

EINDHOVEN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science

CASA-Report 13-31
November 2013

Stochastic Galerkin methods and model order reduction
for linear dynamical systems

by

R. Pulch, E.J.W. ter Maten



Centre for Analysis, Scientific computing and Applications
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
Eindhoven University of Technology
P.O. Box 513
5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands
ISSN: 0926-4507

Stochastic Galerkin Methods and Model Order Reduction for Linear Dynamical Systems

Roland Pulch¹

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Ernst-Moritz-Arndt Universität Greifswald,
Walther-Rathenau-Str. 47, D-17487 Greifswald, Germany.
Email: roland.pulch@uni-greifswald.de

E. Jan W. ter Maten

Centre for Analysis, Scientific computing and Applications (CASA),
Dept. Mathematics & Computer Science, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven,
P.O.Box 513, NL-5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands.
Email: E.J.W.ter.Maten@tue.nl

and

Chair Applied Mathematics and Numerical Analysis (FB C, AMNA),
Bergische Universität Wuppertal,
Gaußstraße 20, Rm WP.05.03, D-42119 Wuppertal, Germany.
Email: Jan.ter.Maten@math.uni-wuppertal.de

Abstract

Linear dynamical systems are considered in form of ordinary differential equations or differential algebraic equations. We change their physical parameters into random variables to represent uncertainties. A stochastic Galerkin method yields a larger linear dynamical system satisfied by an approximation of the random processes. If the original systems own a high dimensionality, then a model order reduction is required to decrease the complexity. We investigate two approaches: the system of the stochastic Galerkin scheme is reduced and, vice versa, the original systems are reduced followed by an application of the stochastic Galerkin method. The properties are analyzed in case of reductions based on moment matching with the Arnoldi algorithm. We present numerical computations for two test examples.

¹corresponding author

1 Introduction

In science and engineering, dynamical systems of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) or differential algebraic equations (DAEs) often appear as mathematical models. The systems include physical parameters, which may exhibit uncertainties due to measurement errors or imperfections of a manufacturing procedure, for example. We quantify the uncertainties using a stochastic modeling, where the deterministic parameters are substituted by random variables.

The solution of the stochastic models can be computed numerically by sampling methods like (quasi) Monte-Carlo simulations, for example. Therein, the dynamical system has to be resolved many times. Alternatively, we consider numerical techniques based on the polynomial chaos expansions of the unknown random processes, see [30, 31]. A stochastic Galerkin (SG) method yields a larger coupled system, which has to be solved just once to obtain an approximation of the random processes, see [15, 32]. This approach has already been applied successfully to systems of ODEs and DAEs, see [21, 22, 23].

We consider linear dynamical systems with random parameters, where the dimension of the state space is already large due to the original modeling. Thus a model order reduction (MOR) is advantageous to decrease the complexity of the problem. Appropriate MOR methods are available for linear dynamical systems, see [1, 5, 26]. Moreover, parameterized model order reduction (pMOR) has been developed to preserve deterministic parameters as independent variables in the reduced order models, see [3, 6, 4, 13]. In case of large numbers of random parameters, a reduction of the random space based on a sensitivity analysis is discussed in [24].

In this paper, we apply MOR in connection to the SG method to solve the stochastic models. On the one hand, the reduction of the coupled system resulting from the SG approach is investigated. This strategy has already been used in [19, 33] for Gaussian random variables. On the other hand, we reduce the original dynamical systems and apply the SG method afterwards. In the second approach, more variants are feasible. We discuss both traditional MOR and pMOR for this purpose. A focus is on reduction using moment matching by the Arnoldi algorithm, see [14], which turns out to be advantageous due to a preservation of smoothness. A brief error analysis is given. We compare the two strategies with respect to accuracy and computational effort.

2 Dynamical systems with random parameters

In this section, we define the problems to be considered in the stochastic methods and the model order reductions.

2.1 Linear dynamical systems

We consider linear dynamical systems of the form

$$\begin{aligned} C(p)\dot{x}(t,p) + G(p)x(t,p) &= Bu(t) \\ y(t,p) &= Lx(t,p) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

in a time interval $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ with predetermined input signals $u : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_{\text{in}}}$. The square matrices $C(p), G(p) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ typically include physical parameters $p \in \Pi$ in some relevant subset $\Pi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^Q$. Consequently, the unknown state variables $x : [t_0, t_1] \times \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ depend on time as well as the parameters. Furthermore, output variables $y : [t_0, t_1] \times \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_{\text{out}}}$ are defined as quantities of interest. The matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N_{\text{in}}}$ and $L \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\text{out}} \times N}$ are associated to the input and the output, respectively, and do not depend on the parameters.

If $\det(C(p)) \neq 0$ holds, then the system (1) represents ordinary differential equations (ODEs). In contrast, the system (1) consists of differential algebraic equations (DAEs) when $\det(C(p)) = 0$. In the latter case, we assume a regular matrix pencil, i.e., it holds for each $p \in \Pi$ that $\det(C(p) + \lambda G(p)) \neq 0$ for almost all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

Let $U(s)$, $X(s, p)$, $Y(s, p)$ be the Laplace transform of the above time-dependent functions with the same dimensions. The input-output behavior of the dynamical system (1) is specified by a transfer function in the frequency domain, see [1]. Due to the dependence on the parameters, the transfer function reads as

$$H(s, p) = L(G(p) + sC(p))^{-1}B \tag{2}$$

with independent variable $s \in \mathbb{C}$. The transfer function is matrix-valued, since it holds that $H(s, p) \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{\text{out}} \times N_{\text{in}}}$. An exception are single-input-single-output (SISO) systems, which imply $N_{\text{out}} = N_{\text{in}} = 1$. The input-output relation is given by $Y(s, p) = H(s, p)U(s)$ in any case. The domain of dependence on s is typically restricted to the imaginary axis.

2.2 Stochastic modeling

Now we assume that the chosen parameters exhibit some uncertainties. To achieve an uncertainty quantification, we substitute the parameters by independent random variables

$$p : \Omega \rightarrow \Pi, \quad \omega \mapsto p(\omega) = (p_1(\omega), \dots, p_Q(\omega))^\top$$

on some probability space (Ω, \mathcal{A}, P) with event space Ω , sigma-algebra \mathcal{A} and probability measure P . For example, uniform distributions, Gaussian distributions or beta distributions can be applied. Using traditional random distributions, a probability density function $\rho : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is available. Consequently, the state variables and outputs satisfying (1) become time-dependent random processes. We are interested in statistics (expected value, variance, etc.) or more sophisticated stochastic quantities of the outputs.

Given a measurable function $f : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ with $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, we introduce the abbreviation

$$\langle f(p) \rangle := \int_{\Omega} f(p(\omega)) \, dP(\omega) = \int_{\Pi} f(p) \rho(p) \, dp \quad (3)$$

for the expected value, provided that it exists. The expected value (3) implies an inner product for the Hilbert space $L^2(\Pi, \rho) := \{f : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{K} \mid \langle |f|^2 \rangle < \infty\}$. Given $f, g \in L^2(\Pi, \rho)$, this inner product is just $\langle f(p)g(p) \rangle$ for $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ and $\langle f(p)\overline{g(p)} \rangle$ for $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$. We apply these notations also componentwise to vector-valued as well as matrix-valued functions.

2.3 Polynomial chaos expansions

Each probability distribution yields an associated orthonormal system of polynomials $(\Phi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ provided that all polynomials belong to $L^2(\Pi, \rho)$, see [30]. Thus it holds that $\langle \Phi_i(p)\Phi_j(p) \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ with the Kronecker delta δ_{ij} . We assume that the orthonormal polynomials are dense in $L^2(\Pi, \rho)$. This property is fulfilled by probability distributions of uniform, Gaussian or beta type, for example. General distributions have to satisfy certain conditions, see [11]. Consequently, a function $f \in L^2(\Pi, \rho)$ exhibits a representation in the so-called polynomial chaos (PC), see [32],

$$f(p) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f_i \Phi_i(p), \quad (4)$$

in which the coefficients $f_i \in \mathbb{K}$ are given by the projection $f_i = \langle f(p)\Phi_i(p) \rangle$. The expansion (4) converges in the norm of $L^2(\Pi, \rho)$. The rate of convergence depends on the smoothness of f with respect to the parameters. The expected value is just $\langle f \rangle = f_0$. For $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, the variance follows from an infinite sum: $\text{Var}(f) = f_1^2 + f_2^2 + \dots$.

Assuming finite second moments, we apply the PC expansions (4) to the state variables, the output variables and the transfer function of the dynamical system (1). Therein, the representation exists pointwise for each time $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ or each frequency $s \in \mathbb{C}$.

To compute an approximation of the random processes x or y solving (1), a PC expansion (4) is truncated after the first M terms. Typically, all basis polynomials $\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_{M-1}$ up to some degree D are chosen. It holds that $M = \frac{(Q+D)!}{Q!D!}$. There are mainly two types of numerical methods to compute the unknown coefficient functions: stochastic collocation techniques and the stochastic Galerkin (SG) method, see [15, 31, 32]. We consider only the SG approach in this paper, since its properties are advantageous in the case of linear dynamical systems, see [10]. However, we admit that in several cases the stochastic collocation method combines providing good results with flexibility in allowing the use of different simulation tools.

2.4 Stochastic Galerkin method

We outline the well-known SG technique for the dynamical system (1) including random parameters. The PC expansion of the state variables as well as the output variables are truncated at some $M \geq 1$, i.e., we obtain

$$x^{(M)}(t, p) = \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} v_i(t)\Phi_i(p), \quad y^{(M)}(t, p) = \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} w_i(t)\Phi_i(p). \quad (5)$$

It holds that $w_i(t) = Lv_i(t)$ for the exact coefficients only. Inserting the finite approximations (5) into the linear dynamical system (1) yields the residuals

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_x(t, p) &:= C(p)\dot{x}^{(M)}(t, p) + G(p)x^{(M)}(t, p) - Bu(t), \\ \delta_y(t, p) &:= y^{(M)}(t, p) - Lx^{(M)}(t, p). \end{aligned}$$

We want to determine the unknown coefficients such that the residuals become small in a sense. The Galerkin method implies that the

residuals are orthogonal with respect to the applied space of basis polynomials, i.e.,

$$\langle \delta_x(t, p) \Phi_l(p) \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \delta_y(t, p) \Phi_l(p) \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for } l = 0, 1, \dots, M-1$$

and each $t \in [t_0, t_1]$. We obtain the larger coupled system

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}\dot{v}(t) + \hat{G}v(t) &= \hat{B}u(t) \\ w(t) &= \hat{L}v(t) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

with $v := (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{M-1})^\top$ and $w := (w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{M-1})^\top$. The resulting matrices $\hat{C}, \hat{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{MN \times MN}$ consist of the following minors

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C} &= (C_{ij})_{i,j=0,\dots,M-1}, & C_{ij} &:= \langle C(p) \Phi_i(p) \Phi_j(p) \rangle, \\ \hat{G} &= (G_{ij})_{i,j=0,\dots,M-1}, & G_{ij} &:= \langle G(p) \Phi_i(p) \Phi_j(p) \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The matrices $\hat{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{MN \times N_{\text{in}}}$ and $\hat{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{MN_{\text{out}} \times MN}$ result to $\hat{B} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top \otimes B$ and $\hat{L} = I_M \otimes L$ with the Kronecker product and the identity matrix I_M , since their entries do not depend on the parameters. The coupled system (6) has to be solved just once to achieve an approximation of the random processes.

In mathematical models of technical applications, and assuming appropriate definitions of the parameters, the entries of the matrices $C(p), G(p)$ in (1) are often polynomials or even affine functions in the variables p . In this case, we can calculate the entries (7) of the matrices \hat{C}, \hat{G} in (6) analytically for traditional probability distributions. In any case, we can use a quadrature for the probabilistic integrals in (7) to compute the entries of \hat{C}, \hat{G} sufficiently accurate a priori, where the computational effort is negligible in comparison to the time integration or an MOR of the coupled system (6).

The coupled system (6) also exhibits an input-output behavior, which is specified by the transfer function

$$\hat{H}(s) := \hat{L}(\hat{G} + s\hat{C})^{-1}\hat{B}. \tag{8}$$

It follows that the entries of $\hat{H}(s) \in \mathbb{C}^{MN_{\text{out}} \times N_{\text{in}}}$ include approximations of the PC coefficients for the original transfer function (2), see [24].

2.5 Model order reduction

We assume that the dynamical systems (1) have a huge dimensionality N now. The following statements also hold for deterministic

parameters. Let first a fixed realization $p \in \Pi$ of the parameters be given. Several approaches exist to reduce the complexity of such systems like moment matching, Krylov-space methods, balanced truncation, SVD-type methods, proper orthogonal decomposition, see [1]. It follows that the system (1) is reduced to a system

$$\begin{aligned} C_r(p)\dot{x}_r(t,p) + G_r(p)x_r(t,p) &= B_r(p)u(t) \\ y_r(t,p) &= L_r(p)x_r(t,p) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

of state space dimension $N_{\text{red}} \ll N$. Yet a good approximation $y_r \approx y$ shall be achieved. The transfer function of the reduced order model (9) reads as

$$H_r(s,p) := L_r(G_r(p) + sC_r(p))^{-1}B_r \quad (10)$$

with same size $\mathbb{C}^{N_{\text{out}} \times N_{\text{in}}}$ as H in (2). Often the MOR approach yields projection matrices $W(p), V(p) \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N_{\text{red}}}$ satisfying the orthogonality $W^H(p)V(p) = I_{N_{\text{red}}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} C_r(p) &= W(p)^H C(p) V(p), & G_r(p) &= W(p)^H G(p) V(p), \\ B_r(p) &= W(p)^H B, & L_r(p) &= L V(p). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Note that the matrices B_r and L_r depend on the parameters now due to the projection matrices.

We consider moment matching for MOR based on Krylov-spaces. Choosing an expansion point $s_0 = i\omega_0$ with $\omega_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the reduced order model (9) is constructed such that the transfer function H_r becomes a Padé approximant of H with identical moments in s_0 up to some order. We will use the Arnoldi process to calculate the projection matrices, which implies $W(p) = V(p)$. Generalizations to several expansion points also exists. For more details, we refer to [1, 14]. This strategy is also applicable to the coupled system (6) in the same manner.

Alternatively, techniques of parameterized model order reduction (pMOR) preserve the parameters as independent variables in reduced systems, see [3, 6, 13]. Often constant projection matrices $W_0, V_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N_{\text{red}}}$ are determined a priori using the information from many samples of the parameters, cf. [18], for example. The matrices of the reduced order model (9) become

$$\begin{aligned} C_r(p) &= W_0^H C(p) V_0, & G_r(p) &= W_0^H G(p) V_0, \\ B_r &= W_0^H B, & L_r &= L V_0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The advantage is that $C_r(p), G_r(p)$ can be evaluated directly for arbitrary $p \in \Pi$. Furthermore, the matrices B_r, L_r are independent of the parameters.

Table 1: Flow chart.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{l} C(p)\dot{x} + G(p)x = Bu \\ y = Lx \\ Y(s,p) = H(s,p)U(s) \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\text{SG}} & \begin{array}{l} \hat{C}\dot{v} + \hat{G}v = \hat{B}u \\ w = \hat{L}v \\ W(s) = \hat{H}(s)U(s) \end{array} \\
 \begin{array}{c} \text{(p)MOR} \downarrow \\ \phantom{\text{(p)MOR}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \text{MOR} \downarrow \\ \phantom{\text{MOR}} \end{array} \\
 \begin{array}{l} C_r(p)\dot{x}_r + G_r(p)x_r = B_r(p)u \\ y_r = L_r(p)x_r \\ Y_r(s,p) = H_r(s,p)U(s) \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\text{SG}} & \begin{array}{l} \hat{C}_r\dot{v}_r + \hat{G}_rv_r = \hat{B}_ru \\ w_r = \hat{L}_rv_r \\ W_r(s) = \hat{H}_r(s)U(s) \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

3 Reduction of stochastic model

In this section, we investigate two approaches, that are illustrated in Table 1. In Sect. 3.1, we first apply the SG method to the random dynamical system and next use an MOR method (first "right", then "down"). In Sect. 3.2, we first employ a (parameterized) MOR method and next apply the SG method (first "down", then "right").

3.1 MOR for the SG system

The SG method changes the random dynamical system (1) into the coupled system (6). If the size N of the original system is already large, then the coupled system exhibits the even higher dimension MN . Hence the coupled system (6) is an excellent candidate for MOR. Moreover, a high potential for reduction appears, because sparse representations are often observed in PC expansions, see [7, 8]. If the number M refers to all polynomials up to a fixed degree, then a sparse representation implies that a smaller number of basis functions would also yield an approximation of the same quality. Ordinary MOR schemes for the coupled system (6) are able to decrease the dimensionality without knowing the significant basis polynomials. In particular, a potential for MOR is given even if the original system (1) does not allow for an efficient reduction. Note that there is no need for pMOR schemes in this procedure, since the parameters do not appear explicitly in the coupled system (6) due to the probabilistic integration

in (7).

An MOR of the coupled system (6) yields a linear dynamical system of smaller size

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_r \dot{v}_r(t) + \hat{G}_r v_r(t) &= \hat{B}_r u(t) \\ w_r(t) &= \hat{L}_r v_r(t).\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

This strategy was already applied in [19, 33] for random variables with Gaussian distributions. In [24], this reduction has been employed for uniformly distributed parameters.

We consider moment matching for a reduction of the system (6), where the Arnoldi algorithm is applied, see [14]. We suppose that all resulting linear systems of algebraic equations are solved directly by an LU -decomposition. Assuming a single expansion point $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, this procedure requires just one decomposition of the matrix $\hat{G} + s_0 \hat{C}$, cf. (8). However, if the dimension MN is huge, then this decomposition represents a bottleneck in the complete strategy.

3.1.1 Convergence properties

To analyze the performance of this approach, we investigate the relations between the transfer functions of the systems (1) and (6). For simplicity, we consider SISO systems, since generalizations to multiple-input multiple-output are straightforward. A result on the Laplace transform is required.

Lemma 1 (Laplace transform) *Let $y(t, p)$ and a sequence $y^{(M)}(t, p)$ be given, where all functions exhibit finite second moments. If the convergence*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \left(y^{(M)}(t, p) - y(t, p) \right)^2 \right\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for each } t \geq 0 \tag{14}$$

is valid and is dominated by a Laplace-transformable function in time, then the associated Laplace transforms inherit the convergence

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \left| Y^{(M)}(s, p) - Y(s, p) \right|^2 \right\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for each } s \tag{15}$$

provided that the Laplace transforms exist.

Proof: We write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle |Y^{(M)}(s, p) - Y(s, p)|^2 \rangle \\
&= \int_{\Pi} \left| \int_0^\infty e^{-st} y^{(M)}(t, p) dt - \int_0^\infty e^{-st} y(t, p) dt \right|^2 \rho(p) dp \\
&\leq \int_{\Pi} \left[\int_0^\infty |e^{-st} (y^{(M)}(t, p) - y(t, p))| dt \right]^2 \rho(p) dp \\
&= \int_{\Pi} \left[\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |e^{-st} e^{-su} (y^{(M)}(t, p) - y(t, p)) (y^{(M)}(u, p) - y(u, p))| du dt \right] \rho(p) dp \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |e^{-st} e^{-su}| \cdot \left[\int_{\Pi} |(y^{(M)}(t, p) - y(t, p)) (y^{(M)}(u, p) - y(u, p))| \rho(p) dp \right] du dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |e^{-st} e^{-su}| \cdot \left\langle |(y^{(M)}(t, p) - y(t, p)) (y^{(M)}(u, p) - y(u, p))| \right\rangle du dt.
\end{aligned}$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle |Y^{(M)}(s, p) - Y(s, p)|^2 \rangle \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |e^{-st} e^{-su}| \sqrt{\langle (y^{(M)}(t, p) - y(t, p))^2 \rangle} \sqrt{\langle (y^{(M)}(u, p) - y(u, p))^2 \rangle} du dt \\
&= \left[\int_0^\infty |e^{-st}| \cdot \sqrt{\langle (y^{(M)}(t, p) - y(t, p))^2 \rangle} dt \right]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

for each $s \in \mathbb{C}$ where the Laplace transform exists. The finiteness of the upper estimate follows from the existence of the Laplace transforms using the inequality $(y^{(M)} - y)^2 \leq (|y^{(M)}| + |y|)^2$. Moreover, the existence of this upper bound allows for the above interchange of the integrations in time domain and probability space by the Theorem of Fubini. For increasing M , the integrand converges point-wise to zero for each $t \geq 0$ due to (14). We obtain the convergence (15) by the Theorem of dominated convergence. \square

We continue by showing that the transfer function of the coupled system converges to the original transfer function of the random dynamical system provided that the SG method converges in time domain.

Theorem 1 (convergence of transfer function) *Let the stochastic Galerkin method be convergent in the time domain, i.e., the sequence $y^{(M)}(t, p)$ of outputs satisfies (14). Under the additional assumptions of Lemma 1, it follows that*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \left| H(s, p) - \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \hat{H}_i(s) \Phi_i(p) \right|^2 \right\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for each } s, \quad (16)$$

where $H(s, p)$ is the transfer function of the dynamical system (1) and $\hat{H}_i(s)$ are the values from (8) belonging the coupled system (6).

Proof: Let $w_i(t)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, M-1$ be the components of the output of the coupled system (6), which means that they are not identical to the exact PC coefficients. Let $W_i(s)$ be the Laplace transform of $w_i(t)$ for each i . The approximation $y^{(M)}(t, p)$ is reconstructed from $w_0(t), \dots, w_{M-1}(t)$. Its Laplace transform can be written as

$$Y^{(M)}(s, p) = \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} W_i(s) \Phi_i(p)$$

due to the linearity of the Laplace transformation. The convergence (14) implies the convergence (15) of the associated Laplace transforms by Lemma 1. Given an arbitrary input u and its Laplace transform U , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \left| Y(s, p) - Y^{(M)}(s, p) \right|^2 \right\rangle &= \left\langle \left| H(s, p)U(s) - \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \hat{H}_i(s)U(s)\Phi_i(p) \right|^2 \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \left| H(s, p) - \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \hat{H}_i(s)\Phi_i(p) \right|^2 \right\rangle \cdot |U(s)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

for each $s \in \mathbb{C}$ where the Laplace transform exists. For each fixed s_0 , we choose the input $u(t) := e^{(-1+s_0)t}$, which results in $U(s_0) = 1$. Hence the convergence (16) follows pointwise for s . \square

3.1.2 Error analysis

We analyze the approximation error for the transfer function. Let $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$ be the norm of the Hilbert space $L^2(\Pi, \rho)$ for complex-valued functions. We denote the components of the transfer function for the reduced system (13) by $(\hat{H}_r)_i$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| H(s, p) - \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} (\hat{H}_r)_i(s)\Phi_i(p) \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \left\| H(s, p) - \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \hat{H}_i(s)\Phi_i(p) \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} [\hat{H}_i(s) - (\hat{H}_r)_i(s)] \Phi_i(p) \right\|_{L^2} \\ &=: E_1(s) + E_2(s). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The term E_1 in (17) converges to zero in view of Theorem 1. The term E_2 in (17) can be estimated by

$$E_2(s) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \left| \hat{H}_i(s) - (\hat{H}_r)_i(s) \right| = \left\| \hat{H}(s) - \hat{H}_r(s) \right\|_1$$

with the vector norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ in \mathbb{C}^M , since each basis polynomial has an L^2 -norm of one. The magnitude of the error term E_2 depends on the MOR scheme applied to the coupled system (6).

3.2 MOR for original parameterized system

Now we reduce the dynamical system (1) at first and use the SG method afterwards. The strategy from Sect. 3.1 is straightforward except for the choice of the MOR scheme. In contrast, the alternative strategy of this subsection allows for several variants with respect to the discretization of probabilistic integrals in the SG technique. Moreover, the feasibility of each approach has to be examined carefully.

We assume that an MOR method yields the matrices in the reduced system (9) of dimension N_{red} for an arbitrary $p \in \Pi$. A direct application of the SG method to the system (9) results in the following formulas for the minors of the matrices

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{C}_r &\in \mathbb{C}^{MN_{\text{red}} \times MN_{\text{red}}} &: (\hat{C}_r)_{ij} &:= \langle C_r(p) \Phi_i(p) \Phi_j(p) \rangle, \\
\hat{G}_r &\in \mathbb{C}^{MN_{\text{red}} \times MN_{\text{red}}} &: (\hat{G}_r)_{ij} &:= \langle G_r(p) \Phi_i(p) \Phi_j(p) \rangle, \\
\hat{B}_r &\in \mathbb{C}^{MN_{\text{red}} \times N_{\text{in}}} &: (\hat{B}_r)_i &:= \langle B_r(p) \Phi_i(p) \rangle, \\
\hat{L}_r &\in \mathbb{C}^{MN_{\text{out}} \times MN_{\text{red}}} &: (\hat{L}_r)_{ij} &:= \langle L_r(p) \Phi_i(p) \Phi_j(p) \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The matrices are real-valued or complex-valued conditioned by the MOR scheme. In (18), the existence of the probabilistic integrals has to be guaranteed. We discuss two variants in the further proceeding.

3.2.1 Matrix sampling

The probabilistic integrals in (18) are approximated by a quadrature formula or a sampling scheme. The approximation with respect to \hat{C}_r reads as

$$\langle C_r(p) \Phi_i(p) \Phi_j(p) \rangle \doteq \sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_k C_r(p^{(k)}) \Phi_i(p^{(k)}) \Phi_j(p^{(k)})$$

with nodes $p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(K)} \in \Pi$ and weights $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K \in \mathbb{R}$. Likewise, the identical quadrature is used for the other matrices. Hence the computational work consists in K reductions of the system (1). It is natural to apply the same MOR approach pointwise for each node $p^{(k)}$

to determine the reduced matrices. Using moment matching, the dimension of the Krylov-spaces may depend on p . However, an identical reduced dimension N_{red} is assumed for all nodes in our approach.

For the existence of the probabilistic integrals in (18), we assume that the reduced matrices are at least continuous with respect to the dependence on the parameters, cf. [3]. Note that there may be some MOR approaches, where this property is violated. Nevertheless, the smoothness of the matrices with respect to parameters is preserved by the Arnoldi procedure.

Lemma 2 (matrices from Arnoldi algorithm) *If the system matrices $C(p)$, $G(p)$ are ℓ -times continuously differentiable on the parameter space Π , then the Arnoldi algorithm yields a projection matrix $V(p)$ that is ℓ -times continuously differentiable again.*

The proof of this lemma can be obtained by checking that each step of the Arnoldi algorithm, see [14], involves differentiable operations. Consequently, the reduced matrices $C_r(p)$, $G_r(p)$, $B_r(p)$, $L_r(p)$ in (11) also inherit the smoothness.

The information from Lemma 2 is valuable, since it allows for conclusions on the convergence of the SG method in case of ODEs (1). If $C(p), G(p) \in \mathcal{C}^\ell$, then the solution satisfies $x, y \in \mathcal{C}^\ell$ with respect to the parameters. The speed of convergence of the PC expansion depends on the smoothness of the random processes. Now the Arnoldi algorithm implies a reduced system (9). We assume that $C_r(p)$ is regular, which is obvious in case of symmetric positive definite matrices $C(p)$. Hence the solution fulfills $x_r, y_r \in \mathcal{C}^\ell$ again. Although the SG method is convergent for just continuous reduced matrices, the rate of convergence of the SG is preserved due to the smoothness. In case of DAEs (1), the analysis of the dependence on parameters is more difficult and the index of the system has to be considered, cf. [17].

3.2.2 Parameterized MOR approach

Now we employ a pMOR as outlined in Sect. 2.5. Given constant projection matrices $W_0, V_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N_{\text{red}}}$, we arrange the reduced matrices (12). The computation of the reduced matrices (18) in the SG method can be done exactly now. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle C_r(p)\Phi_i(p)\Phi_j(p) \rangle &= \langle W_0 C(p) V_0 \Phi_i(p) \Phi_j(p) \rangle = \\ &= W_0 \langle C(p) \Phi_i(p) \Phi_j(p) \rangle V_0 = W_0 \hat{C}_{ij} V_0 \end{aligned}$$

and, likewise, for the other matrices. Since the projection matrices are constant, the existence of the probabilistic integrals follows directly from the continuity of the matrices $C(p), G(p)$.

We refine the minors (7) of the matrix of the coupled system (6) in the above formula. Thus the reduced matrices can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_r &= (I_M \otimes W_0)^H \hat{C} (I_M \otimes V_0), & \hat{G}_r &= (I_M \otimes W_0)^H \hat{G} (I_M \otimes V_0), \\ \hat{B}_r &= (I_M \otimes W_0)^H \hat{B}, & \hat{L}_r &= \hat{L} (I_M \otimes V_0)\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

using Kronecker products and the identity matrix I_M . Hence the construction (19) represents a special case of an MOR for the coupled system (6), cf. Sect. 3.1. The crucial advantage is that an LU -decomposition of a matrix of size MN is omitted in this variant.

We consider two techniques to construct the projection matrices, which will be used for numerical simulations in Sect. 4. Therein, we arrange $W_0 = V_0$.

- a) A trivial pMOR is obtained by using $V_0 := V(\bar{p})$ with some reference realization $\bar{p} \in \Pi$ of the parameters like the expected value $\bar{p} := \langle p \rangle$, for example. The computational effort consists in just a single application of an MOR scheme. However, we do not expect a high accuracy in this variant unless the projection matrix $V(p)$ is nearly constant with respect to the parameters. We refer to [4, 12] for a good example of a projection matrix $V(p)$ that strongly varies with respect to p .
- b) A more sophisticated approach uses samples $p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(K)} \in \Pi$, where an MOR is applied pointwise. A grid of a quadrature rule is feasible, whereas the quadrature weights will not be used. It is allowed that the reduced dimension is different for each grid point now. For brevity, we assume the same dimension in each system. We arrange the projection matrices in a matrix

$$\tilde{V} := (V(p^{(1)}) \dots V(p^{(K)})) \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times KN_{\text{red}}},\tag{20}$$

in which each individual $V(p^{(j)})$ is a non-square matrix with orthonormal columns. In [18], the pMOR was performed by the global matrix $V_0 := \tilde{V}$ obtained by explicit moment matching after expanding in all components of p . A stable implicit moment matching algorithm is provided in [4]. A recycling Krylov-space approach is considered in [13]. Using all these algorithms, one may stop a particular extension of the subspace built so far when the new vector orthogonal to it has a sufficiently small norm.

Also we consider an additional reduction, since the dimension KN_{red} of (20) may be large. We follow an approach in [29], where a global basis was constructed from several local bases. A singular value decomposition (SVD) yields the factorization $\tilde{V} = UDT^H$ with unitary matrices U, T and a diagonal matrix D including the singular values. The span of the column vectors satisfies $\text{span}(\tilde{V}) = \text{span}(UD)$. Choosing an integer $R < KN_{\text{red}}$, we collect the R columns of U , which correspond to the largest singular values, into a global projection matrix $V_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times R}$. Thus we obtain the dominant directions in V_0 .

3.3 Error analysis

We discuss shortly the error of the techniques from Sect. 3.2.1 and Sect. 3.2.2. Similar to (17), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| H(s, p) - \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} (\hat{H}_r)_i(s) \Phi_i(p) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & \leq \left\| H(s, p) - H_r(s, p) \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| H_r(s, p) - \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} (\hat{H}_r)_i(s) \Phi_i(p) \right\|_{L^2} \\ & =: E_3(s) + E_4(s). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The quality of the MOR determines the magnitude of the term $E_3(s)$ in (21). Since the L^2 -norm of the probability space is employed, the MOR is required to be sufficiently accurate in subdomains of the parameters with relatively large probabilities. The term $E_4(s)$ in (21) depends on the convergence of the SG method. Using the Arnoldi procedure, the SG approach is convergent for systems of ODEs (1), due to Lemma 2. Theorem 1 implies that $E_4(s)$ tends to zero.

Finally, Table 2 summarizes the properties of the two approaches. The first strategy indicates a higher accuracy, while a large computational effort appears for large numbers of basis polynomials. Vice versa, the second strategy offers a lower computational time, whereas the accuracy is reduced by further errors.

4 Test examples

We present results for the simulation of two illustrative examples in this section.

Table 2: Comparison of the two approaches in Sect.3.1 and Sect. 3.2.

MOR after SG	SG after MOR
often high potential for reduction of the coupled system	potential for reduction depends only on the parameterized system
matrices \hat{G}, \hat{C} often computable without errors	matrices \hat{G}_r, \hat{C}_r include some discretization error
arbitrary choice of reduced dimension	system has to be reduced to the same dimension for each parameter in matrix sampling
LU -decomposition of higher dimension MN	LU -decompositions of dimension N
potential for parallelism mostly just in LU -decomposition	potential for parallelism by MOR for different parameters

4.1 Anemometer

The anemometer represents a benchmark in the MOR Wiki [34]. Heat is added to a fluid, where a flow field causes an asymmetric heat distribution. Consequently, a temperature difference appears between two thermal sensors, which allows for a measurement of the fluid velocity. Fig. 1 illustrates the layout of the anemometer.

This application is modeled by a convection-diffusion equation

$$\rho c \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla T) - \rho c \vec{v} \cdot \nabla T + \dot{q} \quad (22)$$

for the unknown temperature T in two space dimensions. The heat flow \dot{q} represents the input, whereas the temperature difference of the sensors yields the output. A velocity profile \vec{v} is predetermined. The involved physical parameters are the density ρ , the scalar fluid velocity v (as a part of \vec{v}), the specific heat c and the thermal conductivity κ . We assume a constant density $\rho = 1$. Hence our parameters read as $p = (v, c, \kappa)^\top$. A finite element discretization of the partial differential equation (22) produces an implicit system of ODEs with dimension $N = 29,008$. This SISO system exhibits the following dependence on the parameters

$$\begin{aligned} C(c)\dot{x}(t, p) + G(v, c, \kappa)x(t, p) &= Bu(t), \\ y(t, p) &= Lx(t, p). \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: Layout of the anemometer.

The regular matrix C is diagonal, whereas the matrix G is sparse but asymmetric. The entries of C are affine functions of c and the entries of G represent polynomials up to degree two in the parameters. L selects the temperature difference between the two sensors. These matrices are directly obtained from [34]. More details on this example can be found in [20].

We replace the parameters $p = (v, c, \kappa)^\top$ by independent uniformly distributed random variables with 5% variation around the mean values $\langle v \rangle = 1$, $\langle c \rangle = \frac{1}{2}$, $\langle \kappa \rangle = \frac{3}{2}$. In the PC expansions, we use all multivariate Legendre polynomials up to degree two, i.e., $M = 10$ basis functions appear. Thus the coupled system (6) owns the dimension $MN = 290,080$.

In each MOR, we consider moment matching at the expansion point $s_0 = i\omega_0$ with $\omega_0 = 1$ and apply the Arnoldi algorithm. The coupled system (6) is reduced to dimension 500. Each original system (1) is decreased to size $N_{\text{red}} = 100$. In the matrix sampling from Sect. 3.2.1, we apply a three-dimensional Gauss-Legendre quadrature with 27 nodes. In the pMOR approach from Sect. 3.2.2, the expected value for p is chosen to provide a reference realization. For the SVD variant, we apply the grid of the Gaussian quadrature again and choose the dimension $R = 150$.

In each approach, we obtain approximations for the coefficients of the PC expansions of the transfer function. For a rough comparison of the accuracy in each method, the expected value and the standard deviation of the transfer function is reconstructed by the coefficients separately for real part and imaginary part. As a reference solution,




Figure 2: Expected value of the transfer function for the anemometer.

Table 3: Maximum differences of approximations to reference solution in the frequency interval $\omega \in [10^{-2}, 10^6]$ for the anemometer.

	real/ex.v.	imag./ex.v.	real/st.d.	imag./st.d.
MOR after SG	2.5e-02	2.5e-02	2.45e-01	2.62e-01
matrix sampling	2.0e-02	2.1e-02	1.6e-02	1.7e-02
pMOR (a)	3.1e-02	2.4e-02	9.25e-01	7.44e-01
pMOR (b)	5.6e-02	3.7e-02	7.10e-01	4.36e-01

these statistics of the transfer function are evaluated without reduction using a three-dimensional Gauss-Legendre quadrature with 125 nodes. We consider the frequency interval $\omega \in [10^{-2}, 10^6]$ only, since the transfer function is constant outside this domain for each realization of the parameters.

Table 3 shows the maximum differences of the approximations to the reference solution. Fig. 2 depicts the expected value just for the reference solution, since the other methods produce almost the same result. For the standard deviation, larger differences appear, which are illustrated by Fig. 3. However, the matrix sampling approach coincides with the reference solution again except for small differences, which appear far from the expansion point. Thus the matrix sampling is superior in this test example.

We present some more results on the pMOR method of Sect. 3.2.2




Figure 3: Standard deviation of the transfer function for the anemometer: reference solution (solid), MOR after SG (dashed), matrix sampling (dash-dotted), pMOR (a) (solid-circles) and (b) (dotted).

involving the SVD. Fig. 4 shows the computed singular values as a decreasing sequence. We observe a rapid decay of the singular values after the first $N_{\text{red}} = 100$ numbers, which indicates a high potential for reduction.

4.2 RLC circuit

We apply a linear electric network from [25] shown in Fig. 5. This circuit consists in a repetition of N_{cell} cells and contains N_{cell} capacitances, $N_{\text{cell}} - 1$ inductances, N_{cell} conductances as well as two additional conductances at the boundaries. A voltage source yields the input signal and the current through this source represents the output signal. The modified nodal analysis, see [16], generates an SISO system (1) consisting of DAEs with index one. Therein, the matrices $C(p), G(p)$ are affine functions with respect to the physical parameters. The dimension of the state space becomes $N = 2N_{\text{cell}} + 1$.

We choose $N_{\text{cell}} = 10$ and substitute all physical parameters by random variables except for the two boundary conductances. Thus $Q = 29$ random parameters are involved, where we arrange independent uniform distributions with variations of 10% around the mean values 10^{-9} for capacitances, 10^{-6} for inductances and unity for con-




Figure 4: Singular values appearing in pMOR for anemometer: all values (left) and zoom (right).




Figure 5: Diagramme of RLC circuit.

ductances. In the PC expansions, all multivariate Legendre polynomials up to degree two are used resulting in $M = 465$ basis functions. Hence the SG method produces a coupled system (6) with $MN = 9,765$ equations. The involved matrices \hat{C}, \hat{G} can be calculated analytically.

In each MOR approach, the expansion point $s_0 = i\omega_0$ with $\omega_0 = 10^6$ is used. The method from Sect. 3.1 reduces the system (6) to a system of just 40 equations. For the techniques from Sect. 3.2, the potential for an MOR of the system (1) is low now, since a relatively small dimension of the state space occurs. We select $N_{\text{red}} = 10$, which implies reduced systems of size $MN_{\text{red}} = 4,650$ at the end. The Stroud quadrature of order 3, see [28], yields the matrix sampling. Therein, $K = 58$ nodes are located in the parameter space. For the first pMOR method, the expected value gives us the reference parameter again. For the second pMOR method, we reapply the grid from the Stroud quadrature. While all systems (1) are reduced to the dimension $N_{\text{red}} = 10$, the 12 dominating directions are selected from the SVD. For comparison, we calculate reference solutions without reductions using the Stroud quadrature of order 5, see [28], where 1,683 nodes occur in the 29-dimensional parameter space.

We compare the statistics of the transfer functions for each reduction in the large frequency interval $\omega \in [1, 10^{15}]$. Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 illustrate the expected values and the standard deviations, respectively. We recognize a good agreement of all methods around the expansion point and for smaller frequencies. The matrix sampling technique produces bad approximations for the variance at higher frequencies. We also analyze the differences for the separate complex-valued components of the transfer function in the smaller frequency interval $\omega \in [10^5, 10^7]$ around the expansion point. The absolute values of the maximum differences are shown in Table 4, where the maximum is taken both in the frequency domain and in each group of the components with respect to the degree of the associated basis polynomials. Now the matrix sampling features the best approximations. However, the reduced system of the matrix sampling is much larger than the reduced system from the technique of Sect. 3.1. The agreement of the differences for the pMOR approaches and the MOR after SG reflects that the pMOR can be seen as a special case of this technique due to (19).

We also present the singular values of the second pMOR approach in Fig. 8. Since the dimension of the state space is low, the number of




Figure 6: Expected value of the transfer function for the RLC circuit: reference solution (solid), MOR after SG (dashed), matrix sampling (dash-dotted), pMOR (a) (solid-circles) and (b) (dotted).




Figure 7: Standard deviation of the transfer function for the RLC circuit: reference solution (solid), MOR after SG (dashed), matrix sampling (dash-dotted), pMOR (a) (solid-circles) and (b) (dotted).

Table 4: Maximum differences of approximations to reference solution for the PC coefficients of the transfer function in the frequency interval $\omega \in [10^5, 10^7]$ for the RLC circuit.

	degree zero	degree one	degree two
MOR after SG	1.4606e-03	5.3744e-05	1.3181e-03
matrix sampling	1.8314e-06	3.1944e-05	8.8125e-04
pMOR (a)	1.4735e-03	5.1020e-02	1.3180e-03
pMOR (b)	1.4887e-03	5.1031e-02	1.3181e-03




Figure 8: Singular values appearing in pMOR of RLC circuit.

singular values is equal to N now due to $N < KN_{\text{red}}$. The values do not decline rapidly after the first $N_{\text{red}} = 10$ entries, which indicates a low potential for reduction in this method. Nevertheless, the choice of $R = 12$ dominant directions yields much better approximations than the first pMOR variant with just a reference parameter for frequencies up to $\omega \approx 10^{11}$.

5 Conclusions

We investigated MOR methods to resolve stochastic models consisting of linear dynamical systems with random parameters. The reduction of the larger dynamical system from a stochastic Galerkin method, which was already used in the literature, has been analyzed

more detailed. Moreover, we considered an MOR of the original dynamical systems followed by the stochastic Galerkin technique as a novel alternative. A respective matrix sampling approach was shown to be feasible in case of moment matching using the Arnoldi algorithm. In addition, we examined parameterized MOR in this context, which enables a further variant. Numerical simulations of test examples demonstrate that all discussed approaches produce reasonable approximations. In particular, the matrix sampling variant offers a high accuracy, whereas the computational effort is relatively low. Parameters that affect the geometry and thus discretizations have not been discussed in this work. We restrict ourselves to refer to [9, 27].

Acknowledgements

The second author acknowledges the financial support from the ENIAC JU Artemos Project /2010/SP2/Wireless communication; Project reference 270683-2, "*Agile Rf Transceivers and front-Ends for future smart Multi-standard cOmmunications applications*", website <http://www.artemos.eu>.

The authors thank Dr. Ulrike Baur (MPI, Magdeburg) for helpful discussions on the anemometer example as well as Dr. Michael Striebel (ZF Lenksysteme GmbH, Schwäbisch Gmünd) for the MATLAB code of the RLC circuit example.

References

- [1] A.C. Antoulas: Approximation of Large-Scale Dynamical Systems. SIAM, Philadelphia, 2005.
- [2] F. Augustin, A. Gilg, M. Paffrath, P. Rentrop, U. Wever: Polynomial chaos for the approximation of uncertainties: chances and limits. Euro. Jnl. of Applied Mathematics 19, 149–190.
- [3] U. Baur, C. Beattie, P. Benner, S. Gugercin: Interpolatory projection methods for parameterized model reduction. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 33 (2011), 2489–2518.
- [4] P. Benner, L. Feng: A robust algorithm for parametric model order reduction based on implicit moment matching. In: A. Quarteroni, G. Rozza (eds.): Reduced Order Methods for Modeling and Computational Reduction, Series MS&A (Modeling, Simulation and Applications), Vol. 9, Ch.6, Springer, Berlin, Germany (2014).
- [5] P. Benner, M. Hinze, E.J.W. ter Maten (eds.): Model Reduction for Circuit Simulation. Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering, Vol. 74. Springer, Berlin, Germany (2011).
- [6] B.N. Bond, L. Daniel: A piecewise-linear moment-matching approach to parameterized model-order reduction for highly nonlinear systems. IEEE Trans. on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems 26:12 (2007), 2116–2129.
- [7] P. Conrad, Y. Marzouk: Adaptive Smolyak pseudospectral approximations. 2012. in: arXiv.
- [8] A. Doostan, H. Owhadi, A. Lashgari, G. Iaccarino: Non-adapted sparse approximation of PDEs with stochastic inputs. Center for Turbulence Research, Annual Research Briefs (2009).
- [9] M. Drohmann, B. Haasdonk, M. Ohlberger: Reduced basis method for finite volume approximation of evolution equations on parameterized geometries. Proc. of Algoritmy 2009, 1–10.
- [10] M. Eigel, C. Gittelsohn, Ch. Schwab, E. Zander: Adaptive stochastic Galerkin FEM. Research Report No. 2013-01, Seminar für Angewandte Mathematik, ETH Zürich, Switzerland (2013).
- [11] O.G. Ernst, A. Mugler, H.J. Starkloff, E. Ullmann: On the convergence of generalized polynomial chaos expansions. ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis 46 (2012), 317–339.

- [12] L. Feng, E. Rudnyi, J. Korvink: Preserving the film coefficient as a parameter in the compact thermal model for fast electro-thermal simulation. *IEEE Trans. Comput.-Aided Design Integr. Circuits Syst.* 24:12 (2005), 1838–1847.
- [13] J. Fernández Villena, L.M. Silveira: SPARE - a scalable algorithm for passive, structure preserving, parameter-aware model order reduction. *IEEE Trans. on CAD of Integrated Circuits and Systems* 29:6 (2010), 925–938.
- [14] R. Freund: Model reduction methods based on Krylov subspaces. *Acta Numerica* 12 (2003), 267–319.
- [15] R.G. Ghanem, P. Spanos: *Stochastic Finite Elements: A Spectral Approach*. Springer, New York, 1991.
- [16] M. Günther, U. Feldmann: CAD based electric circuit modeling in industry I: mathematical structure and index of network equations. *Surv. Math. Ind.* 8 (1999), 97–129.
- [17] E. Hairer, G. Wanner: *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations. Vol. 2: Stiff and Differential-Algebraic Equations*. 2nd ed., Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- [18] P. Li, F. Liu, X. Li, L. Pileggi, S. Nassif: Modeling interconnect variability using efficient parametric model order reduction. *Proc. of Design Automation and Test In Europe Conference (DATE) 2005*, pp. 958–963.
- [19] N. Mi, S.X.-D. Tan, P. Liu, J. Cui, Y. Cai, X. Hong: Stochastic extended Krylov subspace method for variational analysis of on-chip power grid networks. In: *Proc. ICCAD 2007*, pp.48–53.
- [20] C. Moosmann, E.B. Rudnyi, A. Greiner, J.G. Korvink: Model order reduction for linear convective thermal flow. In: *THERMINIC 2004*, Sophia Antipolis, France, 2004, pp. 317–321.
- [21] R. Pulch: Modelling and simulation of autonomous oscillators with random parameters. *Math. Comput. Simulat.* 81 (2011), 1128–1143.
- [22] R. Pulch: Polynomial chaos for linear differential algebraic equations with random parameters. *Int. J. Uncertainty Quantification* 1:3, 223–240.
- [23] R. Pulch: Polynomial chaos for semi-explicit differential algebraic equations of index 1. *Int. J. Uncertainty Quantification* 3:1 (2013) 1–23.

- [24] R. Pulch, E.J.W. ter Maten, F. Augustin: Sensitivity analysis and model order reduction for random linear dynamical systems. Preprint IMACM 13/07, Bergische Universität Wuppertal (2013).
- [25] M. Saadvandi: Passivity Preserving Model Reduction and Selection of Spectral Zeros. Master Thesis, KTH, Stockholm, 2008.
- [26] W.H.A. Schilders, M.A. van der Vorst, J. Rommes (eds.), Model Order Reduction: Theory, Research Aspects and Applications, Math. in Industry Vol. 13, Springer, 2008.
- [27] K.K. Stavrakakis, Model order reduction methods for parameterized systems in electromagnetic field simulations. PhD-Thesis, TU-Darmstadt (2012).
- [28] A. Stroud, Approximate Calculation of Multiple Integrals, Prentice Hall, 1971.
- [29] T. Voß, A. Verhoeven, T. Bechtold, E.J.W. ter Maten: Model order reduction for nonlinear differential algebraic equations in circuit simulation. In: L.L. Bonilla, M. Moscoso, G. Platero, J.M. Vega (eds.): Progress in Industrial Mathematics at ECMI 2006. Mathematics in Industry Vol. 12, Springer, 2007, pp. 518–523.
- [30] D. Xiu, G.E. Karniadakis: The Wiener-Askey polynomial chaos for stochastic differential equations. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 24 (2002) 2, 619–644.
- [31] D. Xiu, J.S. Hesthaven: High order collocation methods for differential equations with random inputs. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 27 (2005) 3, 1118–1139.
- [32] D. Xiu: Numerical methods for stochastic computations: a spectral method approach. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- [33] Y. Zou, Y. Cai, Q. Zhou, X. Hong, S.X.-D. Tan, L. Kang: Practical implementation of the stochastic parameterized model order reduction via Hermite polynomial chaos. In: Proc. ASP-DAC 2007, 367–372.
- [34] <http://morwiki.mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de>

PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS IN THIS SERIES:

Number	Author(s)	Title	Month
13-27	B. Besselink A. Lutowska U. Tabak N. van de Wouw H. Nijmeijer M.E. Hochstenbach W.H.A. Schilders D.J. Rixen	A comparison of model reduction techniques from structural dynamics, numerical mathematics and systems and control	Nov. '13
13-28	M.E. Hochstenbach S. Noschese L. Reichel	Fractional regularization matrices for linear discrete ill-posed problems	Nov. '13
13-29	J.H.M. ten Thije Boonkkamp L. Liu J. van Dijk K.S.C. Peerenboom	Harmonic complete flux schemes for conservation laws with discontinuous coefficients	Nov. '13
13-30	R. Pulch E.J.W. ter Maten F. Augustin	Sensitivity analysis of linear dynamical systems in uncertainty quantification	Nov. '13
13-31	R. Pulch E.J.W. ter Maten	Stochastic Galerkin methods and model order reduction for linear dynamical systems	Nov. '13