

New computational paradigms in solving fault detection and isolation problems

Andreas Varga

*German Aerospace Center, DLR-Oberpfaffenhofen
Institute of Robotics and Mechatronics, D-82234 Wessling, Germany
(e-mail: andreas.varga@dlr.de)*

Abstract: Several fault detection and isolation problems are formulated for linear time-invariant systems with additive faults and general existence conditions of their solutions are given. An overview of recently developed computational methods for the synthesis of fault detection filters is presented for all formulated problems. Two remarkable computational paradigms emerged in these developments, which are instrumental in developing generally applicable, numerically reliable and computationally efficient synthesis methods. The first paradigm is the use of integrated synthesis algorithms, where the resulting fault detection filters are determined by successive updating of partial syntheses addressing specific requirements. The second paradigm is the use of the nullspace method as a first synthesis step to reduce all synthesis problems to a simple standard form which allows to easily check solvability conditions and address least order synthesis problems.

Keywords: Fault detection, fault detection and isolation, linear synthesis, nullspace method, numerical methods

1. INTRODUCTION

There exists a vast literature on fault detection and related problems, which includes several textbooks (Gertler, 1998; Chen and Patton, 1999; Saberi et al., 2000; Blanke et al., 2003; Ding, 2008) and thousands of journal and conference papers. Attempts for a systematic categorization of different problems have been made in these books as well as in some survey articles (Saberi et al., 2000; Ding et al., 2000), where both exact and approximate solutions to various problems are described. Although the theoretical developments of the fault detection topics for linear time-invariant systems are essentially completed, still we can often observe differences in the formulations of the same problem. This diversity in problem formulations is partly the consequence of employing particular system theoretical frameworks or focusing on particular classes of solution methods. We provide a set of formulations of exact and approximate fault detection problems using the input-output modelling framework. These formulations are expressed as requirements on various input-output transfer gains. This allows to derive simple necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of solutions in terms of ranks of certain transfer-function matrices.

The development of computational methods for solving the synthesis problems of fault detection filters was a constant activity which complemented most theoretical works. Unfortunately, there are many signs for a general lack of numerical awareness in the fault detection community. For example, many of proposed methods employ highly questionable numerical techniques, as polynomial manipulations, operations involving matrix products and powers, or even the computation of highly sensitive canonical forms. All these methods work in the best case on

toy-size examples, but are completely unsuited for large scale problems. Another class of computational methods includes synthesis procedures, which are strongly tailored to existing computational tools (e.g., H_∞ -synthesis methods available in popular environments as MATLAB). Typically, the applicability of these tools is conditioned by technical assumptions, which are however not necessary for solving specific fault detection problems. Another controversial synthesis approach involves the use of so-called unknown input observers as fault detection filters. In spite of lack of generality, the underlying synthesis methods (e.g., based on eigenvector assignment or geometric methods) are still popular today, being applicable in many practical cases.

In spite of many algorithmic developments, it is rather surprising that, with a few notable exceptions, the vast literature on fault detection until around 2000 contains almost no results on the development of reliable numerical methods along the well established criteria for satisfactory algorithms in the field of linear numerical algebra (Moler and Loan, 1978). Because of the lack of generality and/or the lack of numerical reliability, most of popular synthesis techniques of fault detection filters (e.g., parity space methods, geometric methods, unknown input observer based methods) can not be considered as satisfactory numerical approaches. To remedy this situation, a new generation of numerically reliable computational algorithms has been developed by the author during the last decade. The new algorithms are able to solve various fault detection filter synthesis problems in the most general setting, without any technical assumptions. In this paper we give an overview of these new algorithmic developments, by describing suitable synthesis procedures using the high level input-output description. Details of concrete

computational algorithms are discussed using state space descriptor system based descriptions.

In the development of the new computational techniques two computational paradigms emerged, which are instrumental in developing generally applicable, numerically reliable and computationally efficient synthesis methods. The first paradigm is the use of so-called integrated synthesis algorithms, where the resulting fault detection filters are determined by successive updating of partial syntheses addressing specific requirements. Since each partial synthesis represents a valid fault detection filter, this approach has an increased flexibility in combining different synthesis techniques when compared with the traditionally used one-shot techniques. However, the main strength of the integrated algorithms lies in their ability to exploit at each updating step all available structural information at the previous step, which overall leads to very efficient structure exploiting computations.

The second paradigm is the use of the nullspace method (Patton and Hou, 1998; Frisk and Nyberg, 2001; Varga, 2003) as a first synthesis step to simplify and even solve various synthesis problems. The main appeals of the nullspace based fault detection filter synthesis are: generality, being applicable to both standard and singular (or non-proper) systems; numerical reliability, by relying on numerically sound computational techniques; and flexibility, by leading to simplified problem formulations which allow to easily check solvability conditions and address least order synthesis problems.

Structure of the paper

In Section 2 we formulate several exact and approximate fault detection problems and give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of their solutions. For simplicity, we employ an input-output description based formulation, which leads to simple but general existence conditions involving only rank conditions for rational matrices. In Section 3 we present an overview of the latest developments in the synthesis algorithms to solve the formulated fault detection problems. Two computational paradigms can be clearly observed. The first is the development of algorithms based on detector updating techniques, which led to the concept of integrated synthesis algorithms. The second is the important role of the nullspace based approach, as an universal preprocessing step to reduce the formulated fault detection problems to simpler standard forms. Among other advantages, this approach also leads to easy to check solvability conditions. In Section 4 we discuss the computational aspects associated with the proposed synthesis procedure, with the main emphasis on the two already mentioned paradigms: the preprocessing step based on the nullspace method and integrated synthesis algorithms. The computational procedures are discussed using a state space descriptor system description. A comparison of several methods concludes this section. The main conclusions and some of recent extensions of the presented techniques are mentioned in the Section 5. Two appendices provide additional details on the theoretical and computational issues discussed in the paper.

2. FAULT DETECTION AND ISOLATION PROBLEMS

2.1 Models and residual generators

Consider additive fault models described by input-output representations of the form

$$\mathbf{y}(\lambda) = G_u(\lambda)\mathbf{u}(\lambda) + G_d(\lambda)\mathbf{d}(\lambda) + G_w(\lambda)\mathbf{w}(\lambda) + G_f(\lambda)\mathbf{f}(\lambda) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{y}(\lambda)$, $\mathbf{u}(\lambda)$, $\mathbf{d}(\lambda)$, $\mathbf{w}(\lambda)$, and $\mathbf{f}(\lambda)$ are Laplace-transformed (in the continuous-time case) or Z-transformed (in the discrete-time case) vectors of the p -dimensional system output vector $y(t)$, m_u -dimensional control input vector $u(t)$, m_d -dimensional disturbance vector $d(t)$, m_w -dimensional noise vector $w(t)$ and m_f -dimensional fault vector $f(t)$, respectively, and where $G_u(\lambda)$, $G_d(\lambda)$, $G_w(\lambda)$ and $G_f(\lambda)$ are the *transfer-function matrices* (TFMs) from the control inputs to outputs, disturbance inputs to outputs, noise inputs to outputs, and fault inputs to outputs, respectively. For complete generality of our problem formulations, we will allow that these TFMs are general rational matrices (proper or improper) for which we will not *a priori* assume any further properties.

A linear residual generator (or fault detection filter, or simply fault detector) processes the measurable system outputs $y(t)$ and control inputs $u(t)$ and generates the residual signals $r(t)$ which serve for decision making on the presence or absence of faults. The input-output form of this filter is

$$\mathbf{r}(\lambda) = Q(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}(\lambda) \\ \mathbf{u}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

where $Q(\lambda)$ is the TFM of the filter. For a physically realizable filter, $Q(\lambda)$ must be *proper* (i.e., only with finite poles) and *stable* (i.e., only with poles having negative real parts for a continuous-time system or magnitudes less than one for a discrete-time system). The (dynamic) *order* of $Q(\lambda)$ (also known as *McMillan degree*) is the dimension of the state vector of a minimal state-space realization of $Q(\lambda)$. The dimension q of the residual vector $r(t)$ depends on the fault detection problem to be solved. The form (2) of the fault detection filter is called the *implementation form* (Gertler, 1998).

The residual signal $r(t)$ in (2) generally depends via the system outputs $y(t)$ of all system inputs $u(t)$, $d(t)$, $w(t)$ and $f(t)$. The *internal form* of the filter (Gertler, 1998) is obtained by replacing in (2) $\mathbf{y}(\lambda)$ by its expression in (1), and is given by

$$\mathbf{r}(\lambda) = R_u(\lambda)\mathbf{u}(\lambda) + R_d(\lambda)\mathbf{d}(\lambda) + R_w(\lambda)\mathbf{w}(\lambda) + R_f(\lambda)\mathbf{f}(\lambda) \quad (3)$$

where

$$[R_u(\lambda) \mid R_d(\lambda) \mid R_w(\lambda) \mid R_f(\lambda)] := Q(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} G_u(\lambda) & G_d(\lambda) & G_w(\lambda) & G_f(\lambda) \\ I_{m_u} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

For a successfully designed filter $Q(\lambda)$, the corresponding internal representation is a proper and stable system, which achieves additionally specific fault detection requirements.

For the solution of fault detection problems it is always possible to completely decouple the control input $u(t)$ from

the residual $r(t)$ by requiring $R_u(\lambda) = 0$. Regarding the disturbance input $d(t)$ and noise input $w(t)$ we aim to impose a similar condition on the disturbance input $d(t)$ by requiring $R_d(\lambda) = 0$, while minimizing simultaneously the effect of noise input $w(t)$ on the residual (e.g., by minimizing the norm of $R_w(\lambda)$). Thus, from a practical synthesis point of view, the distinction between $d(t)$ and $w(t)$ lies solely in the way these signals are treated when solving the residual generator synthesis problem.

More precisely, the disturbance inputs in $d(t)$ are additive effects from which exact decoupling of the residuals is presumably possible and is targeted in the detector synthesis. On the other hand, the noise input vector $w(t)$ contains everything else, including proper random noise or “ordinary” disturbances in excess of those which may be exactly decoupled. It may even contain fictive inputs which model the effect of parametric uncertainties in the process model. This distinction between $d(t)$ and $w(t)$ allows to address the solution of both exact (when $G_w(\lambda) = 0$) and approximate (when $G_w(\lambda) \neq 0$) fault detection problems using a unique computational framework.

In all fault detection problems formulated in what follows, we require that by a suitable choice of a stable fault detection filter $Q(\lambda)$, we achieve that the residual signal $r(t)$ is fully decoupled from the control input $u(t)$ and disturbance input $d(t)$. Thus, the following *decoupling conditions* must be generally fulfilled:

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & R_u(\lambda) = 0, \\ (ii) \quad & R_d(\lambda) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

For each fault detection problem specific requirements have to be fulfilled, which are formulated as additional conditions in what follows. For all formulated problems we also give the existence conditions of the solutions of these problems.

2.2 Exact fault detection problem – EFDP

The basic additional requirement is simply to achieve by a suitable choice of a fault detection filter $Q(\lambda)$ that in the absence of noise input (i.e., $G_w(\lambda) = 0$), the residual $r(t)$ is influenced by all fault components $f_j(t)$. Let $R_{f_j}(\lambda)$ denote the j -th column of $R_f(\lambda)$. This requirement can be expressed as the following *detection condition* to be fulfilled for all faults:

$$(iii) \quad R_{f_j}(\lambda) \neq 0, j = 1, \dots, m_f \text{ with } R_f(\lambda) \text{ stable.} \quad (6)$$

The solvability conditions of the EFDP have been established for proper systems, see for example (Ding and Frank, 1991; Nyberg, 2002), and are valid for nonproper systems as well:

Theorem 1. For the system (1) with $G_w(\lambda) = 0$ the EFDP is solvable if and only if

$$\text{rank}[G_{f_j}(\lambda) G_d(\lambda)] > \text{rank} G_d(\lambda), \quad j = 1, \dots, m_f \quad (7)$$

where $G_{f_j}(\lambda)$ denotes the j -th column of $G_f(\lambda)$.

Generically, the condition (7) is fulfilled if $p > m_d$, which basically says that the system must have a sufficiently large number of measurements. For the case $m_d = 0$, this condition reduces to the simple fault input observability conditions:

$$G_{f_j}(\lambda) \neq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m_f \quad (8)$$

2.3 Approximate fault detection problem – AFDP

The effects of the noise input $w(t)$ can usually not fully decoupled from the residual $r(t)$. In this case, the basic requirements for the choice of $Q(\lambda)$ can be expressed to achieve that the residual $r(t)$ is influenced by all fault components $f_j(t)$ and the influence of the noise signal $w(t)$ is negligible. Thus, the following two additional conditions have to be fulfilled:

$$\begin{aligned} (iii) \quad & R_{f_j}(\lambda) \neq 0, j = 1, \dots, m_f \text{ with } R_f(\lambda) \text{ stable,} \\ (iv) \quad & R_w(\lambda) \approx 0, \text{ with } R_w(\lambda) \text{ stable.} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here, (iii) is the detection condition of all faults employed also in the EFDP, while (iv) is the *attenuation condition* for the noise input. The condition $R_w(\lambda) \approx 0$ expresses the requirement that the transfer gain $\|R_w(\lambda)\|$ (measured by any suitable norm) can be made arbitrarily small.

The solvability conditions of the formulated AFDP can be easily established, see also (Varga, 2012a):

Theorem 2. For the system (1) the AFDP is solvable if and only if the EFDP is solvable.

2.4 Exact strong fault detection and isolation problem – ESFDIP

Let $M_r(\lambda)$ be a given $q \times m_f$ TFM of a reference model (i.e., stable, proper) specifying the desired input-output transfer from the faults to residuals as $\mathbf{r}(\lambda) = M_r(\lambda)\mathbf{f}(\lambda)$. Thus, we want to achieve by a suitable choice of a stable and proper $Q(\lambda)$ satisfying (i) and (ii) in (5), that we have additionally $R_f(\lambda) = M_r(\lambda)$. For example, a typical choice for $M_r(\lambda)$ is an m_f -th order diagonal and invertible TFM, which ensures that each residual $r_i(t)$ is influenced only by the fault $f_i(t)$. Such a choice corresponds to the so-called *directional residuals* used in (Gertler, 1998).

To determine $Q(\lambda)$, we have to solve the linear rational equation (4), with the settings $R_u(\lambda) = 0$, $R_d(\lambda) = 0$, and $R_f(\lambda) = M_r(\lambda)$ ($R_w(\lambda)$ and $G_w(\lambda)$ are empty matrices). The choice of $M_r(\lambda)$ may lead to a solution $Q(\lambda)$ which is not proper or is unstable or has both these undesirable properties. Therefore, besides determining $Q(\lambda)$, we also consider the determination of a suitable updating factor $M(\lambda)$ of $M_r(\lambda)$ to ensure the stability and properness of the solution $Q(\lambda)$ for $R_f(\lambda) = M(\lambda)M_r(\lambda)$. Obviously, $M(\lambda)$ must be chosen a proper, stable and invertible TFM. Additionally, $M(\lambda)$ must be chosen diagonal, in order to preserve the zero/nonzero structure encoded in $M_r(\lambda)$ (see also subsection 2.5).

The formulation of the ESFDIP corresponds to the *model-matching approach* of (Chen and Patton, 1999; Blanke et al., 2003). Accordingly, given a stable and proper $M_r(\lambda)$, it is required to determine a stable and proper filter $Q(\lambda)$ and a diagonal, proper, stable and invertible TFM $M(\lambda)$ such that the following condition is additionally fulfilled:

$$(iii) \quad R_f(\lambda) = M(\lambda)M_r(\lambda)$$

The solvability condition of the ESFDIP, also discussed in (Varga, 2004b, 2012a), is the standard solvability condition of the (underdetermined) systems of linear equations:

Theorem 3. For the system (1) with $G_w(\lambda) = 0$ and a given $M_r(\lambda)$, the ESFDIP is solvable if and only if the following condition is fulfilled

$$\text{rank}[G_f(\lambda) G_d(\lambda)] = \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} G_f(\lambda) & G_d(\lambda) \\ M_r(\lambda) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

Proof. A solution $\tilde{Q}(\lambda)$ which satisfies the linear equations $R_u(\lambda) = 0$, $R_d(\lambda) = 0$ and $R_f(\lambda) = M_r(\lambda)$ exists if the condition (10), representing the solvability condition for this linear system, is fulfilled. A stable solution $Q(\lambda)$ satisfying condition (iii) is obtained by expressing $\tilde{Q}(\lambda)$ in the left coprime factorized form $\tilde{Q}(\lambda) = M^{-1}(\lambda)Q(\lambda)$, with $M(\lambda)$ and $Q(\lambda)$ proper and stable TFMs, and $M(\lambda)$ diagonal.

When $M_r(\lambda)$ has full column rank m_f , the solvability condition of the ESFDIP has been derived by Frank and Ding (1994). In this case, (10) reduces to

$$\text{rank}[G_f(\lambda) G_d(\lambda)] = m_f + \text{rank} G_d(\lambda) \quad (11)$$

Generically, the condition (11) is fulfilled if $p \geq m_f + m_d$, which implies that the system must have a sufficiently large number of measurements. For the case $m_d = 0$, this condition reduces to the simple left invertibility condition:

$$\text{rank} G_f(\lambda) = m_f \quad (12)$$

2.5 Exact weak fault detection and isolation problem – EWFDIP

The ESFDIP is often not solvable, due to the lack of a sufficiently large number of measurements. For fault isolation purposes, we can formulate a weaker alternative to the ESFDIP, by interpreting $M_r(\lambda)$ as a structured TFM aiming to ensure that the residual $r_i(t)$ is influenced by the fault $f_j(t)$, only if the element (i, j) of $M_r(\lambda)$ is non-zero and is decoupled of $f_j(t)$ otherwise. In this case, only the zero-nonzero structure of $M_r(\lambda)$ is relevant and instead $M_r(\lambda)$, the corresponding *structure matrix* $\mathcal{S}(M_r(\lambda))$ with only 0/1 entries can be used to encode these dependencies. The matrix $S = \mathcal{S}(M_r(\lambda))$ is determined as follows

$$S_{i,j} := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } [M_r(\lambda)]_{i,j} \neq 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } [M_r(\lambda)]_{i,j} = 0 \end{cases}$$

According to the nomenclature of Gertler (1998), for a desired structure matrix S , the i -th row of S is called the i -th *specification*, while the j -th column of S is called the j -th *fault signature*. The specifications serve mainly for synthesis purposes (see subsection 3.5), while the fault signatures are used mainly for the isolation of specific faults by comparing the signature of fired (nonzero) residuals with those coded in the columns of S . The maximally achievable structure matrix for the system (1) can be determined using a numerically reliable state space based algorithm proposed in (Varga, 2009c).

The formulation of the EWFDIP corresponds to the formulation with *structured residuals* employed in (Gertler, 1998). For a given structure matrix S , it is required to determine a stable and proper filter $Q(\lambda)$ such that the following condition is additionally fulfilled:

$$(iii) \mathcal{S}(R_f(\lambda)) = S, \text{ with } R_f(\lambda) \text{ stable.}$$

The solvability conditions of the EWFDIP can be expressed by formulating for each specification i (i.e., the i -th row of S) the solvability condition corresponding to an EFDP, which arises by redefining each fault signal to

be decoupled (i.e., the corresponding element $S_{i,j} = 0$) as a disturbance input. Let $\hat{G}_d^{(i)}(\lambda)$ be the TFM formed from the columns of $G_f(\lambda)$ for which $S_{i,j} = 0$. We have the following solvability conditions for the EWFDIP:

Theorem 4. For the system (1) with $G_w(\lambda) = 0$ and a given $q \times m_f$ structure matrix S the EWFDIP is solvable if and only if for $i = 1, \dots, q$

$$\text{rank}[G_d(\lambda) \hat{G}_d^{(i)}(\lambda) G_{f_j}(\lambda)] > \text{rank}[G_d(\lambda) \hat{G}_d^{(i)}(\lambda)] \quad (13)$$

for all j such that $S_{i,j} \neq 0$.

2.6 Approximate strong fault detection and isolation problem – ASFDIP

The formulation of the ASFDIP extends the model-matching approach of (Chen and Patton, 1999; Blanke et al., 2003), by including the determination/updating of the reference model. Specifically, for a given stable and proper TFM $M_r(\lambda)$, it is required to determine a stable and proper filter $Q(\lambda)$ and a diagonal, proper, stable and invertible TFM $M(\lambda)$ such that the following conditions are additionally fulfilled:

$$\begin{aligned} (iii) & R_f(\lambda) \approx M(\lambda)M_r(\lambda), \text{ with } R_f(\lambda) \text{ stable;} \\ (iv) & R_w(\lambda) \approx 0, \text{ with } R_w(\lambda) \text{ stable.} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The condition (iii) simply means that we strive $\|R_f(\lambda) - M(\lambda)M_r(\lambda)\| \approx 0$.

The sufficient conditions for solvability are simply those for the solvability of the ESFDIP (Varga, 2012a):

Theorem 5. For the system (1) and a given $M_r(\lambda)$, the ASFDIP is solvable if the ESFDIP is solvable.

2.7 Approximate weak fault detection and isolation problem – AWFDDIP

Let S be a given $q \times m_f$ structure matrix and let \bar{S} be the negated S with the (i, j) -th element $\bar{S}_{i,j} := 1 - S_{i,j}$. Let $X \circ Y$ denote the element-wise multiplication of matrices X and Y of same size. The AWFDDIP can be formulated as follows. For a given structure matrix S it is required to determine a stable and proper filter $Q(\lambda)$ such that the following conditions are additionally fulfilled:

$$\begin{aligned} (iii) & \mathcal{S}(S \circ R_f(\lambda)) = S, \bar{S} \circ R_f(\lambda) \approx 0, \\ & \text{with } R_f(\lambda) \text{ stable,} \\ (iv) & R_w(\lambda) \approx 0, \text{ with } R_w(\lambda) \text{ stable.} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

It is straightforward to show that the sufficient conditions for solvability are simply those for the solvability of the EWFDIP (Varga, 2012a).

Theorem 6. For the system (1) and a given structure matrix S , the AWFDDIP is solvable if the EWFDIP is solvable.

3. NULLSPACE BASED SYNTHESIS ALGORITHMS

In this section we present an overview of the recently developed synthesis procedures of fault detection filters to solve the formulated fault detection problems. In these developments two computational paradigms emerged, which are instrumental in developing generally applicable, numerically reliable and computationally efficient synthesis

methods. The first paradigm is the use of so-called integrated synthesis algorithms, where the resulting fault detection filters are determined by successive updating of partial syntheses addressing specific requirements. In all synthesis algorithms described in this section it is possible to express the TFM of the final filter in a factored form as

$$Q(\lambda) = Q_K(\lambda) \cdots Q_2(\lambda)Q_1(\lambda) \quad (16)$$

where $Q_1(\lambda)$, $Q_2(\lambda)Q_1(\lambda)$, \dots , can be interpreted as partial syntheses addressing specific requirements. Since each partial synthesis may represent a valid fault detection filter, this approach has a high flexibility in using or combining different synthesis techniques.

The second paradigm is the use of the nullspace method as a first synthesis step to reduce all synthesis problems to a simple standard form which allows to easily check solvability conditions and address least order synthesis problems. In this section, we present solution procedures based on the nullspace method for each of the formulated fault detection problems. The concrete numerical aspects of using nullspace methods are described in the next section, where an example of an integrated algorithm for solving the EFDP is also presented.

3.1 Nullspace based reduction to standard form

Assume first $m_u + m_d > 0$ and consider $Q(\lambda)$ in a factored form

$$Q(\lambda) = \bar{Q}_1(\lambda)Q_1(\lambda), \quad (17)$$

where $Q_1(\lambda)$ is a proper left rational nullspace basis satisfying $Q_1(\lambda)G(\lambda) = 0$, where $G(\lambda)$ is defined as

$$G(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} G_u(\lambda) & G_d(\lambda) \\ I_{m_u} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

and $\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)$ is a factor to be further determined. With this choice it follows that $Q(\lambda)$ automatically fulfills the two conditions (i) and (ii) in (5), namely $R_u(\lambda) = 0$ and $R_d(\lambda) = 0$, intervening in all fault detection problems formulated in the previous section. The existence of a rational nullspace basis $Q_1(\lambda)$ is guaranteed provided the existence conditions of Theorems 1–6 are fulfilled. The resulting $Q_1(\lambda)$ has maximal row rank $p - r_d$, where $r_d = \text{rank } G_d(\lambda)$.

The detector in (2) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{r}(\lambda) = \bar{Q}_1(\lambda)Q_1(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}(\lambda) \\ \mathbf{u}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} = \bar{Q}_1(\lambda)\bar{\mathbf{y}}(\lambda) \quad (19)$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{y}}(\lambda) := Q_1(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}(\lambda) \\ \mathbf{u}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} = \bar{G}_f(\lambda)\mathbf{f}(\lambda) + \bar{G}_w(\lambda)\mathbf{w}(\lambda) \quad (20)$$

with

$$[\bar{G}_f(\lambda) \ \bar{G}_w(\lambda)] := Q_1(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} G_f(\lambda) & G_w(\lambda) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

We can choose $Q_1(\lambda)$ stable and such that both $\bar{G}_f(\lambda)$ and $\bar{G}_w(\lambda)$ defined in (21) are proper and stable TFMs (Varga, 2008).

If $m_u = m_d = 0$, we can determine $Q_1(\lambda)$ simply from a proper and stable left coprime factorization

$$[G_f(\lambda) \ G_w(\lambda)] = Q_1^{-1}(\lambda)[\bar{G}_f(\lambda) \ \bar{G}_w(\lambda)]$$

With this first preprocessing step, we reduced the original problems formulated for the system (1) to ones formulated

for the reduced system (20) without control and disturbance inputs, and we have to determine the TFM $\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)$ of the simpler detector (19). At this stage we can assume that the reduced system (20) is proper and even stable, provided $Q_1(\lambda)$ has been chosen a stable TFM (always possible).

The main facts established in (Forney, 1975; Kailath, 1980) about nullspace bases (both polynomial and rational) are summarized in Appendix A. The so-called simple rational bases are useful when solving fault detection problems with least order detectors. For example, building linear combinations of basis vectors to obtain least order candidate detectors is very straightforward. Moreover, left multiplication with diagonal $M(\lambda)$ is possible without altering the simple structure of the basis. Unfortunately, the computation of both polynomial and simple bases involves delicate computational steps leading to potential accuracy losses. As an alternative to a simple basis, we discuss in the Appendix B the computation of a minimal order rational basis using a numerically stable reduction method of a linear matrix pencil.

In what follows, we discuss the synthesis of fault detection filters which solve the formulated fault detection problems and give simpler existence conditions for the solutions of the formulated exact fault detection problems, which can serve for checking the existence of solutions. An important aspect for detector synthesis is the synthesis of residual generators with least order dynamical orders. Only very few methods proposed in the literature are able to address this aspect.

3.2 Solving the EFDP

The solvability conditions of Theorem 1 lead for the reduced system (20) without control and disturbance inputs to the following simplification:

Corollary 1. For the system (20) with $\bar{G}_w(\lambda) = 0$ the EFDP is solvable if and only if

$$\text{rank } \bar{G}_{f_j}(\lambda) > 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m_f \quad (22)$$

Any stable and proper rational nullspace basis $Q_1(\lambda)$ already represents a solution of the EFDP, provided the conditions (22) are fulfilled. In what follows, we discuss the computation of a special solution called the *least order* solution of the EFDP, which is a solution having the least possible McMillan degree. The basic synthesis procedure determines $\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)$ in (17) in the factored form

$$\bar{Q}_1(\lambda) = Q_3(\lambda)Q_2(\lambda)$$

where $Q_2(\lambda)$ is determined such that $Q_2(\lambda)Q_1(\lambda)$ has least order and $Q_3(\lambda)$ is determined such that the overall filter $Q(\lambda) = Q_3(\lambda)Q_2(\lambda)Q_1(\lambda)$ and $R_f(\lambda) = Q_3(\lambda)Q_2(\lambda)\bar{G}_f(\lambda)$ are stable. Additionally we must ensure that $Q(\lambda)$ is *admissible*, that is, the conditions (6) are fulfilled.

In what follows we sketch a synthesis procedure for a least order scalar output detector (i.e., with $q = 1$), which serves only to understand the basic principles, but evidently is not suitable as basis of a reliable computational procedure. Assume $Q_1(\lambda)$ is a simple proper rational basis (see Appendix A) formed of $n - r_d$ rational row vectors $v_i(\lambda)/d_i(\lambda)$, where $v_i(\lambda)$ is a polynomial vector of degree n_i and $d_i(\lambda)$ is a stable polynomial of degree n_i . We

assume that the basis vectors $v_i(\lambda)$ are ordered such that $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_{p-r_d}$ and each $d_i(\lambda)$ divides $d_j(\lambda)$ for $i < j$. It follows immediately, that a linear combination $h^{(i)}Q_1(\lambda)$ of the first i rows with $h^{(i)}$ of the form $h^{(i)} = [h_1, \dots, h_i, 0, \dots, 0]$, $h_i \neq 0$, has a McMillan degree n_i . Thus, choosing the least index i such that $h^{(i)}Q_1(\lambda)$ is admissible, solves the synthesis problem with $Q_2(\lambda) = h^{(i)}$ and $Q_3(\lambda) = 1$. State space computations based algorithms for the least order synthesis will be described in details in Section 4.2.

A short historical note is appropriate in this place. The nullspace method (without using this naming) in a state space based formulation has been originally employed in (Patton and Hou, 1998) to solve the EWFDP using structured residuals. The least order synthesis problem has been for the first time addressed by Frisk and Nyberg (2001), where a minimal polynomial basis based solution has been proposed. A numerically reliable state space approach to the least order synthesis relying on rational nullspace bases has been proposed in (Varga, 2003). Computational details in a state space based setting are discussed in Section 4.2 and Appendix B.

3.3 Solving the AFDP

We have seen in the proof of Theorem 2, that the solution of the EFDP can be used to solve the formulated AFDP. However, better solutions can be obtained by trying to maximize the gap between the fault detectability and noise attenuation requirements. An optimization based approach can be used to achieve this goal. Let $\gamma > 0$ be an admissible level for the influence of the noise signal $w(t)$ in the residual $r(t)$, which can be measured using suitable norms of $R_w(\lambda) = \bar{Q}_1(\lambda)\bar{G}_w(\lambda)$, as for example the H_2 - or H_∞ -norms. As a measure of the fault detectability, several indexes denoted $\|R_f(\lambda)\|_-$ have been used in the literature. The definitions used in (Ding et al., 2000; Jaimoukha et al., 2006; Liu and Zhou, 2007, 2008; Zhang and Ding, 2008) are in terms of the least singular values of the frequency-response of $R_f(\lambda) = \bar{Q}_1(\lambda)\bar{G}_f(\lambda)$ and therefore are meaningful only when $m_f \leq p$. An alternative measure $\|R_f(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty-}$ has been used in (Varga, 2009a; Glover and Varga, 2011)

$$\|R_f(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty-} = \min_{1 \leq j \leq m_f} \|R_{f_j}(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty}, \quad (23)$$

The requirement $\|R_f(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty-} > 0$ merely asks for nonzero columns $R_{f_j}(\lambda)$ and thus is equivalent to the fault detection condition (6).

The $H_-/H_{2/\infty}$ optimization problem to be solved is the following: Given $\gamma > 0$, determine $\beta > 0$ and a stable and proper fault detection filter $\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)$ such that

$$\beta = \max_{\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)} \{ \|\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)\bar{G}_f(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty-} \mid \|\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)\bar{G}_w(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty} \leq \gamma \}$$

Numerically reliable computational methods to solve this optimization problems have been proposed in (Varga, 2009a; Glover and Varga, 2011). Computational procedures relying on alternative definitions of the $\|\cdot\|_-$ index have been proposed in (Ding et al., 2000; Jaimoukha et al., 2006; Liu and Zhou, 2007, 2008; Zhang and Ding, 2008).

The procedure of (Varga, 2009a) determines $\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)$ in the form $\bar{Q}_1(\lambda) = \bar{Q}_2(\lambda)Q_2(\lambda)$, where $Q_2(\lambda)$ ensures

that $Q_2(\lambda)\bar{G}_w(\lambda)$ has full row rank, and $Q_2(\lambda)Q_1(\lambda)$ has least dynamical order. The standard case is when $Q_2(\lambda)\bar{G}_w(\lambda)$ has no unstable zeros on the boundary of the stability domain (i.e., the extended imaginary axis in the continuous-time case, or the unit circle centered in the origin in the discrete-time case). The non-standard case corresponds to the presence of such zeros.

At the next step, using the dual of the algorithm of Oarǎ and Varga (2000) for the continuous-time case and the dual of the algorithm of Oarǎ (2005) for the discrete-time case, we compute the quasi-outer-inner factorization

$$Q_2(\lambda)\bar{G}_w(\lambda) = M_{wo}(\lambda)M_{wi}(\lambda)$$

where the quasi-outer factor $M_{wo}(\lambda)$ is an invertible TFM which has only stable zeros, excepting possible zeros on the boundary of the stability domain, and $M_{wi}(\lambda)$ is inner (i.e., $M_{wi}(\lambda)M_{wi}^*(\lambda) = I$ with $M_{wi}^*(s) = M_{wi}^T(-s)$ in the continuous-time case, and $M_{wi}^*(z) = M_{wi}^T(1/z)$ in the discrete-time case).

In the standard case, $\bar{Q}_2(\lambda)$ is determined in the form $\bar{Q}_2(\lambda) = Q_4(\lambda)Q_3(\lambda)$, where $Q_3(\lambda) = M_{wo}^{-1}(\lambda)$ and $Q_4(\lambda)$ is the optimal solution (or an approximation of it) of the reduced problem

$$\beta = \max_{Q_4(\lambda)} \{ \|Q_4(\lambda)\tilde{G}_f(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty-} \mid \|Q_4(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty} \leq \gamma \}$$

where $\tilde{G}_f(\lambda) = Q_3(\lambda)Q_2(\lambda)\bar{G}_f(\lambda)$.

In the non-standard case, $\bar{Q}_2(\lambda) = Q_3(\lambda)$ is determined by directly solving

$$\beta = \max_{Q_3(\lambda)} \{ \|Q_3(\lambda)\hat{G}_f(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty-} \mid \|Q_3(\lambda)M_{wo}(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty} \leq \gamma \}$$

where $\hat{G}_f(\lambda) = Q_2(\lambda)\bar{G}_f(\lambda)$. Suitable algorithms for this purpose have been developed in (Glover and Varga, 2011).

3.4 Solving the ESFDIP

The solvability condition of Theorem 3 leads for the reduced system (20) to the following simplification:

Corollary 2. For the system (20) with $\bar{G}_w(\lambda) = 0$ and a given $M_r(\lambda)$, the ESFDIP is solvable if and only the following condition is fulfilled

$$\text{rank } \bar{G}_f(\lambda) = \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{G}_f(\lambda) \\ M_r(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

We can determine $\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)$ in the form

$$\bar{Q}_1(\lambda) = Q_3(\lambda)Q_2(\lambda)$$

where $Q_2(\lambda)$ is determined such that

$$Q_2(\lambda)\bar{G}_f(\lambda) = M_r(\lambda) \quad (25)$$

and has least order and the diagonal factor $M(\lambda) = Q_3(\lambda)$ is determined such that $Q(\lambda) = Q_3(\lambda)Q_2(\lambda)Q_1(\lambda)$ is stable and proper. A numerically reliable state space computations based algorithm for this synthesis approach has been proposed in Varga (2004b). Note that the least order synthesis is only possible if $\text{rank } \bar{G}_f(\lambda) < p - r_d$.

3.5 Solving the EWFDP

For a given specification i (contained in the i -th row of S), we define a new disturbance input $\hat{d}^{(i)}$, which contains

all components f_j of f for which $S_{ij} = 0$, define a new fault input $\hat{f}^{(i)}$, which contains all components f_j for which $S_{ij} \neq 0$ and we build $\hat{G}_d^{(i)}(\lambda)$ and $\hat{G}_f^{(i)}(\lambda)$ from the corresponding set of columns of $\bar{G}_f(\lambda)$. We can rewrite the reduced system (20) as

$$\bar{y}(\lambda) = \hat{G}_d^{(i)}(\lambda)\hat{d}^{(i)}(\lambda) + \hat{G}_f^{(i)}(\lambda)\hat{f}^{(i)}(\lambda) + \bar{G}_w(\lambda)\mathbf{w}(\lambda) \quad (26)$$

The solvability conditions of Theorem 4 lead for the reduced system (20) to the following simplification:

Corollary 3. For the system (20) with $\bar{G}_w(\lambda) = 0$ and a given structure matrix S , the EWFDP is solvable if and only for $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$ the following conditions are fulfilled

$$\text{rank} [\hat{G}_d^{(i)}(\lambda) \bar{G}_{f_j}(\lambda)] > \text{rank} \hat{G}_d^{(i)}(\lambda), \quad (27)$$

for all j such that $S_{i,j} \neq 0$.

For the reduced system (20) with $\bar{G}_w(\lambda) = 0$ we can determine, using the standard approach to solve the EFDIP, a bank of q scalar output detectors of least orders, each of the form

$$\mathbf{r}_i(\lambda) = \bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)\bar{y}(\lambda), \quad i = 1, \dots, q \quad (28)$$

such that each detector $\bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)$ solves the EFDIP for the rewritten system (26) with $\bar{G}_w(\lambda) = 0$ and thus achieves the i -th specification coded in the i -th row of S . The TFM of the final detector can be assembled from q individual detectors as

$$Q(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} Q^{(1)}(\lambda) \\ \vdots \\ Q^{(q)}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \bar{Q}^{(1)}(\lambda) \\ \vdots \\ \bar{Q}^{(q)}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} Q_1(\lambda) \quad (29)$$

According to the synthesis procedure for scalar output detectors described in subsection 3.2, each individual detector $\bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)$ can be determined in the factored form

$$\bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda) = Q_3^{(i)}(\lambda)Q_2^{(i)}(\lambda)Q_1^{(i)}(\lambda)$$

where $Q_1^{(i)}(\lambda)$ is a left proper nullspace basis of $\hat{G}_d^{(i)}(\lambda)$, $Q_2^{(i)}(\lambda)$ is a rational vector used to build a linear combination of the basis vectors in $Q_1^{(i)}(\lambda)$, and $Q_3^{(i)}(\lambda)$ is a stable transfer function which ensures a desired dynamics for the i -th detector.

3.6 Solving the ASFDIP

To fulfill the last two conditions in (14) we can solve for a fixed $M(\lambda)$ a $H_{2/\infty}$ -norm minimization problem to determine a stable and proper $\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)$ such that

$$\|[\bar{Q}_1(\lambda)\bar{G}_f(\lambda) - M(\lambda)M_r(\lambda) \bar{Q}_1(\lambda)\bar{G}_w(\lambda)]\|_{2/\infty} = \min$$

This $H_{2/\infty}$ model matching problem can be easily reformulated as a standard $H_{2/\infty}$ -norm minimization based “controller” synthesis problem (Zhou et al., 1996) for which software tools exist, as for example, the functions `h2syn/hinfsyn` available in the MATLAB ROBUST CONTROL Toolbox. The main problem when employing standard tools like `h2syn/hinfsyn`, is that, although a stable and proper solution of the ASFDIP may exist (according to Theorem 5), this solution can not be computed because of an inappropriate choice of $M(\lambda)M_r(\lambda)$ or because of the need to fulfill some technical assumptions.

To face the above limitations, general synthesis procedures have been developed for which no such limitations exist. The key parameter to guarantee the stability and properness of the detector is $M(\lambda)M_r(\lambda)$, the desired TFM relating the faults to the residuals. Often, good candidates for $M(\lambda)$ and $M_r(\lambda)$ result from an exact synthesis (for $G_w(\lambda) = 0$) (Varga, 2004b). However, in (Varga, 2005) a synthesis procedure has been proposed, where the choice of a suitable updating factor $M(\lambda)$ of an initial $M_r(\lambda)$ is part of the solution process. This procedure has been refined in (Varga, 2010, 2011a), by developing an integrated approach to the detector synthesis. An important feature of these computational approaches is that they rely on repeated updating of an initial fault detector. The final detector can be thus expressed in a factored form as in (16).

3.7 Solving the AWFDP

For a given specification i (contained in the i -th row of S), we can rewrite the reduced system (20) analogously to subsection 3.5 in the form (26). Using the approach to solve the AFDP in subsection 3.3, a bank of q scalar output least order detectors of the form

$$\mathbf{r}_i(\lambda) = \bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)\bar{y}(\lambda), \quad i = 1, \dots, q \quad (30)$$

such that each detector $\bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)$ achieves approximately the i -th specification coded in the i -th row of S . For this purpose, we can solve the following $H_-/H_{2/\infty}$ optimization problem: Given $\gamma > 0$, determine $\beta^{(i)} > 0$ and a stable and proper fault detection filter $\bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)$ such that

$$\beta^{(i)} = \max_{\bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)} \{ \|\hat{R}_f^{(i)}(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty} - \|\|\hat{R}_d^{(i)}(\lambda) \hat{R}_w^{(i)}(\lambda)\|_{2/\infty} \leq \gamma \}$$

where $\hat{R}_f^{(i)}(\lambda) = \bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)\hat{G}_f^{(i)}(\lambda)$, $\hat{R}_d^{(i)}(\lambda) = \bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)\hat{G}_d^{(i)}(\lambda)$, and $\hat{R}_w^{(i)}(\lambda) = \bar{Q}^{(i)}(\lambda)\bar{G}_w^{(i)}(\lambda)$. The TFM of the final detector can be assembled from q individual detectors as in (29), where in accordance with the synthesis procedure described in subsection 3.3, each individual detector $Q^{(i)}(\lambda)$ is determined in a factored form.

Concluding remark

An important aspect worth to mention regarding the new synthesis algorithms to solve the approximate synthesis problems AFDP, ASFDIP and AWFDP is that the main focus in developing these algorithms lies on obtaining “useful” solutions of these problems in the most general setting by using sound numerical techniques and not on solving the associated optimization problems. Although the proposed solution approaches in (Varga, 2009a, 2010, 2011a) follow the usual solution processes to determine the optimal solutions, but the resulting filters are usually not optimal. The characterization of “useful” solutions must take into account the actual signal bounds on the contribution of noise inputs in the residual signal and the resulting minimum detectable amplitudes of fault signals.

4. COMPUTATIONAL ASPECTS

In this section we formulate first the requirements for satisfactory computational algorithms to solve the synthesis problems of fault detection filters. Then the two

computational paradigms already mentioned in Section 3 are discussed. First, the nullspace based preprocessing is presented and the details of a computational algorithm are given in Appendix B. Then, the concept of an integrated algorithm is explained in terms of updating the implementation and internal forms of the fault detection filter. An integrated algorithm to solve the EFDP is presented as an example. As it will be apparent, the main strength of the integrated algorithms lies in their ability to exploit at each updating step all available structural information at the previous step, which overall leads to very efficient structure exploiting computations. In the final part, we discuss two alternative approaches to solve the EFDP: the parity space and the *unknown input observer* (UIO) based methods. As it will be shown, none of them can be considered as a satisfactory numerical approach. The main reasons for this are the lack of generality and/or the lack of numerical reliability.

4.1 Developing satisfactory synthesis algorithms

Before discussing the new computational paradigms for computational algorithms for the synthesis of fault detection filters, we first briefly recall three key requirements for a *satisfactory* numerical algorithm: generality, numerical stability, and efficiency (Moler and Loan, 1978). A *general* synthesis algorithm is one which has no limitations for its applicability of any technical nature. It follows, that it should be applicable without any other limitation than the rank conditions on the TFMs in (1) expressing the solvability conditions of various fault detection problems given in Theorems 1–6. For example, a synthesis method to solve the EFDP which is applicable only if $G_d(\lambda)$ has no unstable zeros or is only applicable to strictly proper systems can not be considered satisfactory. A desirable feature in this context is that the synthesis algorithms should be applicable regardless the underlying system (1) is proper or not.

Numerical stability (more precisely, *backward stability*) of an algorithm means that the results computed by that algorithm are exact for slightly perturbed original data. As a consequence, a numerically stable algorithm applied to a well conditioned problem will produce guaranteed accurate results. This is why numerical stability is a key feature for a satisfactory algorithm. A basic ingredient to achieve numerical stability is the use of orthogonal transformations whenever possible. The use of these transformations often leads to bounds for perturbations of the initial data which are equivalent to the cumulative effect of round-off errors occurring during the computations. This is an important way to prove the numerical stability of such an algorithm.

A main technique used to solve complex problems is to perform orthogonal transformations on the original problem data to reduce the original problem to an equivalent one which is easier to solve (e.g., reduction to condensed forms). The use of non-orthogonal transformations should generally be avoided, unless there are guarantees for their well-conditioning. Notoriously ill-conditioned transformations arise during reductions to canonical forms (Jordan, Kronecker, etc.) and therefore must be completely avoided. For similar reasons, algorithms involving computational detours, as for example, model conversions to polynomial forms, cannot be considered satisfactory.

Because of the intrinsic complexity of several computational problems in systems theory, it is not always possible to develop numerically stable algorithms for them. Numerically reliable algorithms are those algorithms, which are either numerically stable or the loss of numerical stability during the computations can be easily detected. Therefore one often imposes only the more general requirement of *numerical reliability* on the individual steps of the algorithm. Although this is not sufficient to guarantee numerical reliability of the global algorithm, one can still expect that it will perform accurately on well-conditioned problems.

The *efficiency* of an algorithm requires a computational complexity of at most $O(n^3)$, where n is the largest dimension in the problem formulation, which typically is the dimension of the underlying state space realization of the input-output model (1). For example, performing repeatedly rank determinations of large matrices, as in the case of parity space methods, may lead to a complexity of $O(n^4)$, which can represent an unacceptable computational burden for large order systems. Also, the associated storage requirements for data should be of the order of the data necessary to store the original system representation.

These requirements rule out many consecrated approaches as candidates for satisfactory numerical methods. A method which is considered satisfactory can serve as basis for a robust numerical software implementation. In what follows, we discuss shortly other aspects which are important in developing satisfactory computational methods to solve fault detection problems.

Choosing adequate system representations

Choosing the right system representation is of primordial importance for reliable numerical computations. This is why, for developing reliable computational algorithms for the synthesis of fault detection filters we employ, instead of the input-output representation (1), an equivalent *descriptor* state-space realization

$$\begin{aligned} E\lambda x(t) &= Ax(t) + B_u u(t) + B_d d(t) + B_w w(t) + B_f f(t) \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + D_u u(t) + D_d d(t) + D_w w(t) + D_f f(t) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

with the n -dimensional state vector $x(t)$. Here, $\lambda x(t) = \dot{x}(t)$ or $\lambda x(t) = x(t+1)$ depending on the type of the system, continuous or discrete, respectively. In general, we can assume that the representation (31) is *minimal*, that is, the descriptor pair $(A - \lambda E, C)$ is *observable* and the pair $(A - \lambda E, [B_u \ B_d \ B_w \ B_f])$ is *controllable*. The corresponding TFMs in (1) are

$$\begin{aligned} G_u(\lambda) &= C(\lambda E - A)^{-1} B_u + D_u \\ G_d(\lambda) &= C(\lambda E - A)^{-1} B_d + D_d \\ G_w(\lambda) &= C(\lambda E - A)^{-1} B_w + D_w \\ G_f(\lambda) &= C(\lambda E - A)^{-1} B_f + D_f \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

or in an equivalent notation

$$[G_u(\lambda) \ G_d(\lambda) \ G_w(\lambda) \ G_f(\lambda)] := \left[\begin{array}{c|cccc} A - \lambda E & B_u & B_d & B_w & B_f \\ \hline C & D_u & D_d & D_w & D_f \end{array} \right]$$

Employing the input-output descriptions via TFMs or matrix polynomial quotients raises serious concerns, because of the intrinsic ill-conditioning of polynomial based representations. In this context, any computational detour involving model conversions to these forms is highly susceptible to numerical instability. Even if E is nonsingular

but potentially ill-conditioned, the reduction of the system (31) to a standard state space form (i.e., with $E = I_n$), should be avoided.

Checking existence conditions

Reliably checking the existence conditions of the solution of various problems is part of any synthesis algorithm. These checks can be performed at the beginning using the original system data from (31) and testing the rank conditions of Theorems 1–6, or can be performed after the first nullspace based preprocessing step by testing the simpler conditions in Corollaries 1–3. In this latter case, it is important that the problem conditioning is not worsened during the preprocessing step. Therefore, only reductions based on orthogonal transformations should be allowed before testing the existence conditions. As we will see, this aim is fully fulfilled using nullspace based computational methods.

Addressing least order synthesis problems

The synthesis of least order fault detection filters is a desirable goal for all synthesis methods and contributes substantially to the reduction of real-time computational demands when implementing these filters. Only few of the currently employed synthesis techniques are able to support the synthesis of least order fault detection filters, because of the lack of suitable information on the achievable least orders. The nullspace based methods have a privileged position among all synthesis methods, because they can benefit from the available full information regarding the possible filter orders. The lack of such knowledge leads to a trial and error process, where typically fault detection filters of increasing orders are tested until they fulfil the design requirements. Other methods, as parity space methods, can address least order synthesis problems, by repeatedly computing nullspace bases of large matrices of increasing sizes. This may lead to unacceptable computational efforts for large order systems.

Optimal tuning of free parameters

Supporting the optimal tuning of free parameters of the fault detection filters is desirable in achieving the best possible fault detection performance. Typical free parameters are the poles of the fault detection filter which impose the speed of the fault detection process, the relative gains used to detect several faults, or simply the relative scaling factors used in the case of a bank of fault detection filters. The optimal choice of these parameters is clearly desirable and the methods described in the previous section usually provide access to the free parameters. Still, the optimal tuning aspect of free parameters has been until now not widely discussed in the literature.

4.2 Nullspace based numerical methods

As apparent from the description of the new generation of synthesis techniques described in Section 3, the nullspace method as a first synthesis step serves to reduce all synthesis problems to simple standard forms which allow to easily check solvability conditions and address least order

synthesis problems. In this subsection, we show how this reduction can be performed by employing numerically stable algorithms, applicable to both standard and singular (or non-proper) systems.

Consider the *descriptor* state space realization (31) of the system (1). The $(p + m_u) \times (m_u + m_d)$ TFM $G(\lambda)$ defined in (18) has the descriptor realization

$$G(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} A - \lambda E & B_u & B_d \\ \hline C & D_u & D_d \\ 0 & I_{m_u} & 0 \end{array} \right]$$

If $m_u + m_d > 0$, let r_d be the rank of $G_d(\lambda)$. Using the method described in Appendix B, we compute a minimal proper left nullspace basis $Q_1(\lambda)$ of $G(\lambda)$. The state space realization of the $(p - r_d) \times (p + m_u)$ TFM $Q_1(\lambda)$ is given by

$$Q_1(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_l - \lambda E_l & B_l \\ \hline C_l & D_l \end{array} \right], \quad (33)$$

where the pair $(A_l - \lambda E_l, C_l)$ is observable and E_l is nonsingular. Additionally, we can assume that E_l is upper triangular and the pair $(A_l - \lambda E_l, C_l)$ is in a staircase form as in (B.5).

A state space realization of the reduced system (20) can be computed as (Varga, 2011c)

$$[\overline{G}_f(\lambda) \overline{G}_w(\lambda)] = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} A_l - \lambda E_l & \overline{B}_f & \overline{B}_w \\ \hline C_l & \overline{D}_f & \overline{D}_w \end{array} \right], \quad (34)$$

where the row partitioning of

$$Q \left[\begin{array}{cc} B_f & B_w \\ D_f & D_w \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{cc} * & * \\ \overline{B}_f & \overline{B}_w \\ \overline{D}_f & \overline{D}_w \end{array} \right]$$

is analogous to the column partitioning in (B.3).

As it can be observed the state space realizations of the implementation form of the partial detector $Q_1(\lambda)$ and the corresponding internal form characterized by the TFMs $\overline{G}_f(\lambda)$ and $\overline{G}_w(\lambda)$ share the matrix triple (E_l, A_l, C_l) , where the $n_l \times n_l$ matrix E_l is invertible (thus all three TFMs are proper) and the pair (A_l, E_l) has only finite generalized eigenvalues. If all eigenvalues are stable, then the detector $Q_1(\lambda)$ represents a solution of the EFDP or a non-optimal solution of the AFDP.

If $m_u = m_d = 0$ and $[G_f(\lambda) G_w(\lambda)]$ is not proper, then realizations of the forms (33) and (34) can be obtained using the technique proposed in (Varga, 2011c) by computing the nullspace basis $[Q_1(\lambda) \overline{G}_f(\lambda) \overline{G}_w(\lambda)]$ satisfying

$$[Q_1(\lambda) \overline{G}_f(\lambda) \overline{G}_w(\lambda)] \begin{bmatrix} G_f(\lambda) & G_w(\lambda) \\ -I_{m_f} & 0 \\ 0 & -I_{m_w} \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

The algorithm in Appendix B can be used for this purpose. Once again, the three TFMs $Q_1(\lambda)$, $\overline{G}_f(\lambda)$ and $\overline{G}_w(\lambda)$ will share the matrix triple (E_l, A_l, C_l) .

The reduced form (34) allows to easily check the existence conditions of a solution to the EFDP and AFDP. According to Corollary 1, we have to check that $\overline{G}_{f_i}(\lambda) \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m_f$. Since the pair $(A_l - \lambda E_l, C_l)$ is observable, checking this condition is equivalent to verify that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \overline{B}_{f_i} \\ \overline{D}_{f_i} \end{bmatrix} \neq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m_f, \quad (35)$$

where \overline{B}_{f_i} and \overline{D}_{f_i} denote the i -th columns of \overline{B}_f and \overline{D}_f , respectively.

The existence conditions of Corollary 2 of a solution for the ESFDIP can be checked as part of the solution algorithm of the underlying linear rational equation (25) proposed in (Varga, 2004a). For this, a second orthogonal reduction to a Kronecker-like form is necessary, which allow to check the compatibility condition simply by checking a simple null rank condition. Since the resulting $Q_2(\lambda)$ may be improper and/or unstable, a third updating step of the detector may be necessary to ensure the stability of $Q(\lambda)$. Note that the solution of the ESFDIP can be also addressed by directly solving the original system of linear equations (i.e., without performing the explicit computation of a left nullspace basis). This approach is to be preferred if the least synthesis aspect is also addressed, for which a suitable algorithm is described in (Varga, 2004b).

The existence conditions of Corollary 3 of a solution for the EWFDIP can be checked by performing q separate checks for the q synthesis problems (e.g., one for each specification coded in the rows of the structure matrix S). For the i -th specification, this involves a left nullspace computation to decouple all the faults f_j for which $S_{i,j} = 0$ and forming a reduced system of the form (20), for which conditions of the form (35) must be checked.

4.3 Integrated synthesis algorithms

Typical algorithmic approaches in control and fault detection can be described as a composition of modularized computational steps, where the problem structure between steps is often not exploited. In contrast, an integrated approach consists of computational steps which are connected at a finer granularity level by exploiting all structural information at the termination of each step. The expected advantages of this approach are: more efficient computations with less overhead and less storage, and also an increased computational reliability, because the structural aspects can be fully exploited. The price for this is a more involved algorithmic development involving careful analysis of structural features and a restricted modularization/reusability of the software implementations.

The synthesis algorithms presented in the previous section determines the TFM of the fault detection filter in a factored form as in (16), where each factor corresponds to a typical computational step. A non-integrated (modular) approach would lead to high order detector models (possibly non-minimal) which is less suited for real-time implementations. In contrast, an integrated synthesis approach would rely on fault detection filter updating techniques, where all cancellations are performed by determining explicit minimal order state space realizations. In such an approach, the nullspace basis $Q_1(\lambda)$ could serve for the initialization of the updating process $Q(\lambda) = Q_1(\lambda)$, while at the successive computational steps $Q(\lambda)$ is replaced by $Q_i(\lambda)Q(\lambda)$, for $i = 2, \dots, K$. In a similar way, it is possible to perform the updating of the internal form of the detector, where only the nonzero TFMs $R_f(\lambda)$ and $R_w(\lambda)$ must be updated (because the initial choice already guarantees $R_u(\lambda) = 0$ and $R_d(\lambda) = 0$). Thus a typical integrated algorithm for the synthesis of fault detection filters has the following conceptual form:

- (1) Compute a left proper nullspace basis $Q(\lambda)$ of $G(\lambda)$ in (18) and compute

$$[R_f(\lambda) \ R_w(\lambda)] := Q(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} G_f(\lambda) & G_w(\lambda) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- (2) For $i = 2, \dots, K$: Determine $Q_i(\lambda)$ and update the design

$$[Q(\lambda) \ R_f(\lambda) \ R_w(\lambda)] \leftarrow Q_i(\lambda)[Q(\lambda) \ R_f(\lambda) \ R_w(\lambda)]$$

In the subsection 4.2, explicit state space realizations of the initial detector $Q(\lambda) = Q_1(\lambda)$, and of the initial $R_f(\lambda) = \overline{G}_f(\lambda)$ and initial $R_w(\lambda) = \overline{G}_w(\lambda)$ have been derived as

$$[Q(\lambda) \ R_f(\lambda) \ R_w(\lambda)] = \left[\begin{array}{c|ccc} A_l - \lambda E_l & B_l & \overline{B}_f & \overline{B}_w \\ \hline C_l & D_l & \overline{D}_f & \overline{D}_w \end{array} \right]$$

These realizations have the remarkable property of sharing the observable pair $(A_l - \lambda E_l, C_l)$. This feature is also a very desirable goal to be ensured at the successive computational steps (as long as possible or meaningful). The main advantage when fulfilling this goal is that the stability of the fault detection filter in its implementation form guarantees automatically its stability in the internal form.

Integrated algorithms fulfilling the above goals have been proposed to solve the EFDP (Varga, 2003, 2008, 2011c), the AFDP (Varga, 2009a; Glover and Varga, 2011), the EWFDIP (Varga, 2007b, 2011c) and ASFDIP (Varga, 2010, 2011a). For the solution of the ESFDIP the direct method of (Varga, 2004b) is able to compute the least order solution, while for the AWFDIP the same methods as for the AFDP can be employed. In what follows we describe the development of an integrated algorithm for solving the EFDP, which exhibits all desirable features mentioned previously.

4.4 Integrated algorithm for solving the EFDP

We discuss the computation of a least order scalar output fault detection filter which solves the EFDP. A synthesis procedure has been already described in the subsection 3.2. Here we give some computational details for state space algorithms which can be used to determine the prefilter $Q_2(\lambda)$, to achieves the least order dynamics of the detector, and a second filter $Q_3(\lambda)$, to stabilize the fault detection filter or to impose a desired dynamics of the filter. The determination of each filter exploits the information available from the previous computational step and implements the updating technique described previously.

We choose $Q_2(\lambda)$ of the particular form

$$Q_2(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_l + KC_l - \lambda E_l & K \\ \hline HC_l & H \end{array} \right]$$

where H is given and K has to be determined. It is easy to check that $Q_2(\lambda)Q(\lambda)$ has the state space realization

$$Q_2(\lambda)Q(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} A_l + KC_l - \lambda E_l & B_l + KD_l & \\ \hline HC_l & HD_l & \end{array} \right] \quad (36)$$

We determine the output injection matrix K such that $Q_2(\lambda)Q(\lambda)$ has the least possible McMillan degree. Taking into account Proposition 3 (see Appendix B), this can be only achieved by the cancellation of the maximum

number of unobservable poles. For this purpose, minimal dynamic cover techniques can be employed to perform this computation.

Computational procedures of minimal dynamic covers are presented in (Varga, 2004c). The general idea of the cover algorithms is to perform a preliminary orthogonal similarity transformation on the system matrices in (33) by applying a special version of the controllability staircase form algorithm of (Varga, 1990) to the descriptor pair $(A_l^T - \lambda E_l^T, [C_l^T H^T C_l^T])$ and then with additional block permutations and non-orthogonal block row/column transformations, to put the transformed system matrices in a *special form* which allows to cancel the maximum number of unobservable eigenvalues. For the so-called Type I dynamic covers (Kimura, 1977), two nonsingular transformation matrices U and V result such that

$$U(A_l - \lambda E_l)V = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widehat{A}_{11} - \lambda \widehat{E}_{11} & \widehat{A}_{12} - \lambda \widehat{E}_{12} \\ \hline \widehat{A}_{21} & \widehat{A}_{22} - \lambda \widehat{E}_{22} \end{array} \right],$$

$$UB_l = \left[\begin{array}{c} \widehat{B}_1 \\ \widehat{B}_2 \end{array} \right], \quad \left[\begin{array}{c} C_l \\ HC_l \end{array} \right] V = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widehat{C}_{11} & \widehat{C}_{12} \\ \hline 0 & \widehat{C}_{22} \end{array} \right],$$

where the pairs $(\widehat{A}_{11} - \lambda \widehat{E}_{11}, \widehat{C}_{11})$ and $(\widehat{A}_{22} - \lambda \widehat{E}_{22}, \widehat{C}_{22})$ are observable, and the submatrices \widehat{C}_{11} and \widehat{A}_{21} have the particular structure

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \widehat{A}_{21} \\ \widehat{C}_{11} \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \ A_{21} \\ 0 \ C_{11} \end{array} \right]$$

with C_{11} having full column rank. By taking

$$K = V \left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ K_2 \end{array} \right]$$

with K_2 satisfying $K_2 C_{11} + A_{21} = 0$, we annihilate \widehat{A}_{21} , and thus make all eigenvalues of $\widehat{A}_{11} - \lambda \widehat{E}_{11}$ unobservable. The resulting $Q_2(\lambda)Q(\lambda)$ of least McMillan degree, obtained by deleting the unobservable part, has the state space realization

$$Q_2(\lambda)Q(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widehat{A}_{22} + K_2 \widehat{C}_{12} - \lambda \widehat{E}_{22} & \widehat{B}_2 + K_2 D_l \\ \hline \widehat{C}_{22} & HD_l \end{array} \right] \quad (37)$$

Since $Q_2(\lambda)R_f(\lambda)$ has the state space realization

$$Q_2(\lambda)R_f(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_l + KC_l - \lambda E_l & \overline{B}_f + K \overline{D}_f \\ \hline HC_l & H \overline{D}_f \end{array} \right],$$

it is straightforward to show that after deleting the unobservable part we obtain

$$Q_2(\lambda)R_f(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widehat{A}_{22} + K_2 \widehat{C}_{12} - \lambda \widehat{E}_{22} & \widehat{B}_{f,2} + K_2 \overline{D}_f \\ \hline \widehat{C}_{22} & H \overline{D}_f \end{array} \right],$$

where

$$U \overline{B}_f = \left[\begin{array}{c} \widehat{B}_{f,1} \\ \widehat{B}_{f,2} \end{array} \right]$$

To simplify the notations, after performing the updating operations $Q(\lambda) \leftarrow Q_2(\lambda)Q(\lambda)$ and $R_f(\lambda) \leftarrow Q_2(\lambda)R_f(\lambda)$, we denote the resulting state-space realizations as

$$[Q(\lambda) R_f(\lambda)] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widetilde{A}_l - \lambda \widetilde{E}_l & \widetilde{B}_l \ \widetilde{B}_f \\ \hline \widetilde{C}_l & \widetilde{D}_l \ \widetilde{D}_f \end{array} \right]$$

Similar formulas apply to update $R_w(\lambda)$ (if necessary).

The crucial issue in determining $Q_2(\lambda)$ is the choice of H . One aspect is that each valid choice of H must guarantee that the resulting $Q(\lambda)$ is admissible. Thus, after performing the minimal dynamic cover based order reduction we need to additionally check

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \widetilde{B}_{f_i} \\ \widetilde{D}_{f_i} \end{array} \right] \neq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m_f \quad (38)$$

If this admissibility test is not fulfilled, the choice of H is rejected.

The second aspect is a suitable choice guaranteeing the least order for an admissible detector. The simplest choice is in the case of a scalar output filter, when we can choose H as a structured row vector of length $p - r_d$

$$H = h^{(i)} := [0, \dots, 0, h_i, \dots, h_1],$$

with $h_i \neq 0$. This choice takes into account the staircase form of the pair $(A_l - \lambda E_l, C_l)$ in (B.5) and, according to (Varga, 2011c, Corollary 1.), leads to an order n_i for the detector $Q(\lambda)$. A systematic search can be performed by generating successive candidates for $h^{(i)}$ with increasing number of nonzero trailing elements and checking for the resulting detector the admissibility conditions (38). These detectors have non-decreasing orders and thus the first admissible detector represents a satisfactory least order design. To speed up the selection, the choice of $i = \mu_0 - \mu_i$ nonzero components of $h^{(i)}$ ensures a tentative order n_i , by building a linear combination of all $\mu_0 - \mu_i$ basis vectors of orders less than or equal to n_i . In this way, repeated checks for the same order are avoided and the search is terminated in at most ℓ steps, where ℓ is the number of diagonal blocks in the staircase form (B.5). Similar ideas can be employed when H is restricted to have a certain row dimension $q > 1$ (e.g., when the updated $R_w(\lambda)$ must have full row rank q).

The algorithm to compute the output injection matrix K is *not* numerically stable, because involves non-orthogonal matrix operations. Still, this algorithm can be categorized as a *numerically reliable* algorithm, because the loss of numerical stability can be easily detected either by detecting large norms of the employed transformation matrices U and V , or a large norm of the resulting K . In both cases, the remedy is usually to generate a new H with the same structure (usually randomly) or to increase the targeted order. For further details, see (Varga, 2004c). For the admissible value of i , it is even possible to determine the optimal choice of $h^{(i)}$, which minimizes the norms of the above matrices.

The resulting $\widetilde{A}_l - \lambda \widetilde{E}_l$ may have “bad” eigenvalues, which are either unstable or provide unsatisfactory dynamics for the detector $Q(\lambda)$. For the final design, the resulting dynamics of the detector can be arbitrarily assigned by choosing $Q_3(\lambda)$ in the form

$$Q_3(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widetilde{A}_l + \widetilde{K} \widetilde{C}_l - \lambda \widetilde{E}_l & \widetilde{K} \\ \hline \widetilde{C}_l & I_q \end{array} \right]$$

After performing the updating operations

$$[Q(\lambda) R_f(\lambda)] \leftarrow Q_3(\lambda)[Q(\lambda) R_f(\lambda)],$$

the resulting state-space realizations are

$$[Q(\lambda) R_f(\lambda)] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widetilde{A}_l + \widetilde{K} \widetilde{C}_l - \lambda \widetilde{E}_l & \widetilde{B}_l + \widetilde{K} \widetilde{D}_l \ \widetilde{B}_f + \widetilde{K} \widetilde{D}_f \\ \hline \widetilde{C}_l & \widetilde{D}_l \ \widetilde{D}_f \end{array} \right]$$

The output injection matrix \tilde{K} is determined such that $\tilde{A}_l + \tilde{K}\tilde{C}_l - \lambda\tilde{E}_l$ has only “good” eigenvalues. Note that the least order of the detector $Q(\lambda)$ resulting from the previous step is automatically preserved by the detector updating.

The computation of \tilde{K} and the corresponding $Q_3(\lambda)$ and $Q_3(\lambda)[Q(\lambda) R_f(\lambda)]$ can be performed using numerically reliable coprime factorization techniques proposed in (Varga, 1998). In these algorithms, partial pole assignment is performed in a recursive manner by successively moving the “bad” eigenvalues to desired “good” locations. The state space realization of the resulting numerator TFM $Q_3(\lambda)[Q(\lambda) R_f(\lambda)]$ involves an additional (implicit) coordinate transformation with orthogonal matrices W and Z , such that the resulting $W(\tilde{A}_l + \tilde{K}\tilde{C}_l - \lambda\tilde{E}_l)Z$ is in a generalized real Schur (or quasi-upper triangular) form. The transformations are automatically performed on all system matrices. See (Varga, 1998) for further computational details.

4.5 Comparison of techniques for solving the EFDP

Parity space method

The parity relations based approach has been pioneered in (Chow and Willsky, 1984; Lou et al., 1986) for standard discrete-time systems and since then widely discussed in the literature. Extension to standard continuous-time case are due, for example, in (Magni and Mouyon, 1994). The parity method is primarily limited to standard systems ($E = I$), although an extension to descriptor systems has been proposed in the discrete-time case (Maquin et al., 1993).

The basic approach relies on expressing the input-output dynamics in the form

$$\bar{y}(t) = S_{0,k}x(t) + S_{u,k}\bar{u}(t) + S_{d,k}\bar{d}(t) + S_{f,k}\bar{f}(t)$$

where

$$S_{0,k} = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ CA \\ \vdots \\ CA^k \end{bmatrix}, \quad S_{u,k} := \begin{bmatrix} D_u & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ CB_u & D_u & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ CA^{k-1}B_u & \cdots & CB_u & D_u \end{bmatrix}$$

and similarly for $S_{d,k}$ and $S_{f,k}$; and

$$\bar{y}^T(t) := [y^T(t) \ \lambda y^T(t) \ \cdots \ \lambda^k y^T(t)]^T$$

and similarly for $\bar{u}(t)$, $\bar{d}(t)$, and $\bar{f}(t)$.

A pseudo-residual is computed as

$$\tilde{r}(t) = H_k(\bar{y}(t) - S_{u,k}\bar{u}(t)), \quad (39)$$

where H_k is a so-called *parity matrix* with $p(k+1)$ columns. The main computation is the determination of H_k as a left annihilator satisfying

$$H_k [S_{0,k} \ S_{d,k}] = 0$$

This computation is performed for $k = \nu + 1, \nu + 2, \dots$, until $H_k S_{f_i,k} \neq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m_f$, where ν is the observability index of pair (A, C) .

The parity space approach appears to be very simple and also allows to search systematically for a solution of least order. However, the computation of the parity matrix H_k

needs to explicitly form the large matrices $S_{0,k}$, $S_{u,k}$, $S_{d,k}$ and $S_{f_i,k}$, which involves evaluating matrix powers and products (e.g., CA^jB) and leads (almost always) to *numerically unstable* computations. The method is also potentially inefficient, having a worst case computational complexity of $O(n^4)$ because of repeated nullspace computations. In light of these facts, the parity space method can not be considered a satisfactory numerical method.

Observer based methods

Observer based methods proposed for solving the EFDP use so-called diagnostic observers to generate the residual signals. For simplicity, we only discuss standard state space systems for which most of synthesis methods have been developed. The observer based approach has been pioneered by Beard (1971) and Jones (1971) to solve fault isolation problems for standard state space systems using full order Luenberger-type observers. As residual generator, the following Luenberger-type output signal observer is used

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \hat{x}(t) &= A\hat{x}(t) + B_u u(t) - K(y(t) - C\hat{x}(t) - D_u u(t)) \\ r(t) &= H(y(t) - C\hat{x}(t) - D_u u(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where the matrices K and H are chosen to achieve, via a stable observer, the conditions (i)–(iii) of the EFDP. This form of the observer automatically fulfills the decoupling condition (i) for the control inputs (i.e., $R_u(\lambda) = 0$).

The residual generator in internal form results by introducing $e(t) = x(t) - \hat{x}(t)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda e(t) &= (A + KC)e(t) + (B_f + KD_f)f(t) + (B_d + KD_d)d(t) \\ r(t) &= HCe(t) + HD_f f(t) + HD_d d(t) \end{aligned}$$

To fulfill requirements (ii) and (iii) of the EFDP, the TFM $R_d(\lambda)$ from d to r must be zero, i.e.

$$R_d(\lambda) = HC(\lambda I - A - KC)^{-1}(B_d + KD_d) + HD_d = 0 \quad (41)$$

and each TFM $R_{f_i}(\lambda)$ from the fault input f_i to r for $i = 1, \dots, m_f$ must be non-zero

$$R_{f_i}(\lambda) = HC(\lambda I - A - KC)^{-1}(B_{f_i} + KD_{f_i}) + HD_{f_i} \neq 0 \quad (42)$$

The solution of this problem has been addressed by various authors using different methods, as for example, eigenstructure assignment (White and Speyer, 1987; Chen and Patton, 1999) or geometric methods (Massoumnia, 1986) (only for the case $D_d = 0$ and $D_f = 0$). The main difficulty with this approach is that the conditions for the solvability of the EFDP in Theorem 1 and the conditions for the existence of an observer of the form (40) which ensures (41) and (42) (see (Saber et al., 2007, Theorems 7.6 & 7.9)), are different. Thus there exists cases when although the EFDP is solvable, however no observer of the form (40) can be used as residual generator. Moreover, it is also possible that although both the decoupling and detectability conditions (41) and (42) can be satisfied, however, due to unstable fixed modes (these are the unstable zeros of $G_d(\lambda)$), the resulting detector is also unstable (Saber et al., 2007). Therefore, the restriction to use full-order observers is a rather severe constraint, significantly limiting the class of problems which can be solved.

Comparison of different methods

In our comparison in Table 1. we also included the nullspace method of Frisk and Nyberg (2001), which is based on polynomial matrix manipulations. This comparison indicates that the only satisfactory computational method for solving the EFDP is the rational nullspace based approach. A more thorough comparison of the existing methods to solve the EFDP is done in (Varga, 2009b).

Table 1. Comparison of methods to solve the EFDP.

Approach	Generality	Least order synthesis	Numerical reliability
Nullspace methods			
– polynomial	yes	yes	no
– rational	yes	yes	yes
Parity space	yes	yes	no
Observer-based design			
– UIO	no	no	yes
– geometric method	no	no	yes

5. CONCLUSIONS

A new generation of satisfactory numerical algorithms based on detector updating techniques has been developed in the last decade to solve the main classes of fault detection filter synthesis problems. In all these new algorithms, the nullspace method has a central role in simplifying the synthesis problems and also in addressing the least order synthesis aspect. The main numerical ingredients of the new methods are numerically stable or numerically reliable algorithms to compute condensed forms of matrices or matrix pairs (Schur, generalized Schur, Kronecker-like forms), factorization methods (proper/stable coprime and inner-outer factorizations), as well as special algorithms developed for the needs to compute least order detectors (minimum dynamic cover, least order solution of linear rational equations). An important aspect is that all basic algorithms use state space system representations in descriptor form, which guarantees full generality and simultaneously leads to better conditioned computational problems by avoiding unnecessary conversions to standard state space representations.

The usefulness of the new synthesis methods would be highly questionable without the availability of robust numerical software to perform all the basic computations. Fortunately, a comprehensive collection of such tools is available in the MATLAB/SLICOT-based Descriptor Systems Toolbox¹ developed by the author in the last decade (Varga, 2000; Huffel et al., 2004). Additionally, all described synthesis algorithms are implemented in the Fault Detection Toolbox (Varga, 2006, 2011b) (a proprietary software of DLR, not licensed).

Recent extensions of the synthesis techniques targeted new classes of systems, as periodic systems and *linear parameter-varying* (LPV) systems. For periodic systems, the first nullspace based synthesis method has been proposed in (Varga, 2005), and subsequently efforts have been invested to develop the main computational ingredients, as algorithms for minimum periodic dynamic covers (Varga, 2007a) and periodic coprime factorization (Varga, 2009d),

¹ Licensed by SYNOPTIO GmbH <http://synmath.synoptio.de/en>

to support the periodic counterparts of the EFDP and EWFDIP. For both these fault detection problems, integrated algorithms have been recently proposed (Varga, 2012b). For LPV-systems based synthesis, the first methods have been developed using geometric techniques for systems with affine dependence of scheduling parameters (Bokor and Balas, 2004). A more general LPV-synthesis framework based on symbolic LPV-nullspace computational techniques has been proposed to solve the robust fault detection problem (Varga, 2011d). This approach has been recently turned into a numerical computations based algorithm for the synthesis of fault detection filters in LPV-forms (Varga, 2011e). The proposed computational approach relies on the numerically reliable synthesis techniques for solving the EFDP described in Section 4.2. An interesting feature of the new techniques is that they can address robustness aspects with respect to both measurable uncertain parameters (thus suitable for gain scheduling) as well as unmeasurable uncertain parameters.

Appendix A. POLYNOMIAL AND RATIONAL NULLSPACE BASES

Since polynomial bases represent an important tool in defining the corresponding concepts for the more general *rational bases*, we will recall shortly some of the main results of Forney (1975). Let $G(\lambda)$ be a $p \times m$ rational matrix of rank r and assume that $N_l(\lambda)$ is a $(p - r) \times p$ polynomial basis of the left nullspace of $G(\lambda)$, thus

$$N_l(\lambda)G(\lambda) = 0$$

Let denote by n_i , the i -th *index* (or *degree*), representing the greatest degree of the i -th row of $N_l(\lambda)$. Then, the *order* of $N_l(\lambda)$ is defined as $n_l = \sum_{i=1}^{p-r} n_i$, (i.e., the sum of row degrees). A *minimal basis* is one which has least order among all polynomial bases. The indices of a minimal basis are called *minimal indices*.

Some properties of a minimal bases are summarized below (Forney, 1975; Kailath, 1980):

Proposition 1. Let $N_l(\lambda)$ be a minimal polynomial basis with row indices n_i , $i = 1, \dots, p - r$. Then the following holds:

- (1) The row indices are *unique* up to permutations (i.e., if $\tilde{N}_l(\lambda)$ is another minimal basis, then $N_l(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{N}_l(\lambda)$ have the same minimal indices).
- (2) The minimal indices are the left Kronecker indices of $G(\lambda)$.
- (3) $N_l(\lambda)$ is irreducible, having full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ (i.e., $N_l(\lambda)$ has no finite or infinite zeros).
- (4) $N_l(\lambda)$ is row reduced (i.e., the leading row coefficient matrix formed from the coefficients of the highest row degrees has full row rank.)

If $M(\lambda)$ is a non-singular rational matrix, then $\tilde{N}_l(\lambda) := M(\lambda)N_l(\lambda)$ is also a nullspace basis. Frequently the matrices $M(\lambda)$ originate from appropriate *left coprime factorizations* of an original basis $N_l(\lambda)$ in the form

$$N_l(\lambda) = M(\lambda)^{-1}\tilde{N}_l(\lambda), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where the factors $M(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{N}_l(\lambda)$ can be chosen to satisfy special requirements (e.g., have only poles in a certain "good" region of the complex plane).

The main advantage of minimal polynomial bases is the possibility to easily build *proper minimal rational bases*. These are proper rational bases having the least McMillan degree of n_l . A proper rational basis with arbitrary poles can be simply constructed by taking

$$M(\lambda) = \text{diag} \left(\frac{1}{d_1(\lambda)}, \dots, \frac{1}{d_{p-r}(\lambda)} \right), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $d_i(\lambda)$ is a polynomial of degree n_i , and forming $\tilde{N}_l(\lambda) := M(\lambda)N_l(\lambda)$. The resulting basis $\tilde{N}_l(\lambda)$ has the additional property that the order of any minimal state space realization of $\tilde{N}_l(\lambda)$ is equal to the sum of orders of the minimal state space realizations of the rows of $\tilde{N}_l(\lambda)$. Furthermore, $D_l := \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{N}_l(\lambda)$ has full row rank. Such a basis is called *simple minimal proper rational basis* in (Vardulakis and Karcnias, 1984) and is the natural counterpart of the minimal polynomial basis introduced by Forney (1975).

Appendix B. COMPUTATION OF MINIMAL PROPER RATIONAL NULLSPACE BASES

We present a method for the computation of a minimal proper rational left nullspace basis $N_l(\lambda)$ of a $p \times m$ rational matrix $G(\lambda)$ of rank r using a pencil reduction method based on a state space representation of $G(\lambda)$ in the form

$$G(\lambda) := \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A - \lambda E & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array} \right] \quad (\text{B.1})$$

which satisfies

$$G(\lambda) = C(\lambda E - A)^{-1}B + D$$

The computational method, proposed in (Varga, 2003), exploits the simple fact that $N_l(\lambda)$ is a left nullspace basis of $G(\lambda)$ iff $[M_l(\lambda) \ N_l(\lambda)]$ is a left nullspace basis of the system matrix

$$S(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} A - \lambda E & B \\ C & D \end{array} \right].$$

Thus, to compute $N_l(\lambda)$ we can determine equivalently a left nullspace basis $Y_l(\lambda)$ of $S(\lambda)$ and then $N_l(\lambda)$ simply results as

$$N_l(\lambda) = Y_l(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_p \end{bmatrix}.$$

$N_l(\lambda)$ can be computed by employing linear pencil reduction algorithms based on orthogonal transformations. The resulting nullspace is obtained in a descriptor system representation which can be immediately used in applications. In what follows we give some details of this approach.

Let Q and Z be orthogonal matrices determined, for instance, by using the algorithms of Beelen (1987); Varga (1996), such that the transformed pencil $\tilde{S}(\lambda) := QS(\lambda)Z$ is in the Kronecker-like staircase form

$$\tilde{S}(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} A_r - \lambda E_r & A_{r,l} - \lambda E_{r,l} & \\ \hline 0 & A_l - \lambda E_l & \\ \hline 0 & C_l & \end{array} \right] \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where the descriptor pair $(A_l - \lambda E_l, C_l)$ is observable, E_l is non-singular, and $A_r - \lambda E_r$ has full row rank excepting possibly a finite set of values of λ (i.e., the invariant zeros of $S(\lambda)$). It follows that we can choose a proper rational left nullspace basis $\tilde{Y}_l(\lambda)$ of $\tilde{S}(\lambda)$ in the form

$$\tilde{Y}_l(\lambda) = [\ 0 \ | \ C_l(\lambda E_l - A_l)^{-1} \ | \ I]. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Then the left nullspace of $G(\lambda)$ is

$$N_l(\lambda) = \tilde{Y}_l(\lambda)Q \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_p \end{bmatrix}$$

and if we partition

$$Q \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} B_{r,l} \\ B_l \\ D_l \end{bmatrix}$$

in accordance with the column partition of $\tilde{Y}_l(\lambda)$, we obtain

$$N_l(\lambda) = C_l(\lambda E_l - A_l)^{-1}B_l + D_l := \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_l - \lambda E_l & B_l \\ \hline C_l & D_l \end{array} \right] \quad (\text{B.4})$$

which is a descriptor system representation for $N_l(\lambda)$. Note that, to obtain this nullspace basis, we performed exclusively orthogonal transformations on the system matrices. We can prove that all computed matrices are exact for a slightly perturbed original system. It follows that the algorithm to compute the nullspace basis is *numerically backward stable*.

The full column rank subpencil $\left[\begin{array}{c} A_l - \lambda E_l \\ C_l \end{array} \right]$ defines the left Kronecker structure of $G(\lambda)$. It is possible to obtain this subpencil in an observability staircase form

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} A_{\ell,\ell+1} & A_{\ell,\ell} - \lambda E_{\ell,\ell} & \cdots & A_{\ell,1} - \lambda E_{\ell,1} \\ \hline & A_{\ell-1,\ell} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \hline & & \ddots & A_{1,1} - \lambda E_{1,1} \\ \hline & & & A_{0,1} \end{array} \right] \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where $A_{i,i+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mu_i \times \mu_{i+1}}$, with $\mu_{\ell+1} = 0$, are full column rank upper triangular matrices, for $i = 0, \dots, \ell$. Note that this form is automatically obtained by using the pencil reduction algorithms described in (Beelen, 1987) or (Varga, 1996). The left (or row) Kronecker indices result as follows: there are $\mu_{i-1} - \mu_i$ Kronecker blocks of size $i \times (i-1)$, for $i = 1, \dots, \ell+1$. The row dimension of $N_l(\lambda)$ (i.e., the number of linearly independent basis vectors) is given by the total number of Kronecker indices, thus $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} (\mu_{i-1} - \mu_i) = \mu_0$. Applying standard linear algebra results, it follows that $\mu_0 := p - r$.

We give now some properties of the computed rational basis, see (Varga, 2011c) for proofs.

Proposition 2. If the realization (B.1) of $G(\lambda)$ is minimal, then the rational matrix $N_l(\lambda)$ defined in (B.4) is a minimal proper rational basis of the left nullspace of $G(\lambda)$.

This result shows that the computed rational basis above has actually the least possible McMillan degree. However, in general, the computed minimal proper basis is not simple. Additionally the following important result holds:

Proposition 3. If the realization (B.1) of $G(\lambda)$ is minimal, then the realization of $N_l(\lambda)$ defined in (B.4) is maximally controllable.

This means that for any output injection matrix K , the pair $(A_l + KC_l - \lambda E_l, B_l + KD_l)$ remains controllable. Notice also that due to the particular form of C_l , the resulting $A_l + KC_l$ has only the last block column changed. It follows that $A_l + KC_l$ has the same staircase form structure as A_l .

REFERENCES

- Beard, R.V. (1971). *Failure accomodation in linear systems through self-reorganization*. Ph. D. Dissertation, Dept. Aeronautics and Astronautics, Mass. Inst. Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Beelen, T. (1987). *New Algorithms for Computing the Kronecker structure of a Pencil with Applications to Systems and Control Theory*. Ph. D. Thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology.
- Blanke, M., Kinnaert, M., Lunze, J., and Staroswiecki, M. (2003). *Diagnosis and Fault-Tolerant Control*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Bokor, J. and Balas, G. (2004). Detection filter design for LPV systems a geometric approach. *Automatica*, 40, 511–518.
- Chen, J. and Patton, R.J. (1999). *Robust Model-Based Fault Diagnosis for Dynamic Systems*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, London.
- Chow, E.Y. and Willsky, A.S. (1984). Analytical redundancy and the design of robust failure detection systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 29, 603 – 614.
- Ding, S.X. (2008). *Model-based Fault Diagnosis Techniques*. Springer Verlag, Berlin.
- Ding, S.X., Frank, P.M., Ding, E.L., and Jeinsch, T. (2000). A unified approach to the optimization of fault detection systems. *Int. J. of Adaptive Contr. and Signal Processing*, 14, 725–745.
- Ding, X. and Frank, P.M. (1991). Frequency domain approach and threshold selector for robust model-based fault detection and isolation. *Proc. of IFAC Symposium SAFEPROCESS'1991, Baden-Baden, Germany*.
- Forney, G.D. (1975). Minimal bases of rational vector spaces with applications to multivariable linear systems. *SIAM J. Control*, 13, 493–520.
- Frank, P.M. and Ding, X. (1994). Frequency domain approach to optimally robust residual generation and evaluation for model-based fault diagnosis. *Automatica*, 30, 789–804.
- Frisk, E. and Nyberg, M. (2001). A minimal polynomial basis solution to residual generation for fault diagnosis in linear systems. *Automatica*, 37, 1417–1424.
- Gertler, J. (1998). *Fault Detection and Diagnosis in Engineering Systems*. Marcel Dekker, New York.
- Glover, K. and Varga, A. (2011). On solving non-standard $\mathcal{H}_-/\mathcal{H}_2/\infty$ fault detection problems. *Proc. of CDC'2011, Orlando, FL*.
- Huffel, S.V., Sima, V., Varga, A., Hammarling, S., and Delebecque, F. (2004). High-performance numerical software for control. *Control Systems Magazine*, 24, 60–76.
- Jaimoukha, I.M., Li, Z., and Papakos, V. (2006). A matrix factorization solution to the $\mathcal{H}_-/\mathcal{H}_\infty$ fault detection problem. *Automatica*, 42, 1907–1912.
- Jones, H.L. (1971). *Failure detection in linear systems*. Ph. D. Thesis, Dept. Aeronautics and Astronautics, Mass. Inst. Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Kailath, T. (1980). *Linear Systems*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Kimura, G. (1977). Geometric structure of observers for linear feedback control laws. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 22, 846–855.
- Liu, N. and Zhou, K. (2007). Optimal solutions to multiobjective robust fault detection problems. *Proc. of CDC'07, New Orleans, USA*.
- Liu, N. and Zhou, K. (2008). Optimal robust fault detection for linear discrete time systems. *Journal of Control Science and Engineering*, vol. 2008, Article ID 829459, 16 pages, doi:10.1155/2008/829459.
- Lou, X.C., Willsky, A.S., and Verghese, G.C. (1986). Optimally robust redundancy relations for failure detection in uncertain systems. *Automatica*, 22, 333–344.
- Magni, J.F. and Mouyon, P. (1994). On residual generation by observer and parity space approaches. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 39, 441 – 447.
- Maquin, D., Gaddouna, B., and Ragot, J. (1993). Generation of parity equations for singular systems. application to diagnosis. *Proc. of Int. Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Le Touquet, France*, volume 3, 400–405.
- Massoumnia, M.A. (1986). *A geometric approach to failure detection and identification in linear systems*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Dept. Aeronautics and Astronautics, Mass. Inst. Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Moler, C.B. and Loan, C.F.V. (1978). Nineteen dubious ways to compute the exponential of a matrix. *SIAM Review*, 20, 801–836.
- Nyberg, M. (2002). Criteria for detectability and strong detectability of faults in linear systems. *Int. J. Control*, 75, 490–501.
- Oară, C. (2005). Constructive solutions to spectral and inner-outer factorizations with respect to the disk. *Automatica*, 41, 1855 – 1866.
- Oară, C. and Varga, A. (2000). Computation of general inner-outer and spectral factorizations. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 45, 2307–2325.
- Patton, R.J. and Hou, M. (1998). Design of fault detection and isolation observers: a matrix pencil approach. *Automatica*, 34(9), 1135–1140.
- Saberi, A., Stoorvogel, A.A., and Sannuti, P. (2007). *Filtering Theory*. Birkhauser.
- Saberi, A., Stoorvogel, A.A., Sannuti, P., and Niemann, H. (2000). Fundamental problems in fault detection and identification. *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, 10, 1209–1236.
- Vardulakis, A.I.G. and Karcanias, N. (1984). Proper and stable, minimal MacMillan degrees bases of rational vector spaces. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 29, 1118 – 1120.
- Varga, A. (1990). Computation of irreducible generalized state-space realizations. *Kybernetika*, 26, 89–106.
- Varga, A. (1996). Computation of Kronecker-like forms of a system pencil: Applications, algorithms and software. *Proc. CACSD'96 Symposium, Dearborn, MI*, 77–82.
- Varga, A. (1998). Computation of coprime factorizations of rational matrices. *Lin. Alg. & Appl.*, 271, 83–115.
- Varga, A. (2000). A DESCRIPTOR SYSTEMS toolbox for MATLAB. *Proc. CACSD'2000 Symposium, Anchorage, Alaska*.
- Varga, A. (2003). On computing least order fault detectors using rational nullspace bases. *Proc. of IFAC Symp. SAFEPROCESS'2003, Washington D.C.*
- Varga, A. (2004a). Computation of least order solutions of linear rational equations. *Proc. of MTNS'04, Leuven, Belgium*.

- Varga, A. (2004b). New computational approach for the design of fault detection and isolation filters. In M. Voicu (ed.), *Advances in Automatic Control*, volume 754 of *The Kluwer International Series in Engineering and Computer Science*, 367–381. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Varga, A. (2004c). Reliable algorithms for computing minimal dynamic covers for descriptor systems. *Proc. of MTNS'04, Leuven, Belgium*.
- Varga, A. (2005). Numerically reliable methods for optimal design of fault detection filters. *Proc. of CDC'05, Seville, Spain*.
- Varga, A. (2006). A FAULT DETECTION toolbox for MATLAB. *Proc. of CACSD'06, Munich, Germany*.
- Varga, A. (2007a). On computing minimal dynamic covers for periodic systems. *Proc. of ECC'07, Kos, Greece*.
- Varga, A. (2007b). On designing least order residual generators for fault detection and isolation. *Proc. 16th Internat. Conf. on Control Systems and Computer Science, Bucharest, Romania*, 323–330.
- Varga, A. (2008). On computing nullspace bases – a fault detection perspective. *Proc. IFAC 2008 World Congress, Seoul, Korea.*, 6295–6300.
- Varga, A. (2009a). General computational approach for optimal fault detection. *Proc. SAFEPROCESS'2009, Barcelona, Spain*.
- Varga, A. (2009b). The nullspace method – a unifying paradigm to fault detection. *Proc. CDC'2009, Shanghai, China*.
- Varga, A. (2009c). On computing achievable fault signatures. *Proc. SAFEPROCESS'2009, Barcelona, Spain*.
- Varga, A. (2009d). On computing periodic coprime factorizations. *Proc. ECC'2009, Budapest, Hungary*.
- Varga, A. (2010). Integrated algorithm for solving \mathcal{H}_2 -optimal fault detection and isolation problems. *Proc. of SYSTOL'2010, Nice, France*.
- Varga, A. (2011a). Integrated computational algorithm for solving \mathcal{H}_∞ -optimal FDI problems. *Proc. IFAC 2011 World Congress, Milano, Italy*.
- Varga, A. (2011b). Linear FDI-Techniques and Software Tools. FAULT DETECTION Toolbox V1.0 – Technical Documentation, German Aerospace Center (DLR), Institute of Robotics and Mechatronics.
- Varga, A. (2011c). On computing minimal proper nullspace bases with applications in fault detection. In P. Van Dooren, S.P. Bhattacharyya, R.H. Chan, V. Olshesky, and A. Routray (eds.), *Numerical Linear Algebra in Signals, Systems and Control*, volume 80 of *Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering*, 433–465. Springer Verlag, Berlin.
- Varga, A. (2011d). On parametric solution of fault detection problems. *Proc. IFAC 2011 World Congress, Milano, Italy*.
- Varga, A. (2011e). Synthesis of robust gain scheduling based fault detection filters for a class of parameter uncertain nonlinear systems. *Proc. of 19th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation, Corfu, Greece*, 467–472.
- Varga, A. (2012a). New computational paradigms in solving fault detection and isolation problems. *Submitted to the Annual Reviews in Control*.
- Varga, A. (2012b). A numerically reliable approach for the synthesis of periodic FDI filters. *Proc. of SAFEPROCESS'12, Mexico City, Mexico*.
- White, J.E. and Speyer, J.L. (1987). Detection filter design: Spectral theory and algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 32, 593–603.
- Zhang, P. and Ding, S.X. (2008). An integrated trade-off design of observer based fault detection systems. *Automatica*, 44, 1886–1894.
- Zhou, K., Doyle, J.C., and Glover, K. (1996). *Robust and Optimal Control*. Prentice Hall.