

Input-output equations and identifiability of linear ODE models

Alexey Ovchinnikov*

Gleb Pogudin[‡]

Peter Thompson[¶]

Abstract

Structural identifiability is a property of a differential model with parameters that allows for the parameters to be determined from the model equations in the absence of noise. The method of input-output equations is one method for verifying structural identifiability. This method stands out in its importance because the additional insights it provides can be used to analyze and improve models. However, its complete theoretical grounds and applicability are still to be established. A subtlety and key for this method to work is knowing if the coefficients of these equations are identifiable.

In this paper, to address this, we prove identifiability of the coefficients of input-output equations for types of differential models that often appear in practice, such as linear models with one output and linear compartment models in which, from each compartment, one can reach either a leak or an input. This shows that checking identifiability via input-output equations for these models is legitimate and, as we prove, that the field of identifiable functions is generated by the coefficients of the input-output equations. Finally, we show that, for a linear compartment model with an input and strongly connected graph, the field of all identifiable functions is generated by the coefficients of the equations obtained from the model just using Cramer’s rule.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Structural identifiability (in what follows, we will say just “identifiability” for simplicity) is a property of a differential model with parameters that allows for the parameters to be uniquely determined from the model equations, noiseless data and sufficiently exciting inputs (also known as the persistence of excitation, see [23, 38, 40]). Performing identifiability analysis is an important first step in evaluating and, if needed, adjusting the model before a reliable practical parameter identification is performed. There are different approaches to assessing identifiability (see [9, 18, 37] for descriptions of methods).

One of these approaches, which is widely used, is based on **input-output equations** [3, 34, 26, 15, 4, 6, 33, 35, 25, 20, 27], and has appeared in software packages such as COMBOS, DAISY, and their successors. Roughly speaking, these are “minimal” equations that depend only on the input and output variables and parameters (see [22] for applications other than identifiability). We will describe a typical algorithm based

*Department of Mathematics, CUNY Queens College and Ph.D. Programs in Mathematics and Computer Science, CUNY Graduate Center, New York, USA; e-mail: aovchinnikov@qc.cuny.edu,

[†]LIX, CNRS, École Polytechnique, Institute Polytechnique de Paris, Palaiseau, France; e-mail: gleb.pogudin@polytechnique.edu

[‡]Department of Computer Science, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

[§]Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, New York, USA

[¶]Ph.D. Program in Mathematics, CUNY Graduate Center, New York, USA; e-mail: pthompson@gradcenter.cuny.edu

on this approach using the following linear compartment model as a running example:

$$\begin{cases} x_1' = -(a_{01} + a_{21})x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + u, \\ x_2' = a_{21}x_1 - a_{12}x_2, \\ y = x_2. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

In the above system,

- x_1 and x_2 are unknown state variables;
- y is the output observed in the experiment;
- u is the input (control) function to be chosen by the experimenter;
- a_{01}, a_{12}, a_{21} are unknown scalar parameters.

The question is whether the values of the parameters a_{01}, a_{12}, a_{21} can be determined from y and u . A typical algorithm operates as follows:

- (1) Find input-output equations, representing them as (differential) polynomials in the input and output variables. For (1), a calculation shows that the input-output equation is

$$y'' + (a_{01} + a_{12} + a_{21})y' + a_{01}a_{12}y - a_{21}u = 0. \quad (2)$$

- (2) Use the following **Assumption (A)**:

a function of parameters is identifiable if and only if it can be expressed as a rational function of the coefficients of the input-output equations.

In our example, this amounts to assuming that a function of parameters is identifiable if and only if it can be expressed as a rational function of $a_{01} + a_{12} + a_{21}$, $a_{01}a_{12}$, and a_{21} .

One possible rationale behind this assumption is the “solvability” condition from [34, Remark 3]: due to the “minimality” of the input-output equations, one would expect that there exist N and $t_1, \dots, t_N \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the linear system

$$\begin{cases} y''(t_1) + c_1y'(t_1) + c_2y(t_1) + c_3u(t_1) = 0 \\ \vdots \\ y''(t_N) + c_1y'(t_N) + c_2y(t_N) + c_3u(t_N) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

in c_1, c_2, c_3 has a unique solution in terms of $y(t_i), y'(t_i), y''(t_i), u(t_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, so the coefficients of (2) are identifiable. However, [18, Example 2.14] and [31, Section 5.2] show that *the assumption is not always satisfied* and, consequently, such N and t_1, \dots, t_N might not exist at all.

- (3) Set up a system of polynomial equations in the parameters setting the coefficients of (2) equal to new variables,

$$\begin{cases} a_{01} + a_{12} + a_{21} = c_1 \\ a_{01}a_{12} = c_2 \\ -a_{21} = c_3, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

and verify if (4) as a system in the a 's with coefficients in the field $\mathbb{C}(c_1, c_2, c_3)$ has a unique solution. This can be done, e.g., using Gröbner bases. Alternatively, for (4), one can see that $a_{21} = -c_3$ can be uniquely recovered, but the values of a_{01} and a_{12} are known only up to exchange due to the symmetry of (4) with respect to a_{01} and a_{12} .

Even though there are complete algorithms (that is, not relying on any assumption like [Assumption \(A\)](#) above) for assessing structural identifiability (see, e.g., [17]), establishing when the input-output equation method is valid is important for the following reasons:

- This method can produce all identifiable functions (also referred to as “true parameters” in [22, Remark 2]), not just assess identifiability of specific parameters. More precisely, [32, Corollary 5.8] shows that the field generated by the coefficients of the input-output equations contains all of the identifiable functions.

In example (1), the field of identifiable functions is generated by the coefficients of (2), so it is equal to

$$\mathbb{C}(a_{01} + a_{12} + a_{21}, a_{01}a_{12}, a_{21}) = \mathbb{C}(a_{01} + a_{12}, a_{01}a_{12}, a_{21}).$$

Generators of the field of identifiable functions can be used to reparametrize the model [3, 7, 24].

- This method can be used for proving general theorems about classes of models [26, 15].
- For a large class of linear compartment models, there are efficient methods for computing their input-output equations [26, 27, 15].

1.2 The problem

As was described above, the approach to assessing identifiability via input-output equations has been used much in the last three decades and has its own distinctive features. However, it heavily relies on [Assumption \(A\)](#), which is not always true (see [18, Example 2.14] and [31, Section 5.2]). It can be verified by an algorithm [11, Section 4.1] and [28, Section 3.4] but is not verified in any implementation we have seen (including [6, 25]). **The general problem** studied in this paper is:

to determine classes of ODE models that satisfy [Assumption \(A\)](#) a priori; consequently, the approach via input-output equations gives correct result for these models.

Discrepancy between different notions of identifiability is not unusual given the wide range of experimental setups and mathematical tools involved. See [40] for the case of local identifiability.

1.3 Our results

The first part of our results shows that [Assumption \(A\)](#) is a priori satisfied for the following classes of models often appearing in practice [2, 5, 12, 13, 14, 25, 36, 39]:

- linear models with one output (Theorem 1);
- linear compartment models such that, from every vertex of the graph of the model, at least one leak or input is reachable (Theorem 2).

Checking whether the model is of one of these types can be done just by visual inspection. For instance, as we will see in Example 2.9, each of these theorems is applicable to model (1). Note that Theorem 1 cannot be strengthened to more than one output if all linear models are allowed, see [18, Example 2.14].

The second part is devoted to relaxing the “minimality” condition on the input-output equations. For linear compartment models, elegant relations involving only parameters, inputs, and outputs were proposed in [26, Theorem 2] based on Cramer’s rule (see also [15, Proposition 2.3]). In general, using these equations instead of the “minimal” relations in the algorithm above would give incorrect results (see [15, Remark 3.11]).

However, in Theorem 3, we show that, for linear compartment models with an input and whose graph is strongly connected, one can use these equations as the input-output equations and obtain the full field of identifiable functions.

We state the consequences of our results for algorithms for computing identifiable functions in Section 3.2 and illustrate the conditions in our main results in Section 3.3.

1.4 Structure of the paper

Basic notions and notation from differential algebra, identifiability, and linear compartment models are given in Section 2. The main results in a brief form are stated in Section 3 and then are stated and proved in Sections 4 and 5. Appendix contains results we use relating the notions used in the paper for linear models to the corresponding notions for nonlinear systems.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall the notation/notions found in the literature and introduce our own notation/notions that we will use to state our main results in Section 3. All fields are assumed to have characteristic zero.

2.1 Identifiability of linear models

Fix positive integers λ , n , m , and κ for the remainder of the paper. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_\lambda)$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$, and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_\kappa)$. Consider a system of ODEs

$$\Sigma = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{u}), \\ \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{u}), \\ \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}^*, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ and $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ are tuples of polynomials in \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} over $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ of degree at most one.

For a rational function $h(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, we will define two notions of identifiability: *identifiability* and *IO-identifiability*, where the former is meaningful from the modeling standpoint, and the latter is what the algorithm outlined in the introduction will check. We will first introduce some notation to give rigorous definitions:

Notation 2.1 (Auxiliary analytic notation).

- (a) Let $\mathbb{C}^\infty(0)$ denote the set of all functions that are complex analytic in some neighborhood of $t = 0$.
- (b) Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^\lambda$ be the complement to the set where at least one of the denominators of the coefficients of (5) in $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ vanishes.
- (c) For every $h \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, we set

$$\Omega_h := \mathbb{C}^n \times \{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \Omega \mid h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \text{ well-defined}\} \times (\mathbb{C}^\infty(0))^\kappa.$$

- (d) For $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$ such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \Omega$, let $X(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$ and $Y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$ denote the unique solution over $\mathbb{C}^\infty(0)$ of the instance of Σ with $\mathbf{x}^* = \hat{\mathbf{x}}^*$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, and $\mathbf{u} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}$ (see [16, Theorem 2.2.2]).
- (e) For any positive integer s , a subset $U \subset \mathbb{C}^s$ is called *Zariski open* if there exists a polynomial P on \mathbb{C}^s such that U is the complement to the zero set of P .

- (f) For any positive integer s , a subset $U \subset (\mathbb{C}^\infty(0))^s$ is called *Zariski open* if there exists a polynomial P in z_1, \dots, z_s and their derivatives such that

$$U = \{\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in (\mathbb{C}^\infty(0))^s \mid P(\hat{\mathbf{z}})|_{t=0} \neq 0\}.$$

- (g) For any positive integer s and $X = \mathbb{C}^s$ or $(\mathbb{C}^\infty(0))^s$, the set of all nonempty Zariski open subsets of X will be denoted by $\tau(X)$.

Definition 2.2 (Identifiability, see [18, Definition 2.5]). We say that $h(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is *identifiable* if

$$\begin{aligned} &\exists \Theta \in \tau(\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^\lambda) \exists U \in \tau((\mathbb{C}^\infty(0))^k) \\ &\forall (\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) \in (\Theta \times U) \cap \Omega_h \quad |S_h(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})| = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$S_h(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) := \{h(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \mid \exists (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \in \Omega_h \text{ such that } Y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) = Y(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\}.$$

The field $\{h \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mid h \text{ is identifiable}\}$ will be called *the field of identifiable functions*.

The notion of IO-identifiability can be defined for systems with rational right-hand side (see Section A.1 from the Appendix). Here we give a specialization of the general definition to the linear case (the equivalence of Definition 2.5 and Definition A.4 restricted to the linear case is established in Proposition A.5). For this, we will first recall several standard notions from differential algebra:

Notation 2.3 (Differential rings and ideals).

- (a) A *differential ring* (R, δ) is a commutative ring with a derivation $' : R \rightarrow R$, that is, a map such that, for all $a, b \in R$, $(a + b)' = a' + b'$ and $(ab)' = a'b + ab'$.
- (b) The *ring of differential polynomials* in the variables x_1, \dots, x_n over a field K is the ring $K[x_j^{(i)} \mid i \geq 0, 1 \leq j \leq n]$ with a derivation defined on the ring by $(x_j^{(i)})' := x_j^{(i+1)}$. This differential ring is denoted by $K\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.
- (c) For a differential polynomial $P \in K\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, *the order of P with respect to x_i* is the order of the highest derivative of x_i appearing in P ($-\infty$ if x_i does not appear in P). It is denoted by $\text{ord}_{x_i} P$.
- (d) An ideal I of a differential ring (R, δ) is called a *differential ideal* if, for all $a \in I$, $\delta(a) \in I$. For $F \subset R$, the smallest differential ideal containing set F is denoted by $[F]$.
- (e) Given Σ as in (5), we define the differential ideal of Σ as

$$I_\Sigma = [\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{g}] \subset \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}.$$

Informally, this is the ideal of all relations between the components of a generic solution of Σ .

Definition 2.4 (a full set of input-output equations). For the system Σ as in (5), a tuple (p_1, \dots, p_m) of differential polynomials from $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}$ is called *a full set of input-output equations* if there exists an ordering of the output variables which we will assume to be $y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_m$ to simplify notation such that

- (1) p_1 is the linear differential polynomial in y_1 and \mathbf{u} in I_Σ of the smallest possible order in y_1 such that the coefficient of the highest derivative of y_1 is one.

(2) For every $\ell > 1$, p_ℓ is the linear differential polynomial in y_1, \dots, y_ℓ and \mathbf{u} in I_Σ such that

- $\text{ord}_{y_j} p_\ell < \text{ord}_{y_j} p_j$ for every $1 \leq j < \ell$;
- the coefficient of the highest derivative of y_ℓ in p_ℓ is one;
- $\text{ord}_{y_\ell} p_\ell$ is the smallest possible.

Definition 2.5 (IO-identifiable function). For a system Σ consider a full set E of input-output equations. Then the subfield of $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ generated by the coefficients of E over \mathbb{C} is called *the field of input-output identifiable (IO-identifiable) functions*. We call $h \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ *IO-identifiable* if $h \in k$.

Remark 2.6. Proposition A.5 establishes the equivalence of this definition to Definition A.4, which is applicable to a general rational ODE systems. Proposition A.5 also implies that the field of input-output identifiable functions does not depend on the choice of a full set of input-output equations.

For examples of input-output equations and IO-identifiable functions, see Section 3.3.

Remark 2.7 (Meaning of IO-identifiability). One can see that the field of IO-identifiable functions is exactly what will be computed by the first two steps of the algorithm outlined in the introduction (see also Algorithm 3.1). The **general problem** as stated in Section 1.2 can be restated as:

Determine classes of ODE models for which

$$\text{identifiable} \iff \text{IO-identifiable}.$$

[32, Theorem 4.2] together with [18, Example 2.14] (see also Example 3.4 and [31, Section 5.2] with non-constant dynamics and outputs) imply that:

$$\boxed{\text{Identifiable}} \subsetneq \boxed{\text{IO-identifiable}}. \quad (6)$$

2.2 Linear compartment models

In this section, we discuss linear compartment models [1]. Such a model consists of a set of compartments in which material is transferred from some compartments to other compartments. We also allow for leakage of material from some compartments out of the system, and for input of material into some compartments from outside the system.

We use the notation of [26, Section 2]. Let G be a simple directed graph with n vertices V and edges E . Let In, Out, and Leak be subsets of V . The coefficients of material transfer are

$$\{a_{ji} \mid j \leftarrow i \in E\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{a_{0i} \mid i \in \text{Leak}\}.$$

For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let x_i be the quantity of material in compartment i . If $i \in \text{In}$, let u_i be the rate at which the experimenter inputs material into the i -th compartment. If $i \in \text{Out}$, let $y_i = x_i$. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$\text{Out} = \{1, \dots, m\}.$$

Now the system of equations governing the dynamics of x_1, \dots, x_n is given by

$$\Sigma = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}' = A(G)\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}, \\ y_i = x_i, \quad \text{for every } i \in \text{Out}, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^T$, \mathbf{u} is the $n \times 1$ matrix whose i -th entry is u_i if $i \in \text{In}$ and 0 otherwise, and $A(G)$ is the matrix defined by

$$A(G)_{ij} = \begin{cases} -a_{0i} - \sum_{k:i \rightarrow k \in E} a_{ki}, & i = j, i \in \text{Leak} \\ -\sum_{k:i \rightarrow k \in E} a_{ki}, & i = j, i \notin \text{Leak} \\ a_{ij}, & j \rightarrow i \in E \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

In the notation of (16), we have


$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} &= \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, \\ \mathbf{y} &= \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}, \\ \mathbf{u} &= \{u_i \mid i \in \text{In}\}, \\ \boldsymbol{\mu} &= \{a_{ji} \mid j \leftarrow i \in E\} \cup \{a_{0i} \mid i \in \text{Leak}\}. \end{aligned}$$

It was observed in [26, Theorem 2] that, for a linear compartment model, one can obtain relations among inputs, outputs, and parameters as follows. Let ∂ be the operator of differentiation. Let $M_{ji}(G)$ denote the submatrix of $\partial I - A(G)$ obtained by deleting the j -th row and i -th column. Then [26, Theorem 2] yields that system (7) implies that for every $i \in \text{Out}$,

$$\det(\partial I - A)(y_i) - \sum_{j \in \text{In}} (-1)^{i+j} \det(M_{ji})(u_j) = 0. \quad (9)$$

Definition 2.8 (Reachability). We say *vertex v is reachable from vertex w* or *one can reach vertex v from vertex w* if there exists a directed path from w to v . For example, in the graph $1 \rightarrow 2$, vertex 2 is reachable from vertex 1. We say a leak (resp. input) is reachable from w if there exists a vertex v in Leak (resp. In) such that v is reachable from w .

Example 2.9. Consider the graph



Here G is the graph given by

$$V = \{1, 2\} \quad \text{and} \quad E = \{1 \rightarrow 2, 2 \rightarrow 1\}.$$

The arrow leaving compartment 1 indicates that $\text{Leak} = \{1\}$, the arrow entering compartment 1 indicates that $\text{In} = \{1\}$, and the other decoration to compartment 2 indicates that $\text{Out} = \{2\}$. Note that the input and leak arrows, as well as the output decoration, are not considered part of the graph. One can see that the corresponding system of differential equations coincides with (1) and can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} -(a_{01} + a_{21}) & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & -a_{12} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} u \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad y = x_2.$$

One can see that this system satisfies the conditions of Theorems 1, 2, and 3. A direct computation shows that the input-output equation (2) is a special case of (9).

3 Main results

In this section, we will state our main results in a condensed form in Section 3.1. For the detailed statements, see the corresponding theorems in the following sections. In Section 3.2, we show how our main results apply to justifying an algorithm computing all identifiable functions of an ODE model. We end with Section 3.3, in which we present examples (both of applied and of purely mathematical nature) illustrating the conditions in the statements of our main results.

3.1 Statements

Theorem 1 (see Theorem 4.2). *If system Σ as in (5) has exactly one output, then IO-identifiable functions coincide with identifiable functions.*

Theorem 2 (see Theorem 5.3). *If the graph of a linear compartment model is such that one can reach a leak or an input from every vertex, then IO-identifiable functions coincide with identifiable functions.*

Problem 3.1. *Will Theorem 2 remain true if the condition on the graph is removed or relaxed? (For a discussion, see Remark 3.6 and Example 3.7.)*

In other words, Theorems 1 and 2 provide classes of models for which the approach via input-output equations outlined in the introduction gives the correct result.

Theorem 3 (see Theorem 5.6). *For a linear compartment model*

- *with at least one input and*
- *whose graph is strongly connected,*

the field of all identifiable functions is generated by the coefficients of equations (9).

3.2 Application to algorithms

In this section, we will rephrase Theorems 1, 2, and 3 as statements about the correctness of two versions of the algorithm outlined in Section 1.1 appearing in literature: Algorithm 3.1 is one of the key components of, e.g., DAISY [6], and Algorithm 3.2 summarizes the approach from [15, Definition 3.9].

Algorithm 3.1 Computing identifiable functions

Input System Σ as in (16)

Output Generators of the field of identifiable functions of Σ (see Corollary 3.1)

(Step 1) Compute a full set \mathcal{C} of input-output equations of Σ .

(Step 2) Return the coefficients of \mathcal{C} considered as differential polynomials in \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{u} .

Corollary 3.1. *Assume that Σ satisfies one of the following conditions*

- (1) Σ is as in (5) and has exactly one output;*
- (2) Σ is a linear compartment model such that one can reach a leak or an input from every vertex.*

Then Algorithm 3.1 will produce a correct result for Σ .

Proof. Algorithm 3.1 will compute generators of the field of IO-identifiable functions. Theorems 1 and 2 imply that, for Σ that we consider, the field of IO-identifiable functions coincides with the field of identifiable functions. \square

Algorithm 3.2 Computing identifiable functions

Input System Σ as in (16) corresponding to a linear compartment model with graph G

Output Generators of the field of identifiable functions of Σ (see Corollary 3.2)

(Step 1) For every $i \in \text{Out}$, compute an input-output equation p_i as in (9).

(Step 2) Return the coefficients of $\{p_i \mid i \in \text{Out}\}$ considered as differential polynomials in \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{u} .

Corollary 3.2. *In the notation of Algorithm 3.2, if graph G is strongly connected and has at least one input, then Algorithm 3.2 will produce a correct result.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 3. \square

3.3 Examples

In this section, we will consider several examples to illustrate the importance of conditions in our main results and their corollaries.

Example 3.3. (*Kinetics of lead in humans and our results for one output*) The following system of equations is used in [1, Section 4A] to model the kinetics of lead in the human body:

$$\begin{cases} x_1' = k_1x_1 + k_2x_2 + k_3x_3 + k_4 \\ x_2' = k_5x_1 + k_6x_2 \\ x_3' = k_7x_1 - k_3x_3 \\ y_1 = x_1 \end{cases}$$

A full set of input-output equations is unique in this case and consists of a single differential polynomial:

$$y_1''' - (k_1 + k_3 + k_6)y_1'' + (-k_1k_3 + k_1k_6 - k_2k_5 - k_3k_6 - k_3k_7)y_1' + (k_1k_3k_6 - k_2k_3k_5 + k_3k_6k_7)y_1 + k_3k_4k_6.$$

By Corollary 3.1 (condition (1)), the field of identifiable functions is generated by

$$k_1 + k_3 + k_6, \quad -k_1k_3 + k_1k_6 - k_2k_5 - k_3k_6 - k_3k_7, \quad k_3(k_1k_6 - k_2k_5 + k_6k_7), \quad k_3k_4k_6.$$

In other words, these parameter combinations are identifiable, and moreover any other identifiable combination of parameters can be written as a rational combination of these.

Example 3.4 (Mathematical examples for Theorem 1). This example illustrates that the conclusion of Theorem 1 may not hold if the system has more than one output. A somewhat smaller example of this is [18, Example 2.14], in which a constant is measured. In the following system, both outputs have non-constant dynamics. Consider the system

$$\begin{cases} x_1' = 0 \\ x_2' = x_2 \\ x_3' = 2x_3 \\ y_1 = x_1 + x_2 \\ y_2 = k_1x_1 + k_2 + x_3. \end{cases}$$

The full set of input-output equations with respect to the ordering $y_1 > y_2$ is

$$p_2 = y_1' - y_1 - \frac{1}{2k_1}y_2' + \frac{1}{k_1}y_2 - \frac{k_2}{k_1}, \quad p_1 = y_2'' - 2y_2'.$$

The system is linear but it does not satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1 because it has two outputs. By [32, Corollary 5.8], the field of IO-identifiable functions is $\mathbb{C}(k_1, k_2)$. However, neither k_1 nor k_2 is identifiable. Indeed, the observable solutions are

$$\begin{aligned} y_1(t) &= x_1(0) + x_2(0)e^t \\ y_2(t) &= k_1x_1(0) + k_2 + x_3(0)e^{2t}, \end{aligned}$$

and so, increasing k_1 by λ and decreasing k_2 by $\lambda x_1(0)$ will result in the same measurements of $y_1(t)$ and $y_2(t)$.

An interested reader could construct additional examples in which Assumption (A) is not satisfied but the non-satisfiability is much less obvious to check (see, e.g., [31, Section 5.2]).

To show that the condition that there is only one output in Theorem 1 is not necessary for Assumption (A) to be satisfied, one can consider the following system


$$\begin{cases} x_1' = x_1 + k_1 \\ y_1 = x_1 \\ y_2 = x_1 + 1. \end{cases}$$

The input-output equations with respect to $y_1 > y_2$ are:

$$y_1 - y_2 + 1, \quad y_1' - y_2 - k_1 + 1,$$

and so the field of IO-identifiable functions is $\mathbb{C}(k_1)$, which coincides with the field of identifiable functions as k_1 is identifiable.

Example 3.5 (Lack of strong connectedness and our theory, see also [15, Remark 3.11]). Consider the linear compartment model



in which an input function u is applied to compartment 1, the quantity in compartment 1 is measured, and material flows from compartment 1 to compartment 3 and from compartment 2 to compartment 3. The corresponding system of equations is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} -a_{31} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -a_{32} & 0 \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} u \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

$$y_1 = x_1.$$

Note that the hypotheses of Corollary 3.2 and Theorem 3 are not satisfied since the graph is not strongly connected. We will see that the conclusion of Theorem 3 does not hold and also that Algorithm 3.2 will

produce an incorrect result if applied to this model, that is, the conclusion of Corollary 3.2 does not hold. For this system, equation (9) is

$$y_1''' + (a_{31} + a_{32})y_1'' + a_{31}a_{32}y_1' - u_1'' - a_{32}u_1' = 0.$$

It is clear that a_{32} , the coefficient of u_1' , is not identifiable, since the flow of material from compartment 2 to compartment 3 cannot be detected by observing compartment 1. The system does, however, satisfy the hypotheses of Corollary 3.1 (condition (1)), so we can use Algorithm 3.1 to compute a generating set of the field of identifiable functions. A full set of input-output equations is unique and equal to $y_1' + a_{31}y_1 - u$. Thus, the field of identifiable functions is $\mathbb{C}(a_{31})$.

Consider now a modification of this example by moving the output to compartment 3, and so $y_1 = x_3$ replaces $y_1 = x_1$ in system (10). In this case, the full set of input-output equations is

$$y_1''' + (a_{31} + a_{32})y_1'' + a_{31}a_{32}y_1' - a_{31}a_{32}u - a_{31}u',$$

which is the same as what (9) gives. So, even though the graph is not strongly connected, the conclusion of Theorem 3 holds. Therefore, the conclusion of Corollary 3.2 holds.

Finally note that, for both models in this example, the assumption of Theorem 2 does not hold but the conclusion holds by Theorem 1.

Remark 3.6. Theorem 2 remains valid for more general linear compartment models, e.g., with output of the form $y = C \cdot x$ for some matrix C with entries in $\mathbb{C}(\mu)$, which were considered, e.g., in [8].

An academic Example 3.7 below shows that, in this more general statement, the condition on the graph cannot be removed. It is an open problem (Problem 3.1) whether the condition on the graph can be removed (or relaxed) in Theorem 2 as it is stated in the paper.

Example 3.7 (Leak is not reachable and Theorem 2). Consider the following linear compartment model

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}' &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -a_{02} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ k_1 & 0 & k_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

On the one hand, one can show that the parameters k_1 and k_2 are not identifiable and the parameter a_{01} is identifiable. On the other hand, a calculation shows that

$$y_1' + a_{02}y_1 + \frac{a_{02}k_2}{k_1}y_3 - \frac{a_{02}}{k_1}y_2, \quad y_2', \quad y_3'$$

is a full set of input-output equations. Hence, $\mathbb{C}(k_1, k_2, a_{02})$ is the field of IO-identifiable functions. In the graph corresponding to (11), one cannot reach a leak (there are no inputs) from either vertex 1 or vertex 3, so the assumption of Theorem 2 is not satisfied. Since, for instance, k_1 is IO-identifiable but not identifiable, the conclusion of Theorem 2 is not satisfied either.

4 “Identifiability \iff IO-identifiability” for linear systems with one output (proof of Theorem 1)

In this section, we prove one of the main results, Theorem 4.2, which shows that, for a linear system with one output, IO-identifiability and identifiability are equivalent. We begin with showing a preliminary result.

Lemma 4.1. *Let K be a field. Consider*

- *the differential polynomial ring $K\{y, \mathbf{u}\}$ with derivation ∂ satisfying $\partial(K) = 0$,*
- *$P \in K\{y, \mathbf{u}\}$ of the form $P = D_P(y) + U_P$, where $D_P \in K[\partial]$ is a linear differential operator over K with leading coefficient 1 and $U_P \in K\{\mathbf{u}\}$.*

Let W be the Wronskian of all the monomials of P except for the one of the highest order with respect to y . Then W does not belong to differential ideal $[P]$.

Proof. Since the coefficients of P and W are in K , the membership $W \in [P]$ would be the same considered over K or its algebraic closure. Therefore, replacing K with its algebraic closure if necessary, we will assume that K is algebraically closed.

Consider a lexicographic monomial ordering induced by an ordering of the variables such that $y^{(i+i)} > y^{(i)}$ for every $i \geq 0$ and y is greater than any derivative of \mathbf{u} . Since for all r $P, P', \dots, P^{(r)}$ is a Gröbner basis for

$$[P] \cap K[y, y', \dots, y^{(r)}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}', \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(r)}],$$

it follows from [19, Lemma 1.5] that P, P', \dots form a Gröbner basis of $[P]$ with respect to this ordering as defined by [19, Definition 1.4].

Since the leading terms of a Gröbner basis are linear, $[P]$ is a prime ideal. Thus, we can introduce $L := \text{Frac}(K\{y, \mathbf{u}\}/[P])$. The field of constants of L will be denoted by $C(L)$. We denote the images of y and \mathbf{u} in L by \bar{y} and $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$, respectively. Since none of derivatives of \mathbf{u} appear in the leading terms of the Gröbner basis, $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ and their derivatives are algebraically independent over K .

Assume that the statement of the lemma is not true. Due to [21, Theorem 3.7, p. 21], this implies that the images in L of the monomials of P except for the one of the highest order in y are linearly dependent over $C(L)$. Therefore, there exists a nonzero polynomial

$$Q = D_Q(y) + U_Q,$$

where $D_Q \in C(L)[\partial]$ is monic and $U_Q \in C(L)\{\mathbf{u}\}$, such that $Q(\bar{y}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}) = 0$ and $\text{ord} D_Q < \text{ord} D_P$. Let D_0 be the gcd of D_P and D_Q with the leading coefficient 1. Then $\text{ord} D_0 < \text{ord} D_P$.

If F is an algebraically closed field and $p \in F[X]$ and p is divisible by a $q \in E[X]$ with the leading coefficient 1, where E is an extension of F , then $q \in F[X]$. Therefore, since D_0 divides D_P and K is algebraically closed, $D_0 \in K[\partial]$ and there exists $D_1 \in K[\partial]$ such that $D_P = D_1 D_0$. There also exist $A, B \in C(L)[\partial]$ such that

$$D_0 = AD_P + BD_Q.$$

Consider

$$R := A(P) + B(Q) = D_0(y) + U_R,$$

where $U_R = A(U_P) + B(U_Q)$. Then $R(\bar{y}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}) = 0$. Since $P - D_1(R) \in C(L)\{\mathbf{u}\}$ vanishes on $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ is differentially independent over $C(L)$, it follows that $P = D_1(R)$.

Considering a basis of $C(L)$ over K , we can write

$$U_R = U_0 + e_1 U_1 + \dots + e_N U_N,$$

where $U_0, \dots, U_N \in K\{\mathbf{u}\}$ and $1, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_N \in C(L)$ are linearly independent over K . Since $D_1(U_R) = U_P$ and $D_1 \in K[\partial]$, $U_1, \dots, U_N \in \ker D_1$, where we consider D_1 as a function from $C(L)\{y, \mathbf{u}\}$ to $C(L)\{y, \mathbf{u}\}$. There are two cases:

- D_1 is not divisible by ∂ . Then $\ker D_1 = \{0\}$. Hence,

$$U_1 = \dots = U_N = 0.$$

- D_1 is divisible by ∂ . Then $\ker D_1 = C(L)$. Thus, U_1, \dots, U_N belong to K . However, since $U_P = D_1(U_R)$, U_P does not contain a term in K . Hence U_Q does not contain a term in $C(L)$ and, consequently, U_R does not contain a term in $C(L)$. Thus,

$$U_1 = \dots = U_N = 0.$$

In both cases, we have shown that $U_R \in K\{\mathbf{u}\}$. Thus, $R \in K\{y, \mathbf{u}\}$ and $R \in [P]$. But this is impossible because P, P', P'', \dots is a Gröbner basis of $[P]$ with respect to the monomial ordering introduced in the beginning of the proof, and $\text{ord} D_0 < \text{ord} D_P$, so R is not reducible with respect to this basis. \square

Theorem 4.2 (Main Result 1). *For every Σ as in (5) with $m = 1$ (that is, single output), for all $h \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$,*

$$h \text{ is identifiable} \iff h \text{ is IO-identifiable.}$$

Proof. [32, Theorem 4.2] implies that identifiable functions are always IO-identifiable, so it remains to show the reverse inclusion. Consider a full set of input-output equations for Σ . Since $m = 1$, it will consist of a single linear differential polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{y, \mathbf{u}\}$. Then, Lemma 4.1 and [32, Lemma 4.6] imply that its coefficients are identifiable, so the reverse inclusion holds as well. \square

5 Applications to linear compartment models

In this section, we will prove our two main results for linear compartment models, Theorems 5.3 and 5.6. For the notation that we will use for such models, see Section 2.2.

5.1 Sufficient condition for “identifiability \iff IO-identifiability” for linear compartment models (proof of Theorem 2)

Lemma 5.1. *Let $F = \text{Frac}(\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}/I_\Sigma)$. The field of constants of F lies in the subfield of F generated by \mathbb{C} , $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and \mathbf{x} .*

Proof. Observe that F as a field is generated by $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, \mathbf{x} , and all the derivatives of \mathbf{u} , and all these elements are algebraically independent. Assume that there exists $\ell \geq 0$ and $h \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)})$ such that $h' = 0$ and, without loss of generality, $\frac{\partial}{\partial u_\kappa^{(\ell)}} h \neq 0$. Then we have

$$h' = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\kappa} u_r^{(i+1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial u_r^{(i)}} h + \sum_{j=1}^n x_j' \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} h = u_\kappa^{(\ell+1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial u_\kappa^{(\ell)}} h + a,$$

where

$$a \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)}, u_1^{(\ell+1)}, \dots, u_{\kappa-1}^{(\ell+1)}).$$

Now $h' = 0$ yields a contradiction since $u_\kappa^{(\ell+1)}$ is transcendental over $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(\ell)}, u_1^{(\ell+1)}, \dots, u_{\kappa-1}^{(\ell+1)})$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial u_\kappa^{(\ell)}} h \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Consider a graph G such that, from every vertex, at least one leak can be reached. Then the eigenvalues of $A(G)$ are distinct and algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} .*

Proof. Let H be a directed spanning forest of G constructed by a breadth-first search (depth-first search would work as well) with the set Leak as the source such that, from every vertex, there is a path to some element of Leak. Relabeling vertices if necessary, $A(H)$ is upper triangular with algebraically independent diagonal entries. It is well known that a breadth-first search on a graph will construct a spanning forest containing all vertices reachable from the source set (cf. [10, Section 22.2]).

We illustrate our procedure with an example. Let G be the graph shown below, with Leak = $\{1, 6\}$:

where f_1, \dots, f_n are as in (16), is zero. If there exists $i \in \text{In}$ such that x_i appears in R , then $\mathcal{L}_\Sigma(R)$ will be of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_\Sigma(R) = \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_i} u_i + (\text{something not involving } u_i) \neq 0.$$

Thus, R does not involve any x_i with $i \in \text{In}$. Then, due to the construction of G^* ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Sigma^*}(R) = \mathcal{L}_\Sigma(R) = 0,$$

so Σ^* also has a rational first integral.

Claim: Σ^ does not have rational first integrals.* Lemma 5.2 implies that the eigenvalues of $A(G^*)$ are algebraically independent. Then [30, Theorem 10.1.2, p. 118] implies that Σ^* does not have rational first integrals. \square

5.2 Using more convenient input-output equations (proof of Theorem 3)

Lemma 5.4. *Let K be a field. For all $a, b, c \in K[x]$ such that $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, there exists at most one pair (p, q) of elements of $K[x]$ such that*

$$ap + bq = c \quad \text{and} \quad \deg p < \deg b.$$

Proof. Suppose (p, q) and (p_1, q_1) are distinct pairs satisfying the two properties above. It follows that

$$a(p - p_1) + b(q - q_1) = 0. \tag{12}$$

Since $(p, q) \neq (p_1, q_1)$, (12) implies that $p \neq p_1$. Since

$$\deg(p - p_1) < \deg b,$$

(12) implies that $\gcd(a, b) \neq 1$, which contradicts our hypothesis. \square

Corollary 5.5. *Let K be a field containing \mathbb{C} . Let $a, b, c \in K[x]$ be such that $\gcd(a, b) = 1$. If there exists a pair of polynomials (p, q) such that*

$$ap + bq = c \quad \text{and} \quad \deg p < \deg b,$$

then the coefficients of p and q belong to the field extension of \mathbb{C} generated by the coefficients of a , b , and c .

Proof. Suppose some coefficient of p or q does not belong to the field generated by the coefficients of a , b , and c . By [29, Theorem 9.29, p. 117], there is a field automorphism σ of \overline{K} that fixes the field extension of \mathbb{C} generated by the coefficients of a , b , and c and moves this coefficient.

We extend σ to $\overline{K}[x]$ by $\sigma(x) = x$. Applying σ to both sides of $ap + bq = c$ gives us

$$a\sigma(p) + b\sigma(q) = c.$$

Using \overline{K} for K in Lemma 5.4, we arrive at a contradiction. \square

Theorem 5.6 (Main Result 3). *Let Σ be a linear compartment model with a graph G . Let $A = A(G)$ and M_{ji} be the submatrix of $\partial I - A$ obtained by deleting the j -th row and the i -th column of $\partial I - A$. Recall that (see (9)), for every solution of Σ , we have for every $i \in \text{Out}$,*

$$\det(\partial I - A)(y_i) = \sum_{j \in \text{In}} (-1)^{i+j} \det(M_{ji})(u_j).$$

If G is strongly connected and has at least one input, then the coefficients of these differential polynomials with respect to y 's and u 's generate the field of identifiable functions of Σ .

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\text{Out} = \{1, \dots, m\}$. We set, for $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$h_i := \det(\partial I - A)(y_i) - \sum_{j \in \text{In}} (-1)^{i+j} \det(M_{ji}) u_j. \quad (13)$$

Let also $D = \det(\partial I - A)$ and, for $i = 1, \dots, m$, let Q_i be the $1 \times n$ matrix of operators defined by

$$\begin{cases} (Q_i)_j = (-1)^{i+j} \det(M_{ji}), & j \in \text{In}, \\ (Q_i)_j = 0, & j \notin \text{In}. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Observe that, for $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$h_i = D(y_i) - Q_i \cdot \mathbf{u},$$

where \mathbf{u} is the $n \times 1$ matrix defined by $\mathbf{u}_j = u_j$ if $j \in \text{In}$ and $\mathbf{u}_j = 0$ otherwise.

First we show that the coefficients of h_1, \dots, h_m are IO-identifiable. Fix i . Consider an ordering of the outputs such that y_i is the smallest one. Let p_1, \dots, p_m be a full set of input-output equations with respect to this ordering (see Definition 2.4) which exists due to Proposition A.5. Then p_1 is of the form

$$g = E(y_i) + B \cdot \mathbf{u},$$

where E is a linear differential operator and B is a $1 \times n$ matrix of linear differential operators, both with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Since $h_i \in I_\Sigma$ and h_i involves only y_i and \mathbf{u} , the second part of Proposition A.5 implies that $h_i \in [p_1]$, so there exists a differential operator $D_0 \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})[\partial]$ such that $h_i = D_0 p_1$. Since G is strongly connected and has an input, by [15, Proposition 3.19],

$$\gcd(D \cup \{(Q_i)_j \mid (Q_i)_j \neq 0\}) = 1.$$

Thus D_0 has order zero, so h_i and p_1 are proportional. Therefore, the coefficients of (13) are IO-identifiable.

Next, we show that the field generated by the coefficients of h_1, \dots, h_m contains the field of IO-identifiable functions. Fix an ordering on the outputs $y_m > \dots > y_1$. We will show that the full set p_1, \dots, p_m of input-output equations with respect to this ordering satisfies:

$$\text{ord}_{y_1} p_1 = n, \quad \text{ord}_{y_i} p_i = 0 \text{ for every } 2 \leq i \leq m. \quad (15)$$

The fact that $\text{ord}_{y_1} p_1 = n$ is implied by the previous paragraph. From (5), we see that the transcendence degree of

$$\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\} / I_\Sigma$$

over $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{u}\}$ is equal to n , so the transcendence degree of

$$\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\} / (I_\Sigma \cap \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\})$$

over $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{u}\}$ is less than or equal to n . From the form of p_1 , we have that

$$y_1, y_1', \dots, y_1^{(n-1)}$$

are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{u}\}$, so for $i = 2, \dots, m$, the elements

$$y_i, y_1, y_1', \dots, y_1^{(n-1)}$$

must be algebraically dependent over $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{u}\}$. Therefore, the equation for y_i has order 0 in y_i . Thus, we have

$$p_1 = D(y_1) - Q_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}$$

and, for every, $2 \leq i \leq m$, we can write

$$p_i = y_i + D_i(y_1) + P_i \cdot \mathbf{u},$$

where P_i is a $1 \times n$ matrix of linear differential operators and the order of operator D_i is at most $n - 1$.

We show that the coefficients of p_1, \dots, p_m can be written in terms of the coefficients of h_1, \dots, h_m . Since h_1 equals $D(y_1) - Q_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}$, this is true for the coefficients of D and Q_1 . It remains to show this for the coefficients of D_2, \dots, D_m and P_2, \dots, P_m . Note that for all i and for $j \notin \text{In}$ we have $(P_i)_j = 0$, so we need only address the coefficients of $(P_i)_j$ for $j \in \text{In}$.

Fix $i > 1$ and let

$$g = y_i + D_i(y_1) + P_i(\mathbf{u}).$$

We have that

$$D(g) - D_i(h_1) = D(y_i) + (DP_i + D_iQ_1)(\mathbf{u}) \in I_\Sigma.$$

It follows that

$$D(y_i) + (DP_i + D_iQ_1)(\mathbf{u}) = h_i,$$

and therefore, for all j ,

$$D(P_i)_j + D_i(Q_1)_j = -(Q_i)_j.$$

By the hypothesis of the theorem, $\text{In} \neq \emptyset$. Fix $j \in \text{In}$. We apply [15, Proposition 3.19] to the model obtained from Σ by deleting all the inputs except for j and obtain, using $D \neq 1$, that $\text{gcd}(D, (Q_1)_j) = 1$ for every $j \in \text{In}$. By Corollary 5.5, we have that the coefficients of $(P_i)_j$ and D_i belong to the field extension of \mathbb{C} generated by the coefficients of D , $(Q_1)_j$, and $(Q_i)_j$.

We have shown that the field extension of \mathbb{C} generated by the coefficients of h_1, \dots, h_m is the field of IO-identifiable functions. By Theorem 5.3, this is the field of identifiable functions. \square

A General facts about identifiability and IO-identifiability

A.1 General definition of identifiability

In this section, we will generalize the notions from Section 2.1 to ODE systems with rational right-hand side. Fix positive integers λ , n , m , and κ for the remainder of the appendix. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_\lambda)$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$, and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_\kappa)$. Consider a system of ODEs

$$\Sigma = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}' = \frac{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{u})}{Q(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{u})}, \\ \mathbf{y} = \frac{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{u})}{Q(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{u})}, \\ \mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{x}^*, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ and $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ are tuples of elements of $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}]$ and $Q \in \mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}] \setminus \{0\}$.

Notation A.1 (Ideal I_Σ).

(a) For an ideal I and element a in a ring R , we denote

$$I: a^\infty = \{r \in R \mid \exists \ell: a^\ell r \in I\}.$$

This set is also an ideal in R .

(b) Given Σ as in (16), we define the differential ideal of Σ as

$$I_\Sigma = [Q\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{f}, Q\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{g}] : Q^\infty \subset \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}.$$

For the case of a linear system as in (5), this ideal coincides with the one from Notation 2.3.

Notation A.2 (Auxiliary analytic notation).

(a) Let

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= \{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^\lambda \times (\mathbb{C}^\infty(0))^\kappa \mid Q(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}(0)) \neq 0\} \\ \Omega_h &= \Omega \cap (\{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+\lambda} \mid h(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \text{ well-defined}\} \times (\mathbb{C}^\infty(0))^\kappa) \end{aligned}$$

for every given $h \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu})$.

(b) For $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) \in \Omega$, let $X(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$ and $Y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$ denote the unique solution over $\mathbb{C}^\infty(0)$ of the instance of Σ with $\mathbf{x}^* = \hat{\mathbf{x}}^*$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, and $\mathbf{u} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}$ (see [16, Theorem 2.2.2]).

Definition A.3 (Identifiability, see [18, Definition 2.5]). We say that $h(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{x}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ is *identifiable* if

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \Theta \in \tau(\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^\lambda) \exists U \in \tau((\mathbb{C}^\infty(0))^\kappa) \\ \forall (\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) \in (\Theta \times U) \cap \Omega_h \quad |S_h(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})| = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$S_h(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) := \{h(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \mid (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) \in \Omega_h \text{ and } Y(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) = Y(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^*, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})\}.$$

In this paper, we are interested in comparing identifiability and IO-identifiability (Definition A.4), and the latter is defined for functions in $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, not in $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and \mathbf{x}^* . Thus, just for the purpose of comparison, we will restrict ourselves to the field

$$\{h \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mid h \text{ is identifiable}\},$$

which we will call *the field of identifiable functions*.

Definition A.4 (IO-identifiability). The smallest field k such that $\mathbb{C} \subset k \subset \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ and $I_\Sigma \cap \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}$ is generated (as an ideal or as a differential ideal) by $I_\Sigma \cap k\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}$ is called *the field of IO-identifiable functions*.

We call $h \in \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ *IO-identifiable* if $h \in k$.

A.2 Specialization to the linear case

Proposition A.5. For every system Σ of the form (5):

- (1) for every ordering of output variables, there exists a unique full set of input-output equations with respect to this ordering;
- (2) if p_1, \dots, p_m is the full set of input-output equations with respect to $y_1 < \dots < y_m$, then the derivatives of p_1, \dots, p_m form a Gröbner basis of $I_\Sigma \cap \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}$ with respect to any lexicographic monomial ordering such that
 - any derivative of any of y 's is greater any derivative of any of u 's;
 - $y_{i_1}^{(j_1)} > y_{i_2}^{(j_2)}$ iff $i_1 > i_2$ or $i_1 = i_2$ and $j_1 > j_2$.

An analogous statement holds for any other ordering of outputs.

(3) Definitions A.4 and 2.5 define the same field. In particular, the field defined in Definition 2.5 does not depend on the choice of a full set of input-output equations.

Proof. We fix an ordering $y_1 < \dots < y_m$ of outputs. Assume that there are full sets of input-output equations p_1, \dots, p_m and q_1, \dots, q_m with respect to this ordering. Let ℓ be the smallest integer such that $p_\ell \neq q_\ell$. By the definition, $\text{ord}_{y_\ell} p_\ell = \text{ord}_{y_\ell} q_\ell$. Then $\text{ord}_{y_i}(p_\ell - q_\ell) < \text{ord}_{y_i} p_i$ for every $i \leq \ell$; this contradicts the definition of a full set of input-output equations. To finish the proof part (1) of the proposition, it remains to show the existence of a full set of input-output equations.

Let $J := I_\Sigma \cap \mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}$. Consider the set of differential polynomials

$$S := \{\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{x}'' - \mathbf{f}', \dots, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{g}', \dots\}.$$

By the definition of I_Σ , these polynomials generate I_Σ . Since these generators are linear, I_Σ has a linear Gröbner basis (see [19, Definition 1.4]) with respect to any monomial ordering. Since J is an elimination ideal of I_Σ , it also has a linear Gröbner basis with respect to any monomial ordering. Moreover, consider any lexicographic monomial ordering on $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}$ such that

- any derivative of any of y_1, \dots, y_m is greater than any derivative of any of x_1, \dots, x_n ;
- any derivative of any of x_1, \dots, x_n is greater than any derivative of any of u_1, \dots, u_κ ;
- for $a = x, y$, $a_{i_1}^{(j_1)} > a_{i_2}^{(j_2)}$ iff $i_1 > i_2$ or $i_1 = i_2$ and $j_1 > j_2$.

Observe that S is a Gröbner basis of I_Σ with respect to any such monomial ordering. Therefore, \mathbf{u} and their derivatives are algebraically independent modulo I_Σ , and the transcendence degree of $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}$ over $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{u}\}$ modulo I_Σ is finite.

Consider the restriction of the ordering described above to $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}$. Consider the reduced Gröbner basis B of J with respect to this ordering. As we have shown, it is linear. Since the transcendence degree of $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}\}$ over $\mathbb{C}(\boldsymbol{\mu})\{\mathbf{u}\}$ modulo J is finite, for every $1 \leq i \leq m$, there is a derivative of y_i among the leading terms of B . Moreover, by differentiating the corresponding element of B , we see that all higher derivatives of y_i will appear as leading terms of B .

For each $1 \leq i \leq m$, we set p_i to be the element in B with the leading term being $y_i^{(j)}$ such that j is the smallest possible. Then the fact that p_1, \dots, p_m are a part of the reduced Gröbner basis implies that they form a full set of input-output equations with respect to the ordering $y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_m$. This finishes the proof of part (1) of the proposition.

To prove part (2) of the proposition, observe that the derivatives of p_1, \dots, p_m form a Gröbner basis of $[p_1, \dots, p_m]$ with respect to the described ordering. Thus, it remains to show that $[p_1, \dots, p_m] = J$. Assume that there is $q \in J \setminus [p_1, \dots, p_m]$. By reducing it with respect to appropriate derivatives of p_1, \dots, p_m , we can assume that $\text{ord}_{y_i} q < \text{ord}_{y_i} p_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$. But this would imply that p_1, \dots, p_m is not a full set of input-output equations, so part (2) of the proposition is proved.

To prove part (3) of the proposition, observe that, since a full set of input-output equations is a part of a reduced Gröbner basis of J , its coefficients belong to the field of definition of J . On the other hand, since the set of all derivatives of p_1, \dots, p_m forms a Gröbner basis of J and the coefficients of these derivatives are the same as the coefficients of p_1, \dots, p_m , the coefficients of p_1, \dots, p_m generate the field of definition of J . \square

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the CCiS at CUNY Queens College for the computational resources and to Julio Banga, Marisa Eisenberg, Nikki Meshkat, Maria Pia Saccomani, Anne Shiu, Seth Sullivant, and Alejandro Villaverde for useful discussions. This work was partially supported by the NSF grants CCF-1563942,

CCF-1564132, CCF-1319632, DMS-1760448, CCF-1708884, DMS-1853650, DMS-1853482; NSA grant #H98230-18-1-0016; and CUNY grants PSC-CUNY #69827-0047, #60098-00 48.

References

- [1] D. H. Anderson. *Compartmental Modeling and Tracer Kinetics*. Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics. Springer, 1983. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-51861-4>.
- [2] S. Audoly, L. D’Angiό, M. Saccomani, and C. Cobelli. Global identifiability of linear compartmental models – a computer algebra algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 45(1):36–47, 1998. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/10.650350>.
- [3] J. Baaijens and J. Draisma. On the existence of identifiable reparametrizations for linear compartment models. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 76(4), 2016. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1038013>.
- [4] D. Bearup, N. Evans, and M. Chappell. The input-output relationship approach to structural identifiability analysis. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 109(2):171–181, 2013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2012.10.012>.
- [5] R. Bellman and K. Åström. On structural identifiability. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 7(3-4):329–339, 1970. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564\(70\)90132-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564(70)90132-X).
- [6] G. Bellu, M. P. Saccomani, S. Audoly, and L. D’Angiό. DAISY: A new software tool to test global identifiability of biological and physiological systems. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 88(1):52–61, 2007. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2007.07.002>.
- [7] A. Ben-Zvi, P. McLellan, and K. McAuley. Identifiability of linear time-invariant differential-algebraic systems. 2. The differential-algebraic approach. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 43(5): 1251–1259, 2004. URL <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie030534j>.
- [8] M. Chapman and K. Godfrey. Some extensions to the exhaustive-modeling approach to structural identifiability. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 77(1-2):305–323, 1985. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564\(85\)90103-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564(85)90103-8).
- [9] O.-T. Chis, J. R. Banga, and E. Balsa-Canto. Structural identifiability of systems biology models: A critical comparison of methods. *PLoS ONE*, 6(11):1–16, 11 2011. URL <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0027755>.
- [10] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, Third Edition*. The MIT Press, 2009.
- [11] L. Denis-Vidal, G. Joly-Blanchard, C. Noiret, and M. Petitot. An algorithm to test identifiability of non-linear systems. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 34(6):197–201, 2001. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-6670\(17\)35173-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-6670(17)35173-X).
- [12] J. DiStefano. *Dynamic Systems Biology Modeling and Simulation*. Academic Press, 2014.
- [13] K. Godfrey and M. Chapman. Identifiability and indistinguishability of linear compartmental models. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 32(3):273–295, 1990. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-4754\(90\)90185-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-4754(90)90185-L).

- [14] K. Godfrey and J. DiStefano. Identifiability of model parameters. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 18(5): 89–114, 1985. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-6670\(17\)60544-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-6670(17)60544-5).
- [15] E. Gross, H. A. Harrington, N. Meshkat, and A. Shiu. Linear compartmental models: input-output equations and operations that preserve identifiability. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 79(4): 1423–1447, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1204826>.
- [16] E. Hille. *Ordinary Differential Equations in the Complex Domain*. Dover, 1997.
- [17] H. Hong, A. Ovchinnikov, G. Pogudin, and C. Yap. SIAN: software for structural identifiability analysis of ODE models. *Bioinformatics*, 35(16):2873–2874, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty1069>.
- [18] H. Hong, A. Ovchinnikov, G. Pogudin, and C. Yap. Global identifiability of differential models. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 73(9):1831–1879, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.21921>.
- [19] K. Iima and Y. Yoshino. Gröbner bases for the polynomial ring with infinite variables and their applications. *Communications in Algebra*, 37(10):3424–3437, 2009. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927870802502878>.
- [20] A. Kalami Yazdi, M. Nadjafikhah, and J. DiStefano. COMBOS2: an algorithm to the inputoutput equations of dynamic biosystems via Gaussian elimination. *Journal of Taibah University for Science*, 14(1):896–907, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/16583655.2020.1776466>.
- [21] I. Kaplansky. *An Introduction to Differential Algebra*. Hermann, Paris, 1957.
- [22] M. Komatsu, T. Yaguchi, and K. Nakajima. Algebraic approach towards the exploitation of “softness”: the input-output equation for morphological computation. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/0278364920912298>.
- [23] L. Ljung and T. Glad. On global identifiability for arbitrary model parametrizations. *Automatica*, 30(2):265–276, 1994. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-1098\(94\)90029-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-1098(94)90029-9).
- [24] N. Meshkat and S. Sullivant. Identifiable reparametrizations of linear compartment models. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 63:46–67, 2014. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2013.11.002>.
- [25] N. Meshkat, C. Kuo, and J. DiStefano. On finding and using identifiable parameter combinations in nonlinear dynamic systems biology models and COMBOS: A novel web implementation. *PLoS ONE*, 9(10):e110261, 2014. URL <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0110261>.
- [26] N. Meshkat, S. Sullivant, and M. Eisenberg. Identifiability results for several classes of linear compartment models. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 77:1620–1651, 10 2014. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11538-015-0098-0>.
- [27] N. Meshkat, Z. Rosen, and S. Sullivant. Algebraic tools for the analysis of state space models. In T. Hibi, editor, *The 50th Anniversary of Gröbner Bases, July 1–10, 2015, Osaka, Japan*, volume 77 of *Advances in Pure Mathematics*, pages 171–205, Tokyo, Japan, 2018. Mathematical Society of Japan. URL <https://doi.org/10.2969/aspm/07710171>.
- [28] H. Miao, X. Xia, A. S. Perelson, and H. Wu. On identifiability of nonlinear ODE models and applications in viral dynamics. *SIAM Review*, 53(1):3–39, 2011. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/090757009>.

- [29] J. S. Milne. Fields and Galois theory (v4.60), 2018. URL <https://www.jmilne.org/math/CourseNotes/ft.html>.
- [30] A. Nowicki. *Polynomial derivations and their rings of constants*. Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń, 1994.
- [31] A. Ovchinnikov, A. Pillay, G. Pogudin, and T. Scanlon. Computing all identifiable functions for ODE models, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.07774>.
- [32] A. Ovchinnikov, G. Pogudin, and P. Thompson. Parameter identifiability and input-output equations. 2020. URL <http://qcpages.qc.cuny.edu/~aovchinnikov/papers/ident-compare.pdf>.
- [33] M. Saccomani and L. D’Angiό. Examples of testing global identifiability with the DAISY software. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 42(10):48–53, 2009. URL <https://doi.org/10.3182/20090706-3-FR-2004.00007>.
- [34] M. Saccomani, S. Audoly, and L. D’Angiό. Parameter identifiability of nonlinear systems: the role of initial conditions. *Automatica*, 39:619–632, 2003. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-1098\(02\)00302-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-1098(02)00302-3).
- [35] M. P. Saccomani and G. Bellu. DAISY: An efficient tool to test global identifiability. Some case studies. In *2008 16th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation*, pages 1723–1728, 2008. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/MED.2008.4602152>.
- [36] J. van den Hof. Structural identifiability of linear compartmental systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 43(6):800–818, 1998. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/9.679020>.
- [37] A. F. Villaverde. Observability and structural identifiability of nonlinear biological systems. *Complexity*, 2019:1–12, Jan. 2019. doi: 10.1155/2019/8497093. URL <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/8497093>.
- [38] A. F. Villaverde, N. D. Evans, M. J. Chappell, and J. R. Banga. Sufficiently exciting inputs for structurally identifiable systems biology models. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 51(19):16–19, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2018.09.015>.
- [39] E. Walter and Y. Lecourtier. Unidentifiable compartmental models: what to do? *Mathematical Biosciences*, 56(1-2):1–25, 1981. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564\(81\)90025-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564(81)90025-0).
- [40] X. Xia and C. Moog. Identifiability of nonlinear systems with application to HIV/AIDS models. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(2):330–336, Feb. 2003. doi: 10.1109/tac.2002.808494. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.2002.808494>.