

AD-A039 388

HARVARD UNIV CAMBRIDGE MASS DIV OF ENGINEERING AND --ETC F/G 9/4
SYSTEM CYCLING FOR PARAMETERS ESTIMATION: OPTIMAL INPUT AND MEA--ETC(U)

JAN 77 S B SCIDA

N00014-75-C-0648

UNCLASSIFIED

TR-666

NL

4 of 22
AD
A039388



END

DATE
FILMED
6-77

12

Office of Naval Research
Contract N00014-75-C-0648 NR-372-012
National Science Foundation Grant - GK-31511

ADA 039388

**SYSTEM CYCLING FOR PARAMETERS ESTIMATION:
OPTIMAL INPUT AND MEASUREMENT SCHEDULES DESIGNS**



By
Sergio Bittanti Scida

January, 1977

Technical Report No. 686

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted by the U. S. Government.

DDC
REPRODUCED
MAY 13 1977
B

AD NO. _____
DDC FILE COPY

Division of Engineering and Applied Physics
Harvard University • Cambridge, Massachusetts

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

9
6
10

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report, 666	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) System Cycling for Parameters Estimation: Optimal Input and Measurement Schedules Designs	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED 14 TR-666	
7. AUTHOR(s) Sergio Bittanti/Scida	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-75-C-0648, NSF-GK-31511	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Division of Engineering and Applied Physics Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 12 37p.	12. REPORT DATE January 1977	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 37
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified	
15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted by the U. S. Government.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Parameters estimation Optimal input design Measurement schedules design Periodic optimization theory		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper deals with the parameters estimation of a discrete-time and time-invariant system, affected by additive output noise, under periodic operation. Assuming a norm of the Fisher Information Matrix as performance index, the problems of the optimal periodic input design, of the joint optimal periodic input and measurement schedules design and of the choice of the best period for parameters estimation are formally stated. Through the introduction of the average per sample Fisher Information Matrix, they are recognized		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-014-6601

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

163 750

LB

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

as Periodic Optimal Control problems. A closed form solution is found in the particular case of linear systems with a scalar unknown parameter.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Office of Naval Research

Contract N00014-75-C-0648 NR-372-012

National Science Foundation Grant GK-31511

SYSTEM CYCLING FOR PARAMETERS ESTIMATION:
OPTIMAL INPUT AND MEASUREMENT SCHEDULES DESIGNS

By

Sergio Bittanti Scida

Technical Report 666

ACCESSION for		
NTIS	White Section	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Buff Section	<input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED		<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION		
BY		
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES		
DIAL	APAIL	SUB/SPECIAL
A		

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted by the U. S. Government.

January 1977

The research reported in this document was made possible through support extended the Division of Engineering and Applied Physics, Harvard University by the U. S. Army Research Office, the U. S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research and the U. S. Office of Naval Research under the Joint Services Electronics Program by Contracts N00014-75-C-0648 and by the National Science Foundation Grant GK 31511.

Division of Engineering and Applied Physics
Harvard University · Cambridge, Massachusetts

1. INTRODUCTION

Even though experimental design has been widely studied in statistical literature, only in the last fifteen years the selection of an optimal input and measurement schedules for parameters estimation of dynamic systems came into full attention.

Since the papers by Levin [1], Levadi [2] and Nahi and Wallis [3], an increasing number of works has been devoted to the input design for identification purposes (see [4] for a survey). In [4] and [5], Mehra contributes a first systematic view of this subject by properly extending to dynamic systems the optimal experiments approach suggested by Fedorov for regression problems [6]. In most cases, the problem has been faced as an optimal control problem with a suitable norm of the Fisher Information Matrix as performance index. The motivation underlying this approach is twofold: first, the evaluation of the covariance matrix of a given estimator is often a difficult task; second, the interest in the conclusion which can be drawn through the analysis of this covariance matrix is obviously restricted to the particular kind of estimators under consideration. Therefore, it is generally assumed that an efficient estimator exists and the problem of designing an input in order to maximize a norm of the Fisher Information Matrix is directly faced.

Strangely enough, the measurement schedules design has not been paid an equally extensive attention as the input design problem. Considerable results concerning both the measurement schedules and the sensor design problems have been recently pointed out in [7] for state estimation purposes.

This paper mainly deals with the problem of jointly optimizing the input and measurement schedules for parameters estimation under system periodic operation. Actually, although the analysis of a number of periodic regimes of a system is a classical tool for the better understanding of its dynamic, only in the last few years it has been possible to provide some results concerning the input design in the frequency domain (see, for instance, [4], [8] - [10]). The present paper deals with time-invariant discrete-time dynamic systems and is organized as follows. First, a number of problems, namely, the optimal periodic input design, the joint optimal periodic input and measurement schedules design and the choice of the best period are stated in a precise formal way (Section 2). By introducing the average per sample Fisher Information Matrix, they are readily recognized (Section 3) to fall within the area of Periodic Optimization Theory. (See [11] - [13] for recent surveys on the subject and [14] for the specific tools in the discrete systems case). The particular case of linear systems affected by a scalar parameter is dealt with in Sections 4 - 6, where a closed form solution is found for most of the problems mentioned above.

2. Problem Statement

Consider the discrete-time and time-invariant dynamic system

$$x(k+1) = f(x(k), u(k), \theta) \quad (1)$$

$$y(k) = g(x(k), u(k), \theta) \quad (2)$$

with initial condition

$$x(0) = x_0(\theta), \quad (3)$$

where $u(k) \in R^m$, $x(k) \in R^n$, $y(k) \in R^p$ are the input, state and output vectors, while $\theta \in R^q$ is the unknown parameters vector. The functions $f(\dots)$, $g(\dots)$ and $x_0(\cdot)$ are assumed to be continuously differentiable with respect to their arguments and $u(\cdot)$ is regarded as a deterministic signal. Denoting by $y(k, u(\cdot), x_0(\theta), \theta)$ the solution of (1) - (3) and by $w(\cdot)$ a p -dimensional zero-mean white gaussian process with positive definite covariance matrix, viz.

$$E[w(h)w'(k)] = R \delta(h-k), \quad R > 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\delta(r) \triangleq \begin{cases} 0, & r \neq 0 \\ 1, & r = 0, \end{cases}$$

assume that the measured output $z(\cdot)$ is given by

$$z(k) = y(k, u(\cdot), x_0(\hat{\theta}), \hat{\theta}) + w(k)$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ is the "true" value of the parameters vector.

Then, it is well known [15] that the Fisher Information Matrix can be usefully written as a function of the output sensitivity coefficients (see the pioneer work of Slepian [16] for the non-dynamic case). More precisely, denoting by \mathcal{P} any discrete time set in which output observations may be performed and letting

$$\eta_i(k, u(\cdot), x_0(\theta), \theta) \triangleq \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} y(k, u(\cdot), x_0(\theta), \theta)$$

(1) Given two square matrices H and K of the same order, $H > K$ [$H > K$] means that $H - K$ is a semi-definite [definite] positive matrix.

$$\eta(k, u(\cdot), x_0(\theta), \theta) \triangleq \begin{vmatrix} \eta_1(k, u(\cdot), x_0(\theta), \theta) & \eta_2(k, u(\cdot), x_2(\theta), \theta) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \eta_q(k, u(\cdot), x_0(\theta), \theta) \end{vmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

the covariance matrix C of any unbiased parameters estimator with measurement schedules \mathcal{P} satisfies the inequality

$$C \geq \mathcal{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}, \hat{\theta}, u(\cdot)) \quad (5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \theta, u(\cdot)) \triangleq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}} \eta'(k, u(\cdot), x_0(\theta), \theta) R^{-1} \eta(k, u(\cdot), x_0(\theta), \theta) \quad (6)$$

is the so called Fisher Information Matrix (if $q=1$, (5) becomes the celebrated Frechet-Cramer-Rao inequality [17]). Note that vector (4) can be regarded as the output of the sensitivity system associated to (1), (2), i.e. as the output of the $(q+1)$ n -th order system

$$x(k+1) = f(x(k), u(k), \theta) \quad (7)$$

$$\sigma_i(k+1) = f_x(x(k), u(k), \theta) \sigma_i(k) + f_{\theta_i}(x(k), u(k), \theta), \quad (8)$$

$$i=1, 2, \dots, q$$

$$\eta_i(k) = g_x(x(k), u(k), \theta) \sigma_i(k) + g_{\theta_i}(x(k), u(k), \theta), \quad (9)$$

$$i=1, 2, \dots, q$$

subject to the initial condition

$$x(0) = x_0(\theta) \quad (10)$$

$$\sigma_i(0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i} x_0(\theta), \quad i=1, 2, \dots, q. \quad (11)$$

Since, in this paper, only the periodic regimes of system (1), (2) are taken into consideration, condition (10) must be replaced by

$$x(0, \theta) = x(N, \theta) \quad (12)$$

where the period N is any positive integer; correspondingly, constraint (11) takes on the form

$$\sigma_i(0, \theta) = \sigma_i(N, \theta), \quad i=1, 2, \dots, q. \quad (13)$$

Denoting by $\tilde{\eta}(N, \cdot, \theta)$ the periodic extension of the solution of system (7)-(9) under the periodicity constraints (12), (13) and by $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(N, \mathcal{P}, \theta, u(\cdot))$ the corresponding Fisher Information Matrix, (6) implies that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(N, \mathcal{P}, \theta, u(\cdot)) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{\eta}'(N, k, \theta) R^{-1} \tilde{\eta}(N, k, \theta) \quad (14)$$

and inequality (5) becomes

$$\tilde{C} \geq \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{-1}(N, \mathcal{P}, \hat{\theta}, u(\cdot)), \quad (15)$$

where \tilde{C} is the covariance matrix of any unbiased estimator based on N -periodic regimes data corresponding to the measurement schedules set \mathcal{P} .

In dealing with the input and measurement schedules design problem on the basis of the Fisher Information Matrix analysis, a main problem arises in connection with the necessity to evaluate this matrix at the (unknown) "true" value $\hat{\theta}$ of the parameters vector in order that (15) holds. To circumvent this difficulty, two approaches have been proposed in the literature; the first one consists in assuming that an a priori probability distribution $h(\cdot): R^q \rightarrow R^1$ for the parameters vector θ is given (Bayesian approach); the second one consists in admitting that a "nominal" value $\bar{\theta}$ of θ is available (see [3], [4] and [18] for a more detailed discussion). In order to apply the latter approach to the problem considered here, the following result is needed, the proof of which is omitted as a straightforward extension to the discrete-time case of the proof given in ([19], page 253).

Proposition 1:

If

(i) system (1) admits a unique N-periodic solution $\tilde{x}(N, \cdot, \bar{\theta})$ corresponding to the value $\theta = \bar{\theta}$ of the parameters vector

(ii) the linear N-periodic system

$$\delta x(k+1) = f_x(\tilde{x}(N, k, \bar{\theta}), u(k), \bar{\theta}) \delta x(k)$$

admits no N-periodic solution other than the trivial one, i.e. the corresponding monodromy matrix has no eigenvalue equal to one,

then there exists a neighborhood Θ of θ such that, for any any

$\theta \in \Theta$ system (1) admits one and only one N-periodic solution $\tilde{x}(N, \cdot, \theta)$, given

by

$$\tilde{x}(N, k, \theta) = \tilde{x}(N, k, \bar{\theta}) + \sum_{i=1}^q \tilde{\sigma}_i(N, k, \bar{\theta}) \delta \theta_i + o(\delta \theta)$$

where $\{\tilde{\sigma}_i(N, \cdot, \bar{\theta}), i=1, 2, \dots, q, \}$ is the unique N-periodic solution of (7),

(8); $\delta \theta_i \triangleq \theta_i - \bar{\theta}_i$ and

$$\lim_{\|\delta \theta\| \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|o(\delta \theta)\|}{\|\delta \theta\|} = 0.$$

□

Roughly, this proposition says that, if $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$, it makes sense to consider

$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(N, \mathcal{P}, \bar{\theta}, u(\cdot))$ as a fair approximation of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(N, \mathcal{P}, \hat{\theta}, u(\cdot))$. In this

connection, it is worthwhile to note that a similar expression of the

Fisher Information Matrix has been derived in [4], with $\bar{\theta}$ playing the

role of the mean of the a priori distribution of θ (Bayesian approach),

while, in [18], a rather obvious iterative procedure is recommended for

the approximation of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \hat{\theta}, u(\cdot))$.

Denoting by R^+ the non-negative real numbers, let $\mu[\cdot]: R^{q \times q} \rightarrow R^+$ be a suitable mapping such that $\mu[\cdot, \tilde{M}(N, \mathcal{P}, \bar{\theta}, u(\cdot))]$ characterizes, in a scalar form, the "magnitude" of $\tilde{M}(N, \mathcal{P}, \bar{\theta}, u(\cdot))$ (for a discussion about some of the possible choices of $\mu[\cdot]$, see, for instance, [6]). Then, the above considerations lead to the problem of maximizing

$$L(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \triangleq \mu[\cdot, \tilde{M}(N, \mathcal{P}, \bar{\theta}, u(\cdot))] \quad (16)$$

under some input constraint $u(\cdot) \in \Omega$, where Ω is a suitably specified function set, e.g.

$$\Omega \triangleq \{u(\cdot): \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} v(u(k)) \leq c\} \quad (17)$$

where $c > 0$ is given as well as the non-negative function $v(\cdot)$.

The analysis of the performance index (16) suggests to take into consideration the following problems as particularly significant. Let \mathcal{Z} be the integers, \mathcal{Z}^+ the positive integers, $\mathcal{P}(\cdot)$ the power set and $\mathcal{P}_v(\cdot)$ the set of all the subsets of cardinality $v \in \mathcal{Z}^+$.

Problem A (Optimal Input Design)

For a given $N \in \mathcal{Z}^+$ and $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$, find $u_0(\cdot) \in \Omega$ such that

$$L(N, \mathcal{P}, u_0(\cdot)) \geq L(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \quad \forall u(\cdot) \in \Omega$$

Problem B (Optimal Input and Period Design)

For a given $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$, find $N_{\theta} \in \mathcal{Z}^+$ and $u_{\theta}(\cdot) \in \Omega$ such that

$$L(N_{\theta}, \mathcal{P}, u_{\theta}(\cdot)) \geq L(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)), \quad \forall (N, u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \times \Omega$$

Problem C (Optimal Input and Measurement Allocation Design)

For a given pair $(N, v) \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \times \mathcal{Z}^+$, find $\mathcal{P}_{\phi} \in \mathcal{P}_v(\mathcal{Z})$ and $u_{\phi}(\cdot) \in \Omega$ such that

$$L(N, \mathcal{P}_\phi, u_\phi(\cdot)) \geq L(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)), \quad \forall (\mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{P}_v(\mathcal{Z}) \times \Omega.$$

Since the computational complexity of the parameter estimator strongly depends on the cardinality of \mathcal{P} , it is obvious that a first meaningful choice of a good measurement schedule set is among "computationally equivalent sets", namely sets of given cardinality (Problem C). In order to state in a consistent way a more general optimal measurement schedule design problem it is necessary to introduce a suitable measure of the obtainable information per unit of computational effort. □

Problem D (Optimal Input and Measurement Schedule Design)

For a given $N \in \mathcal{Z}^+$, find $\mathcal{P}_\phi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ and $u_\phi(\cdot) \in \Omega$ such that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}_\phi|} L(N, \mathcal{P}_\phi, u_\phi(\cdot)) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} L(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)), \quad \forall (\mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z}) \times \Omega,$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality. □

The analysis of Problem D directly leads to the introduction of an average per sample Fisher Information Matrix and constitutes the subject of the next Section 3.

Finally, the formal statement of an optimal input, measurement schedule and period design problem is omitted as trivial.

3. AVERAGE PER SAMPLE FISHER INFORMATION MATRIX UNDER PERIODIC OPERATION

Considering any finite measurement schedule \mathcal{P} , the average per sample Fisher Information Matrix under periodic operation is defined as follows:

$$M(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \mathcal{M}(N, \mathcal{P}, \bar{\theta}, u(\cdot)) \quad (18)$$

(in [4], under stability assumptions - here not necessary - the terminology "asymptotic per sample Fisher Information Matrix" is adopted). In analogy with (16), the scalar

$$J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \triangleq \mu[M(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot))] \quad (19)$$

is associated to matrix (19).

Letting

$$S_N = [0, N-1]$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_j(P) &\triangleq \{k : k-j \in P \mid P \in \mathcal{P}(S_N), j \in \mathcal{J}\} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{J}) &\triangleq \{ \{ \bigcup_{j \in J} Q_j(P) \} \mid P \in \mathcal{P}(S_N), J \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{J}) \} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

in this section, the families of matrices

$$\mathcal{F}_{S_N} \triangleq \{M(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \mid \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)\}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \triangleq \{M(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \mid \mathcal{P} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{J})\}$$

$$\mathcal{F} \triangleq \{M(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \mid \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{J})\}$$

and the corresponding sets of scalars given by (19) are usefully compared.

Given $h \in \mathcal{J}$ and a measurement schedule $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{J})$, denote by

$$\mathcal{P}_h \triangleq \mathcal{P} \cap [hN, (h+1)N-1]$$

$$H \triangleq \{h \mid \mathcal{P}_h \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then, the following preliminary result can be stated.

Proposition 2

The average per sample Fisher Information Matrix corresponding to any measurement schedule $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{J})$ can be given the form

$$M(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) = \sum_{h \in H} \frac{|\mathcal{P}_h|}{|\mathcal{P}|} M(N, \mathcal{P}_h, u(\cdot)). \quad (21)$$

Proof:

Equations (14) and (18) immediately imply (21). □

Noticing that \mathcal{F}_{S_N} is a finite set, denote by χ its cardinality and by

$$CH[\mathcal{F}_{S_N}] \triangleq \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\chi} \alpha_i K_i \mid K_i \in \mathcal{F}_{S_N}, \forall i=1,2,\dots,\chi \right. \\ \left. \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}^+, \forall i=1,2,\dots,\chi; \sum_{i=1}^{\chi} \alpha_i = 1 \right\}$$

its convex hull; furthermore, let

$$W \triangleq \left\{ \frac{a}{b} \mid 0 \leq a \leq N; b \geq N; (a,b) \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \right\}$$

and define

$$CW[\mathcal{F}_{S_N}] \triangleq \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\chi} w_i K_i \mid K_i \in \mathcal{F}_{S_N}, \forall i=1,2,\dots,\chi; \right. \\ \left. w_i \in W, \forall i=1,2,\dots,\chi; \sum_{i=1}^{\chi} w_i = 1 \right\}.$$

Corollary 1

For a given pair $(N, u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{F}^+ \times \Omega$, it is

$$\mathcal{F} = CW[\mathcal{F}_{S_N}], \quad (22)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}_{S_N}. \quad (23)$$

Proof

Let

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h \triangleq \{k \in S_N \mid k \pmod{N} \in \mathcal{P}_h\}.$$

Then, in view of the periodicity of $\tilde{\eta}(N, \cdot, \bar{\theta})$, Eq. (21) can be written as follows

$$M(N, \hat{\mathcal{P}}, u(\cdot)) = \sum_{h \in H} \frac{|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_h|}{|\mathcal{P}|} M(N, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_h, u(\cdot)), \quad (24)$$

so that the first part of the Corollary easily follows.

As for the second part, noticing that, if $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$, then $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{h_1} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{h_2}$, $\forall (h_1, h_2) \in H \times H$, Eq. (24) implies that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{S_N}.$$

Since the converse of this inclusion is trivial, statement (23) is proved.

Theorem 1

For a given pair $(N, u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \times \Omega$, the maximum of $J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot))$ with respect to $\mathcal{P} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{Z})$ exists and is given by

$$\max_{\mathcal{P} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{Z})} J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) = \max_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)} J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)). \quad (25)$$

Furthermore, if $\mu[\cdot]$ is a convex mapping (in particular a matrix norm), the maximum of $J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot))$ with respect to $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ exists and is given by

$$\max_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})} J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) = \max_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)} J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)).$$

Proof

Since $\mathcal{P}(S_N)$ is a finite set, the maximum of $J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot))$ with respect to $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)$ exists. From the obvious equalities

$$\max_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)} J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) = \max_{K \in \mathcal{F}_{S_N}} \mu[K] \quad (26)$$

$$\max_{\mathcal{P} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}})} J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) = \max_{K \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \mu[K],$$

statement (23) immediately imply equality (25). If $\mu[\cdot]$ is a convex mapping, the maximum of $\mu[\cdot]$ over the polyhedral convex set $\text{CH}[\mathcal{F}_{S_N}]$ exists and is given by

$$\max_{K \in \text{CH}[\mathcal{F}_{S_N}]} \mu[K] = \max_{K \in \mathcal{F}_{S_N}} \mu[K]. \quad (27)$$

Then, the trivial inclusions

$$\mathcal{F}_{S_N} \subseteq \text{CW}[\mathcal{F}_{S_N}] \subseteq \text{CH}[\mathcal{F}_{S_N}],$$

together with equality (27), implies that the maximum of $\mu[\cdot]$ over $\text{CW}[\mathcal{F}_{S_N}]$ exists too and is given by

$$\max_{K \in \text{CW}[\mathcal{F}_{S_N}]} \mu[K] = \max_{K \in \mathcal{F}_{S_N}} \mu[K]. \quad (28)$$

From (22) and (26) - (28), the second part of the theorem follows. \square

The above results suggest to replace Problems A, B, D with the following problems, which are stated in much simpler terms by making reference to the time interval $[0, N-1]$ only.

Problem A

For a given $N \in \mathcal{Z}^+$ and $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)$, find $u^0(\cdot) \in \Omega$ such that

$$J(N, \mathcal{P}, u^0(\cdot)) \geq J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)), \quad \forall u(\cdot) \in \Omega.$$

Problem B

For a given $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)$, find $N^0 \in \mathcal{Z}^+$ and $u^0(\cdot) \in \Omega$ such that

$$J(N^0, \mathcal{P}, u^0(\cdot)) \geq J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)), \quad \forall (N, u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \times \Omega.$$

Problem D

For a given $N \in \mathcal{Z}^+$, find $\mathcal{P}^\phi \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)$ and $u^\phi(\cdot) \in \Omega$ such that

$$J(N, \mathcal{P}^\phi, u^\phi(\cdot)) \geq J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)), \quad \forall (\mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{P}(S_N) \times \Omega. \quad \square$$

From a conceptual point of view, it is worthwhile to define also the following problem.

Problem C

For a given $N \in \mathcal{Z}^+$ and $v \in [1, N]$, find $\mathcal{P}^\phi \in \mathcal{P}_v(S_N)$ and $u^\phi(\cdot) \in \Omega$ such that

$$J(N, \mathcal{P}^\phi, u^\phi(\cdot)) \geq J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)), \quad \forall (\mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{P}_v(S_N) \times \Omega. \quad \square$$

However, note that it is mainly the knowledge of the solution of Problem D which does provide useful indications for the search of the solution of Problem C.

Problems A - D are suited to be faced by general Periodic Optimization techniques (see, for instance, [14]); however, it is only in the particularly important case of linear systems that these problems can actually be worked out further up to obtain results which can eventually be exploited in a simple and more direct way. In order to illustrate this point, the remainder of the paper is entirely devoted to the analysis of the special case of linear systems affected by a scalar parameter; as a matter of fact, most of the problems can in this case be given a closed form solution.

4. OPTIMAL INPUT DESIGN

Consider system (1), (2) with

$$f(x(k), u(k), \theta) = A(\theta) x(k) + B(\theta) u(k) \quad (29)$$

$$g(x(k), u(k), \theta) = C(\theta) x(k), \quad (30)$$

where $A(\cdot)$, $B(\cdot)$ and $C(\cdot)$ are continuously differentiable matrices of suitable order and θ is a scalar parameter. In order that, for each N , the corresponding $2n$ -th order sensitivity system admits a unique N -periodic solution in a neighborhood of the parameter nominal value $\bar{\theta}$, it is assumed that no eigenvalue of $A(\bar{\theta})$ has unitary absolute value.

Since, in the here considered case, the Fisher Information Matrix is obviously a (non negative) scalar, in view of (14), (18), and (19), the performance index can be given the form

$$J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{n}'(N, k, \bar{\theta}) R^{-1} \tilde{n}(N, k, \bar{\theta}), \quad (31)$$

where $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)$.

As far as constraint (17) is concerned, a power-constraint of the form

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k \in S_N} u'(k) Q u(k) \leq c \quad (32)$$

is now considered, where Q is any given positive definite matrix. Without any loss of generality, constraint (32) will be given the simpler form

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k \in S_N} u'(k) u(k) \leq 1 \quad (33)$$

In order to synthetically state the following results, some preliminary notations and definitions are now introduced.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
 G(z) &\triangleq C_{\bar{\theta}}(zI-A(\bar{\theta}))^{-1}B(\bar{\theta}) \\
 &+ C(\bar{\theta})(zI-A(\bar{\theta}))^{-1}A_{\theta}(\bar{\theta})(zI-A(\bar{\theta}))^{-1}B(\bar{\theta}) \\
 &+ C(\bar{\theta})(zI-A(\bar{\theta}))^{-1}B_{\theta}(\bar{\theta})
 \end{aligned}$$

be the z-transfer matrix of system (7) - (9), (29), (30) corresponding to the parameter nominal value and $\Pi_{r,s}(N, \mathcal{P})$ be the following $m \times m$ complex valued matrix

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pi_{r,s}(N, \mathcal{P}) &= b_{r,s}(N, \mathcal{P})G^*(\exp(jr \frac{2\pi}{r})) R^{-1}G(\exp(js \frac{2\pi}{N})), \\
 &(r,s) \in S_N \times S_N, \quad (34)
 \end{aligned}$$

where the scalar $b_{r,s}(N, \mathcal{P})$ is given by

$$b_{r,s}(N, \mathcal{P}) \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}} \exp(-jrk \frac{2\pi}{N}) \exp(jsk \frac{2\pi}{N}) \quad (35)$$

and * denotes conjugate transpose (in the following, the trivial case when $G(z) = 0, \forall z$, is not considered). Since

$$\Pi_{r,s}^*(N, \mathcal{P}) = \Pi_{s,r}(N, \mathcal{P}), \quad \forall (r,s) \in S_N \times S_N$$

the $mN \times mN$ matrix

$$\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P}) \triangleq [\Pi_{r,s}(N, \mathcal{P})]_{\substack{r=0,1,\dots,N-1 \\ s=0,1,\dots,N-1}} \quad (36)$$

turns out to be Hermitian.

Finally, consider the Finite Fourier Transform expansion [20] of $u(\cdot)$

$$u(k) = \sum_{h \in S_N} U_h \exp(jkh \frac{2\pi}{N}) \quad (37)$$

and let

$$U^* = [U_0^* \ U_1^* \ \dots \ U_{N-1}^*]. \quad (38)$$

Theorem 2

The performance index (31), under (7) - (9), (12), (13), (29), (30) can be given the form

$$J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) = U^* \Gamma(N, \mathcal{P}) U \quad (39)$$

while constraint (33) can be written as

$$U^* U \leq 1. \quad (40)$$

Proof

When $\theta = \bar{\theta}$, the output of the sensitivity system (7) - (9), (29), (30) under (12), (13), corresponding to the input (37) is given by

$$\tilde{\eta}(N, k, \bar{\theta}) = \sum_{h \in S_N} G(\exp(jh \frac{2\pi}{N})) U_h \exp(jkh \frac{2\pi}{N}) \quad (41)$$

From (31) and (41), it follows that

$$J(N, \mathcal{P}, u(\cdot)) = \sum_{r \in S_N} \sum_{s \in S_N} U^* \Pi_{r,s}^{(N, \mathcal{P})} U_s,$$

which is equivalent to (39); (40) is direct consequence of (33) and (37).

Remark 1

The matrix $\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})$ is obviously positive semi-definite. Since it is also Hermitian, its eigenvalues are all non-negative real numbers. Furthermore, it can easily be seen, from (34) and (35), that

$$\Pi_{N-r, N-s}^{(N, \mathcal{P})} = \overline{\Pi_{r,s}^{(N, \mathcal{P})}}, \quad \forall (r,s) \in S_N \times S_N, \quad \forall \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)$$

(—denotes conjugate). Therefore, to each eigenvalue λ of $\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})$ it can be associated a (non zero) eigenvector U^λ with the property

$$U_{N-h}^\lambda = \bar{U}_h^\lambda, \quad \forall h \in S_N. \quad (42)$$

□

The solution of Problem A can now be obtained. Let

$$F(N) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} [f_{r,s}]_{\substack{r=0,1,\dots,N-1 \\ s=0,1,\dots,N-1}}$$

$$f_{r,s} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \exp(jrs \frac{2\pi}{N})$$

and denote by

$$\mathcal{F}(N) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} F(N) \times I_m$$

the Kronecker product (see [21], page 227) of $F(N)$ and the m -th order identity matrix I_m . Furthermore, define the mN vector \mathcal{U} as

$$\mathcal{U}' \stackrel{\Delta}{=} [u'(0) \ u'(1) \ \dots \ u'(N-1)] \quad (43)$$

and denote by $\mathcal{U}^0(N, \mathcal{P})$ vector (43) corresponding to the solution $u^0(N, \mathcal{P}, \cdot)$ of Problem A, where, for the sake of notational clarification, the dependence on N and \mathcal{P} is explicitly pointed out.

Theorem 3

Let $U^0(N, \mathcal{P})$ be a unitary norm eigenvector of $\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})$ corresponding to its maximum eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}[\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})]$ and satisfying condition (42). Then,

$$\mathcal{U}^0(N, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{F}(N) \ U^0(N, \mathcal{P}) \quad (44)$$

and

$$J(N, \mathcal{P}, u^0(N, \mathcal{P}, \cdot)) = \lambda_{\max}[\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})].$$

Proof

Since $\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})$ is a positive semi-definite Hermitian matrix, it is well known that the maximum of (39) under constraint (40) is reached when U is a unitary norm eigenvector of $\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})$ associated to its maximum eigenvalue. On the other hand, in order that the inverse transform \mathcal{U} of U (given by $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{F}(N)U$) be a real vector, it is necessary and sufficient that condition (42) is

satisfied (see Remark 1). □

As far as the particularly significant cases $\mathcal{P} = S_N$ and $\mathcal{P} = S_1 \triangleq \{0\}$ are concerned, the following results are easily derived from Theorem 3.

Theorem 4 ($\mathcal{P} = S_N$)

Let

$$\Pi(z) \triangleq G^*(z)R^{-1}G(z) \quad (45)$$

and denote by V_h a unitary norm eigenvector of $\Pi(\exp(jh \frac{2\pi}{N}))$ corresponding to its maximum eigenvalue λ_h . Then, if $h^0 \in S_N$ is defined as follows

$$\lambda_{h^0} \geq \lambda_h, \quad \forall h \in S_N,$$

the optimal input is given by

$$u^0(N, S_N, k) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2} \operatorname{Re}\{V_{h^0} \exp(jkh^0 \frac{2\pi}{N})\}, & h^0 \neq 0 \\ V_0, & h^0 = 0 \end{cases} \quad (46.a)$$

$$(46.b)$$

(Re { . } denotes the real part).

Proof

If $\mathcal{P} = S_N$, (34) and (35) imply that

$$\Pi_{r,s}(N, S_N) = \begin{cases} \Pi(\exp(jr \frac{2\pi}{N})), & s=r \\ 0, & s \neq r \end{cases}$$

Consequently, $\Gamma(N, S_N)$ turns out to be a block diagonal matrix (see (36)), so

that

$$\lambda_{\max}[\Gamma(N, S_N)] = \lambda_{h^0}$$

and

$$U^0(N, S_N)' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\Psi' \Psi' \dots \Psi' V_{h^0}' \Psi' \dots \Psi' \bar{V}_{h^0}' \Psi' \dots \Psi'], & h^0 \neq 0 \\ [V_0' \Psi' \Psi' \dots \Psi'] & , h^0 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (47.a)$$

$$(47.b)$$

where Ψ is the m -dimensional zero vector while V_{h^0} and \bar{V}_{h^0} enter (47.a) in the h^0 -th and $(N-h^0)$ -th positions. respectively (note that λ_{h^0} is an eigenvalue of $\Pi_{N-h^0, N-h^0}(N, S_N)$ and \bar{V}_{h^0} the associated unitary norm eigenvector). From (44) and (47), the thesis follows.

Theorem 5 ($\mathcal{P} = S_1$)

Let

$$\Phi(N) \triangleq \left[G(\exp(j0 \frac{2\pi}{N})) \mid G(\exp(j1 \frac{2\pi}{N})) \mid \dots \mid G(\exp(j(N-1) \frac{2\pi}{N})) \right] \quad (48)$$

$$Z \triangleq \sqrt{R^{-1}} \quad (49)$$

$$H(N) \triangleq Z\Phi(N) \quad (50)$$

and denote by $h_i(N)$ the i -th row of $H(N)$. Then,

$$\Gamma(N, S_1) = \sum_{i \in [1, p]} h_i^*(N) h_i(N). \quad (51)$$

Proof

From (35), it follows that

$$b_{r,s}(N, S_1) = 1, \quad \forall (r,s) \in S_N \times S_N.$$

Therefore, (39) becomes

$$\Gamma(N, S_1) = H^*(N)H(N) = \sum_{i \in [1, p]} h_i^*(N) h_i(N). \quad \square$$

As for the general case $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)$, the following general properties of $\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})$ can be usefully pointed out.

Theorem 6

Let

$$\rho \triangleq \sum_{h \in S_N} \text{rank} [G(\exp(jh \frac{2\pi}{N}))];$$

then

$$\text{rank} [\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})] = \min\{p, |\mathcal{P}|\}, \quad \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N).$$

Proof

Letting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}(N) &\triangleq \text{diag}[Z, Z, \dots, Z], \quad \mathcal{Z}(N) \in R^{pN \times pN} \\ \mathcal{G}(N) &\triangleq \text{diag}[G(\exp(j0 \frac{2\pi}{N})), G(\exp(j1 \frac{2\pi}{N})), \dots, G(\exp(j(N-1) \frac{2\pi}{N}))] \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$B(N, \mathcal{P}) \triangleq [b_{r,s}]_{\substack{r=0,1,\dots,N-1 \\ s=0,1,\dots,N-1}}$$

$$\mathcal{B}(N, \mathcal{P}) \triangleq B(N, \mathcal{P}) \times I_p,$$

a simple but cumbersome computation shows that

$$\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{G}^*(N) \mathcal{Z}^*(N) \mathcal{B}(N, \mathcal{P}) \mathcal{Z}(N) \mathcal{G}(N),$$

so that

$$\text{rank} [\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})] \leq \min\{\text{rank}[\mathcal{G}(N)], \text{rank}[\mathcal{B}(N, \mathcal{P})]\}.$$

Since

$$\text{rank} [\mathcal{B}(N, \mathcal{P})] = p \text{rank}[B(N, \mathcal{P})]$$

(see [21], page 227) and

$$B(N, \mathcal{P}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}} B^*(k) B(k),$$

where

$$B(k) \triangleq [\exp(jk0 \frac{2\pi}{N}) \quad \exp(jk1 \frac{2\pi}{N}) \quad \dots \quad \exp(jk(N-1) \frac{2\pi}{N})],$$

then, if $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_n)$,

$$\text{rank} [\mathcal{B}(N, \mathcal{P})] = p|\mathcal{P}|$$

and the theorem follows.

Corollary 2

If $N \geq np|\mathcal{P}|$, then

$$\text{rank} [\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})] \leq p|\mathcal{P}|, \quad \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N).$$

Proof

Since, by assumption, $G(z)$ is not identically equal to zero, there is at least one of its elements which can be zero at most in $n-1$ points of the complex plane. Therefore,

$$\sum_{h \in [0, n-1]} \text{rank}[G(\exp(jh \frac{2\pi}{N}))] \geq 1, \quad \forall N > n.$$

Proposition 3

The trace of $\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})$ is the same for all $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)$.

Proof

The proof is trivially obtained by noticing that, for each $r \in S_N$,

$$\Pi_{r,r}(N, \mathcal{P}) = \Pi(\exp(jr \frac{2\pi}{N})), \quad \forall \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N).$$

5. JOINT OPTIMAL INPUT AND MEASUREMENT SCHEDULE DESIGN

The key result for the solution of Problem D in the simplest case of linear system affected by a scalar parameter is supplied by the following theorem.

Theorem 7

For each $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(S_N)$, the maximum eigenvalue of $\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})$ satisfies the following inequalities

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \max_{i=1, \dots, p} \|h_i(N)\|^2 \leq \lambda_{\max}[\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})] \leq \lambda_{\max}[\sum_{i \in [1, p]} h_i^*(N)h_i(N)], \quad (53)$$

where $h_i(N)$ is defined as in Theorem 5.

Proof

Letting

$$T(N,k) \triangleq \text{diag}[\exp(jk0 \frac{2\pi}{N}), \exp(jk1 \frac{2\pi}{N}), \dots, \exp(jk(N-1) \frac{2\pi}{N})]$$

$$\mathcal{F}(N,k) \triangleq T(N,k) \times I_m$$

$$v(N,k,i) \triangleq h_i(N) \mathcal{F}(N,k),$$

$\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})$ can be given the following form

$$\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{i \in [1,p]} v^*(N,k,i) v(N,k,i),$$

which, in turn, implies that

$$\lambda_{\max}[\Gamma(N, \mathcal{P})] = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \max_{\|\xi\|=1} \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{P}} \xi^* \mathcal{F}^*(N,k) \left[\sum_{i \in [1,p]} h_i^*(N) h_i(N) \right] \mathcal{F}(N,k) \xi \right\}. \quad (54)$$

For each $k \in S_N$, $\mathcal{F}(N,k)$ is an orthogonal matrix. Hence, if $\|\xi\| = 1$,

$$\xi^* \mathcal{F}(N,k) \left[\sum_{i \in [1,p]} h_i^*(N) h_i(N) \right] \mathcal{F}(N,k) \xi \leq \lambda_{\max} \left[\sum_{i \in [1,p]} h_i^*(N) h_i(N) \right], \quad (55)$$

for all $k \in S_N$.

From (54) and (55), the right hand inequality in statement (53) follows, while the left hand side is an easy consequence of (54).

Remark 2

When $\mathcal{P} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{Z})$, Theorem 7 yields interesting bounds for $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{-1}(N, \mathcal{P}, \bar{\theta}, u_0(\cdot))$, namely the Frechet-Cramer-Rao approximate covariance lower bound. More

precisely, assuming, without any loss of generality, that $\mathcal{P}_1 \triangleq \mathcal{P} \cap S_N \neq \emptyset$,

(14), (31) and (53) imply that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|} \left\{ \lambda \max_{i \in [1,p]} \left[h_i^*(N) h_i(N) \right] \right\}^{-1} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{-1}(N, \mathcal{P}, \bar{\theta}, u_o(\cdot))$$

$$\leq \frac{|\mathcal{P}_1|}{|\mathcal{P}|} \left\{ \max_{i=1, \dots, p} \|h_i(N)\|^2 \right\}^{-1},$$

$$\forall \mathcal{P} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}).$$

Corollary 3

For each period $N \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$, the optimal measurement schedule \mathcal{P}^ϕ is a singleton; up to time delays, the solution of Problem D is precisely given by

$$\mathcal{P}^\phi = \{0\} \tag{56}$$

$$u^\phi(\cdot) = u^o(N, S_1, \cdot). \tag{57}$$

Proof

Theorems 5 and 7 imply that (56), (57) is a solution of Problem D. On the other hand, in view of the invariance of system (7)-(9) and of the form of constraints (12), (13), the set $\{h\}$, $h \in S_N$, and the control $u(k) \triangleq u^o(N, S_1, k-h)$ is a solution of Problem D too.

Remark 3

In the case of single input-single output system, Corollary 3 is a trivial consequence of Theorem 6 and Proposition 3.

Remark 4

Obviously, in view of Theorem 1, a solution of Problem D is given by (56) and the periodic extension of (57).

Remark 5

The peculiar form of (56) enables one to solve Problem C for any measurement schedule set $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ of a given cardinality $v \in \mathcal{Z}^+$. As a matter of fact, it is apparent that the choice

$$\mathcal{P}_\phi = \{0, N, 2N, \dots, (v-1)N\}$$

$$u_\phi(.) = PE[u^\phi(.)],$$

where $PE[.]$ denotes periodic extension, results in a maximal "information" for parameter identification. Correspondingly, the minimum parameter estimators variance is given by

$$\frac{1}{v} \{ \lambda_{\max} [\sum_{i \in [1, p]} h_i^*(N) h_i(N)] \}^{-1}$$

Note that such a strong conclusion cannot be drawn in the general case.

6. OPTIMAL PERIOD DESIGN

As far as the period design is concerned, the cases $\mathcal{P} = S_N$ and $\mathcal{P} = S_1$ are here discussed.

With reference to definition (45), denote by $\lambda(\alpha)$ the maximum eigenvalue of $\Pi(\exp(j\alpha))$, $\alpha \in [0, 2\pi]$, and by $V(\alpha)$ a unitary norm eigenvalue of $\Pi(\exp(j\alpha))$ corresponding to $\lambda(\alpha)$. Observe that the continuity of the function $\lambda(.)$ implies that there exists $\alpha^0 \in [0, 2\pi]$ such that $\lambda(\alpha^0) \geq \lambda(\alpha)$, $\forall \alpha \in [0, 2\pi]$.

Then, the following result can be stated.

Theorem 8

Let $\mathcal{S} = S_N$.

If $\alpha^0/2\pi$ is a rational number, so that there exist two integers a^0 and N^0 such that

$$\frac{\alpha^0}{2\pi} = \frac{a^0}{N^0},$$

then a solution of Problem B is given by

$$N^\circ = N^0$$

$$u^\circ(k) = u^\circ(N^0, S_{N^0}, k) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2} \operatorname{Re}\{V(a^0) \exp(jka^0 \frac{2\pi}{N^0})\} & , \quad a^0 \neq 0 \\ V(0) & , \quad a^0 = 0. \end{cases}$$

If $\alpha^0/2\pi$ is an irrational number, for each $N > 0$ there exists an $\hat{N} > N$ such that

$$J(\hat{N}, S_{\hat{N}}, u^\circ(\hat{N}, S_{\hat{N}}, \cdot)) > J(N, S_N, u^\circ(N, S_N, \cdot))$$

and, therefore, the optimal period does not exist.

Proof

The first part of the theorem immediately follows from Theorem 4. As for the second part, recall that, according to Theorem 4, the optimal N -periodic control is given by a discrete-time sinusoid of frequency h^0/N . Then, since $\alpha^0/2\pi$ is an irrational number

$$\frac{h^0}{N} 2\pi \neq \alpha^0, \quad \forall N > 1.$$

Therefore, letting

$$\gamma \triangleq \min\{\alpha^0, \frac{h^0}{N} 2\pi\}$$

$$\delta \triangleq \max\{\alpha^0, \frac{h^0}{N} 2\pi\},$$

in view of the continuity of $\lambda(\cdot)$, it is possible to find two non-zero integers \hat{a} and \hat{N} such that

$$\frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{N}} \in (\gamma, \delta)$$

and

$$\lambda\left(\frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{N}} 2\pi\right) = J(N, S_N, u^0(N, S_N, \cdot)) < J(\hat{N}, S_{\hat{N}}, \hat{u}(\cdot)) < \lambda(\alpha^0),$$

where

$$\hat{u}(k) \triangleq \sqrt{2} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ v\left(\frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{N}} 2\pi\right) \exp(jk\hat{a} \frac{2\pi}{\hat{N}}) \right\}.$$

Theorem 9

Let $\mathcal{P} = S_1$.

Then, for each $N \geq 1$, there exist an integer $\check{N} > N$ such that

$$J(\check{N}, S_1, u^0(\check{N}, S_1, \cdot)) > J(N, S_1, u^0(N, S_1, \cdot));$$

hence, the optimal period does not exist.

Proof

With reference to Theorem 5, it is

$$\begin{aligned} J(N, S_1, u^0(N, S_1, \cdot)) &= \lambda \max_{\{i \in [1, p]\}} [h_i^*(N) h_i(N)] \\ &\geq \max_{i=1, \dots, p} ||h_i(N)||^2 \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Now, from (50) it follows that

$$h_i(N) = z_i \phi(N),$$

where z_i is the i -th row of matrix (49) and $\phi(N)$ has been defined in (48).

Since z_i must be non-zero and there exists at least one element of the transfer matrix $G(z)$ which may be zero in at most $n-1$ points, there exists a \check{r} such that

$$||h_1(\check{r}N)||^2 > ||h_1(N)||^2, \quad \forall i \in [1, p] \quad (58)$$

From (58) and (59), the statement follows. □

Theorems 8 and 9 show that the performance index admits a maximum with respect to N neither if $\mathcal{P} = S_N$ and $\alpha^0/2\pi$ is irrational nor if $\mathcal{P} = S_1$. However, only in the latter of these two cases the supremum of the performance index takes on an infinite value; precisely, the following result can be stated.

Theorem 10

The supremum of the performance index $J(N, \mathcal{P}, u^0(N, \mathcal{P}, \cdot))$ with respect to the period N is given by

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} J(N, S_N, u^0(N, S_N, \cdot)) = \lambda(\alpha^0) \quad (60)$$

for $\mathcal{P} = S_N$ and by

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} J(N, S_1, u^0(N, S_1, \cdot)) = +\infty \quad (61)$$

for $\mathcal{P} = S_1$.

Proof

Formula (60) can easily be derived from the proof of Theorem 8.

As for (61), observe first that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{N \geq 1} J(N, S_1, u^0(N, S_1, \cdot)) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} J(N, S_1, u^0(N, S_1, \cdot)) \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\max} [\phi^*(N) R^{-1} \phi(N)] \end{aligned}$$

(See Theorems 5 and 9.) Since R^{-1} is a positive definite matrix, (61) is proved by showing that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\max} [\phi^*(N) \phi(N)] = +\infty. \quad (62)$$

With this aim, denote by $\phi_i(N)$, the i -th row of $\Phi(N)$.

From the identity

$$\Phi^*(N)\Phi(N) = \sum_{i \in [1,p]} \phi_i^*(N)\phi_i(N),$$

it follows that

$$\lambda_{\max}[\Phi^*(N)\Phi(N)] \geq \|\phi_i\|^2, \quad \forall i \in [1,p]. \quad (63)$$

Let now $t, t \in [1,p]$, be any integer such that, for some integer $v \in [1,m]$, the transfer function $G_{t,v}(z)$ is not identically zero. From (48), it

is apparent that

$$\|\phi_t(N)\|^2 \geq \sum_{k \in S_N} |G_{t,v}(\exp(jk \frac{2\pi}{N}))|^2. \quad (64)$$

Then, consider an interval $[\beta_1, \beta_2] \subseteq [0, 2\pi]$, $\beta_2 > \beta_1$, such that

$$G_{t,v}(\exp(j\alpha)) \neq 0, \quad \forall \alpha \in [\beta_1, \beta_2]$$

(such an interval does obviously exist) and let

$$\mathcal{J} = \min_{\alpha \in [\beta_1, \beta_2]} |G_{t,v}(\exp(j\alpha))|^2. \quad (65)$$

From (64) and (65), it follows that

$$\|\phi_t(N)\|^2 \geq \mathcal{J} \tau(N), \quad (66)$$

where $\tau(N)$ is the cardinality of

$$[\beta_1, \beta_2] \cap \{0 \frac{2\pi}{N}, 1 \frac{2\pi}{N}, \dots, (N-1) \frac{2\pi}{N}\}.$$

Finally, since $\mathcal{J} > 0$ and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau(N)}{N} = \frac{\beta_2 - \beta_1}{2\pi}, \quad (67)$$

(63) and (66) give (61) and the proof is completed.

Remark 6

In view of the above result, an interesting comparison between the trends of the approximate variance lower bound for the measurement allocation sets

$$\mathcal{P}' = [0, \zeta N - 1] \quad (68)$$

$$\mathcal{P}'' = \{0, N, 2N, \dots, (\zeta N - 1)N\},$$

where the cardinality ν of the two sets is the same and is given by $\nu = \zeta N$, can usefully be pointed out.

If $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}'$, (60) implies that, either if N is fixed and $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ or ζ is fixed and $\nu \rightarrow \infty$, the variance lower bound goes to zero as $1/\nu$. On the other hand, definition (18) and Theorems 3 and 5 enable to derive that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{-1}(N, \mathcal{P}'', \bar{\theta}, u_0(\cdot)) = \frac{1}{\zeta N} \{ \lambda_{\max} [\phi^*(N) R^{-1} \phi(N)] \}^{-1}.$$

Therefore, the variance lower bound corresponding to $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}''$ goes to zero as $1/\nu$ for $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ and N fixed, while, in view of (63), (64), (66), and (67), for $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ and ζ fixed, it goes to zero at least as $1/\nu^2$. □

For the sake of illustration of the results presented in Sections 4-6, the simple case of single input-single output systems is now briefly discussed.

Remark 7

Consider a single input-single output system; in this case, $G(z)$ is simply the nominal sensitivity system transfer function. Suppose that the measurable output is observed for $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}'$ (see (68)). Then (Theorem 4), the optimal control for the parameter identification is given by

$$u^0(k) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2} \cos(kh^0 \frac{2\pi}{N}), & h^0 \neq 0 \\ 1 & h^0 = 0, \end{cases}$$

where h^0 is such that

$$|G(\exp(jh^0 \frac{2\pi}{N}))| \geq |G(\exp(jh \frac{2\pi}{N}))|, \quad \forall h \in [0, N-1].$$

The approximate variance lower bound is then

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{-1}(N, \mathcal{P}', \bar{\theta}, PE[u^0(N, S_N, \dots)]) = \frac{R}{v |G(\exp(jh^0 \frac{2\pi}{N}))|^2} \quad (69)$$

R being the variance of the additive noise.

If $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}''$, according to Theorems 3 and 5, the optimal control turns out to be

$$u^0(k) = \left[\sum_{h=0}^{N-1} |G(\exp(jh \frac{2\pi}{N}))|^2 \right]^{-1/2} \left\{ \sum_{h=0}^{N-1} G(\exp(jh \frac{2\pi}{N})) \exp(jkh \frac{2\pi}{N}) \right\}$$

and the variance lower bound is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^{-1}(N, \mathcal{P}', \bar{\theta}, PE[u^0(N, S_1, \dots)]) = \frac{R}{v \left[\sum_{h=0}^{N-1} |G(\exp(jh \frac{2\pi}{N}))|^2 \right]}, \quad (70)$$

which is obviously smaller than (69). Finally, it is apparent that, for a fixed ζ , (69) and (70) go to zero, when v goes to the infinity, as $1/v$ and at least as $1/v^2$ respectively.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, a number of problems concerning the optimal cycling for parameter identification of discrete-time and time-invariant systems with output additive noise have been raised and properly stated as Periodic Optimization Problems. As it is natural to expect, explicit solutions are given for linear systems only, affected by a scalar parameter.

The results reported in the present paper leave a number of interesting questions open for further research; among them, the extension to the multiparameter case and/or to problems characterized by non-integral control constraints of the results given in Sections 4 - 6 as well as the same analysis for systems affected by additive noise not only on the output equation but on the state equation too seem to be the most challenging ones.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

For most valuable suggestions, the author is grateful to Professor Guido Guardabassi, who also conjectured the result presented here as Corollary 3. For their friendly cooperation, the author wishes to thank Professor Arturo Locatelli and Dr. Nicola Schiavoni, who, together with Professor Guido Guardabassi, made it possible his leave period at the Division of Engineering and Applied Physics, Harvard University. Finally, thanks are also due to Professor Y. C. Ho for his kind hospitality and to a NATO Fellowship, by the Centro di Teoria dei Sistemi (CNR) of Milano (Italy) for partial support.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. Levin, Optimal estimation of impulse response in presence of noise, IRE Transactions on Circuit Theory, CT-7 (1960), pp. 50-56.
- [2] V. S. Levadi, Design of input signals for parameter estimation, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, AC-11, No. 2 (1966), pp. 205-211.
- [3] N. E. Nahi, D. E. Wallis, Jr., Optimal inputs for parameter estimation in dynamic systems with white observation noise, Joint Automatic Control Conference, Boulder, Colorado, 1969, pp. 506-513.
- [4] R. K. Mehra, Optimal input signals for parameters estimation in dynamic systems-survey and new results, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, AC-19, No. 6 (1974), pp. 753-768.
- [5] _____, Optimal inputs for linear system identification, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, AC-19, No. 3 (1974), pp. 192-200.
- [6] V. V. Fedorov, Theory of optimal experiments, Academic Press, New York, 1972.
- [7] R. K. Mehra, Optimization of measurement schedules and sensor designs for linear dynamic systems, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, AC-21, No. 1, (1976), pp. 55-64.
- [8] R. L. Payne, G. C. Goodwin, Simplification of frequency domain experiment design for single input single output systems, Report 74/3, Department of Computing and Control, Imperial College, London, 1974.
- [9] A. Van der Bos, Selection of periodic test signals for estimation of linear system dynamics, IFAC Symposium Identification, Prague, 1967.
- [10] S. Bittanti, G. Guardabassi, Optimal process cycling for parameter identification, IFAC Symposium Identification, Tblisi, 1976.
- [11] G. Guardabassi, The optimal periodic control problem, Journal A, 17 (1976), pp. 75-83.
- [12] G. Guardabassi, A. Locatelli, S. Rinaldi, "The status of periodic optimization of dynamical systems, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 14, No. 1, (1974), pp. 1-20.
- [13] E. Noldus, A survey of optimal periodic control of continuous systems, Journal A, 16, No. 1 (1975), pp. 11-16.

- [14] S. Bittanti, G. Fronza, G. Guardabassi, Necessary Conditions for a discrete periodic optimization problem, *Avtomatika i Telemekhanika*, 10 (1974), pp. 877-884.
- [15] M. Aoki, R. M. Staley, On input signal synthesis in parameter identification, *Automatica*, 6 (1970), pp. 431-440.
- [16] D. Slepian, Estimation of signal parameters in the presence of noise, *IRE Transactions on Information Theory*, PGIT 3 (1954), pp. 68-89.
- [17] H. Cramer, *Mathematical methods of statistics*, Princeton, New York, 1946.
- [18] N. E. Nahi, *Estimation theory and applications*, John Wiley, New York, 1969.
- [19] A. Halanay, *Differential equations*, Academic Press, New York, 1966.
- [20] J. W. Cooley, P. A. W. Lewis, P. D. Welch, The finite Fourier transform, *IEEE Transactions on Audio and Electroacoustics*, AU-17, No. 2 (1969), pp. 77-85.
- [21] R. Bellman, *Introduction of matrix analysis*, Mc Graw-Hill, New York, 1960.

DEPT REPORTS DISTRIBUTION LIST
NSDD-14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100

Defense John Center
Attn: DDC (A. M. V. Caputo)
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Asst. Director
Electronics and Computer Sciences
Office of Director of Defense Research
and Engineering
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20315

Office of the Director of Defense
Research and Engineering
Information Office Library Branch
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20315

USAF European Office of Aerospace
Electronics
201 Park Street
New York, New York 10014

Chief, R and D Division (AFD)
Defense Communications Agency
Washington, DC 20301

Director, National Security Agency
Fort George G. Meade, Maryland 20715
Attn: Dr. T. J. Reed

Institute for Defense Analysis
Science and Technology Division
490 Army Navy Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202

Dr. Shirley
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
Attn: Technical Library
1600 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Dr. B. Reynolds
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
Attn: Technical Library
1600 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209

AF/ISRM
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330

AFPC (L) (Mr. Irving K. Mitchell)
Address AFB
Washington, DC 20334

Directorate of Electronics and Weapons
HQ AFPC/DEW
Address AFB, Maryland 20334

Directorate of Science
HQ AFPC/ISA
Address AFB
Washington, DC 20334

LTC J. W. Gregory
AF/ISRM, TAC
Air Force Office of Scientific Research
Building AFB
Washington, DC 20334

Mr. Carl Stanton
AFPC/L2
Hannover AFB, MA 01711

Dr. Richard Picard
AFPC/ISRM
Hannover AFB, MA 01711

Mr. Robert Barrett
AFPC/L2
Hannover AFB, MA 01711

Dr. John N. Howard
AFPC/L2
Hannover AFB, MA 01711

Dr. Richard B. Mack
AFPC/L2
Hannover AFB, MA 01711

Document Library (TILD)
Rand Air Development Center
Griffiss AFB, New York 13441

Mr. R. E. Fink, Jr. (BEP)
Rand Air Development Center
Griffiss AFB, New York 13441

Mr. Murray Rosenbaum (BKA)
Rand Air Development Center
Griffiss AFB, New York 13441

Mr. W. Edwards
AFPC/L2
Wright Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

Mr. E. D. Lewis
AFPC/L2
Wright Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

Chief Scientist
AFPC/L2
Wright Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

HQ RBZ (DR/Eng 11)
Hannover AFB, MA 01711

Professor R. F. Franken
Head Dept. of Electrical Eng.
AFPC/ISRM
Wright Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

Mr. John Mottishaw (MCTT)
HQ RBZ (AFPC)
Hannover AFB, MA 01711

LTC Richard J. Gowan
Professor
Dept. of Electrical Engineering
USAF Academy, Colorado 80940

AD/LES WAF
Maxwell AFB, Alabama 36112

AFRTS Technical Library
P. O. Box 4009, MD 1630
Patrick AFB, Florida 32942

ADTC (DLO/EL)
Eglin AFB, Florida 32542

NSG AMD (RND/IO/Golden)
Brooks AFB, Texas 78235

USAF European Office of Aerospace
Research
1000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002

Dr. Carl E. Baum
AFRL/ER
Kirtland AFB, New Mexico 87117

ASAFSAM/AL
Brooks AFB, Texas

HQDA (DAMA, ARZ, A)
Washington, DC 20310

Commander
US Army Security Agency
Attn: DAED-T
Arlington Hall Station
Arlington, Virginia 22212

Commander
US Army Materiel Development
and Readiness Command
Attn: Technical Library, Box 18 35
1801 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22303

Commander
US Army Ballistic Research
Laboratory
Attn: DSR/EL
Aberdeen Proving Ground
Aberdeen, MD 21005

Commander
Priority Aerial
Attn: SMD/EL, TS-T-8
Chester, NJ 07811

US Army Research Office
Attn: Dr. Raymond F. Paul
P. O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

US Army Research Office
Attn: Dr. Thomas G. Soffa
P. O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

US Army Research Office
Attn: Dr. Neal Williams
P. O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Commander
Frankford Arsenal
Attn: Mr. George C. Wise, Jr.
Deputy Director, Program Development
Philadelphia, PA 19137

Commander
US Army Missile Command
Attn: Chief, Document Section
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35897

Commander
US Army Missile Command
Attn: DSR/MS
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35899

Commander
US Army Materiel and Machine
Research Center
Attn: Chief, Materials Sciences
Department
Watertown, MA 02172

Commander
Naval Research Laboratory
Attn: Mr. John E. Rosenburg
3400 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783

Commander
US Army Air Defense School
Attn: AIRAD-T/COM
Fort Bliss, TX 79916

Commander
US Army Command and General
Staff College
Attn: Acquisition, Lib. Div.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027

Dr. Hans R. Ziegler
Army Member, TAC/ISRP
US Army Electronics Command
DMSEL, TL 07
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07731

Mr. J. E. Van
Executive Secretary, TAC/ISRP
US Army Electronics Command
DMSEL, TL 07
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07731

Director
High Voltage Laboratory, ECOM
Attn: DMSEL, NY 12
Fort Belvoir, VA 22040

Commander/Director
Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory
ECOM
Attn: DMSEL, EL 10
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88001

Director
Electronic Warfare Laboratory
ECOM
Attn: DMSEL, WI, NY
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002

Commander
US Army Armament Command
Attn: DMSEL, D
Rock Island, IL 61201

Director, Div. of Neurophysiology
Water Reed Army Institute of
Research
Washington, DC 20312

Commander
URAD/TCOM
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07731

Commander
US Army R and D Group
(Fax Unit)
APO San Francisco, CA 96341

Commander
US Army Communications Command
Attn: Director, Advanced Concepts
Office
Fort Huachuca, AZ 85613

Project Manager
SARTAIN
KAI Building
New Long Beach, NJ 07754

Commander
US Army White Sands Missile Range
Attn: STW/IS-8
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002

Director, TBI, TAC
Attn: TBI AD/ISRM, Building
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07731

Commander
US Army Communications Command
Attn: DMSEL, P2
Fort Huachuca, AZ 85613

COL Robert New
Senior Standardization Representative
US Army Standardization Group
Canada
Canadian Forces Headquarters
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0K2

Commander
US Army Electronics Command
Attn: DMSEL, P2/2 (Dr. W. J. McAnis)
CT 2 (Dr. R. Buser)
NL 2 (Dr. R. Buser)
NL 2 (Mr. R. Kellner)
TL 2
TL 2
WL 2
TL 2 (Mr. N. Lipeta)
NL 2 (Dr. F. Scherling)
NL 2 (Dr. R. Knechtel)
TL 2 (Dr. J. Kuhl)
NL 2 (Dr. C. Thurston)
NL 2 (Dr. S. Amerson)
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07731

Project Manager
Ballistic Missile Defense Program Office
Attn: DMSEL BMDP (Mr. A. Gold)
1300 Wilson Blvd
Washington, DC 20009

Dr. Sidney Ross
Technical Director
SARTAIN
Frankford Arsenal
Philadelphia, PA 19137

Department of Naval Research
Electronic and Inert Data
Scientific Program Code 473
400 N. DuPont
Arlington, Virginia 22211

Office of Naval Research
C. M. 100
A. Leland Child for Technology
80 N. DuPont
Arlington, Virginia 22211

Office of Naval Research
Electronic Science Program
(Code 473)
400 N. DuPont
Arlington, Virginia 22211

Naval Research Laboratory
4555 Overlook Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20376
Attn: Codes: 2627
4000
4101
4200
4300
4400
4500
4600
4700
4800
4900
5000
5100
5200
5300
5400
5500
5600
5700
5800
5900
6000

Director
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
316 South Clark Street
Chicago, Illinois 60609

San Francisco Area Office
Office of Naval Research
160 Market Street, Room 447
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dr. A. Leland
Chief Scientist
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
139 East Broadway
Pasadena, CA 91101

Director
Office of Naval Research
Branch Office
111 Broadway, 16th Floor
New York, New York 10003

Mr. J. W. Sutter
Naval Electronics Systems Command
NO No.
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22204

Mr. R. Fratelli
Naval Electronics Systems Command
NO No.
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22204

Mr. N. Butler
Naval Electronics Systems Command
NO No. 1
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22204

Dr. H. J. Mueller
Naval Air Systems Command
JP No. 1
1411 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22204

Capt. R. B. Meeks
Naval Sea Systems Command
NO No. 2
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22204

Commander
Naval Surface Weapons Center
Attn: Technical Library
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Office in Charge
Naval Surface Weapons Center
Delridge Laboratory
Delridge, Virginia 22044

Naval Air Development Center
Attn: Technical Library
Johnston
Warrenton, Penn. 18074

Commander
Naval Air Station Facility
Indianapolis, Indiana 46241
Attn: 50735 Technical Library
Code 1411

Naval Weapons Center
Attn: Technical Library
Code 431
China Lake, CA 91305

Naval Weapons Center
Attn: Code 6210
China Lake, CA 91355

Naval Weapons Center
Mathematics Division
China Lake, CA 91355

Naval Training Equipment Center
Technical Library
Orlando, Florida 32813

Naval Research Laboratory
Underwater Sound Reference Div.
Technical Library
P. O. Box 8117
Orlando, Florida 32806

Naval Underwater Sound Center
Technical Library
New London, Conn. 06320

U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office
Library, Code 1620
Washington, DC 20373

Commander, Marine Corps
Scientific Advisor (Code AX)
Washington, DC 20386

Dr. Gerald M. B. Winkler
Director, Undersea Research
US Naval Observatory
Master Acs. 4140 S. N. W.
Washington, DC 20390

Naval Postgraduate School
Technical Library
Monterey, California 93940

Naval Electronics Laboratory Center
Technical Library
San Diego, California 92152

Naval Electronics Laboratory Center
Technical Library
Attn: Codes: 2212
2200
2210
2220
2230
2240
2250
2260
2270
2280
2290
2300
2310
2320
2330
2340
2350

Naval Undersea Center
Technical Library
San Diego, California 92152

Naval Ship Research and Development
Center
David W. Taylor
Code 122
Bethesda, Maryland 20884

Office of Chief of Naval Operations
NAVICOM/NSR Planning Branch
NCP 9110, Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310

Chief Scientist
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
139 East Broadway
Pasadena, CA 91101

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory
Attn: Reports Library
P. O. Box 1663
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

M. Paul Thurston
Deputy Director Institute for
Complex Systems and Technology
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, DC 20234

Director, Office of Postal
Technology (P and D)
US Postal Service
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway
Bethesda, Maryland 20852

NAEA Lewis Research Center
Attn: Library
13900 Brookpark Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44135

Library 351
Bureau of Standards
Gaithersburg
Gaithersburg, Colorado 80502

MIT Lincoln Laboratory
Attn: Library A 542
P. O. Box 71
Lexington, Mass. 02173

Dr. Jay Harris
Program Director
Division and Areas Program NEF
1800 G Street
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Howard W. Sidel
Deputy Director
Div. of Materials Research NEF
1800 G Street
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Dean Mitchell
Program Director
Solid State Physics
Div. of Materials Research
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street
Washington, DC 20550

Director
Research Laboratory of Electronics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Director
Microelectronics Institute
Polytechnic Institute of New York
Long Island Graduate Center, Route 116
Brookville, New York 11545

Asst. Director
Microelectronics Institute
Polytechnic Institute of New York
131 Jay Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Director
Columbia Radiation Laboratory
Dept. of Physics
Columbia University
138 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

Director
Coordinated Science Laboratory
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61806

Director
Stanford Electronics Laboratory
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Director
Microwave Laboratory
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Director
Electronics Research Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Director
Electronics Sciences Laboratory
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90087

Director
Electronics Research Center
The University of Texas at Austin
Engineering Center, Bldg. 102
Austin, Texas 78712

Director of Laboratories
Div. of Engineering and Appl. Physics
Harvard University
Pierce Hall
Cambridge, Mass. 02138