

Line zonotopes: a set representation suitable for unbounded systems and its application to set-based state estimation and active fault diagnosis of descriptor systems*

Brenner S. Rego^{a,*}, Davide M. Raimondo^b, Guilherme V. Raffo^c

^aDepartment of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of São Paulo, São Carlos, SP 13566-590, Brazil

^bDepartment of Engineering and Architecture, University of Trieste, 34127, Trieste, Italy

^cDepartment of Electronics Engineering, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG 31270-901, Brazil

Abstract

This paper proposes new methods for set-based state estimation and active fault diagnosis (AFD) of linear descriptor systems (LDS). In contrast to intervals, ellipsoids, and zonotopes, linear static constraints on the state variables, typical of descriptor systems, can be directly incorporated in the mathematical description of constrained zonotopes (CZs). Thanks to this feature, methods using CZs could provide less conservative enclosures than zonotope methods. However, an enclosure on the states should be known for all $k \geq 0$, which is not true in the case of unstable or unobservable LDS. In this context, this paper proposes a new representation for unbounded sets, which allows to develop methods for state estimation and AFD of stable and unstable LDS. Unlike many other extensions of CZs, the proposed set inherits most of their properties, including polynomial time complexity reduction methods, while allowing to describe different classes of sets, such as strips, hyperplanes, and the entire n -dimensional Euclidean space. The advantages of the proposed approaches with respect to CZ methods are highlighted in numerical examples.

Keywords: Descriptor systems, Set-based computing, State estimation, Fault diagnosis

1. Introduction

Descriptor systems (also known as singular or implicit systems) are processes that exhibit dynamic and static behaviors described through differential and algebraic equations (Wang et al., 2018a). These characteristics are present in many physical systems of practical interest, such as socioeconomic systems, chemical processes (Kumar & Daoutidis, 1995), battery packs, water distribution networks (Vrachimis et al., 2018), and robotic systems with holonomic and nonholonomic constraints (Janschek, 2011; Yang et al., 2019). However, they pose significant challenges for control, state estimation, and fault diagnosis.

Set-based state estimation is a wide topic that has been addressed in the literature since the 60's (Schweppe, 1968), and is particularly important for systems with bounded uncertainties. This is not different in the case of linear descriptor systems (LDS). Luenberger-type observers have been used in Merhy et al. (2019) for state estimation of LDS, with sets described by ellipsoids. Despite being able to provide stable bounds, ellipsoids are conservative since the complexity of the sets is fixed, leading to significant wrapping effect. Due to their properties and variable complexity, zonotopes have been used in

more recent methods for state estimation of LDS (Wang et al., 2018a,b). However, zonotopes are not able to incorporate linear equality constraints, which are related to the static behavior present in descriptor systems. To mitigate this limitation of zonotopes, a state estimation method for LDS based on *constrained zonotopes* (CZs) has been proposed in Rego et al. (2020b). Constrained zonotopes are capable of capturing the equality constraints inherent of LDS, while maintaining many properties of zonotopes, such as variable complexity. Nevertheless, the method requires the knowledge of an admissible set enclosing all the system states during all the experiment, which is an unrealistic assumption in case of unstable LDS.

Another important topic addressed in this work is set-based fault diagnosis of LDS. The goal is to identify which fault is occurring in the system. Zonotopes have been used in Wang et al. (2019) to identify additive faults using unknown input observers, and in Yang et al. (2019) to investigate active fault diagnosis (AFD) of LDS through separation of reachable sets using a designed input sequence. However, as in state estimation, zonotopes cannot capture effectively the static relationships of descriptor systems, requiring a longer time interval for fault diagnosis. An AFD method using CZs has been proposed in Rego et al. (2020b) based on the separation of reachable output sets using mixed-integer quadratic programming. This approach is able to incorporate the linear equality constraints of LDS. Still, the proposed method requires the knowledge of an admissible state set, which is a prohibitive assumption for online applications involving unstable and unobservable systems.

This manuscript proposes new methods for set-based state estimation and AFD of linear descriptor systems based on

*This work was partially supported by the Brazilian agencies CNPq, under grants 465755/2014-3 (INCT project), and 315695/2020-0; FAPESP, under grants 2014/50851-0, and 2022/05052-8; CAPES, under the grants 001 and 88887.136349/2017-00; FAPEMIG, under grant APQ-03090-17; and by the CHIPS Joint Undertaking and the European Union through the EcoMobility project (grant 101112306).

*Corresponding author, brennersr7@usp.br

line zonotopes (LZs), an extension of CZs capable of describing unbounded sets. Line zonotopes inherit the properties of CZs, such as efficient Minkowski sum, linear mapping and intersection, whereas maintaining efficient complexity reduction methods (unlike other extensions, e.g., constrained polynomial zonotopes (Kochdumper & Althoff, 2023), hybrid zonotopes (Bird et al., 2023), and constrained convex generators (CCGs) (Silvestre, 2022)), and allowing to describe additional classes of sets, such as strips and the n -dimensional Euclidean space. In addition to directly incorporating linear static constraints, which are typical of LDS, the new set representation eliminates the need for prior knowledge of bounds on the initial state and subsequent trajectories of the state variables for state estimation and fault diagnosis in descriptor systems. This allows the development of new methods for state estimation and tube-based AFD also for unstable descriptor systems, for which constrained zonotope methods are shown to fail. Moreover, LZs are advantageous for addressing unobservable LDS, where the absence of measurements prevents providing bounds for some states. The effectiveness of the proposed methods with respect to CZ approaches is highlighted in numerical examples.

This paper is organized as follows. Mathematical preliminaries on set operations and CZs are described in Section 2, along with the problem formulation and a motivational example. Section 3 introduces the set representation proposed in this paper, called line zonotopes, along with their fundamental properties, complexity reduction methods and conceptual examples. The new state estimation method based on LZs is described in Section 4. Section 5 develops the tube-based AFD method using line zonotopes. Numerical examples are presented in Section 6 to corroborate the effectiveness of the respective new methods, and Section 7 concludes the paper.

2. Preliminaries and problem formulation

Constrained zonotopes are an extension of zonotopes, defined as in Scott et al. (2016), capable of describing also asymmetric convex polytopes, while maintaining many of the well-known computational benefits of zonotopes.

Definition 1. A set $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a *constrained zonotope* if there exists $(\mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_g} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n_c \times n_g} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ such that

$$Z = \{\mathbf{c}_z + \mathbf{G}_z \boldsymbol{\xi} : \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_\infty \leq 1, \mathbf{A}_z \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{b}_z\}. \quad (1)$$

We refer to (1) as the *constrained generator representation* (CG-rep). Each column of \mathbf{G}_z is a line segment, denoted as *generator*, \mathbf{c}_z is the *center*, and $\mathbf{A}_z \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{b}_z$ are the *constraints*. We use the notation $Z = (\mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)_{\text{CZ}}$ for CZs, and $Z = (\mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z)_Z$ for zonotopes¹. Consider $Z, W \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Let $Z \times W \triangleq \{(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) : \mathbf{z} \in Z, \mathbf{w} \in W\}$ be the Cartesian product, $\mathbf{R}Z \triangleq \{\mathbf{R}\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{z} \in Z\}$ be the linear mapping, $Z \oplus W \triangleq \{\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{z} \in Z, \mathbf{w} \in W\}$ be the Minkowski sum, and $Z \cap_{\mathbf{R}} Y \triangleq \{\mathbf{z} \in Z : \mathbf{R}\mathbf{z} \in Y\}$ be the generalized intersection. These set operations can be computed exactly and trivially

¹Generator representation, referred to as G-rep.




Figure 1: Top: The feasible sets for the system (2): the initial set X_0 (red), and the sets S_0 (yellow), S_1 (cyan), and S_2 (green). Bottom: The feasible sets for the system (2) with X_0 (red) unbounded along x_2 and x_3 (denoted by arrows).

with CZs, while causing a linear increase in the complexity of the CG-rep. By defining the constrained unitary hypercube² $B_\infty(\mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z) \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_g} : \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_\infty \leq 1, \mathbf{A}_z \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{b}_z\}$, a CZ Z can be written as $Z = \mathbf{c} \oplus \mathbf{G}_z B_\infty(\mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)$. Efficient complexity reduction methods to enclose a CZ with another one with a fewer number of generators and constraints are available (Scott et al., 2016).

2.1. Motivational example

In this subsection, we present a motivational example illustrating that, in the general case, the feasible sets of a linear discrete-time descriptor system cannot be described exactly by zonotopes even when X_0 , W , and V are all zonotopes. For the sake of simplicity, consider

$$\mathbf{E}\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \quad (2)$$

with

$$\mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.8 & 0.95 & 0 \\ 0.3 & 0.1 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

²We use the notation $B_\infty^{n_g}$ for the n_g -dimensional unitary hypercube (i.e., without equality constraints). We drop the superscript n_g for $B_\infty(\mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)$ since this dimension can be inferred from the number of columns of \mathbf{A}_z .

Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in X_0$, where X_0 is a zonotope given by

$$X_0 = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.6 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 \\ 0 \\ 0.25 \end{bmatrix} \right)_Z. \quad (3)$$

Since the last row of \mathbf{E} is zero, the dynamics (2) further constrains \mathbf{x}_{k-1} for $k \geq 1$. In particular, \mathbf{x}_0 should be consistent with both (3) and the constraints in (2). Therefore, $\mathbf{x}_0 \in S_0$ with $S_0 = \{\mathbf{x} \in X_0 : (2) \text{ holds for } k = 1\}$. Similarly, we define $S_k = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{E}\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{E}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}' \in S_{k-1}\}$, with $k \geq 1$. Figure 1 (top) shows the zonotope X_0 and the convex polytopes S_k for $k = 0, 1, 2$. These latter are computed exactly using the MPT toolbox (Herceg et al., 2013). As it can be noticed, the sets S_k are not symmetric, and therefore cannot be described accurately by zonotopes. In addition, due to the scarcity of information in practical systems, the known set X_0 may not be bounded in general, resulting in unbounded reachable sets S_k which cannot be described by constrained zonotopes (see Figure 1, bottom).

2.2. Problem formulation

Consider a linear discrete-time descriptor system with time k , state $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$, input $\mathbf{u}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, process uncertainty $\mathbf{w}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$, measured output $\mathbf{y}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$, and measurement uncertainty $\mathbf{v}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v}$. In each discrete-time tuple $(k-1, k)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, the system evolves according one of possible n_m known models

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}^{[i]} \mathbf{x}_k^{[i]} &= \mathbf{A}^{[i]} \mathbf{x}_{k-1}^{[i]} + \mathbf{B}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_{k-1} + \mathbf{B}_w^{[i]} \mathbf{w}_{k-1}, \\ \mathbf{y}_k^{[i]} &= \mathbf{C}^{[i]} \mathbf{x}_k^{[i]} + \mathbf{D}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{D}_v^{[i]} \mathbf{v}_k, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with $\mathbf{E}^{[i]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathbf{A}^{[i]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathbf{B}^{[i]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_u}$, $\mathbf{B}_w^{[i]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_w}$, $\mathbf{C}^{[i]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n}$, $\mathbf{D}^{[i]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_u}$, and $\mathbf{D}_v^{[i]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_v}$, $i \in \mathcal{M} \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, n_m\}$. We assume that $\mathbf{E}^{[i]}$ can be singular. In such case, one has $n - \text{rank}(\mathbf{E})$ purely static constraints. In addition, $\mathbf{x}_0^{[i]} \in X_0$ and $(\mathbf{w}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) \in W \times V$ for all $k \geq 0$, where X_0 , W and V are known convex polytopic sets. Moreover, the initial condition $(\mathbf{x}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{v}_0)$ is assumed to be feasible, i.e., consistent with the static relations in (4), and the output \mathbf{y}_0 is computed as $\mathbf{y}_0^{[i]} = \mathbf{C}^{[i]} \mathbf{x}_0^{[i]} + \mathbf{D}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{D}_v^{[i]} \mathbf{v}_0$. Furthermore, n_q denotes the number of all possible different combinations of $(i, j) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}$, $i \neq j$, and $Q \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, n_q\}$.

The goals of our work are twofold. The first objective, *state estimation*, consists in computing a tight enclosure \hat{X}_k of the possible states consistent with (4) and the considered uncertainties, for each $k \geq 0$. We assume the system obeys one of the models $i \in \mathcal{M}$ in (4), with i known a priori. The second goal, *active fault diagnosis*, consists in finding which model describes the process behaviour, facilitated by the injection of an appropriate input \mathbf{u}_k . The dynamics of the system are assumed to not change during the diagnosis procedure, i.e. the AFD is fast enough to avoid the switching between models. In this sense, a sequence $(\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N)$ of minimal length N is designed such that any output $\mathbf{y}_N^{[i]}$ is consistent with only one $i \in \mathcal{M}$. If feasible, this problem may admit multiple input solutions. For this reason, we introduce a cost function and select among the feasible input sequences the optimal one. In this case, we assume $\mathbf{u}_k \in U$, with U being a bounded known convex polytopic set.

3. Line zonotopes

In this section, we propose a new set representation referred to as *line zonotope*, which is an extension of CZs that describes a larger class of sets. Line zonotopes inherit the properties of constrained zonotopes, while having the additional ability to describe unbounded sets.

Definition 2. A set $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a *line zonotope* if there exists $(\mathbf{M}_z, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, \mathbf{S}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_\delta} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_g} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n_c \times n_\delta} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_c \times n_g} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ such that

$$Z = \{\mathbf{c}_z + \mathbf{M}_z \boldsymbol{\delta} + \mathbf{G}_z \boldsymbol{\xi} : \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta}, \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_\infty \leq 1, \mathbf{S}_z \boldsymbol{\delta} + \mathbf{A}_z \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{b}_z\}. \quad (5)$$

We refer to (5) as *constrained line-and-generator representation* (CLG-rep). Each column of \mathbf{M}_z is a *line*, each column of \mathbf{G}_z is a *generator*, \mathbf{c}_z is the *center*, and $\mathbf{S}_z \boldsymbol{\delta} + \mathbf{A}_z \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{b}_z$ are the *constraints*. Unlike generators (line segments), lines are unbounded. Then, by the definition of the CLG-rep (5), if \mathbf{S}_z is a matrix of zeros, then Z is *unbounded* in the directions given by the columns of \mathbf{M}_z . This allows (5) to describe symmetrically unbounded sets, such as strips and the entire space \mathbb{R}^n (Proposition 1). We use the notation $Z = (\mathbf{M}_z, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, \mathbf{S}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)_{LZ}$ for LZs. Moreover, we denote by ‘_’ an empty argument to this notation. For instance, $(\mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z)_Z = (_, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, _, _, _)_{LZ}$, and $(\mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)_{CZ} = (_, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, _, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)_{LZ}$. For convenience, we define $(\mathbf{M}_z, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z)_{LZ} \triangleq (\mathbf{M}_z, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, _, _, _)_{LZ}$ for LZs without equality constraints. In addition, we define the set $B_{\mathbb{R}, \infty}(\mathbf{S}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z) \triangleq \{(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta} \times B_\infty^{n_g} : \mathbf{S}_z \boldsymbol{\delta} + \mathbf{A}_z \boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{b}_z\}$, which rewrites (5) as $Z = \{\mathbf{c}_z + \mathbf{M}_z \boldsymbol{\delta} + \mathbf{G}_z \boldsymbol{\xi} : (\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \in B_{\mathbb{R}, \infty}(\mathbf{S}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)\}$.

Consider line zonotopes $Z, W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, i.e., $Z \triangleq (\mathbf{M}_z, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, \mathbf{S}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)_{LZ}$, $W \triangleq (\mathbf{M}_w, \mathbf{G}_w, \mathbf{c}_w, \mathbf{S}_w, \mathbf{A}_w, \mathbf{b}_w)_{LZ}$, $Y \triangleq (\mathbf{M}_y, \mathbf{G}_y, \mathbf{c}_y, \mathbf{S}_y, \mathbf{A}_y, \mathbf{b}_y)_{LZ}$, and a real matrix $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Then, the set operations described in Section 2 are computed trivially as

$$\mathbf{R}Z = (\mathbf{R}\mathbf{M}_z, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{c}_z, \mathbf{S}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)_{LZ}, \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z \oplus W &= ([\mathbf{M}_z \ \mathbf{M}_w], [\mathbf{G}_z \ \mathbf{G}_w], \mathbf{c}_z + \mathbf{c}_w, \\ &\quad \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{S}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_w \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{A}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_w \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{b}_z \\ \mathbf{b}_w \end{array} \right])_{LZ}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z \cap_{\mathbf{R}} Y &= ([\mathbf{M}_z \ \mathbf{0}], [\mathbf{G}_z \ \mathbf{0}], \mathbf{c}_z, \\ &\quad \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{S}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_y \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{A}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_y \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{b}_z \\ \mathbf{b}_y \end{array} \right], \\ &\quad \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{R}\mathbf{M}_z & -\mathbf{M}_y \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{R}\mathbf{G}_z & -\mathbf{G}_y \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{c}_y - \mathbf{R}\mathbf{c}_z \end{array} \right])_{LZ}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z \times W &= \left(\left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{M}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{M}_w \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{G}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{G}_w \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{c}_z \\ \mathbf{c}_w \end{array} \right], \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{S}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_w \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{A}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_w \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{b}_z \\ \mathbf{b}_w \end{array} \right] \right)_{LZ}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The demonstration of (6)–(8) is analogous to the CZ case, which is presented in Scott et al. (2016), whereas (9) is straightforward. In addition, note that a CZ is a particular case of a LZ (i.e., with no lines), and, consequently, every zonotope is also a LZ. In the following proposition, we demonstrate that other classes of sets can also be represented as LZs. Figure 2 shows examples of unbounded sets described by LZs.

Proposition 1. The Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , strips, and hyperplanes are line zonotopes.




Figure 2: Examples of line zonotopes: a strip $S = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |[-1 \ 1]\mathbf{x} - 1| \leq 0.5\} = (\mathbf{I}_2, \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 1}, \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 1}, [-1 \ 1], -0.5, 1)_{LZ}$ (left), and the set $([1 \ 5 \ 3]^T, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{0}_{3 \times 1}, 0, [-2 \ 1 \ -1], 2)_{LZ}, \mathbf{G}_z \neq \mathbf{0}$ (right).

Proof. Let $\mathbf{M}_R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_\delta}$ be a full row rank matrix, and let $\mathbf{c}_R \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{M}_R) = n$, for every $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exist at least one $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta}$ such that $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{c}_R + \mathbf{M}_R \delta$. Therefore, $\mathbb{R}^n \subseteq (\mathbf{M}_R, _, \mathbf{c}_R)_{LZ}$. On the other side, choose one $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta}$, and define $\mathbf{r} \triangleq \mathbf{c}_R + \mathbf{M}_R \delta$. Since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{M}_R) = n$, there must exist $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{r}$. Therefore, $(\mathbf{M}_R, _, \mathbf{c}_R)_{LZ} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, which implies $\mathbb{R}^n = (\mathbf{M}_R, _, \mathbf{c}_R)_{LZ}$. Consider a strip $S = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\rho_s^T \mathbf{x} - d_s| \leq \sigma_s\}$, with $\rho_s \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $d_s, \sigma_s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma_s \geq 0$. Note that an equivalent definition of S is $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \rho_s^T \mathbf{x} \in [-\sigma_s + d_s, \sigma_s + d_s]\}$. Therefore, by writing the interval $[-\sigma_s + d_s, \sigma_s + d_s]$ in G-rep as $(\sigma_s, d_s)_Z$, or equivalently in CLG-rep as $(_, \sigma_s, d_s)_{LZ}$, and $\mathbb{R}^n = (\mathbf{I}_n, _, \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1})_{LZ}$, we have that S can be described in CLG-rep as $S = \mathbb{R}^n \cap_{\rho^T} (\sigma_s, d_s)_Z = (\mathbf{I}_n, \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}, \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}, \rho_s^T, -\sigma_s, d_s)_{LZ}$. Finally, a hyperplane is a particular case of a strip given by $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\rho_s^T \mathbf{x} - d_s| \leq 0\} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \rho_s^T \mathbf{x} = d_s\}$ (i.e., a degenerated strip), which concludes the proof. ■

Remark 1. Without loss of generality, in the remainder of the paper we choose $(\mathbf{I}_n, _, \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1})_{LZ}$ to describe \mathbb{R}^n in CLG-rep.

Remark 2. Line zonotopes are a particular case of the CCGs proposed in Silvestre (2022). Nevertheless, unlike general CCGs, which are also able to describe unbounded sets, LZs have efficient, polynomial time complexity reduction methods, as described in the next section.

3.1. Complexity reduction of line zonotopes

Similarly to zonotopes and constrained zonotopes, the set operations (6)–(9) result in a linear increase of number of lines, generators, and constraints of the CLG-rep (5). If these operations are performed iteratively, which is the case in set-based state estimation, the complexity of the set may increase indefinitely. This section presents methods for complexity reduction of line zonotopes, which outer-approximate a line zonotope by another one with fewer lines, generators, and constraints.

3.1.1. Line elimination

The proposed procedure to eliminate lines is similar to the constraint elimination of CZs, as explained below. Let $Z = (\mathbf{M}_z, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, \mathbf{S}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)_{LZ} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a line zonotope with n_g generators, n_δ lines, and n_c constraints. It will be shown that a number of lines equal to the row rank of \mathbf{S}_z can always be eliminated, and additionally, this procedure does not introduce conservatism. The procedure is similar to the constraint elimination

Algorithm 1 Elimination of one line from (5).

- 1: Let $Z \triangleq (\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b})_{LZ}$. Choose i, j such that $S_{i,j} \neq 0$.
 - 2: Solve the i -th constraint for δ_j , as $\delta_j = S_{i,j}^{-1}(b_i - \sum_{m \neq j} S_{i,m} \delta_m - \sum_\ell A_{i,\ell} \xi_\ell)$.
 - 3: Replace δ_j above in $\mathbf{S}\delta + \mathbf{A}\xi = \mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{M}\delta + \mathbf{G}\xi$.
-

method in Scott et al. (2016), with the difference that the chosen variable to be eliminated is a line, instead of a generator. This is done by solving the constraints $\mathbf{S}_z \delta + \mathbf{A}_z \xi = \mathbf{b}_z$ in the variables δ , and substituting these in $\mathbf{c}_z + \mathbf{M}_z \delta + \mathbf{G}_z \xi$ in (5). Note that this simultaneously eliminates the same number of constraints from Z . However, in contrast to eliminating a generator, δ is unbounded, hence no information is lost, leading to an equivalent set. Moreover, note that in the case that all the lines of Z can be eliminated through this procedure, then Z is a constrained zonotope. Algorithm 1 summarizes the proposed procedure, which has complexity $O((n + n_c)(n_\delta + n_g))$ for each line eliminated.

3.1.2. Constraint elimination and generator reduction

Let $Z = (\mathbf{M}_z, \mathbf{G}_z, \mathbf{c}_z, \mathbf{S}_z, \mathbf{A}_z, \mathbf{b}_z)_{LZ} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Constraint elimination of line zonotopes can be done exactly as with CZs by using the method described in Scott et al. (2016). However, since the removal of a line is not conservative, if $\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}_z) > 0$ then $k_\delta \triangleq \text{rank}(\mathbf{S}_z)$ lines are chosen to be eliminated together with k_δ constraints prior to removing any generator from Z . Constraint elimination is done in this order for reduced conservatism. The elimination of one constraint using one generator has complexity $O((n_g + n_c)^3)$.

For generator reduction of Z , without loss of generality, we consider the case in which \mathbf{S}_z can be reduced to a matrix of zeros through the line elimination procedure (since the resulting rank is zero). In other words, let $Z^- = (\mathbf{M}_z^-, \mathbf{G}_z^-, \mathbf{c}_z^-, \mathbf{S}_z^-, \mathbf{A}_z^-, \mathbf{b}_z^-)_{LZ} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be the equivalent line zonotope obtained after removing $k_\delta = \text{rank}(\mathbf{S}_z)$ constraints and lines from Z . We assume that $\mathbf{S}_z^- = \mathbf{0}$. Then, the resulting line zonotope Z^- can be decoupled as $Z^- = \mathbf{c}_z^- \oplus \mathbf{M}_z^- \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta} \oplus \mathbf{G}_z^- B_\infty(\mathbf{A}_z^-, \mathbf{b}_z^-)$. Therefore, generator reduction of LZs can be done exactly as in generator reduction of CZs in Scott et al. (2016), i.e., by first lifting $\mathbf{G}_z^- B_\infty(\mathbf{A}_z^-, \mathbf{b}_z^-)$ and then using a zonotope order reduction method. The resulting line zonotope is given by $\tilde{Z} = \mathbf{c}_z^- \oplus \mathbf{M}_z^- \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta} \oplus \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_z B_\infty(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_z) \supseteq Z^-$, with $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_z$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z$ being the resulting matrices provided by the zonotope generator reduction method. The reduction by k_g generators has complexity $O(n^2 n_g + k_g n_g n)$.

3.2. Some examples using line zonotopes

3.2.1. Intersection of a zonotope and a strip

Since both zonotopes and strips are line zonotopes, then the intersection of a zonotope and a strip can be computed trivially and efficiently in CLG-rep, using the generalized intersection (8) as illustrated below. This operation often appears in the update step of set-based state estimation using zonotopes. Consider the zonotope (Bravo et al., 2006)

$$Z = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.2812 & 0.1968 & 0.4235 \\ 0.0186 & -0.2063 & -0.2267 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right)_Z,$$

and the strip $S = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |\boldsymbol{\rho}_s^T \mathbf{x} - d_s| \leq \sigma_s\}$, with $\boldsymbol{\rho}_s = [1 \ -1]^T$, $d_s = 1$, and $\sigma_s = 0.1$. The intersection $Z \cap S$ is computed by writing S in CLG-rep, then using (8). The resulting set is

$$Z \cap S = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.2812 & 0.1968 & 0.4235 & 0 \\ 0.0186 & -0.2063 & -0.2267 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -0.1 \\ 0.2812 & 0.1968 & 0.4235 & 0 \\ 0.0186 & -0.2063 & -0.2267 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right)_{LZ}$$

Figure 3 shows the zonotope Z (gray) and strip S (blue), as well as the zonotope obtained using the intersection method in Bravo et al. (2006) (yellow) and the line zonotope $Z \cap S$ computed in CLG-rep (red). The latter is obtained using Proposition 1 and (8), and as it can be noticed, it corresponds to the exact intersection of the zonotope Z and the strip S . This result can also be obtained using constrained zonotopes through generalized intersection, unlike the operations presented next.




Figure 3: The zonotope Z (gray), the strip S (blue), the zonotope obtained using the conservative intersection method in Bravo et al. (2006) (yellow), and the line zonotope $Z \cap S$ computed in CLG-rep (red)

3.2.2. Set operations with strips

The operations (6)–(9) are computed efficiently for strips in CLG-rep, which may be useful, for instance, in state estimation when the initial set is unknown. In particular, let $S_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be strips, with $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. The intersection $\bigcap_{i=1}^p S_i$ is not bounded in the general case, and therefore, it cannot be computed using constrained zonotopes. Moreover, for $p < n$, this intersection is not a strip in general. On the other side, since S_i can be written in CLG-rep using Proposition 1, the set $\bigcap_{i=1}^p S_i$ is then a line zonotope and can be computed using (8). Let $S_1 \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |\boldsymbol{\rho}_1^T \mathbf{x} - d_1| \leq \sigma_1\}$ and $S_2 \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |\boldsymbol{\rho}_2^T \mathbf{x} - d_2| \leq \sigma_2\}$, with $\boldsymbol{\rho}_1 = [1 \ -1 \ 1]^T$, $\boldsymbol{\rho}_2 = [1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$, $d_1 = 1$, $d_2 = 1$, $\sigma_1 = 0.1$, and $\sigma_2 = 0.1$. Figure 4 shows the strips S_1 (blue) and S_2 (red), as well as the intersection $S_1 \cap S_2$ computed in CLG-rep (magenta). It is worth highlighting that the intersection in this case cannot be expressed as a constrained zonotope or a strip, while it can be described exactly using the CLG-rep (5).




Figure 4: The strips S_1 (blue) and S_2 (red), and the intersection $S_1 \cap S_2$ computed in CLG-rep (magenta).

3.2.3. Enclosing the domain of p linear mappings

Consider p sets $Z_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and p real matrices $\mathbf{R}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n}$, with $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Define the operator

$$\bigcap_{\mathbf{R}_i}^{(1,p)} Z_i \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{x} \in Z_1, \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{x} \in Z_2, \dots, \mathbf{R}_p \mathbf{x} \in Z_p\}. \quad (10)$$

Note that the generalized intersection (8) is a particular case of (10) in which $p = 2$, $\mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{R}_2 = \mathbf{R}$. Moreover, (10) is also a generalization of the intersection of strips described in Section 3.2.2. If the sets Z_i are in CLG-rep, the operator (10) can be computed as follows. Let $\bigcap_{\mathbf{R}_i}^{(1,p)} Z_i$ be rewritten as $\bigcap_{\mathbf{R}_i}^{(1,p)} Z_i = \mathbb{R}^n \cap_{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}} \tilde{Z}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} \triangleq [\mathbf{R}_1^T \ \dots \ \mathbf{R}_p^T]^T$, and $\tilde{Z} \triangleq Z_1 \times \dots \times Z_p$. Moreover, let $Z_i = \{\mathbf{M}_i, \mathbf{G}_i, \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{S}_i, \mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{b}_i\}$, with n_{δ_i} lines, and n_{g_i} generators. Additionally³, $\tilde{\mathbf{M}} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{M}_1, \dots, \mathbf{M}_p)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{G}} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{G}_1, \dots, \mathbf{G}_p)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} \triangleq [\mathbf{c}_1^T \ \dots \ \mathbf{c}_p^T]^T$, $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_p)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_p)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} \triangleq [\mathbf{b}_1^T \ \dots \ \mathbf{b}_p^T]^T$, $\tilde{n}_{\delta} \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^p n_{\delta_i}$, $\tilde{n}_g \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^p n_{g_i}$, and let $\mathbb{R}^n = (\mathbf{I}_n, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1})_{LZ}$. Then, using (8) leads to

$$\bigcap_{\mathbf{R}_i}^{(1,p)} Z_i = \left([\mathbf{I}_n \ \mathbf{0}_{n \times \tilde{n}_{\delta}}], \mathbf{0}_{n \times \tilde{n}_g}, \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\mathbf{S}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{R}} & -\tilde{\mathbf{M}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \\ -\tilde{\mathbf{G}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{c}} \end{bmatrix} \right)_{LZ}.$$

4. Set-based state estimation of LDS using LZs

In state estimation, $i \in \mathcal{M}$ is assumed to be known and constant. Thus, without loss of generality, we drop the superscripts i from (4). Given the set X_0 and an input \mathbf{u}_k with $k \geq 0$, let

$$\hat{X}_0 \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} \in X_0 : \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{D}\mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{D}_v \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{v} \in V\}. \quad (11)$$

Let $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^T$ be obtained through singular value decomposition, where \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are invertible by construction. Since

³For given matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , $\text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ is a block diagonal matrix with \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} in the main diagonal.

\mathbf{E} is square, then Σ is also square. Let Σ be arranged as $\Sigma = \text{blkdiag}(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{0})$, where $\tilde{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_z}$ is diagonal containing the $n_z = \text{rank}(\mathbf{E})$ nonzero singular values of \mathbf{E} . Moreover, given $\mathbf{T} = (\mathbf{V}^T)^{-1}$, let $\mathbf{z}_k = (\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k, \check{\mathbf{z}}_k) = \mathbf{T}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_k$, $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$, $\check{\mathbf{z}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{T}, \\ \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{B}} \\ \check{\mathbf{B}} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}^{-1} \mathbf{B}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with $\check{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n}$, $\check{\mathbf{B}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_u}$, $\check{\mathbf{B}}_w \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z \times n_w}$. Then, as in [Rego et al. \(2020b\)](#), system (4) can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k = \check{\mathbf{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{w}_{k-1}, \quad (13a)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = \check{\mathbf{A}} \check{\mathbf{z}}_k + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_k + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{w}_k, \quad (13b)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{z}_k + \mathbf{D} \mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{D}_v \mathbf{v}_k. \quad (13c)$$

Initializing with (11), and defining $\hat{Z}_0 \triangleq \{\mathbf{T}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_0 : \mathbf{x}_0 \in \hat{X}_0, \check{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{T}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_0 + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_0 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{0}\}$, in this work, for $k \geq 1$, we formulate the *prediction* and *update steps*, respectively, as the computation of enclosures \tilde{Z}_k and \hat{Z}_k , satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_k \supseteq \{(\check{\mathbf{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{w}_{k-1}, \check{\mathbf{z}}_k) : \mathbf{0} = \check{\mathbf{A}} \check{\mathbf{z}}_k + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_k + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{w}_k, \\ (\mathbf{z}_{k-1}, \check{\mathbf{z}}_k, \mathbf{w}_{k-1}, \mathbf{w}_k) \in \hat{Z}_{k-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-n_z} \times W \times W\}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$\hat{Z}_k \supseteq \{\mathbf{z}_k \in \tilde{Z}_k : \mathbf{y}_k = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{z}_k + \mathbf{D} \mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{D}_v \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{v}_k \in V\}, \quad (15)$$

with the estimated enclosure \hat{X}_k given by $\hat{X}_k \triangleq \{\mathbf{T} \mathbf{z}_k : \mathbf{z}_k \in \hat{Z}_k\}$.

4.1. Proposed method

This section presents a new method for set-based state estimation of system (4) using line zonotopes. The ability of describing unbounded sets allows the set-based state estimation of the LDS (4) to be performed using CLG-rep: (i) without the necessity of knowing a bounded initial set satisfying $\mathbf{x}_0 \in X_0$ (in such case, $X_0 = \mathbb{R}^n$); and (ii) without requiring the existence of an admissible set satisfying Assumption 1 in [Rego et al. \(2020b\)](#).

Let $W = (\mathbf{M}_w, \mathbf{G}_w, \mathbf{c}_w, \mathbf{S}_w, \mathbf{A}_w, \mathbf{b}_w)_{LZ}$, and \hat{X}_0 given by (11). From (13b), the state \mathbf{z}_0 must satisfy $\check{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{z}_0 + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_0 + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{0}$. This constraint is incorporated in the CLG-rep of \hat{Z}_0 as follows. Let $\mathbf{T}^{-1} \hat{X}_0 \triangleq (\hat{\mathbf{M}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{G}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{S}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_0)_{LZ}$, with $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_0 = [\mathbf{M}_0 \ \mathbf{0}]$, $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0 = [\mathbf{G}_0 \ \mathbf{0}]$, $\hat{\mathbf{c}}_0 = \mathbf{c}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_0 &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}_0 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_w \\ \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{M}}_0 & \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \hat{\mathbf{M}}_w \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{A}}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_0 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_w \\ \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{G}}_0 & \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \hat{\mathbf{G}}_w \end{bmatrix}, \\ \hat{\mathbf{b}}_0 &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_0 \\ \mathbf{b}_w \\ -\check{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{c}_0 - \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{c}_w - \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the extra columns in $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$ and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_0$ come from $\mathbf{w}_0 \in W$. It is important to notice that, at each $k \geq 0$, the variables $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k$ are fully determined by (13a), while $\check{\mathbf{z}}_k$ are obtained a posteriori by (13b). An effective enclosure of the prediction step for the descriptor system (13) can be obtained in CLG-rep as follows.

Lemma 1. Consider the transformed state-space (13). Let $\mathbf{z}_{k-1} \in \hat{Z}_{k-1} \triangleq (\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{k-1})_{LZ}$, and $\mathbf{w}_{k-1}, \mathbf{w}_k \in W \triangleq (\mathbf{M}_w, \mathbf{G}_w, \mathbf{c}_w, \mathbf{S}_w, \mathbf{A}_w, \mathbf{b}_w)_{LZ}$, for all $k \geq 1$. Then $\mathbf{z}_k \in \tilde{Z}_k \triangleq (\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{c}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k)_{LZ}$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_k &= \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1} & \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{M}_w & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{n-n_z} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{k-1} & \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{G}_w & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{c}}_k &= \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{c}_w \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-n_z) \times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_k &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{k-1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_w & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_w & \mathbf{0} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} & \check{\mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{M}_w \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} & \mathbf{0} & \check{\mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{I}_{n-n_z} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_k &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{k-1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_w & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_w \\ \check{\mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{k-1} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} & \check{\mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{G}_w \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} & \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{G}_w \end{bmatrix}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{k-1} \\ \mathbf{b}_w \\ \mathbf{b}_w \\ -\check{\mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{c}_w \\ \mathbf{0}_{n-n_z \times 1} \end{bmatrix} - \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_k - \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{c}_w \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since by assumption $(\mathbf{z}_{k-1}, \mathbf{w}_{k-1}, \mathbf{w}_k) \in \hat{Z}_{k-1} \times W \times W$, there exists $(\delta_{k-1}, \xi_{k-1}, \vartheta_{k-1}, \varphi_{k-1}, \delta_k, \varphi_k) \in B_{\mathbb{R}, \infty}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{k-1}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{k-1}) \times B_{\mathbb{R}, \infty}(\mathbf{S}_w, \mathbf{A}_w, \mathbf{b}_w) \times B_{\mathbb{R}, \infty}(\mathbf{S}_w, \mathbf{A}_w, \mathbf{b}_w)$ such that $\mathbf{z}_{k-1} = \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{k-1} + \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1} \delta_{k-1} + \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{k-1} \xi_{k-1}$, $\mathbf{w}_{k-1} = \mathbf{c}_w + \mathbf{S}_w \vartheta_{k-1} + \mathbf{G}_w \varphi_{k-1}$, and $\mathbf{w}_k = \mathbf{c}_w + \mathbf{S}_w \vartheta_k + \mathbf{G}_w \varphi_k$. Moreover, since $\check{\mathbf{z}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_z}$, then there must exist $\delta_R \in \mathbb{R}^{n-n_z}$ such that $\check{\mathbf{z}}_k = \mathbf{0}_{(n-n_z) \times 1} + \mathbf{I}_{n-n_z} \delta_R \in (\mathbf{I}_{n-n_z}, -, \mathbf{0}_{(n-n_z) \times 1})_{LZ}$. Then, substituting these equalities in (13a) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k \\ \check{\mathbf{z}}_k \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{c}_w \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-n_z) \times 1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{k-1} & \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{G}_w \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{k-1} \\ \varphi_{k-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1} & \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{M}_w & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{n-n_z} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{k-1} \\ \vartheta_{k-1} \\ \delta_R \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

From the constraint (13b), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{c}_w + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{G}_w \varphi_k + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{M}_w \vartheta_k + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_k \\ &+ \check{\mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{u}_{k-1} + \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{c}_w \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n-n_z) \times 1} \end{bmatrix} + \check{\mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{k-1} & \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{G}_w \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{k-1} \\ \varphi_{k-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \check{\mathbf{A}} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}} \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1} & \check{\mathbf{B}}_w \mathbf{M}_w & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{n-n_z} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{k-1} \\ \vartheta_{k-1} \\ \delta_R \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Rearranging the equalities (16) and (17), grouping the variables $(\delta_{k-1}, \vartheta_{k-1}, \vartheta_k, \delta_R)$ and $(\xi_{k-1}, \varphi_{k-1}, \varphi_k)$, and writing the result in the CLG-rep (5), proves the lemma. \blacksquare

Remark 3. The enclosure \tilde{Z}_k provided by Lemma 1 has $n_\delta + n_{\delta_R} + 2n_{\delta_w}$ lines, $n_g + 2n_{g_w}$ generators, and $n_c + 2n_{c_w} + n - n_z$ constraints.

Lemma 1 provides a predicted enclosure of the state \mathbf{z}_k in which the equality constraints (13b) are directly incorporated, thus satisfying (14). As in the case of CZs, this is possible thanks to the fact that LZs incorporate equality constraints. The prediction-update algorithm proposed for (4) consists in the computation, at each $k \geq 1$, of LZs \bar{Z}_k , \hat{Z}_k , and \hat{X}_k , such that $\bar{Z}_k = (\bar{\mathbf{M}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{G}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{c}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{S}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{A}}_k, \bar{\mathbf{b}}_k)_{\text{LZ}}$, $\hat{Z}_k = \bar{Z}_k \cap_{\text{CT}} ((\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{D}_u \mathbf{u}_k) \oplus (-\mathbf{D}_v V_k))$, and $\hat{X}_k = \mathbf{T} \hat{Z}_k$. The initial set is \hat{Z}_0 . The algorithm operates recursively with (\bar{Z}_k, \hat{Z}_k) in the state-space (13), while the enclosure in the original state-space (4) is given by \hat{X}_k .

Remark 4. By construction, the CLG-rep in Lemma 1 corresponds to the exact feasible state set of (13) at k for the known state and uncertainty bounds. In addition, \hat{Z}_k and \hat{X}_k can be computed exactly. However, in practice and in order to limit the complexity of the resulting sets, these are outer approximated by using the complexity reduction algorithms in Section 3.1. Accordingly, using Algorithm 1, the computation of enclosures for descriptor systems with limited set complexity using LZs is less conservative than using CZs. This is thanks to the fact that the elimination method leads to an equivalent enclosure, and therefore does not introduce conservativeness.

Remark 5. The CZ method proposed in Rego et al. (2020b) requires the knowledge of a bounded set enclosing \mathbf{x}_k . In contrast, state estimation of (4) using LZs does not require the knowledge of such bounded set. Accordingly, the new method can be applied also to unstable and unobservable LDS. Moreover, since X_0 is described in CLG-rep (5), our new method does not require the knowledge of a bounded X_0 . The enclosures \hat{X}_k will be bounded depending on the observability of the system.

5. Active fault diagnosis of LDS using LZs

The work in Rego et al. (2020b) has addressed the problem of the set-based AFD of descriptor systems using constrained zonotopes, allowing the separation of the final output reachable set for a given time interval. In this work, by using the concept of reachable tubes, an approach based on the method developed in Section 4 is employed in the design of a tube-based AFD method accounting for a finite number of possible abrupt faults using LZs. It allows for the separation of output reachable tubes at any given time instant inside the time interval.

For active fault diagnosis, we consider the input and disturbance sequences $\vec{\mathbf{u}} = (\mathbf{u}_0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)n_u}$, $\vec{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{w}_0, \dots, \mathbf{w}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)n_w}$, $\vec{\mathbf{v}} = (\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)n_v}$, $\vec{W} = W \times \dots \times W$, and $\vec{V} = V \times \dots \times V$. Moreover, let⁴ $\mathbf{z}_k = (\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k, \check{\mathbf{z}}_k) = (\mathbf{T}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{w}_k)$, $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$, $\check{\mathbf{z}}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$, with $\check{n}_z \triangleq n + n_w - n_z$, $\mathbf{T}^{[i]} = ((\mathbf{V}^{[i]})^T)^{-1}$, $\mathbf{V}^{[i]}$ being obtained from the SVD $\mathbf{E}^{[i]} = \mathbf{U}^{[i]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{[i]} (\mathbf{V}^{[i]})^T$. Then, (4) can be rewritten as

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}_k^{[i]} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{k-1}^{[i]} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_{k-1}, \quad (18a)$$

⁴For AFD, since we use an open-loop approach, in order to refine the known bound W using the algebraic constraints for time k , we augment the state vector with the disturbances \mathbf{w}_k . This augmentation could also be used in state estimation. However, due to the update step with \mathbf{y}_k , no noticeable improvements were obtained in our experiments.

$$\mathbf{0} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k^{[i]} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_k, \quad (18b)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_k^{[i]} = \mathbf{F}^{[i]} \bar{\mathbf{z}}_k^{[i]} + \mathbf{D}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{D}_v^{[i]} \mathbf{v}_k, \quad (18c)$$

with $\mathbf{F}^{[i]} = \mathbf{C}^{[i]} \mathbf{T}^{[i]} \mathbf{L}$, where $\mathbf{L} = [\mathbf{I}_n \ \mathbf{0}_{n \times n_w}]$, $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} = [\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^{[i]} \ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_w^{[i]}]$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} = [\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^{[i]} \ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_w^{[i]}]$. Note that the (\cdot) and $(\check{\cdot})$ variables are defined according to (12) for each $i \in \mathcal{M}$.

For each model $i \in \mathcal{M}$, let $Z_\sigma^{[i]} = (\mathbf{M}_\sigma^{[i]}, \mathbf{G}_\sigma^{[i]}, \mathbf{c}_\sigma^{[i]}, \mathbf{S}_\sigma^{[i]}, \mathbf{A}_\sigma^{[i]}, \mathbf{b}_\sigma^{[i]})_{\text{LZ}} \triangleq (\mathbf{T}^{[i]})^{-1} X_0 \times W$, and define the initial feasible set $Z_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) = \{\mathbf{z} \in Z_\sigma^{[i]} : (18b) \text{ holds for } k = 0\}$. This set is given by $Z_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) = (\mathbf{M}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{G}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{c}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{S}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{A}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{b}_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0))_{\text{LZ}}$, where $\mathbf{M}_0^{[i]} = \mathbf{M}_\sigma^{[i]}$, $\mathbf{G}_0^{[i]} = \mathbf{G}_\sigma^{[i]}$, $\mathbf{c}_0^{[i]} = \mathbf{c}_\sigma^{[i]}$,

$$\mathbf{S}_0^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}_\sigma^{[i]} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{M}_0^{[i]} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{A}_0^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_\sigma^{[i]} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{G}_0^{[i]} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{b}_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_\sigma^{[i]} \\ -\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_0^{[i]} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Define the solution mappings $(\phi_k^{[i]}, \psi_k^{[i]}) : \mathbb{R}^{(k+1)n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{(k+1)n_w} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_v} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+n_w} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_v}$ such that $\phi_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}})$ and $\psi_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{v}_k)$ are the state and output of (18) at time k , respectively. Then, for each $i \in \mathcal{M}$, define *state and output reachable sets* at time k as $Z_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \triangleq \{\phi_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}) : (\mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}) \in Z_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) \times \vec{W}\}$, and $Y_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \triangleq \{\psi_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{v}_k) : (\mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{v}_k) \in Z_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) \times \vec{W} \times V\}$, respectively. In addition, let $\vec{\phi}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}) \triangleq (\phi_0^{[i]}, \phi_1^{[i]}, \dots, \phi_N^{[i]})(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}})$, and $\vec{\psi}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}, \vec{\mathbf{v}}) \triangleq (\psi_0^{[i]}, \psi_1^{[i]}, \dots, \psi_N^{[i]})(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}, \vec{\mathbf{v}})$, with $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Given $k \in [0, N]$, for each model $i \in \mathcal{M}$, we define the *state reachable tube* (SRT) and the *output reachable tube* (ORT) as

$$\vec{Z}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \triangleq \{\vec{\phi}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}) : (\mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}) \in Z_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) \times \vec{W}\},$$

$$\vec{Y}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \triangleq \{\vec{\psi}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}, \vec{\mathbf{v}}) : (\mathbf{z}_0, \vec{\mathbf{w}}, \vec{\mathbf{v}}) \in Z_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) \times \vec{W} \times \vec{V}\}.$$

We denote the reachable tubes $\vec{Z}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ and $\vec{Y}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ obtained using LZs by $\vec{Z}_{\text{LZ}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ and $\vec{Y}_{\text{LZ}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$, respectively. Moreover, let $\mathbb{R}^{n-n_z} \triangleq (\mathbf{I}_{n-n_z}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{(n-n_z) \times 1})_{\text{LZ}}$, $W = (\mathbf{M}_w, \mathbf{G}_w, \mathbf{c}_w, \mathbf{S}_w, \mathbf{A}_w, \mathbf{b}_w)_{\text{LZ}}$, and $Z_A = (\mathbf{M}_A, \mathbf{G}_A, \mathbf{c}_A, \mathbf{S}_A, \mathbf{A}_A, \mathbf{b}_A)_{\text{LZ}} \triangleq \mathbb{R}^{n-n_z} \times W$, where $\mathbf{c}_A = (\mathbf{0}_{(n-n_z) \times 1}, \mathbf{c}_w)$, $\mathbf{G}_A = [\mathbf{0} \ \mathbf{G}_w^T]^T$, $\mathbf{M}_A = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{I}_{n-n_z}, \mathbf{M}_w)$, $\mathbf{S}_A = [\mathbf{0} \ \mathbf{S}_w]$, $\mathbf{A}_A = \mathbf{A}_w$, $\mathbf{b}_A = \mathbf{b}_w$. Using (6)–(7), the set $Z_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ is given by the CLG-rep $(\mathbf{M}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{G}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{c}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathbf{S}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{A}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{b}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))_{\text{LZ}}$, where $\mathbf{M}_k^{[i]}$, $\mathbf{G}_k^{[i]}$, $\mathbf{c}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$, $\mathbf{S}_k^{[i]}$, $\mathbf{A}_k^{[i]}$, and $\mathbf{b}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ are given by the recursive relations

$$\mathbf{c}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_{k-1}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_{k-1} \\ \mathbf{c}_A \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{M}_k^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{M}_{k-1}^{[i]} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{G}_k^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{G}_{k-1}^{[i]} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{S}_k^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{k-1}^{[i]} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_A \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{A}_k^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{k-1}^{[i]} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_A \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{b}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_{k-1}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \\ \mathbf{b}_A \\ -\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_k \end{bmatrix},$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$. It is worth noting that the third constraint in $(\mathbf{S}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{A}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{b}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))$, comes from the fact that (18b) must hold. Us-

ing the above recursive equations with the initial values (19), re-organizing equations, and removing redundant constraints, the SRT $\vec{Z}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ can be written as an explicit function of the input sequence $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$ as $\vec{Z}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = (\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))_{LZ}$, where $\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_\sigma + \vec{\mathbf{p}}^{[i]} + \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\alpha}^{[i]} + \vec{\Lambda}^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_\sigma + \vec{\Omega}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$ (definitions can be found in Appendix A).

Since $\vec{Z}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ is a line zonotope, the ORT $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ is then a LZ obtained in accordance with (18c), as

$$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{Z}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \oplus \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{u}} \oplus \vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{v}}, \quad (20)$$

where $\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{F}^{[i]}, \dots, \mathbf{F}^{[i]})$, $\vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[i]} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{D}^{[i]}, \dots, \mathbf{D}^{[i]})$, and $\vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{D}_v^{[i]}, \dots, \mathbf{D}_v^{[i]})$. Using properties (6) and (7), and letting $V \triangleq (\mathbf{M}_v, \mathbf{G}_v, \mathbf{c}_v, \mathbf{S}_v, \mathbf{A}_v, \mathbf{b}_v)_{LZ}$, the ORT (20) is given by the CLG-rep $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = (\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))_{LZ}$, in which

$$\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) + \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{u}} + \vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{c}}_v, \quad (21)$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y[i]} = [\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{M}}^{[i]} \quad \vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{M}}_v^{[i]}], \quad \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[i]} = [\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{[i]} \quad \vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{G}}_v^{[i]}], \quad (22)$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y[i]} = \text{blkdiag}(\vec{\mathbf{S}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{S}}_v^{[i]}), \quad \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[i]} = \text{blkdiag}(\vec{\mathbf{A}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{A}}_v^{[i]}), \quad (23)$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \\ \vec{\mathbf{b}}_v^{[i]} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

where $\vec{\mathbf{c}}_v \triangleq (\mathbf{c}_v, \dots, \mathbf{c}_v)$, $\vec{\mathbf{G}}_v \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{G}_v, \dots, \mathbf{G}_v)$, $\vec{\mathbf{A}}_v \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{A}_v^{[i]}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_v^{[i]})$, and $\vec{\mathbf{b}}_v \triangleq (\mathbf{b}_v, \dots, \mathbf{b}_v)$.

5.1. Separation of output reachable tubes

Consider the input sequence $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \vec{U}$ to be injected into the set of models (18), and let $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[i]}$ denote the observed output sequence. The following definition is essential for the AFD method proposed in this paper.

Definition 3. An input sequence $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$ is said to be a *separating input* of the tuple $(\vec{Y}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$ if $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \vec{U}$, and for every $i, j \in \mathcal{M}$, $i \neq j$, $\vec{Y}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \cap \vec{Y}^{[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \emptyset$.

Clearly, if $\vec{Y}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \cap \vec{Y}^{[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \emptyset$ holds for all $i, j \in \mathcal{M}$, $i \neq j$, then $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[i]} \in \vec{Y}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ must hold only for one i . In the case this is not valid for any $i \in \mathcal{M}$, one concludes that the plant dynamics does not belong to the set of models (18). We denote the set of inputs satisfying Definition 3 as $\mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$. By construction, $\mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U}) \subseteq \vec{U}$. In this section, we are interested in the design of an optimal input sequence that minimizes a functional $J(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ satisfying $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$. The following theorem is based on the computation of $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ by (20).

Theorem 1. An input $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \vec{U}$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$ iff

$$\begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \\ \vec{\Omega}^{(q)} \end{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{u}} \notin \vec{\mathcal{Y}}^{(q)} \triangleq \left(\begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} \\ -\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix} \right)_{LZ} \quad (25)$$

$\forall q \in \mathcal{Q}$, where \mathcal{Q} is the set of all possible combinations of $(i, j) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}$, $i < j$, $\vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \triangleq (\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[j]} + \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[j]}) - (\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]} + \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[i]})$, $\vec{\Omega}^{(q)} \triangleq [(\vec{\Omega}^{[i]})^T \quad \mathbf{0} \quad (\vec{\Omega}^{[j]})^T \quad \mathbf{0}]^T$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)} &\triangleq [\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y[i]} \quad -\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y[j]}], & \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} &\triangleq [\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[i]} \quad -\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[j]}], \\ \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)} &\triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y[j]}), & \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} &\triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[j]}), \\ \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} &\triangleq \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{0}}) - \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{0}}), & \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} &\triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{0}}) \\ \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{0}}) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $i, j \in \mathcal{M}$ is the pair associated to each $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{0}}$ denotes the zero input sequence.

Proof. From (21) and (24), and the expressions obtained for $\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ and $\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$, one has $\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{0}}) = \vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} (\vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_\sigma + \vec{\mathbf{p}}^{[i]}) + \vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_v$, and $\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{0}}) = [(\vec{\alpha}^{[i]} + \vec{\Lambda}^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_\sigma)^T \quad (\mathbf{b}_v)^T]^T$. Hence, the following equalities hold:

$$\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{0}}) + (\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]} + \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[i]}) \vec{\mathbf{u}}, \quad (26)$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{0}}) + \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\Omega}^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{u}}. \quad (27)$$

From (8) with $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}$, $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \cap \vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \emptyset$ iff $\nexists (\delta^{(q)}, \xi^{(q)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times B_\infty$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y[i]} & -\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y[j]} \\ \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y[i]} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y[j]} \end{bmatrix} \delta^{(q)} + \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[i]} & -\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[j]} \\ \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[i]} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[j]} \end{bmatrix} \xi^{(q)} = \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) - \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \\ \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \\ \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using (26)–(27), one has $\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) - \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = -\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} + \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$, and $[(\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))^T \quad (\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))^T]^T = \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} + \vec{\Omega}^{(q)} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$, with $\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)}$, and $\vec{\Omega}^{(q)}$ defined as in the statement of the theorem. Then, $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \cap \vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[j]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \emptyset$ iff $\nexists (\delta^{(q)}, \xi^{(q)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times B_\infty$ such that $\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)} \delta + \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \xi^{(q)} = -\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} + \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)} \delta + \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} \xi^{(q)} = \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} + \vec{\Omega}^{(q)} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$, with $\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)}$ defined as in the statement of the theorem. This is true iff $\nexists (\delta^{(q)}, \xi^{(q)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times B_\infty$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix} \delta^{(q)} + \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix} \xi^{(q)} + \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} \\ -\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \\ \vec{\Omega}^{(q)} \end{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{u}},$$

which in turn holds iff (25) is satisfied. \blacksquare

Since $\vec{\mathcal{Y}}^{(q)}$ is a line zonotope, then for a given $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, the relation (25) can be verified by solving a linear program (LP).

Lemma 2. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \vec{U}$, and consider $\vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{\Omega}}^{(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)}$, $\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)}$ as defined in Theorem 1. Define

$$\hat{\kappa}^{(q)}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \triangleq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min_{\kappa^{(q)}, \delta^{(q)}, \xi^{(q)}} \kappa^{(q)} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|\xi^{(q)}\|_\infty \leq 1 + \kappa^{(q)}, \\ \left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{\Omega}}^{(q)} \end{array} \right] \vec{\mathbf{u}} = \left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)} \end{array} \right] \delta^{(q)} + \left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} \end{array} \right] \xi^{(q)} + \left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} \\ -\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right\}. \quad (28)$$

Then, (25) holds iff $\hat{\kappa}^{(q)}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) > 0$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to Lemma 4 in Scott et al. (2014). The addition of the unbounded decision variables $\delta^{(q)}$ does not result in new facts to the analysis. ■

Remark 6. The number of decision variables in Lemma 2 increases with the dimensionality of the LZ $\vec{\mathcal{Y}}^{(q)}$ in (25). However, in contrast to the CZ method in Raimondo et al. (2016), the reduction of the number of constraints and decision variables in (28) is not trivial since $\vec{\mathbf{\Omega}}^{(q)} \neq \mathbf{0}$ in general.

5.2. Input-dependent constraint elimination

To reduce the complexity of (28), the number of generators of $\vec{\mathcal{Y}}^{(q)}$ in (25) can be reduced by applying the generator reduction methods discussed in Section 3.1. However, this process is limited by the dimension of $\vec{\mathcal{Y}}^{(q)}$. Therefore, to overcome this limitation, we propose a methodology to reduce the number of equality constraints in the LP (28). It can be demonstrated that

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{\Omega}}^{(q)} \end{array} \right] \vec{\mathbf{u}} \notin \left(\left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)} \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} \\ -\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} \end{array} \right] \right)_{\text{LZ}} \iff \mathbf{0} \notin (\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)}, \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)}, \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} - \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)}\vec{\mathbf{u}}, \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)}, \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)}, \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} + \vec{\mathbf{\Omega}}^{(q)}\vec{\mathbf{u}})_{\text{LZ}}. \quad (29)$$

Note that the right-hand-side of (29) is a line zonotope, and therefore the number of generators can be reduced as described in Section 3.1. However, the constraints in this line zonotope are dependent on the input sequence $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$, which is yet to be designed. To circumvent this issue, we rewrite the right-hand-side of (29) with a change of variables as follows.

By assumption, \vec{U} is a bounded convex polytopic set, thus let $\vec{U} \triangleq (\vec{\mathbf{G}}_u, \vec{\mathbf{c}}_u, \vec{\mathbf{A}}_u, \vec{\mathbf{b}}_u)_{\text{CZ}}$. Then, since $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}_{\text{LZ}}^{[1]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U}) \implies \vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \vec{U}$, $\exists \xi_u \in B_\infty(\vec{\mathbf{A}}_u, \vec{\mathbf{b}}_u)$ such that $\vec{\mathbf{u}} = \vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \xi_u$. Let the right-hand-side in (29) have n_δ^Y lines and n_ξ^Y generators, and let \vec{n}_{g_u} be the number of generators of \vec{U} . Hence, for such ξ_u , (29) $\iff \exists (\delta^Y, \xi^Y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta^Y} \times B_\infty^{n_\xi^Y}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{0} = \vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)} \delta^Y + \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \xi^Y + \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} - \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)}(\vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \xi_u), \\ \mathbf{0} = \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)} \delta^Y + \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} \xi^Y - \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} - \vec{\mathbf{\Omega}}^{(q)}(\vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \xi_u), \\ \mathbf{0} = \vec{\mathbf{A}}_u \xi_u - \vec{\mathbf{b}}_u, \end{cases}$$

$$\iff \mathbf{0} \notin (\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{Y(q)}, [\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \quad -\vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)}\vec{\mathbf{G}}_u], \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} - \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)}\vec{\mathbf{c}}_u, \left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{Y(q)} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} -\vec{\mathbf{\Omega}}^{(q)}\vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \\ \vec{\mathbf{A}}_u \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} + \vec{\mathbf{\Omega}}^{(q)}\vec{\mathbf{c}}_u \\ \vec{\mathbf{b}}_u \end{array} \right] \right)_{\text{LZ}}. \quad (30)$$

Therefore $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}_{\text{LZ}}^{[1]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U}) \iff (30)$ for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$. To reduce the complexity of the right-hand-side of (30), some constraints can be eliminated using the methods in Section 3.1.

Remark 7. The removal of generators related to the input sequence $\vec{\mathbf{u}} = \vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \xi_u$ must be avoided (i.e., only generators from δ^Y and ξ^Y are eliminated in the dualization process). Otherwise, there may not exist $\xi_u \in B_\infty(\vec{\mathbf{A}}_u, \vec{\mathbf{b}}_u)$ such that $\vec{\mathbf{u}} = \vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \xi_u$, and therefore the relation $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \vec{U}$ is no longer guaranteed ($\vec{\mathbf{u}}$ will belong to a conservative enclosure of \vec{U}).

Let

$$\check{\mathcal{Z}}^{(q)} \triangleq (\check{\mathbf{M}}^{Z(q)}, [\check{\mathbf{G}}^{Z(q)} \quad \check{\mathbf{G}}_u^{(q)}], \check{\mathbf{c}}^{Z(q)}, \check{\mathbf{S}}^{Z(q)}, [\check{\mathbf{A}}^{Z(q)} \quad \check{\mathbf{A}}_u^{(q)}], \check{\mathbf{b}}^{Z(q)})_{\text{LZ}} \quad (31)$$

denote the LZ obtained after eliminating some of the constraints of the right-hand-side in (30). Then, $\check{\mathcal{Z}}^{(q)}$ contains the right-hand-side of (30) by construction. Consequently, $\mathbf{0} \notin \check{\mathcal{Z}}^{(q)} \implies (30)$, hence $\mathbf{0} \notin \check{\mathcal{Z}}^{(q)} \forall q \in \mathcal{Q} \implies \vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}_{\text{LZ}}^{[1]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$. Finally, $\mathbf{0} \notin \check{\mathcal{Z}}^{(q)}$ iff $\exists (\delta^Z, \xi^Z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta^Z} \times B_\infty^{n_\xi^Z}$ such that $\mathbf{0} = \check{\mathbf{M}}^{Z(q)} \delta^Z + \check{\mathbf{G}}^{Z(q)} \xi^Z + \check{\mathbf{G}}_u^{(q)} \xi_u + \check{\mathbf{c}}^{Z(q)}$, and $\mathbf{0} = \check{\mathbf{S}}^{Z(q)} \delta^Z + \check{\mathbf{A}}^{Z(q)} \xi^Z + \check{\mathbf{A}}_u^{(q)} \xi_u - \check{\mathbf{b}}^{Z(q)}$, which hold iff $\exists (\delta^Z, \xi^Z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\delta^Z} \times B_\infty^{n_\xi^Z}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{G}}_u^{(q)} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_u^{(q)} \end{array} \right] \xi_u &= \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{M}}^{Z(q)} \\ \check{\mathbf{S}}^{Z(q)} \end{array} \right] \delta^Z + \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{G}}^{Z(q)} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}^{Z(q)} \end{array} \right] \xi^Z + \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{c}}^{Z(q)} \\ -\check{\mathbf{b}}^{Z(q)} \end{array} \right] \\ \iff - \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{G}}_u^{(q)} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_u^{(q)} \end{array} \right] \xi_u &\notin \left(\left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{M}}^{Z(q)} \\ \check{\mathbf{S}}^{Z(q)} \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{G}}^{Z(q)} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}^{Z(q)} \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{c}}^{Z(q)} \\ -\check{\mathbf{b}}^{Z(q)} \end{array} \right] \right)_{\text{LZ}}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Remark 8. By the definition of $\check{\mathcal{Z}}^{(q)}$, the dimension of the set in (32) is smaller than (25). By construction, if (32) holds for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, then $\vec{\mathbf{u}} = \vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \xi_u \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}_{\text{LZ}}^{[1]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$ as desired. However, this procedure requires a change of decision variables, in which the new designed sequence is ξ_u .

5.3. Mixed-integer program formulation

This section investigates the design of optimal separating inputs based on (25), with ξ_u as decision variables. The following lemma allows to further reduce the computational complexity of the optimization problem to be solved.

Lemma 3. Consider $\check{\mathbf{M}}^{Z(q)}$, $\check{\mathbf{G}}^{Z(q)}$, $\check{\mathbf{c}}^{Z(q)}$, $\check{\mathbf{S}}^{Z(q)}$, $\check{\mathbf{A}}^{Z(q)}$, $\check{\mathbf{b}}^{Z(q)}$, $\check{\mathbf{G}}_u^{(q)}$, and $\check{\mathbf{A}}_u^{(q)}$ as defined in (31), and let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{N}^\dagger(q) &\triangleq - \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{G}}_u^{(q)} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_u^{(q)} \end{array} \right], \quad \mathbf{M}^\dagger(q) \triangleq \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{M}}^{Z(q)} \\ \check{\mathbf{S}}^{Z(q)} \end{array} \right], \\ \mathbf{G}^\dagger(q) &\triangleq \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{G}}^{Z(q)} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}^{Z(q)} \end{array} \right], \quad \mathbf{c}^\dagger(q) \triangleq \left[\begin{array}{c} \check{\mathbf{c}}^{Z(q)} \\ -\check{\mathbf{b}}^{Z(q)} \end{array} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, let $\mathbf{M}^{\dagger(q)}$ be full column rank. Then, there exist matrices $\mathbf{M}^{-(q)}$, $\mathbf{M}^{+(q)}$, $\mathbf{G}^{-(q)}$, $\mathbf{G}^{+(q)}$, $\mathbf{N}^{-(q)}$, $\mathbf{N}^{+(q)}$, and vectors $\mathbf{c}^{-(q)}$, $\mathbf{c}^{+(q)}$, such that

$$(32) \iff \mathring{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \vec{\xi}_u \notin \mathring{\mathcal{Y}}^{(q)} \triangleq (\mathring{\mathbf{G}}^{(q)}, \mathring{\mathbf{c}}^{(q)})_{\mathcal{Z}}, \quad (33)$$

with $\mathring{\mathbf{G}}^{(q)} \triangleq \mathbf{G}^{-(q)} - \mathbf{M}^{-(q)}(\mathbf{M}^{+(q)})^{-1}\mathbf{G}^{+(q)}$, $\mathring{\mathbf{c}}^{(q)} \triangleq \mathbf{c}^{-(q)} - \mathbf{M}^{-(q)}(\mathbf{M}^{+(q)})^{-1}\mathbf{c}^{+(q)}$, $\mathring{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \triangleq \mathbf{N}^{-(q)} - \mathbf{M}^{-(q)}(\mathbf{M}^{+(q)})^{-1}\mathbf{N}^{+(q)}$.

Proof. Recall that (32) $\iff \mathring{\mathcal{H}}(\delta^Z, \xi^Z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s^Z} \times B_{\infty}^{n_s^Z} : \mathbf{M}^{\dagger(q)}\delta^Z + \mathbf{G}^{\dagger(q)}\xi^Z + \mathbf{c}^{\dagger(q)} = \mathbf{N}^{\dagger(q)}\vec{\xi}_u$. Since $\mathbf{M}^{\dagger(q)}$ is full column rank, then by rearranging the rows of $\mathbf{M}^{\dagger(q)}\delta + \mathbf{G}^{\dagger(q)}\xi + \mathbf{c}^{\dagger(q)} = \mathbf{N}^{\dagger(q)}\vec{\xi}_u$, there exists an invertible matrix $\mathbf{M}^{+(q)}$ satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}^{+(q)} \\ \mathbf{M}^{-(q)} \end{bmatrix} \delta^Z + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}^{+(q)} \\ \mathbf{G}^{-(q)} \end{bmatrix} \xi^Z + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}^{+(q)} \\ \mathbf{c}^{-(q)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{N}^{+(q)} \\ \mathbf{N}^{-(q)} \end{bmatrix} \vec{\xi}_u. \quad (34)$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{M}^{+(q)}\delta^Z + \mathbf{G}^{+(q)}\xi^Z + \mathbf{c}^{+(q)} = \mathbf{N}^{+(q)}\vec{\xi}_u$ holds, implying that $\delta^Z = (\mathbf{M}^{+(q)})^{-1}(-\mathbf{G}^{+(q)}\xi^Z - \mathbf{c}^{+(q)} + \mathbf{N}^{+(q)}\vec{\xi}_u)$. Substituting the latter in the lower part of (34) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{G}^{-(q)} - \mathbf{M}^{-(q)}(\mathbf{M}^{+(q)})^{-1}\mathbf{G}^{+(q)})\xi^Z + (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{M}^{-(q)}(\mathbf{M}^{+(q)})^{-1})\mathbf{c}^{+(q)} \\ & = (\mathbf{N}^{-(q)} - \mathbf{M}^{-(q)}(\mathbf{M}^{+(q)})^{-1}\mathbf{N}^{+(q)})\vec{\xi}_u. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Therefore (32) $\iff \mathring{\mathcal{H}}\xi^Z \in B_{\infty}^{n_s^Z} : (35)$, proving the lemma. \blacksquare

By Lemma 3, we have (33) $\implies \vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[1]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$. Similarly to the LP in Lemma 2, for each $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, the condition (33) can be verified for one $\vec{\xi}_u \in B(\vec{\mathbf{A}}_u, \vec{\mathbf{b}}_u)$ by solving the LP

$$\hat{\kappa}^{(q)}(\vec{\xi}_u) \triangleq \left\{ \min_{\kappa^{(q)}, \xi^{(q)}} \kappa^{(q)} : \begin{array}{l} \mathring{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \vec{\xi}_u = \mathring{\mathbf{G}}^{(q)} \xi^{(q)} + \mathring{\mathbf{c}}^{(q)}, \\ \|\xi^{(q)}\|_{\infty} \leq 1 + \kappa^{(q)} \end{array} \right\}, \quad (36)$$

where (33) holds iff $\hat{\kappa}^{(q)}(\vec{\xi}_u) > 0$. Consider again the design of an optimal input $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$ that minimizes a functional $J(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ subject to $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}^{[1]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$ for known initial conditions X_0 and \mathbf{u}_0 . By rewriting the problem in terms of the variables $\vec{\xi}_u$, and using (33) and (36), we have that $\vec{\mathbf{u}} = \vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \vec{\xi}_u^* \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}^{[1]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$, where $\vec{\xi}_u^*$ is the solution to the optimization problem (the derivation is similar to Scott et al. (2014))

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\vec{\xi}_u, \kappa^{(q)}, \xi^{Z(q)}, \lambda^{(q)}, \mu_1^{(q)}, \mu_2^{(q)}, \mathbf{p}_1^{(q)}, \mathbf{p}_2^{(q)}} J(\vec{\xi}_u) \quad (37) \\ \text{s.t. } & \vec{\xi}_u \in B_{\infty}(\vec{\mathbf{A}}_u, \vec{\mathbf{b}}_u), \quad \mathbf{K}\vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \vec{\xi}_u = \mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{K}\vec{\mathbf{c}}_u, \\ & \varepsilon \leq \hat{\kappa}^{(q)} \leq \hat{\kappa}_m^{(q)}, \quad \mathring{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \vec{\xi}_u = \mathring{\mathbf{G}}^{(q)} \xi^{Z(q)} + \mathring{\mathbf{c}}^{(q)}, \\ & \|\xi^{Z(q)}\|_{\infty} \leq 1 + \kappa^{(q)}, \quad (\mathring{\mathbf{G}}^{(q)})^T \lambda^{(q)} = \mu_1^{(q)} - \mu_2^{(q)}, \\ & 1 = (\mu_1^{(q)} + \mu_2^{(q)})^T \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathbf{0} \leq \mu_1^{(q)}, \mu_2^{(q)}, \\ & \mathbf{p}_1^{(q)}, \mathbf{p}_2^{(q)} \in \{0, 1\}^{n_s^{(q)}}, \quad \mu_1^{(q)} \leq \mathbf{p}_1^{(q)}, \quad \mu_2^{(q)} \leq \mathbf{p}_2^{(q)}, \\ & \xi_j^{Z(q)} - 1 - \kappa^{(q)} \in [-2(1 + \hat{\kappa}_m^{(q)})(1 - p_{1,j}^{(q)}), 0], \\ & \xi_j^{Z(q)} + 1 + \kappa^{(q)} \in [0, 2(1 + \hat{\kappa}_m^{(q)})(1 - p_{2,j}^{(q)})], \end{aligned}$$

$\forall q = 1, \dots, n_q$, with $\varepsilon > 0$ being the *minimum separation threshold*, $\mathbf{K} \triangleq [\mathbf{I}_{n_u} \quad \mathbf{0}_{n_u \times N n_u}]$, and $\hat{\kappa}_m^{(q)}$ is an upper bound for $\hat{\kappa}^{(q)}(\vec{\xi}_u)$ defined as in (36), for all $\vec{\xi}_u \in (\vec{\mathbf{A}}_u, \vec{\mathbf{b}}_u)$.

To minimize any harmful effects of injecting $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$ into (4) with respect to a reference input sequence⁵ $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \vec{U}$, one may be interested in the quadratic functional $J(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \triangleq (\vec{\mathbf{u}} - \vec{\mathbf{u}})^T \mathbf{R}(\vec{\mathbf{u}} - \vec{\mathbf{u}})$, where $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)n_u \times (N+1)n_u}$ is positive definite. Then, in the new variables, $J(\vec{\xi}_u) = (\vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \vec{\xi}_u - \vec{\mathbf{u}})^T \mathbf{R}(\vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \vec{\xi}_u - \vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\xi}_u^T \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u^T \mathbf{R} \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u \vec{\xi}_u + 2(\vec{\mathbf{c}}_u^T \mathbf{R} \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u - \vec{\mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{R} \vec{\mathbf{G}}_u) \vec{\xi}_u - 2\vec{\mathbf{c}}_u^T \mathbf{R} \vec{\mathbf{u}} + \vec{\mathbf{c}}_u^T \mathbf{R} \vec{\mathbf{c}}_u + \vec{\mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{R} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$. In this work, we use an approach with similar effect, but with reduced computational cost. We adopt $J(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \|\mathbf{R}(\vec{\mathbf{u}} - \vec{\mathbf{u}})\|_1$, which, by using $(N+1)n_u$ auxiliary decision variables, leads to a mixed-integer linear program (MILP).

6. Numerical examples

6.1. State estimation

This section compares the results obtained using the state estimation methods proposed in Wang et al. (2018a)⁶, Rego et al. (2020b), and Section 4 for descriptor systems using zonotopes, CZs and LZs, respectively (denoted by Zonotope, CZ and LZ). Consider system (4) with matrices $\mathbf{E} = \text{diag}(1, 1, 0)$, $\mathbf{B}_w = \text{diag}(0.1, 1.5, 0.6)$, $\mathbf{D}_v = \text{diag}(0.5, 1.5)$,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0 & 0.5 \\ 0.8 & 0.95 & 0 \\ -1 & 0.5 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{0}$. The known input is $\mathbf{u}_k = (0.5 \sin(kT_s) + 1, -2 \cos(kT_s))$, with $T_s = 0.1\pi$ s. The initial state \mathbf{x}_0 is bounded by the zonotope

$$X_0 = (\text{diag}(0.1, 1.5, 0.6), [0.5 \ 0.5 \ 0.25]^T)_{\mathcal{Z}}, \quad (38)$$

and the uncertainties are random uniform disturbances bounded by $\|\mathbf{w}_k\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, $\|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{\infty} \leq 1$. Conversely, to demonstrate the capabilities of the LZ method, the considered LZ initial set is the entire state space \mathbb{R}^3 . The CZ $X_A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ in Assumption 1 in Rego et al. (2020b), i.e., satisfying $\mathbf{x}_k \in X_A$, is chosen as $X_A = \{50 \cdot \mathbf{I}_3, \mathbf{0}\}$. The simulation is conducted for $\mathbf{x}_0 = [0.5 \ 0.5 \ 0.25]^T$, using Gurobi 10.0.1 and MATLAB 9.1, on a laptop with 32 GB RAM and an Intel Core i7-12700H processor, and the complexity of the CZs and LZs is limited to 30 generators and 5 constraints using the constraint elimination algorithm and generator reduction both described in Scott et al. (2016). The complexity of the zonotopes is limited to 30 generators using Method 4 in Yang & Scott (2018). For LZs, lines are eliminated prior to eliminating constraints, as proposed in Section 3.1.

⁵This sequence may be generated by a nominal controller, or be a replication of the initial condition \mathbf{u}_0 , for instance.

⁶We use the set-membership approach proposed in Wang et al. (2018a) with Kalman correction matrix.




Figure 5: The radii of the enclosures \hat{X}_k obtained using the methods proposed in Wang et al. (2018a), Rego et al. (2020b), and the line zonotope method proposed in Section 4 (top), as well as the projections of \hat{X}_k onto x_3 centered at x_3 (bottom). The circles at the bottom red curves denote the instant k in which the enclosure generated by LZ becomes bounded.

Figure 5 shows the radii of the enclosures \hat{X}_k for $k \in [0, 100]$ obtained using Zonotope, CZ, and LZ, as well as the projections of \hat{X}_k onto x_3 , centered at x_3 . As it can be noticed, both CZ and LZ provide substantially sharper bounds in comparison to zonotopes. This is possible since the enclosures proposed in Rego et al. (2020b) and Lemma 1 explicitly take the static constraints into account. However, since the system is unstable, the state \mathbf{x}_k does not lie in X_A for the entire simulation, leading to empty sets in CZ for $k \geq 25$. In contrast, LZ is able to provide enclosures that are as accurate as the ones obtained using CZ, but without leading to empty sets since it does not require the existence of an admissible set X_A . Also, the enclosure \hat{X}_k provided by LZ at $k = 0$ is unbounded, which is a result of considering the entire state space as initial set (for demonstration purposes). This enclosure becomes bounded at $k = 1$ (denoted by the circles at the bottom red curves) since more measurements are added to the computed set. It is important to notice that, although one can choose X_A as large as desired, the unstable trajectory of the system will leave X_A at a given $k \geq 0$, rendering the CZ method useless for this scenario. Conversely, LZ was able to construct the sets with a few steps without having bounded X_0 and X_A . Additionally, the average computational times of Zonotope, CZ, and LZ, for $k \in [1, 21]$, are 0.37 ms, 2.43 ms, and 2.02 ms, respectively. Zonotope is significantly faster, but leads to severe conservatism. On the other hand, LZ is faster than CZ because line elimination has lower computational complexity than generator reduction (see Section 3.1). In

this case, the same variables are being eliminated, except that one is a line and another is a generator (from X_A), highlighting yet another advantage of the new set representation.

6.2. Active fault diagnosis

We now evaluate the effectiveness of the AFD method proposed in Section 5, denoted by AFDLZ. We compare the results with the CZ method described in Appendix B, denoted by AFDCZ.⁷ The input sequences designed by these methods are denoted by $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$ and $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDCZ}}$, respectively. Consider (4) with $\mathbf{E}^{[1]}$, $\mathbf{A}^{[2]}$, $\mathbf{B}^{[1]}$, and $\mathbf{B}_w^{[1]}$ described in the previous example (Section 6.1), and $\mathbf{C}^{[1]} = [1 \ -1 \ 0]$, $\mathbf{C}^{[4]} = [1 \ -1 \ 0.1]$,

$$\mathbf{A}^{[1]} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.8 & 0.95 & 0 \\ -1 & 0.5 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}^{[3]} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.9 \\ -0.1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$\mathbf{D}_v^{[1]} = 0.5$, $\mathbf{E}^{[i]} = \mathbf{E}^{[1]}$, $\mathbf{A}^{[3]} = \mathbf{A}^{[4]} = \mathbf{A}^{[1]}$, $\mathbf{B}^{[2]} = \mathbf{B}^{[4]} = \mathbf{B}^{[1]}$, $\mathbf{C}^{[2]} = \mathbf{C}^{[3]} = \mathbf{C}^{[1]}$, and $\mathbf{D}_v^{[i]} = \mathbf{D}_v^{[1]}$, $\mathbf{D}^{[i]} = \mathbf{D}^{[1]} = \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2}$, $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. The initial state $\mathbf{x}_0^{[i]}$ is bounded by (38), the uncertainties are bounded by $\|\mathbf{w}_k\|_\infty \leq 0.1$, $\|\mathbf{v}_k\|_\infty \leq 0.1$, and the input is limited by $\|\mathbf{u}_k\|_\infty \leq 8$. The initial input is $\mathbf{u}_0 = (0.5, -1)$, and the reference sequence is given by $\vec{\mathbf{u}} = (\mathbf{u}_0, \dots, \mathbf{u}_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2(N+1)}$. For the AFDCZ, we consider $X_A = \{\mathbf{I}_3, \mathbf{0}\}$. The separation threshold is $\varepsilon = 1 \cdot 10^{-4}$. The separation horizon is chosen as $N = 3$. All the models $i \in \mathcal{M}$ are considered to be faulty and must be separated. The number of generators in AFDLZ and AFDCZ is limited to 1.6 times the dimension of the sets, with number of constraints limited to 2, while the number of lines in AFDLZ is reduced to the minimum possible once the elimination process is not conservative. The optimal input sequences were obtained using Gurobi 10.0.1 and MATLAB 9.1, with $J(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \|\vec{\mathbf{u}} - \vec{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, and are

$$\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}} = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.5 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -3.4399 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1.0854 \\ -7.0632 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDCZ}} = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0.5 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2.9286 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 3.1628 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

For a comparison analysis, we compute $\vec{Y}_{\text{LZ}}^{[i]}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{M}$, obtained by injecting $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$, $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDCZ}}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$. Table 1 shows $\vec{Y}_{\text{LZ}}^{[i]} \cap \vec{Y}_{\text{LZ}}^{[j]}$ for $i \neq j$, where $*$ denotes a non-empty intersection, and \checkmark being an empty intersection. As it can be noticed, the reference sequence $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$ does not separate any of the ORTs, while $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDCZ}}$ is able to separate only a few combinations. The latter is due to the fact that one of the models in \mathcal{M} is unstable, leading to a violation of Assumption 1 in Rego et al. (2020b). On the other hand, $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$ separates all the ORTs, leading to guaranteed fault diagnosis.

Additionally, we generate 500 samples of $\vec{y}^{[i]}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{M}$ using $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$, $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDCZ}}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$, and verify the inclusion $\vec{y}^{[i]} \in$

⁷As it shown in Section 6.1, and also in Rego et al. (2020b), zonotopes provide very weak enclosures for LDS in comparison to CZs and LZs. For this reason, we do not conduct comparisons with zonotope methods in this section.




Figure 6: Projections of the ORTs $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}})$ onto $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, for models $i = 1$ (red), $i = 2$ (yellow), $i = 3$ (blue), and $i = 4$ (magenta).

$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[j]}$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{M}$ (this inclusion can be verified through an LP similar to Proposition 2 in Scott et al. (2016)). As shown in Table 2, in contrast to the other input sequences, $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$ is able to separate all the cases, with $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[i]} \in \vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}$ holding only for $i = j$. Finally, Figure 6 shows the projections of the ORTs $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}})$ onto $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, resulting from the injection of the designed $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$. Note that $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}})$ are disjoint for every $i \in \mathcal{M}$, showing that the injection of $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$ guarantees fault diagnosis in the given time interval. Additionally, it is worth highlighting that, although one can choose X_A as large as desired, in the general case there is no guarantee that it will contain the system trajectories in every faulty scenario (note that model $i = 2$ is unstable), rendering AFDCZ inappropriate for this case, since fault diagnosis is not guaranteed.

Table 1: Intersection of ORTs: \checkmark if empty, * otherwise.

$\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$				$\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDCZ}}$			
\cap	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[2]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[3]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[4]}$	\cap	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[2]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[3]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[4]}$
$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[1]}$	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[1]}$	\checkmark	*	*
$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[2]}$		\checkmark	\checkmark	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[2]}$		\checkmark	\checkmark
$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[3]}$			\checkmark	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[3]}$			*
$\vec{\mathbf{u}}$							
\cap	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[2]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[3]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[4]}$				
$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[1]}$	*	*	*				
$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[2]}$		*	*				
$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[3]}$			*				

We now investigate the performance of AFDLZ for a system with unbounded initial set X_0 . Consider a system whose dynamics obeys one of possible n_m known models $x_k^{[i]} = a^{[i]}x_{k-1}^{[i]} + b^{[i]}u_{k-1} + b_w^{[i]}w_{k-1}$, and $y_k^{[i]} = c^{[i]}x_k^{[i]} + d^{[i]}u_k + d_v^{[i]}v_k$, where $a^{[1]} = 1$, $a^{[2]} = 0.2$, $a^{[3]} = -0.5$, $b^{[i]} = 1$, $b_w^{[i]} = 1$, $c^{[i]} = 1$, $d^{[i]} = 0$, $d_v^{[i]} = 1$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. The initial set is $x_0^{[i]} \in \mathbb{R} = (1, 0, 0)_{LZ}$. The uncertainties are bounded by $|w_k| \leq 0.1$, $|v| \leq 0.1$, and the input is limited by $|u_k| \leq 2$. The separation threshold is $\varepsilon = 1 \cdot 10^{-1}$. The initial input is $u_0 = 0$, and the reference sequence is given by $\vec{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{0}_{(N+1) \times 1}$. The separation horizon is chosen as $N = 3$.

Table 2: Inclusion $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[i]} \in \vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[j]}$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{M}$, considering 500 samples of $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[i]}$

$\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$					$\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDCZ}}$				
\in	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[1]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[2]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[3]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[4]}$	\in	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[1]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[2]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[3]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[4]}$
$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[1]}$	500	0	0	0	$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[1]}$	500	0	483	311
$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[2]}$	0	500	0	0	$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[2]}$	0	500	0	0
$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[3]}$	0	0	500	0	$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[3]}$	479	0	500	98
$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[4]}$	0	0	0	500	$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[4]}$	377	0	155	500
$\vec{\mathbf{u}}$									
\in	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[1]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[2]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[3]}$	$\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[4]}$					
$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[1]}$	500	164	490	500					
$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[2]}$	360	500	152	380					
$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[3]}$	489	40	500	436					
$\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[4]}$	500	264	475	500					

All the models $i \in \mathcal{M}$ are considered to be faulty and must be separated. The number of generators in AFDLZ is limited to 3 times the dimension of the sets. The separating input sequence was obtained for $J(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \|\vec{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, and is $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}} = (0, 0.99, 0, 0)$. We compute $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{M}$, obtained by injecting $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$, and verify $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]} \cap \vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[j]}$ for $i \neq j$. As in the previous case, the reference sequence $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$ does not separate any of $\vec{Y}_{LZ}^{[i]}$. On the other hand, $\vec{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{AFDLZ}}$ separates all the unbounded ORTs, leading to guaranteed AFD even if no bounds were known for the initial state. A three-dimensional view of the unbounded ORTs can be found in <https://youtu.be/LKIcveOzSAw>.

7. Conclusions

This paper proposed new methods for set-based state estimation and AFD of LDS with bounded uncertainties. The methods used a new set representation called line zonotopes, a generalization of CZs, capable of describing unbounded sets, while inheriting most of the computational benefits of CZs, as well as similar complexity reduction methods. This allowed the description of the reachable sets of unstable and unobservable LDS without assuming prior knowledge of an enclosure bounding the states for all $k \geq 0$. The proposed methods led to consistent and effective state estimation and AFD of unbounded LDS in cases which CZ methods failed. The key advantages of LZs were corroborated by numerical examples.

Appendix A. Fault diagnosis: state reachable tubes

The SRT $\vec{Z}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ obtained in Section 5 is given by $\vec{Z}_{LZ}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = (\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \vec{\mathbf{S}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))_{LZ}$, where $\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]}\mathbf{c}_\sigma + \vec{\mathbf{p}}^{[i]} + \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]}\vec{\mathbf{u}}$, $\vec{\mathbf{M}}^{[i]} = [\vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]}\mathbf{M}_\sigma^{[i]} \quad \vec{\mathbf{P}}_M^{[i]}]$, $\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{[i]} = [\vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]}\mathbf{G}_\sigma^{[i]} \quad \vec{\mathbf{P}}_G^{[i]}]$,

$\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{[i]} + \vec{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_\sigma + \vec{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$, and

$$\vec{\mathbf{A}}^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_\sigma \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{G}_\sigma^{[i]} \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_\sigma^{[i]} & \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^2 \mathbf{G}_\sigma^{[i]} & \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^N \mathbf{G}_\sigma^{[i]} & \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{N-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_A & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_A \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{S}}^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}_\sigma \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{M}_\sigma^{[i]} \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}_\sigma^{[i]} & \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^2 \mathbf{M}_\sigma^{[i]} & \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^N \mathbf{M}_\sigma^{[i]} & \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{N-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{S}_A & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{S}_A \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with $\vec{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{[i]} \triangleq \vec{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{[i]} + \vec{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{p}}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^{[i]} \triangleq \vec{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{[i]} \triangleq \vec{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}^{[i]} + \vec{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]}$, and the variables

$$\vec{\mathbf{p}}^{[i]} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^T & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{c}_A^{[i]} \end{bmatrix}^T & \cdots & \sum_{m=1}^N \left(\begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{m-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{c}_A^{[i]} \end{bmatrix} \right)^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]} \triangleq \left[\cdots \left(\begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^\ell \right)^T \cdots \right]^T, \quad \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]} = [\cdots (\mathbf{H}_\ell^{[i]})^T \cdots]^T, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\mathbf{H}_\ell^{[i]} \triangleq \left[\cdots \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{\ell-m} \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}}_{m=1,2,\dots,\ell} \cdots \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}}_{N-\ell+1 \text{ blocks}} \cdots \right], \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\vec{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{[i]} \triangleq \left[(\mathbf{b}_\sigma^{[i]})^T \quad \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (N+1)n_c} \quad (\mathbf{b}_A^{[i]})^T \quad \cdots \quad (\mathbf{b}^{[i]})^T \right]^T, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\vec{\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}}^{[i]} \triangleq \left[\mathbf{0}_{(N+1)(n+n_w) \times n_c} \quad \Xi(-\check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]})^T \quad \mathbf{0}_{(N+1)(n+n_w) \times n_{c_A}} \right]^T, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\vec{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}^{[i]} \triangleq \left[\mathbf{0}_{(N+1)n_u \times n_c} \quad \Xi(-\check{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]})^T \quad \mathbf{0}_{(N+1)n_u \times (N+1)n_{c_A}} \right]^T, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{P}}_G^{[i]} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{N-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{N-2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{G}_A \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{P}}_M^{[i]} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{N-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^{N-2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{M}_A \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

with $\ell = 0, \dots, N$. The expression $\mathbf{H}_\ell^{[i]}$ holds for $\ell = 1, \dots, N$, while $\mathbf{H}_0^{[i]} = \mathbf{0}_{n \times (N+1)n_u}$. The operator $\Xi(\cdot)$ is defined as $\Xi(\cdot) \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$, with $N+1$ matrices (\cdot) .

Appendix B. Tube-based AFD of LDS using CZs

The work in [Rego et al. \(2020b\)](#) has presented a method based on the separation of the final output reachable set to address the problem of AFD of descriptor systems using constrained zonotopes. For comparison with the LZ method developed in Section 5, we develop a tube-based AFD method using CZs allowing for the separation of output tubes in CG-rep along the time interval $k \in [0, N]$.

Similarly to Section 5, for each model $i \in \mathcal{M}$, consider the CZ $Z_A^{[i]} = (\mathbf{T}^{[i]})^{-1} X_A \times W = (\mathbf{G}_A^{[i]}, \mathbf{c}_A^{[i]}, \mathbf{A}_A^{[i]}, \mathbf{b}_A^{[i]})_{\text{CZ}}$, where X_A is a CZ satisfying Assumption 1 in [Rego et al. \(2020b\)](#). Moreover, let $(\mathbf{G}_z^{[i]}, \mathbf{c}_z^{[i]}, \mathbf{A}_z^{[i]}, \mathbf{b}_z^{[i]})_{\text{CZ}} \triangleq (\mathbf{T}^{[i]})^{-1} X_0 \times W$, and define the initial feasible set $Z_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) = \{\mathbf{z} \in (\mathbf{T}^{[i]})^{-1} X_0 \times W : (18b) \text{ holds for } k = 0\}$. This set is given by $Z_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) = (\mathbf{G}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{c}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{A}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{b}_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0))_{\text{CZ}}$, where $\mathbf{G}_0^{[i]} = \mathbf{G}_z^{[i]}$, $\mathbf{c}_0^{[i]} = \mathbf{c}_z^{[i]}$,

$$\mathbf{A}_0^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_z^{[i]} \\ \check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{G}_0^{[i]} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{b}_0^{[i]}(\mathbf{u}_0) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_z^{[i]} \\ -\check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_0^{[i]} - \check{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Define the solution mappings $(\boldsymbol{\phi}_k^{[i]}, \boldsymbol{\psi}_k^{[i]}) : \mathbb{R}^{(k+1)n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{(k+1)n_w} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_w} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+n_w} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ and the state and output reachable tubes as in Section 5. As in [Rego et al. \(2020a\)](#), using the CZ version of (6)–(7), and taking note that by assumption $\check{\mathbf{z}}_k^{[i]} \in (\check{\mathbf{G}}_A^{[i]}, \check{\mathbf{c}}_A^{[i]}, \mathbf{A}_A, \mathbf{b}_A)_{\text{CZ}}$ for every $k \geq 0$, with the latter being the lower part of $Z_A^{[i]}$, the set $Z_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ is given by the CZ $(\mathbf{G}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{c}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathbf{A}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{b}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))_{\text{CZ}}$, where $\mathbf{G}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{c}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathbf{A}_k^{[i]}$, and $\mathbf{b}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$

are obtained by the recursive relations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) &= \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_{k-1}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_{k-1} \\ \check{\mathbf{c}}_A^{[i]} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{G}_k^{[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{G}_{k-1}^{[i]} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \check{\mathbf{G}}_A^{[i]} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{A}_k^{[i]} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{k-1}^{[i]} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_A^{[i]} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{b}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_{k-1}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \\ \mathbf{b}_A^{[i]} \\ -\check{\mathbf{A}}_z^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) - \check{\mathbf{B}}^{[i]} \mathbf{u}_k \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$. The third set of constraints in $(\mathbf{A}_k^{[i]}, \mathbf{b}_k^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))$ comes from the fact that (18b) must hold. Using the initial values (B.1) and following the recursive equations (B.2), the state reachable tube $\vec{Z}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ can be written as an explicit function of the input sequence $\vec{\mathbf{u}}$ as $\vec{Z}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = (\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))_{\text{CZ}}$, where $\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_z^{[i]} + \vec{\mathbf{p}}^{[i]} + \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$, $\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{[i]} = [\vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]} \mathbf{G}_z^{[i]} \quad \vec{\mathbf{P}}_G^{[i]}]$, $\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\alpha}^{[i]} + \vec{\Lambda}^{[i]} \mathbf{c}_z + \vec{\Omega}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{u}}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{A}}^{[i]}$ given by (A.1), with $\vec{\alpha}^{[i]} \triangleq \vec{\beta}^{[i]} + \vec{\Upsilon}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{p}}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\Lambda}^{[i]} \triangleq \vec{\Upsilon}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\Omega}^{[i]} \triangleq \vec{\Gamma}^{[i]} + \vec{\Upsilon}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]}$, and the variables $\vec{\mathbf{p}}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\beta}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\Upsilon}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\Gamma}^{[i]}$, $\vec{\mathbf{P}}_G^{[i]}$ given by (A.3)–(A.9), with $\mathbf{G}_A \triangleq \check{\mathbf{G}}_A$, and $\mathbf{c}_A \triangleq \check{\mathbf{c}}_A$.

The output reachable tube is obtained analogously to the LZ case, as $\vec{Y}_{\text{CZ}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{Z}^{[i]} \oplus \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{u}} \oplus \vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{v}}$. Using the CZ versions of (6) and (7), and letting $V = (\mathbf{G}_v, \mathbf{c}_v, \mathbf{A}_v, \mathbf{b}_v)_{\text{CZ}}$, this set is given by $\vec{Y}_{\text{CZ}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = (\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))_{\text{CZ}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) &= \vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{[i]} + \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{u}} + \vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{c}}_v, \\ \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[i]} &= [\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{[i]} \quad \vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{G}}_v], \quad \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[i]} = \text{blkdiag}(\vec{\mathbf{A}}^{[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{A}}_v), \quad (\text{B.3}) \\ \vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) &= [(\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}))^T \quad (\vec{\mathbf{b}}_v)^T]^T, \end{aligned}$$

with $\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{F}^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{F}^{[i]}, \dots, \mathbf{F}^{[N]})$, $\vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[i]} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{D}^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{D}^{[i]}, \dots, \mathbf{D}^{[N]})$, $\vec{\mathbf{D}}_v^{[i]} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{D}_v^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{D}_v^{[i]}, \dots, \mathbf{D}_v^{[N]})$, $\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{F}^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{F}^{[i]}, \dots, \mathbf{F}^{[N]})$, $\mathbf{L} = [\mathbf{I}_n \quad \mathbf{0}_{n \times n_w}]$, $\mathbf{F}^{[i]} = \mathbf{C}^{[i]} \mathbf{T}^{[i]} \mathbf{L}$, $\vec{\mathbf{c}}_v = (\mathbf{c}_v, \dots, \mathbf{c}_v)$, $\vec{\mathbf{G}}_v = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{G}_v, \dots, \mathbf{G}_v)$, $\vec{\mathbf{A}}_v = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{A}_v^{[1]}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_v^{[N]})$, and $\vec{\mathbf{b}}_v = (\mathbf{b}_v, \dots, \mathbf{b}_v)$.

Consider the input sequence $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \vec{U}$ to be injected into the set of models (18), and let $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^{[i]} \triangleq (\mathbf{y}_0^{[i]}, \mathbf{y}_1^{[i]}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N^{[i]})$ denote the observed output sequence of model $i \in \mathcal{M}$. We are interested in the design of an input sequence satisfying $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}_{\text{CZ}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$.

Theorem 2. An input $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \vec{U}$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}_{\text{CZ}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$ iff

$$\begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{(q)} \end{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{u}} \notin \vec{Y}^{(q)} \triangleq \left(\begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} \\ -\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix} \right)_{\mathcal{Z}} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$\forall q \in \mathcal{Q}$, where $\vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \triangleq (\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[j]} \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[j]} + \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[j]}) - (\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{[i]} \vec{\mathbf{H}}^{[i]} + \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{[i]})$, $\vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{(q)} \triangleq [(\vec{\Omega}^{[i]})^T \quad \mathbf{0} \quad (\vec{\Omega}^{[j]})^T \quad \mathbf{0}]^T$, $\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \triangleq [\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[i]} \quad -\vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y[j]}]$, $\vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} \triangleq \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[i]}(\mathbf{0}) - \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y[j]}(\mathbf{0})$, $\vec{\mathbf{A}}^{(q)} \triangleq \text{blkdiag}(\vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[i]}, \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y[j]})$, and $\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} \triangleq [(\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[i]}(\mathbf{0}))^T \quad (\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y[j]}(\mathbf{0}))^T]^T$, in which $i, j \in \mathcal{M}$ is the

pair associated to each $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{0}}$ denotes the zero input sequence.

Proof. The proof is similar to Theorem 1, and therefore is omitted. \blacksquare

Since $\vec{Y}^{(q)}$ given by (B.4) is a zonotope, analogously to the methods in Scott et al. (2014) and Rego et al. (2020b), the relation (B.4) can be verified by solving the LP

$$\hat{\delta}^{(q)}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \triangleq \left\{ \min_{\delta^{(q)}, \xi^{(q)}} \delta^{(q)} : \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{N}}^{(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{Q}}^{(q)} \end{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{u}} = \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{G}}^{Y(q)} \\ \vec{\mathbf{A}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix} \xi^{(q)} + \begin{bmatrix} \vec{\mathbf{c}}^{Y(q)} \\ -\vec{\mathbf{b}}^{Y(q)} \end{bmatrix}, \right. \\ \left. \|\xi^{(q)}\|_{\infty} \leq 1 + \delta^{(q)} \right\}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where (B.4) holds iff $\hat{\delta}^{(q)}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) > 0$.

Remark 9. Similarly to the LZ case, the complexity of the LP (B.5) can be reduced by using the change of variables $\vec{\mathbf{u}} = \vec{\mathbf{c}} + \vec{\mathbf{G}} \xi_u$, and applying the constraint elimination approach described in Section 5.2 to CZs.

Finally, consider the design of an input sequence that minimizes a functional $J(\vec{\mathbf{u}})$ subject to $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{S}(\vec{Y}_{\text{CZ}}^{[i]}(\vec{\mathbf{u}}), \mathcal{M}, \vec{U})$, with initial conditions X_0 and \mathbf{u}_0 . As in the LZ method, if $J(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) \triangleq (\vec{\mathbf{u}} - \vec{\mathbf{u}})^T \mathbf{R} (\vec{\mathbf{u}} - \vec{\mathbf{u}})$, where $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)n_u \times (N+1)n_u}$ is positive definite, and $\vec{\mathbf{u}} \in \vec{U}$ is a reference input sequence, then this optimization problem, similar to (37), can be written as an MIQP. On the other hand, if $J(\vec{\mathbf{u}}) = \|\mathbf{R}(\vec{\mathbf{u}} - \vec{\mathbf{u}})\|_1$, it leads to an MILP.

References

- Bird, T. J., Pangborn, H. C., Jain, N., & Koeln, J. P. (2023). Hybrid zonotopes: a new set representation for reachability analysis of mixed logical dynamical systems. *Automatica*, 154, 111107.
- Bravo, J. M., Alamo, T., & Camacho, E. F. (2006). Bounded error identification of systems with time-varying parameters. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 51, 1144–1150.
- Herceg, M., Kvasnica, M., Jones, C., & Morari, M. (2013). Multi-Parametric Toolbox 3.0. In *Proc. of the 2013 European Control Conference* (pp. 502–510). <http://control.ee.ethz.ch/~mpt>.
- Janschek, K. (2011). *Mechatronic systems design: methods, models, concepts*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Kochdumper, N., & Althoff, M. (2023). Constrained polynomial zonotopes. *Acta Informatica*, 60, 279–316.
- Kumar, A., & Daoutidis, P. (1995). Feedback control of nonlinear differential-algebraic-equation systems. *AIChE Journal*, 41, 619–636.
- Merhy, D., Maniu, C. S., Alamo, T., & Camacho, E. F. (2019). Ellipsoidal set-membership state estimation for descriptor systems. In *Proc. of the 23rd International Conference on System Theory, Control and Computing* (pp. 1–6).
- Raimondo, D. M., Marsaglia, G. R., Braatz, R. D., & Scott, J. K. (2016). Closed-loop input design for guaranteed fault diagnosis using set-valued observers. *Automatica*, 74, 107–117.
- Rego, B. S., Raffo, G. V., Scott, J. K., & Raimondo, D. M. (2020a). Guaranteed methods based on constrained zonotopes for set-valued state estimation of nonlinear discrete-time systems. *Automatica*, 111, 108614.
- Rego, B. S., Raimondo, D. M., & Raffo, G. V. (2020b). Set-based state estimation and fault diagnosis of linear discrete-time descriptor systems using constrained zonotopes. In *Proc. of the 1st IFAC-V World Congress* (pp. 4291–4296).
- Schweppe, F. (1968). Recursive state estimation: Unknown but bounded errors and system inputs. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 13, 22–28.

- Scott, J. K., Findeisen, R., Braatz, R. D., & Raimondo, D. M. (2014). Input design for guaranteed fault diagnosis using zonotopes. *Automatica*, *50*, 1580–1589.
- Scott, J. K., Raimondo, D. M., Marseglia, G. R., & Braatz, R. D. (2016). Constrained zonotopes: a new tool for set-based estimation and fault detection. *Automatica*, *69*, 126–136.
- Silvestre, D. (2022). Constrained convex generators: A tool suitable for set-based estimation with range and bearing measurements. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, *6*, 1610–1615.
- Vrachimis, S. G., Eliades, D. G., & Polycarpou, M. M. (2018). Leak Detection in Water Distribution Systems Using Hydraulic Interval State Estimation. In *IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA)* (pp. 565–570). IEEE.
- Wang, Y., Puig, V., & Cembrano, G. (2018a). Set-membership approach and kalman observer based on zonotopes for discrete-time descriptor systems. *Automatica*, *93*, 435–443.
- Wang, Y., Puig, V., Xu, F., & Cembrano, G. (2019). Robust fault detection and isolation based on zonotopic unknown input observers for discrete-time descriptor systems. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, *356*, 5293–5314.
- Wang, Y., Wang, Z., Puig, V., & Cembrano, G. (2018b). Zonotopic set-membership state estimation for discrete-time descriptor LPV systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, . In press.
- Yang, S., Xu, F., Wang, X., Yang, J., & Liang, B. (2019). Set-based active fault diagnosis for discrete-time linear descriptor systems. In *Proc. of the 2019 American Control Conference* (pp. 5045–5051).
- Yang, X., & Scott, J. K. (2018). A comparison of zonotope order reduction techniques. *Automatica*, *95*, 378–384.