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ABSTRACT

Most of the approaches available in the literature for the identification of Linear Parameter-Varying (LPV) systems rely on the assumption that only the measurements of the output signal are corrupted by the noise, while the observations of the scheduling variable are considered to be noise free. However, in practice, this turns out to be an unrealistic assumption in most of the cases, as the scheduling variable is often related to a measured signal and, thus, it is inherently affected by a measurement noise. In this paper, it is shown that neglecting the noise on the scheduling signal, which corresponds to an error-in-variables problem, can lead to a significant bias on the estimated parameters. Consequently, in order to overcome this corruptive phenomenon affecting practical use of data-driven LPV modeling, we present an identification scheme to compute a consistent estimate of LPV Input/Output (IO) models from noisy output and scheduling signal observations. A simulation example is provided to prove the effectiveness of the proposed methodology.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The concept of linear parameter-varying (LPV) systems, originally introduced in Shamma and Athans (1990), offers a promising framework for modeling and control of a large class of nonlinear (NL) and time-varying (TV) systems. LPV systems can be seen as an extension of linear time-invariant (LTI) systems, as the dynamic relation between the input and the output signals is linear. Unlike in the LTI case, these signal relations are allowed to change over time and they are assumed to depend on a measurable time-varying signal, commonly referred in the literature as the scheduling variable. Scheduling variables can be external signals like space coordinates, measurable disturbances or changing operating conditions. In this way, the nonlinear and time-varying behavior of the system can be embedded in the solution set of a linear dynamic input–output relationship which varies with the scheduling variable.

The LPV modeling paradigm has evolved rapidly in the last twenty years, and it has been employed in many control applications like aircrafts (Lu, Wu, & Kim, 2006; Marcos & Balas, 2004), automotive systems (Cerone, Piga, & Regruto, 2011a; Corno, Tanelli, Savaresi, & Fabbri, 2011; Novara, Ruiz, & Milanese, 2011; Wei & del Re, 2007), robotic manipulators (Hashemi, Abbas, & Werner, 2012) and induction motors (Prempain, Postlethwaite, & Benchaib, 2002). Motivated by the need of accurate and low-complexity LPV models for control design purposes, significant efforts have been spent in the last years for developing efficient approaches for identification of LPV systems from measured data. In the current literature, the existing LPV identification approaches have been mainly formulated in discrete-time (DT) and they are categorized by the used model structure. In particular, identification schemes for LPV models based on a state-space (SS) representation are discussed in Felici, Van Wingerden, and Verhaegen (2007), Lopes dos Santos, Ramos, and Martins de Carvalho (2008), Mercère, Palsson, and Poinot (2011), Sznider and Mazzaro (2003), van Wingerden and Verhaegen (2009), Verdult and Verhaegen (2005) and Wills and Ninness (2011), identification of LPV models represented in terms...

Most of the LPV identification methods rely on the assumption that only the output measurements are corrupted by noise, while the observations of the scheduling signal are considered to be noise free. However, in practice, this turns out to be an unrealistic assumption in most of the cases, as the scheduling variable is often related to a measured signal and, thus, it is inherently affected by a measurement noise. Assuming noise on the scheduling variables corresponds to a so-called error-in-variables (EIV) problem for which several identification methods have been proposed in the LTI context (Hong, Söderström, & Zheng, 2007; Söderström, 2007; Zheng, 1998). In the LPV setting, in order to model a broader class of behaviors, the dependency on the scheduling variable is mostly considered to be nonlinear. This renders the EIV problem to be more difficult than in the LTI case, since the stochastic noise affecting the scheduling observations is distorted by nonlinear functions. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, the only contributions available in the literature addressing the identification of LPV systems from noise-corrupted measurements of both the output and the scheduling signal are given in Butcher et al. (2008) and Cerone, Piga, and Regruto (2011b, 2013). The methodologies in Cerone et al. (2011b, 2013) focus on the identification of LPV-IO systems in the set-membership (or bounded-error) identification context. Specifically, a convex relaxation approach is used to calculate an outer-bounding box of the so-called feasible parameter set (FPS), that is the set of all system parameters consistent with the measurements, the error bounds, and the assumed model structure, under the assumption that the noise corrupting the output and scheduling signal observations is bounded. The worst-case realization of the noise sequence is computed and hard bounds on the possible values of the model parameters that are consistent with the a priori assumptions are obtained. Unfortunately, the selection of a nominal model within the computed approximation of the FPS remains an open problem. Furthermore, because of high computational complexity, the applicability of the approaches in Cerone et al. (2011b, 2013) is limited to small/medium scale LPV identification problems. The work (Butcher et al., 2008) proposes an instrumental-variable (IV) based approach for identification of LPV-IO systems in a statistical framework. The advantage of using IV-based estimation in the LPV setting is the ability to cope with realistic assumptions on the output noise instead of applying nonlinear optimization. The IV method delivers unbiased estimates for a large generality of noise scenarios with the sole condition that all disturbances can be expressed as a zero mean noise process. Furthermore, refined extension of the IV method in Laurain et al. (2010) offers a solution to minimize the variance of the IV estimate for even Box–Jenkins (BJ) noise models under the condition of noise-free scheduling variables. In case of noisy dependency, it is shown in Butcher et al. (2008) that unbiased estimates can be computed if (i) the instrument is uncorrelated with the scheduling variable noise and (ii) the scheduling dependency is linear. The latter condition limits the applicability of the IV-based scheme in Butcher et al. (2008). Furthermore, as discussed in Laurain et al. (2010), in order to minimize the variance of the IV estimate, the chosen instrument should be correlated with the noise-free output and of the scheduling signal of the data-generating system. Although the refined IV algorithm proposed in Laurain et al. (2010) can be used to iteratively compute an approximation of the noise-free output, computing a variable which is correlated with the noise-free scheduling signal and, at the same time, uncorrelated with the measurement noise, can be a difficult task in many applications, in particular when the scheduling signal is not directly manipulatable.

In this paper, a bias-corrected, IV-based method is developed for the identification of LPV models from noise-corrupted measurements of the output and of the scheduling signal. The noise process associated with the output is assumed to be colored, zero-mean and with unknown distribution, while the measurements of the scheduling signal are supposed to be affected by a white Gaussian noise. The advantages of the proposed method w.r.t. the approach in Butcher et al. (2008) are twofold:

- it provides a consistent estimate of LPV models with polynomial dependence on the scheduling variable;
- the used instrument is only required to be uncorrelated with the noise corrupting the output observations. Thus, an approximation of the noise-free scheduling signal does not need to be computed.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the problem formulation. In Section 3, the asymptotic properties of the IV approach, developed in Butcher et al. (2008), are discussed. A bias-corrected IV-based method is presented in Section 4 to compute a consistent estimate of the system parameters under the assumption that the variance of the noise corrupting the scheduling signal measurements is a priori known. This assumption is relaxed in Section 5 to extend the applicability of the developed method for a more general setting. The effectiveness of the presented identification approach is shown in Section 6 through a simulation example and the obtained results are compared with the ones obtained by the IV method in Butcher et al. (2008).

2. Problem description

2.1. The data-generating system

Consider a discrete-time single-input single-output (SISO) linear-parameter-varying system \( \mathbf{A}_u(p_s(k), q^{-1})y_s(k) = \mathbf{B}_u(p_s(k), q^{-1})u(k) \) (1a),
\[ y(k) = y_s(k) + v_o(k), \] (1b)
where \( u(k) \in \mathbb{R} \) is the input signal, \( p_s(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n \) is the value of the scheduling variable at time \( k, y_s(k) \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( y(k) \in \mathbb{R} \) are the noise-free and the noise-corrupted output, respectively, \( v_o(k) \in \mathbb{R} \) is an additive zero-mean colored noise with bounded spectral density. For the sake of exposition, only the case of scalar scheduling variable \( p_s(k) \) (i.e., \( n_p = 1 \)) will be discussed in this paper. The terms \( \mathbf{A}_u(p_s(k), q^{-1}) \) and \( \mathbf{B}_u(p_s(k), q^{-1}) \) in (1) are polynomials in the backward shift operator \( q^{-1} \) (i.e., \( q^{-1}u(k) = u(k - 1) \)) of finite degree \( n_s \) and \( n_o \), respectively, i.e.,
\[ \mathbf{A}_u(p_s(k), q^{-1}) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} a_i^o(p_s(k))q^{-i}, \] (2a)
\[ \mathbf{B}_u(p_s(k), q^{-1}) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_o} b_j^p(p_s(k))q^{-j}, \] (2b)
where \( a_i^o : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) and \( b_j^p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) are polynomial functions in the scheduling variable \( p_s(k) \) of maximum degree \( n_p \), i.e.,
\[ a_i^o(p_s(k)) = a_i^o,0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} a_{i,i}^o p_s^i(k), \] (3a)
\[ b_j^p(p_s(k)) = b_j^p,0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_o} b_{j,i}^p p_s^i(k), \] (3b)
where $a_s^o \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_s^o \in \mathbb{R}$ (with $s \in \{0, \ldots, n_g\}$) are unknown real constants. For the sake of simplicity, in (3), the polynomials $a_s^o$ and $b_s^o$ are considered with the same degree $n_g$. Nevertheless, the discussion reported in the sequel can be straightforwardly extended to the case when $a_s^o$ and $b_s^o$ have different degrees.

In order to describe the data-generating system $\delta_s$ in a compact form, let us introduce the following matrix notation:

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix}
g(k) \\
p_{1}(k) \\
p_{2}(k) \\
\vdots \\
p_{n}(k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
a_{0}^o \\
\vdots \\
a_{n_g}^o \\
\vdots \\
b_{n_g}^o
\end{bmatrix}^T, \\
\begin{bmatrix}
g(k) \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
p_{n}(k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
a_{0}^o \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
b_{n_g}^o
\end{bmatrix}^T, \\
\begin{bmatrix}
\theta_o(k) \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\theta_n(k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
(\theta_0^o)^T \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
(\theta_{n_g}^o)^T
\end{bmatrix}^T, \\
\begin{bmatrix}
p_o(k) \\
p_1(k) \\
p_2(k) \\
\vdots \\
p_n(k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 \\
p_o(k) \\
p_1^o(k) \\
\vdots \\
p_n^o(k)
\end{bmatrix}^T, \\
\begin{bmatrix}
p_{1}(k) \\
p_{2}(k) \\
p_{3}(k) \\
\vdots \\
p_{n}(k)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
p_o^o(k) \\
p_1^o(k) \\
p_2^o(k) \\
\vdots \\
p_n^o(k)
\end{bmatrix}^T.
\end{align*}
$$

with $\alpha$ and $\beta$ defined similarly as $a_s^o$ and $b_s^o$, and $\phi(k)$ being the observed regressor at time $k$ defined as

$$
\phi(k) = \chi(k) \otimes p(k),
$$

with

$$
\chi(k) = [-y(k-1) \ldots -y(k-n_a) u(k) \ldots u(k-n_b)]^T, \\
p(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 p(k) p^2(k) \ldots p^n(k) \end{bmatrix}^T.
$$

### 2.4. The problem setting

The parameters $\theta_s$ describing the LPV system to be identified, are estimated based on an observed data sequence $\mathcal{D}_N = \{u(k), p(k), y(k)\}_{k=1}^N$ of the system $\delta_s$. The identification scheme developed in this work is based on an appropriate modification of the instrumental-variable approach proposed in Butcher et al. (2008). Before introducing the developed method, the asymptotic behavior of the IV-based estimates for LPV systems is analyzed in the following section.

### 3. Asymptotic behavior of the IV estimate

The basic IV estimate, originally introduced in Söderström and Stoica (1983) for identification of LTI systems and extended to LPV system identification in Butcher et al. (2008), can be seen as a modification of the least-squares (LS) estimate:

$$
\hat{\theta}_{LS} = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \phi(k) \phi^T(k) \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \phi(k) y(k),
$$

with the following expression:

$$
\hat{\theta}_{IV} = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) \phi^T(k) \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) y(k),
$$

where $z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_h}$ is the so-called instrument and it is chosen by the user to satisfy the following conditions:

- C1 $\Gamma_s^{-1} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) \phi^T(k) \right)^{-1}$ exists;
- C2 the instrument $z(k)$ is not correlated with the noise $v_o(k)$ corrupting the output measurements, i.e., $\mathbb{E} \{z(k) v_o(k)\} = 0$ for all $k$.

In order to analyze the asymptotic behavior of the IV estimate $\hat{\theta}_{IV}$, let us first decompose the output signal $y(k)$ as follows:

$$
y(k) = \phi_o^T(k) \theta_o + v_o(k),
$$

where $\theta_o \in \mathbb{R}^{n_o}$, $v_o(k) = \{x_o(k) \otimes p_o(k)\}^T \theta_o + v_o(k)$,

$$
= \left[ x_o(k) \otimes \chi(k) \right]^T \theta_o + \left[ x_o(k) \otimes \chi(k) \right]^T \theta_o + \left[ x_o(k) \otimes \chi(k) \right]^T \theta_o + v_o(k),
$$

$$
= \left( \chi(k) \otimes [p_o(k) - p_o(k)] \right)^T \theta_o + v_o(k) + v_o(k),
$$

$$
= \left( \chi(k) \otimes [p_o(k) - p_o(k)] \right)^T \theta_o + v_o(k) + v_o(k).
$$

Based on Eq. (13), the parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}_{IV}$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$
\hat{\theta}_{IV} = \Gamma_s^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} z(k) y(k),
$$

$$
= \Gamma_s^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} z(k) \chi(k) \otimes p(k)^T \theta_o.
$$
\[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) \left\{ (\chi_0(k) - \chi(k)) \otimes p_0(k) \right\}^\top \theta_0 \] (14b)
\[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) v_0(k) \] (14c)
\[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) \left\{ (p_0(k) - p(k)) \right\}^\top \theta_0. \] (14d)

The asymptotical behavior of each term in Eq. (14) is now analyzed. First, note that, because of the definition of the regressor \( \phi(k) \) (see Eq. (10)), the term (14a) is equal to \( \theta_0 \). As far as the terms (14b) and (14c) are concerned, they converge toward zero as \( N \) goes to infinity. This follows from the fact that \( (\chi_0(k) - \chi(k)) \) and \( v_0(k) \) are zero mean and they are not correlated with the instrument \( z(k) \) (see Butcher et al. 2008 for a rigorous proof). As far as the term (14d) is concerned, this is guaranteed to converge to zero only when \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) and both of the following conditions are fulfilled:

- the coefficient functions \( a_i(p(k)) \) and \( b_i(p(k)) \) depend affinely on the scheduling variable \( p(k) \), i.e., \( \mathbb{E}[ (\chi(k) \otimes (p_0(k) - p(k)) ] = 0 \) since, if \( a_i \) and \( b_i \) are affine functions of \( p(k) \), we have:

\[ \mathbb{E}[ p_0(k) - p(k) ] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\eta_\theta(k) \end{bmatrix} \right] = 0; \] (15)

- the instrument \( z(k) \) is not correlated with the noise \( \eta_\theta(k) \) affecting the scheduling signal measurements, i.e., \( \mathbb{E}[ z(k) \eta_\theta(k) ] = 0 \) for all \( k \), or equivalently, provided that also the above condition and \( C_2 \) are satisfied, \( \mathbb{E}[ z(k) \left\{ \chi(k) \otimes (p_0(k) - p(k)) \right\}^\top ] = 0. \)

Thus, at least one of the above conditions is not satisfied, the term (14d) introduces a bias in the estimate \( \theta_0 \). Note that, in principle, the latter condition is not hard to fulfill since the instrument \( z(k) \) is chosen by the user. However, in practice, in order to reduce the variance of the estimate of the system parameters \( \theta_0 \), the instrument \( z(k) \) should be correlated with the noise-free regressor \( \phi_0(k) \) given by \( \chi_0(k) \otimes p_0(k) \), as discussed in Laurain et al. (2010). Although an approximation of the noise-free output can be obtained through iterative schemes based on simulation of a model of the system to be identified (see, e.g., Laurain et al., 2010), approximating the noise-free scheduling signal \( p_0(k) \) is not an easy task. In order to overcome such a problem, two realizations of \( p(k) \) are used in Butcher et al. (2008).

In the following section, we propose an algorithm to eliminate the bias introduced by the term in (14d). This allows to compute a consistent estimate for LPV systems under the conditions that: (i) the scheduling signal observations \( p(k) \) are corrupted by noise; (ii) the coefficient functions \( a_i(p(k)) \) and \( b_i(p(k)) \) depend polynomially on \( p(k) \); (iii) only one noise-corrupted measurement of \( p_0(k) \) is available.

4. A bias-corrected IV estimate

4.1. Construction of a consistent estimate

Denote with \( B_\Delta(\theta_0, p, p_0) \) the term in (14d), i.e., let

\[ B_\Delta(\theta_0, p, p_0) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \left\{ z(k) \left\{ (\chi_0(k) - \chi(k)) \otimes (p_0(k) - p(k)) \right\}^\top \theta_0 \right. \] (16)

The term \( B_\Delta(\theta_0, p, p_0) \) will be referred in the sequel as structural bias. Note that \( B_\Delta(\theta_0, p, p_0) \) depends both on the true system parameters \( \theta_0 \) and on the noise-free observations \( p_0(k) \) of the scheduling signal. As a consequence, \( B_\Delta(\theta_0, p, p_0) \) cannot be computed from the observations \( D_N = \{ u(k), p(k), y(k) \}_{k=1}^{N} \) and thus it cannot be directly subtracted from the estimate \( \hat{\theta}_N \).

Instead, inspired by (14), the following corrected IV estimate is introduced:

\[ \hat{\theta}_{IV} = \hat{\theta}_N - B_\Delta(\hat{\theta}_{IV}, p, p_0), \] (17)

where \( B_\Delta(\hat{\theta}_{IV}, p, p_0) \) is (16) evaluated at \( \hat{\theta}_{IV} \) (instead of \( \theta_0 \)) and the instruments \( z(k) \) are chosen according to conditions \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \).

Algebraic manipulations of Eq. (17) lead to

\[ \hat{\theta}_{IV} = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) \left\{ \chi(k) \otimes p_0(k) \right\}^\top \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{z(k)y(k)}{N}. \] (18)

Property 1. Let us assume that the following limit exists:

\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) \left\{ \chi(k) \otimes p_0(k) \right\}^\top \right)^{-1} \sim \theta_0 \text{ w.p. } 1. \] (19)

Then, \( \hat{\theta}_{IV} \) is a consistent estimate of the true parameters \( \theta_0 \), that is:

\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} \hat{\theta}_{IV} = \theta_0 \text{ w.p. } 1. \] (20)

Proof. See Appendix A.1.

Note that, unlike the structural bias \( B_\Delta(\theta_0, p, p_0) \), the correction term \( B_\Delta(\hat{\theta}_{IV}, p, p_0) \) does not depend on the true parameter vector \( \theta_0 \). However, \( \hat{\theta}_{IV} \) cannot be computed since \( B_\Delta(\hat{\theta}_{IV}, p, p_0) \) depends on the noise-free observations \( p_0(k) \) of the scheduling variable. In order to overcome such a problem, the estimate \( \hat{\theta}_{IV} \) (Eq. (18)) is modified by replacing each matrix \( \Omega_k := z(k) \chi(k) \otimes p_0(k) \) by \( p_0(k) \) for \( k \in I_N := \{1, \ldots, N \} \) with a matrix \( \Psi_k \) (constructed through the procedure described in Section 4.2) satisfying the following properties:

- \( C_3 \) for all \( k \in I_N \), the matrix \( \Psi_k \) does not depend on the noise-free scheduling signal \( p_0(k) \), but only on the noisy observations \( p(k) \) and on the variance \( \sigma_z^2 \) of the noise corrupting these measurements.

\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) \chi(k) \otimes p_0(k) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \Psi_k \] w.p. 1.

4.2. Construction of the matrices \( \Psi_k \)

Under the assumption that the variance \( \sigma_z^2 \) of the noise corrupting the scheduling signal observations is known, the matrices \( \Psi_k \) satisfying conditions \( C_3 \) and \( C_4 \) can be constructed through the following procedure (inspired by Piga & Töth, 2014):

(i) For each \( k \in I_N \), compute the analytical expression of the matrix \( \mathbb{E}[\Omega_k | y_N] \), which denotes the conditional expected value of the matrix \( \Omega_k = z(k) \chi(k) \otimes p_0(k) \) given the output observation sequence \( y_N = \{ y(k) \}_{k=1}^{N} \). Note that, since each component of \( p_0(k) \) is a polynomial in \( p(k) \), the entries of \( \mathbb{E}[\Omega_k | y_N] \) are described by an affine combination of the monomials \( p_0(k), p_0^2(k), p_0^3(k), \ldots \).

(ii) For each monomial \( p_0(k), p_0^2(k), p_0^3(k), \ldots \), compute the coefficients \( \alpha_0(k), \alpha_0^2(k), \alpha_0^3(k), \ldots \) satisfying the following properties:

- \( \alpha_0(k) = E \{ p(k) \} \)
- \( \alpha_0^2(k) = E \{ p^2(k) \} \)
- \( \alpha_0^3(k) = E \{ p^3(k) \} \)
- \( \ldots \)
The coefficients $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \ldots$ are computed in a recursive way. Consider first $\alpha_1(k)$. Then,
\[ p_0(k) = E \{ p(k) + \alpha_1(k) \} \]
\[ = E \{ p_0(k) + p_0(k) + \alpha_1(k) \} \]
\[ = p_0(k) + E \{ \alpha_1(k) \}. \]
Eq. (21) implies that $E \{ \alpha_1(k) \} = 0$ and $p_0(k) = E \{ p(k) \}$. Thus, a possible choice of $\alpha_1(k)$ is $\alpha_1(k) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_1^\infty$. For $\alpha_2$, we have:
\[ p_0^2(k) = E \{ p^2(k) + 2 \alpha_2(k) \} \]
\[ = E \{ (p_0(k) + \eta_0(k))^2 + 2 \alpha_2(k) \} \]
\[ = p_0^2(k) + 2 \sigma_\eta^2 + E \{ \alpha_2(k) \}. \]
Therefore, a possible choice of $\alpha_2(k)$ is $\alpha_2(k) = -\sigma_\eta^2$, which provides $p_0^2(k) = E \{ p^2(k) \} - \sigma_\eta^2$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_1^\infty$.

In case $d > 2$, the values of $\alpha_i(k)$ can be recursively computed on the basis of the (previously computed) unbiased estimates of $p_0(k), p_0^2(k), \ldots, p_0^{d-1}(k)$. For instance, for $d = 3$, a possible choice of $\alpha_3(k)$ can be computed as follows:
\[ p_0^3(k) = E \{ p^3(k) + 3 \alpha_3(k) \} \]
\[ = E \{ (p_0(k) + \eta_0(k))^3 + 3 \alpha_3(k) \} \]
\[ = p_0^3(k) + 3 \sigma_\eta^2 k + E \{ \alpha_3(k) \}. \]
Eq. (23) implies that $\alpha_3(k)$ should be such that:
\[ E \{ \alpha_3(k) \} = -3 \sigma_\eta^2. \]
Since, based on the previous computation, $p_0(k) = E \{ p(k) \}$, from Eq. (24) we get:
\[ E \{ \alpha_3(k) \} = -3 E \{ p(k) \} \sigma_\eta^2 = E \{ -3 p(k) \sigma_\eta^2 \}. \]
This means that a possible choice for $\alpha_3(k)$ is $\alpha_3(k) = -3 p(k) \sigma_\eta^2$. Thus,
\[ p_0^3(k) = E \{ p^3(k) - 3 p(k) \sigma_\eta^2 \} \]
for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_1^\infty$.

(iii) The matrix $\Psi_k$ is obtained by replacing, in the analytical expression of $E \{ \Omega_k \mid y_N \}$, the monomials $p_0(k), p_0^2(k), p_0^3(k), \ldots$, with $p(k) + \alpha_1(k), p^2(k) + \alpha_2(k), p^3(k) + \alpha_3(k), \ldots$.

An illustrative example of the construction of the matrices $\Psi_k$ is reported in Appendix A.4.

Remark 1. Note that the structure of the matrices $\Psi_k$ only depends on the monomials used to parameterize the $p$-dependent coefficient functions $a_i$ and $b_i$ in (7).

Remark 2. The assumption that the noise $\eta_0$ corrupting the scheduling signal has a Gaussian distribution is only required for the computation of the $\alpha_i$ coefficients in the construction of the matrices $\Psi_k$. In case of other distributions, the statistical moments of $\eta_0$ are required to construct $\Psi_k$. Therefore, the Gaussian distribution assumption can be relaxed by assuming that the moment-generating function of $\eta_0$ is known or can be estimated.

Remark 3. By construction, the matrix $\Psi_k$ satisfies the following condition for all $k = 1, \ldots, N$:
\[ E \{ \Omega_k \mid y_N \} = E \{ \Psi_k \mid y_N \}. \]

Property 2. The computed matrices $\Psi_k$ satisfy conditions C3 and C4 under the assumption that the amplitude of the measured output and of the scheduling signal is bounded, i.e., there exists $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that: $\|y\|_\infty < C$ and $\|p_0\|_\infty < C$, where $\| \cdot \|_\infty$ denotes the $\ell_\infty$-norm of a signal.

Proof. See Appendix A.2.

4.3. A consistent data-dependent parameter estimate

The matrix $\Psi_k$ represents the expectation of $\Omega_k$ and it is constructed by using the available observations of $p(k)$ and the knowledge of the variance $\sigma_\eta^2$ of the noise corrupting these observations.

Thus, the new corrected IV estimate $\hat{\theta}_{\text{CIV}}$ is given by replacing in (18) the term $\Omega_k = z(k) [x(k) \otimes p_0(k)]^T$ with its expected value $\Psi_k$, i.e.,
\[ \hat{\theta}_{\text{CIV}} = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \Psi_k \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) y(k) \frac{1}{N}. \]

Property 3. Let us assume that the limit in Eq. (19) exists. Then, $\hat{\theta}_{\text{CIV}}$ is a consistent estimate of the true parameters $\theta_o$ that is:
\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} \hat{\theta}_{\text{CIV}} = \theta_o \text{ w.p. 1}. \]

Proof. See Appendix A.3.

4.4. Choice of the instrument $z(k)$

As discussed in the previous section, the instrument $z(k)$ used to compute $\hat{\theta}_{\text{CIV}}$ (Eq. (27)) has to satisfy condition C2, which means that $z(k)$ has to be chosen by the user so that it is independent of the output noise realization $v_o(k)$. It is worth pointing out that, in case the scheduling signal measurements are not affected by noise, the optimal instrument $z(k)$ minimizing the asymptotic covariance matrix of the estimated parameters is given by the noise-free regressor (Laurain et al., 2010), i.e.,
\[ z(k) = \phi_h(k) = x_o(k) \otimes p_o(k). \]

Consequently, the instrument chosen to address the bias-corrected IV solution is inspired by the instrument proposed in the LPV identification setting with noise-free scheduling parameter. More precisely, the variable $z(k)$ is chosen to be maximally correlated with the noise-free part of the sample $\phi_h(k)$. Note that neither $x_o(k)$ nor $p_o(k)$ is available in practice. Nevertheless, since $z(k)$ is not required to be uncorrelated with the noise $v_o(k)$ affecting the scheduling signal measurements, the following instrument can be used to approximate the optimal instrument in (29):
\[ z(k) = \hat{x}(k) \otimes p(k), \]
where
\[ \hat{x}(k) = [-\hat{y}(k-1), \ldots, -\hat{y}(k-n_a), u(k), \ldots, u(k-n_b)]^T, \]
with $\hat{y}(k-1), \ldots, \hat{y}(k-n_a)$ being an approximation of the noise-free output samples $y_o(k-1), \ldots, y_o(k-n_a)$ obtained, for instance, by simulating an estimated model of the system. This choice of the instrument resembles the widely used IV solution for linear regression (Ljung, 1999; Söderström & Stoica, 1983). The following iterative algorithm can be implemented in order to mitigate the effect of the estimated noiseless signals on the IV scheme and hence “maximize” the accuracy of the IV solution by iteratively refining the instruments.

5. Estimation with unknown noise variance

The application of the proposed identification approach is limited, in principle, to the case when the variance $\sigma_\eta^2$ of the noise $\eta_0(k)$ affecting the scheduling signal measurements is known. In this section, we present an approach to extend the applicability of the developed identification procedure to the case when $\sigma_\eta^2$ is not a-priori available.

In order to estimate the noise variance $\sigma_\eta^2$, an additional equation relating $\sigma_\eta^2$ and the system parameters $\theta_o$ is required. Inspired
Algorithm 1 Recursive IV scheme

1: set \( \tau \leftarrow 0 \).
2: compute the LS parameter estimate \( \hat{\theta}_{LS} \) via (11), resulting in the biased model estimate \( \mathcal{M}^{(0)} \).
3: repeat
4: set \( \tau \leftarrow \tau + 1 \)
5: use \( \mathcal{M}^{(\tau-1)} \) and the sequence \( \{u(k), p(k)\}_{k=1}^{N} \) to generate, by simulation, \( \{\tilde{y}(k)\}_{k=1}^{N} \).
6: calculate \( z(k)_{k=1}^{N} \) via (30) using \( \{u(k), p(k), \tilde{y}(k)\}_{k=1}^{N} \).
7: estimate \( \hat{\theta}_{\text{IV}}^{(\tau)} \) via (27), resulting in the model estimate \( \mathcal{M}^{(\tau)} \).
8: until \( \hat{\theta}_{\text{IV}}^{(\tau)} \) has converged or the maximum number of iterations is reached.
9: return parameter estimate \( \hat{\theta}_{\text{IV}}^{(\tau)} \).

by the papers (Hong et al., 2007; Zheng, 1998), where bias-eliminated least-squares algorithms for identification of LTI systems in the EIV framework are discussed, let us introduce the following augmented vectors:

\[
\theta_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_0^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T, \\
\tilde{z}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{z}(k)^T & (u(k) - (n_b + 1)p)^p(k) \end{bmatrix}^T = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{z}(k) \otimes p(k) \end{bmatrix}^T u(k) - (n_b + 1) \end{bmatrix}^T, \\
\text{and the augmented matrices } \tilde{\Psi}_k \text{ with } k \in \mathbb{N}_n, \text{ which are constructed in order to satisfy the condition:}
\]

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \tilde{z}(k) \rightleftharpoons \begin{bmatrix} \chi(k) \otimes p(k) \end{bmatrix}^T u(k) - (n_b + 1) p(k) \rightleftharpoons 1. \tag{31}
\]

Eq. (31) follows from the fact that

\[
y(k) = \left[ \chi_0 \right] (k) \otimes p(k) \rightleftharpoons \theta_0 \rightleftharpoons v_o(k) + v_o(k) = \left[ \chi_0 \right] (k) \otimes p(k) \rightleftharpoons u(k) - (n_b + 1) p(k) \rightleftharpoons v_o(k) \rightleftharpoons v_o(k).
\]

Eq. (31) provides an (asymptotic) additional relation between the noise variance \( \sigma_e^2 \) (which appears in the construction of \( \tilde{\Psi}_k \)) and the true system parameters \( \theta_0 \). Specifically, an estimate of the noise variance \( \sigma_e^2 \) and the system parameters \( \theta_0 \) can be computed by combining Eqs. (27) and (31) for finite \( N \). This leads to the set of bilinear equations in the variables \( (\theta, \sigma^2) \):

\[
\theta = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \tilde{\Psi}_k \sigma^2 \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{z(k)y(k)}{N}, \\
\left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k)y(k) \right]_{n_b+1} = \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \tilde{\Psi}_k \sigma^2 \right] \begin{bmatrix} \theta_0 \end{bmatrix}_{n_b+1}, \tag{32b}
\]

where the symbol \( \tilde{\Psi}_k(\sigma^2) \) has been used to highlight that the matrix \( \tilde{\Psi}_k \) depends on the chosen noise variance \( \sigma^2 \). In (32b), \( [\cdot]_i \) denotes the \( i \)-th component of a vector. This means that, for finite \( N \), (32b) is the last equation of the system of equations in (31). Indeed, as \( N \to \infty \), the pair \( (\theta, \sigma^2) \) becomes a solution of the set of equations in (32). The solution of (32) can be easily computed through a grid over different noise variances, as described in the following:

- (i) Generate a set \( \{\sigma^2_i\}_{i=1}^{M} \) of \( M \) equally-spaced points in the interval \([0, \sigma^2_0]\), with \( \sigma^2_0 \) being an upper bound of the expected noise variance \( \sigma_e^2 \).
- (ii) For all the points \( \{\sigma^2_i\}_{i=1}^{M} \) generated at step (i), compute \( \hat{\theta}(i) \) through Eq. (32a) with \( \sigma^2 = \sigma^2_i \) i.e.,

\[
\hat{\theta}(i) = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \tilde{\Psi}_k(\sigma^2_i) \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k)y(k)/N.
\]

- (iii) Among the \( M \) parameter vectors \( \hat{\theta}(i) \) computed at step (ii), the estimate \( \hat{\theta}_{\text{IV}} \) is given by the vector \( \hat{\theta}(i) \) which satisfies Eq. (32) with the least error.

Remark 4. The identification approach developed in the paper can be extended, in principle, to the case of multidimensional scheduling variable \( p_n(k) \) i.e., \( n_p > 1 \), at the cost of increasing the computational complexity. As a matter of fact, increasing the dimension of the scheduling variable \( p_n(k) \) requires to consider a larger number of monomials to characterize the \( p \)-dependent coefficient functions \( a_i(p(k)) \) and \( b_j(p(k)) \) in (7). As a consequence, the construction of the matrices \( \Psi_k \) and \( \tilde{\Psi}_k \) requires to compute a larger number of coefficients \( a_i(k) \). Furthermore, in order to solve Eqs. (32), a gridding of an \( n_p \)-dimensional box should be performed. Thus, in case the variance of the noise corrupting the scheduling observations is unknown, the computational complexity of the developed algorithm increases exponentially with \( n_p \).

6. Simulation example

The purpose of this section is to demonstrate the performance of the developed identification approach through a numerical example and to show how the noise on the measurements of the scheduling signal can deteriorate the estimate of the system parameters, if the bias-correction scheme is not applied.

6.1. Data-generating system and model structure

The considered data-generating system \( \delta_0 \) is described by (1)-(3) with

\[
a_1^1(p_0(k)) = 1 - 0.5p_0(k) - 0.3p_0^2(k), \tag{33a}
\]

\[
a_2^1(p_0(k)) = 0.5 - 0.7p_0(k) - 0.5p_0^2(k), \tag{33b}
\]

\[
b_1^1(p_0(k)) = 0.5 - 0.4p_0(k) + 0.1p_0^2(k), \tag{33c}
\]

\[
b_2^1(p_0(k)) = 0.2 - 0.3p_0(k) - 0.2p_0^2(k). \tag{33d}
\]

In this example, we will focus on the comparison between the developed bias-correction approach and the IV based approach proposed in Butcher et al. (2008), hence the data-generating system is assumed to belong to the chosen model class. The following LPV model structure is used:

\[
y(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} a_i(p(k), \theta) y(k - i) + \sum_{j=1}^{2} b_j(p(k), \theta) u(k - j) + \varepsilon(k).
\]

The functions \( a_i \) and \( b_j \) are parameterized as follows:

\[
a_1(p(k), \theta) = a_{1,0} + a_{1,1}p(k) + a_{1,2}p^2(k), \tag{34a}
\]

\[
a_2(p(k), \theta) = a_{2,0} + a_{2,1}p(k) + a_{2,2}p^2(k), \tag{34b}
\]

\[
b_1(p(k), \theta) = b_{1,0} + b_{1,1}p(k) + b_{1,2}p^2(k), \tag{34c}
\]

\[
b_2(p(k), \theta) = b_{2,0} + b_{2,1}p(k) + b_{2,2}p^2(k). \tag{34d}
\]
The input \( u(k) \) is taken as a white-noise sequence with uniform distribution \( \mathcal{U}(0, 1) \) and length \( N = 4000 \), while the noise-free scheduling signal \( p_k(k) \) is given by:

\[
p_k(k) = 0.2 + 0.4 \sin(0.035\pi k) + \delta(k),
\]

with \( \delta(k) \) being a random variable with uniform distribution \( \mathcal{U}(0, 0.3) \). The noises \( \nu_\theta(k) \) and \( \nu_p(k) \) corrupting the output and the scheduling signal measurements, respectively, are white Gaussian noise processes with standard deviation \( \sigma_\nu = 0.08 \) and \( \sigma_p = 0.10 \). This corresponds to the following signal-to-noise-ratios:

\[
\text{SNR}_\text{y} = 10 \log \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N} (y_k(k) - \bar{y}_k)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} (\nu_\theta^2(k))} = 17 \text{ dB},
\]

\[
\text{SNR}_p = 10 \log \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N} (p_k(k) - \bar{p}_k)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} (\eta_\nu^2(k))} = 21 \text{ dB},
\]

with \( \bar{y}_k \) and \( \bar{p}_k \) denoting the mean value of the noise-free output and scheduling signal, respectively. Note that, since \( \nu_\theta(k) \) is white, the data-generating system (1) is an LPV system with an output-error type of model structure. In order to empirically study the statistical properties of the developed bias-correction scheme, a Monte Carlo study with \( N_{\text{MC}} = 100 \) runs with new input, scheduling variable and noise realizations in each run is carried out.

6.2. Obtained results

The model parameters \( \theta \) are computed with the following three approaches:

- IV based approach (Butcher et al., 2008);
- Bias-corrected IV identification approach with known noise variance \( \sigma_\nu^2 \);
- Bias-corrected IV identification approach with unknown noise variance \( \sigma_\nu^2 \). The parameter estimate \( \hat{\theta}_{\text{CV}} \) is then computed through the procedure discussed at the end of Section 5, by setting the upper bound \( \bar{a}_\nu^2 \) on the noise variance equal to 0.2, and by gridding the interval \([0, \bar{a}_\nu^2] \) with \( M = 100 \) equidistant points.

The obtained results are reported in Table 1, which shows the average of the estimated parameters and their standard deviation over the 100 Monte Carlo runs. Table 1 shows that the estimate of the system parameters is very sensitive to the noise on the scheduling signal measurements. As a matter of fact, although the SNR on the scheduling signal measurements is relatively moderate (21 dB), the IV based identification approach in Butcher et al. (2008) provides a biased parameter estimate, with a bias which, in some cases, has the same magnitude as the true value of the parameters (see, e.g., the estimate of the parameters \( a_{1,1} \), \( a_{2,2} \), \( b_{1,1} \) and \( b_{2,2} \)). On the other hand, in line with the theory, the bias-corrected IV method proposed in the paper provides an unbiased estimate of the true system parameters \( \theta_o \), also when the noise variance is unknown.

The performance of the IV based approach (Butcher et al., 2008) and the bias-corrected IV identification approach with unknown noise variance \( \sigma_\nu^2 \) is also tested on a noiseless validation data sequence of length \( N_{\text{val}} = 200 \). The true output \( y_o \) and the simulated output sequences \( \hat{y} \) of the estimated models are plotted in Fig. 1(a)–(b), while the error between the true output \( y_o(k) \) and the estimated output \( \hat{y}(k) \) is plotted in Fig. 1(c)–(d). The best fit rate (BFR) and the mean squared error (MSE), defined as

\[
\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} (y_o(k) - \hat{y}(k))^2,
\]

\[
\text{BFR} = \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{\|y_o(k) - \hat{y}(k)\|_2}{\|y_o(k) - y_o\|_2}, 0 \right\} \cdot 100\%.
\]

and computed on the simulated response \( \hat{y} \) of the estimated models, are reported in Table 2. The obtained results show that the bias-corrected identification algorithm significantly outperforms the standard IV approach.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, a solution has been proposed for the challenging problem of LPV system identification under the realistic assumption of noise-corrupted measurements of the scheduling variable.
In order to prove Property 1, the following necessary results coming from the application of the results presented in Butcher et al. (2008) are first reported:

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) \left[ (\chi_\theta(k) - \chi(k)) \otimes \mathbf{p}_\theta(k) \right]^\top = 0, \quad (38a)
\]

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) v_\nu(k) = 0, \quad (38b)
\]

with probability 1. Eqs. (38a) and (38b) hold since \(\chi_\theta(k) - \chi(k)\) and \(v_\nu(k)\) are zero mean and both of them are not correlated with the instrument \(z(k)\).

Property 1 is now proven. Substitution of Eq. (13) into (18) leads to:

\[
\hat{\theta}_{\text{IV}} = R(\mathbf{p}_\theta)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} z(k) \left[ (\chi_\theta(k) - \chi(k)) \otimes \mathbf{p}_\theta(k) \right]^\top \theta_\nu \quad (39a)
\]

\[
+ R(\mathbf{p}_\theta)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} z(k) v_\nu(k) \quad (39b)
\]

\[
+ R(\mathbf{p}_\theta)^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k) [\chi(k) \otimes \mathbf{p}_\theta(k)]^\top \theta_\nu. \quad (39c)
\]

From (38a) and (38b), Eqs. (39a) and (39b) converge to zero as \(N \to \infty\). This implies (20).

A.2. Proof of Property 2

The matrices \(\Psi_k\) satisfy condition C3 by construction. In order to prove that \(\Psi_k\) satisfies also condition C4, the following necessary lemma coming from a direct application of Ninness’ strong law of large numbers (Ninness, 2000) is first presented.

Lemma 1 (Ninness’ Strong Law of Large Numbers Ninness, 2000). Let \(\{v(t)\}\) be a sequence of random variables with arbitrary correlation structure (not necessarily stationary) that is characterized by the
existence of a finite value $C$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} E \{v(t)v(s)\} < CN.$$  

(40)

Then,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^{N} v(t) \overset{a.s.}{\longrightarrow} 0 \quad \text{as} \quad N \to \infty. \quad \blacksquare$$  

(41)

Property 2 will now be proven. Let us denote with $[i,j]$ the $(i,j)$-th entry of a matrix. Let us define the variable $v_{ij}(k)$ as follows:

$$[\Psi_k - z(k)(\chi(k) \otimes p_o(k))^\top]_{ij} = v_{ij}(k).$$  

(42)

By construction of the matrix $\Psi_k$ (see Remark 3), we have:

$$E \{v_{ij}(k) | y_N\} = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad k = 1, \ldots, N.$$  

(43)

Moreover, since the noise process $\eta_k$ corrupting the scheduling signal observations is white, we have:

$$E \{v_{ij}(k)v_{ij}(t) | y_N\} = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad k, t \geq 0, k \neq t.$$  

(44)

Note also that, since the output signal $y(k)$ and the scheduling variable $p_o(k)$ are assumed to be bounded, $E \{v_{ij}(k)v_{ij}(k) | y_N\}$ is bounded for any index-pair $k > 0$, i.e., there exists a positive constant $G_{ij}$ such that

$$E \{v_{ij}(k)v_{ij}(k) | y_N\} < G_{ij} \quad \text{for all} \quad k > 0.$$  

(45)

Based on the above considerations, we have:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{N} E \{v_{ij}(k)v_{ij}(t) | y_N\} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} E \{v_{ij}(k)v_{ij}(k) | y_N\} < G_{ij}N.$$  

(46)

Therefore, from Lemma 1, it follows

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} v_{ij}(k) \overset{a.s.}{\longrightarrow} 0 \quad \text{as} \quad N \to \infty,$$

or equivalently, (see Eq. (42))

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \Psi_k \right]_{ij} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N} z(k)(\chi(k) \otimes p_o(k))^\top \right]_{ij} \quad \text{w.p. 1.}$$

A.3. Proof of Property 3

Property 3 is proven similarly to Property 1. More specifically, let us decompose the estimate $\hat{\theta}_{\text{CV}}$ as follows:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{CV}} = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \Psi_k \right]^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} z(k) \times \left[ (\chi \sigma - \chi(k) \otimes p_o(k))^\top \theta_0 \right]$$

(47a)

$$+ \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \Psi_k \right]^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} z(k)v_o(k)$$

(47b)

$$+ \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \Psi_k \right]^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} z(k)[\chi(k) \otimes p_o(k)]^\top \theta_o.$$  

(47c)

From (38a) and (38b), Eqs. (47a) and (47b) converge to zero as $N \to \infty$. Furthermore, since the matrices $\Psi_k$ are constructed in order to satisfy condition C4, the term in (47c) converges to $\theta_o$ as $N \to \infty$. This implies (28).

A.4. Construction of the matrices $\Psi_k$: an illustrative example

Consider an LPV data-generating system $\delta$ of the form:

$$y_o(k) = -a_{1,2}p_o^2(k)y_o(k-1) + b_{0,2}p_o^2(k)u(k),$$

$$y(k) = y_o(k) + v_o(k),$$

$$p(k) = p_o(k) + \eta_o(k).$$

Then, according to the definitions used in the paper, we have:

$$\chi(k) = [-y(k-1) u(k)]^\top,$$

$$p(k) = p^2(k), \quad p_o(k) = p_o^2(k),$$

$$\chi(k) \otimes p_o(k) = [-y(k-1) u(k)p_o^2(k)]^\top,$$

and

$$z(k) = [-y(k-1) u(k)p^2(k)]^\top,$$

where $y(k-1)$ is the instrument and it is chosen to be uncorrelated with the noise process $v_o(k)$.

Then, the matrix $z(k)(\chi(k) \otimes p_o(k))^\top$ is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\hat{y}(k-1)y(k-1)p_o^2(k)p_o^2(k)
-u(k)y(k-1)p_o^2(k)p_o^2(k)
\end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\hat{y}(k-1)y(k-1)
-u(k)y(k-1)
\end{pmatrix}^\top.$$  

(47d)

Since

$$p_o^2(k) = E \{p^2(k) - \sigma_p^2 \},$$

and

$$p^2(k) = E \{p^4(k) - 3\sigma_p^4 + 6\sigma_p^2\sigma_o^2 \},$$

then, the matrix $\Psi_k$ with $k = 1, \ldots, N$, is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\hat{y}(k-1)y(k-1)
-u(k)y(k-1)
\end{pmatrix}^\top.$$  
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