STATE-SPACE MODELLING OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL VECTOR-EXPONENTIAL TRAJECTORIES

P. RAPISARDA[*] AND A.C. ANTOULAS[†]

Abstract. We solve two problems in modelling polynomial vector-exponential trajectories dependent on two independent variables. In the first one we assume that the data-generating system has no inputs, and we compute a state representation of the Most Powerful Unfalsified Model for this data. In the second instance we assume that the data-generating system is controllable and quarter-plane causal, and we compute a Roesser i/s/o model. We provide procedures for solving these identification problems, both based on the factorization of constant matrices directly constructed from the data, from which state trajectories can be computed.

Key words. multidimensional systems, most powerful unfalsified model, Roesser models, bilinear differential forms

AMS subject classifications. 93A30, 93B15, 93B20, 93B30, 93C20

1. Introduction. We consider two problems in modelling two-dimensional ($2D$ in the following) continuous trajectories from data. In both cases the data consistis of polynomial vector-exponential trajectories, and we seek *state-space models* explaining it, i.e. systems of partial differential equations of first order in an auxiliary, "state" variable, and zeroth-order in the measured, "external" variable. The two situations differ in the model class we assume the data-generating system belongs to: in the first case we seek an *autonomous* state model , i.e. a system without inputs; in the second one we assume that an input/output partition of the external variable is given, and we compute an *input-state-output* (i/s/o in the following) model.

Modelling $2D$ polynomial vector-exponential trajectories with autonomous systems has been considered in [32, 33], on whose results the first part of this paper on the computation of autonomous models heavily relies. Modelling vector-exponential trajectories with transfer-function (i.e. input-output) models is closely related to two-variable rational interpolation; the latter has been investigated in the SISO case in [2]. The approach taken in the present paper differs fundamentally from those: we use data to first compute state trajectories corresponding to it, and in a second stage we compute a state representation for the data and the identified state trajectories by solving linear equations in the unknown state-, input- and output matrices.

Modelling methodologies where state-trajectories are computed from data and state-equations are subsequently computed are well-known in the $1D$ case as *subspace identification* methods (see e.g. [12]). Such ideas have been pursued much less frequently in the $2D$ case: see [7, 19] for a pioneering subspace-identification approach to the computation of i/s/o representations of denominator-separable $2D$ discrete-systems from data. Our modelling approach differs essentially from those, in that it does not exploit the shift-invariance properties of data trajectories, but rather the fact that *external properties*- i.e. properties at the level of external variables, in our case *duality*- are reflected into *internal properties*- i.e. at the level of state. To make the connection between internal and external properties conceptually and computationally accessible we use constant matrices associated with bilinear forms on the system

[*]Vision, Learning and Control Group, School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, SO17 1BJ Southampton, UK, `pr3@ecs.soton.ac.uk`

[†]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Rice University, Houston, TX 77005, USA, `aca@rice.edu` and Jacobs University Bremen, School of Engineering and Science, Bremen, Germany

variables and their derivatives. Our approach is related to the 1D *Loewner frame-work*; we refer to [3, 20] for an introduction to the Loewner framework close in spirit to the ideas illustrated in this paper.

In section 2 we state two modelling problems, and we discuss some of their features and relations with previous work. In section 3 we gather the necessary background material. We illustrate our approach to the computation of state representations for the autonomous case in section 4, where we also state an algorithm to compute a minimal state representation for such models. In section 5 we discuss our framework for the solution of the input-state-output modelling problem. Section 6 contains our concluding remarks, including an overview of issues of current research.

Notation. We denote by $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ the set of all $m \times n$ matrices with entries in $\mathbb{C}$. $\mathbb{C}^{\bullet \times n}$ denotes the set of matrices with n columns and an unspecified (finite) number of rows. Given $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, we denote by A^* its conjugate transpose, and by $A^\dagger$ its Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse. If A, B are matrices with the same number of columns, $\mathrm{col}(A, B)$ is the matrix obtained stacking A on top of B. $\mathbb{C}[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ is the ring of bivariate polynomials in the indeterminates ξ_1, ξ_2 with complex co-efficients, and $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ that of $m \times n$ bivariate polynomial matrices. Similarly, $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$ is the ring of $m \times n$ polynomial matrices in the indeterminates ζ_1, ζ_2, η_1, η_2. $\mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}})$ denotes the space of $\mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}}$-valued smooth functions defined on $\mathbb{R}^2$. $e^{\lambda_1 \cdot} e^{\lambda_2 \cdot}$ denotes the function from $\mathbb{R}^2$ to C whose value at (t_1, t_2) is $e^{\lambda_1 t_1} e^{\lambda_2 t_2}$.

2. Problem statement. We are given a finite set of $2D$ polynomial vector-exponential trajectories $w_i(\cdot, \cdot)$, whose value at (t_1, t_2) is

$$(2.1) \qquad w_i(t_1, t_2) := \sum_{k_1=0}^{L_1^i} \sum_{k_2=0}^{L_2^i} \overline{w_{k_1, k_2}^i} t_1^{k_1} t_2^{k_2} e^{\lambda_1^i t_1} e^{\lambda_2^i t_2} \ , \ i = 1, \dots, N$$

where $\overline{w_{k_1, k_2}^i} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}}$, $k_\ell = 0, \dots, L_\ell^i$, $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\lambda_j^i \in \mathbb{C}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, $j = 1, 2$, and t_1 and t_2 are two independent continuous variables. In the following we state *two identification problems* that differ from each other in the underlying assumptions on the model class the system generating the data (2.1) belongs to.

2.1. The autonomous case. It has been shown in [32] that the data (2.1) can be modelled by the *Most Powerful Unfalsified Model* (*MPUM*), i.e. the smallest linear subspace $\mathfrak{B}^* \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}})$ closed under differentiation that contains the trajectories (2.1). *Ibid.* it is shown that the MPUM for (2.1) is *autonomous*: there are no *free* components in w, i.e. components which can take arbitrary values in $\mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}})$; moreover, the MPUM is *finite-dimensional* as a subspace of $\mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}})$.

In the proof of Th. 3 of [32] an algorithm ultimately based on commutative algebra is provided to construct a *state-representation* of the MPUM, i.e. to compute $\mathtt{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ and matrices $A_i \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{n} \times \mathtt{n}}$, $i = 1, 2$ and $C \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{n}}$ such that the MPUM is

$$\mathfrak{B}^* := \big\{ w \in \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}}) \mid \exists \, x \in \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{n}})$$

$$(2.2) \qquad \text{s.t. } \frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} x = A_i x, i = 1, 2 \text{ and } w = Cx \big\} \ .$$

In [32] the matrices A_i, $i = 1, 2$ and C of a (generally non-minimal) representation (2.2) are computed by inspection directly from the data (2.1). In section 4 of this paper we pursue a different approach to compute a *minimal* state representation (2.2) of the MPUM, based on the rank-revealing factorization of a constant matrix obtained

from the trajectories w_i and their derivatives at $(t_1, t_2) = (0, 0)$. Such rank-revealing factorization produces the values at $(0, 0)$ of state trajectories $x(\cdot, \cdot)$ associated with the data (2.1) and their partial derivatives. The matrices A_1, A_2, C corresponding to a minimal state-space representation (2.2) of the MPUM can then be computed solving a system of linear equations involving the constructed state trajectories values and the data. An advantage of our approach over the method of [32] is that minimal state representations of the MPUM are obtained *directly* from the data, without any further computation, e.g. the reduction of a pre-computed representation to a Kalman observability form suggested in sect. 2 of [32].

2.2. The input-output case. The second problem considered in this paper arises when an *input-output partition* $w = \mathrm{col}(u, y)$ of the variables is known, and moreover the data-generating system is *controllable* (see [31] for a definition) and *quarter-plane causal* (see sect. III of [27]). It is well-known that such a system can be represented by a *Roesser i/s/o representation* (introduced in [28] in the discrete-case):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} x_1 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} x_2 \end{bmatrix} = A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix} u$$

(2.3)
$$y = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & C_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} + Du \,,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, $B := \mathrm{col}(B_1, B_2) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$, $C := \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & C_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times n}$, $D \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times m}$, and the external variable $w := \mathrm{col}(u, y)$.

In sect. 5 of this paper we show how to compute matrices A, B, C such that (2.3) are satisfied for some trajectories x_i and the data $w_i = \mathrm{col}(u_i, y_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ in (2.1). Our approach to this identification problem is based on rank-revealing factorizations of *constant matrices* obtained from the data (2.1) and their *dual trajectories*, i.e. external trajectories of the *dual system*[1]. Such factorizations produce the values at $(0, 0)$ of state trajectories x_i corresponding to the data w_i in some Roesser representation (2.3). Once the $x_i(0, 0)$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are known, the matrices A, B, C and D can be computed in a straightforward way. In our approach an essential role is played by the calculus of *bilinear differential forms*, and their representation as four-variable polynomial matrices.

3. Background material. We give only the minimum amount of information needed; see [10, 17, 18] for more information, and [11, 13, 14, 21, 23] for important details and for applications of $2D$ bilinear- and quadratic differential forms.

3.1. Two-dimensional systems. A subset $\mathfrak{B}$ of the space $\mathfrak{C}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{w})$ of infinitely differentiable trajectories in two independent variables is called a *2D linear differential behavior* if it is the solution set of a system of linear, constant-coefficient partial differential equations (in the following PDEs) in two independent variables. That is, $\mathfrak{B}$ is the subset of $\mathfrak{C}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{w})$ consisting of all solutions to

(3.1)
$$R\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \right) w = 0$$

where R is a polynomial matrix in the indeterminates ξ_i, $i = 1, 2$. We call (3.1) a *kernel representation* of $\mathfrak{B}$, and we denote the set consisting of all linear differential $2D$-systems with w external variables with $\mathcal{L}_2^{w}$.

---

[1]We show in Rem. 5 that dual trajectories do not need to be measured from the dual system, but can be computed *directly* from the primal data (2.1) via a technique called *mirroring*.

If $\mathfrak{B}$ is *controllable* (see Def. 1 of [18]) then it admits an image representation

$$(3.2) \qquad w = M\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right)\ell$$

where $w \in \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}})$, the *latent variable* $\ell \in \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^1)$, and M is a polynomial matrix in the indeterminates ξ_i, $i = 1, 2$ with a suitable number of columns. Such set of PDEs represents the *full behavior* $\mathfrak{B}_f \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}+1}$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{B}_f := \{(w, \ell) \in \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}+1}) \mid (3.2) \text{ are satisfied}\}$$

and the *external behavior* $\mathfrak{B}$

$$\mathfrak{B} := \{w \in \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}}) \mid \exists \ell \in \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^1) \text{ s.t. } (3.2) \text{ are satisfied}\}$$

It can be shown that $\mathfrak{B}$ belongs to $\mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$, in other words, it can be described by a set of kernel equations such as (3.1) (see [17]).

In the following we need the notion of (weakly) *autonomous* 2D-behavior. In order to formalize such concept we need to define the characteristic ideal and characteristic variety associated with a kernel representation (3.1). Let $R \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{r} \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi_1, \xi_2]$; its *characteristic ideal* is the ideal of $\mathbb{R}[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ generated by the determinants of all $\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}$ minors of R, and the *characteristic variety* is the set of solutions common to all polynomials in the ideal. A behavior represented in kernel form by (3.1) is (weakly) *autonomous* if its characteristic ideal is not the zero ideal; or equivalently, if its characteristic variety is not all of $\mathbb{C}^2$. The characteristic variety is finite iff the behavior is *finite-dimensional*, i.e. it consists only of polynomial vector-exponential trajectories.

Finally, we introduce the notion of *dual* of a linear differential behavior. We denote by $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}})$ the set of infinitely differentiable trajectories from $\mathbb{R}^2$ to $\mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}}$ with compact support. Let $J \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}$ be an involution, i.e. $J^2 = I_{\mathtt{w}}$; given a controllable behavior $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$, we define its *J-dual* as

$$\mathfrak{B}^{\perp_J} := \left\{w' \in \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}}) \mid \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} w'^* J w \, dt_1 dt_2 = 0 \right.$$
$$(3.3) \qquad\qquad \left. \text{for all } w \in \mathfrak{B} \cap \mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}})\right\} .$$

Using an integration-by-parts argument it can be shown (see also sect. 5 of [16]) that if $\mathfrak{B} = \ker R\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right) = \operatorname{im} M\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right)$, then

$$(3.4) \qquad \mathfrak{B}^{\perp_J} = \ker M\left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, -\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right)^\top J = \operatorname{im} JR\left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, -\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right)^\top .$$

If $J = I$, we denote $\mathfrak{B}^{\perp_J}$ by $\mathfrak{B}^\perp$.

3.2. 2D bilinear differential forms. In order to simplify the notation, define the vector $\mathbf{t} := (t_1, t_2)$, the multi-indices $\mathbf{k} := (k_1, k_2)$ and $\mathbf{l} := (l_1, l_2)$, and the notation $\zeta := (\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$ and $\eta := (\eta_1, \eta_2)$. Thus $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2}[\zeta, \eta]$ denotes the ring $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$ of real polynomial $\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2$ matrices in the four indeterminates ζ_i and η_i, $i = 1, 2$; and $\zeta^{\mathbf{k}} \eta^{\mathbf{l}} = \zeta_1^{k_1} \zeta_2^{k_2} \eta_1^{l_1} \eta_2^{l_2}$.

An element of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2}[\zeta, \eta]$ is of the form $\Phi(\zeta, \eta) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} \Phi_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} \zeta^{\mathbf{k}} \eta^{\mathbf{l}}$, where $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2}$; the sum ranges over all nonnegative multindices $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{l}$, and is assumed to

be finite. Such matrix induces a *bilinear differential form* (*BDF* in the following) L_Φ

$$L_\Phi : \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}_1}) \times \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}_2}) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C})$$

$$(v, w) \longrightarrow \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} \left(\frac{\partial^{\mathbf{k}} v}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}}} \right)^* \Phi_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} \frac{\partial^{\mathbf{l}} w}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{l}}}$$

where the **k**-th derivatives $\frac{\partial^{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}}}$ and $\frac{\partial^{\mathbf{l}}}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{l}}}$ are defined by $\frac{\partial^{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}}} := \frac{\partial^{k_1 + k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}}, \frac{\partial^{\mathbf{l}}}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{l}}} := \frac{\partial^{l_1 + l_2}}{\partial t_1^{l_1} \partial t_2^{l_2}}$.

Given $\mathfrak{B}_i \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$, $i = 1, 2$, two BDFs L_{Φ_i}, $i = 1, 2$ are *equivalent along* $\mathfrak{B}_1 \times \mathfrak{B}_2$, denoted by $L_{\Phi_1} \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1 \times \mathfrak{B}_2}{=} L_{\Phi_2}$ or by $\Phi_1 \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1 \times \mathfrak{B}_2}{=} \Phi_2$, if $L_{\Phi_1}(v, w) = L_{\Phi_2}(v, w)$ for all $(v, w) \in \mathfrak{B}_1 \times \mathfrak{B}_2$. In the following result we characterize equivalence of BDFs along behaviors in terms of properties of the associated polynomial matrices.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Let* $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \ker R_1 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{t}} \right) \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}_1}$, $\mathfrak{B}_2 = \ker R_2 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{t}} \right) \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}_2}$, *and let* $\Phi_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$, $\Phi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$.

$L_{\Phi_1} \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1 \times \mathfrak{B}_2}{=} L_{\Phi_2}$ *if and only if there exist* $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet \times \bullet}[\xi_1, \xi_2]$, $i = 1, 2$ *such that*

$$\Phi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) = \Phi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) + R_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)^\top Y_1(\eta_1, \eta_2) + Y_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)^\top R_2(\eta_1, \eta_2) .$$

Proof. The proof of sufficiency is straightforward. To prove necessity, an argument analogous to that of Prop. 10 in [10] can be used. ◻

In the following we often differentiate a BDF with respect to one of the independent variables, i.e. from L_Φ we define for $i = 1, 2$:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} L_\Phi : \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}_1}) \times \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}_2}) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C})$$

$$(v, w) \longrightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} L_\Phi(v, w) .$$

It is easy to see that the partial derivative of a BDF is also a BDF. Using Leibniz's rule for the expression $\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} (\frac{\partial^{\mathbf{k}} v}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}}})^* \Phi_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} \frac{\partial^{\mathbf{l}} w}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{l}}} \right)$, it can be verified in a straightforward way that the polynomial matrix representing $\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} L_\Phi$ is

$$(3.5) \qquad\qquad (\zeta_i + \eta_i) \Phi(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) , i = 1, 2 .$$

We also consider vectors $\Psi \in (\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2])^2$, i.e. $\Psi = (\Psi_1^\top, \Psi_2^\top)^\top$ with $\Psi_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$, $i = 1, 2$. Ψ induces a *vector of BDFs* (*VBDFs*) defined by

$$L_\Psi : \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}_1}) \times \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}_2}) \longrightarrow (\mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{C}))^2$$

$$L_\Psi(v, w) \longrightarrow \mathrm{col} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} \left(\frac{\partial^{\mathbf{k}} v}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{k}}} \right)^* \Psi_{i, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}} \frac{\partial^{\mathbf{l}} w}{\partial \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{l}}} \right)_{i = 1, 2}$$

where $\Psi_{i, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}}$ is the $(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l})$-coefficient of the i-th component of Ψ.

Finally, we introduce the notion of *divergence* of a VBDFs, the counterpart of the derivative of a BDF in the $1D$ case. Given a VBDFs $L_\Psi = \mathrm{col} (L_{\Psi_i})_{i=1,2}$, we define its *divergence* as the BDF defined by

$$(3.6) \qquad (\mathrm{div}\, L_\Psi)(w_1, w_2) := \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} L_{\Psi_1} \right)(w_1, w_2) + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} L_{\Psi_2} \right)(w_1, w_2)$$

for all infinitely differentiable trajectories w_1, w_2. In terms of the 4-variable polynomial matrices associated with the BDF's, the relationship between a VBDFs and its divergence is expressed as (see Th. 4 of [18]):

$$\text{div col}(\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2), \Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)) = (\zeta_1 + \eta_1)\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)$$
(3.7)
$$+ (\zeta_2 + \eta_2)\Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) .$$

4. State representations of the MPUM. We recall the following definition from p. 1160 of [32].

DEFINITION 4.1. *A state-representation (2.2) is* observable *if for every $w \in \mathfrak{B}$ there exists a unique $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that (w, x) satisfies (2.2) $\implies x(0, 0) = x_0$.*

Using the fact that $\frac{\partial^{k_1 + k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} w = C A_1^{k_1} A_2^{k_2} x$ for all $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, it can be verified in a straightforward way that a representation (2.2) is observable if and only if $\bigcap_{(k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2} \ker C A_1^{k_1} A_2^{k_2} = \{0\}$. Any finite-dimensional behavior $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$ admits an observable state representation (2.2), see Th. 4 p. 1160 of [32].

Our approach is based on the analysis of two infinite matrices computed from the data (2.1), which we now introduce. Given $\{w_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,N}$ and $(k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we first define the matrix of the (k_1, k_2)-th derivative of the data trajectories by

$$\mathcal{H}_{k_1, k_2} := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^{k_1 + k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} w_1 & \cdots & \frac{\partial^{k_1 + k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} w_N \end{bmatrix} .$$

Now define the *matrix of jets* by

(4.1)
$$\mathcal{H} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{0,0} & \mathcal{H}_{1,0} & \mathcal{H}_{0,1} & \mathcal{H}_{2,0} & \mathcal{H}_{1,1} & \mathcal{H}_{0,2} & \cdots \\ \mathcal{H}_{1,0} & \mathcal{H}_{2,0} & \mathcal{H}_{1,1} & \mathcal{H}_{3,0} & \mathcal{H}_{2,1} & \mathcal{H}_{1,2} & \cdots \\ \mathcal{H}_{0,1} & \mathcal{H}_{1,1} & \mathcal{H}_{0,2} & \mathcal{H}_{2,1} & \mathcal{H}_{1,2} & \mathcal{H}_{0,3} & \cdots \\ \mathcal{H}_{2,0} & \mathcal{H}_{3,0} & \mathcal{H}_{2,1} & \mathcal{H}_{4,0} & \mathcal{H}_{3,1} & \mathcal{H}_{2,2} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} .$$

The matrix $\mathcal{H}(0, 0)$ of jets at $(0, 0)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_{k_1, k_2}(0, 0) := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^{k_1 + k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} w_1(0, 0) & \cdots & \frac{\partial^{k_1 + k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} w_N(0, 0) \end{bmatrix} ,$$

and

(4.2)
$$\mathcal{H}(0, 0) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{0,0}(0,0) & \mathcal{H}_{1,0}(0,0) & \mathcal{H}_{0,1}(0,0) & \cdots \\ \mathcal{H}_{1,0}(0,0) & \mathcal{H}_{2,0}(0,0) & \mathcal{H}_{1,1}(0,0) & \cdots \\ \mathcal{H}_{0,1}(0,0) & \mathcal{H}_{1,1}(0,0) & \mathcal{H}_{0,2}(0,0) & \cdots \\ \mathcal{H}_{2,0}(0,0) & \mathcal{H}_{3,0}(0,0) & \mathcal{H}_{2,1}(0,0) & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} .$$

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

THEOREM 4.2. *Let (2.1) be given, and define $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}(0, 0)$ by (4.1) and (4.2), respectively. Then $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathtt{n} = \dim \mathfrak{B}^*$, and $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H}(0, 0)) = \mathtt{n} = \dim \mathfrak{B}^*$. Moreover, let $\mathcal{H} = SX$ be such that $S \in \mathbb{C}^{\infty \times \mathtt{n}}$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{n} \times N}$, and denote the i-th column of X by $\overline{x}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. There exists a minimal state representation (2.2) of $\mathfrak{B}^*$ with x_i the state trajectory corresponding to w_i, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, such that $x_i(0, 0) = \overline{x}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathfrak{B}^* = \text{lin span} \left\{ \frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} w_i \mid (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2 , \ i = 1, \ldots, N \right\}$.
Consequently, $\mathfrak{B}^*$ coincides with the image of the submatrix $\mathcal{H}'$ of $\mathcal{H}$ consisting of its first $\mathbf{w}$ rows, and $\mathbf{n} = \dim \mathfrak{B}^* = \text{rank } \mathcal{H}'$. Now choose a set of $\mathbf{n}$ linearly independent columns of $\mathcal{H}'$ that generate im $\mathcal{H}'$, and consider the corresponding $\mathbf{n}$ columns of $\mathcal{H}$. Linearity of the operation of partial differentiation implies that any other column of $\mathcal{H}$ is linearly dependent on the selected set. Consequently $\dim \mathcal{H} = \mathbf{n}$.

To prove the second statement, let (2.2) be a minimal state representation of $\mathfrak{B}$, and denote by x_i the state trajectory associated with w_i in such state representation. Recall that $\frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} w_i = C A_1^{k_1} A_2^{k_2} x_i$ for all $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Define

$$\mathcal{O} := \begin{bmatrix} C^\top & (CA_1)^\top & (CA_2)^\top & (CA_1^2)^\top & (CA_1 A_2)^\top & \ldots \end{bmatrix}^\top ,$$

where the powers of A_i, $i = 1, 2$ in the j-th block row of $\mathcal{O}$ are ordered in the same way as the partial derivatives in the j-th block row of $\mathcal{H}$. Now define

$$\mathcal{X}_{k_1, k_2} := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} x_1 & \cdots & \frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} x_N \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathcal{X}_{k_1, k_2}(0,0) := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} x_1(0,0) & \cdots & \frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2}}{\partial t_1^{k_1} \partial t_2^{k_2}} x_N(0,0) \end{bmatrix} ,$$

and observe that

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{O} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}_{0,0} & \mathcal{X}_{1,0} & \mathcal{X}_{0,1} & \mathcal{X}_{2,0} & \mathcal{X}_{1,1} & \ldots \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \mathcal{O} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}_{0,0} & A_1 \mathcal{X}_{0,0} & A_2 \mathcal{X}_{0,0} & A_1^2 \mathcal{X}_{0,0} & A_1 A_2 \mathcal{X}_{0,0} & \ldots \end{bmatrix}}_{=:\mathcal{X}} ,$$

$$\mathcal{H}(0,0) = \mathcal{O} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}_{0,0}(0,0) & \mathcal{X}_{1,0}(0,0) & \mathcal{X}_{0,1}(0,0) & \mathcal{X}_{2,0}(0,0) & \ldots \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \mathcal{O} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}_{0,0}(0,0) & A_1 \mathcal{X}_{0,0}(0,0) & A_2 \mathcal{X}_{0,0}(0,0) & A_1^2 \mathcal{X}_{0,0}(0,0) & \ldots \end{bmatrix}}_{=:\mathcal{X}(0,0)} .$$

Since the chosen state-representation is minimal, it is also observable, and consequently $\text{rank}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathbf{n}$. From this and statement 1) it follows that rank $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{n}$. We now prove that rank $\mathcal{X}(0,0) = \mathbf{n}$; this will prove the second statement of the Theorem.

Select $\mathbf{n}$ linearly independent columns of $\mathcal{H}'$, the submatrix consisting of the first $\mathbf{n}$ rows of $\mathcal{H}$. Consider the submatrix $\mathcal{X}'(0,0)$ consisting of the columns of $\mathcal{X}(0,0)$ corresponding to this selection of columns of $\mathcal{H}'$; denote its j-th column by $\mathcal{X}_j'(0,0)$. Now assume by contradiction that there exist $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}$, $j = 1, \ldots, \mathbf{n}$, not all zero, such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\mathbf{n}} \alpha_j \mathcal{X}_j'(0,0) = 0$. Then the trajectory of $\mathfrak{B}^*$ obtained by combining linearly the columns of $\mathcal{H}'$ with the coefficients α_j, $j = 1, \ldots, \mathbf{n}$ is zero, since its corresponding state trajectory is $\sum_{j=1}^{\mathbf{n}} \alpha_j \mathcal{X}_j'(\cdot, \cdot)$ and it is zero at $(0,0)$. This leads to a contradiction: the chosen columns of $\mathcal{H}'$ were linearly independent by assumption.

To prove the last part of the theorem, consider that given any two factorizations $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{O}\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{O}'\mathcal{X}'$, it holds that row span $\mathcal{H} = $ row span $\mathcal{X} = $ row span $\mathcal{X}'$, and consequently there exists a nonsingular matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet \times \bullet}$ such that $\mathcal{X}' = T\mathcal{X}$. Thus the columns of any matrix $\mathcal{X}$ obtained from a rank-revealing factorization of $\mathcal{H}$ are related by a nonsingular transformation to the vectors $x_i(0,0)$ corresponding to the value at $(0,0)$ of the state trajectories x_j corresponding to the w_j. $\square$

It follows from Th. 4.2 that any factorization $\mathcal{H}(0,0) = \mathcal{O}\mathcal{X}$ of the matrix $\mathcal{H}(0,0)$ such that rank $\mathcal{O} = $ rank $\mathcal{X} = $ rank $\mathcal{H}(0,0)$ yields a set of vectors associated with

the values at $(0,0)$ of state trajectories associated with $\frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2}}{\partial^{k_1}t_1\partial^{k_2}t_2}w_i$. We call such a factorization a *rank-revealing factorization* of $\mathcal{H}(0,0)$. We now show how to exploit rank-revealing factorizations of $\mathcal{H}(0,0)$ to obtain a state-representation of $\mathfrak{B}^*$.

Let $\mathcal{H}(0,0) = \mathcal{O}\mathcal{X}$ be a rank-revealing factorization of $\mathcal{H}(0,0)$, and let X be any finite submatrix of $\mathcal{X}$ of rank $\mathbf{n} = \mathrm{rank}(\mathcal{X})$. It follows from Th. 4.2 that there exist matrices A_i, $i = 1,2$ and C of a minimal state-representation of $\mathfrak{B}^*$ such that each column of X is of the form $A_1^{k_1}A_2^{k_2}x_j(0,0)$ for some $k_1,k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{1,\ldots,N\}$, where x_j is the state trajectory corresponding to w_j. Now denote by $\partial_1 X$, respectively $\partial_2 X$, the $\mathbf{n}\times\mathbf{n}$ submatrix of $\mathcal{X}$ whose columns are $A_1^{k_1+1}A_2^{k_2}x_j(0,0)$, respectively $A_1^{k_1}A_2^{k_2+1}x_j(0,0)$; we call these matrices the *shifts of X in the i-th direction*.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{H}(0,0) = \mathcal{O}\mathcal{X}$ be a rank-revealing factorization, and let X be any finite submatrix of $\mathcal{X}$ of rank $\mathbf{n} = \mathrm{rank}(\mathcal{X})$. Denote by $\partial_1 X$, respectively $\partial_2 X$, the shifts of X in the first, respectively second direction; and by $X^\dagger$ a right-inverse of X. Define $A_i := (\partial_i X)\, X^\dagger$, $i = 1,2$ and the matrix C as that consisting of the first $\mathbf{w}$ rows of the matrix $\mathcal{O}$. Then (A_1,A_2,C) is a minimal state realization of $\mathfrak{B}^*$.*

Proof. It follows from Th. 4.2 that given $\partial_i X$ and X, there exist matrices A_i of a realization of $\mathfrak{B}$ such that the equations $\partial_i X = A_i X$, $i = 1,2$ are satisfied. Now use the assumption that X has full row rank $\mathbf{n}$ to conclude that $A_i = (\partial_i X)\, X^\dagger$, $i = 1,2$. The last part of the proof follows in a straightforward way. $\square$

We now state an algorithm for computing a representation (2.2) of $\mathfrak{B}^*$.

Algorithm 1
Input: Vector-exponential trajectories $\overline{w^i}e^{\lambda_1^i\cdot}e^{\lambda_2^i\cdot}$, $i = 1,\ldots,N$;
Output: Minimal representation (2.2) of $\mathfrak{B}^*$ for lin span $\{\overline{w^i}e^{\lambda_1^i\cdot}e^{\lambda_2^i\cdot}\}_{i=1,\ldots,N}$.
 Compute $\mathcal{H}(0,0)$;
 Compute a rank-revealing factorization $\mathcal{H}(0,0) = \mathcal{O}\mathcal{X}$;
 Select submatrix X of $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathrm{rank}(X) = \mathrm{rank}(\mathcal{X})$;
 Define $\partial_i X$ to be the i-th shift of X, $i = 1,2$;
 Define $A_i := \partial_i X X^\dagger$, $i = 1,2$
 Define $C :=$ submatrix consisting of the first $\mathbf{w}$ rows and $\mathbf{n}$ columns of $\mathcal{H}(0,0)$.
 Return A_1, A_2 and C.

We illustrate the application of Algorithm 1 with an example.

EXAMPLE 1. Consider trajectories whose value at (t_1,t_2) is $w_1(t_1,t_2) := e^{2t_1}$, $w_2(t_1,t_2) := t_1 e^{3t_1}e^{5t_2}$. The matrix obtained from w_1, w_2 and their derivatives, with columns and rows ordered in the total degree lexicographic ordering up to $(0,2)$ is

$$
\mathcal{H}'(0,0) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 6 & 0 & 5 & 0 & 0 \\
2 & 1 & 4 & 6 & 0 & 5 & 8 & 27 & 0 & 30 & 0 & 25 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 30 & 0 & 25 & 0 & 0 \\
4 & 6 & 8 & 27 & 0 & 30 & 16 & 108 & 0 & 135 & 0 & 150 \\
0 & 5 & 0 & 30 & 0 & 25 & 0 & 135 & 0 & 150 & 0 & 125 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 25 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 150 & 0 & 125 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix},
$$

and it has rank 3. The rank does not increase adding columns and rows of $\mathcal{H}(0,0)$; consequently, the minimal dimension of the state space is 3. A rank-revealing factorization of $\mathcal{H}'(0,0)$ is $\mathcal{H}'(0,0) = \mathcal{O}'X'$, where

$$
\mathcal{O}'^\top = \begin{bmatrix}
-0.363 & -2.49 & -1.78 & -11.7 & -12.4 & -8.89 \\
-0.321 & 0.393 & -1.78 & 5.28 & 1.61 & -8.90 \\
1.23 & 1.92 & 0.115 & 1.68 & -2.44 & 0.575
\end{bmatrix}^\top
$$

and

$$X' := \begin{bmatrix} -0.138 & 0.191 & 0.823 \\ -0.356 & 0.355 & -0.0127 \\ -0.276 & 0.382 & 1.65 \\ -2.47 & -0.341 & -0.00574 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1.78 & 1.77 & -0.0635 \\ -0.551 & 0.763 & 3.29 \\ -11.6 & -5.24 & 0.0798 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -12.4 & -1.70 & -0.0287 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -8.90 & 8.87 & -0.317 \end{bmatrix}^{\top} .$$

A full row-rank submatrix of X' is that consisting of the first, second, and fourth column. The corresponding $\partial_1 X'$ consists of the third, fourth, and eighth column of X'; $\partial_2 X'$ consists of columns 5,6 and 10 of X'. Solving $\partial_i X = A_i X$, $i = 1, 2$ in the least-squares sense yields

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 4.97 & -1.95 & 0.948 \\ 1.97 & 1.04 & 0.553 \\ -0.0391 & 0.0158 & 1.99 \end{bmatrix}, \; A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 4.99 & 0.0244 & 0.831 \\ 0.00733 & 4.97 & -1.15 \\ 0.0316 & -0.146 & 0.0391 \end{bmatrix},$$

while the first row of $\mathcal{O}'$ gives $C = \begin{bmatrix} -0.363 & -0.321 & 1.23 \end{bmatrix}$. The norm of $A_1 A_2 - A_2 A_1$ is of the order of 10^{-14}, suggesting that if the factorizations could be performed in infinite precision, the commutativity of state matrices for state-representations (2.2) of the MPUM would be verified. $\square$

5. Roesser state models from i/o data. This section is divided in three parts. In the first one we show that an inner product of external primal- and dual trajectories is the divergence of a field whose components are the inner products of the first- and second state variables of the primal- and dual Roesser models. In sect. 5.2 we characterize zero-divergence fields, also along a pair of behaviors. In sect. 5.3 we show how to compute a Roesser model interpolating given vector-exponential trajectories on the basis of the decomposition of a constant matrix derived from the data in the sum of two lower-rank matrices. Finally, in sect. 5.4 we illustrate our procedure with a numerical example, and comment on several issues.

5.1. Duality and divergence of fields of state variables. We associate to a Roesser representation (2.3) its *dual* one, defined by the equations:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} x'_1 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} x'_2 \end{bmatrix} = -A^{\top} \begin{bmatrix} x'_1 \\ x'_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} C_1^{\top} \\ C_2^{\top} \end{bmatrix} u'$$

(5.1)
$$y' = \begin{bmatrix} B_1^{\top} & B_2^{\top} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x'_1 \\ x'_2 \end{bmatrix} - D^{\top} u' .$$

The adjective "dual" is justified by the following result.

PROPOSITION 5.1. *Assume that the external behaviors $\mathfrak{B}$, respectively $\mathfrak{B}'$, of (2.3) and (5.1), respectively, are controllable. Then $\mathfrak{B}' = \mathfrak{B}^{\perp}$ defined by (3.3).*

Proof. We show that the transfer functions $H'(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ of $\mathfrak{B}'$ and $H(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ of $\mathfrak{B}$ satisfy $H'(\xi_1, \xi_2) = -H(\xi_1, \xi_2)^{\top}$. This leads straightforwardly to the claim. Partition

$A =: \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ accordingly to the partitions of x and x'; it is a matter of verification using 2D-Laplace transforms to check that

$$H(\xi_1, \xi_2) = C \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 I_{n_1} - A_{11} & -A_{12} \\ -A_{21} & -\xi_2 I_{n_2} - A_{22} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} B + D$$

$$H'(\xi_1, \xi_2) = B^\top \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 I_{n_1} + A_{11}^\top & A_{21}^\top \\ A_{12}^\top & \xi_2 I_{n_2} + A_{22}^\top \end{bmatrix}^{-1} C^\top - D^\top ,$$

from which it follows that $H'(\xi_1, \xi_2) = -H(-\xi_1, -\xi_2)^\top$. Now let $N(\xi_1, \xi_2)D(\xi_1, \xi_2)^{-1}$ be a right-coprime factorization of $H(\xi_1, \xi_2)$; then $-D(-\xi_1, -\xi_2)^{-\top} N(-\xi_1, -\xi_2)^\top$ is a left-coprime factorization of $H'(\xi_1, \xi_2)$. Consequently the external behavior of (2.3) is im $\begin{bmatrix} D(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}) \\ N(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}) \end{bmatrix}$ and that of (5.1) is ker $\begin{bmatrix} N(-\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, -\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2})^\top & -D(-\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, -\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2})^\top \end{bmatrix}$.
To conclude the proof use (3.4). $\square$

In the computation of i/s/o representations from vector-exponential data, an important role is played by the following result.

PROPOSITION 5.2. *Let* $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{L}_2^w$ *be controllable, and let* $\mathfrak{B} = $ ker $R\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right) =$ im $M\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right)$. *Define* $\Phi(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) := R(-\zeta_1, -\zeta_2)M(\eta_1, \eta_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$. *Then there exist* $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$ *such that*

$$\Phi(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) = \text{div} \left(\text{col}(\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2), \Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2))\right)$$
$$= (\zeta_1 + \eta_1)\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) + (\zeta_2 + \eta_2)\Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) .$$

Proof. Recall that $R(\xi_1, \xi_2)M(\xi_1, \xi_2) = 0$, and apply Th. 4 p. 1411 of [18]. $\square$
From Prop. 5.1 and Prop. 5.2 it follows that there exists a vector $\text{col}(L_{\Psi_1}, L_{\Psi_2})$ of bilinear differential forms acting on the external variables of the primal and dual system, such that for every $w \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $w' \in \mathfrak{B}^\perp$ the following equality holds:

$$(5.2) \qquad w'^* w = \text{div} \left(L_{\Psi_1}(w, w'), L_{\Psi_2}(w, w')\right) .$$

We show that $w'^* w$ is the divergence of a VBDFs acting respectively on the *first-* and *second state variables* associated to w and w' in the primal and the dual system.

THEOREM 5.3. *Let* $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}^\perp \in \mathcal{L}_2^w$, *with state representations (2.3) and (5.1), respectively. Let* $w = \text{col}(u, y) \in \mathfrak{B}$ *and* $w' = \text{col}(u', y') \in \mathfrak{B}'$, *with associated state trajectories* $x = \text{col}(x_1, x_2)$ *and* $x' = \text{col}(x_1', x_2')$, *respectively. Then*

$$(5.3) \begin{bmatrix} u^* & y^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{m \times p} & I_m \\ I_p & 0_{p \times m} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u' \\ y' \end{bmatrix} = \text{div}\,(x_1^* x_1', x_2^* x_2') = \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}(x_1^* x_1') + \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}(x_2^* x_2') .$$

Proof. The claim follows from the following chain of equalities:

$$y^* u' + u^* y' = \left(x^* C^\top + u^* D^\top\right) u' + u^* \left(B^\top x' - D^\top u'\right) = x^* \left(C^\top u'\right) + \left(u^* B^\top\right) x'$$
$$= x^* \left(A^\top x' + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} x_1' \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} x_2' \end{bmatrix}\right) + \left(\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} x_1 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} x_2 \end{bmatrix} - A \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}\right)^* x' .$$

$\square$

10

REMARK 1. If (w, x) and (w', x') are full trajectories of two $1D$ behaviors $\mathfrak{B}$, respectively $\mathfrak{B}^\perp$, then $w'^* w = \frac{d}{dt}\left(x'^\top x\right)$ (see Prop. 10.1 p. 1730 of [30]). Such relation is at the basis of the $1D$ Loewner approach to rational interpolation, see [3]. Th. 5.3 provides an analogous result in the $2D$ case. $\qquad\square$

REMARK 2. From Th. 5.3 follows an alternative proof of Prop. 5.1. Indeed, for any pair consisting of a compact support trajectory $w = \mathrm{col}(u, y) \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $w' = \mathrm{col}(u', y') \in \mathfrak{B}'$ and associated state trajectories x, x', equation (5.3) implies that

$$(5.4) \quad \int\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} u^* y' + y^* u' \, dt_1 dt_2 = \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}\left(x_1^* x_1'\right)\big|_{t_1=-\infty}^{t_1=+\infty} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\left(x_2^* x_2'\right)\big|_{t_2=-\infty}^{t_2=+\infty} = 0 ,$$

where the last equality is justified by the fact that since the external trajectories have compact support, also x has compact support. $\qquad\square$

In the rest of the paper we assume that the data is purely vector-exponential, i.e. $L_1^i = 0 = L_2^i$, $i = 1, 2$ in (2.1). For the moment we also assume that a set of N dual trajectories is known; we show in Rem. 5 that such assumption is of little import, since dual trajectories are readily computed from primal ones. Consequently, for the time being we assume that the following data is available:

$$(5.5) \qquad w_i(\cdot, \cdot) = \mathrm{col}(u, y)(\cdot, \cdot) = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{u_i} \\ \overline{y_i} \end{bmatrix} e^{\lambda_1^i \cdot} e^{\lambda_2^i \cdot} \in \mathfrak{B} , \ i = 1, \dots, N$$

$$w_i'(\cdot, \cdot) = \mathrm{col}(u', y')(\cdot, \cdot) = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{u_i'} \\ \overline{y_i'} \end{bmatrix} e^{\mu_1^i \cdot} e^{\mu_2^i \cdot} \in \mathfrak{B}^{\perp_J} , \ i = 1, \dots, N .$$

To such trajectories correspond vector-exponential state trajectories

$$(5.6) \qquad\qquad \overline{x_i} e^{\lambda_1^i \cdot} e^{\lambda_2^i \cdot} , \ \overline{x_j}' e^{\mu_1^i \cdot} e^{\mu_2^i \cdot}$$

(where $\overline{x_i}', \overline{x_i} \in \mathbb{C}^n$), $i = 1, \dots, N'$, $j = 1, \dots, N$ satisfying equations (5.1) and (2.3), respectively. We partition $\overline{x_i}' =: \mathrm{col}(\overline{x_{i,1}}', \overline{x_{i,2}}')$ and $\overline{x_i} =: \mathrm{col}(\overline{x_{i,1}}, \overline{x_{i,2}})$ according to the partition of the state trajectories in (5.1) and (2.3).

Define from (5.5), (5.6) the matrices

$$L := \begin{bmatrix} w_1' & \dots & w_N' \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w} \times N} , \ R := \begin{bmatrix} w_1 & \dots & w_N \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w} \times N}$$

$$(5.7) \quad \Lambda_i := \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_i^k)_{k=1,\dots,N} , \ M_i := \mathrm{diag}(\mu_i^k)_{k=1,\dots,N} , \ i = 1, 2$$

$$X' := \begin{bmatrix} \overline{x_1}' & \dots & \overline{x_{N'}}' \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} X_1' \\ X_2' \end{bmatrix} , \ X := \begin{bmatrix} \overline{x_1} & \dots & \overline{x_N} \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{n} \times N} .$$

The following result, a straightforward consequence of Th. 5.3, establishes the connection between matrices computed from the external data and matrices computed from the internal (i.e. state) ones.

PROPOSITION 5.4. *Define the matrices L, R, Λ_i, M_i, X', X by (5.7). Then*

$$(5.8) \qquad L^* J R = M_1^* X_1'^* X_1 + X_1'^* X_1 \Lambda_1 + M_2^* X_2'^* X_2 + X_2'^* X_2 \Lambda_2 .$$

Proof. The claim follows in a straightforward way considering the value at $(0, 0)$ of equation (5.3) on the external data and their associated state trajectories. $\square$

We now give sufficient conditions under which the matrices X and X' defined in (5.6) have rank equal to the dimension of the state variables x_i, x_i', $i = 1, 2$.

PROPOSITION 5.5. *Let* $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}^{\perp} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$ *be controllable. Let (5.5) be given, and denote by* $x_i(\cdot, \cdot)$*, respectively* $x'_j(\cdot, \cdot)$*, a state trajectory corresponding to* $w_i(\cdot, \cdot)$*, respectively* $w'_j(\cdot, \cdot)$*, in a Roesser representation (2.3), respectively (5.1).*

Assume that $N > \mathtt{n}_1 + \mathtt{n}_2$*, and that there exist* $\mathtt{n} = \mathtt{n}_1 + \mathtt{n}_2$ *linearly independent trajectories among those in* $\{w_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,N}$ *and* $\{w'_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,N}$*, respectively. Then*

$$\text{rank } \begin{bmatrix} x_{i,1}(0) & \ldots & x_{i,N}(0) \end{bmatrix} = \mathtt{n}_i = \text{rank } \begin{bmatrix} x'_{i,1}(0) & \ldots & x'_{i,N}(0) \end{bmatrix} , \ i = 1, 2 .$$

Proof. We prove the first and third equalities; the other two follow in an analogous manner. Assume by contradiction that rank $\overline{X} := \text{rank } \begin{bmatrix} x_{1,1}(0) & \ldots & x_{1,N}(0) \\ x_{2,1}(0) & \ldots & x_{2,N}(0) \end{bmatrix} <$ $\mathtt{n}_1 + \mathtt{n}_2$. Reordering the trajectories w_i if needed, we can assume that the first $\mathtt{n}$ of them are linearly independent. Since rank $\overline{X} < \mathtt{n}$, the submatrix $\overline{X}'$ of $\overline{X}$ consisting of its first $\mathtt{n}$ columns is such that there exist $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$, $i = 1, \ldots, \mathtt{n}$, not all zero, such that $\overline{X}' \text{col}(\alpha_i)_{i=1,\ldots,\mathtt{n}_1+\mathtt{n}_2} = 0$. The MPUM for the set $\{\text{col}(w_i, x_i)\}_{i=1,\ldots,\mathtt{n}_1+\mathtt{n}_2}$ is autonomous and finite dimensional; moreover, since such behavior is a subset of the set of full (external, state)-trajectories of a state representation of $\mathfrak{B}$, x is a state variable also for it. Now define $\widehat{w}(\cdot, \cdot) := \sum_{k=1}^{\mathtt{n}_1+\mathtt{n}_2} \alpha_k \overline{w_k} e^{\lambda_1^k \cdot} e^{\lambda_2^k \cdot}$; its associated state trajectory is $\widehat{x}(\cdot, \cdot) := \sum_{k=1}^{\mathtt{n}_1+\mathtt{n}_2} \alpha_k x_k(0,0) e^{\lambda_1^k \cdot} e^{\lambda_2^k \cdot}$. Since $\overline{X}' \text{col}(\alpha_i)_{i=1,\ldots,\mathtt{n}_1+\mathtt{n}_2} = 0$, the value at $(0,0)$ of such state trajectory is zero. Given that the MPUM is autonomous, this implies that $\hat{w}$ is also zero. This however is in contradiction with the linear independence of the first $\mathtt{n}$ external trajectories and the assumption that not all α_i's are equal to zero. Consequently $\overline{X}$ has rank $\mathtt{n}_1 + \mathtt{n}_2$. This is readily seen to imply that rank $\begin{bmatrix} x_{1,1}(0) & \ldots & x_{1,N}(0) \end{bmatrix} = \mathtt{n}_1$ and rank $\begin{bmatrix} x_{2,1}(0) & \ldots & x_{2,N}(0) \end{bmatrix} = \mathtt{n}_2$. $\square$

REMARK 3. A sufficient condition for the external vector-exponential trajectories to be linearly independent is that $\left(\lambda_1^k, \lambda_2^k\right) \neq \left(\lambda_1^j, \lambda_2^j\right)$ for $j \neq k$, $j, k = 1, \ldots, N$, and $\left(\mu_1^i, \mu_2^i\right) \neq \left(\mu_1^\ell, \mu_2^\ell\right)$, for $i \neq \ell$, $i, \ell = 1, \ldots, N$.

5.2. Zero-divergence fields and their characterization. Given two controllable behaviors $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}^{\perp} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$ described by equations (2.3) and (5.1), the $\mathtt{n}_i \in \mathbb{N}$, matrices $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{n}_i \times N}$, $X'_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{n}_i \times N}$, $i = 1, 2$, defined by (5.7) satisfy (5.8). If such X_i, X'_i can be computed from the LHS of (5.8) and a "sufficiently informative" set of data is available, then matrices (A, B, C, D) of a Roesser model for the primal system can be computed solving a system of linear equations. However, given $L^* J R$ the solutions X_i, X'_i, $i = 1, 2$ to (5.8) are non-unique, since the homogeneous matrix equation in $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$

$$(5.9) \qquad\qquad 0 = M_1^* \mathcal{X}_1 + \mathcal{X}_1 \Lambda_1 + M_2^* \mathcal{X}_2 + \mathcal{X}_2 \Lambda_2 ,$$

has nonzero solutions $\mathcal{X}_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Such non-uniqueness arises since the divergence operator appearing on the right-hand side of (5.3), from which (5.8) derives, is *non-invertible*: given a 2D function f, there are many fields $F : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\nabla F = f$. See also sect. 27-4 of [29] on the issues arising in Maxwell's equations from the non-injectivity of the divergence operator.

The following result is a characterization of zero-divergence fields in terms of properties of the corresponding polynomial matrices.

PROPOSITION 5.6. *Let* $\Psi_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$*,* $i = 1, 2$*. The following three statements are equivalent:*

1. div col$(L_{\Psi_1}, L_{\Psi_2}) = 0$;

2. $(\zeta_1 + \eta_1)\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) + (\zeta_2 + \eta_2)\Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) = 0$;

3. There exists $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$ *such that*

$$\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) = (\zeta_2 + \eta_2)\Psi(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)$$
$$\Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) = -(\zeta_1 + \eta_1)\Psi(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) .$$

Moreover, let $\mathfrak{B}_i = \ker R_i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathtt{t}}\right) \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$, $i = 1, 2$. *The following two statements are equivalent:*

4. div col$(L_{\Psi_1}, L_{\Psi_2}) \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1 \times \mathfrak{B}_2}{=} 0$;

5. $(\zeta_1 + \eta_1)\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) + (\zeta_2 + \eta_2)\Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1 \times \mathfrak{B}_2}{=} 0$;

6. There exist $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2]$, $i = 1, 2$ *such that*

$$(\zeta_1 + \eta_1)\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) + (\zeta_2 + \eta_2)\Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)$$
$$= R_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)^\top Y_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) + Y_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)^\top R_2(\eta_1, \eta_2)$$

Proof. The equivalence of statements 1) and 2) follows from (3.7).

That 3) $\implies$ 2) holds is a matter of straightforward verification.

The implication 2) $\implies$ 3) follows observing that if $(\zeta_1 + \eta_1)\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) = -(\zeta_2 + \eta_2)\Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)$, then Ψ_1 is divisible by $(\zeta_2 + \eta_2)$, and Ψ_2 by $(\zeta_1 + \eta_1)$. Consequently, there exist $\Psi_j'(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)$, $j = 1, 2$ such that $\Psi_j(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) = (\zeta_i + \eta_i)\Psi_j'(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)$, $i, j = 1, 2$, $i \neq j$. Statement 3) follows readily from such equality.

To prove the second part of the claim: the equivalence of 4) and 5) follows from (3.7). The equivalence of 5) and 6) follows from (3.7) and Prop. 3.1. $\square$

The identifiability issues raised by the non-invertibility of the divergence operator will be considered elsewhere (see Prop. 5.5 below for a preliminary result); in the next section we present a procedure to compute Roesser models for the data (5.5).

5.3. Computing Roesser unfalsified models. The following result follows from Prop. 5.4.

THEOREM 5.7. *Let* $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}^\perp \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$ *be controllable and quarter-plane causal. Let data (5.5) be given and define* L, R, Λ_i, M_i, $i = 1, 2$ *by (5.7). Define*

$$U := \begin{bmatrix} \overline{u_1} & \cdots & \overline{u_N} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{m} \times N} , \ Y := \begin{bmatrix} \overline{y_1} & \cdots & \overline{y_N} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{p} \times N}$$

(5.10) $\quad U' := \begin{bmatrix} \overline{u_1'} & \cdots & \overline{u_N'} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{p} \times N} , \ Y' := \begin{bmatrix} \overline{y_1'} & \cdots & \overline{y_N'} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{m} \times N} .$

There exist $\mathtt{n}_i \in \mathbb{N}$, *matrices* $X_i, X_i' \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{n}_i \times N}$ $i = 1, 2$, *such that (5.8) holds. Moreover, there exist* $A_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{n}_i \times \mathtt{n}_j}$, $i = 1, 2$, $C_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{p} \times \mathtt{n}_i}$, $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{n}_i \times \mathtt{m}}$, $i = 1, 2$ *such that the following equations hold:*

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_1 \Lambda_1 \\ X_2 \Lambda_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix} U$$

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & C_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \end{bmatrix} + DU ,$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_1' M_1 \\ X_2' M_2 \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} A_{11}^\top & A_{21}^\top \\ A_{12}^\top & A_{22}^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_1' \\ X_2' \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} C_1^\top \\ C_2^\top \end{bmatrix} U'$$

(5.11) $\qquad Y' = \begin{bmatrix} B_1^\top & B_2^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_1' \\ X_2' \end{bmatrix} - D^\top U' .$

13

Given such matrices A_{ij}, B_i, C_i, $i,j = 1, 2$, equations (2.3) and (5.1) define unfalsified Roesser models for the data (5.5).

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}^\perp \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$ are controllable, they admit Roesser state representations (2.3) and (5.1), respectively. Denote by $x_i = \mathrm{col}(x_{1,i}, x_{2,i})$, $x_i' = \mathrm{col}(x_{1,i}', x_{2,i}')$, the state trajectories associated in such representations with w_i, respectively w_i', $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Now consider the value at $(0, 0)$ of (2.3) and (5.1) with such external- and state trajectories. This argument proves the first part of the theorem and the equations (5.11). The last part of the claim is straightforward. $\square$

From Th. 5.7 it follows that the crucial issue in computing unfalsified models for the primal data is finding matrices S_i, $i = 1, 2$ solving the Sylvester-type equation

$$(5.12) \qquad L^* J R = M_1^* S_1 + S_1 \Lambda_1 + M_2^* S_2 + S_2 \Lambda_2 \ ,$$

from which matrices X_i, X_i', $i = 1, 2$ can be computed such that the first two equations in (5.11) are satisfied. The following result gives sufficient conditions on S_1, S_2 and the data for this to happen.

THEOREM 5.8. *Let $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}^\perp \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$ be controllable. Let data (5.5) be given and define L, R, Λ_i, M_i, $i = 1, 2$ by (5.7) and U, Y, U', Y' by (5.10).*

Assume that $\mathrm{im}\ Y'^* \cap \mathrm{im}\ U'^* = \{0\}$. Assume also that $S_1, S_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ solve (5.12) and moreover that

     1. $\mathrm{im}\ S_1 \cap \mathrm{im}\ S_2 = \{0\}$;

     2. $\mathrm{im}\ \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \end{bmatrix} \cap \mathrm{im}\ U'^* = \{0\}$.

Let $S_i = X_i'^* X_i$, $i = 1, 2$ be rank-revealing factorizations. There exist a left inverse $\begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}^\dagger$ of $\begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}$ and $F \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{p} \times N}$ such that

$$(5.13) \qquad \begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}^\dagger U'^* = 0_{N \times \mathtt{p}} \text{ and } F \begin{bmatrix} Y'^* & U'^* \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{\mathtt{p} \times \mathtt{m}} & I_{\mathtt{p}} \end{bmatrix} \ .$$

Let $\begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}^\dagger$, F satisfy (5.13), and define

$$A := - \begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} M_1^* X_1'^* & M_2^* X_2'^* \end{bmatrix} \ , \ B := \begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}^\dagger Y'^*$$

$$C := F \left(I_N - \begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}^\dagger \right) \begin{bmatrix} M_1^* X_1'^* & M_2^* X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(5.14) \qquad D := F \begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}^\dagger Y'^* \ .$$

Then A, B, C, D define an unfalsified Roesser model for the data.

Proof. From $S_i = X_i'^* X_i$, $i = 1, 2$ being rank-revealing factorizations we conclude that $\mathrm{im}\ \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathrm{im}\ \begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}$. From this and assumption 1) it follows that $\begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}$ admits a left inverse. From assumption 2) conclude that such a left-inverse can be chosen satisfying the first equation in (5.13).

Now multiply both sides of (5.12) by such left-inverse to conclude that

$$(5.15) \qquad \begin{bmatrix} X_1 \Lambda_1 \\ X_2 \Lambda_2 \end{bmatrix} = A \begin{bmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \end{bmatrix} + BU \ ,$$

where A and B are defined by the first two equations in (5.14). Use the assumption $\mathrm{im}\ Y'^* \cap \mathrm{im}\ U'^* = \{0\}$ to conclude that an F exists such that the second equation in (5.13) holds. Multiply both sides of (5.12) by such F and use (5.15) to conclude that

$$(5.16) \qquad Y = C \begin{bmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \end{bmatrix} + DU \ ,$$

where C and D are defined by the last two equations in (5.14). The fact that A, B, C and D define an unfalsified model for the primal data follows from (5.15) and (5.16). This concludes the proof of the Theorem. $\square$

Based on the results of Th.s 5.7 and 5.8 , to compute a Roesser model for data (5.7) we can proceed as follows. Assume that the condition im $Y'^{\top} \cap$ im $U'^{\top} = \{0\}$, with Y', U' defined by (5.10) is satisfied. Beginning with $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2) := (1, 0)$, and following the total degree lexicographic ordering in $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$, we check the existence of a solution $\begin{bmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \end{bmatrix}$ to (5.12) with rank $S_i = \mathbf{n}_i$, $i = 1, 2$ satisfying conditions $1) - 2)$ of Th. 5.8. Such check can be performed as follows: let $\begin{bmatrix} \overline{S}_1 & \overline{S}_2 \end{bmatrix}$ be a solution of (5.12); note that a solution always exists, since the data belongs to a controllable model and consequently equation (5.3) is satisfied. Now define

$$(5.17) \qquad \mathcal{G} := \{(G_1, G_2) \mid G_1, G_2 \text{ solve } (5.9)\} \ ,$$

and note that since (5.9) is a linear matrix equation, a parametrization of $\mathcal{G}$ is straightforward to obtain. We can now check whether there exist $(G_1, G_2) \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $S_1 := \overline{S}_1 + G_1$, $S_2 := \overline{S}_2 + G_2$ satisfy conditions $1) - 2)$ of Th. 5.8; a mixed symbolicnumerical method is illustrated in Example 2 below. If such G_1, G_2 exist, then rank-revealing factorizations of $\overline{S}_i + G_i$, $i = 1, 2$ together with (5.13)-(5.14) yield an unfalsified model. If they do not, we can update $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$ to the next element of $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ in the total degree lexicographic order and start over. The model identified in this way is also of *minimal complexity* (state dimension) $\mathbf{n}_1 + \mathbf{n}_2$ among the unfalsified Roesser models for the data satisfying the conditions of Th. 5.8.

5.4. Example and comments. We give an example of the application of our procedure, and some comments and remarks addressing important issues.

EXAMPLE 2. Consider the Roesser model associated with the matrices $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$, $B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $C = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, corresponding to the transfer function $G(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \frac{2\xi_1 + 2\xi_2 - 1}{\xi_1 \xi_2 - 2\xi_1 - \xi_2 + 1}$, and the image- and kernel representations

$$M(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_2 \xi_1 - 2\xi_1 - \xi_2 + 1 \\ 2\xi_1 + 2\xi_2 - 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$R(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 2\xi_1 + 2\xi_2 - 1 & -\xi_2 \xi_1 + 2\xi_1 + \xi_2 - 1 \end{bmatrix} \ .$$

We generate from such primal system vector-exponential data at the frequencies $(4, 3)$, $(5, 4)$ and $(9, \frac{1}{4})$, namely $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 13 \end{bmatrix} e^{4t_1} e^{3t_2}$, $\begin{bmatrix} 7 \\ 17 \end{bmatrix} e^{5t_1} e^{4t_2}$, and $\begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ -7 \end{bmatrix} e^{9t_1} e^{\frac{1}{4} t_2}$. Using the representation (3.4) of the dual system, we generate dual trajectories at the frequencies $(3, 1)$, $(\frac{1}{9}, 2)$, and $(7, \frac{1}{3})$, namely $\begin{bmatrix} -9 \\ -11 \end{bmatrix} e^{3t_1} e^{t_2}$, $\begin{bmatrix} -47 \\ -31 \end{bmatrix} e^{\frac{1}{9} t_1} e^{2t_2}$, $\begin{bmatrix} -47 \\ -53 \end{bmatrix} e^{7t_1} e^{\frac{1}{3} t_2}$. It follows that $L^* JW = \begin{bmatrix} -161 & -250 & 23 \\ -497 & -856 & -65 \\ -783 & -1230 & 89 \end{bmatrix}$. It can be verified that the condition im $Y'^* \cap$ im $U'^* = \{0\}$ of Th. 5.8 is satisfied by such data.

To compute a solution $\begin{bmatrix} \overline{S}_1 & \overline{S}_2 \end{bmatrix}$ to (5.12), we solve the Sylvester equations

$$(5.18) \qquad M_i^* \overline{S}_i + \overline{S}_i \Lambda_i = \frac{1}{2} L^* JW \ ,$$

15

$i = 1, 2$, obtaining

$$\overline{S}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{23}{2} & -\frac{125}{8} & \frac{23}{24} \\ -\frac{4473}{74} & -\frac{1926}{23} & -\frac{585}{164} \\ -\frac{783}{22} & -\frac{205}{4} & \frac{89}{32} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \overline{S}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{161}{8} & -25 & \frac{46}{5} \\ -\frac{497}{10} & -\frac{214}{3} & -\frac{130}{9} \\ -\frac{2349}{20} & -\frac{1845}{13} & \frac{534}{7} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The following two matrices are solutions to (5.9):

$$G_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 4g_{11} & 5g_{12} & \frac{5g_{13}}{4} \\ 5g_{21} & 6g_{22} & \frac{9g_{23}}{4} \\ \frac{10g_{31}}{3} & \frac{13g_{32}}{3} & \frac{7g_{33}}{12} \end{bmatrix}, \quad G_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -7g_{11} & -8g_{12} & -12g_{13} \\ -\frac{37g_{21}}{9} & -\frac{46g_{22}}{9} & -\frac{82g_{23}}{9} \\ -11g_{31} & -12g_{32} & -16g_{33} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $g_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ is a free parameter, $i, j = 1, \ldots, 3$.

To check for the existence of parameters g_{ij} for which $S_i = \overline{S}_i + G_i$ satisfy the conditions of Th. 5.8, we proceed as follows. Beginning with $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2) = (1, 0)$, we compute the Gröbner bases of the ideals generated by the minors of S_i of order $\mathbf{n}_i + 1$, $i = 1, 2$. It can be verified that for the minors of order 1 such bases consist only of the polynomial 1; consequently there exist no parameters g_{ij} for which S_1 and S_2 have ranks 1 and 0 or 0 and 1, respectively. This implies that no state models exist with $\mathbf{n}_1 = 1$ and $\mathbf{n}_2 = 0$ or $\mathbf{n}_1 = 0$ and $\mathbf{n}_2 = 1$. The Gröbner bases of the minors of order 2 do not consist of the unit polynomial only; moreover, the sum of the two ideals consisting of the order 2 minors also has a nontrivial Groebner basis; this implies that values of the parameters exist such that the matrices S_1 and S_2 have both rank 1.

Using `Mathematica` it can be computed that one set of values g_{ij} for which the minors of order 2 of S_1 and S_2 simultaneously annihilate, i.e. for which rank S_1 and rank S_2 both have rank 1 is

$$(g_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,3} = \begin{bmatrix} -3.02377 & -2.71645 & 6.25416 \\ -12.9249 & -11.8467 & 22.2606 \\ -11.5443 & -9.33238 & 42.4618 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The corresponding S_1 and S_2 are

$$S_1 = \overline{S}_1 + G_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -23.5951 & -29.2072 & 8.77604 \\ -125.071 & -154.819 & 46.5192 \\ -74.072 & -91.6903 & 27.5506 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$S_2 = \overline{S}_2 + G_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.04137 & -3.26841 & -65.8499 \\ 3.43585 & -10.7837 & -217.263 \\ 9.53762 & -29.9345 & -603.103 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For such matrices, conditions $1) - 2)$ of Th. 5.8 hold. Computing rank-revealing factorizations $S_i = X_i'^* X_i$, $i = 1, 2$ via a SVD yields

$$X_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -9.49275 & -11.7506 & 3.53077 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$X_1' = \begin{bmatrix} 2.48559 & 13.1754 & 7.80301 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$X_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.401179 & 1.25913 & 25.3682 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$X_2' = \begin{bmatrix} -2.59577 & -8.5644 & -23.774 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Via a SVD of $\begin{bmatrix} X_1'^\top & X_2'^\top & U'^\top \end{bmatrix}$ we compute a left inverse of $\begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}$ satisfying the first equation in (5.13):

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_1'^* & X_2'^* \end{bmatrix}^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} -0.344338 & 0.150758 & -0.0167127 \\ 0.555166 & -0.0558363 & -0.0825641 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The state and input matrices computed from the first two formulas (5.14) are

$$A' = \begin{bmatrix} 3.25981 & 1.55603 \\ 0.451739 & -0.169619 \end{bmatrix}, \ B' = \begin{bmatrix} -3.20108 \\ 1.50833 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Via a SVD of $\begin{bmatrix} U'^* & Y'^* \end{bmatrix}$ we compute F satisfying the second condition in (5.13):

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} -0.0115895 & 0.0450062 & -0.0427869 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The last two equations in (5.14) yield $C' = \begin{bmatrix} -1.30788 & -0.155653 \end{bmatrix}$ and $D' = 0.261076$. Such matrices correspond to the transfer function

$$G(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \frac{-1.69695 - 0.190492\xi_1 + 3.33557\xi_2 + 0.261076\xi_1\xi_2}{\xi_1\xi_2 + 0.169619\xi_1 - 3.25981\xi_2 - 1.25585},$$

which satisfies the interpolation conditions $G(4,3) = \frac{13}{2}$, $G(5,4) = \frac{17}{7}$, $G(9, \frac{1}{4}) = -\frac{7}{6}$ derived from the primal data directions $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 13 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 7 \\ 17 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 6 \\ -7 \end{bmatrix}$. $\qquad\Box$

We conclude this section discussing several issues. Firstly, we examine alternative approaches to the procedure used in Ex. 2. We then show how dual trajectories can be constructed from primal ones. Subsequently, we discuss the relation of our approach to the $2D$ Loewner one, and to the solution to the bi-variate Nevanlinna interpolation problem of Agler and co-authors. Finally, we consider applying duality ideas to the identification of Fornasini-Marchesini i/s/o models.

REMARK 4 (*Computational issues*). In Ex. 2 we used a mixed symbolic-numerical approach to compute Roesser models. Anecdotal evidence obtained dealing with only a few more interpolation points suggests that such approach is impractical for larger scale problems, since verifying the parametric rank conditions $1) - 2)$ in Th. 5.8 using Gröbner bases is computationally rather intensive. The bottleneck is the calculation of minimal rank solutions S_1 and S_2 to (5.12); checking whether such solutions satisfy the additional conditions of Th. 5.8 is a matter of standard computations.

One pair of solutions to (5.12) is straightforward to compute, see eq. (5.18); and the set $\mathcal{G}$ in (5.17) is described by linear equations. Thus the computation of S_i can be reduced to an *affine rank minimization* problem:

$$\text{Minimize rank } S_1 + \text{rank } S_2$$
$$\text{subject to } \mathcal{A}(S_1, S_2) = b,$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is a linear map, b is a vector obtained from L^*JR, and $\mathcal{A}(S_1, S_2) = b$ is a vector-formulation of (5.12). Several algorithms to solve this NP-hard problem are known, see e.g. [26]. $\qquad\Box$

REMARK 5 (*Data dualization via mirroring*). In general it is difficult to obtain data from the dual system, and only data coming from the primal one are available (unless of course the two systems coincide- see [22, 24] for examples in the $1D$ case). We now describe the *mirroring* technique, already used in the $1D$ case (see [8, 9, 25]), to obtain dual data on the basis of primal ones.

PROPOSITION 5.9. *Let* $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$ *be controllable, and* $J \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}$ *be an involution. Let* $\overline{w}e^{\lambda_1 \cdot}e^{\lambda_2 \cdot} \in \mathfrak{B}$, *and let* $\overline{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}}$ *satisfy* $\overline{v}^*\overline{w} = 0$. *Then* $J\overline{v}e^{-\lambda_1^* \cdot}e^{-\lambda_2^* \cdot} \in \mathfrak{B}^{\perp J}$.

Proof. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{m}}[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{p} \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ with $\mathtt{w} = \mathtt{p} + \mathtt{m}$ induce an image, respectively kernel representation of $\mathfrak{B}$. Since $R(\xi_1, \xi_2)M(\xi_1, \xi_2) = 0_{\mathtt{p} \times \mathtt{m}}$, for all

$(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, im $M(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (\text{im } R(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)^*)^\perp$, with orthogonality in the Euclidean sense in $\mathbb{C}^{\mathtt{w}}$. It follows that $J\overline{v}e^{-\lambda_1^* \cdot}e^{-\lambda_2^* \cdot} \in \text{im } JR\left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, -\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right)^\top = \mathfrak{B}^{\perp_J}$. $\blacksquare$ $\qquad$ $\square$

REMARK 6 (*Bivariate rational interpolation in the Loewner approach*). In [2] a Loewner approach to bi-variate rational interpolation is developed for SISO systems, based on the *Loewner matrix* of the data, which we now introduce through BDFs. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{m}}[\xi_1, \xi_2]$, $R \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{p} \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ induce an image, respectively kernel representation of $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{L}_2^{\mathtt{w}}$. The multi-variable representation of equation (5.2) is

$$(5.19) \quad R(-\zeta_1, -\zeta_2)M(\eta_1, \eta_2) = (\zeta_1+\eta_1)\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) + (\zeta_2+\eta_2)\Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) ,$$

from which it follows that

$$(5.20) \qquad \frac{R(-\zeta_1, -\zeta_2)M(\eta_1, \eta_2)}{(\zeta_1 + \eta_1)(\zeta_2 + \eta_2)} = \frac{\Psi_1(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)}{\zeta_2 + \eta_2} + \frac{\Psi_2(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \eta_1, \eta_2)}{\zeta_1 + \eta_1} .$$

Since $w_i \in \text{im } M\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right)$ and $w_i' \in \text{im } R\left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}, -\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\right)^\top$ in (5.5), it follows that there exist latent variable trajectories $\ell_i(\cdot, \cdot) = \overline{\ell_i}e^{\lambda_1^i \cdot}e^{\lambda_2^i \cdot}$ and $\ell_i'(\cdot, \cdot) = \overline{\ell_i'}e^{\mu_1^i \cdot}e^{\mu_2^i \cdot}$ such that $\overline{w_i} = \begin{bmatrix}\overline{u_i}\\\overline{y_i}\end{bmatrix} = M(\lambda_1^i, \lambda_2^i)\overline{\ell_i}$ and $\overline{w_i'} = \begin{bmatrix}\overline{u_i'}\\\overline{y_i'}\end{bmatrix} = R(-\mu_1^i, -\mu_2^i)\overline{\ell_i'}$. Now substitute the values $(\lambda_1^i, \lambda_2^i)$ and (μ_1^j, μ_2^j) in place of (η_1, η_2) and (ζ_1, η_2), respectively in (5.20) and multiply on the right by $\overline{\ell_i}$ and the left by $\overline{\ell_i'}$, respectively, obtaining $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{P}_1 + \mathbb{P}_2$, where the *Loewner matrix* $\mathbb{L}$ and $\mathbb{P}_i$, $i = 1, 2$ are $\mathbb{L}_{i,j} = \frac{\overline{w_i'}^\top \overline{w_j}}{(-\mu_1^j+\lambda_1^i)(-\mu_2^j+\lambda_2^i)}$, $(\mathbb{P}_1)_{n,m} = \frac{\overline{\ell_n'}^\top \Psi_1(-\mu_1^n, -\mu_2^n, \lambda_1^m, \lambda_2^m)\overline{\ell_m}}{-\mu_2^n+\lambda_2^m}$, $(\mathbb{P}_2)_{n,m} = \frac{\overline{\ell_n'}^\top \Psi_2(-\mu_1^n, -\mu_2^n, \lambda_1^m, \lambda_2^m)\overline{\ell_m}}{-\mu_1^n+\lambda_1^m}$, $i, j, n, m = 1, \ldots, N$. If all frequencies lie on the same side of the imaginary axis, e.g. the right-hand side one, such matrices are Gramians obtained integrating the corresponding BDFs on the external, respectively latent variables, from $-\infty$ to 0, and (5.20) is the integral version of (5.2). In [2] bi-variate Lagrange interpolation polynomial bases and kernels of appropriate submatrices of the Loewner matrix $\mathbb{L}$ are used to obtain generalized state-space models corresponding to *bi-directional* interpolating functions, i.e. satisfying the left- and right interpolation conditions $G(\lambda_1^i, \lambda_2^i) = \frac{\overline{y_i}}{\overline{u_i}}$ and $G(\mu_1^i, \mu_2^i) = \frac{\overline{y_i'}}{\overline{u_i'}}$. $\qquad$ $\square$

REMARK 7 (*Operator-theoretic approaches to bivariate interpolation*). Agler, McCarthy and others worked on discrete nD metric interpolation problems (see [1, 4, 6]) using operator-theoretic techniques, see also [5]. Interesting similarities exist between their formulas and ours, compare e.g. Th. 11.49 of [1] with (5.19). A thorough investigation of the connections of such approaches with ours is a matter of pressing research, especially in view of the usefulness of BDF techniques in solving similar interpolation problems in the $1D$ case (see [8, 9, 25]). $\qquad$ $\square$

REMARK 8 (*Fornasini-Marchesini i/s/o models*). The Roesser model is more advantageous than other classes of $2D$ quart-plane causal i/s/o representations to the application of our methodology; we examine the case of *second-order Fornasini-Marchesini models*

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2}x = A_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}x + A_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}x + A_3 x + Bu$$
$$(5.21) \qquad\qquad\qquad y = Cx + Du .$$

It is a matter of straightforward verification to check that the dual of (5.21) is

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2} x' = -A_1^\top \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} x' - A_2^\top \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} x' + A_3^\top x' + C^\top u'$$

(5.22)
$$y' = B^\top x' - D^\top u' \ .$$

With tedious but straightforward manipulations it can be verified that if $\operatorname{col}(u, y, x)$ satisfies (5.21) and $\operatorname{col}(u', y', x')$ satisfies (5.22), then

(5.23)
$$y'^\top u + u'^\top y = \operatorname{div} \begin{bmatrix} x'^\top A_1 x + \frac{1}{2} x'^\top \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} x \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} x' \right)^\top x \\ x'^\top A_2 x + \frac{1}{2} x'^\top \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} x \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} x' \right)^\top x \end{bmatrix} \ .$$

Given Th. 5.3 and the equivalence of Roesser and Fornasini-Marchesini models, it is not surprising that the external bilinear form is the divergence of a field involving the primal and the dual state. However, partial derivatives of the state are present, and thus the right-hand side of the matrix equation obtained from (5.23) for vector-exponential trajectories is more involved than the right-hand side of (5.12). □

6. Conclusions. We considered two versions of the problem of modelling vector-exponential trajectories dependent on two independent variables with state-space models, and we provided two procedures to solve it, both essentially based on the factorization of constant matrices directly constructed from the data. Current research is aimed in several directions. Firstly, we want to establish identifiability conditions based only on properties of the external data, since Prop. 5.5 falls short of being completely satisfactory (see [15] on identifiability of nD systems). Secondly, we need to develop a computationally efficient and numerically sound approach to the implementation of our procedure to compute Roesser models (see Rem. 4). A third research direction is the identification problem from *general* (i.e. not polynomial vector-exponential) *discrete* data; cf. [22] for a BDF approach to such problem in the $1D$ case. On a longer horizon and a broader perspective, we want to investigate the application of our duality-based approach to *model reduction*. Finally, Roesser models only describe quarter-plane causal systems, and we need to generalise our results to more general notions of "causality" (e.g. those considered in [27] in the discrete case).

REFERENCES

[1] J. Agler and J.E. McCarthy. *Pick interpolation and Hilbert function spaces*, volume 44 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 2002.
[2] A.C. Antoulas, A.C. Ionita, and S. Lefteriu. On two-variable rational interpolation. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 436(8):2889 – 2915, 2012.
[3] A.C.A. Antoulas and P. Rapisarda. Bilinear differential forms and the Loewner framework for rational interpolation. In M. Belur, M.K. Çamlibel, and P. Rapisarda, editors, *Mathematical Control Theory II: Lect. Notes Control, vol. 462*, chapter 2. Springer-Verlag, 2015.
[4] J.A. Ball and V. Bolotnikov. Canonical transfer-function realization for Schur-Agler-class functions of the polydisk. In H. Dym, M.A. Kaashoek, P. Lancaster, H. Langer, and L. Lerer, editors, *A Panorama of Modern Operator Theory and Related Topics*, volume 218 of *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*, pages 75–122. Springer Basel, 2012.
[5] J.A. Ball, C. Sadosky, and V. Vinnikov. Scattering systems with several evolutions and multidimensional input/state/output systems. *Integral Equations and Operator Theory*, 52(3):323–393, 2005.

[6] K. Bickel and G. Knese. Canonical Agler decompositions and transfer function realizations. *ArXiv preprint arXiv:1312.0177v1 [math:FA]*, 2013.

[7] M. Farah, G. Mercere, R. Ouvrard, T. Poinot, and J. Ramos. Identification of 2D Roesser models by using linear fractional transformations. In *Proc. 2014 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 382–387, June 2014.

[8] O. Kaneko and P. Rapisarda. Recursive exact H_∞-identification from impulse-response measurements. *Syst. Contr. Lett.*, 49(5):323–334, 2003.

[9] O. Kaneko and P. Rapisarda. On the Takagi interpolation problem. *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 425(2):453–470, 2007.

[10] C. Kojima, P. Rapisarda, and K. Takaba. Canonical forms for polynomial and quadratic differential operators. *Syst. Contr. Lett.*, 56(11):678–684, 2007.

[11] C. Kojima, P. Rapisarda, and K. Takaba. Lyapunov stability analysis of higher-order 2D systems. *Mult. Syst. Sign. Proc.*, 22(4):287–302, 2011.

[12] B. De Moor M. Moonen, L. Vandenberghe, and J. Vandewalle. On- and off-line identification of linear state-space models. *Int. J. Contr.*, 49(1):219–232, 1989.

[13] D. Napp-Avelli, P. Rapisarda, and P. Rocha. Lyapunov stability of 2D finite-dimensional behaviours. *Int. J. Contr.*, 84(4):737–745, 2011.

[14] D. Napp-Avelli, P. Rapisarda, and P. Rocha. Time-relevant stability of 2D systems. *Automatica*, 47(11):2373–2382, 2011.

[15] U. Oberst. On the minimal number of trajectories determining a multidimensional system. *Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems*, 6(3):264–288, 1993.

[16] H.K. Pillai and H. Narayanan. On duality of behavioural systems. *Mult. Syst. Sign. Proc.*, 13(4):357–383, 2002.

[17] H.K. Pillai and S. Shankar. A behavioral approach to control of distributed systems. *SIAM J. Contr. Opt.*, 37(2):388–408, 1999.

[18] H.K. Pillai and J.C. Willems. Lossless and dissipative distributed systems. *SIAM J. Contr. Opt.*, 40(5):1406–1430, 2002.

[19] J. Ramos. A subspace algorithm for identifying 2-D separable in denominator filters. *IEEE Trans. Circ. Syst. II: Analog and Digital Signal Processing*, 41(1):63–67, 1994.

[20] P. Rapisarda and A.C. Antoulas. A duality perspective on Loewner interpolation. In *Proc. 56th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2096–2100, December 2015.

[21] P. Rapisarda and P. Rocha. Lyapunov functions for time-relevant 2D systems, with application to first-orthant stable systems. *Automatica*, 48(9):1998–2006, 2012.

[22] P. Rapisarda and H.L. Trentelman. Identification and data-driven model reduction of state-space representations of lossless and dissipative systems from noise-free data. *Automatica*, 47(8):1721–1728, 2011.

[23] P. Rapisarda and A.J. van der Schaft. From integration by parts to state and boundary variables of linear differential and partial differential systems. In K. Hüper and J. Trumpf, editors, *Mathematical System Theory - Festschrift in Honor of Uwe Helmke on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, pages 437–448. CreateSpace, 2013.

[24] P. Rapisarda and A.J. van der Schaft. Identification and data-driven reduced-order modeling for linear conservative port- and self-adjoint Hamiltonian systems. *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decis. Contr., Firenze, Italy*, 2013.

[25] P. Rapisarda and J.C. Willems. The subspace Nevanlinna interpolation problem and the most powerful unfalsified model. *Systems & control letters*, 32(5):291–300, 1997.

[26] B. Recht, M. Fazel, and P.A. Parrilo. Guaranteed minimum-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via nuclear norm minimization. *SIAM Review*, 52(3):471–501, 2010.

[27] P. Rocha and J.C. Willems. Controllability of 2-D systems. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Contr.*, 36(4):413–423, 1991.

[28] R.P. Roesser. A discrete state-space model for linear image processing. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Contr.*, 20(1):1–10, 1975.

[29] R.B. Leighton R.P. Feynman and M. Sands. *The Feynman Lectures on Physics vol. 2*. Addison-Wesley, 1964.

[30] J.C. Willems and H.L. Trentelman. On quadratic differential forms. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 36:1703–1749, 1998.

[31] E. Zerz. Multidimensional behaviours: an algebraic approach to control theory for PDE. *Int. J. Contr.*, 77(9):812–820, 2004.

[32] E. Zerz. Characteristic frequencies, polynomial-exponential trajectories, and linear exact modeling with multidimensional behaviors. *SIAM J. Contr. Opt.*, 44(3):1148–1163, 2005.

[33] E. Zerz. The discrete multidimensional MPUM. *Multidim. Syst. Sign. Proc.*, 19(3-4):307–321, 2008.