

On Non-intrusive Data-driven Implementations of IRKA and Balanced Truncation

Umair Zulfiqar^{a,*}

^a*School of Electronic Information and Electrical Engineering, Yangtze University, Jingzhou, Hubei, 434023, China*

Abstract

Balanced truncation and the Iterative Rational Krylov Algorithm (IRKA) are two of the most significant model order reduction techniques, having stood the test of time as the most accurate methods in the field over the past two decades. The data-driven implementation of balanced truncation has been successfully achieved in the literature by approximating the integrals of Gramians using numerical quadrature. This formulation is non-intrusive, meaning it does not require access to the transfer function or state-space model for constructing reduced-order models. Instead, only samples of the transfer function and its derivative, or alternatively, samples of the impulse response and its derivative, are sufficient. Similarly, the data-driven formulation of IRKA also relies on samples of the transfer function and its derivatives, but unlike balanced truncation, the sampling frequencies are updated iteratively and are not known in advance. If the transfer function expression is available, new samples can be generated without needing the state-space model. However, if the transfer function is unavailable, IRKA must either pause until new samples are obtained through experiments or estimate new samples from existing data.

This paper introduces quadrature-based approaches that enable offline sampling of the transfer function and its derivative from available frequency response or impulse response data. Unlike quadrature-based data-driven balanced trun-

*Corresponding author

Email address: umairzulfiqar@shu.edu.cn (Umair Zulfiqar)

cation, the proposed methods do not require samples of the transfer function’s derivative or the impulse response’s derivative. Additionally, a non-intrusive approach to track the error in IRKA as it refines the interpolation data is presented. Furthermore, a non-intrusive data-driven implementation of balanced truncation, equivalent to ADI-based low-rank balanced truncation, is proposed. This approach is not quadrature-based and only requires samples of the transfer function at the mirror images of the ADI shifts to construct the reduced-order model. The quality of the low-rank approximation of the Gramians in this method can also be monitored in a non-intrusive manner. Both the non-intrusive implementations of IRKA and balanced truncation are also extended to discrete-time systems in this paper. For discrete-time IRKA, the impulse response-based implementation uses a truncated summation approach, as the time-domain formulation of discrete-time IRKA involves summations rather than integrals. The paper includes two illustrative examples: one for the non-intrusive data-driven implementations of IRKA and balanced truncation for continuous-time systems, and another for discrete-time systems.

Keywords: ADI, Balanced truncation, Data-driven, \mathcal{H}_2 -optimal, IRKA, Low-rank, Non-intrusive

1. Preliminaries

Consider an n^{th} -order linear time-invariant (LTI) system $G(s)$ represented by the state-space realization

$$G(s) = C(sE - A)^{-1}B,$$

where $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$. Throughout the paper, the matrix A is assumed to be Hurwitz and the matrix E is assumed to be invertible.

Suppose the r^{th} -order reduced-order model (ROM) $G_r(s)$ is given by the state-space realization

$$G_r(s) = C_r(sE_r - A_r)^{-1}B_r,$$

where $E_r \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, $A_r \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, $B_r \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times m}$, and $C_r \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$.

The ROM is derived from $G(s)$ using Petrov-Galerkin projection, defined as

$$E_r = W^T E V, \quad A_r = W^T A V, \quad B_r = W^T B, \quad C_r = C V,$$

where $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, and both V and W are full column rank matrices. Let $T_v \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ and $T_w \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times r}$ be invertible matrices. The projection matrices W and V can be substituted with $W T_w$ and $V T_v$, yielding the same ROM $G_r(s)$ but with a different state-space realization. This property can be utilized to transform complex projection matrices and the resulting state-space matrices of the ROM into real ones. For the sake of clarity and simplicity in presentation, we will assume V , W , E_r , A_r , B_r , and C_r to be complex matrices throughout the remainder of the paper, without any loss of generality.

1.1. Balanced Truncation (BT) [1]

Let P and Q denote the controllability and observability Gramians, respectively, defined by the following integral expressions:

$$P = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (j\omega E - A)^{-1} B B^T (-j\omega E^T - A^T)^{-1} d\omega, \quad (1)$$

$$Q = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (-j\omega E^T - A^T)^{-1} C^T C (j\omega E - A)^{-1} d\omega. \quad (2)$$

P and Q can also be expressed using time-domain integral formulas as follows:

$$P = \int_0^{\infty} e^{E^{-1} A \tau} E^{-1} B B^T E^{-T} e^{A^T E^{-T} \tau} d\tau, \quad (3)$$

$$Q = \int_0^{\infty} e^{E^{-T} A^T \tau} E^{-T} C^T C E^{-1} e^{A E^{-1} \tau} d\tau. \quad (4)$$

The Gramians P and Q can also be computed by solving the following Lyapunov equations:

$$A P E^T + E P A^T + B B^T = 0, \quad (5)$$

$$A^T Q E + E^T Q A + C^T C = 0. \quad (6)$$

Next, we compute the Cholesky factorizations of P and Q as:

$$P = Z_p Z_p^T \quad \text{and} \quad Q = Z_q Z_q^T.$$

The balanced square root algorithm [2] proceeds as follows. First, compute the singular value decomposition (SVD) of $Z_q^T E Z_p$:

$$Z_q^T E Z_p = \begin{bmatrix} U_1 & U_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & 0 \\ 0 & S_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_1^T \\ V_2^T \end{bmatrix}.$$

Finally, the projection matrices W and V in BT are constructed as:

$$W = Z_q U_1 S_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad V = Z_p V_1 S_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

1.2. Review of Interpolation Theory [3]

Let the right interpolation points be $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ and the left interpolation points be (μ_1, \dots, μ_r) , with their corresponding right tangential directions (b_1, \dots, b_r) and left tangential directions (c_1, \dots, c_r) . The projection matrices $V \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$ and $W \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times r}$ within the interpolation framework can be constructed as follows:

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} (\sigma_1 E - A)^{-1} B b_1 & \dots & (\sigma_r E - A)^{-1} B b_r \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} (\mu_1^* E^T - A^T)^{-1} C^T c_1^* & \dots & (\mu_r^* E^T - A^T)^{-1} C^T c_r^* \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

The ROM obtained using these projection matrices satisfies the following tangential interpolation conditions:

$$G(\sigma_j) b_j = G_r(\sigma_j) b_j, \quad c_i G(\mu_i) = c_i G_r(\mu_i),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $j = 1, \dots, r$. Additionally, if there are common right and left interpolation points, i.e., $\sigma_j = \mu_i$, the following Hermite interpolation conditions are also satisfied for those points:

$$c_i G'(\sigma_j) b_j = c_i G'_r(\sigma_j) b_j.$$

1.3. Iterative Rational Krylov Algorithm (IRKA) [4]

Assume that $G(s)$ and $G_r(s)$ have simple poles. In this case, they can be expressed in the following pole-residue form:

$$G(s) = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{l_k r_k^*}{s - \lambda_k}, \quad G_r(s) = \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{\hat{l}_k \hat{r}_k^*}{s - \hat{\lambda}_k}.$$

The necessary conditions for a local optimum of $\|G(s) - G_r(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$ are given by:

$$\hat{l}_i^* G'(-\hat{\lambda}_i) \hat{r}_i = \hat{l}_i^* G_r'(-\hat{\lambda}_i) \hat{r}_i, \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{l}_i^* G(-\hat{\lambda}_i) = \hat{l}_i^* G_r(-\hat{\lambda}_i), \quad (10)$$

$$G(-\hat{\lambda}_i) \hat{r}_i = G_r(-\hat{\lambda}_i) \hat{r}_i, \quad (11)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

Since the ROM $G_r(s)$ is initially unknown, the Iterative Rational Krylov Algorithm (IRKA) employs fixed-point iterations starting from an arbitrary initial guess of the interpolation data to search for the local optimum. After each iteration, the interpolation data is updated as $\sigma_i = \mu_i = -\hat{\lambda}_i$, $b_i = \hat{r}_i$, and $c_i = \hat{l}_i^*$ until convergence is achieved. Upon convergence, a local optimum of $\|G(s) - G_r(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$ is attained.

1.4. Pseudo-optimal Rational Krylov (PORK) Algorithm [5]

Let $S_b = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$, $S_c = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$, $L_b = [b_1, \dots, b_r]$, and $L_c^* = [c_1^*, \dots, c_r^*]$. The projection matrices V and W in the interpolation framework solve the following Sylvester equations:

$$AV - EVS_b + BL_b = 0, \quad (12)$$

$$A^T W - E^T W S_c^* + C^T L_c^* = 0. \quad (13)$$

By pre-multiplying (12) with W^* , it can be observed that the matrix A_r can be expressed as $A_r = E_r S_b - B_r L_b$. This allows A_r to be parameterized in terms of E_r and B_r without affecting the interpolation conditions induced by V , as this is equivalent to varying W . Assume the pair $(-S_b, L_b)$ is observable and solves the following Lyapunov equation:

$$-S_b^* Q_s - Q_s S_b + L_b^* L_b = 0. \quad (14)$$

By setting $E_r = I$ and $B_r = Q_s^{-1} L_b^*$, A_r becomes $A_r = -Q_s^{-1} S_b^* Q_s$. The resulting ROM:

$$\begin{aligned} E_r &= I, & A_r &= -Q_s^{-1} S_b^* Q_s, \\ B_r &= Q_s^{-1} L_b^*, & C_r &= C V, \end{aligned}$$

satisfies the optimality condition (11). This approach will be referred to as Input PORK (I-PORK) throughout this paper.

Similarly, by pre-multiplying (13), it can be noted that A_r can also be represented as $A_r = S_c E_r - L_c C_r$. This allows A_r to be parameterized in terms of E_r and C_r without affecting the interpolation conditions induced by W , as this is equivalent to varying V . Assume the pair $(-S_c, L_c)$ is controllable and solves the following Lyapunov equation:

$$-S_c P_s - P_s S_c^* + L_c L_c^* = 0. \quad (15)$$

By setting $E_r = I$ and $C_r = L_c^* P_s^{-1}$, A_r becomes $A_r = -P_s S_c^* P_s^{-1}$. The resulting ROM:

$$E_r = I, \quad A_r = -P_s S_c^* P_s^{-1}, B_r = W^* B, C_r = L_c^* P_s^{-1},$$

satisfies the optimality condition (10). This approach will be referred to as Output PORK (O-PORK) throughout this paper.

1.5. Interpolatory Loewner framework [6]

In the Loewner framework, the matrices of the ROM are constructed from transfer function samples at the interpolation points as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} W^* E V &= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{c_1 G(\sigma_1) b_1 - c_1 G(\mu_1) b_1}{\sigma_1 - \mu_1} & \dots & \frac{c_1 G(\sigma_r) b_r - c_1 G(\mu_1) b_r}{\sigma_r - \mu_1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{c_r G(\sigma_1) b_1 - c_r G(\mu_r) b_1}{\sigma_1 - \mu_r} & \dots & \frac{c_r G(\sigma_r) b_r - c_r G(\mu_r) b_r}{\sigma_r - \mu_r} \end{bmatrix}, \\ W^* A V &= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sigma_1 c_1 G(\sigma_j) b_1 - \mu_1 c_1 G(\mu_1) b_1}{\sigma_1 - \mu_1} & \dots & \frac{\sigma_r c_1 G(\sigma_r) b_r - \mu_1 c_1 G(\mu_1) b_r}{\sigma_r - \mu_1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\sigma_1 c_r G(\sigma_1) b_1 - \mu_r c_r G(\mu_r) b_1}{\sigma_1 - \mu_r} & \dots & \frac{\sigma_r c_r G(\sigma_r) b_r - \mu_r c_r G(\mu_r) b_r}{\sigma_r - \mu_r} \end{bmatrix}, \\ W^* B &= \begin{bmatrix} c_1 G(\mu_1) & \vdots & c_r G(\mu_r) \end{bmatrix}, \quad C V = \begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1) b_1 & \dots & G(\sigma_r) b_r \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

When $\sigma_j \approx \mu_i$, the expressions approach to:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_i G(\sigma_i) b_j - c_i G(\mu_j) b_j}{\sigma_i - \mu_j} &\approx c_i G'(\sigma_j) b_j, \\ \frac{\sigma_j c_i G(\sigma_j) b_j - \mu_i c_i G(\mu_i) b_j}{\sigma_r - \mu_r} &\approx c_i G(\sigma_j) b_j + \sigma_j c_i G'(\sigma_j) b_j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, when there are common elements in the sets of right and left interpolation points, samples of the derivative of $G(s)$ at those common points are also required to construct W^*EV and W^*AV . If block interpolation is needed instead of tangential interpolation, one can set $b_j = c_i = 1$ in the above formulas.

The matrices E_r and A_r in the above formulas exhibit a special structure known as the Loewner matrix and shifted Loewner matrix, respectively. This structure is the reason behind the name ‘‘Interpolatory Loewner framework’’.

1.6. Data-driven Quadrature-based Balanced Truncation (QuadBT)[7]

The integrals (1) and (2) can be approximated using a numerical quadrature rule as follows:

$$P \approx \hat{P} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} w_{p,i}^2 (j\omega_i E - A)^{-1} B B^T (-j\omega_i E^T - A^T)^{-1} + w_{p,\infty}^2 E^{-1} B B^T E^{-T},$$

$$Q \approx \hat{Q} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_q} w_{q,i}^2 (-j\nu_i E^T - A^T)^{-1} C^T C (j\nu_i E - A)^{-1} + w_{q,\infty}^2 E^{-T} C^T C E^{-1},$$

where ω_i and ν_i are the quadrature nodes, and $w_{p,i}^2$ and $w_{q,i}^2$ are the corresponding quadrature weights. The weights $w_{p,\infty}^2$ and $w_{q,\infty}^2$ are associated with the nodes at infinity. The low-rank factors of P and Q , denoted as $\hat{P} = \hat{Z}_p \hat{Z}_p^T$ and $\hat{Q} = \hat{Z}_q \hat{Z}_q^T$, can be decomposed as:

$$\hat{Z}_p = \tilde{V} L_p, \quad \hat{Z}_q = \tilde{W} L_q,$$

where

$$\tilde{V} = \begin{bmatrix} (j\omega_1 E - A)^{-1} B & \cdots & (j\omega_{n_p} E - A)^{-1} B & E^{-1} B \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\tilde{W} = \begin{bmatrix} (-j\nu_1 E^T - A^T)^{-1} C^T & \cdots & (-j\nu_{n_q} E^T - A^T)^{-1} C^T & E^{-T} C^T \end{bmatrix},$$

$$L_p = I_m \otimes \text{diag}(w_{p,1}, \dots, w_{p,n_p}, w_{p,\infty}),$$

$$L_q = I_p \otimes \text{diag}(w_{q,1}, \dots, w_{q,n_q}, w_{q,\infty}).$$

The low-rank factors \hat{Z}_p and \hat{Z}_q can then replace Z_p and Z_q in the balanced square root algorithm as:

$$L_q^T (\tilde{W}^* E \tilde{V}) L_p = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{U}_1 & \tilde{U}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{S}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{S}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{V}_1^* \\ \tilde{V}_2^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

The ROM in quadrature-based low-rank balanced truncation is obtained as:

$$\begin{aligned} E_r &= I, & A_r &= \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{U}_1^* L_q^T (\tilde{W}^* A \tilde{V}) L_p \tilde{V}_1 \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ B_r &= \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{U}_1^* L_q^T (\tilde{W}^* B), & C_r &= (C \tilde{V}) L_p \tilde{V}_1 \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The terms $\tilde{W}^* E \tilde{V}$, $\tilde{W}^* A \tilde{V}$, $\tilde{W}^* B$, and $C \tilde{V}$ can be constructed non-intrusively using transfer function samples at the quadrature nodes within the Loewner framework. Additionally, L_p and L_q can be computed from the quadrature weights. As a result, quadrature-based low-rank balanced truncation can be implemented non-intrusively using frequency-domain data without requiring access to the state-space realization of the original system.

Similarly, the integrals (3) and (4) can be approximated using numerical quadrature as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P &\approx \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} w_{p,i} e^{E^{-1} A t_i} E^{-1} B B^T E^{-T} e^{A^T E^{-T} t_i}, \\ Q &\approx \sum_{i=1}^{n_q} w_{q,i} e^{E^{-T} A^T \tau_i} E^{-T} C^T C E^{-1} e^{A E^{-1} \tau_i}. \end{aligned}$$

The low-rank factors of P and Q , denoted as $\hat{P} = \hat{Z}_p \hat{Z}_p^T$ and $\hat{Q} = \hat{Z}_q \hat{Z}_q^T$, can be decomposed as $\hat{Z}_p = \tilde{V} L_p$ and $\hat{Z}_q = \tilde{W} L_q$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V} &= \begin{bmatrix} e^{E^{-1} A t_1} E^{-1} B & \dots & e^{E^{-1} A t_{n_p}} E^{-1} B \end{bmatrix}, \\ \tilde{W} &= \begin{bmatrix} e^{E^{-T} A^T \tau_1} E^{-T} C^T & \dots & e^{E^{-T} A^T \tau_{n_q}} E^{-T} C^T \end{bmatrix}, \\ L_p &= I_m \otimes \text{diag}(w_{p,1}, \dots, w_{p,n_p}, w_{p,\infty}), \\ L_q &= I_p \otimes \text{diag}(w_{q,1}, \dots, w_{q,n_q}, w_{q,\infty}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $h(t)$ denote the impulse response of $G(s)$. The impulse response and its derivative can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) &= C e^{E^{-1} A t} E^{-1} B = C E^{-1} e^{A E^{-1} t} B, \\ h'(t) &= C e^{E^{-1} A t} E^{-1} A E^{-1} B. \end{aligned}$$

The terms $\tilde{W}^T E \tilde{V}$, $\tilde{W}^T A \tilde{V}$, $\tilde{W}^T B$, and $C \tilde{V}$ can be constructed non-intrusively

using samples of the impulse response and its derivative as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{W}^T E \tilde{V} &= \begin{bmatrix} h(\tau_1 + t_1) & \cdots & h(\tau_1 + t_{n_p}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h(\tau_{n_q} + t_1) & \cdots & h(\tau_{n_q} + t_{n_p}) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \tilde{W}^T A \tilde{V} &= \begin{bmatrix} h'(\tau_1 + t_1) & \cdots & h'(\tau_1 + t_{n_p}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h'(\tau_{n_q} + t_1) & \cdots & h'(\tau_{n_q} + t_{n_p}) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \tilde{W}^T B &= \begin{bmatrix} h(\tau_1) \\ \vdots \\ h(\tau_{n_q}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad C \tilde{V} = [h(t_1) \quad \cdots \quad h(t_{n_p})].\end{aligned}$$

Additionally, L_p and L_q can be computed from the quadrature weights. Therefore, quadrature-based low-rank balanced truncation can be implemented non-intrusively using impulse response data without requiring access to the state-space realization of the original system.

2. Data-driven Implementations of IRKA for Continuous-time Systems

IRKA is highly effective for constructing \mathcal{H}_2 -optimal ROMs through iterative refinement of interpolation data. However, its data-driven implementation poses a significant practical challenge. Each IRKA iteration updates the interpolation points, necessitating new measurements of $G(\sigma_i)b_i$, $c_i G(\sigma_i)$, and $G'(\sigma_i)$. As a consequence, the algorithm must be paused to conduct new experiments, making it unsuitable for practical applications. In this section, an approach based on numerical integration is presented to implement IRKA using precomputed frequency response or impulse response data.

2.1. Offline Sampling of $G(s)$ and $G'(s)$ using Frequency Response Data

In industries such as aerospace, defense, and automotive, frequency-domain data is collected to construct the Fourier transform $G(j\omega)$ by exciting systems at

various frequencies ω rad/sec. This data plays a critical role in numerous analysis and design tasks, including system identification, control design, resonance frequency calculation, and vibration analysis, among others [8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. Given the importance of this data for ensuring the safe and effective operation of systems, it is essential to construct the Fourier transform accurately. In this subsection, we demonstrate that this existing data is sufficient to generate offline samples of $G(s)$ at any desired complex frequency $s = \sigma + j\omega$.

When the interpolation points σ_i and μ_i have positive real parts, V and W can be computed using the integral expressions:

$$V = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (j\nu E - A)^{-1} B L_b (-j\nu I + S_b)^{-1} d\nu, \quad (17)$$

$$W^* = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (-j\nu I + S_c)^{-1} L_c C (j\nu E - A)^{-1} d\nu, \quad (18)$$

cf. [13]. These integrals can be approximated using numerical integration as follows:

$$V \approx \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i=1}^{n_v} w_{v,i} (j\xi_i E - A)^{-1} B L_b (-j\xi_i I + S_b)^{-1}, \quad (19)$$

$$W^* \approx \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i=1}^{n_w} w_{w,i} (-j\zeta_i I + S_c)^{-1} L_c C (j\zeta_i E - A)^{-1}, \quad (20)$$

where ξ_i and ζ_i are nodes, and $w_{v,i}$ and $w_{w,i}$ are their respective weights.

Let us define \bar{V} , \hat{V}_r , \bar{W} , and \hat{W}_r as follows:

$$\bar{V} = \left[(j\xi_1 E - A)^{-1} B \quad \cdots \quad (j\xi_{n_v} E - A)^{-1} B \right], \quad (21)$$

$$\hat{V}_r = \frac{1}{2\pi} \begin{bmatrix} w_{v,1} L_b (-j\xi_1 I + S_b)^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ w_{v,n_v} L_b (-j\xi_{n_v} I + S_b)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

$$\bar{W}^* = \begin{bmatrix} C (j\zeta_1 E - A)^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ C (j\zeta_{n_w} E - A)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

$$\hat{W}_r^* = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[(-j\zeta_1 I + S_c)^{-1} L_c w_{w,1} \quad \cdots \quad (-j\zeta_{n_w} I + S_c)^{-1} L_c w_{w,n_w} \right]. \quad (24)$$

It is evident that the summations (19) and (20) can be represented as $\bar{V}\hat{V}_r$ and $\hat{W}_r^*\bar{W}^*$, respectively. Thus, $V \approx \bar{V}\hat{V}_r$ and $W \approx \bar{W}\hat{W}_r$. Consequently,

$$C_r = C\bar{V}\hat{V}_r = \begin{bmatrix} G(j\xi_1) & \cdots & G(j\xi_{n_v}) \end{bmatrix} \hat{V}_r \approx \begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1)b_1 & \cdots & G(\sigma_r)b_r \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_r = \hat{W}_r^*\bar{W}^*B = \hat{W}_r^* \begin{bmatrix} G(j\zeta_1) \\ \vdots \\ G(j\zeta_{n_w}) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} c_1G(\mu_1) \\ \vdots \\ c_rG(\mu_r) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Once the samples $G(\sigma_i)b_i$ and $c_iG(\mu_i)$ are computed from frequency response data $G(j\xi_i)$ and $G(j\zeta_i)$, respectively, E_r and A_r can be computed from (16).

To implement IRKA, transfer function samples and their derivatives at r interpolation points are required. These can be computed by numerically integrating a single integral. Let us define S_b and L_b as follows:

$$S_b = \text{blkdiag} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 I_m & I_m \\ 0 & \sigma_1 I_m \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_r I_m & I_m \\ 0 & \sigma_r I_m \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

$$L_b = \begin{bmatrix} I_m & 0 & \cdots & I_m & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

By solving the Sylvester equation (12), we obtain:

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} (\sigma_1 E - A)^{-1}B & -(\sigma_1 E - A)^{-1}E(\sigma_1 E - A)^{-1}B & \cdots \\ (\sigma_r E - A)^{-1}B & -(\sigma_r E - A)^{-1}E(\sigma_r E - A)^{-1}B \end{bmatrix},$$

as described in [5]. Consequently,

$$CV = \begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1) & G'(\sigma_1) & \cdots & G(\sigma_r) & G'(\sigma_r) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, by setting S_b and L_b as in (25), we can compute:

$$\begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1) & G'(\sigma_1) & \cdots & G(\sigma_r) & G'(\sigma_r) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} G(j\xi_1) & \cdots & G(j\xi_{n_v}) \end{bmatrix} \hat{V}_r. \quad (26)$$

This demonstrates that IRKA can be implemented using frequency response data $G(j\xi_i)$, and the samples $G(\sigma_i)$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ can be generated offline each time IRKA updates them. The pseudo-code for the frequency-domain quadrature-based IRKA (FD-Quad-IRKA) is presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 FD-Quad-IRKA

Input: Frequency-domain data: $(G(j\xi_1), \dots, G(j\xi_{n_v}))$; Nodes: $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n_v})$;
Quadrature weights: $(w_{v,1}, \dots, w_{v,n_v})$; Interpolation data: $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$,
 (b_1, \dots, b_r) , (c_1, \dots, c_r) ; Tolerance: tol.

Output: ROM: (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r)

- 1: **while**(relative change in $\lambda_i \geq \text{tol}$)
 - 2: Set S_b and L_b as in (25).
 - 3: Set \hat{V}_r as in (22).
 - 4: Compute $G(\sigma_i)$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ from (26).
 - 5: Compute (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r) from (16).
 - 6: Compute the eigenvalue decomposition: $E_r^{-1}A_r = T_r\Lambda T_r^{-1}$ where $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$.
 - 7: Update the interpolation data: $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) = (-\lambda_1, \dots, -\lambda_r)$; $[b_1 \dots b_r] = B_r^* E_r^{-*} T_r^{-*}$; $[c_1^* \dots c_r^*] = C_r T_r$.
 - 8: **end while**
-

Range of Frequency Domain Sampling: Let us restrict the integral range of (17) from $[-\infty, \infty]$ to $[-\nu, \nu]$ rad/sec. Then $V_\nu = V|_{-\nu}^{\nu}$ solves the following Sylvester equation:

$$AV_\nu - EV_\nu S_b + S_{\nu,a} B L_b + B L_b S_{\nu,s} = 0,$$

where

$$S_{\nu,a} = \frac{E}{2\pi} \int_{-\nu}^{\nu} (j\nu E - A)^{-1} d\nu, \quad S_{\nu,s} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\nu}^{\nu} (j\nu I + S_b)^{-1} d\nu,$$

as described in [14]. Theoretically, $S_{\nu,a} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}I$ and $S_{\nu,s} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}I$ as $\nu \rightarrow \infty$. In practice, $S_{\nu,a}$ reduces to $\frac{1}{2}I$ outside the bandwidth of $G(s)$. Similarly, $S_{\nu,s}$ begins to approach $\frac{1}{2}I$ once ν exceeds the largest imaginary part of the eigenvalues of S_b . As a result, V_ν becomes numerically equivalent to V beyond a finite frequency range. Therefore, in practice, the nodes of the numerical quadrature can be confined to a finite frequency range, especially when the bandwidth of the system $G(s)$ is known.

Alternatively, the integration limits of the numerical quadrature rule can be mapped to $[-\infty, \infty]$. For instance, the integration limits $[-1, 1]$ in the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule can be mapped to $[-\infty, \infty]$ using the following transformation:

$$y = \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{2}x\right), \quad \frac{dy}{dx} = \frac{\pi}{2} \sec^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2}x\right).$$

The quadrature weights can then be adjusted as $w_y = w_x \frac{\pi}{2} \sec^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2}x\right)$.

2.2. Offline Sampling of $G(s)$ and $G'(s)$ using Impulse Response Data

In many applications, obtaining frequency-domain measurements is impractical. Instead, impulse response data is frequently utilized for various analysis and design tasks. In such cases, frequency response data is derived from the impulse response data. When direct impulse response measurements are not feasible, a step input can be applied, and the impulse response can be obtained through differentiation. While a detailed review of these methods falls outside the scope of this paper, we refer readers to [15, 16, 17, 18, 19] for further insights. In this subsection, we demonstrate that existing impulse response data is sufficient to generate offline samples of $G(s)$ at any desired complex frequency $s = \sigma + j\omega$.

If the interpolation points σ_i and μ_i have positive real parts, V and W can be computed using the following integral expressions:

$$V = \int_0^\infty e^{E^{-1}A\tau} E^{-1} B L_b e^{-S_b\tau} d\tau, \quad (27)$$

$$W^* = \int_0^\infty e^{-S_c\tau} L_c C E^{-1} e^{AE^{-1}\tau} d\tau, \quad (28)$$

where $S_b = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$, $S_c = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$, $L_b = [b_1, \dots, b_r]$, and $L_c^* = [c_1^*, \dots, c_r^*]$.

These integrals can be approximated using numerical integration as follows:

$$V \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n_v} w_{v,i} e^{E^{-1}A t_i} E^{-1} B L_b e^{-S_b t_i}, \quad (29)$$

$$W^* \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n_w} w_{w,i} e^{-S_c \tau_i} L_c C E^{-1} e^{AE^{-1}\tau_i}, \quad (30)$$

where t_i and τ_i are quadrature nodes, and $w_{v,i}$ and $w_{w,i}$ are their respective weights.

Let us define \bar{V} , \hat{V}_r , \bar{W} , and \hat{W}_r as follows:

$$\bar{V} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{E^{-1}At_1} E^{-1}B & \dots & e^{E^{-1}At_{n_v}} E^{-1}B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (31)$$

$$\hat{V}_r = \begin{bmatrix} w_{v,1} L_b e^{-S_b t_1} \\ \vdots \\ w_{v,n_v} L_b e^{-S_b t_{n_v}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

$$\bar{W}^* = \begin{bmatrix} C E^{-1} e^{A E^{-1} \tau_1} \\ \vdots \\ C E^{-1} e^{A E^{-1} \tau_{n_w}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (33)$$

$$\hat{W}_r^* = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-S_c \tau_1} L_c w_{w,1} & \dots & e^{-S_c \tau_{n_w}} L_c w_{w,n_w} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (34)$$

It is evident that the summations (29) and (30) can be represented as $\bar{V}\hat{V}_r$ and $\hat{W}_r^*\bar{W}^*$, respectively. Thus, $V \approx \bar{V}\hat{V}_r$ and $W \approx \hat{W}_r^*\bar{W}^*$. Consequently,

$$C_r = C\bar{V}\hat{V}_r = \begin{bmatrix} h(t_1) & \dots & h(t_{n_v}) \end{bmatrix} \hat{V}_r \approx \begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1)b_1 & \dots & G(\sigma_r)b_r \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_r = \hat{W}_r^*\bar{W}^*B = \hat{W}_r^* \begin{bmatrix} h(\tau_1) \\ \vdots \\ h(\tau_{n_w}) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} c_1 G(\mu_1) \\ \vdots \\ c_r G(\mu_r) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Once the samples $G(\sigma_i)b_i$ and $c_i G(\mu_i)$ are computed from impulse response data $h(t_i)$ and $h(\tau_i)$, respectively, E_r and A_r can be computed from (16).

Similar to the frequency domain, by setting S_b and L_b as in (25), we can compute the following:

$$\begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1) & G'(\sigma_1) & \dots & G(\sigma_r) & G'(\sigma_r) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} h(t_1) & \dots & h(t_{n_v}) \end{bmatrix} \hat{V}_r. \quad (35)$$

Thus, IRKA can be implemented using impulse response data $h(t_i)$, and the samples $G(\sigma_i)$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ can be generated offline each time IRKA updates them. The pseudo-code for the time-domain quadrature-based IRKA (TD-Quad-IRKA) is detailed in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 TD-Quad-IRKA

Input: Impulse response data: $(h(t_1), \dots, h(t_{n_v}))$; Nodes: (t_1, \dots, t_{n_v}) ;
Quadrature weights: $(w_{v,1}, \dots, w_{v,n_v})$; Interpolation data: $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$,
 (b_1, \dots, b_r) , (c_1, \dots, c_r) ; Tolerance: tol.

Output: ROM: (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r)

- 1: **while**(relative change in $\lambda_i \geq \text{tol}$)
 - 2: Set S_b and L_b as in (25).
 - 3: Set \hat{V}_r as in (32).
 - 4: Compute $G(\sigma_i)$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ from (35).
 - 5: Compute (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r) from (16).
 - 6: Compute the eigenvalue decomposition: $E_r^{-1}A_r = T_r\Lambda T_r^{-1}$ where $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$.
 - 7: Update the interpolation data: $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) = (-\lambda_1, \dots, -\lambda_r)$; $[b_1 \dots b_r] = B_r^* E_r^{-*} T_r^{-*}$; $[c_1^* \dots c_r^*] = C_r T_r$.
 - 8: **end while**
-

Range of Impulse Response Sampling: Let us restrict the integral range of (27) from $[0, \infty]$ to $[0, t_f]$ rad/sec. Then $V_\tau = V|_0^{t_f}$ solves the following Sylvester equation:

$$AV_\tau - EV_\tau S_b + BL_b - Ee^{E^{-1}At_f} E^{-1}BL_b e^{-S_b t_f} = 0,$$

as described in [20]. Theoretically, $e^{E^{-1}At_f} \rightarrow 0$ and $e^{-S_b t_f} \rightarrow 0$ as $t_f \rightarrow \infty$. In practice, $e^{E^{-1}At_f}$ and $e^{-S_b t_f}$ rapidly approach zero for a finite t_f , depending on how far the eigenvalues of $E^{-1}A$ and $-S_b$ are from the $j\omega$ -axis. The farther the eigenvalues of $E^{-1}A$ and $-S_b$ are from the $j\omega$ -axis, the faster the exponentials $e^{E^{-1}At_f}$ and $e^{-S_b t_f}$ decay to zero. As a result, V_τ becomes numerically equivalent to V beyond a finite time range. Therefore, in practice, the nodes of the numerical quadrature can be confined to a finite time range, especially when the poles of $G(s)$ are located far from the $j\omega$ -axis in the left half of the s -plane. Consequently, we can use a finite t_f in the numerical quadrature rule, and the integration limits can be mapped accordingly. For instance, the inte-

gration limits $[-1, 1]$ in the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule can be mapped to $[0, t_f]$ using the following transformation:

$$y = 0.5t_f(x + 1), \quad \frac{dy}{dx} = 0.5t_f.$$

The quadrature weights can then be adjusted as $w_y = 0.5t_f w_x$.

2.3. Tracking the Error $\|G(s) - G_r(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$

Let $G_r(s)^{(i-1)}$ and $G_r(s)^{(i)}$ represent the interim ROMs in the $(i-1)^{th}$ and i^{th} iterations of IRKA, respectively. As noted in [21], the error in the $(i-1)^{th}$ iteration can be computed after the i^{th} iteration as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|G(s) - G_r(s)^{(i-1)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 \\ &= \|G(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 + \|G_r(s)^{(i-1)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 - 2\text{trace}\left(C_r^{(i)}(C_r^{(i-1)}T_r^{(i-1)})^*\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, with a delay of one iteration, the error $\|G(s) - G_r(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ can be tracked if $\|G_r(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$ is computed in every iteration. It is important to note that the original expression presented in [21] is intrusive, whereas the expression above is its non-intrusive equivalent. To summarize, the error in data-driven IRKA can also be monitored non-intrusively by tracking the following term:

$$\|G_r(s)^{(i-1)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 - 2\text{trace}\left(C_r^{(i)}(C_r^{(i-1)}T_r^{(i-1)})^*\right).$$

However, it should be noted that the term $-2\text{trace}\left(C_r^{(i)}(C_r^{(i-1)}T_r^{(i-1)})^*\right)$ is an approximation and not exact. Its accuracy depends on the precision of the numerical integration of the integrals (17) or (27).

3. Non-intrusive Low-rank Balanced Truncation for Continuous-time Systems

Projection-based low-rank methods for Lyapunov equations approximate the Lyapunov equation (5) as follows:

$$P \approx V\hat{P}V^*.$$

Any low-rank method for Lyapunov equations where V is interpolatory and \hat{P} can be computed non-intrusively can effectively be used to develop a non-intrusive balanced truncation algorithm. This is because, when V and W in $P \approx V\hat{P}V^*$ and $Q \approx W\hat{Q}W^*$, respectively, are interpolatory, the terms W^*EV , W^*AV , W^*B , and CV can be computed non-intrusively within the Loewner framework using data. If $\hat{P} = \hat{Z}_p\hat{Z}_p^* = VL_pL_p^*V^*$ and $\hat{Q} = \hat{Z}_q\hat{Z}_q^* = WL_qL_q^*W^*$ can also be computed non-intrusively, a non-intrusive formulation can be readily achieved.

In [22], it is shown that the low-rank approximation of Lyapunov equations produced by the block version of PORK is identical to that produced by the ADI method [23] when the mirror images of the interpolation points are used as ADI shifts. The block version of PORK enforces block interpolation instead of tangential interpolation. Over the past few decades, the ADI method has been highly successful in extending the applicability of BT to large-scale systems. In the sequel, a data-driven implementation of the block version of PORK is formulated, which produces results identical to the ADI method.

The controllability Gramian \hat{P} of the ROM produced by I-PORK is given by $\hat{P} = Q_s^{-1}$. Similarly, the observability Gramian \hat{Q} of the ROM produced by O-PORK is given by $\hat{Q} = P_s^{-1}$. These Gramians can be computed non-intrusively using only interpolation data. Furthermore, the projection matrices V and W in I-PORK and O-PORK, respectively, are interpolatory. Thus, PORK qualifies for use in the non-intrusive implementation of low-rank balanced truncation.

In block interpolation, the projection matrices

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} (\sigma_1 E - A)^{-1}B & \cdots & (\sigma_{n_p} E - A)^{-1}B \end{bmatrix},$$

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} (\mu_1^* E^T - A^T)^{-1}C^T & \cdots & (\mu_{n_q}^* E^T - A^T)^{-1}C^T \end{bmatrix},$$

solve the following Sylvester equations:

$$AV - EVS_b + BL_b = 0,$$

$$A^T W - E^T W S_c^* + C^T L_c^T = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_b &= \text{blkdiag}(\sigma_1 I_m, \dots, \sigma_{n_p} I_m), & S_c &= \text{blkdiag}(\mu_1 I_p, \dots, \mu_{n_q} I_p), \\ L_b &= \begin{bmatrix} I_m & \cdots & I_m \end{bmatrix}, & L_c^T &= \begin{bmatrix} I_p & \cdots & I_p \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Assume that the pairs $(-S_b, L_b)$ and $(-S_c, L_c)$ are observable and controllable, respectively, and the Gramians Q_s and P_s solve the Lyapunov equations (14) and (15), respectively.

The block version of PORK produces low-rank approximations of P and Q as $P \approx V\hat{P}V^*$ and $W\hat{Q}W^*$, where $\hat{P} = Q_s^{-1}$ and $\hat{Q} = P_s^{-1}$. These are the same approximations achieved using the ADI method with shifts $(-\sigma_1, \dots, -\sigma_{n_p})$ and $(-\mu_1, \dots, -\mu_{n_q})$, respectively.

Let us decompose $\hat{P} = L_p L_p^*$ and $\hat{Q} = L_q L_q^*$, and define $\hat{Z}_p = V L_p$ and $\hat{Z}_q = W L_q$. Thus, $P \approx \hat{Z}_p \hat{Z}_p^*$ and $Q \approx \hat{Z}_q \hat{Z}_q^*$. Low-rank BT can then be performed using these low-rank factors of the Gramians via the balanced square-root algorithm. Like Quad-BT, $W^* E V$, $W^* A V$, $W^* B$, and $C V$ can be computed non-intrusively within the Loewner framework. The pseudo-code for the data-driven ADI-based BT (DD-ADI-BT) is provided in Algorithm 3.

So far, we have developed a data-driven, non-intrusive formulation of ADI-based low-rank BT using the block version of PORK. However, we have not yet discussed the selection of shifts or the quantification of the following residuals:

$$\begin{aligned} &A(\hat{Z}_p \hat{Z}_p^*)E + E^T(\hat{Z}_p \hat{Z}_p^*)A^T + BB^T, \\ &A^T(\hat{Z}_q \hat{Z}_q^*)E^T + E(\hat{Z}_q \hat{Z}_q^*)A + C^T C. \end{aligned}$$

The accuracy of the ADI method heavily depends on the shifts. IRKA is known to produce good shifts for the ADI method. The non-intrusive formulation of IRKA presented in the previous section can be used to generate these shifts for low-rank BT. Furthermore, the low-rank Gramians produced by PORK monotonically approach the original Gramians as the number of interpolation points

Algorithm 3 DD-ADI-BT

Input: ADI shifts for approximating P : $(-\sigma_1, \dots, -\sigma_{n_p})$; ADI shifts for approximating Q : $(-\mu_1, \dots, -\mu_{n_q})$; Frequency-domain data: $(G(\sigma_1), \dots, G(\sigma_{n_p}), G(\mu_1), \dots, G(\mu_{n_q}))$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ for $\sigma_i = \mu_j$; Reduced order: r .

Output: ROM: (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r)

- 1: Set $S_b, S_c, L_b,$ and L_c as in (36).
- 2: Compute Q_s and P_s by solving the Lyapunov equations (14) and (15).
- 3: Decompose $Q_s^{-1} = L_p L_p^*$ and $P_s^{-1} = L_q L_q^*$.
- 4: Compute $(W^* E V, W^* A V, W^* B, C V)$ from (16).
- 5: Compute the singular value decomposition:

$$L_q^*(W^* E V)L_p = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{U}_1 & \tilde{U}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{S}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{S}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{V}_1^* \\ \tilde{V}_2^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

- 6: Compute the ROM:

$$E_r = I, A_r = \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{U}_1^* L_q^*(W^* A V)L_p \tilde{V}_1 \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$
$$B_r = \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{U}_1^* L_q^*(W^* B), C_r = (C V)L_p \tilde{V}_1 \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

increases. Note that PORK satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(s) - G_r(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 &= \text{trace}(CPC^T) - \text{trace}(CVQ_s^{-1}V^*C^T) \\ &= \text{trace}(C(P - VQ_s^{-1}V^*)C^T), \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(s) - G_r(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 &= \text{trace}(B^TQB) - \text{trace}(B^TWP_s^{-1}W^*B) \\ &= \text{trace}(B^T(Q - WP_s^{-1}W^*)B), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The only variable part in (37) is $\text{trace}(CVQ_s^{-1}V^*C^T)$, which grows monotonically as the number of interpolation points increases. Similarly, the only variable part in (38) is $\text{trace}(B^TWP_s^{-1}W^*B)$, which also grows monotonically as the number of interpolation points increases. Both these terms can be computed non-intrusively, allowing us to quantify the improvement in the accuracy of the Gramians by monitoring their growth.

4. Data-driven Implementations of IRKA for Discrete-time Systems

Consider the following discrete-time system of order n , denoted as $G(z)$, and its ROM of order r , denoted as $G_r(z)$:

$$\begin{aligned} G(z) &= C(zE - A)^{-1}B, \\ G_r(z) &= C_r(zE_r - A_r)^{-1}B_r, \end{aligned}$$

where $z = e^{j\omega}$.

Assuming that $G(z)$ and $G_r(z)$ have simple poles, they can be expressed in the pole-residue form as follows:

$$G(z) = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{l_k r_k^*}{z - \lambda_k}, \quad G_r(z) = \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{\hat{l}_k \hat{r}_k^*}{z - \hat{\lambda}_k}.$$

The necessary conditions for a local optimum of $\|G(z) - G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$ are given by:

$$\hat{l}_i^* G' \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_i} \right) \hat{r}_i = \hat{l}_i^* G_r' \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_i} \right) \hat{r}_i, \quad (39)$$

$$\hat{l}_i^* G \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_i} \right) = \hat{l}_i^* G_r \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_i} \right), \quad (40)$$

$$G \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_i} \right) \hat{r}_i = G_r \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_i} \right) \hat{r}_i, \quad (41)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

Similar to the continuous-time case, since the ROM $G_r(z)$ is initially unknown, the discrete-time IRKA (DT-IRKA) [24] employs fixed-point iterations starting from an arbitrary initial guess of the interpolation data to search for a local optimum. After each iteration, the interpolation data is updated as $\sigma_i = \mu_i = \frac{1}{\lambda_i}$, $b_i = \hat{r}_i$, and $c_i = \hat{l}_i^*$ until convergence is achieved. Upon convergence, a local optimum of $\|G(z) - G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$ is attained.

However, since DT-IRKA updates the interpolation points during the process, it requires evaluating the transfer function samples at these updated points. This necessitates halting DT-IRKA and conducting new experiments to obtain new samples, which is often impractical. Additionally, since $G_r(z)$ is stable, the interpolation points $\frac{1}{\lambda_i}$ lie outside the unit circle. Exciting the system at these frequencies can be dangerous or even impossible [25]. These challenges motivate the development of offline transfer function sampling strategies that utilize existing data.

4.1. Offline Sampling of $G(z)$ and $G'(z)$ Using Frequency Response Data

Let us define the following matrices: $S_b = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$, $S_c = \text{diag}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$, $L_b = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & \dots & b_r \end{bmatrix}$, $L_c^* = \begin{bmatrix} c_1^* & \dots & c_r^* \end{bmatrix}$, $\bar{S}_b = S_b^{-1}$, $\bar{L}_b = L_b S_b^{-1}$, $\bar{S}_c = S_c^{-1}$, $\bar{L}_c = S_c^{-1} L_c$.

By post-multiplying equations (12) and (13) with S_b^{-1} and S_c^{-*} , respectively, it can be observed that V and W in (7) and (8) satisfy the following Stein equations:

$$AV\bar{S}_b - EV + B\bar{L}_b = 0, \quad (42)$$

$$A^T W \bar{S}_c^* - E^T W + C^T \bar{L}_c^* = 0. \quad (43)$$

When the eigenvalues of A , \bar{S}_b , and \bar{S}_c lie within the unit circle, V and W can be expressed using the following integral representations:

$$V = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (e^{j\nu} E - A)^{-1} B \bar{L}_b (e^{-j\nu} I - \bar{S}_b)^{-1} d\nu, \quad (44)$$

$$W^* = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (e^{-j\nu} I - \bar{S}_c)^{-1} \bar{L}_c C (e^{j\nu} E - A)^{-1} d\nu, \quad (45)$$

cf. [26]. These integrals can be approximated numerically as follows:

$$V \approx \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i=1}^{n_v} w_{v,i} (e^{j\xi_i} E - A)^{-1} B \bar{L}_b (e^{-j\xi_i} I - \bar{S}_b)^{-1}, \quad (46)$$

$$W^* \approx \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i=1}^{n_w} w_{w,i} (e^{-j\zeta_i} I - \bar{S}_c)^{-1} \bar{L}_c C (e^{j\zeta_i} E - A)^{-1}, \quad (47)$$

where ξ_i and ζ_i are the nodes, and $w_{v,i}$ and $w_{w,i}$ are their corresponding weights.

Next, define the following matrices:

$$\bar{V} = \begin{bmatrix} (e^{j\xi_1} E - A)^{-1} B & \cdots & (e^{j\xi_{n_v}} E - A)^{-1} B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

$$\hat{V}_r = \frac{1}{2\pi} \begin{bmatrix} w_{v,1} \bar{L}_b (e^{-j\xi_1} I - \bar{S}_b)^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ w_{v,n_v} \bar{L}_b (e^{-j\xi_{n_v}} I - \bar{S}_b)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (49)$$

$$\bar{W}^* = \begin{bmatrix} C (e^{j\zeta_1} E - A)^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ C (e^{j\zeta_{n_w}} E - A)^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (50)$$

$$\hat{W}_r^* = \frac{1}{2\pi} \begin{bmatrix} (e^{-j\zeta_1} I - \bar{S}_c)^{-1} \bar{L}_c w_{w,1} & \cdots & (e^{-j\zeta_{n_w}} I - \bar{S}_c)^{-1} \bar{L}_c w_{w,n_w} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (51)$$

From these definitions, it is clear that the summations (46) and (47) can be represented as $\bar{V} \hat{V}_r$ and $\hat{W}_r^* \bar{W}^*$, respectively. Thus, $V \approx \bar{V} \hat{V}_r$ and $W \approx \bar{W} \hat{W}_r$.

Consequently,

$$C_r = C \bar{V} \hat{V}_r = \begin{bmatrix} G(e^{j\xi_1}) & \cdots & G(e^{j\xi_{n_v}}) \end{bmatrix} \hat{V}_r \approx \begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1) b_1 & \cdots & G(\sigma_r) b_r \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_r = \hat{W}_r^* \bar{W}^* B = \hat{W}_r^* \begin{bmatrix} G(e^{j\zeta_1}) \\ \vdots \\ G(e^{j\zeta_{n_w}}) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} c_1 G(\mu_1) \\ \vdots \\ c_r G(\mu_r) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Once the samples $G(\sigma_i) b_i$ and $c_i G(\mu_i)$ are computed from the frequency response data $G(e^{j\xi_i})$ and $G(e^{j\zeta_i})$, respectively, E_r and A_r can be determined using (16).

To implement DT-IRKA, transfer function samples and their derivatives at r interpolation points are required. These can be computed by numerically

integrating a single integral. Define \bar{S}_b and \bar{L}_b as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{S}_b &= \text{blkdiag} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 I_m & I_m \\ 0 & \sigma_1 I_m \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_r I_m & I_m \\ 0 & \sigma_r I_m \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1}, \\ \bar{L}_b &= \begin{bmatrix} I_m & 0 & \dots & I_m & 0 \end{bmatrix} \bar{S}_b.\end{aligned}\quad (52)$$

By solving the Stein equation (42), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}V &= \begin{bmatrix} (\sigma_1 E - A)^{-1} B & -(\sigma_1 E - A)^{-1} E (\sigma_1 E - A)^{-1} B & \dots \\ (\sigma_r E - A)^{-1} B & -(\sigma_r E - A)^{-1} E (\sigma_r E - A)^{-1} B \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$CV = \begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1) & G'(\sigma_1) & \dots & G(\sigma_r) & G'(\sigma_r) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, by setting \bar{S}_b and \bar{L}_b as in (52), we can compute:

$$\begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1) & G'(\sigma_1) & \dots & G(\sigma_r) & G'(\sigma_r) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} G(e^{j\xi_1}) & \dots & G(e^{j\xi_{n_v}}) \end{bmatrix} \hat{V}_r. \quad (53)$$

This demonstrates that DT-IRKA can be implemented using frequency-domain data $G(e^{j\xi_i})$, and the samples $G(\sigma_i)$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ can be generated offline whenever DT-IRKA updates them. Furthermore, since the eigenvalues $\frac{1}{\sigma_i}$ of \bar{S}_b lie within the unit circle, the interpolation points can be outside the unit circle, and $G(s)$ and $G'(s)$ can be sampled outside the unit circle without any issues. The pseudo-code for the frequency-domain quadrature-based DT-IRKA (FD-Quad-DTIRKA) is outlined in Algorithm 4.

4.2. Offline Sampling of $G(z)$ and $G'(z)$ Using Impulse Response Data

When the eigenvalues of A and \bar{S}_b lie within the unit circle, the projection matrices V and W in the Stein equations (42) and (43) can be expressed as the following infinite sums:

$$V = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (E^{-1}A)^i E^{-1} B \bar{L}_b \bar{S}_b^i, \quad (54)$$

$$W^* = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\bar{S}_c)^i \bar{L}_c C E^{-1} (A E^{-1})^i. \quad (55)$$

Algorithm 4 FD-Quad-DTIRKA

Input: Frequency-domain data: $(G(e^{j\xi_1}), \dots, G(e^{j\xi_{n_v}}))$; Nodes: $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n_v})$;
Quadrature weights: $(w_{v,1}, \dots, w_{v,n_v})$; Interpolation data: $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$,
 (b_1, \dots, b_r) , (c_1, \dots, c_r) ; Tolerance: tol.

Output: ROM: (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r)

- 1: **while**(relative change in $\lambda_i \geq \text{tol}$)
 - 2: Set \bar{S}_b and \bar{L}_b as in (52).
 - 3: Set \hat{V}_r as in (49).
 - 4: Compute $G(\sigma_i)$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ from (53).
 - 5: Compute (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r) from (16).
 - 6: Compute the eigenvalue decomposition: $E_r^{-1}A_r = T_r\Lambda T_r^{-1}$ where $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$.
 - 7: Update the interpolation data: $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) = (\frac{1}{\lambda_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{\lambda_r})$; $[b_1 \dots b_r] = B_r^* E_r^{-*} T_r^{-*}$; $[c_1^* \dots c_r^*] = C_r T_r$.
 - 8: **end while**
-

Since the eigenvalues of A and \bar{S}_b are inside the unit circle, the terms A^i and \bar{S}_b^i decay as i increases. Consequently, after a finite number of terms, the summands $(E^{-1}A)^i E^{-1} B \bar{L}_b \bar{S}_b^i$ and $(\bar{S}_c)^i \bar{L}_c C E^{-1} (A E^{-1})^i$ approach zero. This allows us to approximate V and W by truncating these sums as follows:

$$V \approx \sum_{i=0}^{i_v} (E^{-1}A)^i E^{-1} B \bar{L}_b \bar{S}_b^i, \quad (56)$$

$$W^* \approx \sum_{i=0}^{i_w} (\bar{S}_c)^i \bar{L}_c C E^{-1} (A E^{-1})^i. \quad (57)$$

Next, define the following matrices:

$$\bar{V} = \begin{bmatrix} E^{-1}B & \cdots & (E^{-1}A)^{i_v}E^{-1}B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (58)$$

$$\hat{V}_r = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{L}_b \\ \vdots \\ \bar{L}_b \bar{S}_b^{i_v} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (59)$$

$$\bar{W}^* = \begin{bmatrix} CE^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ CE^{-1}(AE^{-1})^{i_w} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (60)$$

$$\hat{W}_r^* = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{L}_c & \cdots & (\bar{S}_c)^{i_w} \bar{L}_c \end{bmatrix}. \quad (61)$$

From these definitions, it is evident that the sums (56) and (57) can be represented as $\bar{V}\hat{V}_r$ and $\hat{W}_r^*\bar{W}^*$, respectively. Thus, we have the approximations $V \approx \bar{V}\hat{V}_r$ and $W \approx \bar{W}\hat{W}_r$.

Given that the impulse response of $G(z)$ is $h(k) = C(E^{-1}A)^k E^{-1}B = CE^{-1}(AE^{-1})^k B$, it follows that:

$$C_r = C\bar{V}\hat{V}_r = \begin{bmatrix} h(0) & \cdots & h(i_v) \end{bmatrix} \hat{V}_r \approx \begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1)b_1 & \cdots & G(\sigma_r)b_r \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_r = \hat{W}_r^*\bar{W}^*B = \hat{W}_r^* \begin{bmatrix} h(0) \\ \vdots \\ h(i_w) \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} c_1 G(\mu_1) \\ \vdots \\ c_r G(\mu_r) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Once the samples $G(\sigma_i)b_i$ and $c_i G(\mu_i)$ are computed from the impulse response data $h(k)$, the matrices E_r and A_r can be determined using (16).

To implement DT-IRKA, transfer function samples and their derivatives at r interpolation points are required. By setting \bar{S}_b and \bar{L}_b as in (52), we can compute:

$$\begin{bmatrix} h(0) & \cdots & h(i_v) \end{bmatrix} \hat{V}_r \approx \begin{bmatrix} G(\sigma_1) & G'(\sigma_1) & \cdots & G(\sigma_r) & G'(\sigma_r) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (62)$$

This shows that DT-IRKA can be implemented using impulse response data $h(k)$, and the samples $G(\sigma_i)$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ can be generated offline whenever DT-IRKA updates them. Additionally, since the eigenvalues $\frac{1}{\sigma_i}$ of \bar{S}_b lie within the

unit circle, the interpolation points can be outside the unit circle, allowing $G(s)$ and $G'(s)$ to be sampled outside the unit circle without any issues. The pseudo-code for the time-domain DT-IRKA (TD-DTIRKA) is provided in Algorithm 5.

Algorithm 5 TD-DTIRKA

Input: Impulse response data: $(h(0), \dots, h(i_v))$; Nodes: $(0, \dots, i_v)$; Interpolation data: $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$, (b_1, \dots, b_r) , (c_1, \dots, c_r) ; Tolerance: tol.

Output: ROM: (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r)

- 1: **while** (relative change in λ_i \geq tol)
 - 2: Set \bar{S}_b and \bar{L}_b as in (52).
 - 3: Set \hat{V}_r as in (59).
 - 4: Compute $G(\sigma_i)$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ from (62).
 - 5: Compute (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r) from (16).
 - 6: Compute the eigenvalue decomposition: $E_r^{-1}A_r = T_r\Lambda T_r^{-1}$ where $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$.
 - 7: Update the interpolation data: $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) = (\frac{1}{\lambda_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{\lambda_r})$; $[b_1 \dots b_r] = B_r^* E_r^{-*} T_r^{-*}$; $[c_1^* \dots c_r^*] = C_r T_r$.
 - 8: **end while**
-

4.3. Tracking the Error $\|G(z) - G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$

Let $G_r(z)^{(i-1)}$ and $G_r(z)^{(i)}$ represent the interim ROMs in the $(i-1)^{th}$ and i^{th} iterations of DT-IRKA, respectively. Similar to the continuous-time case, the error in the $(i-1)^{th}$ iteration can be computed after the i^{th} iteration as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|G(z) - G_r(z)^{(i-1)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 \\ &= \|G(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 + \|G_r(z)^{(i-1)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 - 2\text{trace}\left(C_r^{(i)}(C_r^{(i-1)}T_r^{(i-1)})^*\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, with a delay of one iteration, the error $\|G(z) - G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ can be tracked by computing $\|G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$ in each iteration. Specifically, the variable component of

the error in data-driven DT-IRKA can be monitored non-intrusively by tracking the following term:

$$\|G_r(z)^{(i-1)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 - 2 \operatorname{trace}\left(C_r^{(i)}(C_r^{(i-1)}T_r^{(i-1)})^*\right).$$

However, it is important to note that the term $-2 \operatorname{trace}\left(C_r^{(i)}(C_r^{(i-1)}T_r^{(i-1)})^*\right)$ is an approximation and not exact. Its accuracy depends on the precision of the numerical integration of the integral (44) or the accuracy of the truncated sum of the infinite summation (54).

5. Pseudo-optimal Rational Krylov (PORK) Algorithm for Discrete-time Systems

In this section, we extend PORK to discrete-time systems and show that the discrete-time version maintains properties comparable to its continuous-time counterpart. Building on the findings from this section, we will formulate a non-intrusive, data-driven BT implementation for discrete-time systems in the following section.

5.1. Input PORK (I-PORK)

By pre-multiplying equation (42) with W^* , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} A_r \bar{S}_b - E_r + B_r \bar{L}_b &= 0, \\ A_r &= (E_r - B_r \bar{L}_b) \bar{S}_b^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that A_r can be parameterized in terms of E_r and B_r without altering the interpolation conditions imposed by V , as this is equivalent to varying W .

Assume that the pair (\bar{S}_b, \bar{L}_b) is observable, and its observability Gramian \bar{Q}_s satisfies the following discrete-time Lyapunov equation:

$$\bar{S}_b^* \bar{Q}_s \bar{S}_b - \bar{Q}_s + \bar{L}_b^* \bar{L}_b = 0. \quad (63)$$

Theorem 5.1. *By setting $E_r = I$ and $B_r = \bar{Q}_s^{-1} \bar{L}_b^*$, the following properties hold:*

1. $A_r = \bar{Q}_s^{-1} \bar{S}_b^* \bar{Q}_s$.
2. The controllability Gramian P_r of the pair (A_r, B_r) is $P_r = \bar{Q}_s^{-1}$.
3. The ROM $(E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r) = (I, \bar{Q}_s^{-1} \bar{S}_b^* \bar{Q}_s, \bar{Q}_s^{-1} \bar{L}_b^*, CV)$ satisfies the optimality condition (41).

Proof. Pre-multiplying (63) by \bar{Q}_s^{-1} and post-multiplying by \bar{S}_b^{-1} , we obtain:

$$\bar{Q}_s^{-1} \bar{S}_b^* \bar{Q}_s - (I + \bar{Q}_s^{-1} \bar{L}_b^* \bar{L}_b) \bar{S}_b^{-1} = 0.$$

Thus, $A_r = \bar{Q}_s^{-1} \bar{S}_b^* \bar{Q}_s$.

The controllability Gramian P_r satisfies the discrete-time Lyapunov equation:

$$\begin{aligned} A_r P_r A_r^T - E_r P_r E_r^T + B_r B_r^T &= 0, \\ \bar{Q}_s^{-1} \bar{S}_b^* \bar{Q}_s P_r \bar{Q}_s \bar{S}_b \bar{Q}_s^{-1} - P_r + \bar{Q}_s^{-1} \bar{L}_b^* \bar{L}_b \bar{Q}_s^{-1} &= 0, \\ \bar{S}_b^* \bar{Q}_s P_r \bar{Q}_s \bar{S}_b - \bar{Q}_s P_r \bar{Q}_s + \bar{L}_b^* \bar{L}_b &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Due to uniqueness, $\bar{Q}_s P_r \bar{Q}_s = \bar{Q}_s$, and thus $P_r = \bar{Q}_s^{-1}$.

Applying a state transformation using \bar{Q}_s , the modal form of the ROM becomes:

$$A_r = \bar{S}_b^*, \quad B_r = \bar{L}_b^*, \quad C_r = C\bar{V}\bar{Q}_s^{-1}.$$

From the modal form, it is evident that this ROM satisfies the optimality condition $G\left(\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_i^*}\right)\hat{r}_i^* = G_r\left(\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_i^*}\right)\hat{r}_i^*$ since $\hat{\lambda}_i = \frac{1}{\sigma_i^*}$ and $\hat{r}_i = b_i^*$. \square

5.2. Output PORK (O-PORK)

By taking the Hermitian of equation (43) and post-multiplying with V , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_c A_r - E_r + \bar{L}_c C_r &= 0, \\ A_r &= \bar{S}_c^{-1} (E_r - \bar{L}_c C_r). \end{aligned}$$

This demonstrates that A_r can be parameterized in terms of E_r and C_r without affecting the interpolation conditions imposed by W , as this is equivalent to varying V .

Assume that the pair (\bar{S}_c, \bar{L}_c) is controllable, and its controllability Gramian \bar{P}_s satisfies the following discrete-time Lyapunov equation:

$$\bar{S}_c \bar{P}_s \bar{S}_c^* - \bar{P}_s + \bar{L}_c \bar{L}_c^* = 0. \quad (64)$$

Theorem 5.2. *By setting $E_r = I$ and $C_r = \bar{L}_c^* \bar{P}_s^{-1}$, the following properties hold:*

1. $A_r = \bar{P}_s \bar{S}_c^* \bar{P}_s^{-1}$.
2. *The observability Gramian Q_r of the pair (A_r, C_r) is $Q_r = \bar{P}_s^{-1}$.*
3. *The ROM $(E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r) = (I, \bar{P}_s \bar{S}_c^* \bar{P}_s^{-1}, W^* B, \bar{L}_c^* \bar{P}_s^{-1})$ satisfies the optimality condition (40).*

Proof. The proof is dual to that of Theorem 5.1 and is therefore omitted for brevity. \square

5.3. Approximation of Gramians

Note that, similar to its continuous-time counterpart, PORK can be implemented non-intrusively using samples of $G(z)$ at $G(\sigma_i)$ and $G(\mu_i)$ without any modifications. Additionally, discrete-time PORK also exhibits a monotonic decay in error as the number of interpolation points increases, analogous to its continuous-time version, as will be explained below.

Consider constructing an $(r-1)^{th}$ -order ROM $G_{r-1}(z)$ using I-PORK with the right interpolation points $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r-1})$ and tangential directions (b_1, \dots, b_{r-1}) .

Clearly, $G_{r-1}(z)$, like $G_r(z)$, satisfies the interpolation conditions for $i = 1, \dots, r-1$.

1. Thus, $G_{r-1}(z)$ is a pseudo-optimal ROM for both $G_r(z)$ and $G(z)$. Consequently, the following relationships hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(z) - G_{r-1}(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 &= \|G(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 - \|G_{r-1}(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2, \\ \|G_r(z) - G_{r-1}(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 &= \|G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 - \|G_{r-1}(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2, \\ \|G(z) - G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 &= \|G(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 - \|G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2, \\ \|G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 &\geq \|G_{r-1}(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2, \\ \|G(z) - G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 &\leq \|G(z) - G_{r-1}(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as the order of the ROM increases, $\|G(z) - G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ decays monotonically. A similar result can be shown for O-PORK.

Note that the controllability Gramian P and the observability Gramian Q of the discrete-time state-space realization (E, A, B, C) satisfy the following discrete-time Lyapunov equations:

$$\begin{aligned} APA^T - EPE^T + BB^T &= 0, \\ A^TQA - E^TQE + C^TC &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

When either the optimality condition (40) or (41) is satisfied, the following holds:

$$\|G(z) - G_r(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 = \text{trace}(C(P - VP_rV^*)C^T) = \text{trace}(B^T(Q - WQ_rW^*)B),$$

cf. [24]. I-PORK can approximate P as $P \approx VP_rV^*$, and O-PORK can approximate Q as $Q \approx WQ_rW^*$. These approximations $P \approx VP_rV^*$ and $Q \approx WQ_rW^*$ monotonically approach P and Q , respectively, as the number of interpolation points increases in PORK.

6. Non-intrusive Low-rank Balanced Truncation for Discrete-time Systems

The low-rank approximations of P and Q can be derived from the block version of discrete-time PORK, similar to the continuous-time case, by defining \bar{S}_b , \bar{L}_b , \bar{S}_c , and \bar{L}_c as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_b &= \left(\text{blkdiag}(\sigma_1 I_m, \dots, \sigma_{n_p} I_m) \right)^{-1}, \\ \bar{L}_b &= \begin{bmatrix} I_m & \dots & I_m \end{bmatrix} \bar{S}_b, \\ \bar{S}_c &= \left(\text{blkdiag}(\mu_1 I_p, \dots, \mu_{n_q} I_p) \right)^{-1}, \\ \bar{L}_c^* &= \begin{bmatrix} I_p & \dots & I_p \end{bmatrix} \bar{S}_c^*. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

The quality of approximation of P and Q can be tracked non-intrusively by observing the growth of $CV\bar{Q}_s^{-1}V^*C^T$ and $B^TW^*\bar{P}_s^{-1}W^*B$, respectively. Note

that CV , W^*B , $P_r = \bar{Q}_s^{-1}$, and $Q_r = \bar{P}_s^{-1}$ can be computed using interpolation data and samples of $G(z)$ at the interpolation points σ_i and μ_i . Furthermore, since W^*EV and W^*AV can also be computed non-intrusively from (16) via the Loewner framework, a data-driven low-rank BT algorithm can be formulated, analogous to its continuous-time counterpart. The pseudo-code for the data-driven PORK-based discrete-time BT (DD-PORK-DTBT) is presented in Algorithm 6.

Algorithm 6 DD-PORK-DTBT

Input: Shifts for approximating P : $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n_p})$; Shifts for approximating Q : $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{n_q})$; Frequency-domain data: $(G(\sigma_1), \dots, G(\sigma_{n_p}), G(\mu_1), \dots, G(\mu_{n_q}))$ and $G'(\sigma_i)$ for $\sigma_i = \mu_j$; Reduced order: r .

Output: ROM: (E_r, A_r, B_r, C_r)

- 1: Set \bar{S}_b , \bar{S}_c , \bar{L}_b , and \bar{L}_c as in (65).
- 2: Compute \bar{Q}_s and \bar{P}_s by solving the Lyapunov equations (63) and (64).
- 3: Decompose $\bar{Q}_s^{-1} = L_p L_p^*$ and $\bar{P}_s^{-1} = L_q L_q^*$.
- 4: Compute (W^*EV, W^*AV, W^*B, CV) from (16).
- 5: Compute the singular value decomposition:

$$L_q^*(W^*EV)L_p = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{U}_1 & \tilde{U}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{S}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{S}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{V}_1^* \\ \tilde{V}_2^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

- 6: Compute the ROM:

$$E_r = I, A_r = \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{U}_1^* L_q^*(W^*AV)L_p \tilde{V}_1 \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$B_r = \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{U}_1^* L_q^*(W^*B), C_r = (CV)L_p \tilde{V}_1 \tilde{S}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

7. Illustrative Examples

In this section, the applicability of the proposed algorithms is demonstrated through two examples. The first example illustrates the use of continuous-time algorithms, while the second example focuses on discrete-time algorithms. The convergence tolerance tol for the IRKA algorithms is set to 1×10^{-4} . Both the

time-domain and frequency-domain IRKA algorithms are initialized with the same arbitrary interpolation data.

7.1. Continuous-time Example

Consider an 8th-order system with 3 inputs and 2 outputs, defined by the following matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}
 E &= \begin{bmatrix} -0.1329 & -0.1830 & 0.4204 & 0.2123 & -0.0090 & -0.7048 & 0.0718 & -0.4744 \\ 0.7153 & 0.3962 & -0.0090 & -0.1671 & -0.4707 & -0.2211 & 0.1660 & -0.0735 \\ 0.1216 & -0.7623 & 0.1513 & -0.1346 & -0.5465 & 0.1089 & -0.1673 & 0.1571 \\ -0.0025 & 0.2308 & 0.1280 & 0.3308 & -0.0813 & -0.3293 & -0.6168 & 0.5704 \\ 0.4626 & -0.2890 & 0.1556 & -0.3241 & 0.6522 & -0.2244 & 0.0647 & 0.3054 \\ 0.0604 & 0.1404 & 0.7664 & 0.2866 & -0.0072 & 0.3993 & 0.3319 & 0.1935 \\ -0.0587 & -0.1731 & -0.3653 & 0.4137 & -0.0965 & -0.2614 & 0.6318 & 0.4304 \\ 0.4846 & -0.2051 & -0.1970 & 0.6641 & 0.1957 & 0.2368 & -0.2130 & -0.3217 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 A &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.3165 & 0.0433 & -0.0897 & -0.3059 & 0.4835 & 0.4722 & 0.1491 & 0.4026 \\ -1.6384 & 0.0697 & -0.1594 & 0.4011 & 2.5586 & 0.4127 & -0.2951 & 0.3963 \\ -0.7925 & 0.2861 & -0.1234 & 0.0915 & 1.9041 & 0.3298 & 0.1228 & 0.1631 \\ 0.6408 & -0.1553 & 0.2905 & -0.5050 & 0.0275 & 0.4285 & 1.0360 & -0.3904 \\ -1.9040 & 0.4285 & -1.2363 & 1.4055 & -1.5859 & -0.4700 & -0.1853 & -0.3179 \\ -0.6808 & 0.1826 & -0.7794 & 0.2324 & -0.1947 & -0.3516 & -0.9833 & -0.3325 \\ 1.1166 & -0.1632 & 0.5548 & -0.9137 & 0.3656 & 0.1125 & -1.2094 & -0.6877 \\ -0.3043 & 0.0552 & -0.0005 & -0.0203 & -0.1093 & -0.1074 & 0.4194 & 0.3044 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 B &= \begin{bmatrix} -1.0574 & -0.1187 & 0.1997 \\ 2.7334 & 0.2065 & -0.9609 \\ -1.2774 & -0.0729 & -0.2255 \\ 0.2804 & -0.4175 & -0.1790 \\ 0.3311 & 0.7797 & -0.9579 \\ -0.3825 & -1.1348 & -0.5093 \\ -0.3486 & -0.4840 & -0.5349 \\ 0.8811 & -0.5043 & -2.0357 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 C &= \begin{bmatrix} -0.3343 & 1.0126 & -0.1878 & -0.2024 & 1.8780 & 0.2148 & 1.2366 & -0.9683 \\ 0.6666 & -0.0618 & -0.3138 & -0.5563 & -0.2946 & 0.9158 & 0.2502 & 0.4380 \end{bmatrix}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For FD-Quad-IRKA, the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule is applied, with the integration limits $[-1, 1]$ mapped to $[-\infty, \infty]$ using the previously described mapping. The number of nodes is set to 40, and the weights and transfer function samples are computed for these nodes. The following initial guess for the interpolation data is used to initialize FD-Quad-IRKA:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3) &= (5 + 7i, 5 - 7i, 15) \\
 (b_1, b_2, b_3) &= \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 (c_1, c_2, c_3) &= ([1 \ 1], [1 \ 1], [1 \ 1]).
 \end{aligned}$$

FD-Quad-IRKA converged in 11 iterations, producing the following ROM:

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_r &= \begin{bmatrix} 13.9771 & -15.8941 & -23.5713 \\ -8.6005 & 10.4622 & 15.6333 \\ 0.4613 & -0.5135 & -0.5346 \end{bmatrix}, & A_r &= \begin{bmatrix} -2.6081 & 3.1316 & 0.3632 \\ 2.1461 & -2.8052 & -2.3640 \\ 0.0256 & -0.0393 & -0.6668 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 B_r &= 10^3 \times \begin{bmatrix} -1.7187 & -0.2291 & -0.0865 \\ 1.2412 & 0.2255 & 0.1000 \\ -0.0261 & -0.0097 & -0.0227 \end{bmatrix}, & C_r &= \begin{bmatrix} -0.0159 & 0.0194 & 0.0206 \\ -0.0018 & 0.0039 & 0.0151 \end{bmatrix}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This ROM is almost a local optimum.

For TD-Quad-IRKA, the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule is also used, with the integration limits $[-1, 1]$ mapped to $[0, 10]$. The number of nodes is set to 40, and the weights and impulse response samples are computed for these nodes. TD-Quad-IRKA converged in 23 iterations, producing the following ROM:

$$E_r = \begin{bmatrix} 13.9172 & -15.5228 & 2.8180 \\ -7.9277 & 9.3409 & -1.7265 \\ -5.1194 & 5.6322 & -0.7672 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_r = \begin{bmatrix} -2.5660 & 3.0421 & 0.0153 \\ 2.1867 & -2.7041 & 0.3385 \\ -0.2934 & 0.2440 & -0.7435 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_r = \begin{bmatrix} -459.7932 & -67.1071 & -31.7401 \\ 316.6824 & 57.6408 & 23.8200 \\ 87.8575 & 29.1344 & 63.0026 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_r = \begin{bmatrix} -0.0596 & 0.0700 & -0.0093 \\ -0.0088 & 0.0140 & -0.0063 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This ROM is also almost a local optimum.

For DD-ADI-BT, the mirror images of the poles of the ROM produced by FD-Quad-IRKA are used as shifts for approximating the controllability Gramian, and the mirror images of the poles of the ROM produced by TD-Quad-IRKA are used as shifts for approximating the observability Gramian. Specifically:

$$(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3) = (1.9632, 0.1981, 0.4179), \quad (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) = (1.7135, 0.2554, 0.4042).$$

The matrices L_p and L_q are derived from this interpolation data as follows:

$$L_p = \begin{bmatrix} 3.7386 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3.7386 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3.7386 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1.2465 & 0 & 0 & 1.7640 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1.2465 & 0 & 0 & 1.7640 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1.2465 & 0 & 0 & 1.7640 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -3.0036 & 0 & 0 & -2.3935 & 0 & 0 & 0.9142 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -3.0036 & 0 & 0 & -2.3935 & 0 & 0 & 0.9142 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -3.0036 & 0 & 0 & -2.3935 & 0 & 0 & 0.9142 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$L_q = \begin{bmatrix} 4.0431 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 4.0431 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2.8747 & 0 & 3.1681 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2.8747 & 0 & 3.1681 & 0 & 0 \\ -5.0667 & 0 & -3.8828 & 0 & 0.8991 & 0 \\ 0 & -5.0667 & 0 & -3.8828 & 0 & 0.8991 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The matrices $W^T E V, W^T A V, W^T B, C V$ in DD-ADI-BT are computed via (16)

as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
W^T E V &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.5259 & 0.1013 & 0.0620 & 2.7176 & 0.2951 & 0.0395 & 1.8238 & 0.2482 & 0.0690 \\ 0.1269 & 0.0296 & -0.0151 & 0.0801 & 0.0470 & 0.1733 & 0.1578 & 0.0495 & 0.0725 \\ 2.1358 & 0.2567 & 0.0524 & 10.5079 & 0.5952 & -0.2479 & 7.0971 & 0.5631 & -0.0943 \\ 0.1149 & 0.0459 & 0.1139 & -0.7513 & 0.0042 & 1.1237 & -0.2462 & 0.0425 & 0.6419 \\ 1.6483 & 0.2270 & 0.0671 & 8.1513 & 0.5749 & -0.1417 & 5.5035 & 0.5187 & -0.0243 \\ 0.1511 & 0.0463 & 0.0617 & -0.4000 & 0.0309 & 0.7896 & -0.0445 & 0.0564 & 0.4351 \end{bmatrix}, \\
W^T A V &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.0459 & -0.0744 & -0.1029 & -0.4482 & -0.2148 & -0.2168 & -0.2244 & -0.1696 & -0.1958 \\ -0.2374 & -0.0457 & 0.1383 & -0.4707 & -0.0944 & 0.2023 & -0.4206 & -0.0830 & 0.1983 \\ -0.3098 & -0.1824 & -0.1957 & -2.4212 & -0.5684 & -0.3478 & -1.5369 & -0.4510 & -0.3381 \\ -0.4255 & -0.0846 & 0.1933 & -0.7999 & -0.1738 & 0.1923 & -0.7539 & -0.1569 & 0.2379 \\ -0.1891 & -0.1562 & -0.1820 & -1.8102 & -0.4880 & -0.3417 & -1.1250 & -0.3852 & -0.3238 \\ -0.3938 & -0.0776 & 0.1891 & -0.7697 & -0.1624 & 0.2245 & -0.7090 & -0.1449 & 0.2499 \end{bmatrix}, \\
W^T B &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.9866 & 0.2733 & 0.2246 \\ 0.4866 & 0.1037 & -0.1680 \\ 4.5028 & 0.6863 & 0.2987 \\ 0.6511 & 0.1747 & 0.0303 \\ 3.4249 & 0.6019 & 0.3137 \\ 0.6905 & 0.1685 & -0.0680 \end{bmatrix}, \\
CV &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.8553 & 0.2480 & 0.2091 & 5.1049 & 0.7204 & 0.2845 & 3.3495 & 0.5948 & 0.3140 \\ 0.4549 & 0.0963 & -0.1642 & 0.6080 & 0.1749 & 0.0947 & 0.6911 & 0.1677 & -0.0740 \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by applying the square root algorithm, DD-ADI-BT produced the following ROM:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_r &= \begin{bmatrix} -0.2325 & 0.0511 & -0.2810 \\ -0.2856 & -0.5514 & 0.7366 \\ 0.2492 & 0.4914 & -1.4570 \end{bmatrix}, & B_r &= \begin{bmatrix} -1.4800 & -0.2263 & -0.0763 \\ -0.8791 & -0.2040 & 0.0567 \\ 0.8023 & -0.2298 & -0.8316 \end{bmatrix}, \\
C_r &= \begin{bmatrix} -1.4844 & 0.1491 & -0.9375 \\ -0.2103 & -0.8950 & 0.7178 \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

The Hankel singular values of the original system are: (4.8327, 0.7466, 0.4747, 0.2939, 0.0844, 0.0539, 0.0122, 0.0100). The Hankel singular values of the ROM produced by DD-ADI-BT are: (4.8342, 0.7522, 0.4790). It is evident that this ROM nearly preserves the three most significant Hankel singular values of the original system.

7.2. Discrete-time Example

Consider an 8th-order system with 3 inputs and 2 outputs, represented by the following matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}
 E &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.1128 & 0.2556 & 0.3542 & -0.2709 & -0.3405 & -0.2389 & -0.6211 & 0.4055 \\ 0.0359 & -0.3409 & 0.2193 & -0.2796 & 0.3983 & 0.1950 & 0.2743 & 0.6959 \\ -0.5181 & -0.5566 & 0.4506 & -0.2155 & -0.1785 & 0.0772 & -0.1283 & -0.3434 \\ -0.2592 & 0.3539 & -0.0051 & -0.2226 & -0.6091 & 0.3368 & 0.4991 & 0.1563 \\ 0.0092 & -0.4512 & -0.4328 & -0.0936 & -0.3741 & -0.6240 & 0.1821 & 0.1945 \\ -0.1329 & 0.2315 & -0.3025 & -0.8089 & 0.3256 & -0.1219 & -0.0406 & -0.2457 \\ 0.5842 & 0.0222 & 0.5145 & -0.1892 & -0.0571 & -0.2761 & 0.4236 & -0.3143 \\ -0.5397 & 0.3546 & 0.2826 & 0.2313 & 0.2708 & -0.5523 & 0.2434 & 0.1092 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 A &= \begin{bmatrix} -0.0030 & -0.0238 & 0.0017 & -0.0953 & 0.0369 & 0.2394 & 0.4077 & 0.4283 \\ 0.1787 & 0.0492 & 0.1552 & -0.0488 & -0.0253 & -0.0845 & -0.5262 & 0.0706 \\ -0.0119 & 0.1576 & -0.1530 & -0.0118 & 0.2401 & 0.0549 & 0.2410 & 0.0497 \\ -0.2845 & -0.0224 & -0.1401 & 0.0054 & 0.2620 & -0.4944 & -0.2717 & 0.1072 \\ 0.1327 & 0.0064 & -0.1139 & 0.4362 & 0.1511 & 0.2174 & -0.0164 & 0.1906 \\ -0.0165 & 0.0767 & 0.2010 & 0.2852 & 0.3392 & 0.2377 & 0.0397 & -0.0182 \\ 0.0894 & -0.2719 & -0.3776 & -0.2099 & 0.2297 & 0.1287 & -0.1241 & 0.0270 \\ -0.2572 & 0.1215 & -0.2234 & -0.0036 & -0.1692 & 0.4077 & -0.1834 & -0.0071 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 B &= \begin{bmatrix} -1.3348 & 0.3701 & 0.3354 \\ -0.0577 & 0.0682 & 0.3743 \\ -0.3404 & 0.7916 & 1.4179 \\ -1.2247 & -1.1469 & -0.8465 \\ 0.7263 & 1.3864 & 0.6982 \\ -1.6794 & 0.3728 & -0.3906 \\ -0.0074 & 0.7447 & -1.2426 \\ 1.3958 & -1.0287 & 0.9076 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 C &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.4879 & 0.2181 & -0.9189 & -0.0798 & -1.1905 & 0.3303 & 1.3089 & 1.7497 \\ -1.4809 & 0.2055 & -0.2881 & -1.7835 & 1.5231 & -2.4484 & 0.9090 & 0.5729 \end{bmatrix}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For FD-Quad-DTIRKA, the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule is applied, with the integration limits $[-1, 1]$ mapped to $[-\pi, \pi]$. The number of nodes is set to 40, and the weights and transfer function samples are computed for these nodes. The same interpolation data used in the continuous-time case is used to initialize the discrete-time algorithms. FD-Quad-DTIRKA converged in 16 iterations, producing the following ROM:

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_r &= \begin{bmatrix} -0.9675 & 4.4540 & 16.7551 \\ -4.2954 & -0.9563 & -21.3456 \\ 10.2074 & 20.8577 & 608.8286 \end{bmatrix}, & A_r &= \begin{bmatrix} -1.1258 & -1.6224 & -15.3391 \\ 3.7672 & -3.2506 & 17.4896 \\ -11.1758 & -14.8510 & -567.8891 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 B_r &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.0057 & -0.0007 & 0.0085 \\ -0.0006 & -0.0081 & -0.0054 \\ 0.0015 & 0.1134 & 0.0988 \end{bmatrix}, & C_r &= 10^4 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0.0503 & -0.0768 & -1.0906 \\ 0.0620 & 0.1076 & 0.8695 \end{bmatrix}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This ROM is nearly a local optimum.

For TD-DTIRKA, the first 40 samples of the impulse response are used. TD-DTIRKA is initialized with the same interpolation data as used for all other IRKA algorithms. It converged in 16 iterations and produced the following ROM:

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_r &= \begin{bmatrix} -0.9693 & 4.3792 & 15.8339 \\ -4.2544 & -0.9183 & -20.5145 \\ 10.6939 & 19.9215 & 574.8606 \end{bmatrix}, & A_r &= \begin{bmatrix} -1.0656 & -1.6208 & -14.5316 \\ 3.7171 & -3.2960 & 16.7150 \\ -11.5905 & -13.8887 & -534.4197 \end{bmatrix}, \\
 B_r &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.0055 & -0.0008 & 0.0081 \\ -0.0007 & -0.0078 & -0.0053 \\ 0.0019 & 0.1096 & 0.0958 \end{bmatrix}, & C_r &= 10^4 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0.0494 & -0.0779 & -1.0834 \\ 0.0651 & 0.1077 & 0.8645 \end{bmatrix}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For DD-PORK-DTBT, the reciprocals of the poles of the ROM produced by FD-Quad-DTIRKA are used as shifts for approximating the controllability Gramian, and the reciprocals of the poles of the ROM produced by TD-DTIRKA are used as shifts for approximating the observability Gramian. Specifically:

$$(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3) = (-0.9175 - 1.1467i, -0.9175 + 1.1467i - 1.0688),$$

$$(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3) = (-0.9179 - 1.1535i, -0.9179 + 1.1535i, -1.0724).$$

The following 3^{rd} -order ROM is produced by DD-PORK-DTBT:

$$A_r = \begin{bmatrix} -0.9319 & -0.0709 & 0.0512 \\ 0.0290 & -0.5601 & 0.4335 \\ 0.0524 & -0.7041 & -0.3164 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_r = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0284 & 1.3941 & 1.2291 \\ -0.8544 & 0.9899 & -0.7287 \\ 0.7074 & 0.0289 & 0.8730 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$C_r = \begin{bmatrix} -1.4486 & 1.0136 & 0.3851 \\ 1.1751 & -0.0479 & 1.5625 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The Hankel singular values of the original system are: 26.5204, 4.6502, 4.1466, 2.1027, 1.3598, 0.6920, 0.36, 0.1077. The Hankel singular values of this ROM are: 26.5458, 4.4287, 3.8934. Considering that discrete-time BT, unlike continuous-time BT, does not preserve the Hankel singular values exactly, DD-PORK-DTBT has been highly successful in closely approximating the first three most significant Hankel singular values.

8. Conclusion

This paper introduces data-driven, non-intrusive implementations of IRKA for both continuous-time and discrete-time systems. The proposed implementations utilize available frequency response or impulse response data to compute samples of the transfer function and its derivative offline. Additionally, data-driven, non-intrusive implementations of BT are presented for both continuous-time and discrete-time systems. It is demonstrated that data-driven IRKA can generate excellent shifts for data-driven low-rank BT, which in turn effectively captures the most significant Hankel singular values of the systems. Two illustrative examples are provided to showcase the applicability and effectiveness of the proposed algorithm.

References

- [1] B. Moore, Principal component analysis in linear systems: Controllability, observability, and model reduction, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 26 (1) (1981) 17–32.
- [2] M. S. Tombs, I. Postlethwaite, Truncated balanced realization of a stable non-minimal state-space system, *International Journal of Control* 46 (4) (1987) 1319–1330.
- [3] C. A. Beattie, S. Gugercin, et al., Model reduction by rational interpolation, *Model Reduction and Approximation* 15 (2017) 297–334.
- [4] S. Gugercin, A. C. Antoulas, C. Beattie, \mathcal{H}_2 model reduction for large-scale linear dynamical systems, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 30 (2) (2008) 609–638.
- [5] T. Wolf, \mathcal{H}_2 pseudo-optimal model order reduction, Ph.D. thesis, Technische Universität München (2014).
- [6] A. Mayo, A. C. Antoulas, A framework for the solution of the generalized realization problem, *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* 425 (2-3) (2007) 634–662.
- [7] I. V. Gosea, S. Gugercin, C. Beattie, Data-driven balancing of linear dynamical systems, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 44 (1) (2022) A554–A582.
- [8] L. Lennart, *System identification: Theory for the user*, Vol. 28, 1999.
- [9] H. Özbay, S. Gümüşsoy, K. Kashima, Y. Yamamoto, *Frequency Domain Techniques for \mathcal{H}_∞ Control of Distributed Parameter Systems*, SIAM, 2018.
- [10] R. Pintelon, J. Schoukens, Y. Rolain, Frequency-domain approach to continuous-time system identification: Some practical aspects, *Identification of continuous-time models from sampled data* (2008) 215–248.

- [11] J. Gillberg, Frequency domain identification of continuous-time systems: Reconstruction and robustness, Ph.D. thesis, Institutionen för systemteknik (2006).
- [12] E. A. Morelli, J. A. Grauer, Practical aspects of frequency-domain approaches for aircraft system identification, *Journal of Aircraft* 57 (2) (2020) 268–291.
- [13] D. C. Sorensen, A. Antoulas, The Sylvester equation and approximate balanced reduction, *Linear algebra and Its Applications* 351 (2002) 671–700.
- [14] U. Zulfiqar, V. Sreeram, X. Du, Frequency-limited pseudo-optimal rational Krylov algorithm for power system reduction, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 118 (2020) 105798.
- [15] G.-B. Stan, J.-J. Embrechts, D. Archambeau, Comparison of different impulse response measurement techniques, *Journal of the Audio Engineering Society* 50 (4) (2002) 249–262.
- [16] R. J. Finno, S. L. Gassman, Impulse response evaluation of drilled shafts, *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering* 124 (10) (1998) 965–975.
- [17] M. Holters, T. Corbach, U. Zölzer, Impulse response measurement techniques and their applicability in the real world, in: *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Digital Audio Effects (DAFx-09)*, 2009, pp. 108–112.
- [18] S. Foster, Impulse response measurement using golay codes, in: *ICASSP'86. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, Vol. 11, IEEE, 1986, pp. 929–932.
- [19] J. Borish, J. B. Angell, An efficient algorithm for measuring the impulse response using pseudorandom noise, *Journal of the Audio Engineering Society* 31 (7/8) (1983) 478–488.

- [20] U. Zulfiqar, V. Sreeram, X. Du, Time-limited pseudo-optimal-model order reduction, *IET Control Theory & Applications* 14 (14) (2020) 1995–2007.
- [21] P. Benner, M. Köhler, J. Saak, Sparse-dense sylvester equations in \mathcal{H}_2 -model order reduction, Preprint MPIMD/11-11, Max Planck Institute Magdeburg, available from <http://www.mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de/preprints/> (Dec. 2011).
- [22] T. Wolf, H. K. Panzer, The ADI iteration for Lyapunov equations implicitly performs \mathcal{H}_2 pseudo-optimal model order reduction, *International Journal of Control* 89 (3) (2016) 481–493.
- [23] P. Benner, P. Kürschner, J. Saak, Efficient handling of complex shift parameters in the low-rank cholesky factor ADI method, *Numerical Algorithms* 62 (2013) 225–251.
- [24] A. Bunse-Gerstner, D. Kubalińska, G. Vossen, D. Wilczek, \mathcal{H}_2 -norm optimal model reduction for large scale discrete dynamical MIMO systems, *Journal of Computational and Applied mathematics* 233 (5) (2010) 1202–1216.
- [25] M. S. Ackermann, S. Gugercin, Time-domain iterative rational Krylov method, arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12670 (2024).
- [26] G.-R. Duan, Generalized sylvester equations/g, R. Duan. *Unified Parametric Solutions*: CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL (2015).