$

is a path in Γ' from $p'_0 = z'_k$ to $p'_r = s'_j$, then with respect to the identification $z_k = z'_k$ we can interpret

$$\rho \circ \pi' = (n_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow n_{l-1} \rightarrow p'_0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow p'_r) \quad (94)$$

as a path in $\Gamma \circ \Gamma'$ with

$$F(\rho \circ \pi') = F(\rho)F(\pi') = F(\rho)F(\pi). \quad (95)$$

We can introduce a multi-index notation

$$\sigma^\psi := \sigma^{\text{len } \rho} \bar{\sigma}^{\text{len } \pi} \quad (96)$$

because we know, that any path ψ in $\Gamma \circ \Gamma'$ has always a unique decomposition in such a ρ and π' . We end up with the formula

$$G_{ji}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{|\sigma|^2} \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}(s_i, s'_j)} \frac{F(\psi)}{\sigma^\psi} \quad (97)$$

Before we turn our interest to the meaning of the gramian for dynamic compressed sensing, we want to provide tools in the form of the following lemma and proposition.

Lemma 8 *Let $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, \mathcal{M})$ be a gammoid and let $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$ be two input nodes. In $\Gamma \circ \Gamma'$ let $\eta_{aa'}$ denote the shortest path from a to a' , $\eta_{bb'}$ the shortest path from b to b' and $\eta_{ab'}$ shall denote the shortest path from a to b' . Then*

$$\frac{\text{len}(\eta_{aa'}) + \text{len}(\eta_{bb'})}{2} \leq \text{len}(\eta_{ab'}). \quad (98)$$

Proof 12 *By construction we know that there is a $z \in \mathcal{M}$ and a decomposition $\eta_{ab'} = \alpha \circ \beta'$ such that α goes from a to z and β' goes from b to z . We now find that $\alpha \circ \alpha'$ goes from a to a' . By assumption of the lemma, $\alpha \circ \alpha'$ is not shorter than $\eta_{aa'}$, thus*

$$\text{len}(\eta_{aa'}) \leq \text{len}(\alpha \circ \alpha') = 2 \text{len}(\alpha). \quad (99)$$

Analogously we find

$$\text{len}(\eta_{bb'}) \leq 2 \text{len}(\beta). \quad (100)$$

We can now add these two inequalities together to get

$$\text{len}(\eta_{aa'}) + \text{len}(\eta_{bb'}) \leq 2(\text{len}(\alpha) + \text{len}(\beta)). \quad (101)$$

On the right hand side we identify the length of $\eta_{ab'}$ to get

$$\text{len}(\eta_{aa'}) + \text{len}(\eta_{bb'}) \leq 2 \text{len}(\eta_{ab'}). \quad (102)$$

Proposition 4 Let T be the transfer function of a dynamic system with input set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_M\}$ and gammoid Γ , and let $G = T^*T$ be the input gramian. Consider the quantity

$$\mu_{ij}(\sigma) := \frac{|G_{ij}(\sigma)|}{\sqrt{G_{ii}(\sigma)G_{jj}(\sigma)}}. \quad (103)$$

Let $\eta_{ij'}$ be the shortest path in $\Gamma \circ \Gamma$ from s_i to s_j' . If lemma 8 holds with equality, then

$$\lim_{|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{ij}(\sigma) = \frac{|F(\eta_{ij'})|}{\sqrt{F(\eta_{ii'})F(\eta_{jj'})}}. \quad (104)$$

If the lemma holds with strict inequality, then

$$\lim_{|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{ij}(\sigma) = 0. \quad (105)$$

Note, that there can be several shortest paths, so $\eta_{ii'}$ can be a set of paths.

Proof 13 Say $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_M\}$ is the input set that leads to the transfer function T and the input gramian G . Using equation (97) we can write

$$\mu_{ij}(\sigma) = \frac{\left| \sum_{\psi \in \mathcal{P}(s_i, s_j')} F(\psi) \sigma^{-\psi} \right|}{\sqrt{\sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(s_i, s_i')} F(\pi) \sigma^{-\pi} \sum_{\theta \in \mathcal{P}(s_j, s_j')} F(\theta) \sigma^{-\theta}}}. \quad (106)$$

The terms under the square-root are non-negative. To see that, let $\pi = \alpha \circ \beta'$ be a path from s_i to s_i' . Then we know, that also $\beta \circ \alpha'$, $\alpha \circ \alpha'$ and $\beta \circ \beta'$ exist and all go from s_i to s_i' . Thus, in G_{ii} we always find the four terms

$$R := \frac{F(\alpha \circ \beta')}{\sigma^{\text{len} \alpha} \bar{\sigma}^{\text{len} \beta}} + \frac{F(\beta \circ \alpha')}{\sigma^{\text{len} \beta} \bar{\sigma}^{\text{len} \alpha}} + \frac{F(\alpha \circ \alpha')}{\sigma^{\text{len} \alpha} \bar{\sigma}^{\text{len} \alpha}} + \frac{F(\beta \circ \beta')}{\sigma^{\text{len} \beta} \bar{\sigma}^{\text{len} \beta}} \quad (107)$$

together. So it is sufficient to show, that R is non-negative. With $A := F(\alpha)/\sigma^{\text{len} \alpha}$ and $B := F(\beta)/\sigma^{\text{len} \beta}$ we can rewrite R as

$$R = A\bar{B} + B\bar{A} + A\bar{A} + B\bar{B}. \quad (108)$$

With $A = x + iy$ and $B = u + iv$ we find

$$R = (x + u)^2 + (y + v)^2 \geq 0. \quad (109)$$

The same holds for G_{jj} .

We now proceed with (106). As we want to take the limit $|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty$, the smallest powers of σ will be dominant. The smallest powers of σ correspond to the shortest paths. We neglect higher orders and the asymptotic behaviour

$$\mu_{ij}(\sigma) \simeq \frac{|F(\eta_{ij'}) \sigma^{-\eta_{ij'}}|}{\sqrt{F(\eta_{ii'}) F(\eta_{jj'}) \sigma^{-(\eta_{ii'} + \eta_{jj'})}} \quad (110)$$

where we use the sign “ \simeq ” to denote the asymptotic behaviour for $|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty$. Since the path $\eta_{ii'}$ is always symmetric in the sense $(\eta_{ii'})' = \eta_{ii'}$ we find $\sigma^{-\eta_{ii'}} = |\sigma|^{\text{len}(\eta_{ii'})}$. The same holds for $\eta_{jj'}$. With this we get

$$\mu_{ij}(s) \simeq \frac{|F(\eta_{ij'})|}{\sqrt{F(\eta_{ii'}) F(\eta_{jj'})}} |\sigma|^{\frac{1}{2}(\text{len}(\eta_{ii'}) + \text{len}(\eta_{jj'})) - \text{len}(\eta_{ij'})}. \quad (111)$$

From lemma 8 we know, that the exponent of $|s|$ is always non-negative, thus the limit always exists. If the lemma holds with equality, then the exponent equals zero and we get

$$\mu_{ij}(\sigma) \simeq \frac{|F(\eta_{ij'})|}{\sqrt{F(\eta_{ii'}) F(\eta_{jj'})}}. \quad (112)$$

If inequality holds, then the exponent of $|\sigma|$ is negative and we find

$$\lim_{|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{ij}(\sigma) = 0. \quad (113)$$

3 On the relation between Spark and Mutual Coherence

We will first discuss why it makes sense to consider the *generic rank* instead of the standard rank of the transfer function T . This will help us to finally deduce a global inequality to estimate the spark via the mutual coherence.

Let $T : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{P \times M}$ be the transfer function of a linear dynamic system. One knows, that T has singularities at the eigenvalues of A (see section 6. 2.4), but these will cause no issue for the following calculations. Assume for an $\sigma_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ we find the rank

$$\text{rank } T(\sigma) = r < M. \quad (114)$$

If we regard $T(\sigma) = (\mathbf{t}_1(\sigma), \dots, \mathbf{t}_M(\sigma))$ as a set of column vectors, then $\{\mathbf{t}_1(\sigma_0), \dots, \mathbf{t}_M(\sigma_0)\}$ is a linearly dependent set of vectors. This can have two reasons. Either, $\{\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_M\}$ as function are linearly dependent, say of rank r . Then it is clear, that the rank of $T(\sigma)$ will never exceed r . Or, $\{\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_M\}$ is a set of linearly independent functions, and the linear dependence at σ_0 is just an unfortunate coincidence. In this case, for any σ in a vicinity of σ_0 , we will find that the rank of $T(\sigma)$ is M almost everywhere. For this reason, one defines the *structural* [15] or *generic rank* [16] of T as

$$\text{Rank } T := \max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{C}} \text{rank } T(\sigma). \quad (115)$$

From linear algebra it is clear, that for a fixed $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$, the equation

$$T(\sigma)\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\sigma) = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}(\sigma) \quad (116)$$

can be solved for $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\sigma)$ if the rank of $T(\sigma)$ equals M . From the argumentation above it becomes clear, that a generic rank of M already renders the whole system invertible.

3.1 Strict Diagonal Dominance of the Gramian

Now, we formulate the well known Gershgorin theorem [17] in a form suitable for our purpose.

Lemma 9 Consider a complex matrix $G : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{M \times M}$. We call G strict diagonal dominant in σ if for all $i = 1, \dots, M$ we find

$$|G(\sigma)_{ii}| > \sum_{j \neq i} |G(\sigma)_{ij}|. \quad (117)$$

If G is strict diagonal dominant in σ , then zero is not an eigenvalue of $G(\sigma)$.

Proof 14 For a fixed σ set $A := G(\sigma)$. Assume $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is an eigenvalue of A with eigenvector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^M$. Let v_i be a component of \mathbf{v} of maximal magnitude, i.e. $|v_i| \geq |v_j|$ for all $j = 1, \dots, M$. Without loss of generality we assume $v_i = 1$. We write the eigenvalue equation in components

$$\sum_{j=1}^M A_{ij}v_j = \lambda v_i. \quad (118)$$

We extract $j = i$ from the sum to get

$$\sum_{j \neq i} A_{ij}v_j = \lambda - A_{ii}. \quad (119)$$

Taking the absolute value and applying the triangle inequality yields

$$|\lambda - A_{ii}| \leq \sum_{j \neq i} |A_{ij}| |v_j|. \quad (120)$$

By constriction $|v_j| \leq |v_i| = 1$ thus we get the final result

$$|\lambda - A_{ii}| \leq \sum_{j \neq i} |A_{ij}|. \quad (121)$$

With $r_i = \sum_{j \neq i} |A_{ij}|$ we can give a boundary of the spectrum $\text{spec}(A)$ via a union of circles in the complex plane,

$$\text{spec}(A) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^M \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\lambda - A_{ii}| \leq r_i\}. \quad (122)$$

Note that a strictly diagonal dominant matrix necessarily has diagonal elements $|A_{ii}| > 0$ - Furthermore $A_{ii} > r_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, M$ and thus

$$0 \notin \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\lambda - A_{ii}| \leq r_i\}. \quad (123)$$

Consequently $0 \notin \text{spec}(A)$.

Note, that the diagonal element of an input gramian G_{ii} is given by

$$G_{ij}(\sigma) = \sum_{j=1}^P T_{ij}^*(\sigma)T_{ji}(\sigma) = \sum_{j=1}^P |T_{ji}(\sigma)|^2 \quad (124)$$

and thus it is the zero function if and only if each T_{ji} for $j = 1, \dots, P$ is the zero function. Again consider the dynamic system

$$T(\sigma)\tilde{w}(\sigma) = \tilde{y}(\sigma). \quad (125)$$

If the i -th column of $T(\sigma)$ is zero for all $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$, then \tilde{w}_i has no influence on the output at all. It is therefore trivially impossible to gain any information about \tilde{w}_i . We want to exclude this trivial case from our investigation and henceforth assume, that the diagonal elements of G are non-zero. By construction it is clear, that each diagonal element $G_{ii}(\sigma)$ is indeed a positive real number.

3.2 Strict Diagonal Dominance Condition

Consider a linear dynamic input-output system with input set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_M\}$ and input gramian $G : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{M \times M}$ and recall the definition of the coherence between input nodes s_i and s_j

$$\mu_{ij}(\sigma) := \frac{|G_{ij}(\sigma)|}{\sqrt{G_{ii}(\sigma)G_{jj}(\sigma)}}. \quad (126)$$

The mutual coherence at σ is defined as

$$\mu(\sigma) := \max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij}(\sigma). \quad (127)$$

For the special case, that the transfer function T is constant and real, this coincides with the definition of the mutual coherence from [13]. Also from there we take the following theorem and show that it stays valid for the dynamic problem.

Proposition 5 *Consider a linear dynamic input-output system with input set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_M\}$, input gramian G . Let $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\mu(\sigma)$ the mutual coherence in σ . If the inequality*

$$G_{ii}(s) > \mu(s) \quad (128)$$

holds for $i = 1, \dots, M$, then G is strictly diagonally dominant at s .

Proof 15 *First, rescale the system by*

$$G(\sigma) \rightsquigarrow \frac{G(\sigma)}{\text{tr}G(\sigma)} \quad (129)$$

which gives the property

$$\sum_{i=1}^M G_{ii}(\sigma) = 1. \quad (130)$$

Note, that $G_{ii}(\sigma) > 0$ is already clear and from the equation above $G_{ii} < 1$. The case $M = 1$ is trivial. By definition for all $i, j = 1, \dots, M$ with $i \neq j$

$$|G_{ij}(\sigma)| \leq \mu(\sigma)\sqrt{G_{ii}(\sigma)G_{jj}(\sigma)}. \quad (131)$$

By assumption of the proposition $\mu(\sigma) \leq G_{ii}(\sigma)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, M$, and since all quantities are non-negative

$$\mu < \sqrt{G_{ii}(\sigma)G_{jj}(\sigma)} \quad (132)$$

for all $i \neq j$. Combine the latter two inequalities and sum over all $j = 1, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, M$ to get

$$\sum_{j \neq i} |G_{ij}(\sigma)| < G_{ii}(\sigma) \sum_{j \neq i} G_{jj}(\sigma) \quad (133)$$

for all i, \dots, M . Due to equation (130), the sum on the right hand side is smaller than one, thus for all $i = 1, \dots, M$ we find

$$\sum_{j \neq i} |G_{ij}(\sigma)| < G_{ii}(\sigma) \quad (134)$$

which is exactly the definition of strict diagonal dominance at σ .

3.3 A note on the Coherence Measure

In contrast to the static problem, where the coherence is a constant, we have here a function in the complex plane. Say, we have a small input set $S = \{s_1, s_2\}$. It is possible, that s_1 and s_2 are coherent in one regime of \mathbb{C} but will be incoherent in another. Proposition 5 and lemma 9 show, that a small coherence in a single $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$ is sufficient to get a high generic rank, and by this invertibility of the system. To have a measure whether two nodes s_i and s_j are distinguishable somewhere in \mathbb{C} it makes sense to define the *global coherence*

$$\mu_{ij} := \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{C}} \mu_{ij}(\sigma). \quad (135)$$

It is easy to see that the inequality

$$\max_{i \neq j} \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{C}} \mu_{ij}(\sigma) \leq \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{C}} \max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij}(\sigma) \quad (136)$$

holds, formulated in terms of the global coherence μ_{ij} and mutual coherence $\mu(\sigma)$

$$\max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij} \leq \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{C}} \mu(\sigma). \quad (137)$$

Proposition 5 holds for the mutual coherence $\mu(\sigma)$ at any $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$. The least restrictive bound for strict diagonal dominance is obviously achieved for a small mutual coherence $\mu(\sigma)$, so we would like to compute the minimum or infimum of $\mu(\sigma)$, the *global mutual coherence*

$$\mu := \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{C}} \mu(\sigma). \quad (138)$$

The inequality above indicates, that small global coherences μ_{ij} do not necessarily lead to a small global mutual coherence μ . More precisely

$$\max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij} \leq \mu. \quad (139)$$

As an example, consider three input nodes s_1, s_2 and s_3 and three subsets of the complex plane $U, V, W \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. It might happen that $\mu_{12}(\sigma)|_U$ is small, let us assume it vanishes, and so do $\mu_{23}(\sigma)|_V$ and $\mu_{13}(\sigma)|_W$. Thus, all global coherences are vanishingly small. However, if U, V and W do not intersect, the global coherences are attained at different regions in the complex plane which means, in U we can distinguish s_1 from s_2 but we cannot distinguish s_2 from s_3 , and the same for V and W .

3.4 Shortest Path Coherence

We want to estimate the global mutual coherence by the *mutual shortest path coherence*

$$\mu^{\text{short}} := \lim_{|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\sigma). \quad (140)$$

which is clearly an upper bound for the global mutual coherence. In contrast to the non-commuting infimum and maximum operations, the proposition below shows, that the limit and the maximum operations commute. We find

$$\lim_{|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij}(\sigma) = \max_{i \neq j} \lim_{|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{ij}(\sigma) = \max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij}^{\text{short}}. \quad (141)$$

The quantity on the right hand side, μ_{ij}^{short} is the *shortest path coherence* between s_i and s_j , which already appeared in proposition 4.

Proposition 6 *Let $\mu_{ij}(\sigma)$ be the coherence of s_i and s_j . Then*

$$\lim_{|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \neq j} \mu_{ij}(\sigma) = \max_{i \neq j} \lim_{|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{ij}(\sigma). \quad (142)$$

Proof 16 *First note, that $\mu_{ij}(\sigma)$ is continuous, $0 \leq \mu_{ij}(\sigma) \leq 1$ and that any singularity of $\mu_{ij}(\sigma)$ is removable. Furthermore we have already seen that each $\mu_{ij}(\sigma)$ convergent with limit μ_{ij}^{short} as $|\sigma| \rightarrow \infty$. Due to these convenient properties, the following setting is sufficient.*

Let $f_a : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a family of continuous and bounded functions with $a \in I$ where I is a finite index set. We want to show that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \max_{a \in I} f_a(x) = \max_{a \in I} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f_a(x). \quad (143)$$

To see that, let $M_a := \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f_a(x)$ and let $a^ \in I$ such that $M_{a^*} = \max_{a \in I} M_a$. By definition of M_a , for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is an x_a such that for all $x > x_a$ we have*

$$|f_a(x) - M_a| < \epsilon. \quad (144)$$

Set $x_0 := \max_{a \in I} x_a$ such that we can use the same epsilon and x_0 for all indices a . Let us divide $I = I_0 \dot{\cup} I_1$ such that I_0 contains all indices with $M_a < M_{a^*}$ and I_1 contains this indices with $M_a = M_{a^*}$

Let us first consider all I_0 and let us choose ϵ such that

$$\epsilon < \frac{1}{2} |M_{a^*} - M_a| \quad (145)$$

for all $a \in I_0$. We can rewrite this as

$$M_a + \epsilon < M_{a^*} - \epsilon. \quad (146)$$

For this choice of ϵ there is an x_0 such that $|f_a(x) - M_a| < \epsilon$ for $x > x_0$, i.e.,

$$f_a(x) \in (M_a - \epsilon, M_a + \epsilon) \quad (147)$$

an analogously

$$f_{a^*}(x) \in (M_{a^*} - \epsilon, M_{a^*} + \epsilon). \quad (148)$$

Due to our choice of epsilon these two intervals are disjoint and one can see that $f_a(x) < f_{a^*}(x)$ for all $x > x_0$. Thus for x large enough we can always neglect I_0 ,

$$\max_{a \in I} f_a(x) = \max_{a \in I_1} f_a(x). \quad (149)$$

Let us now focus on I_1 . Consider

$$r_a(x) := |f_a(x) - M_{a^*}| \quad (150)$$

for $a \in I_1$ and let $a' \in I_1$ such that $f_{a'}(x) = \max_{a \in I_1} f_a(x)$. It is now clear that

$$r_{a'}(x) \leq \max_{a \in I_1} r_a(x) \quad (151)$$

for all x . Insertion of the definitions yields

$$|f_{a'}(x) - M_{a^*}| \leq \max_{a \in I_1} |f_a(x) - M_{a^*}| \quad (152)$$

and for $x > x_0$ we deduce

$$|f_{a'}(x) - M_{a^*}| < \epsilon. \quad (153)$$

Since we can do that for arbitrary small $\epsilon > 0$ we find the convergence

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f_{a'}(x) = M_{a^*}. \quad (154)$$

We can now insert the definitions

$$f_{a'}(x) = \max_{a \in I_1} f_a(x) = \max_{a \in I} f_a(x) \quad (155)$$

and

$$M_{a^*} = \max_{a \in I} M_a = \max_{a \in I} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f_a(x) \quad (156)$$

to get the desired result

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \max_{a \in I} f_a(x) = \max_{a \in I} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f_a(x). \quad (157)$$

3.5 Feed-Forward Graphs

As one special case we want to consider systems with a feed-forward structure. Such a structure for instance appears in artificial neural networks. From the matroid theory side, such systems correspond to cascade gammoids which were investigated in [11].

A gammoid $\Gamma = (\mathcal{L}, g, \mathcal{M})$ is called a *cascade* if it has the following structure. The graph $g = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ consists of a disjoint union of $L + 1$ node sets

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_0 \dot{\cup} \dots \dot{\cup} \mathcal{N}_L \quad (158)$$

called layers. With (i, l) we mean node i from layer \mathcal{N}_l . Each edge in \mathcal{E} has the form

$$(i, l) \rightarrow (j, l + 1). \quad (159)$$

The input and output ground sets are set to be $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{N}_0$ and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}_L$.

In a cascade, all paths from the input layer to the output layer have the same length. For $(i, 0) \in \mathcal{L}$ and $(j, L) \in \mathcal{M}$ we find the transfer function to be

$$T_{ji}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma^L} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}((i,0),(j,L))} F(\pi) \quad (160)$$

One can see that

$$A_{ji} := \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}((i,0),(j,L))} F(\pi) \quad (161)$$

defines the entries of a real constant matrix A . The transfer function achieves the simple form

$$T(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma^L} A \quad (162)$$

and the coherence $\mu_{ij}(\sigma)$ turns out to be a constant

$$\mu_{ij}(\sigma) = \frac{\langle a_i, a_j \rangle}{\|a_i\| \|a_j\|}. \quad (163)$$

The latter equation looks exactly like the coherence one defines for the static compressed sensing problem [13]. It follows, that for the class of cascade gammoids the different notions of coherence all coincide, and consequently the shortest path coherence indeed yields a method to compute the mutual coherence exactly.

3.6 Estimation of the Spark

This calculation is in analogy to the static problem from [13]. Let G be the gramian of a linear dynamic input-output system with input set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_M\}$ and let $\mu(\sigma)$ be its mutual coherence at $\sigma \in \mathbb{C}$. By the definition

$$|G_{ij}(\sigma)| \leq \mu(\sigma) \sqrt{G_{ii}(\sigma) G_{jj}(\sigma)}. \quad (164)$$

Now let $G_{kk}(\sigma)$ be the maximum of all $G_{ii}(\sigma)$ for $i = 1, \dots, M$. We replace the square root and sum over all $j = 1, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, M$ to get

$$\sum_{j \neq i} |G_{ij}(\sigma)| \leq (M-1) \mu(\sigma) G_{kk}(\sigma), \quad (165)$$

where we used that the right hand side is independent of j . The gramian is strict diagonal dominant if for all $i = 1, \dots, M$ we have

$$(M-1) \mu(\sigma) G_{kk}(\sigma) < G_{ii}(\sigma). \quad (166)$$

The latter inequality is therefore sufficient for strict diagonal dominance at σ and consequently to invertibility of the dynamic system. We therefore proceed with this inequality by using $G_{ii}(\sigma)/G_{kk}(\sigma) < 1$ to get

$$M < \frac{1}{\mu(\sigma)} + 1. \quad (167)$$

Note, that the gammoid G depends on the choice of the input set $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. However, the sufficient condition for strict diagonal dominance only takes $M = \text{card } S$ into account. It becomes clear, that for all $\tilde{S} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $\text{card } \tilde{S} \leq M$ we get strict diagonal dominance. Since strict diagonal dominance leads to invertibility, it also tells us that \tilde{S} is independent Γ . By definition of the spark, $\text{spark } \Gamma$ is the largest integer such that \tilde{S} is independent in Γ whenever $\text{card } \tilde{S} \leq \text{spark } \Gamma$. Since any M that fulfils (167) leads to independence, it becomes clear, that the spark is not smaller than the right hand side of this inequality. Therefore

$$\text{spark } \Gamma \geq \frac{1}{\mu(\sigma)} + 1, \quad (168)$$

and we have proven the validity of theorem 3.

4 Convex Optimization

Here we provide the proof of theorem 5.

Proof 17 We first show, that the constraint set

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U} \mid \|\Phi(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq \epsilon\} \quad (169)$$

with $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ is convex. Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that $\alpha + \beta = 1$. We have to show that

$$\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow (\alpha\mathbf{u} + \beta\mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (170)$$

Given that Φ is linear we can estimate

$$\|\Phi(\alpha\mathbf{u} + \beta\mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{y}\|_2 = \|\alpha\Phi(\mathbf{u}) - \alpha\mathbf{y} + \beta\Phi(\mathbf{v}) - \beta\mathbf{y}\|_2 \quad (171)$$

and with the triangle inequality

$$\|\Phi(\alpha\mathbf{u} + \beta\mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq \alpha\|\Phi(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{y}\|_2 + \beta\|\Phi(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq \alpha\epsilon + \beta\epsilon = \epsilon. \quad (172)$$

Since $\|\cdot\|_q$ is a proper norm on \mathcal{U} we again apply the triangle inequality

$$\|\alpha\mathbf{u} + \beta\mathbf{v}\|_1 \leq \alpha\|\mathbf{u}\|_1 + \beta\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \quad (173)$$

to see that the function we want to minimize is convex.

5 Restricted Isometry Property

The following lemma was proven for matrices in [1] and can now be generalized to linear dynamic systems.

Lemma 10 Assume RIP2k and let \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} with disjoint support. Then

$$\langle \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{u})}, \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})} \rangle \leq \delta_{2k} \|\mathbf{u}\|_2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_2. \quad (174)$$

Proof 18 First we divide (174) by $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_2$ to get a normalized version of (174)

$$\frac{\langle \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{u})}, \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_2} = \left\langle \Phi\left(\frac{\mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2}\right), \Phi\left(\frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_2}\right) \right\rangle \leq \delta_{2k} \quad (175)$$

where we used the homogeneity of $\underline{\cdot}$ and the linearity of Φ . Note, that underlined vectors are simply vectors in \mathbb{R}^P , hence the scalar product is the standard scalar product. For simplicity of notation we henceforth assume $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 = 1$. We apply the parallelogram identity to the left hand side of (174) to get

$$\langle \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{u})}, \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})} \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \left(\|\underline{\Phi(\mathbf{u})} + \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})}\|_2^2 - \|\underline{\Phi(\mathbf{u})} - \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})}\|_2^2 \right) \quad (176)$$

and since RIP2k holds we get

$$\langle \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{u})}, \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})} \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \left((1 + \delta_{2k}) \|\underline{\mathbf{u}} + \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^2 - (1 - \delta_{2k}) \|\underline{\mathbf{u}} - \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^2 \right). \quad (177)$$

We apply lemma 2 to see that due to the disjoint support we get

$$\|\underline{\mathbf{u}} + \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^2 = \|\underline{\mathbf{u}} - \underline{\mathbf{v}}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \quad (178)$$

and proposition 2 yields

$$\langle \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{u})}, \underline{\Phi(\mathbf{v})} \rangle \leq 2\delta_{2k} (\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2) = \delta_{2k}. \quad (179)$$

To see that our framework is in agreement with the results for the static problem consider the following: Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times N}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^P$ be given and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Solve

$$A\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{y} \quad (180)$$

for \mathbf{w} . This problem can be seen as a dynamic system with trivial time-development and input-output map A . Consequently an input set $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots\}$ is independent in the gammoid if and only if the columns $\{\mathbf{a}_{s_1}, \mathbf{a}_{s_2}, \dots\}$ of A are linearly independent. In this special case we can drop the underline notation and we can rewrite the RIP2k condition as follows. Let $\kappa := 2k$. For each $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \Sigma_k$

$$(1 - \delta_{2k}) \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \leq \|A\mathbf{u} - A\mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \quad (181)$$

is equivalent to saying that for each $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$ in $\Sigma_{2k} = \Sigma_\kappa$ we have

$$(1 - \delta_\kappa) \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq \|A\mathbf{w}\|_2^2. \quad (182)$$

The same argumentation holds for the second inequality, so that we can say, the system has the RIP of order κ if and only if for all $\mathbf{w} \in \Sigma_\kappa$

$$(1 - \delta_\kappa) \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq \|A\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_\kappa) \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2. \quad (183)$$

The latter is exactly the RIP condition that one usually formulates for static compressed sensing. We can therefore say, that our framework contains the classical static problem as special case.

We now turn our interest to one important proposition about systems that fulfil the RIP2k. This one corresponds to Lemma 1.3 from [1]. We follow the idea of the proof given there, however, some additional steps are necessary in order to get a result valid for dynamic systems.

Proposition 7 *Assume the RIP2k holds and let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let Λ_0 be an index set of size $\text{card } \Lambda_0 \leq k$. Let Λ_1 correspond to the k largest entries of $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_0^c}$ (see lemma 5), Λ_2 to the second largest and so forth. We set $\Lambda := \Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1$ and*

$$\alpha := \frac{\sqrt{2}\delta_{2k}}{1 - \delta_{2k}}, \quad \beta := \frac{1}{1 - \delta_{2k}}. \quad (184)$$

Then

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \alpha \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}} + \beta \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{u}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{u}_\Lambda\|_2}. \quad (185)$$

Proof 19 *For two complementary sets Λ and Λ^c we have $\Lambda \cap \Lambda^c = \emptyset$ so that we can use equation (18). Furthermore, $\Lambda \cup \Lambda^c = \{1, \dots, N\}$ shows that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_\Lambda + \mathbf{u}_{\Lambda^c}$. Thus due to linearity of Φ we get*

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda) = \Phi(\mathbf{u}) - \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda^c}). \quad (186)$$

By construction $\Lambda^c = \Lambda_2 \dot{\cup} \Lambda_3 \dot{\cup} \dots$ so we can substitute the latter term by a sum

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda) = \Phi(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}). \quad (187)$$

By construction we also know that $\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0}, \mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1} \in \Sigma_k$, so from the RIP2k we get

$$(1 - \delta_{2k}) \|\underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_0} - \underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_1}\|_2^2 \leq \|\underline{\Phi}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_0}) - \underline{\Phi}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_1})\|_2^2 \quad (188)$$

On the left hand side we notice that Λ_0 and Λ_1 are disjoint so we use lemma 2 to see that

$$\|\underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_0} - \underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_1}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0} + \mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{u}_\Lambda\|_2^2. \quad (189)$$

On the right hand side we use lemma 6 and the linearity of Φ to get

$$\|\underline{\Phi}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_0}) - \underline{\Phi}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\Lambda_1})\|_2^2 \leq \|\Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0}) + \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1})\|_2^2 = \|\Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda)\|_2^2. \quad (190)$$

We can estimate $\|\Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda)\|_2^2$ by

$$\|\Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda)\|_2^2 \leq \left\langle \Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{u}) \right\rangle + \left\langle \Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda), \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}) \right\rangle. \quad (191)$$

To see that, we first wrote the norm as a scalar product

$$\|\Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda)\|_2^2 = \left\langle \Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}) \right\rangle \quad (192)$$

where the second vector comes from equation (187). The triangle inequality from lemma 1 yields

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}) \leq \underline{\Phi}(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}) \quad (193)$$

as well as

$$\sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}) \leq \sum_{j \geq 2} \underline{\Phi}(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}) \quad (194)$$

for each component $i = 1, \dots, P$. We proceed with the second scalar product in equation (191)

$$\left\langle \frac{\Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda), \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})}{\sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})} \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{\Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0}), \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})}{\sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})} \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1}), \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})}{\sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})} \right\rangle \quad (195)$$

where we again used the linearity and triangle inequality in each component,

$$\underline{\Phi}_i(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda) = \underline{\Phi}_i(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0}) + \underline{\Phi}_i(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1}) \leq \underline{\Phi}_i(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0}) + \underline{\Phi}_i(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1}). \quad (196)$$

For $m = 0, 1$ we first write the sum outside of the scalar product and apply lemma 10

$$\left\langle \frac{\Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_m}), \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})}{\sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})} \right\rangle = \sum_{j \geq 2} \left\langle \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_m}), \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}) \right\rangle \leq \sum_{j \geq 2} \delta_{2k} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_m}\|_2 \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}\|_2 \quad (197)$$

and then lemma 5 to get

$$\left\langle \frac{\Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_m}), \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})}{\sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j})} \right\rangle \leq \delta_{2k} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_m}\|_2 \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (198)$$

We add the two inequalities for $m = 0$ and $m = 1$ to get

$$\left\langle \Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda), \sum_{j \geq 2} \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_j}) \right\rangle \leq \delta_{2k} (\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1}\|_2) \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (199)$$

From lemma 4 we know that

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2} \|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0} + \mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_1}\|_2 = \sqrt{2} \|\mathbf{u}_\Lambda\|_2. \quad (200)$$

We combine all these results to get

$$(1 - \delta_{2k}) \|\mathbf{u}_\Lambda\|_2^2 \leq \langle \Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{u}) \rangle + \delta_{2k} \sqrt{2} \|\mathbf{u}_\Lambda\|_2 \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (201)$$

For $\delta_{2k} < 1$ and with α and β as defined above we can divide the inequality by $(1 - \delta) \|\mathbf{u}_\Lambda\|_2$ to get the desired inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \alpha \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}} + \beta \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{u}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{u}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{u}_\Lambda\|_2}. \quad (202)$$

We want to make use of the latter proposition in the following way: Say $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}$ is a fixed vector, e.g., the true model error that we want to reconstruct, and \mathbf{u} is our estimate for the model error, e.g., obtained by some optimization procedure. To measure how good the optimization procedure performs, we compute the difference $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$ and utilize the proposition to get an upper bound for $\|\mathbf{w}\|_2$

Now assume the RIP $2k$ holds with a constant $\delta_{2k} < \sqrt{2} - 1$. For the proposition we can choose an arbitrary index set Λ_0 of size k . We choose Λ_0 such that it corresponds to the k components of $\underline{\mathbf{v}}$ with highest magnitude. As said in the proposition, Λ_1 will now correspond to the k largest components in $\underline{\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c}}$, Λ_2 to the second largest and so forth and we set $\Lambda = \Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1$.

Recap, that $\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_q$ is the distance between \mathbf{v} and the the best k -sparse approximation [2]

$$\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_q := \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \Sigma_k} \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{v}\|_q \quad (203)$$

and note that

$$\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1 = \|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0} - \mathbf{v}\|_1. \quad (204)$$

To see the latter equation, let $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{v}\|_1$ is minimal. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ is k -sparse, there is a $\tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}$. Written as a sum

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{v}\|_1 = \sum_{i \in \tilde{\Lambda}} \tilde{v}_i - v_i + \sum_{i \in \tilde{\Lambda}^c} v_i. \quad (205)$$

The non-zero components must be chosen $\tilde{v}_i = v_i$ since this makes the first sum vanish. In order to minimize the second sum the index set $\tilde{\Lambda}^c$ must correspond to the smallest v_i , in other words, $\tilde{\Lambda}$ corresponds to the largest v_i , thus $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0}$.

In the remainder of this section we follow the argumentation line of [1] where the static problem in \mathbb{R}^N was considered. Therein, many results are utilized that were first presented in [18]. We show, how a line of reasoning can be made for the general case of composite Banach spaces, i.e., valid for dynamic systems.

Lemma 11 Consider the setting explained above and assume $\|\mathbf{u}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_1$. Then

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq 2\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 + 2\frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (206)$$

Proof 20 We begin with splitting \mathbf{w} and applying the triangle inequality

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda + \mathbf{w}_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 + \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda^c}\|_2. \quad (207)$$

Since $\Lambda^c = \Lambda_2 \dot{\cup} \Lambda_3 \dot{\cup} \dots$ we can apply the triangle inequality and lemma 5

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 = \left\| \sum_{j \geq 2} \mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_j} \right\|_2 \leq \sum_{j \geq 2} \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_j}\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (208)$$

By construction $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}$ so it is clear that

$$\|\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_1. \quad (209)$$

For the complementary sets Λ_0 and Λ_0^c we can apply proposition 2 with $q = 1$ to get

$$\|\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}\|_1 = \|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0} + \mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c} + \mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1. \quad (210)$$

In the proof of lemma 6 we know for each component that

$$\|v_i - |w_i|\| \leq |v_i + w_i|. \quad (211)$$

So we estimate the norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0} + \mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 &= \sum_{i \in \Lambda_0} |v_i + w_i| \geq \sum_{i \in \Lambda_0} \|v_i - |w_i|\| \\ &\geq \left| \sum_{i \in \Lambda_0} (|v_i| - |w_i|) \right| = |(\|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 - \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1)| \geq \|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 - \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 \end{aligned} \quad (212)$$

and the same holds for Λ_0^c . With this result equation (210) becomes

$$\|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 - \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 - \|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \quad (213)$$

which yields a lower bound for $\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1$

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 - \|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + \|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1. \quad (214)$$

A calculation as in equation (212) and equation (204) show that

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 - \|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 = \sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1 \quad (215)$$

and since Λ_0^c is complementary to Λ_0 , $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0} + \mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0^c}$, thus

$$\|\mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 = \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 = \sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1. \quad (216)$$

Combining the latter three results we get

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + 2\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1. \quad (217)$$

Inserting the latter result into equation (208) yields

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1 + 2\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (218)$$

From lemma 3 we get

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_2 + 2\frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (219)$$

We now use the triangle inequality

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 + \|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda^c}\|_2 \quad (220)$$

and the fact, that $\Lambda_0 \subseteq \Lambda$, thus

$$\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 \quad (221)$$

to get the desired inequality

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq 2\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 + 2\frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (222)$$

The following theorem follows from a combination of proposition 7 and lemma 11. It is the key result for the optimization problem we present for linear dynamic input-output systems.

Proposition 8 *Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\|\mathbf{u}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_1$ and assume for Φ we have the RIP2k with $\delta_{2k} < \sqrt{2} - 1$. Let Λ_0 correspond to the k largest components of $\underline{\mathbf{v}}$. We set $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}$ and let Λ_1 correspond to the k largest components of $\underline{\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c}}$, Λ_2 to the second largest and so forth. Let $\Lambda := \Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1$. There are two constants C_0 and C_1 such that*

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq C_0 \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}} + C_1 \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2}. \quad (223)$$

Proof 21 *We start with proposition 7 applied to \mathbf{w}*

$$\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \alpha \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}} + \beta \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2}. \quad (224)$$

In lemma 11 equation 219 we found an estimate of $\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0^c}\|_1$, inserted into the latter inequality

$$\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \alpha \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_1}{\sqrt{k}} + 2\alpha \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}} + \beta \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2}. \quad (225)$$

The first term can be treated with lemma 3 and then we use the fact that $\Lambda_0 \subseteq \Lambda$, thus $\|\mathbf{w}_{\Lambda_0}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2$, to get

$$\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \alpha \|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 + 2\alpha \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}} + \beta \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2}. \quad (226)$$

Due to the assumption $\delta_{2k} < \sqrt{2} - 1$ we also get $\alpha < \sqrt{2} - 1 < 1$ hence $(1 - \alpha)$ is positive so we rewrite the latter equation as

$$\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 \leq \frac{2\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}} + \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha} \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2}. \quad (227)$$

To close the proof we use lemma 11 to get

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\|\mathbf{w}\| - 2 \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}} \right) \leq \frac{2\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}} + \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha} \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2} \quad (228)$$

and with

$$C_0 := \left(\frac{4\alpha}{1 - \alpha} + 2 \right) \quad (229)$$

and

$$C_1 := \frac{2\beta}{1 - \alpha} \quad (230)$$

we finally obtain

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq C_0 \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{v})_1}{\sqrt{k}} + C_1 \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2}. \quad (231)$$

We can now apply proposition 8 to the solutions of the $\|\cdot\|_0$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ optimization problems. Assume $\mathbf{y}^{\text{data}} \in \mathcal{Y}$ is given data which is produced by a sparse “true” input $\mathbf{w}^* \in \mathcal{U}$, i.e.,

$$\Phi(\mathbf{w}^*) = \mathbf{y}^{\text{data}}. \quad (232)$$

We want to infer \mathbf{w}^* from \mathbf{y}^{data} . Sparsity of the “true” input \mathbf{w}^* means, that for all \mathbf{u} in

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U} \mid \|\Phi(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{y}\|_2 = 0\} \quad (233)$$

we find

$$\|\mathbf{w}^*\|_0 \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_0. \quad (234)$$

Now let $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ be a solution of the convex $\|\cdot\|_1$ optimization problem, that is, for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}$ we find

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}\|_1 \leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_1. \quad (235)$$

We can now apply proposition 8 to $\mathbf{w} = \hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}^*$. Note, that

$$\Phi(\hat{\mathbf{w}}) = \Phi(\mathbf{w}^*) \Rightarrow \Phi(\mathbf{w}) = 0. \quad (236)$$

We find

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2 \leq C_0 \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{w}^*)_1}{\sqrt{k}}. \quad (237)$$

Note that by definition $\sigma_k(\mathbf{w}^*)_1$ is the best k -sparse approximation to \mathbf{w}^* in 1-norm. Thus we have shown, that the convex $\|\cdot\|_1$ optimization yields an approximation of the unknown ‘‘true’’ input.

Proposition 8 might be adjusted for various scenarios where we can make further assumptions about the model error \mathbf{w}^* or about stochastic or measurement errors. We want to derive a last inequality for the case of bounded noise. Let ξ represent the noise, and $\Phi_{\text{noiseless}}$ the solution operator we have discussed so far. We now consider a new solution operator

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u})(t) := \Phi_{\text{noiseless}}(\mathbf{u})(t) + \xi(t) \quad (238)$$

that incorporates the noise ξ . Since $\xi(t) \in \mathbb{R}^P$ we can interpret $\xi \in \mathcal{Y}$ and use the norm on \mathcal{Y} . We assume that ξ is a bounded noise with $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\|\xi\|_2 \leq \epsilon. \quad (239)$$

We adjust the solution set

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U} \mid \|\Phi(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq \epsilon\} \quad (240)$$

and define $\mathbf{w}^*, \hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{A}$ as before with minimal $\|\cdot\|_0$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ norm, respectively. From the theorem we get

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq C_0 \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{w}^*)_1}{\sqrt{k}} + C_1 \frac{\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle}{\|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2}. \quad (241)$$

We want to estimate the scalar product by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle \leq \|\Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda)\|_2 \|\Phi(\mathbf{w})\|_2. \quad (242)$$

By construction $\Lambda = \Lambda_0 \cup \Lambda_1$ has at most $2k$ elements. thus, it is possible to write $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$ where $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \Sigma_k$ have disjoint support. With lemma 1 we get

$$\|\Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda)\|_2 = \|\Phi(\mathbf{u}) + \Phi(\mathbf{v})\|_2 \leq \|\Phi(\mathbf{u})\|_2 + \|\Phi(\mathbf{v})\|_2. \quad (243)$$

We can now use the RIP $2k$ to get

$$\|\Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}} \|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_2 \quad (244)$$

and with lemma 2

$$\|\Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}} \|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\|_2 = \sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}} \|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2. \quad (245)$$

On the other hand we can write $\mathbf{w} = \hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}^*$ and get

$$\|\Phi(\mathbf{w})\|_2 = \|(\Phi(\hat{\mathbf{w}}) - \mathbf{y}) - (\Phi(\mathbf{w}^*) - \mathbf{y})\|_2 \leq \|\Phi(\hat{\mathbf{w}}) - \mathbf{y}\|_2 + \|\Phi(\mathbf{w}^*) - \mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq 2\epsilon. \quad (246)$$

With this, equation (242) becomes

$$\langle \Phi(\mathbf{w}_\Lambda), \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \rangle \leq 2\epsilon \sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}} \|\mathbf{w}_\Lambda\|_2 \quad (247)$$

and inserting this into equation (241) leads to

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq C_0 \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{w}^*)_1}{\sqrt{k}} + C_1 2\epsilon \sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}}. \quad (248)$$

We can now adjust the constant $C_2 := \sqrt{1 + \delta_{2k}} C_1$ to get the result

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_2 \leq C_0 \frac{\sigma_k(\mathbf{w}^*)_1}{\sqrt{k}} + C_2 \epsilon \quad (249)$$

which is the equation from theorem 6 of the main text.

References

- [1] Y. C. Eldar and G. Kutyniok, *Compressed Sensing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [2] S. Foucart and H. Rauhut, *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing*, ser. Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis. Cambridge, MA: Birkhauser Boston Inc., 2013.
- [3] J. Bergh and J. Lofstrom, *Interpolation Spaces: An Introduction*, ser. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1976.

- [4] D. L. Donoho, "Compressed sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1289–1306, Apr. 2006.
- [5] T. Wey, "Rank and Regular Invertibility of Nonlinear Systems: A Graph Theoretic Approach," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 31, no. 18, pp. 257–262, Jul. 1998.
- [6] H. Perfect, "Applications of Menger's graph theorem," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 96–111, Apr. 1968.
- [7] J. S. Pym, "The Linking of Sets in Graphs," *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. s1-44, no. 1, pp. 542–550, Jan. 1969.
- [8] —, "A proof of the linkage theorem," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 636–638, Sep. 1969.
- [9] H. Perfect, "Independence Spaces and Combinatorial Problems," *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. s3-19, no. 1, pp. 17–30, 1969.
- [10] A. W. Ingleton and M. J. Piff, "Gammoids and transversal matroids," *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 51–68, Aug. 1973.
- [11] J. H. Mason, "On a Class of Matroids Arising From Paths in Graphs," *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. s3-25, no. 1, pp. 55–74, Jun. 2018.
- [12] H. Whitney, "On the Abstract Properties of Linear Dependence," *American Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 509–533, Jul. 1935.
- [13] D. L. Donoho and M. Elad, "Optimally sparse representation in general (nonorthogonal) dictionaries via ℓ_1 minimization," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 100, no. 5, pp. 2197–2202, Mar. 2003.
- [14] M. Newman, *Networks: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, Mar. 2010.
- [15] J. Lunze, "Einführung in die Mehrgrößenregelung," in *Regelungstechnik 2: Mehrgrößensysteme, Digitale Regelung*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2016.
- [16] K. Murota, *Matrices and Matroids for Systems Analysis*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Oct. 2009.
- [17] S. A. Gershgorin, "Über die Abgrenzung der Eigenwerte einer Matrix," *Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS. VII. Série*, vol. 1931, no. 6, pp. 749–754, 1931.
- [18] E. J. Candès, "The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing," *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, vol. 346, no. 9, pp. 589–592, May 2008.