

Exploiting structural observability and graph colorability for optimal sensor placement in water distribution networks

J.J.H. van Gemert, V. Breschi, D.R. Yntema, K.J. Keesman, M. Lazar

Abstract—Water distribution networks (WDNs) are critical systems for our society and detecting leakages is important for minimizing losses and water waste. This makes optimal sensor placement for leakage detection very relevant. Existing sensor placement methods rely on simulation-based scenarios, often lacking structure and generalizability, or depend on the knowledge of specific parameters of the WDN as well as on initial sensor data for linearization and demand estimation. Motivated by this, this paper investigates the observability of an entire WDN, based on structural observability theory. This allows us to establish the conditions for the observability of the WDN model, independently of parameter uncertainties and without the need for initial sensor data. Additionally, a sensor placement algorithm is proposed, that leverages such observability conditions and graph theory and accounts for the industrial and material costs. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, we apply it to a hydraulic-transient WDN model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Water distribution networks (WDNs) are essential pressurized systems that provide drinking water to various regions. Undetected leakages and bursts lead to significant water losses and contamination, which can be costly and a waste of precious resources, especially considering the growing issue of water scarcity due to climate change. Even in highly developed countries like the Netherlands, up to 5% of drinking water is lost on a yearly basis [1]. In this context, placing sensors in a WDN to monitor the network and effectively identifying and localizing leaks is essential [2]. However, placing sensors in a WDN is both costly and time-consuming, making optimal sensor placement critical to maximizing detection capabilities while taking into account resource constraints.

Traditional sensor placement methods in WDNs rely on simulation-based approaches where multiple leakage scenarios are simulated with several sensor combinations to find the best solution [3]–[5]. Although these methods have promising results overall, they are unstructured and have poor generalizability since leakage detection is guaranteed only across the (finite) scenarios explored in simulation. Therefore, incorporating control theory, particularly observability theory, could be advantageous for optimal sensor placement in WDNs to improve leakage detection and monitoring. Achieving observability allows for the reconstruction of

pressure and flow rates throughout the entire WDN. By continuously comparing the reconstructed pressure and flow rates with expected values, any discrepancies exceeding a predefined threshold can be flagged as a potential leakage. With accurate reconstruction, these leakages can be flagged more accurately. Moreover, using observability theory can result in a more structured sensor placement approach that exploits all possible sensor placement combinations.

In literature, several methods using observability theory for sensor placement have been proposed. In [6], [7], two approaches utilizing the observability Gramian to guarantee observability and maximize the minimum eigenvalue of the Gramian to enhance detectability are presented. The method introduced in [8] extends this by examining the ratio between the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of the observability Gramian. However, these methods rely on the assumption that the model parameters are known, e.g., pipe lengths, diameters, flow resistance, and demand patterns, and can be sensitive to deviations in these model parameters. For WDNs, these parameters are often uncertain or unknown, which can result in unobservable outcomes in scenarios where these values vary. A method that accounts for some variations in parameters is proposed in [9]. They present an algorithm that places sensors such that the state estimation error of a Kalman filter estimator is minimized, thereby enhancing network-wide observability. Furthermore, the method in [10] accounts for an even larger set of uncertainties by developing a new algorithm based on structural functional observability (SFO). Their approach provides necessary and sufficient conditions for observability without relying on system observability decomposition and offers efficient greedy heuristics for selecting a minimal number of sensors from a predetermined set. Although these methods are promising, they are primarily developed for linear dynamical models while WDN models are generally nonlinear [11]. Therefore, initial sensors would be required to gather pressure and flow rate data to determine their average values for linearization. Additionally, the observability guarantees would only hold locally around the linearization point [12]. Thus, it would be beneficial to develop a method that considers uncertainties in model parameters and guarantees the observability of the WDN.

Motivated by this, this paper aims to exploit structural observability principles based on the existing structural controllability theory in [13], which can also be applied to establish observability of a WDN model. By utilizing structural observability, we do not rely on the assumptions that the system parameters are fully known or the availability of

J.J.H. van Gemert, V. Breschi and M. Lazar are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands. E-mail of corresponding author: J.J.H.v.Gemert@tue.nl

D. Yntema is with Wetsus, Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Water Technology, 8900 Leeuwarden, The Netherlands.

K.J. Keesman is with the Systems and Control Group, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

initial sensors for linearization. Additionally, we present an optimal sensor placement algorithm that exploits colorability [13] and graph centrality measures, guaranteeing observability for a nonlinear WDN model with uncertain parameters while considering resource constraints. The sensor placement algorithm incorporates a cost-based search algorithm that considers the importance of the possible sensor location, the number of connected states, and the industrial cost of sensor placement associated with sensor installation and material costs. We demonstrate the effectiveness of this algorithm with an example based on a generally accepted hydraulic-transient WDN model given in [14].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the considered system dynamics, along with observability theory, structural system theory, and graph theory are introduced. In Section III the setting as well as the problem formulation are given and in Section IV, the main results including the observability conditions and the sensor placement algorithm are described. Afterward, two examples using the introduced optimal sensor placement algorithm are shown in Section V, followed by the conclusions in Section VI.

Notation: Let \mathbb{R} , $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and $\mathbb{R}_{> 0}$ denote the field of real numbers, the set of non-negative reals, and the set of positive reals, respectively. A variable $a \in \{0, 1\}$ is called a binary variable. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, x_i denotes the i -th element of x , $\sqrt{x} = [\sqrt{x_1} \ \sqrt{x_2} \ \dots \ \sqrt{x_n}]^\top$ denotes the element-wise square root of x and $|x| = [|x_1| \ |x_2| \ \dots \ |x_n|]^\top$ the element-wise absolute value of x . A vector $\vec{0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes a vector that contains all zero elements, where a vector that contains only ones is denoted by $\mathbb{1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$, A^\top denotes its transpose and A^{-1} denotes its inverse. A diagonal matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ is denoted as $\text{diag}\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{n_x}$.

II. PRELIMINARIES

We now introduce the preliminaries on observability theory, structured systems, and graph theory which will be needed throughout the paper. Note that the class of systems considered in this section is already a generalization of the WDN model described in Section III.

A. Preliminaries on observability theory

Consider the continuous-time, autonomous, time-invariant, nonlinear system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= f(x(t)), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \\ y(t) &= Cx(t), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$ are the state and the output of the system, respectively, $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_x}$ is the output measurement matrix. In this paper, we will mainly focus on the linearization of (1) around an arbitrary operation point $x_o \in \mathbb{X}$, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \dot{x}(t) &= A(x_o) \delta x(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \\ \delta y(t) &= C \delta x(t), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\delta x(t) = x(t) - x_o$ and $A(x_o) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ is the state matrix. When studying the observability of a system, we aim to determine whether the system's internal state $x(t)$, can be estimated from its available output measurements over time according to the definition below.

Definition II.1 ([15]) A system (1) or (2), is said to be observable if, for any unknown initial state $x(0) \in \mathbb{X}$, there exists a finite time such that the output $y(\cdot) : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$ suffices to uniquely determine $x(0)$.

Given any operation point $x_o \in \mathbb{X}$, local observability of the nonlinear system (1) around the operation point can be studied using the following definition.

Definition II.2 ([16]) If the linearized system (2), derived from (1), around an arbitrary operation point $x_o \in \mathbb{X}$ is observable, then the nonlinear system is locally observable around x_o . If additionally, the linearized system is observable for all $x_o \in \mathbb{X}$, then the nonlinear system (1) is observable.

Next, we introduce structural observability, a framework that enables the study of observability of (1) based on the linearized system (2), while accounting for uncertainties in both the model parameters and the operation point.

B. Structured linear systems

Structural system theory uses so-called pattern matrices to evaluate the observability of uncertain linear systems solely based on their structure. To that end, let us first introduce the concept of a pattern matrix \mathcal{X} as defined in [13].

Definition II.3 ([13]) Consider a family of matrices $X \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ sharing the same structure, defined by the pattern matrix $\mathcal{X} \in \{0, *, ?\}^{p \times q}$. Then we say that X belongs to the class of pattern matrices $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q} \mid & X(i, j) = 0 \text{ if } \mathcal{X}(i, j) = 0, \\ & X(i, j) \neq 0 \text{ if } \mathcal{X}(i, j) = *, \\ & X(i, j) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ if } \mathcal{X}(i, j) = ? \}. \end{aligned}$$

According to Definition II.3, for system (2), we define the pattern matrices $\mathcal{A} \in \{0, *, ?\}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $\mathcal{C} \in \{0, *, ?\}^{n_y \times n_x}$, such that $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ and $C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C})$, representing the family of systems (2). We refer to this family of systems as a *structured system*, denoted by the pair of pattern matrices $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$. In the case of WDNs, embedding system (2) in a structural representation allows us to handle uncertain WDN parameters in the state matrix and arbitrary operation points. The notation of a structured system allows for an extension of the concept of observability introduced in Section II, to that of structural observability, which is formalized as follows.

Definition II.4 A structured system $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$, is called strongly structurally observable if the pair (A, C) is observable for all $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ and $C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C})$.

In [13], necessary and sufficient conditions for establishing the strong structural controllability of a structured system are




Fig. 1. A schematic view of a triangular WDN.

introduced. By exploiting the duality between controllability and observability [12], these conditions can also be used to verify the strong structural observability of the pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$ by applying the theory to $(\mathcal{A}^\top, \mathcal{C}^\top)$. To assess strong structural observability and evaluate the importance of nodes within a network, we will utilize graph-based methods. To facilitate this, we first introduce the necessary preliminaries on graph theory.

C. Preliminaries on graph theory

A graph is defined as $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is the set of nodes and $\mathcal{E} = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is the set of edges (or links). A graph is undirected if each edge connects nodes bidirectionally. Conversely, a graph is directed if each edge has a direction, indicating a one-way relation from one node to another. For both directed and undirected graphs, the adjacency matrix A_{adj} , indicates whether pairs of nodes are connected by an edge. For an undirected graph, the adjacency matrix is always symmetric, namely $A_{\text{adj}}(i, j) = A_{\text{adj}}(j, i) = 1$ if there is an edge between v_j and v_i , and 0 otherwise. Meanwhile for a directed graph, $A_{\text{adj}}(i, j) = 1$ if there is an edge from v_j to v_i , but $A_{\text{adj}}(i, j) = 0$ if there is no edge from v_j to v_i . For directed graphs, the incidence matrix A_{inc} indicates the relationship between nodes and edges, i.e., $A_{\text{inc}}(i, j) = -1$ if v_i is the tail of edge e_j , and $A_{\text{inc}}(i, j) = 1$ if v_i is the head of edge e_j . As an example, consider the WDN in Fig. 1, the corresponding adjacency and incidence matrices are

$$A_{\text{adj}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_{\text{inc}} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

To assess the importance of each node, centrality measures are used in graph theory to evaluate a node's influence within a network. While various centrality algorithms exist, we will focus on PageRank centrality for sensor placement. PageRank centrality not only considers the number of connections of a node but also the significance of the nodes it connects to. The PageRank vector containing the ranking of each node denoted by PR, is given as the unique positive solution to

$$\text{PR}(i) = \alpha \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{A_{\text{adj}}(i, j)}{d_j^{\text{in}}} \text{PR}(j) + \frac{1 - \alpha}{n}, \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is the convex combination coefficient, n the number of nodes, A_{inc} the incidence matrix and d_j^{in} the in-degree of node j , [17]. The above-defined graph theory will be used throughout the paper to assess strong structural observability as well as the importance of possible sensor locations.

III. SETTING AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

Let us consider a nonlinear elastic water column (EWC) model for hydraulic transient analysis of WDNs given by dynamics (1) with [14]:

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} q(t) \\ h(t) \end{bmatrix}, \\ f(x(t)) &= \begin{bmatrix} -L^{-1}R \text{diag}\{|q(t)|\}q(t) + L^{-1}A_{\text{inc}}^\top h(t) \\ F^{-1} \left(A_{\text{inc}}q(t) - Q - D\sqrt{h(t)} \right) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $F = \text{diag}\{\frac{1}{2}|A_{\text{inc}}|C_l + C_n\}$, $Q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the outflow and demand, while the remaining parameters are defined in Table I. Note that R, L, D are diagonal matrices, with R and L both being positive definite, and all elements of C_l and C_n are positive.

TABLE I
PARAMETERS OF THE WDN MODEL (5).

Parameter	Symbol	Dimension
Volumetric flow rate	$q(t)$	\mathbb{R}^m
Piezometric head	$h(t)$	\mathbb{R}^n
Hydraulic inductance	L	$\mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$
Hydraulic resistance	R	$\mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$
Valve and pressure discharge	D	$\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$
Hydraulic link capacitance	C_l	\mathbb{R}^m
Hydraulic node capacitance	C_n	\mathbb{R}^n
Incidence matrix	A_{inc}	$\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$

Assumption III.1 The flow rate in each pipe is always positive as well as the piezometric head in each junction, i.e., $q(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ and $h(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. This implies that, $x(t) \in \mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$.

Note that WDNs are pressurized distribution systems. Therefore, Assumption III.1 accurately portrays a real-world scenario [11].

A. Problem formulation

Let us assume that L, R, D, C_l, C_n and Q in (1) with (5) are *unknown*, and let us assume we can shape the output measurement matrix, defining it as follows: $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_x}$ where $C(i, j) \in \{1, 0\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n_y$ and $j = 1, \dots, n_x$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^{n_x} C(i, j) = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n_y} C(i, j) \leq 1$. Note that these assumptions on the output matrix imply that each row contains exactly one element equal to 1, and the rows are linearly independent. This specific format is chosen to represent a realistic WDN scenario, as pressure and flow sensors in WDNs cannot be connected to multiple states, e.g. a flow sensor is restricted to measure the flow rate in one specific pipe only.

Under these assumptions, our first objective is to study the observability of (1) with (5) and to establish the conditions that ensure the observability of the WDN model.

By relying on the solution to the former problem, our second objective is to develop a sensor placement approach that minimizes n_y , i.e. the number of sensors, guaranteeing the observability of the WDN model while considering industrial costs and relying on the structural properties of the WDN model only.

IV. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we address the two main objectives. The first subsection focuses on studying the observability of the nonlinear WDN model, while the second subsection introduces an algorithm aimed at tackling our second objective.

A. Structural observability of the WDN model

To investigate the observability of the WDN model in (1) and (5) without estimating its unknown parameters, we employ a structural approach for linear systems inspired by [13]. To this end, we first linearize the WDN model around an operation point $x_o = (q_o^\top, h_o^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{X}$, leading to (2) with

$$A(x_o) = \begin{bmatrix} -L^{-1}R \operatorname{diag} \left\{ \frac{2q_o^2}{|q_o|} \right\} & L^{-1}A_{\text{inc}}^\top \\ F^{-1}A_{\text{inc}} & -F^{-1}D \operatorname{diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{h_o}} \right\} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Next, we derive a structured representation for the linearized WDN model (2) with (6). We begin by defining a pattern matrix $\mathcal{C} \in \{0, *\}^{n_y \times n_x}$ with

$$\mathcal{C}(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } C(i, j) = 0 \\ * & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

such that $C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C})$. We now focus on A in (6). Since L and R are nonzero diagonal matrices, and the flow rate is assumed to be always nonzero (see Assumption III.1), its first block is a diagonal matrix with nonzero entries. We can thus define a pattern matrix $\mathcal{I} = \operatorname{diag}\{*\} \in \{0, *\}^{m \times m}$ such that

$$-L^{-1}R \operatorname{diag} \left\{ \frac{2q_o^2}{|q_o|} \right\} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{I}).$$

For the fourth block of A a similar reasoning holds, leading to

$$-F^{-1}D \operatorname{diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{h_o}} \right\} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}).$$

Nonetheless, due to the arbitrary nature of the discharge matrix D , $\mathcal{D} = \operatorname{diag}\{?\} \in \{0, ?\}^{n \times n}$. Next, we look at the second and fourth blocks of A . The multiplication of the diagonal nonzero matrices L and F with the (transpose) incidence matrix leads to a pattern matrix $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inc}} \in \{0, *\}^{n \times m}$ with

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{inc}}(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A(i, j) = 0 \\ * & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

such that

$$L^{-1}A_{\text{inc}}^\top \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inc}}^\top), \quad F^{-1}A_{\text{inc}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inc}}),$$

which represents the coupling between the two sets of states in the linearized WDN model (6). We can now define the pattern matrix

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{I} & \mathcal{A}_{\text{inc}}^\top \\ \mathcal{A}_{\text{inc}} & \mathcal{D} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}} \in \{0, *, ?\}^{n_x \times n_x}$ such that $A(x_o) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}})$. We can now make some conclusions on the observability of the nonlinear WDN model based on the above-defined structured system $(\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}}, \mathcal{C})$.

Lemma IV.1 *Suppose Assumption III.1 holds and the structured system $(\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}}, \mathcal{C})$ with (7) and (8), is strongly structurally observable. Then, the nonlinear WDN model (1) with (5) is observable as in Definition II.1.*

Proof: This result follows directly from three key points. First, by Definition II.2, a nonlinear system is observable if its linearization is observable around every operation point $x_o \in \mathbb{X}$. Second, Assumption III.1, specifies that the states of the WDN model operate within a specific set, namely $q(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ and $h(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. This implies that every linearization point $x_o = (q_o^\top, h_o^\top)^\top$ lies within the set $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^m \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ ensuring that $A(x_o) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}})$ for all possible operation points. Finally, since the structured system $(\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}}, \mathcal{C})$ is observable, then by Definition II.4, the pair $(A(x_o), \mathcal{C})$ is observable for all $A(x_o) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}})$ and $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C})$, thus concluding the proof. ■

To verify the observability of the structured linearized WDN system, we apply the colorability approach introduced in [13]. This approach employs a color-change rule to determine if the structured system is controllable, but it can also be applied to structured observability due to the dual relation between the two system properties. Before introducing colorability, we need to introduce two more matrices $\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{A}^\top \quad \mathcal{C}^\top]$ and $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = [\bar{\mathcal{A}}^\top \quad \bar{\mathcal{C}}^\top]$ where

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}(i, i) := \begin{cases} * & \text{if } \mathcal{A}(i, i) = 0 \\ ? & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

We can associate a directed graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M}) = (V, E)$ as follows. The set of nodes is taken as $V = \{1, \dots, n_x, \dots, n_x + n_y\}$. For the edges we include $(j, i) \in E_* \in V \times V$ if $M(i, j) = *$ and $(j, i) \in E_? \in V \times V$ if $M(i, j) = ?$. To distinguish between these edges visually, we represent the edges in E_* with solid arrows and those in $E_?$ with dashed arrows. For a graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$, one can define the color change rule as follows.

Every node in V is originally colored white. If node j has exactly one out-neighbor i with $(j, i) \in E_*$ that is white (self-loops included), then we change the color of node i , to white. If the nodes $V(i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n_x$, i.e., all the nodes that represent the states of \mathcal{A}^\top , then the graph is called *colorable* [13].

Example IV.2 Consider the following pattern matrices

$$\mathcal{A}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * & * \\ * & * & 0 \\ * & ? & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{A}}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} * & * & * \\ * & ? & 0 \\ * & ? & ? \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} * \\ 0 \\ * \end{bmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

which form the combined matrices

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * & * & * \\ * & * & 0 & 0 \\ * & ? & * & * \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \bar{\mathcal{M}} = \begin{bmatrix} * & * & * & * \\ * & ? & 0 & 0 \\ * & ? & ? & * \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

The associated graphs $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{G}(\bar{\mathcal{M}})$ are shown in the first column with 2 plots in Fig. 2. In examining the upper left graph in Fig. 2 linked to $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$, we see that each node has two out-neighbors that are white. This means that no node can be colored, rendering the graph non-colorable. Now, let us adjust \mathcal{C} as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * & * & * & 0 \\ * & * & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ * & ? & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

As shown in columns 2 and 3 in Fig. 2, with this new \mathcal{C} matrix, the graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ is now colorable. \square




Fig. 2. Examples of the color change rule based on pattern matrices \mathcal{M} and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ in (11) and \mathcal{M} in (12).

Based on this color change rule, we now give the condition for which the structured system is strongly structurally observable.

Definition IV.3 ([13]) A structured system $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$ is strongly structurally observable if the graphs associated with the pattern matrices $M = [\mathcal{A}^\top \quad \mathcal{C}^\top]$ and $\bar{M} = [\bar{\mathcal{A}}^\top \quad \mathcal{C}^\top]$ are colorable.

Based on Definition IV.3 and Corollary IV.1, the WDN model (1) with (5) is observable if the graphs $M = [\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}}^\top \quad \mathcal{C}^\top]$ and $\bar{M} = [\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\text{WDN}}^\top \quad \mathcal{C}^\top]$ are colorable.

Next, we define a search algorithm to efficiently select the optimal measurement matrix \mathcal{C} , which results in a colorable combination of $(\mathcal{A}^\top, \mathcal{C}^\top)$. Note that this implicitly yields a sensor placement solution via the structure of the resulting \mathcal{C} matrix. This structure can be further optimized via cost functions and other relevant criteria.

B. Sensor placement algorithm

To set up the sensor placement algorithm, we first introduce a procedure that verifies the colorability of a graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ following the color change rule provided in [13], detailed in Algorithm 1. Here, $x\{i\}$ denotes the i -th element of a vector x , and $\mathcal{M}\{i, j\}$ represents the element at row i and column j in \mathcal{M} . The vector Color is a binary vector where $\text{Color}\{i\} = 0$ signifies a black node and $\text{Color}\{i\} = 1$ a white node. Entries in \mathcal{M} marked with ? are ignored,

as they do not affect colorability. The algorithm begins by computing each node's out-degree (number of outgoing edges) and placing nodes with only one outgoing edge into a *queue*. Starting with these nodes, the algorithm iteratively colors the out-neighbors of nodes with only one outgoing edge black if they haven't been colored yet. Once a node is colored black, its incoming edges are removed from \mathcal{M} , retaining only edges in E_* that connect to white nodes. The outgoing edges of each node are then updated. This step is essential, as the edges that connect to black nodes are not of interest. The algorithm continues until the *queue* is empty. If all nodes originally associated with \mathcal{A} are colored black at the end, the algorithm returns 1, confirming that the graph is colorable and hence, the underlying WDN model is observable.

Algorithm 1 Colorability check for observability

```

1: Input:  $\mathcal{M}$  or  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$  of size  $n_x \times (n_x + n_y)$ 
2: Output: Binary value isColorable
3:  $\text{Color} = \vec{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_x + n_y)}$ 
4: if  $\mathcal{M}\{i, j\} == ?$  then
5:    $\mathcal{M}\{i, j\} = 0$ 
6: end if
7:  $\text{out\_Deg}\{i\} = \sum_{j=1}^{(n_x + n_y)} \mathcal{M}\{i, j\}$ 
8: for  $i = 1, \dots, n_x + n_y$  do
9:   if  $\text{out\_Deg}\{i\} == 1$  then
10:     $\text{queue} = [\text{queue}; i]$ 
11:   end if
12: end for
13: while  $\text{queue} \neq \emptyset$  do
14:    $\text{Node} = \text{queue}\{1\}$ 
15:    $\text{queue}\{1\} = []$ 
16:    $\text{out\_edge} = (\mathcal{M}\{\text{Node}, :} == *)$ 
17:   if  $\text{length}(\text{out\_edge}) == 1$  then
18:      $\text{newNode} = \text{out\_edge}$ 
19:      $\text{queue} = [\text{queue}; \text{newNode}]$ 
20:     if  $\text{Color}\{\text{newNode}\} == 0$  then
21:        $\text{Color}\{\text{newNode}\} = 1$ 
22:        $\text{in\_edge} = (\mathcal{M}\{\text{Node}, :} == *)$ 
23:       for  $i = 1, \dots, \text{length}(\text{in\_edge})$  do
24:          $\mathcal{M}\{\text{in\_edge}, \text{newNode}\} = 0$ 
25:       end for
26:     end if
27:   end if
28: end while
29: Output: isColorable = true if all nodes from 1 to  $n_x$ 
are colored, else false

```

Next, we present the search algorithm for sensor placement defined in Algorithm 2, with its corresponding flowchart illustrated in Fig. 3. The structure of \mathcal{C} considered in this algorithm is defined in Section III-A. We remark that the goal of the search algorithm is to minimize n_y , i.e., the number of sensors, while considering industrial costs and scalability. In describing the algorithm, we use the term "possible sensor location" to refer to the state or node to which a sensor can be




Fig. 3. Search algorithm for sensor placement based on colorability.

assigned. The inputs required for this algorithm include the pattern matrices \mathcal{A} and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$, a vector containing the industrial cost of each possible sensor combination, denoted by c_{ind} , the PageRank value for each node and a vector containing all the possible sensor locations denoted by $nodes$. The PageRank values can be calculated using the inverse of the PageRank formula as described in equation (4). The inverse of the original PageRank vector is considered, as a higher centrality implies more interest in the corresponding sensor location, thus lowering its cost. The PageRank values are stored in the vector $c_{\text{PR}}(i) = \frac{1}{c_{\text{PR}}(i)}$.

The first step in Algorithm 2 (line 3 and 4), is to compute the in- and out-degree of each node and store them in the vectors c_{in} and c_{out} , respectively. Before preceding, all cost vectors are normalized:

$$c_{x_n} = \frac{c_x - \min(c_x)}{\max(c_x) - \min(c_x)}, \quad (13)$$

such that $c_{x_n} \in [0, 1]^n$. The normalized cost vectors are used to calculate the average cost of each possible sensor location c_n , with every unique cost stored in c_{idx} , with the lowest cost first and the highest cost last. The possible sensor locations are then grouped, based on their average cost (see lines 5 to 10).

The algorithm proceeds by iterating over each group, evaluating the possible sensor locations in the n^{th} group alongside those from all preceding groups (i.e., the groups 1 through n). These subsets of possible sensor combinations are stored in \mathcal{K} (line 19). For example, if $S_n = [1, 2, 3]$ and the subset size $k = 2$, the possible combinations are

$$\mathcal{K}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

To avoid repetitive evaluations, only combinations that include elements from the current group, $group\{n\}$, are considered, resulting in \mathcal{K}_n as indicated in line 20.

To enhance computational efficiency, particularly for larger networks, the algorithm iteratively evaluates subsets with possible sensor combinations within S_n .

Algorithm 2 Heuristic Search for Minimal Sensor Placement with Colorability Check

- 1: **Input:** \mathcal{A} and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ of size $n_x \times n_x$, c_{PR} , and c_{ind} of size n_x and $nodes$ of size n_x
- 2: **Output:** Observable sensor configurations C_{obs}
- 3: $c_{\text{in}} = \mathcal{A}\mathbf{1}$
- 4: $c_{\text{out}} = \mathcal{A}^\top\mathbf{1}$
- 5: Normalize c_{in} , c_{out} , c_{ind} , c_{PR} using (13)
- 6: $c_n = \frac{1}{4}(c_{\text{PR}} + c_{\text{in}} + c_{\text{out}} + c_{\text{ind}})$
- 7: $c_{idx} = \text{unique costs in } c_n$
- 8: **for** $i = 1, \dots, \text{length}(c_{idx})$ **do**
- 9: $group\{i\} = (nodes == c_{idx}\{i\})$
- 10: **end for**
- 11: $C_{\text{obs}} = []$
- 12: $C_{\text{unobs}} = []$
- 13: **for** $n = 1, \dots, \text{length}(group)$ **do**
- 14: $S_n = []$
- 15: **for** $j = 1, \dots, n$ **do**
- 16: $S_n = [S_n; group\{j\}]$
- 17: **end for**
- 18: **for** $k = 1, \dots, \text{length}(S_n)$ **do**
- 19: $\mathcal{K} = \text{subset of } k \text{ combinations within } S_n$
- 20: $\mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K} \cap group\{n\}$
- 21: **for** $i = 1, \dots, \text{size}(\mathcal{K}_n, 1)$ **do**
- 22: $\mathcal{C} = \text{diag}(\mathcal{K}_n\{:, i\})$
- 23: $\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{A}^\top, \mathcal{C}^\top]$
- 24: $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = [\bar{\mathcal{A}}^\top, \mathcal{C}^\top]$
- 25: Colorability₁ \leftarrow Algorithm 1 with **input** \mathcal{M}
- 26: Colorability₂ \leftarrow Algorithm 1 with **input** $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$
- 27: **if** Colorability₁ == 1 & Colorability₂ == 1 **then**
- 28: $C_{\text{obs}} = [C_{\text{obs}}; \mathcal{C}]$
- 29: **else**
- 30: $C_{\text{unobs}} = [C_{\text{unobs}}; \mathcal{C}]$
- 31: **end if**
- 32: **end for**
- 33: **if** $C_{\text{obs}} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 34: **break;**
- 35: **end if**
- 36: **end for**
- 37: **end for**
- 38: **Output:** C_{obs} with all nodes as sensors if no minimal configuration is found

For each combination, the associated matrix \mathcal{C} is defined using the format defined in Section III-A. Together with \mathcal{A} and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$, the colorability of \mathcal{M} and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ is evaluated and thereby the observability of the pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$. This is done using Algorithm 1 for the colorability check (lines 25 and 26). If a sensor combination passes this check, the corresponding matrix \mathcal{C} is stored in C_{obs} . If it fails, it is stored in C_{unobs} . When an observable pair is found, the algorithm terminates

and returns C_{obs} , which enhances computational efficiency further. If no observable combination is identified within the current group, the algorithm proceeds to the next group and resumes from line 13.

It is important to note that this algorithm guarantees an observable solution. In the worst-case scenario, the algorithm will select all possible sensor locations, returning \mathcal{C} such that $n_y = n_x$.

V. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

In the first example, we analyze a star network with an associated pattern matrix:

$$\mathcal{A}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & * \\ * & * & * & * & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

The edge between nodes 1 and 4, represented by $\mathcal{A}^\top(4, 1)$ in (14), introduces a cycle among nodes 1, 5, and 4. This modified star network is chosen to include the presence of cycles typical of most dynamical networks including WDNs. The cost associated with potential sensor locations is listed in Table II. Based on the pattern matrix (14) and the costs from

TABLE II
SENSOR COSTS FOR THE STAR NETWORK IN (14).

Sensor location	c_{out}	c_{in}	c_{PR}	c_{ind}	c_n
5	1	1	0	1	1
4	0.333	0	1	1	0.381
1	0	0.333	0.83503	1	0.000486
2	0	0	1	1	0
3	0	0	1	1	0

Table II, the search algorithm returns the following pattern matrix \mathcal{C} as its solution,

$$\mathcal{C}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{C}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

resulting in a colorable graph for the structured system $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$ with (14) and (15). Fig. 4 illustrates the graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ associated with $\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{A}^\top \ \mathcal{C}^\top]$. Referring back to the color-change rule outlined in Section IV-A, we observe that connecting a sensor to nodes 2, 3, and 4 instead of 2, 3, and 1, would also produce a colorable graph. However, due to the significantly lower cost associated with node 1 compared to node 4, the algorithm selects this configuration as the optimal solution.

Next, we show an example of the WDN illustrated in Fig. 1. The corresponding incidence matrix is given in equation (3), with the pattern matrix \mathcal{A}_{WDN} constructed in Section IV-A and detailed in equation (8). The costs associated with the possible sensor locations in the WDN are provided in Table III. In this network, states 1 through 4 represent flow rates in the pipes, while states 5 through 8 correspond to the pressure




Fig. 4. Star network: Colorable graph $\mathcal{G}([\mathcal{A}^\top, \mathcal{C}^\top])$ where a star denotes a sensor, a circle denotes a state and the color denotes the cost of connecting a sensor to that specific state.

TABLE III
SENSOR COST OF THE WDN NETWORK IN (8).

Sensor location	c_{out}	c_{in}	c_{PR}	c_{ind}	c_n
2	0.75	0.75	0.16967	1	1
3	0.75	0.75	0.16967	1	1
5	1	1	0.14991	0	0.78423
4	0.75	0.75	0.14578	0.4995	0.78086
1	0.75	0.75	0	0.4995	0.76509
6	0.5	0.5	0.61626	0	0.39658
7	0.5	0.5	0.61626	0	0.39658
8	0	0	1	0	0

in each junction. Due to the higher installation expenses associated with flow sensors, the cost values for these sensors are higher, as shown in c_{in} in Table III. Additionally, placing sensors connected to states 2 and 3 is undesirable due to their remote locations, which significantly increase their installation costs. Applying the search algorithm to this network with the pattern matrix \mathcal{A}_{WDN} with (8), and the cost values in Table III, we obtain the following colorable matrices \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 as optimal solutions for sensor placement:

$$\mathcal{C}_1^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{C}_1^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{C}_2^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{C}_2^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

Although placing a sensor connected to state 8, i.e., a pressure sensor at the tank, would not add any extra cost, it would have minimal impact on the colorability of the overall network. Consequently, the search algorithm does not select such a solution. Moreover, according to the color-change rule, it is evident that choosing sensor pairs $\{2, 6\}$ or $\{3, 7\}$ would also yield a colorable graph. However, as shown in Table III, these configurations would lead to a higher overall cost, explaining the optimal solution provided by the search algorithm.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we studied the observability of a WDN model using structural observability theory. We established




Fig. 5. WDN network: Colorable graph $\mathcal{G}([\mathcal{A}_{\text{WDN}}^{\top}, \mathcal{C}^{\top}])$ where a star denotes a sensor, a circle denotes a state and the color denotes the cost of connecting a sensor to that specific state.

the conditions under which the WDN model is observable, independent of parameter uncertainties, and without the need for initial sensor data. Additionally, we presented a sensor placement algorithm that exploits colorability and graph centrality measures, guaranteeing observability for a nonlinear WDN model with uncertain parameters. The developed search algorithm incorporates a cost-based search that considers the importance of each possible sensor location, the number of connected states, and the industrial costs. The proposed search algorithm was used to construct observable configurations for two examples including a WDN. Through these examples, we demonstrated that the proposed approach allows for cost-effective sensor placement and can be tailored to meet the preferences of the water industry.

For future work, some directions can be explored to further build on the results of this paper. One potential direction is to extend the proposed sensor placement algorithm to handle larger, more complex WDNs. Additionally, reducing the conservatism of the proposed algorithms, aiming to achieve observability with fewer sensors while maintaining the detectability of leakages.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. N. Europe, "Eu urges to monitor and reduce water leakages," 2023, accessed: 2024-10-29. [Online]. Available: www.waternewseurope.com/reduce-water-leakages
- [2] A. M. Annaswamy, K. H. Johansson, and G. Pappas, "Control for societal-scale challenges: Road map 2030," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 30–32, 2024.

- [3] R. Sarrate, J. Blesa, F. Nejari, and J. Quevedo, "Sensor placement for leak detection and location in water distribution networks," *Water Science and Technology: Water Supply*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 795–803, 2014.
- [4] M. V. Casillas, V. Puig, L. E. Garza-Castanón, and A. Rosich, "Optimal sensor placement for leak location in water distribution networks using genetic algorithms," *Sensors*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 14984–15005, 2013.
- [5] D. Steffebauer, M. Neumayer, M. Günther, and D. Fuchs-Hansch, "Sensor placement and leakage localization considering demand uncertainties," *Procedia Engineering*, vol. 89, pp. 1160–1167, 2014.
- [6] C. V. Geelen, D. R. Yntema, J. Molenaar, and K. J. Keesman, "Optimal sensor placement in hydraulic conduit networks: A state-space approach," *Water*, vol. 13, no. 21, p. 3105, 2021.
- [7] S. D. Bopardikar, "A randomized approach to sensor placement with observability assurance," *Automatica*, vol. 123, p. 109340, 2021.
- [8] A. N. Montanari and L. A. Aguirre, "Observability of network systems: A critical review of recent results," *Journal of Control, Automation and Electrical Systems*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 1348–1374, 2020.
- [9] A. F. Taha, S. Wang, Y. Guo, T. H. Summers, N. Gatsis, M. H. Giacomoni, and A. A. Abokifa, "Revisiting the water quality sensor placement problem: Optimizing network observability and state estimation metrics," *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, vol. 147, no. 7, p. 04021040, 2021.
- [10] Y. Zhang, T. Fernando, and M. Darouach, "Functional observability, structural functional observability and optimal sensor placement," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [11] M. H. Chaudhry, *Applied hydraulic transients*. Springer, 2014, vol. 415.
- [12] E. B. Lee and L. Markus, "Foundations of optimal control theory," (No Title), 1967.
- [13] J. Jia, H. J. Van Waarde, H. L. Trentelman, and M. K. Camlibel, "A unifying framework for strong structural controllability," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 391–398, 2020.
- [14] W. Zeng, A. C. Zecchin, and M. F. Lambert, "Elastic water column model for hydraulic transient analysis of pipe networks," *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, vol. 148, no. 12, p. 04022027, 2022.
- [15] R. E. Kalman, "On the general theory of control systems," in *Proceedings first international conference on automatic control, Moscow, USSR*, 1960, pp. 481–492.
- [16] J. Tsitsiklis and V. Blondel, "Dynamics of nonlinear systems, lecture notes, mit," 2003.
- [17] S. Brin and L. Page, "The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual web search engine," *Computer networks and ISDN systems*, vol. 30, no. 1-7, pp. 107–117, 1998.
- [18] E. Kivits, "Modelling and identification of physical linear networks," 2024.

APPENDIX

In this section, we will show two general examples, for which the sensor placement algorithm can be employed and the observability can be examined using the approach shown in this paper.

a) *Mass spring damper system*: We consider the standard mass-spring-damper system from [18, Section 2.4.3] of the form (2) with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -M^{-1}K & -M^{-1}D(x_o) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where $M \succ 0$ with $M = M^{\top}$ is the mass matrix, K is the spring matrix and $D(x_o)$ is the linearized damping matrix. The spring and damper constants defined in K and $D(x_o)$, are assumed to be uncertain but nonzero. The spring matrix can be rewritten $A_{\text{inc}}K_c$, such that $K_c \succ 0$ is a diagonal matrix containing the spring constants and A_{inc} is the incidence matrix describing the connections of the masses

through the springs,

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -M^{-1}K_c A_{\text{inc}} & -M^{-1}D(x_o) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Given the properties of M , K_c and A_{inc} , we can define $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inc}} \in \{0, *\}$, such that $-M^{-1}K_c A_{\text{inc}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_{\text{inc}})$. For the second and fourth block, we define $\mathcal{I} \in \{0, *\}$ and $\mathcal{D} \in \{0, ?\}$ such that $I \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{I})$ and $D(x_o) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D})$, where \mathcal{D} has the arbitrary structure as $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, including 0. Then, the structured matrix is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{I} \\ \mathcal{A}_{\text{inc}} & \mathcal{D} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

such that $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. The structured matrix \mathcal{A} for the mass-spring-damper system closely resembles the structured matrix of the WDN network, \mathcal{A}_{WDN} , as defined in (8). Consequently, the resulting graph features such as self-loops and a fully connected structure are inherited as well. Furthermore, since this represents the general form of mass-spring-damper systems, the algorithms introduced in this paper, Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, can be used to either the determination of optimal sensor configurations or the validation of system observability. It is important to note, however, that for this approach to be viable, the structural representation of the system must be explicitly known.

b) Electrical circuit: Let us now consider a simple electrical circuit from [18, Section 2.4.2] of the form (2) with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{C} \\ \frac{1}{L} & -\frac{R_L + R_C}{L} \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

where $x = [V_C^\top \ I_L^\top]^\top$, and $R, L, C \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, i.e., the variables R, L, C are uncertain. Then we can define $\mathcal{A} \in \{0, *\}$ where

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

such that $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. Note that this is a general example of an electrical circuit, but the structure of \mathcal{A} varies depending on the specifics of your electrical circuit. Nevertheless, the algorithms presented in this paper, Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, can still be applied for sensor placement or observability analysis in such circuits. However, it is important to emphasize that the network's structure must be known in advance. Additionally, if the system is nonlinear, it must be linearizable for the algorithms to be applicable.