



# LUND UNIVERSITY

## Certainty Equivalence and An Identification Problem from Econometry

Sternby, Jan

1978

*Document Version:*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Sternby, J. (1978). *Certainty Equivalence and An Identification Problem from Econometry*. (Technical Reports TFRT-7144). Department of Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology (LTH).

*Total number of authors:*

1

### General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117  
221 00 Lund  
+46 46-222 00 00



CERTAINTY EQUIVALENCE AND AN IDENTIFICATION  
PROBLEM FROM ECONOMETRY

JAN STERNBY

Department of Automatic Control  
Lund Institute of Technology  
June 1978

Dokumentutgivare  
Lund Institute of Technology  
Handläggare Dept of Automatic Control  
Jan Sternby  
Författare  
Jan Sternby

Dokumentnamn  
REPORT  
Utgivningsdatum  
June 1978

Dokumentbeteckning  
LUTFD2/(TFRT-7144)/1-5/(1978)  
Ärendebeteckning  
STU 76-3804

10T4

Dokumenttitel och undertitel

1810

Certainty Equivalence and an Identification Problem from Econometry.

Referat (sammandrag)

2510

An econometric model from Anderson and Taylor(1976) is considered. It is shown that with certainty equivalence control of such a simplified system, the parameter identification will not work.

This work was supported by the Swedish Board for Technical Development under contract No. 76-3804.

Referat skrivet av

Author

Förslag till ytterligare nyckelord

4410

Klassifikationssystem och -klass(er)

5010

Indextermer (ange källa)

5210

Omfång

5 pages

Språk

English

Sekretessuppgifter

5010

Övriga bibliografiska uppgifter

5612

ISSN

60T4

ISBN

5016

Dokumentet kan erhållas från

Department of Automatic Control  
Lund Institute of Technology  
P O Box 725, S-220 07 LUND 7, Sweden

Mottagarens uppgifter

62T4

Pris

5616

Blankett LU 11:25 1976-07

## INTRODUCTION

Models of economy tend to be large. One method of handling that problem is to study one equation at a time, and simplify the equations as much as possible. But as shown below, this may introduce artificial difficulties.

Anderson and Taylor(1976) consider an extremely simplified model under certainty equivalence control. They find that with this control law, the model parameters can not be estimated by least squares, but the control law converges to its desired value. This situation will now be analysed using the differential equation approach developed by Ljung(1977). It is shown why the parameter estimates do not, in general, converge to the true values, whereas the input does. However, the parameters can be made to converge if the model is slightly changed in a natural way.

## PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider the system

$$y(t) = b_1 u_1(t-1) + b_2 u_2(t-1) + e(t) \quad (1)$$

where  $\{e(t)\}$  is a sequence of independent random variables with zero mean and variance  $\sigma^2$ . The parameters  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  are constant, but unknown. Only one of the control variables is used for control of the system. The second input,  $u_2$ , is not considered to be available for control of (1). It may e.g. be designated for control of some other equation in a larger model.

The control objective is to keep the output close to a prescribed reference value  $y_r$ . To do so, the unknown parameters  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  must be estimated. This is done with a least squares estimator, and the estimates are denoted  $\hat{b}_1(t)$  and  $\hat{b}_2(t)$ . The certainty equivalence control rule then is

$$u_1(t) = \frac{y_r - \hat{b}_2(t)u_2(t)}{\hat{b}_1(t)} \quad (2)$$

Unfortunately, there is no feedback from the output in the control law (2). This is because the model (1) is very simplified. Normally, the output must also be allowed to depend on previous values of the output. This would then introduce feedback into the control law.

In the analysis it is assumed that  $u_2(t)$  is constant, i.e.  $u_2(t) = u_2$ . The effects of a time-varying  $u_2(t)$  will be discussed later on.

## ANALYSIS

### The estimation algorithm

To analyse the performance of the closed-loop system with least squares estimation, the ordinary differential equations approach of Ljung(1977) will be used. These ODEs describe the evolution of the parameter estimates, and equations for the recursive least squares estimator are needed in a special form. With

$$\theta = [b_1 \ b_2]^T$$

$$\varphi(t) = [u_1(t-1) \ u_2(t-1)]^T$$

the equations are

$$\hat{\theta}(t) = \hat{\theta}(t-1) + \frac{1}{t} \cdot R(t)^{-1} \varphi(t) \cdot [y(t) - \hat{\theta}(t-1)^T \varphi(t)] \quad (3)$$

$$R(t) = R(t-1) + \frac{1}{t} \cdot [\varphi(t) \varphi(t)^T - R(t-1) + \delta \cdot I] \quad (4)$$

The term  $\delta \cdot I$  of (4) is added here to ensure the invertibility of  $R(t)$ . In normal least squares estimation  $\delta=0$ , but  $\delta \neq 0$  may be used to avoid numerical difficulties. Equation (4) is normally written in terms of  $P(t) = [t \cdot R(t)]^{-1}$ , but the form (4) facilitates the analysis.

### The differential equations

According to Ljung(1977) the equations (3)-(4) can be associated with the differential equations

$$\dot{\underline{\theta}} = E \{ \underline{R}^{-1} \varphi(\tau) \cdot [y(\tau) - \underline{\theta}^T \varphi(\tau)] \}$$

$$\dot{\underline{R}} = E \{ \varphi(\tau) \varphi(\tau)^T - \underline{R} + \delta \cdot I \}$$

The expectations shall be evaluated for fixed values of  $\underline{\theta}$  and  $\underline{R}$  and with the input from (2)

$$\underline{u} = \frac{y_r - b_2 u_2}{b_1} \quad (5)$$

Also let

$$\underline{\varphi} = [ \underline{u}_1 \ u_2 ]^T \quad (6)$$

The only random variable is then  $y(\tau)$ , which contains  $e(\tau)$ . The differential equations are

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\hat{b}}_1 \\ \dot{\hat{b}}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \underline{R}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \underline{\varepsilon} \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{\underline{R}} = \underline{\varphi} \underline{\varphi}^T - \underline{R} + \delta \cdot \underline{I} \quad (8)$$

where

$$\underline{\varepsilon} = (b_1 - \hat{b}_1) \cdot u_1 + (b_2 - \hat{b}_2) \cdot u_2 \quad (9)$$

### Possible convergence points

In Ljung(1977) it is stated that the asymptotic behaviour of the identification algorithm is described by the solution to the differential equations (7)-(9). Only their stable stationary points are possible convergence points for the identification. With  $u_2 \neq 0$  the only possibility is then  $\varepsilon = 0$ . With  $u_1$  inserted this implies that the asymptotic estimates must satisfy ( $\hat{b}_1 \neq 0$ )

$$b_1(y_r - \hat{b}_2 u_2) = \hat{b}_1(y_r - b_2 u_2) \quad (10)$$

There is thus a whole line of stationary points of (7)-(9). The true values are fortunately on this line.

To check the stability, the ODEs (7)-(9) are linearized around these stationary points. The linearized system will have three eigenvalues in -1 (from equation (8)) and one in zero (with the eigenvector along the line of stationary points). The last eigenvalue will be

$$-\frac{b_1}{\hat{b}_1} (u_1^2 + u_1^2)$$

For this to be negative,  $b_1$  and its estimate must have the same sign. Since this is necessary for stability, the sign of  $b_1$  will always be correctly estimated.

The above analysis explains the identification problems encountered by Anderson and Taylor(1976). It is also possible to answer their question if  $\hat{b}_1$  will converge to  $b_1$  w.p.1. The analysis shows that it will not.

It should be noted that the input  $u_1$  will always converge to its desired value. From (10) it is obvious that

$$u_1 = \frac{y_r - \hat{b}_2 u_2}{\hat{b}_1} \rightarrow \frac{y_r - b_2 u_2}{b_1}$$

This agrees well with the findings of Anderson and Taylor. Thus, if the main concern is control, this method is probably good. But if the parameter estimates are wanted it cannot be used unchanged.

### Modifications

It was stated in the introduction that the difficulties arise from the over-simplified model. It is not easy to see why. The reason is, that the stationary points of (7) can be described by the simple equation  $\underline{\epsilon} = 0$  or (10). This in turn is caused by  $\varphi$  being a constant in the expectation defining the ODEs.

There are several ways to avoid the problem. They all assure a random  $\varphi$  in the expectation, either through  $u_1$  or  $u_2$  or both. In fact, they need not be random. It is sufficient if they change irregularly enough.

One possibility is to introduce dynamics in the model (1). This will make  $u_1$  a feedback controller. Another possibility is to make frequent changes of the reference value or of the input  $u_2$ .

### REFERENCES

- Anderson, T.W., Taylor, J.B.(1976): Some Experimental Results on the Statistical Properties of Least Squares Estimates in Control Problems. *Econometrica* 44, 1289-1302.
- Ljung, L.(1977): Analysis of Recursive Stochastic Algorithms. *IEEE Trans on Autom. Control* 22, 551-575.