

On System Operators with Variation Bounding Properties

Chaim Roth* and Christian Grussler†

October 1, 2024

Abstract

The property of linear discrete-time time-invariant system operators mapping inputs with at most $k-1$ sign changes to outputs with at $k-1$ sign changes is investigated. We show that this property is tractable via the notion of k -sign consistency in case of the observability/controlability operator, which as such can also be used as a sufficient condition for the Hankel operator. Our results complement the literature in several aspects: an algebraic characterization, independent of rank and dimension, is provided for variation bounding and diminishing matrices and their computational tractability is discussed. Based on these, we conduct our studies of variation bounding system operators beyond existing studies on order-preserving k -variation diminishment. Our results are applied to the open problem of bounding the number of sign changes in a system's impulse response.

1 Introduction

Linear time-invariant (LTI) systems

$$\begin{aligned} x(t+1) &= Ax(t) + bu(t) \\ y(t) &= cx(t), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $b, c^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, that map nonnegative inputs u to nonnegative outputs y are characterized by *nonnegative impulse* responses $g(t) := cA^{t-1}b \geq 0$, $t \geq 1$ and referred to as *externally positive* [8]. In the particular case that A , b and c are element-wise nonnegative, the system is called *internally positive* as it is externally positive and preserves the positivity of the state for nonnegative inputs. Systems of this kind frequently occur through compartmental modelling [3, 9] and are known for several advantageous analytical properties such as

*The author is with the faculty of Mechanical Engineering at the Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, 3200003 Haifa, Israel. chaim.roth@campus.technion.ac.il

†The author is with the faculty of Mechanical Engineering at the Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, 3200003 Haifa, Israel. cgrussler@technion.ac.il

scalable stability certificates [25], optimal controller design [21, 28] or the avoidance of over- and undershooting in closed-loop design [5, 13, 23, 27].

In recent years, efforts have been made to study systems with extended positivity properties based on their influence on the variation, i.e., number of sign changes, of the input signal u or the state $x(t)$ (see, e.g., [12, 14, 18, 29]). A mapping $u \mapsto Xu$ is called *k-variation bounding* (VB_k) if it maps an input u with at most k sign changes to an output Xu of at most k sign changes. If the mapping is VB_j for all $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, it is called *k-variation diminishing* (VD_k) and if, additionally, the order of sign changes is preserved whenever u and Xu have equal variation, the VD_k property is called *order-preserving* (OVD_k).

Systems with input-output OVD_k properties have been studied in terms of Hankel and Toeplitz operator [14], which resulted in intermediates between external positivity (OVD_0 operators) and the well-known class of *relaxation systems* [31] (OVD_∞ Hankel operators). These intermediates have been exploited in [11] to provide guarantees for internal positivity preserving model order reduction – a property well-known for OVD_∞ Hankel operators. Studies of autonomous (unforced) systems with VD_k and VB_k state-transition transition maps [18, 19, 30] have provided an extended, unified approach to several important non-linear system analysis tools such as monotonicity/cooperativity, contraction analysis or Poincare-Bendixson results. A system class that was proposed to merge the input-output and autonomous case has been suggested in [12]. This resulted in a first certificate for OVD_k observability/controllability operators and its application to bounding the variation of an impulse response beyond external positivity. The later is still an open problem for which several lower bounds [4, 6, 26], but only few upper bounds [6] are known.

The goal of this work is to derive a tractable characterization of systems with VB_k observability/controllability operators. This complements the literature in several aspects. Firstly, we close the gap of algebraic characterization of VB_k and VD_k matrices beyond limitations to rank and dimensions (cf. [17, 29]) or OVD_k matrices (cf. [14, 17]). Based on that, computationally tractable certificates are achieved by extending related results in [22]. Secondly, it is shown that an application of these results to the infinite-dimensional observability/controllability operator leads to the external positivity of a related family of linear time-invariant systems. This is similar to the approach in [14], but goes beyond OVD_k and does not requiring A to be OVD_k (cf. [12]). To underline this benefit, we present a system example for which there exists a realization with VD_2 observability operator, but no realization with an VD_2 A . This mimics the fact that not all externally positive systems have an internally positive realization [1, 8, 13]. Lastly, as any Hankel operator factors into observability and controllability operator, our results also provide a first sufficient certificate of VB_k and VD_k Hankel operators. Our results are illustrated by bounding the variation of the impulse response aka. the number of over- and undershoots in an step response. In future work, we hope to use these insights to also derive characteristics in terms of zeros and poles.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We begin with some extensive preliminaries in Section 2 that will enable us to present our main results in Section 3. In Section 4, these result are illustrated by examples and conclusions are drawn in Section 5.

Proofs are stated in the Appendix.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce basic notations and provide an extensive review of concepts that are essential for the presentation of our new results.

2.1 Notations

We write \mathbb{Z} for the set of integers and \mathbb{R} for the set of reals, with $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ standing for the respective subsets of nonnegative elements – the corresponding notations are also used for subsets starting from non-zero values, strict inequality as well as reversed inequality signs. The set of real sequences with indices in \mathbb{Z} is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. For matrices $X = (x_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, we say that X is *nonnegative*, $X \geq 0$ or $X \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times m}$ if all elements $x_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ – corresponding notations are used for matrices with strictly positive entries and reversed inequality signs. These notations are also used for sequences $x = (x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. For $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, we write $(k : l) := \{k, k + 1, \dots, l\}$, $k \leq l$. In the case $k > l$, the notation represents the empty set. The complement of a k -tuple, I , is I^c such that $I \cup I^c = (1 : n)$. If $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, then $\sigma(X) = \{\lambda_1(X), \dots, \lambda_n(X)\}$ denotes its *spectrum*, where the eigenvalues are ordered by descending absolute value, i.e., $\lambda_1(X)$ is the eigenvalue with the largest magnitude, counting multiplicity. If the magnitude of two eigenvalues coincides, we sub-sort them by decreasing real part. The identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is denoted by I_n or if the dimensions are obvious, simply by I . A (*consecutive*) j -*minor* of X in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is a minor which is constructed of j columns and j rows of X (with (consecutive) indices). The set of j -consecutive minors with column (row) indices $(1 : j)$ are said to be the j -*column(row) initial minors*. The submatrix with rows $I \subset (1 : n)$ and columns $J \subset (1 : m)$ is written as $X_{I,J}$. In case of subvectors, we simply write x_I . With slight abuse of notation, we also use this to denote subsets of ordered index sets $x \in \mathcal{I}_{n,r}$, where

$$\mathcal{I}_{n,r} := \{v = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\} \subset \mathbb{N} : 1 \leq v_1 < \dots < v_r \leq n\}.$$

Finally, if $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is such that $\det X_{(2:n-1), (2:n-1)} \neq 0$, then the following identity exists [16, Equation 0.8.11]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \det X_{(1:n), (1:n)} \det X_{(2:n-1), (2:n-1)} \\ &= \det X_{(1:n-1), (1:n-1)} \det X_{(2:n), (2:n)} \\ & \quad - \det X_{(1:n-1), (2:n)} \det X_{(2:n), (1:n-1)} \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

2.2 Variation diminishing maps

The *variation* of a sequence or vector u is defined as the number of sign-changes in u . We employ two versions that only differ in the treatment of zero entries.

$$S^-(u) := \sum_{i \geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_{<0}}(\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_{i+1}), \quad S^-(0) := -1$$

where \tilde{u} is the vector resulting from deleting all zeros in u and $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{A}}(x)$ is the indicator function with subset \mathbb{A} , i.e., $\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{A}}(x) = 1$ if $x \in \mathbb{A}$ and zero otherwise. Further,

$$S^+(u) := \sum_{i \geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_{<0}}(\bar{u}_i \bar{u}_{i+1}),$$

where \bar{u} is the vector resulting from replacing zeros by elements that maximize the resulting sum. Obviously, $S^-(u) \leq S^+(u)$. Most essential to this work is the definition of variation bounding.

Definition 1. A linear map $u \mapsto Xu$ is said to be *k-variation bounding* (VB_k), $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, if for all $u \neq 0$ with $S^-(u) \leq k$ it holds that

$$S^-(Xu) \leq k$$

If $S^-(Xu)$ can be replaced with $S^+(Xu)$, the mapping said to *strictly k-variation bounding* (SVB_k). For brevity, we simply say X is $(\text{S})\text{VB}_k$.

A special case of variation bounding is that of (order-preserving) variation diminishment.

Definition 2. A linear operator X is said to be *k-variation diminishing* (VD_k), if X is VB_j for all $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. If additionally, the sign of the first non-zero elements in u and Xu coincide whenever $S^-(u) = S^-(Xu)$, we say that X is *order-preserving k-variation diminishing* (OVD_k).

2.3 Total Positivity Theory

Total positivity theory [17] is known to provide algebraic conditions for the OVD_{k-1} and SVB_{k-1} property by means of compound matrices. For $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, the (i, j) -th entry of the so-called *r-th multiplicative compound matrix* $X_{[r]} \in \mathbb{R}^{\binom{n}{r} \times \binom{m}{r}}$ is defined via $\det(X_{I,J})$, where I and J are the i -th and j -th element of the r -tuples in $\mathcal{I}_{n,r}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{m,r}$, respectively, assuming *lexicographical ordering*. For example, if $X \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \det(X_{\{1,2\},\{1,2\}}) & \det(X_{\{1,2\},\{1,3\}}) & \det(X_{\{1,2\},\{2,3\}}) \\ \det(X_{\{1,3\},\{1,2\}}) & \det(X_{\{1,3\},\{1,3\}}) & \det(X_{\{1,3\},\{2,3\}}) \\ \det(X_{\{2,3\},\{1,2\}}) & \det(X_{\{2,3\},\{1,3\}}) & \det(X_{\{2,3\},\{2,3\}}) \end{pmatrix}$$

equals $X_{[2]}$. In our derivations, the following properties of the multiplicative compound matrix will be elementary (see, e.g., [10, Section 6] and [15, Subsection 0.8.1]).

Lemma 1. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$.

- i) $(XY)_{[r]} = X_{[r]}Y_{[r]}$ (Cauchy-Binet formula).
- ii) For $p = n$: $\sigma(X_{[r]}) = \{\prod_{i \in I} \lambda_i(X) : I \in \mathcal{I}_{n,r}\}$.
- iii) For $p = n$ and $\det(X) \neq 0$: $(X^{-1})_{[r]} = X_{[r]}^{-1}$.
- iv) If $k = \text{rank}(X)$, then $\text{rank}(X_{[k]}) = 1$

It is readily seen that X is OVD_0 if and only if $X = X_{[1]} \geq 0$. This equivalence can be generalized to higher orders by the following definitions and characterizations (see [14, Prop. 7] and [17, Theorem 5.1.1]).

Definition 3. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $k \leq \min\{m, n\}$. X is called

- i. (strictly) k -sign consistent ((S) SC_k) if $X_{[k]} \geq (>)0$ or $X_{[k]} \leq (<)0$.
- ii. (strictly) k -sign regular ((S) SR_k) if X is (S) SC_j for all $j \in (1 : k)$.
- iii. (strictly) k -positive if $X_{[j]} \geq (>)0$ for all $j \in (1 : k)$. In case of $k = \min\{m, n\}$, X is also called (strictly) totally positive.

Proposition 1. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with $n \geq m$. Then, X is k -positive with $k \in (1 : m)$ if and only if X is OVD_{k-1} .

Proposition 2. $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n > m$, is SSC_m if and only if X is SVB_{m-1} .

Note that one is only interested in cases with $n > m$, because any $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is SVB_{n-1} . In order to extend strict to the non-strict cases, the following proposition (see, e.g., [17, Propositions 5.1.1 & 5.1.2], [12, Propositions 2.7]) and lemma [17, Lemma 5.1.1] will be used.

Proposition 3. Let $T(\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be given by $T(\sigma)_{i,j} = e^{-\sigma(i-j)^2}$, with $\sigma > 0$, and let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with $m \leq n$. Then for $k \leq m$, the following hold:

- i. $T(\sigma)$ is strictly totally positive
- ii. $T(\sigma) \rightarrow I$ as $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$, and $T(\sigma)X \rightarrow X$ as $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$
- iii. if X is SC_k , and if all k columns of X are linearly independent, then $T(\sigma)X$ is SSC_k .
- iv. if $T(\sigma)X$ is SC_k for all $\sigma > 0$, then X is SC_k .
- v. if X is VB_{k-1} and $\text{rank}(X) = m$, then $T(\sigma)X$ is SVB_{k-1}

Lemma 2. Let $x(\sigma) \rightarrow x$ as $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$, then $S^-(x) \leq \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow \infty} S^+(x(\sigma))$ and $\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow \infty} S^-(x(\sigma)) \leq S^+(x)$.

For example, Proposition 3 in conjunction with Lemma 2 characterizes VB_{m-1} by SC_m as in [17, Theorems 5.1.3 & 5.1.3’].

Proposition 4. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n > m$ and rank m . X is SC_m if and only if X is VB_{m-1} .*

In this work, we will extend these characterization to the case of $(S)VB_k$.

Next, we will review how checking the sign of the elements in $X_{[k]}$ can be simplified compared to computing all of its entries. This does will not only make $(S)VB_{k-1}$ more tractable, but is particularly important for our applications to infinite-dimensional operators. We begin with a sufficient condition for m -sign consistency [17, Theorem 2.3.1], which only requires to consider consecutive row and column initial minors.

Proposition 5. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n \geq m$ be such that*

- i. the k -column initial minors of X are positive $k = 1, 2, ..m - 1$*
- ii. the m column initial minors are nonnegative (positive).*

Then all m -order minors of X are nonnegative (positive). The same is true for $m \geq n$ by replacing column with row initial minors.

An application of this result yields the following (sufficient) certificate (see [14, Proposition 8]) for (non-)strict k -positivity.

Proposition 6. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $k \leq \min\{n, m\}$, be such that*

- i. all consecutive r -minors of X are positive, $r \in (1 : k - 1)$,*
- ii. all consecutive k -minors of X are nonnegative (positive).*

Then, X is (strictly) k -positive. In the strict case, these are also necessary conditions.

A related results is the following sufficient and necessary condition for SSC_m [22, Theorem 2.2] and its application to SSC_k case.

Proposition 7. *$X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n > m$, is SSC_m if and only if the minors $\det(X_{\alpha, (1:m)})$ have the same strict sign for all $\alpha = \{(1 : m - r), (t : t + r - 1)\}$ with $1 \leq r \leq m$ and $m - r \leq t \leq n - r + 1$.*

For example, checking whether

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 3 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{4 \times 2}$$

is SSC_2 only requires to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} r = 1 : & \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}, \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \\ r = 2 : & \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}, \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

have the same strict sign. Propositions 5 – 7 turn the combinatorial complexity of verifying SSC_m or $(S)TP_k$ via $X_{[m]}$ into polynomial complexity.

A simple application of Propositions 7 to all k columns of X also provides a characterization of SSC_k .

Corollary 1. $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n > m$, is SSC_k , $k \leq m$ if and only if the minors $\det(X_{\alpha,\beta})$ have the same strict sign for all $\alpha = \{(1 : k - r), (t : t + r - 1)\}$ with $r \in (1 : k)$ and $t \in (k - r + 1 : n - r + 1)$ and all $\beta = \{(1 : k - \bar{r}), (\bar{t} : \bar{t} + \bar{r} - 1)\}$ with $\bar{r} \in (1 : k)$ and $\bar{t} \in (k - \bar{r} + 1 : m - \bar{r} + 1)$.

Proposition 7 utilizes a bijection between the m -order minors of a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and the minors of a related transformed matrix [22], which we will also use for a new non-strict counter-parts.

Lemma 3. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n > m$, such that $\det X_{(1:m),(1:m)} \neq 0$ and

$$C := X_{(n-m+1:n),(1:m)} \left(X_{(1:m),(1:m)} \right)^{-1} K,$$

where $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is defined by

$$k_{ij} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{j-1} & i + j = m + 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Then there is a bijection between the m -order minors $\det X_{\gamma,(1:m)}$ with $\gamma \in \mathcal{I}_{n,m} \setminus (1 : m)$ and all minors of C . Concretely, $\det C_{\alpha,\beta}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}_{n-m,r}$, $\beta \in \mathcal{I}_{m,r}$ for all $r \in (1 : \min\{m, n - m\})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{m-r+1-j} &= m + 1 - \beta_j^c & \text{for } j \in (1 : m - r) \\ \gamma_{m-r+i} &= m + \alpha_i & \text{for } i \in (1 : r) \end{aligned}$$

and $r \in (1 : \min\{m, n - m\})$ is the order of the respective minor of C . The sign of the minors are equal up to the sign of $\det X_{(1:m),(1:m)}$.

2.4 Variation diminishing observability operators

The observability operator of (1) is defined by

$$(\mathcal{O}(A, c)x_0)(t) := cA^t x_0, \quad x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3)$$

As discussed in [12, Lemma 3.4], the OVD_k property of $\mathcal{O}(A, c)$ is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{O}^t(A, c)^\top := \begin{pmatrix} c^\top & A^\top c^\top & \dots & A^{t-1\top} c^\top \end{pmatrix}$$

being OVD_k for all $t \geq k$. For brevity, we will mostly drop (A, c) and write \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}^t , respectively. A sufficient condition based on the assumption of a k -positive A was shown in [12, Theorem 3.5].

Proposition 8. *If A is k -positive and $\mathcal{O}^j_{[j]} \geq 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$, then \mathcal{O}^t is k -positive for all $t \geq k$.*

Since the impulse response of (1) can be expressed as $g = \mathcal{O}b$, these results have been used to provide bounds on the number of sign changes in g by

$$S^-(g) = S^-(\mathcal{O}b) \leq S^-(b)$$

whenever \mathcal{O} is OVD_k and $S^-(b) \leq k$. In this work, we aim at relaxing this idea to VB_k observability operators, which then provides the bound $S^-(g) \leq k$.

Finally, we will abbreviate a discrete-time LTI system (1) by the triple (A, b, c) and say that it is *strictly externally positive* (1) if $g(t) = cA^{t-1}b > 0$ for all $t \geq 1$. Correspondingly, we use the term *strictly externally negative* if the inequality is reversed.

3 Main Results

The main goal of this work is to verify the general case of \mathcal{O} being $(S)\text{VB}_{k-1}$ using $(S)SC_k$. This enables us to derive numerical certificates as well as necessary conditions in terms of the eigenvalues of A . In particular, we also get necessary and sufficient conditions for $(O)\text{VD}_k$ \mathcal{O} and as such no longer require k -positivity of A as in Proposition 8. Finally, by substitution of (A, c) with (A^\top, b^\top) , these results may also be used to check if the *controllability operator* $\mathcal{C}(A, b) = \mathcal{O}(A^\top, b^\top)^\top$ of (1) is $(S)\text{VB}_k$ and as result provide a first sufficient certificate for the Hankel operator $\mathcal{H}_g = \mathcal{O}(A, c)\mathcal{C}(A, b)$ of (1) to be $(S)\text{VB}_k$.

Our investigations start with the SVB_{k-1} case and are subsequently extended to the VB_{k-1} case.

3.1 The SVB_{k-1} case

Analogously to the OVD_{k-1} case, one can show that \mathcal{O} is SVB_{k-1} if and only if \mathcal{O}^t is SVB_{k-1} for all $t \geq k-1$. Thus, by Proposition 2, it suffices to check SSC_{n-1} of \mathcal{O}^t for all $t \geq n-1$. Using Proposition 7, this is equivalent to the strict positivity/negativity of certain sequences of $n-1$ -minors. Next, we will show that these sequences of $n-1$ -minors correspond to impulse responses of related LTI system. Checking SVB_{k-1} then becomes equivalent to the verification of strict external positivity of n LTI systems for which numerically efficient certificates can be found, e.g., in [13, 27].

Theorem 1. *Let (A, c) be observable. Then, \mathcal{O} is SVB_{n-1} if and only if $(\tilde{A}_r, \tilde{b}_r, \tilde{c}_r)$ is strictly externally positive for all $r \in (1 : n)$ with $\tilde{A}_r = A_{[r]}$, $\tilde{c}_r = (\mathcal{O}^r)_{[r]}$ and*

$$\tilde{b}_r = \left(A^{n-r} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_r \end{pmatrix} \right)_{[r]}.$$

In order to proceed with the general SVB_{k-1} case, we need the following generalization of Proposition 2, which has appeared earlier in several related forms (see, e.g., [17, 29]), but to the best of our knowledge not been stated and derived in given full generality.

Proposition 9. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $k < \min(m + 1, n)$. Then, X is SSC_k if and only if X is SVB_{k-1} .*

With the next theorem we achieve a method for checking whether \mathcal{O} is SVB_{k-1} .

Theorem 2. *Let (A, c) be observable, $k \in (1 : n)$, $r \in (1 : k)$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{I}_{n,k}$. Then, for $N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, $t \in (1 : N - k + 1)$ and $\alpha = \{(1 : k - r), (k - r + t : k + t - 1)\}$, it holds that*

$$\det(O_{\alpha, \beta}^N) = \tilde{c}_r \tilde{A}_r^{t-1} \tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta},$$

where $\tilde{A}_r := A_{[r]}$, $\tilde{c}_r := \mathcal{O}^r_{[r]}$ and

$$\tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta} := \left(\left(A^{k-r} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_{n-k+r} \end{pmatrix} \right)_{[r]} \quad 0 \right) (\mathcal{O}^n P_\beta)_{[k]}$$

with $P_\beta := I_{(1:n),\beta}$. Therefore, \mathcal{O} is SVB_k if and only if $(\tilde{A}_r, \tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta}, \tilde{c}_r)$ is strictly externally positive/negative for all (r, β) with $r \in (1 : k)$ and β as in Corollary 1.

Since strict externally positivity requires a dominant positive pole (see, e.g., [1, 9, 20]), the following eigenvalue constraint can be shown as a consequence of Item ii in Lemma 1.

Corollary 2. *Let (A, c) be such that*

- i. A is diagonalizable.*
- ii. \mathcal{O} is observable and SSC_k .*

Then, the dominant eigenvalues $\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_k(A) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

Interestingly, this necessary condition is also implied by k -positivity of A as in Proposition 8 as well as by the k -positivity of the Hankel and Toeplitz operators [14]. In particular, if $k = n$, there exists a $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that $T^{-1}AT = \text{diag}(\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A))$ and $cT = (1 \ \cdots \ 1)$, which as shown in [12] fulfills the requirements of Proposition 8.

3.2 The VB_{k-1} case

Next, we will extend the above strict version to their corresponding non-strict counterparts. To this end, we will start by relaxing Proposition 9 and Corollary 1. Unlike the strict case, we need to divide the characterization of VB_{k-1} matrices into two distinct cases.

Theorem 3. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n > m$ and $k = \text{rank } X < m$. Then the following are equivalent*

- i. Each column of $X_{[k]}$ has elements of the same sign.*
- ii. For every $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $S^-(Xu) \leq k - 1$.*

Theorem 4. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $k < \text{rank}(X)$ be such that any k columns of X are linearly independent. Then*

$$X \text{ is } VB_{k-1} \iff X \text{ is } SC_k$$

Proposition 7 is a result of Lemma 3 in conjunction with the following characterization of strictly totally positive matrices (see, e.g., [7, Theorem 2.1]).

Proposition 10. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. X is strictly totally positive if and only if all row and column initial minors of X are positive.*

For completion, a new proof of Proposition 10, similar to [24, Theorem 2.3], is stated in the appendix. Based on that, we show the following new non-strict relaxation similar to Proposition 6.

Proposition 11. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be such that row and column initial k -order minors of X are positive for $k = 1, 2, \dots, \min\{n - 1, m - 1\}$ and nonnegative for $k = \min\{n, m\}$. Then, X is totally positive and all minors of order less than k are positive.*

Non-strict analogues of Propositions 7 and 1 then read as follows.

Theorem 5. *$X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n \geq 2m$, is SC_m if the minors $\det(X_{\alpha, (1:m)})$ have the same strict sign for all $\alpha = \{(1 : m - r), (t : t + r - 1)\}$ with $1 \leq r < m$, $m - r \leq t \leq n - r + 1$, and $\alpha = (t : t + m - 1)$, $1 \leq t \leq m$. In addition the minors need to have the same non-strict sign for $\alpha = (t : t + m - 1)$, $m + 1 \leq t \leq n - m + 1$.*

Corollary 3. *$X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $n > m$, is SC_k , $2k \leq m$ if the minors $\det(X_{\alpha, \beta})$ have the same strict sign for all $\alpha = \{(1 : k - r), (t : t + r - 1)\}$ with $r \in (1 : k)$ and $t \in (k - r + 1 : n - r + 1)$ and all $\beta = \{(1 : k - \bar{r}), (\bar{t} : \bar{t} + \bar{r} - 1)\}$ with $\bar{r} \in (1 : k)$ and $\bar{t} \in (k - \bar{r} + 1 : m - \bar{r} + 1)$, except for the cases where $\alpha = (t : t + r - 1)$ $r = k$, $t \in (k + 1 : n - k + 1)$ and $\beta = (\bar{t} : \bar{t} + \bar{r} - 1)$, $\bar{r} = k$, $\bar{t} \in (k + 1 : m - k + 1)$, where a non-strict sign is sufficient.*

Equipped with our new non-strict matrix conditions, we are ready to state the following sufficient analogues of Theorems 1 & 2.

Proposition 12. Let (A, c) be observable and $(\tilde{A}_r, \tilde{b}_r, \tilde{c}_r)$ be defined by $\tilde{A}_r := A_{[r]}$, $\tilde{c}_r := (\mathcal{O}^r)_{[r]}$ and

$$\tilde{b}_r := \left(A^{n-r} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_r \end{pmatrix} \right)_{[r]}.$$

for all $r \in (1 : n)$. Then, \mathcal{O} is VB_{n-1} if and only if $(\tilde{A}_r, \tilde{b}_r, \tilde{c}_r)$ is strictly externally positive for all $r \in (1 : n-1)$ and externally positive for $r = n$ with $\tilde{c}_n \tilde{A}_n^{l-1} \tilde{b} > 0$ for all $l \in (1 : n-1)$.

Proposition 13. Let (A, c) be observable, $k \in (1 : n)$, $r \in (1 : k)$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{I}_{n,k}$. Then, for $N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, $t \in (1 : N - k + 1)$ and $\alpha = \{(1 : k - r), (k - r + t : k + t - 1)\}$, it holds that

$$\det(O_{\alpha, \beta}^N) = \tilde{c}_r \tilde{A}_r^{t-1} \tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta},$$

where $\tilde{A}_r := A_{[r]}$, $\tilde{c}_r := \mathcal{O}^r_{[r]}$ and

$$\tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta} := \left(\left(A^{k-r} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_{n-k+r} \end{pmatrix} \right)_{[r]} \quad 0 \right) (\mathcal{O}^n P_\beta)_{[k]}$$

with $P_\beta := I_{(1:n),\beta}$. Therefore, \mathcal{O} is VB_{k-1} if $(\tilde{A}_r, \tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta}, \tilde{c}_r)$ is strictly externally positive/negative for all (r, β) with $r \in (1 : k)$ and β as in Corollary 1, except for the following cases $\beta = (\bar{t} : \bar{t} + \bar{r} - 1)$, $\bar{r} = k$, $\bar{t} \in (k + 1 : m - k + 1)$, where non-strict externally positive/negative is sufficient if $\tilde{c}_r \tilde{A}_r^{l-1} \tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta} \neq 0$ for all $l \in (1 : k)$.

3.3 The OVD_k/VD_k case

An application of Theorem 2 also provides a new method to check OVD_k . To this end note that the systems in Theorem 2, which represent the k -consecutive minors of \mathcal{O} are the pairs with $r = k$. In conjunction with Proposition 6, this provides the following corollary for k -positive \mathcal{O} .

Corollary 4. Let (A, c) be observable. Using the notation of Theorem 2, it holds that if

- i. $(\tilde{A}_r, b_{r,r,\beta}, \tilde{c}_r)$ is strictly externally positive, $r \in (1 : k - 1)$
- ii. $(\tilde{A}_r, b_{k,k,\beta}, \tilde{c}_r)$ is (strictly) externally positive,

then \mathcal{O} is (strictly) k -positive.

It is important to note that unlike Proposition 8, Corollary 4 does not require A to be k -positive. In Subsection 4.3, an example is presented where the system does not permit any realization with k -positive A .

Finally, for VD_k there exists an equivalence to SR_k with a full rank requirement [17, Theorem 5.1.4]. Based on Theorem 4, we are able to relax this requirement, too.

Corollary 5. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $\text{rank}(X) > k$ be such that any k columns of X are linearly independent. Then

$$X \text{ is } VD_{k-1} \iff X \text{ is } SR_k$$




Figure 1: Impulse responses $\tilde{g}_{1,1,\beta}(t)$ of $(\tilde{A}_1, b_{1,1,\beta}, \tilde{c}_1)$ in Theorem 2: \bullet $\tilde{g}_{1,1,\{1\}}(t)$, \blacksquare $\tilde{g}_{1,1,\{2\}}(t)$ and \bullet $\tilde{g}_{1,1,\{3\}}(t)$ are strictly positive.

4 Illustrative Examples

In this section, we want to illustrate our results based on three system examples (1) for which we want to bound the variation of the their impulse responses via the relationship $g = \mathcal{O}b$. The three systems have the following distinct properties:

- i. \mathcal{O} is OVD_1 , but A is not 2-positive, i.e., Proposition 8 does not apply for the given realization.
- ii. \mathcal{O} is SVB_1 , but not 2-positive, i.e., variation diminishing results cannot be used, but our new results can be used to verify the variation bounding property.
- iii. \mathcal{O} is VD_2 , but there exists no other realization with SC_2 A . As such, even a possible extension of Proposition 8 to SC_2 would not be applicable.

4.1 Example 1: OVD_1 \mathcal{O}

We begin by considering

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -1.20 & -1.50 & -1.88 \\ 1.51 & 1.75 & 1.88 \\ -0.16 & -0.01 & 0.40 \end{pmatrix}, \quad c^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 1.16 \\ 1.8 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $A \not\geq 0$, A is not 2-positive and Proposition 8 is not applicable. However, by checking the impulse responses corresponding to consecutive minors of \mathcal{O} (see Figures 1 & 2), it follows from Corollary 4 that \mathcal{O} is 2-positive. Thus, for all $b \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $S^-(b) \leq 1$, it follows that $S^-(g) \leq S^+(g) \leq 1$.

4.2 Example 2: SVB_1 \mathcal{O}

Next, we consider

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0.7 & 0.6 & -2 \\ 0.15 & 0.15 & -0.25 \\ 0 & 0.03 & 0.1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad c^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 1.1 \\ 0.1 \\ -5.5 \end{pmatrix}$$




Figure 2: Impulse responses $\tilde{g}_{2,2,\beta}(t)$ of $(\tilde{A}_2, b_{2,2,\beta}, \tilde{c}_2)$ in Theorem 2: \bullet $\tilde{g}_{2,2,\{1,2\}}(t)$, \blacksquare $\tilde{g}_{2,2,\{1,3\}}(t)$ and \bullet $\tilde{g}_{2,2,\{2,3\}}(t)$ are strictly positive.




Figure 3: Impulse responses $\tilde{g}_{2,1,\beta}(t)$ of $(\tilde{A}_1, b_{2,1,\beta}, \tilde{c}_1)$ in Theorem 2: \bullet $\tilde{g}_{2,1,\{1,2\}}(t)$, \blacksquare $\tilde{g}_{2,1,\{1,3\}}(t)$ and \blacktriangle $\tilde{g}_{2,1,\{2,3\}}(t)$ are strictly positive.




Figure 4: Impulse responses $\tilde{g}_{2,2,\beta}(t)$ of $(\tilde{A}_2, b_{2,2,\beta}, \tilde{c}_2)$ in Theorem 2: \bullet $\tilde{g}_{2,2,\{1,2\}}(t)$, \blacksquare $\tilde{g}_{2,2,\{1,3\}}(t)$ and \blacktriangle $\tilde{g}_{2,2,\{2,3\}}(t)$ are strictly positive.

with

$$\mathcal{O}^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1.10 & 0.10 & -5.50 \\ 0.79 & 0.51 & -2.78 \\ 0.63 & 0.46 & -1.98 \end{pmatrix}$$

Since \mathcal{O}^3 contains elements of mixed signs, \mathcal{O} is not 0-variation diminishing. Hence, independent of the choice of b , no upper bound on the variation of the impulse response can be provided with variation diminishing arguments. Fortunately, as illustrated in Figures 3 & 4, Theorem 2 guarantees that \mathcal{O} is SVB_1 . Then, for any $b \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $S^-(b) \leq 1$ we have that $S^-(g) \leq S^+(g) \leq 1$.

4.3 Example 3: SVB₁ \mathcal{O} without k -positive A representation

Corollary 4 has the advantage that A does not need to be k -positive. This is especially useful in cases where a system does not admit a realization with k -positive A . In the following, we derive an example where our results can be used to verify that \mathcal{O} is SR_2 . However, this system does not permit any realization where A is SC_2 . Consequently, even a possible extension of Proposition 8 to the SC_k case would not be applicable to this example.

We start by defining the system $(\bar{A}, \bar{c}, \bar{b})$ as

$$\bar{A} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cos(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}}) & -\sin(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}}) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sin(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}}) & \cos(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{b} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\bar{c} = (1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0.001 \quad 0.001)$$

and the corresponding truncated Hankel operator

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\bar{g}} = \mathcal{O}(\bar{A}, \bar{c})\mathcal{O}^5(\bar{A}^\top, \bar{b}^\top)^\top.$$

Using the states-space transformation $T = \mathcal{O}^5(\bar{A}^\top, \bar{b}^\top)^\top$, we define our pair (A, c) by

$$A := T\bar{A}T^{-1}, \quad c := \bar{c}T^{-1}.$$

such that

$$\mathcal{O}(A, c) = \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\bar{g}}.$$

In order to show that $\mathcal{O}(A, c)$ is VD_1 , it suffices to verify that $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\bar{g}}$ is VD_1 . To this end, note that the impulse response of $(\bar{A}, \bar{c}^\top, \bar{b})$ is given by

$$\bar{g}(t) = \frac{t}{2} + 0.002 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}}(t-1)\right) + \frac{t^2}{2} + 2, \quad t > 0$$

which can be easily verified to be positive. Similarly, the consecutive 2 minors

$$\bar{g}_2(t) = \bar{g}(t-1)\bar{g}(t+1) - \bar{g}(t)^2, \quad t > 0$$

can be shown to be negative. The operator resulting from reversing the column order in $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\bar{g}}$ then has positive 2-minors and as such fulfills the requirements of Proposition 6. As SC_2 is invariant to column inversion, this shows that $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\bar{g}}$ is SR_2 and by Corollary 5, we conclude that \mathcal{O} is VD_1 . Finally, as the dominant eigenvalues in \bar{A} include complex ones with arguments that are non-rational multiples of π , it can be shown by Lemma 1 and [2, Theorem 5] that there does not exist any realization where A is SC_2 .

Note that while for easy of exposition, we used Proposition 6 to confirm our claim, it is not difficult to modify this example to cases where \mathcal{O} is only VB_2 , e.g., by choosing $\bar{c}^\top = (-3 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0.001 \quad 0.001)$. In such instances, only our new results are applicable, which, however, also come with more involved analytic computations.

5 Conclusion

We have derived a tractable approach to certify that the observability operator of a discrete-time LTI system maps a vector with at most k sign changes to a sequence with at most k sign changes. Our derivations are based on new complements to the existing matrix literature of k -variation bounding matrices and their application to the observability operator. These complements include the relaxation of rank and dimension assumptions for the characterization of k -variation bounding matrices as well as their simplified certification. Interestingly, application of those results to the observability operator transform our problem into a problem of externally positivity verification. While this generalizes recent certificates for the more restrictive notion of order-preserving k -variation diminishment [12], it became also evident that variation bounding and variation diminishing properties in system operators share the same eigenvalue requirements, i.e., the $k + 1$ largest eigenvalues of A have to be real and positive.

An advantage of our certificate over [12] is removal the k -positivity requirement on A . In particular, we have constructed an example of a variation-diminishing observability operator, where independent of the system realization such an A does not exist. Our results are applied to the problem of bounding the number of sign changes in the impulse response.

In future work, we would like to extend our findings to the Hankel and Toeplitz operator without operator splitting and convert our findings into closed-loop design conditions.

Acknowledgment

The project was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 2406/22), while the second author was also a Jane and Larry Sherman Fellow.

Appendix

A Proof to Proposition 3

We only prove Items **iii** & **v** as the others are from [17, Propositions 5.1.1 & 5.1.2] and [12, Propositions 2.7].

- Item **iii**: from Lemma 1 Item **i**, $T(\sigma)X$ is the product of a positive matrix with a nonnegative/nonpositive matrix. Since all k columns of X are linearly independent, there are no zero columns in $X_{[k]}$ and as such the product of matrices results in no zero entries, where all the entries retain the same sign as $X_{[k]}$.
- Item **v**: From X being $S^-(k-1)$ for any u , $S^-(u) \leq k-1$ then $S^-(Xu) \leq$. In addition for $u \neq 0$ then $Xu \neq$ because $\text{rank}(X) = m$. Then since $T(\sigma)$ is SVB_{k-1} we have $S^+(T(\sigma)Xu) \leq S^-(Xu) \leq k-1$ for $u \neq 0$.

B Proof to Theorem 1

By Proposition 2, we need to check that \mathcal{O}^s is SSC_n , $s \geq n$. Applying Proposition 7 yields that \mathcal{O}^s is SSC_n if and only if the determinants of the following matrices have the same strict sign:

$$M_r[t] = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}^{n-r} \\ \mathcal{O}^r A^{n-r+t-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for $r \in (1 : n)$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. For each r the sequence $\{\det(M_r[t])\}_{t \geq 1}$ is the impulse response to $(\tilde{A}_r, \tilde{b}_r, \tilde{c}_r)$ up to the factor of $\det((\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1})$. To show this we multiply $M_r[t]$ on the right by $(\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1}$

$$M_r[t] (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{n-r} & 0 \\ \mathcal{O}^r A^{n-r+t-1} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

this is a block-triangular matrix whose determinant can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \det(M_r[t] (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1}) \\ &= \det \begin{pmatrix} I_{n-r} & 0 \\ \mathcal{O}^r A^{n-r+t-1} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \det \left(\mathcal{O}^r A^{t-1} A^{n-r} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_r \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &= (\mathcal{O}^r)_{[r]} A_{[r]}^{t-1} \left(A^{n-r} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_r \end{pmatrix} \right)_{[r]} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses the block-diagonal structure and the last equality exploits Cauchy-Binet (see Lemma 1). Then, since

$$\det(M_r[t] (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1}) = \det(M_r[t]) \det((\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1})$$

our claim follows. Finally, $\det(\mathcal{O}^n)$ is a particular minor of \mathcal{O} , which has the same sign as $\det((\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1})$, which is why $\det(M_r[t] (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1})$ needs to be strictly positive.

C Proof to Proposition 9

We begin by noticing that if X is SVB_{k-1} , then so is $X_{(1:n,v)}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{I}_{m,j}$ and $j \in (k : m)$. In particular, if $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}_{m,k}$, then by assumption $S^+(Xu(\alpha)) \leq k-1$ for all $u(\alpha)$ with $u(\alpha)_i = 0$, $i \notin \alpha$. Then, by Proposition 2, $X_{(1:n),\alpha}$ is SSC_k for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}_{m,k}$. In order to conclude that X is SSC_k we need to show strict sign agreement between all the $X_{(1:n),\alpha}$, which is equivalent to showing that $X_{(1:k),\beta}$ is SSC_k for all $\beta \in \mathcal{I}_{m,k+1}$. To this end, let $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ be such that $X_{(1:k),\beta} \bar{u} = 0$ and $X_{(1:k),\beta_{(1:k)}} \bar{u}_{(1:k)} = X_{(1:k),\beta_{\{k+1\}}}$. Then, by Cramer's rule [16, Sec. 0.8.3],

$$\det(X_{(1:k),\beta_{(1:k)}}) \bar{u}_j = (-1)^{k-j} \det(X_{(1:k),\beta^j}),$$

where $\beta^j = \beta_{(1:j-1)} \cup \beta_{(j+1:k+1)}$. Our claim is proven if $\det(X_{(1:k),\beta^j}) \det(X_{(1:k),\beta^{j+1}}) > 0$ for all $j \in (1 : k)$. Assuming the contrary, there exists at least one j^* such that $\bar{u}_{\beta_{j^*}} \bar{u}_{\beta_{j^*+1}} > 0$.

Then, $S^-(\bar{u}) \leq k - 1$ and $S^+(X_{(1:n),\beta}\bar{u}) \geq k$ as the first k elements in $X_{(1:n),\beta}\bar{u}$ are zero. This is a contradiction, since $X_{(1:n),\beta}$ is SVB_{k-1} by assumption.

Conversely, let X be SSC_k . By Proposition 2, $X_{(1:n),\alpha}$ is SVB_{k-1} for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}_{m,k}$. Thus, for all $u(\alpha)$ as above, $S^+(Xu) \leq k - 1$. In order to finish the proof, it remains to consider u with at least k non-zero entries. In this case, u can be partitioned into k parts

$$(u_1, \dots, u_{s_1}), (u_{s_1+1}, \dots, u_{s_2}), \dots, (u_{s_{k-1}+1}, \dots, u_m),$$

where each part contains no sign changes and at least one non-zero element. Letting $s_0 := 0$, $s_k = m$, we can then define an $\tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{(1:n),\{j\}} &= \sum_{i=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} |u_i| X_{(1:n),\{i\}}, \\ \tilde{u}_j &= \text{sign} \left(\sum_{i=s_{j-1}+1}^{s_j} u_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $j \in (1 : k)$, such that $Xu = \tilde{X}\tilde{u}$. Since the multi-linearity of the determinant implies that also $\tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ is SSC_k , it must hold by Proposition 2 that $S^+(Xu) = S^+(\tilde{X}\tilde{u}) \leq k - 1$

D Proof to Theorem 2

By Proposition 9, we need to check that \mathcal{O}^s is SSC_k , $s \geq k$. Using Corollary 1, this is equivalent to $\det(\mathcal{O}_{\alpha,\beta}^N)$ sharing the same sign across all defined choices of α , β and N . Since

$$\mathcal{O}_{\alpha,\beta}^N = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}^{k-r} & \\ \mathcal{O}^r A^{k-r+t-1} & \end{pmatrix}}_{=: M_{k,r}[t]} P_\beta,$$

we need to show that the determinants of $M_{k,r}[t]P_\beta$ coincide with the impulse response of $(\tilde{A}_r, \tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta}, \tilde{c}_r)$. To this end, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \det(M_{k,r}[t]P_\beta) &= \det(M_{k,r}[t] (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \mathcal{O}^n P_\beta) \\ &= \det \left(\begin{pmatrix} I_{k-r} & 0 \\ \mathcal{O}^r A^{k-r+t-1} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} & \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}^n P_\beta \right) \\ &= \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} I_{k-r} & 0 \\ \mathcal{O}^r A^{k-r+t-1} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} & \end{pmatrix}}_Q (\mathcal{O}^n P_\beta)_{[k]}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses Lemma 1. Further, since Q is block-diagonal, we can express it as

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \left(\left(\mathcal{O}^r A^{k-r+t-1} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_{n-k+r} \end{pmatrix} \right)_{[r]} \quad 0 \right) \\ &= \left(\mathcal{O}^r_{[r]} A^{t-1}_{[r]} \left(A^{k-r} (\mathcal{O}^n)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_{n-k+r} \end{pmatrix} \right)_{[r]} \quad 0 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality utilizes the fact that a k -minor is zero when the identity matrix I_{k-r} is not part of the corresponding submatrix.

Since the considered α 's are the same as in Corollary 1, it follows that \mathcal{O}^s , $s \geq k$, is SSC_k if and only if $(\tilde{A}_r, \tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta}, \tilde{c}_r)$ is strictly externally positive/negative for all $r \in (1 : k)$ and all β as in Corollary 1.

E Proof to Corollary 2

We begin by noting that by Item ii in Lemma 1, the dominant eigenvalue of $A_{[r]}$ is given by $\prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i(A)$. Further, since by assumption \mathcal{O} is SSC_k , it follows from Theorem 2 that for each $\beta \in \mathcal{I}_{n,k}$, the impulse response of the systems defined in Theorem 2 have to be strictly externally positive/negative. Since this requires that each system has a dominant positive pole [1, 9, 20], it follows that $\prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i(A) \neq 0$ and our claim will be proven by Theorem 2 if we can show that $\prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i(A)$ is a controllable and observable mode of $(\tilde{A}_r, \tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta}, \tilde{c}_r)$ for each $r \in (1 : k)$ and at least one corresponding choice of $\beta \in \mathcal{I}_{n,k}$.

By assumption, there exists an invertible $T \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ with

$$cT = (1 \quad \cdots \quad 1), \quad T^{-1}AT = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1(A) & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \lambda_n(A) \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\lambda_1(A) \neq \lambda_2(A) \neq \dots \neq \lambda_n(A)$. Thus, our claim is proven if $\prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i(A)$ is an observable and controllable mode of $(\bar{A}_r, \bar{b}_{k,r,\beta}, \bar{c}_r) := ((T^{-1}AT)_{[r]}, T_{[r]}^{-1} \tilde{b}_{k,r,\beta}, \tilde{c}_r T_{[r]})$. Since \bar{A}_r is diagonal with its first element being $\prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i(A)$, this can only be the case if the first element in $\bar{b}_{k,r,\beta}$ and in \bar{c}_r is non-zero.

To this end, we observe that since $\bar{c}_r = (\bar{O}^r)_{[r]}$ with $\bar{O}^r = \mathcal{O}^r(\bar{A}_1, \bar{c}_1)$ by Lemma 1, it follows from

$$\bar{O}^r = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \lambda_1(A) & \lambda_2(A) & \cdots & \lambda_n(A) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \lambda_1^{r-1}(A) & \lambda_2^{r-1}(A) & \cdots & \lambda_n^{r-1}(A) \end{pmatrix}$$

and [16, Sec. 0.9.11] that all elements in \bar{c}_r are non-zero. Further, the first element in $\bar{b}_{k,r,\beta}$ is zero for all $\beta \in \mathcal{I}_{n,k}$ if and only if

$$\underbrace{\left(\begin{array}{c} L_r (\bar{\mathcal{O}}^n)^{-1} R_{n-k+r} \\ \hline 0 \end{array} \right)_{[r]} (\bar{\mathcal{O}}^n)_{[k]} (T^{-1})_{[k]} = 0,}_{=:v}$$

where $L_j := (I_j \ 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{j \times n}$ and $R_j := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I_j \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times j}$. Since $(T^{-1})_{[k]} = T_{[k]}^{-1}$ by Lemma 1, this is the case if and only if $v = 0$. However, by going backwards in the proof of Theorem 2, we can see that

$$v = \begin{pmatrix} L_{k-r} \bar{\mathcal{O}}^n \\ L_r (\bar{\mathcal{O}}^n)^{-1} \bar{\mathcal{O}}^n \end{pmatrix}_{[k]} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{O}}^n_{(1:k-r),(1:n)} \\ L_r \end{pmatrix}_{[k]} \neq 0,$$

because $|v_1| = |\det(\bar{\mathcal{O}}^n_{(1:k-r,r+1:k)})| \neq 0$ by [16, Sec. 0.9.11]. Hence, there exists at least one β such that the first element \bar{b}_r is non-zero. This concludes the proof.

F Proof to Theorem 3

Let $X = FG$, $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $G \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ be a full rank factorization and $b = Gu \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Since $S^-(b) \leq k - 1$, we will show the following:

- *ii.* \implies *i.*: if $S^-(Fb) \leq k - 1$ then F is VB_{k-1} . From Proposition 4, F is then SC_k , which is why $F_{[k]} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\binom{n}{k}} \cup \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}^{\binom{n}{k}}$. Since $G_{[k]}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\binom{m}{k}}$, it follows by Lemma 1 Item i that $X_{[k]} = F_{[k]}G_{[k]}$ fulfills our claimed Item i.
- *i.* \implies *ii.*: Since $\text{rank}(X_{[k]}) = 1$ (Lemma 1 Item iv), it follows from 1 Item i that $X_{[k]}$ is factored as the product of a column vector $F_{[k]}$ and row vector $G_{[k]}$. By our sign assumption on $X_{[k]}$, this requires that F is SC_k . From Proposition 4 this implies that F is VB_{k-1} . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} S^-(Fb) \leq k - 1 &\iff S^-(FGu) \leq k - 1 \\ &\iff S^-(Xu) \leq k - 1 \end{aligned}$$

which proves our claim.

G Proof to Theorem 4

We begin by noticing that $X_{[k]}$ has no zero column by assumption, because all k columns are linearly independent. Further, $T(\sigma)$ is assumed to be as in Lemma 1. Based on that, the following arguments hold.

- \Leftarrow : since $(T(\sigma)X)_{[k]} > 0$ or $(T(\sigma)X)_{[k]} < 0$ it follows from Proposition 9 that $T(\sigma)X$ is SVB_k , which by Lemma 2 implies that X is VB_k .
- \Rightarrow : assuming that X is VB_{k-1} , any submatrix, $X_{(1:n),I}$, $I \in \mathcal{I}_{m,k}$ is also VB_{k-1} . It follows from Proposition 3 Item v then that $T(\sigma)X_{(1:n),I}$ is SVB_k , which is hwy $T(\sigma)X_{(1:n),I}$ is SSC_k by Proposition 9. Lastly, by Proposition 3 Item iv, $X_{(1:n),I}$ is SC_k .

It remains to show that each $(X_{(1:n),I})_{[k]}$ consists of elements that share the same sign accross all possible choices of I . This will be shown by considering a sequence of submatrices with properties that interlink all $(X_{(1:n),I})_{[k]}$. To this end, let $J^* \in \mathcal{I}_{m,k+1}$ be a fixed index set such that $\text{rank}(X_{(1:n),J^*}) = k + 1$ (J^* always exists because $\text{rank}(X) > r$). The sequence $\{X_{(1:n),J^i}\}_{i=1}^{k+1}$ of submatrices in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times k+1}$ is then defined by a sequence of index sets $\{J^i\}_{i=1}^{k+1}$, $J^i \in \mathcal{I}_{m,k+1}$ with the following properties:

1. $I \subset J^1$
2. $J^{k+1} = J^*$.
3. $X_{(1:n),J^i}$ is full rank for all $i \in (1 : k + 1)$
4. There are k elements in $J^i \cap J^{i+1}$ for all $i \in (1 : k)$

It is readily seen that such a sequence exists for any I :

$$J^1 = I \cup j \text{ with } j \in J^* \text{ and } \text{rank}(X_{(1:n),J^1}) = k + 1$$

Next J^2 has one element from I replaced with an element from J^* such that $\text{rank}(X_{(1:n),J^2}) = k + 1$. This is repeated until the sequence is complete. In the case that elements of I overlap with elements of J^* , the sequence will be created using the same steps with less elements in total.

Now, by construction (Item (4)), $(X_{(1:n),J^i})_{[k]}$ and $(X_{(1:n),J^{i+1}})_{[k]}$ share an identical column for all $i \in (1 : k)$. Since, as argued above, all $X_{(1:n),J^i}$ are SC_k , this implies that $(X_{(1:n),J^i})_{[k]}$ and $(X_{(1:n),J^{i+1}})_{[k]}$, and as such all $(X_{(1:n),J^i})_{[k]}$, $i \in (1 : k + 1)$, consist of elements that mutually share the same sign. Since $X_{(1:n),J^*}$ is a common element independent of the choice of I , our claim follows.

H Proof to Proposition 10

Without loss of generality we will assume that $n \geq m$. We will show that if all row initial column and rows minors of X are positive, then X is strictly totally positive or equivalently a submatrix from the first i columns are strictly totally positive by induction. The converse holds trivially.

The proof is performed by induction over three nested levels:

1. on total positivity of submatrices of the initial columns of X
2. on the consecutive k -minors including an added added column
3. on all the consecutive minors of the same order.

Base case 1 ($i = 1$): All elements in $X_{(1:n),\{1\}}$ a part of the column initial minors, which is why $X_{(1:n),\{1\}} > 0$.

Induction hypotheses 1: Assume that $X_{(1:n),(1:i-1)}$ is strictly totally positive, $i \in (2 : m)$.

Induction step 1: We want to show that $X_{(1:n),(1:i)}$ is strictly totally positive. By Proposition 6 and the induction hypotheses, it is sufficient to show that all consecutive minors that include the i -th column are strictly positive. This will be done by another induction from the i -th order minors down to the first order minors.

Base case 2 ($(X_{(1:n),(1:i)})_{[i]} > 0$): This follows from Proposition 5 as X is assumed to have positive column initial minors.

Induction hypotheses 2: Let all $i - k + 1$ consecutive minors be positive.

Induction step 2: We want to show that all $i - k$ consecutive minors that include the i -th column are positive. To see this, we will use another induction over $\det X_{(j:j+i-k-1),(k+1:i)}$, $j \in (1 : n - i + k + 1)$.

Base case 3 ($j = 1$): $\det X_{(1:i-k),(k+1:i)}$ is a row initial minor, which by assumption is positive.

Induction hypotheses 3: Assume that the minor $\det X_{(j-1:j+i-k-2),(k+1:i)}$ is positive.

Induction step 3: Using (2) we have

$$0 < \det X_{(j:j+i-k-1),(k+1:i)} = \frac{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \alpha_4}{\alpha_5} \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &:= \det X_{(j-1:j+i-k-1),(k:i)} \\ \alpha_2 &:= \det X_{(j:j+i-k-2),(k+1:i-1)} \\ \alpha_3 &:= \det X_{(j-1:j+i-k-2),(k+1:i)} \\ \alpha_4 &:= \det X_{(j:j+i-k-1),(k:i-1)} \\ \alpha_5 &:= \det X_{(j-1:j+i-k-2),(k:i-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

because all the minors on the right are positive by induction hypotheses and the assumptions of the theorem. Concretely, induction assumption 2 of positive $i - k + 1$ consecutive minors gives α_1 being positive. From induction assumption 1 of strict total positivity of the first $i - 1$ columns $\alpha_2, \alpha_4, \alpha_5$ are positive. From induction assumption 3 α_3 is positive. This concludes the proof all three inductions and, thus, the claim follows.

I Proof to Proposition 11

The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 10 with the following changes:

- Induction 1 is not needed, because we start with $X_{(1:n),(1:m-1)}$ being strictly totally positive by application of Proposition 10 to the first $m - 1$ columns.
- From Proposition 6 it is sufficient to show that all consecutive minors that are formed by using the m -th column need to be positive for minors of orders less than m and nonnegative for minors of order m .
- For induction 2, the base case still uses Proposition 5, but its non-strict part.
- For induction 3, when showing proving the sign of $\det X_{(j:j+m-k-1),(k+1:m)}$, where $k = 1$, the term α_1 is nonnegative instead of of positive.

J Proof to Theorem 5

The proof is similar to the proof in [22, Theorem 2.2(i)]. The idea is to use the bijection in Lemma 3 between the original matrix X and another matrix, C , which has to be totally positive for X to be SC_m . Using our modification for the non-strict case in Proposition 11, this switches a strict sign requirement to a non-strict sign requirement for some of the minors in C and, hence, X .

In particular, the minors in Lemma 3 that are allowed to be non-strict are those with

$$\begin{aligned} r &= m \\ \gamma_i &= m + \alpha_i. \end{aligned}$$

Since we are looking only at row and column initial minors, all minors are consecutive, which is why α is consecutive. Hence, these correspond to all the consecutive minors of X starting from the $m + 1$ row. This concludes the proof.

K Proof to Corollary 3

The matrix is sliced to look at submatrices $X_{(1:n),\beta}$. For β that are part of the exception Theorem 5 is applied otherwise Proposition 7 can be used. This then allows applying Theorem 5 to all $\text{TX}_{\gamma,(1:m)}$ for $\gamma \in \mathcal{I}_{n,k}$ which gives SC_k .

L Proof to Proposition 12

The relationship between the minors and the compound systems was already established in the proof of Theorem 1. Using Theorem 5 we see that, now, the compound system $(\tilde{A}_n, \tilde{b}_n, \tilde{c}_n)$ only needs to be (non-strictly) externally positive, but still requiring that $\tilde{c}\tilde{A}_n^{l-1}\tilde{b} > 0$ for all $l \in (1 : n - 1)$.

M Proof to Proposition 13

From the proof of Theorem 2 the equivalence between the impulse responses and the minors is already established. Corollary 3 can be used then to establish the above relaxed requirement of (strict) external positivity/negativity of the system corresponding the non-strict sign consistency assumption.

References

- [1] L. Benvenuti and L. Farina. A tutorial on the positive realization problem. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(5):651–664, 2004.
- [2] L. Benvenuti and L. Farina. A tutorial on the positive realization problem. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(5):651–664, 2004.
- [3] R. F. Brown. Compartmental system analysis: State of the art. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, BME-27(1):1–11, 1980.
- [4] T. Damm and L. N. Muhirwa. Zero crossings, overshoot and initial undershoot in the step and impulse responses of linear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(7):1925–1929, 2014.
- [5] Swaroop Darbha. On the synthesis of controllers for continuous time lti systems that achieve a non-negative impulse response. *Automatica*, 39(1):159 – 165, 2003.
- [6] Mario El-Khoury, Oscar D. Crisalle, and Roland Longchamp. Discrete transfer-function zeros and step-response extrema. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 26(2, Part 2):537 – 542, 1993.
- [7] Shaun Fallat, Charles R. Johnson, and Alan D. Sokal. Total positivity of sums, hadamard products and hadamard powers: Results and counterexamples. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 520:242 – 259, 2017.
- [8] L. Farina and S. Rinaldi. *Positive linear systems: theory and applications*. Pure and applied mathematics (John Wiley & Sons). Wiley, 2000.
- [9] Lorenzo Farina and Sergio Rinaldi. *Positive Linear Systems: Theory and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [10] Miroslav Fiedler. *Special matrices and their applications in numerical mathematics*. Courier Corporation, 2008.
- [11] C. Grussler, T. Damm, and R. Sepulchre. Balanced truncation of k -positive systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67:526–531, 2021.

- [12] Christian Grussler, Thiago Burghi, and Somayeh Sojoudi. Internally Hankel k -positive systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 60(4):2373–2392, 2022.
- [13] Christian Grussler and Anders Rantzer. On second-order cone positive systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(4):2717–2739, 2021.
- [14] Christian Grussler and Rodolphe Sepulchre. Variation diminishing linear time-invariant systems. *Automatica*, 136:109985, 2022.
- [15] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, 2013.
- [16] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2012.
- [17] Samuel Karlin. *Total positivity*, volume 1. Stanford University Press, 1968.
- [18] Michael Margaliot and Eduardo D. Sontag. Revisiting totally positive differential systems: A tutorial and new results. *Automatica*, 101:1–14, 2019.
- [19] Ron Ofir, Alexander Ovsevich, and Michael Margaliot. Contraction and k -contraction in lurie systems with applications to networked systems. *Automatica*, 159:111341, 2024.
- [20] Yoshito Ohta, Hajime Maeda, and Shinzo Kodama. Reachability, observability, and realizability of continuous-time positive systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 22(2):171–180, 1984.
- [21] Richard Pates, Carolina Bergeling, and Anders Rantzer. On the optimal control of relaxation systems. In *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6068–6073. IEEE, 2019.
- [22] J. M. Peña. Matrices with Sign Consistency of a Given Order. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 16(4):1100–1106, 1995.
- [23] Susan F. Phillips and Dale E. Seborg. Conditions that guarantee no overshoot for linear systems. *International Journal of Control*, 47(4):1043–1059, 1988.
- [24] Allan Pinkus. *Totally Positive Matrices*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [25] Anders Rantzer. Scalable control of positive systems. *European Journal of Control*, 24:72 – 80, 2015.
- [26] D. Swaroop and D. Niemann. Some new results on the oscillatory behavior of impulse and step responses for linear time invariant systems. In *Proceedings of 35th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, volume 3, pages 2511–2512 vol.3, 1996.

- [27] Hamed Taghavian and Mikael Johansson. External positivity of discrete-time linear systems: Transfer function conditions and output feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(11):6649–6663, 2023.
- [28] T. Tanaka and C. Langbort. The bounded real lemma for internally positive systems and h-infinity structured static state feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(9):2218–2223, 2011.
- [29] Eyal Weiss and Michael Margaliot. A generalization of linear positive systems. In *2019 27th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation (MED)*, pages 340–345, 2019.
- [30] Eyal Weiss and Michael Margaliot. A generalization of linear positive systems with applications to nonlinear systems: Invariant sets and the poincaré–bendixson property. *Automatica*, 123:109358, 2021.
- [31] Jan C Willems. Realization of systems with internal passivity and symmetry constraints. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 301(6):605–621, 1976.