
Dynamic importance learning using fisher information gain for nonlinear system identification

Vahid MohammadZadeh Eivaghi

Department of Electrical Engineering K. N. Toosi
University of Technology Tehran, Iran, email:
vmohammadzadeh@email.kntu.ac.ir

Mahdi Aliyari Shoorehdeli

Department of Electrical Engineering K. N. Toosi
University of Technology Tehran, Iran, email:
aliyari@kntu.ac.ir

Abstract

The Fisher Information Matrix (FIM) provides a way for quantifying the information content of an observable random variable concerning unknown parameters within a model that characterizes the variable. When parameters in a model are directly linked to individual features, the diagonal elements of the FIM can signify the relative importance of each feature. However, in scenarios where feature interactions may exist, a comprehensive exploration of the full FIM is necessary rather than focusing solely on its diagonal elements. This paper presents an end-to-end black box system identification approach that integrates the FIM into the training process to gain insights into dynamic importance and overall model structure. A decision module is added to the first layer of the network to determine the relevance scores using the entire FIM as input. The forward propagation is then performed on element-wise multiplication of inputs and relevance scores. Simulation results demonstrate that the proposed methodology effectively captures various types of interactions between dynamics, outperforming existing methods limited to polynomial interactions. Moreover, the effectiveness of this novel approach is confirmed through its application in identifying a real-world industrial system, specifically the PH neutralization process.

Keywords – Dynamic importance selection, fisher information matrix, automatic relevance determination, nonlinear system identification

1. Introduction

The problem of nonlinear system identification deals with finding a mathematical description of the dynamic behavior of a system from measured data $\{x_t, y_t\}_{t=1}^N$ to provide accurate prediction of the future behavior given input(s) [1] and [2]:

$$y_t = f_{\theta}(x_t) + e_t, \quad E(e_t) = 0, E(e_t e_t) = R \quad (1)$$

Where the y_t is the system output(s), e_t is iid noise sequence of zero mean and finite variance, and input(s) x_t may be a lagged window of system input(s), output(s), and error in general, i.e. $x_t = [y_{t-k_1}, \dots, y_{t-1}, u_{t-k_2}, \dots, u_{t-1}, e_{t-k_3}, \dots, e_{t-1}]$. Model (1) represents a large class of nonlinear models. The well-known nonlinear autoregressive model with exogenous input (NARX) can be easily instantiated from (1) by skipping those terms related to the error signal e_t . Regardless of the model one adopts, identification problem is usually done in two steps: identification of influential

variables and nonlinear function approximation [3]. The former is the topic of variable selection within statistical learning theory, which has only received scattered attention from system identification communities. The latter, however, is a mature topic in system identification. A very popular approach for realizing function approximation in the literature is to express the unknown function f as the linear combination of some nonlinear functions called basis function [1].

$$y_t = \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k \phi_k(x_t; \theta) + e_t \quad (2)$$

There is no limitation on how the basis functions are modeled. They can be modeled by black box models like a multi-layered perceptron, Gaussian process, polynomial approximation, functional expansion, and deep learning or transparent models like lookup tables, locally linear models, and fuzzy approximation [1].

For many real-world problems, contributing variables included in x_t are sparse, so not all variables should be included in modeling [4]. It allows us to understand the impact of input variables, rank them, select the most influential inputs, and drop non-relevant ones from the model. This is remarkably important for improving the model's accuracy, revealing the complex interaction among variables in nonlinear context, and improving the model's interpretability in applications like condition monitoring and fault diagnosis. In this regard, the most important part of an identification problem is inferring the influential variables. This is the topic of model order determination in system identification communities. Correlation analysis before the identification procedure is the most frequently used method for order selection in linear models, yet this is not the case for nonlinear systems where the relationship between the input and output of the system is complex and nonlinear. Mutual information [5] and distance correlation [6] are two important measures for revealing the complex dependencies between input and output. Some methods are introduced from machine learning and statistics that determine the most important variables based on their predictive power on output, forward selection, backward elimination, stepwise learning, and regularization methods like LASSO are some examples of the mentioned category [7], [8], and [9]. There are also some model-free approaches for model order determination. [3] is of earlier work that presents a model-free variable selection. The unknown function, which should be estimated based on available data, is assumed to be smooth so that the largest Lipchitz quotient can be computed from the data as a bound. Removing those variables that contribute more to the prediction will force the Lipchitz quotient to exceed the calculated bound. In [4], another model-free variable selection is given, working based on an estimation of goodness of fit. It is stated that such criteria as global sensitivity analysis, mutual information, and distance correlation for variable selection can be misleading, and goodness of fit is an appropriate criterion for selecting variables. In [10], a variable selection procedure is given based on the derivative squared average estimation. There is no restriction on the unknown function, so the function and its derivative are unknown. Two algorithms are given to approximate the function and its partial derivative.

Although variable importance analysis has received scattered attention from system identification communities, it is well-studied by statisticians and machine learning researchers. It is performed at both local and global levels [11] and [12]. The objective of local variable importance analysis is to provide insight into explaining the influence of features for each sample.

In contrast, the global analysis provides an average understanding of the importance of variables. Generally, two main approaches for variable importance analysis are encountered in literature: global sensitivity analysis aiming at quantifying the portion of output variance due to the individual and interaction effects of input variables, and variable importance techniques whose objective is to measure the predictive power of input variables [11]. The most well-known method within the former category is the analysis of variance (ANOVA) [13], decomposing the output function into the summation of some terms, including the individual effects of each variable, 2-way interactions of variables, 3-way interaction of variables, and so on. To make a model interpretable, only 2-way interactions are considered in practice [12] since the number of interactions to test grows exponentially with interaction order. ANOVA and its variants are a post-hoc interpretation method for variable importance analysis, meaning a model should be in hand. However, [14] proposes a functional ANOVA using Variational auto-encoders to learn a decomposable latent space while training. Forward selection, backward elimination, stepwise learning, and LASSO methods are well-known variable importance techniques utilizing the prediction power of input variables as their importance score.

All mentioned methodologies require either a pre-trained model or some effort for model order determination before the identification process, which should be provided by human intervention. To the best of the authors' knowledge, there is no work to pay attention to dynamic selection while training. In this regard, we propose an end-to-end framework for modeling a nonlinear system. We adopt a black-box model that exploits the Fisher Information Matrix (FIM) to compute the importance of time steps. The FIM provides a way to quantify the information content of an observable random variable concerning unknown parameters within a model that describes the variable. As a result, it can be said that for models that include a correspondence relationship between parameter and input variables, FIM will contain information about the input variables. [15] utilizes diagonal elements of FIM to prune the neural networks. However, using diagonal elements of FIM as an importance score cannot capture the interaction between neurons. In the context of dynamic systems, since there are temporal dependencies between input variables, exploiting diagonal elements of FIM to score the importance of input variables doesn't make sense. To address the mentioned issue, we introduce a decision unit that takes the full FIM as input and computes the variable importance as the linear combination of row elements of FIM. The results show that the proposed methodologies can capture complex interactions in input dynamics.

1- Related works

The present work is similar to [15], which introduces a pruning method exploiting the fisher information matrix to prune a neural network. The proposed approach uses diagonal elements of FIM as an importance score. The larger the elements of FIM are, the more important the corresponding neurons are. However, the adopted approach will prune neurons without considering their interaction. There may be cases where the neurons contribute to the prediction in the presence of other neurons, meaning the full matrix of FIM should be considered rather than its diagonal elements. In our works, the mentioned issue is rectified by introducing a decision unit fed by the full FIM to decide the importance of each neuron. The proposed decision unit calculates the importance scores of each input neuron as a linear combination of row elements of FIM followed

by a sigmoid function to scale the scores between 0 and 1. After training, neurons with smaller importance scores can be pruned away. Although the adopted approach is applied for dynamic selection, the presented methodology can be applied to prune intermediate layers.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In the next section, the proposed method is elaborated. In section 4, the proposed method's effectiveness is illustrated by identifying both numerical and real-world PH neutralization processes.

2- Proposed method

The problem of black-box nonlinear system identification is formulated as $y_t = f_\theta(x_t)$ where f_θ is parameterized using a neural network and x_t is a lagged window of system input and output. For a neural network with activation function ϕ , the first layer activation is computed as the following:

$$A^{(1)} = \phi(W^{(1)}x_t + b^{(1)}) \quad (3)$$

Where $x_t = [u_{t-\tau}, \dots, u_{t-1}, y_{t-\tau}, \dots, y_{t-1}]$. We introduce a relevance score into the formulation as $x_t \odot \alpha_t$ where α_t is of the same dimension as x_t and \odot indicate the elementwise product. Therefore, the activation of the first layer of the network would be $A^{(1)} = \phi(W^{(1)}x_t \odot \alpha_t + b^{(1)})$. This is equivalent to the modulation of each column of $W^{(1)}$ with elements of α_t . In a better word, the relevance score of each system dynamics can be seen as the importance of each column of the weight matrix. This view collides with automatic relevance determination for feature selection learned by the model itself. To do so, we use the covariance of weight matrices as their importance during the training process. Considering the Newton method for updating the weight matrix $\theta_{k+1}^{(1)} = \theta_k^{(1)} - [H_{\theta^{(1)}}L]^{-1}[\nabla_{\theta^{(1)}}L]$, the covariance of weight matrices is computed as the following:

$$cov(\theta_{k+1}^{(1)} - \theta_k^{(1)}) = cov\left([H_{\theta^{(1)}}L]^{-1}[\nabla_{\theta^{(1)}}L]\right) \quad (4)$$

Where:

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \epsilon(\theta)^T \epsilon(\theta) \rightarrow \nabla_{\theta^{(1)}}L = \frac{1}{N} \nabla_{\theta^{(1)}} \epsilon(\theta)^T \epsilon(\theta) \quad (5)$$

So we have:

$$\begin{aligned} cov\left([H_{\theta^{(1)}}L]^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \nabla_{\theta^{(1)}} \epsilon(\theta)^T \epsilon(\theta)\right) \\ = [H_{\theta^{(1)}}L]^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \nabla_{\theta^{(1)}} \epsilon(\theta)^T \nabla_{\theta^{(1)}} \epsilon(\theta) [H_{\theta^{(1)}}L]^{-1} cov(\epsilon(\theta)) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Where under mild conditions, the fisher information matrix $\frac{1}{N} \nabla_{\theta^{(1)}} \epsilon(\theta)^T \nabla_{\theta^{(1)}} \epsilon(\theta)$ equals to $H_{\theta^{(1)}}L$. So we have:

$$cov\left([H_{\theta^{(1)}}L]^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \nabla_{\theta^{(1)}} \epsilon(\theta)^T \epsilon(\theta)\right) = [\nabla_{\theta^{(1)}} \epsilon(\theta)^T \nabla_{\theta^{(1)}} \epsilon(\theta)]^{-1} \sigma^2 \quad (7)$$

Where σ^2 is the variance of error. The obtained relationship states that the importance of weight parameters is a function of the fisher information matrix. If the input variables are independent, the diagonal elements of the fisher information matrix can be used to determine the importance of the score. However, this is not the case for nonlinear system identification since there are temporal dependencies among different time steps of model input. Hence, we must consider the full fisher information matrix rather than its diagonal elements. The obtained formulation is an apparent application of fisher information matrix to achieve the Cramer-Rao lower bound on the covariance of parameter estimation.

To make the process end-to-end, we introduce a decision unit, a simple logistic regression model, fed by a full fisher information matrix to compute the relevance score as a linear combination of row elements of FIM followed by a sigmoid activation to scale the relevance score between 0 and 1. The overall scheme of the proposed approach is associated with Figure 1. The decision unit is a simple logistic regression, and the model is a time-delayed neural network. Although the scheme is illustrated for dynamic selection, it can be used for the intermediate layer to prune the neural network.




Figure 1 – The proposed approach for dynamic selection. The full FIM feeds the decision unit and outputs the relevance score of each time step

The objective function for tuning the parameter has remained intact, and we use maximum likelihood estimation. The partial derivative of the loss function $L(\theta) = \ln p_{\theta}(y|x)$ for a weight $W_{ij}^{(1)}$ in the first layer, is given by:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial W_{ij}^{(1)}} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial A_i^{(1)}} \times \frac{\partial A_i^{(1)}}{\partial W_{ij}^{(1)}} \quad (8)$$

Here, $\frac{\partial L}{\partial A_i^{(1)}}$ represents the gradient of the loss concerning the output of neuron i in the first layer, which can be computed through backpropagation from the final output. The term $\frac{\partial A_i^{(1)}}{\partial W_{ij}^{(1)}}$ is the gradient of neuron i 's output for its weight $W_{ij}^{(1)}$, which is given by:

$$\frac{\partial A_i^{(1)}}{\partial W_{ij}^{(1)}} = \phi'(z_i^{(1)})x_j \quad (9)$$

Where $z_i^{(1)} = \sum_{j=1}^T w_{ij}^{(1)} x_j + b_i$, and T is the length of the input sequence. So, the elements of the fisher information matrix related to $W_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $W_{kl}^{(1)}$ is calculated by taking the expectation of the product of their gradients:

$$I_{ij,kl} = E \left[\frac{\partial L}{\partial W_{ij}^{(1)}} \cdot \frac{\partial L}{\partial W_{kl}^{(1)}} \right] = \phi'(z_i^{(1)})\phi'(z_k^{(1)})E(x_i x_k) \quad (10)$$

Where $E(x_i x_k)$ is the ik 's element of the input autocorrelation matrix Σ_x . The FIM elements are directly influenced by the variation in model inputs modulated by the nonlinear activation function derivatives. This reveals that the correlation between input dynamics scaled by the output's sensitivity to the weights is considered a key measure to determine the relevance dynamics. Since there is a temporal dependency between input dynamics, the decision unit considers a linear combination of all row elements to decide the importance of each time step. The decision unit is parametrized using a simple logistic regression model to output importance scores α_t as the following:

$$\alpha_t = \sigma(W^D I + b^D) \quad (11)$$

Where I is the full fisher information matrix.

In the next section, the proposed approach's effectiveness is illustrated by identifying some fictional nonlinear systems and the experimental setup of the PH neutralization process.

3- Simulation

In this section, we discuss our experiments on both simulated and real-world systems to show the performance of our study on feature importance detection. We consider some fictional nonlinear systems with different complexity to examine the presented work. Results show that the adopted approach can capture any complex interaction among input variables.

4-1- Test suits of fictional nonlinear systems


The list of simulated systems is mentioned in Table 1, covering systems with different nonlinearities and structures. From each simulated system, we generate 16000 samples for training and 10000 samples for test excited using uniformly distributed input signal u in the interval $[-2.5, 2.5]$. The results are obtained by averaging over 100 identified models for each simulated system. We train a time-delayed neural network to approximate the listed functions where a lag of 10 for both input and output of systems is considered, i.e. $x_t = [u_{t-10}, \dots, u_{t-1}, y_{t-10}, \dots, y_{t-1}]$. The

results for some simulated systems are shown in Figure 2 – 5, where the importance score of system dynamics is depicted as a bar plot.


Table 1 – Test suites of data generation functions

F_1	$\sin(y_{t-1}) + 0.01y_{t-2} + u_{t-4} + u_{t-1}^2 + u_{t-2}u_{t-3}$
F_2	$0.01y_{t-1}^2 + u_{t-1}^5 + u_{t-2}u_{t-3}u_{t-4}^4$
F_3	$u_{t-1}^2 + u_{t-2}u_{t-3}u_{t-4}$
F_4	$u_{t-3}u_{t-2} + u_{t-3}u_{t-1} + u_{t-3}u_{t-2}u_{t-1} + \sin(y_{t-2}) + \exp(-y_{t-1})$
F_5	$\sin(u_{t-1}u_{t-2}) + \exp(-y_{t-1}y_{t-2})$
F_6	$\exp(\sin y_{t-1}) + y_{t-3}\exp(-u_{t-2})$
F_7	$u_{t-5}\exp(\sin y_{t-1}) + y_{t-3}\exp(-u_{t-2})$
F_8	$\exp(u_{t-1} + u_{t-3}) + u_{t-2}u_{t-4} + \frac{1}{1 + y_{t-6}^2}$
F_9	$\frac{\sqrt{\exp(u_{t-5})} + 1}{1 + y_{t-6}^2 + u_{t-2}^2}$
F_{10}	$2^{- u_{t-1}u_{t-2} }\sqrt{y_{t-1} + \arcsin(y_{t-10})}$
F_{11}	$u_{t-10}\arctan(y_{t-1} + u_{t-1}) + \max(u_{t-2}, 0.5) + \frac{1}{1 + y_{t-5}^2 + u_{t-3}^2}$

As it is clear, the adopted approach incorporates the correct dynamics into the modeling by forcing the relevance score of unimportant dynamics to be close to zero. We can generally set a predefined threshold on importance scores to prune the unimportant dynamics and select those that exceed the threshold. For instance, consider $F_{11} = u_{t-10}\arctan(y_{t-1} + u_{t-1}) + \max(u_{t-2}, 0.5) + \frac{1}{1 + y_{t-5}^2 + u_{t-3}^2}$ formed by a complex nonlinear relationship between 6 lagged model inputs. Figure 2. a shows that among 20 dynamics fed to the network, the relevance score of all 6 dynamics is computed as 1, and non-relevant ones are calculated as 0, meaning the network captures influential variables with appropriate MSE loss as 0.0043. The same performance is reported for all other simulated systems. The importance scores and output results for simulated systems F_{10} , F_9 and F_8 are also illustrated in Figures 3, 4, and 5.




(a)




(b)

Figure 2 – (a) The relevance score computation for each dynamic, and (b) the system and model output for the simulated system F_{11}




(a)




(b)

Figure 3 – (a) The relevance score computation for each dynamic, and (b) the system and model output for the simulated system F_{10}




(a)




(b)

Figure 4 – (a) The relevance score computation for each dynamic, and (b) the system and model output for the simulated system F_9



(a)



(b)

Figure 5 – (a) The relevance score computation for each dynamic, and (b) the system and model output for the simulated system F_8

4-2- PH neutralization process

A laboratory experiment is conducted to demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed method. The inputs to the process include the flow rates of acid, water, and base, while the outputs are the fluid's PH value and the level of the mixing tank. The base flow rate acts as the controlled variable in the pH control loop, while the acid flow rate serves as a disturbance input. The level setpoint for the mixing tank is held constant for simplicity, and the level is regulated by adjusting the water flow rate. Given that the settling time of the level process can be disregarded, the influence of the level control loop on the pH control loop is minimal, allowing for the decoupling of the level control loop [16].




Figure 6 – The flow rate of base and PH value of fluid

Given the base and acid flow rate, we aim to predict the fluid's PH value. Since the acid flow rate is constant, the identification process is done based on the fluid's PH value and the base's flow rate. For this purpose, we collected 4000 data, as illustrated in Figure 6. We chose 2000 sample points for training and 2000 for testing. We adopt the ARX model with $n_a = n_b = 5$. The corresponding importance scores of each input dynamic are computed in Figure 7.




Figure 7 – The relevance score of input dynamics for the PH neutralization process

Figure 8 highlights that only 5 input variables are relevant to the output, and others are non-relevant. As it has been shown, the PH neutralization process possesses the structure of the form:

$$\frac{y_t}{u_t} = \frac{b_5 z^{-5} + b_3 z^{-3}}{1 + a_4 z^{-4} + a_2 z^{-2} + a_1 z^{-1}}$$

Figure 8 is the output plot of the process. Compared to the first-order approximation utilized for the PH neutralization process in [16], our method achieves an MSE that is 40 times smaller.




Figure 8 – The output plots of the PH neutralization process and the model

4- Conclusion

This paper introduces an end-to-end nonlinear system identification process that combines two key steps - identifying relevant variables and approximating nonlinear functions - into a unified procedure. The method involves incorporating a decision module at the first layer of the network.

This decision unit is a simple logistic regression model, taking the complete Fisher information matrix as input and generating relevant scores. Following training, variables with relevance scores below a specified threshold can be eliminated. Furthermore, this methodology can assess intermediate neurons to facilitate dynamic network pruning. Results obtained from numerical and laboratory tests demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach.

6- References

- [1] Oliver Nelles. *“Nonlinear system identification: From classical approaches to neural networks, fuzzy models, and Gaussian processes”*. Springer, 2020.
- [2] Ljung, Lennart. *“Linear system identification as curve fitting.”* Directions in mathematical systems theory and optimization. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2002.
- [3] He, X., & Asada, H. *“A new method for identifying orders of input-output models for nonlinear dynamic systems.”* In Proceedings of the ACC (pp. 2520–2523). San Francisco, CA, 2003.
- [4] Cheng, Changming, and Er-Wei Bai. *“Ranking the importance of variables in nonlinear system identification.”* *Automatica* 103 (2019): 472-479.
- [5] Peng, H., Long, F., & Ding, C. *“Feature selection based on mutual information: criteria of Max-Dependency, Max-Relevance, and Min-Redundancy.”* *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 27, 1226–1238, 2005.
- [6] Székely, G. J., Rizzo, M. L., & Bakirov, N. K. *“Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances.”* *The Annals of Statistics*, 35, 2769–2794, 2007.
- [7] S. Theodoridis, *“Machine learning: A Bayesian and optimization perspective”*, second edition, Elsevier, 2020.
- [8] Bishop, Christopher M. *“Pattern recognition and machine learning”*. Vol. 4. No. 4. New York: Springer, 2006.
- [9] Peduzzi, P. *“A stepwise variable selection procedure for nonlinear regression methods.”* *Bioemetrics*, 36, 510–516, 1980.
- [10] Cheng, Changming, and Erwei Bai. *“Variable selection based on squared derivative averages.”* *Automatica* 127 (2021): 109491.
- [11] I. A. Dfuf, J. F. Pérez-Minayo, J. M. M. McWilliams, and C. G. Fernández, *“Variable importance analysis in imbalanced datasets: A new approach,”* *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 127 404–127 430, 2020.
- [12] Molnar, Christoph, Giuseppe Casalicchio, and Bernd Bischl. *“Interpretable machine learning—a brief history, state-of-the-art and challenges.”* Joint European conference on machine learning and knowledge discovery in databases. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [13] Lind, I., & Ljung, L. *“Regressor and structure selection in NARX models using a structure ANOVA approach.”* *Automatica*, 44, 383–395, 2008.
- [14] Märtens, Kaspar, and Christopher Yau. *“Neural decomposition: Functional anova with variational autoencoders.”* International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics. PMLR, 2020.

[15] Tu, Ming, et al. *"Reducing the model order of deep neural networks using information theory."* 2016 IEEE Computer Society Annual Symposium on VLSI (ISVLSI). IEEE, 2016.

[16] Kheirandish, Amid, Alireza Fatehi, and Mir Sajjad Gheibi. *"Identification of slow-rate integrated measurement systems using expectation–maximization algorithm."* IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement 69.12 (2020): 9477-9484.